

THE AGES DIGITAL LIBRARY
JOHN OWEN COLLECTION

THE WORKS OF
JOHN OWEN
VOLUME 16

by John Owen

Books For The Ages
AGES Software • Albany, OR USA
Version 1.0 © 2000

THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN

EDITED BY

WILLIAM H. GOOLD

VOLUME 16

This Edition of
THE WORKS OF JOHN OWEN
first published by Johnstone & Hunter, 1850-53

PUBLISHERS' NOTE

TO 1968 REPRINT OF VOLUME SIXTEEN

The Goold edition of John Owen's works originally comprised seventeen volumes, with an additional seven volumes containing Owen's *Exposition on the Epistle to the Hebrews*. The latter exposition is not being reprinted at present and the seventeen volumes have been reduced to sixteen by the omission of the author's Latin writings — these will be found listed on page 548 of this volume. Should his Latin works be subsequently translated and reprinted they would form an additional volume of approximately 600 pages.

Posthumous Sermons and *Three Discourses Suitable to the Lord's Supper*, which appeared as the only material in English in volume seventeen of Goold's edition, have been transferred to volume sixteen of this re-issue of John Owen's works.

CONTENTS

THE TRUE NATURE OF A GOSPEL CHURCH.

Prefatory Note By The Editor,

The Preface to the Reader,

1. — The subject-matter of the church,
2. — Of the formal cause of a particular church,
3. — Of the polity, rule, or discipline, of the church in general,
4. — The officers of the church,
5. — The especial duty of pastors of churches,
6. — Of the office of teachers in the church, or an inquiry into the state, condition, and work, of those called teachers in the Scripture,
7. — Of the rule of the church, or of ruling elders,
8. — The nature of church polity or rule, with the duty of elders,
9. — Of deacons,
10. — Of excommunication,
11. — Of the communion of churches,

A LETTER CONCERNING EXCOMMUNICATION.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

A Letter concerning the matter of the present Excommunications,

OF THE ADMINISTRATION OF CHURCH CENSURES.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

A Discourse concerning the Administration of Church Censures

AN ANSWER UNTO TWO QUESTIONS.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

Question First,

Question Second,

Twelve Arguments, etc.

OF MARRYING AFTER DIVORCE.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

Of Marrying after Divorce in case of Adultery,

OF INFANT BAPTISM AND DIPPING.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

Of Infant Baptism,

A Vindication of two passages in Irenaeus against the exceptions of Mr.
Tombs,

Of Dipping,

REFLECTIONS ON A SLANDEROUS LIBEL.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

Reflections on a Slandorous Libel

TREATISES CONCERNING THE SCRIPTURES.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

The Epistle Dedicatory,

OF THE DIVINE ORIGINAL OF THE SCRIPTURES.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

- 1.** — The divine original of the Scripture the sole foundation of its authority — The original of the Old Testament — The peculiar manner of the revelation of the word — The written word, as written, preserved by the providence of God — Cappellus' opinion about various lections considered — The Scripture not *ἰδίᾱς ἐπιλύσεως* — The true meaning of that expression — Entirely from God, to the least tittle — Of the Scriptures of the New Testament, and their peculiar prerogative,
- 2.** — The main question proposed to consideration — How we may know assuredly the Scripture to be the word of God — The Scripture to be received by divine faith — The authority of God the foundation —

The way whereby that authority is evidenced or made known — The various ways of God's revealing himself and his mind — 1. By his works; 2. By the light of nature; 3. By his word — All of these evince themselves to be from him, his word especially,

3. — Arguments of two sorts — Inartificial arguments, by way of testimony to the truth — To whom these arguments are valid — Of **ἡσυχαστική** — The rejection of a plea of **ἡσυχαστική**, wherein it consists — Of miracles, their efficacy to beget faith compared with the word,
4. — Innate arguments in the Scripture of its divine original and authority — Its self-evidencing efficacy — All *light* manifests itself — The Scripture light — Spiritual light evidential — Consecrations from the premises laid down — What the self-evidencing light of the Scripture peculiarly is — *Power* self-evidencing — The Scripture the power of God, and powerful — How this power exerts itself — The whole question resolved,
5. — Of the testimony of the Spirit — Traditions — Miracles,
6. — Consequential considerations, for the confirmation of the divine authority of the Scripture,

INTEGRITY AND PURITY OF THE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXT.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

1. — The occasion of this discourse — The danger of supposing corruptions in the originals of the Scripture — The great usefulness of the Biblia Polyglotta — The grounds of the ensuing animadversions — The assertions proposed to be vindicated laid down — Their weight and importance — Sundry principles in the Prolegomena, prejudicial to the truth contended for, laid down — Those principles formerly asserted by others — Reasons of the opposition made to them,
2. — Of the putty of the originals — The **ἀντίγραφα** of the Scripture lost — That of Moses, how and how long preserved — Of the book found by Hilkiah — Of the **ἀντίγραφα** of the New Testament — Of the first copies of the originals — The scribes of those copies not **ἡσυχαστοί** — What is ascribed to them — The great and

incomparable care of the scribes of it — The whole word of God, in every tittle of it, preserved entire in the copies of the original extant — Heads of arguments to that purpose — What various lections are granted in the original of the Old and New Testaments — Sundry considerations concerning them, manifesting them to be of no importance — That the Jews have not corrupted the text — The most probable instants considered,

3. — Of various lections in the Greek copies of the New Testament,
4. — General premises — Opinions prejudicial to the authority of the originals in the Prolegomena enumerate — The just consequences of these premises — Others ended in these opinion — Of Cappellus — Of Origen, Ximenes, Arias Montanus' editions of the Bible,
5. — The original of the points proposed to consideration in particular — The importance of the points to the right understanding of the Scriptural — The testimony of Morinus, Junius, Johannes Isaac, Cevallerius, and others — The use made by the Papists of the opinion of the novelty of the points — The importance of the points further manifested — The extreme danger of making the Hebrew punctuation arbitrary — That danger evinced by instance — No relief against that danger on the grounds of the opinion considered — The authors of the Hebrew punctuation according to the Prolegomena; who and what — Morinus' folly — The improbability of this pretense — The state of the Jews, the supposed inventors of the points, after the destruction of the temple — Two attempts made by them to restore their religion: the first under Barchochab, with its issue; the second under R. Judah with its issue — The rise and foundation of the Talmuds — The state of the Jews upon and after the writing of the Talmuds — Their rancor against Christ — Who the Tiberian Masoretes were, that are the supposed authors of the Hebrew punctuation; their description — That figment rejected — The late testimony of Dr Lightfoot to this purpose — The rise of the opinion of the novelty of the points — Of Elias Levita — The value of his testimony in this case — Of the validity of the testimony of the Jewish Rabbins — Some considerations about the antiquity of the points: the first, from the nature of the punctuation itself, in reference unto grammatical rules; [the second,] from the Chaldee paraphrase. and integrity of the Scripture as now pointed,

6. — Arguments for the novelty of the Hebrew points proposed to consideration — The argument from the Samaritan letters considered and answered — Of the copy of the law preserved in the synagogues without points — The testimony of Elias Levita and Aben Ezra considered — Of the silence of the Mishna, Talmud and Gemaru, about the points — Of the Keri and Ketib — Of the number of the points — Of the ancient translations, Greek, Chaldee, Syriac — Of Jerome — The new argument of Morinus in this cause — The concision, about the necessity of the points,
7. — Of the קֶרִי וְכֵתִיב, their nature and original — The differences is in the consonants — Morinus' vain charge on Arias Montaus — The senses of both consistent — Of the great congregation — The spring and rise of these various readings — The judgment of the Prolegomena about them — Their order given twice over in the Appendix — The rise assigned to them considered — Of Cappellus, his opinion, and the danger of it.
8. — Of gathering various lections by the help of translations — The proper use and benefit of translations — Their new pretended use — The state of the originals on this new pretense — Of the remedy tendered to the relief of that state — No copies of old differing in the learnt from those we now enjoy, inferred from the testimony of our Savior — No testimony, new or old, to that purpose — Requisites unto good translations — Of the translations in the Biblia Polyglotta — Of the Arabic — Of the Syriac — Of the Samaritan Pentateuch — Of the Chaldee Paraphrase — Of the Vulgar Latin — Of the Septuagint — Of the translations of the New Testament — Of the Persian — Of the Ethiopian — The value of these translations as to the work in hand — Of the supposition of gross corruption in the originals — Of various lections out of Grotius — Of the Appendix in general,

POSTHUMOUS SERMONS.

Prefatory Note by the Editor,

1. — The furnace of divine wrath. — ³⁵²⁷Ezekiel 22:17-22,
2. — The wisdom of making the Lord our refuge. — ³⁴⁴⁰Psalms 14:6,

3. — Faith's answer to divine reproofs. — Habakkuk 2:1-4,
4. — Spiritual strength; — its reality, decay, and renovation. ^{<2481>}Isaiah 40:31,
5. — Holiness urged from the liability of all things to dissolution. — ^{<681>}2 Peter 3:11,
6. — The obligation to increase in godliness. — 1 Thessalonians 4:1.
7. — Perilous Times. — ^{<581>}2 Timothy 3:1-5,
8. — The mutual care, of believers over one another — ^{<405>}Ephesians 4:15, 16,
9. — National sins and national judgments. — ^{<248>}Isaiah 3:8, 9,
10. — The death of the righteous, — ^{<250>}Isaiah 57:1, 2,
11. — The humiliation and condescension of christ. — ^{<445>}Philippians 2:5-8,
12. — Enoch's walk with God. — ^{<1054>}Genesis 5:24,
13. — A fast sermon: — Christian duties under the hidings of God's face. — ^{<2487>}Isaiah 8:17,

THREE DISCOURSES SUITABLE TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

THE TRUE NATURE
OF
A GOSPEL CHURCH AND ITS
GOVERNMENT.

[THE SECOND PART.]

WHEREIN THESE FOLLOWING PARTICULARS ARE
DISTINCTLY HANDLED: —

1. THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE CHURCH.
2. THE FORMAL CAUSE OF A PARTICULAR CHURCH.
3. OF THE POLITY, RULE, OR DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH IN GENERAL,
4. THE OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH.
5. THE DUTY OF PASTORS OF CHURCHES.
6. THE OFFICE OF TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH.
7. OF THE RULE OF THE CHURCH, OR OF RULING ELDERS.
8. THE NATURE OF CHURCH POLITY OR RULE, WITH THE DUTY OF ELDERS.
9. OF DEACONS.
10. OF EXCOMMUNICATION.
11. OF THE COMMUNION OF CHURCHES.

PREFATORY NOTE.

On the ground of some statements in the following treatise, which was published in 1889, it has been gravely argued that the author returned to the Presbyterianism of his early days before he died. In the “Inquiry concerning Evangelical Churches,” (see vol. 15), which forms the first part of this work, Owen states that he would “neither examine nor oppose the opinion” in favor of “a national church-state, arising from an association of the officers of particular churches, in several degrees, which they call *classical* and *provincial*.” — P. 262. He declares, in his answer to Stillingfleet, that had the Presbyterian government been established at the Restoration “without a rigorous imposition of every thing supposed by any to belong thereto,” Presbyterians and Independents “would have been both to blame” if they had continued in a state of separation from each other. “If it shall be asked, then,” he proceeds, “why they did not formerly agree in the Assembly? I answer, —

(1.) I was none of them, and cannot tell;

(2.) They did agree in my judgment well enough, if they could have thought so; and further I am not concerned in the difference.” — P. 433. The author of the anonymous memoir prefixed to Marshall’s edition of his Sermons remarks, “He was of so healing a temper, that I heard him say before a person of quality and others, that he could readily join with Presbytery as it was exercised in Scotland.” In his MSS. *Analecta*, under date 1716, the historian Wodrow records the following statement: — “Mr George Redpath told me two or three years ago, when in Edinburgh, that he visited Dr Owen on his deathbed, and Presbytery and Episcopacy came to be discoursed of; and the Doctor said how he had seen his mistake as to the Independent way, and declared to him a day or two before his death, that, after his utmost search into the Scriptures and antiquity, he was now satisfied that Presbytery was the way Christ had appointed in his new testament church.” If we add, that on the subject of the ruling elder (see chapter 7 of the following treatise) the views of Owen are in perfect harmony with Presbyterianism, and that, under certain qualifications, he contends for the lawfulness and authority of synods, we exhaust the

evidence that in his last days he was more of a Presbyterian than an Independent.

Mr Orme admits that “he seems to contend for a distinct office of ruling elder, or for elders who are called to rule and not to teach;” but he argues that it was a view which could not be reconciled with his other sentiments, and that it differs from the Presbyterian scheme, according to which pastor and elder “are offices so distinct that the ministers alone are considered as mere pastors, and the elders as mere laymen.” But Presbyterians really do not hold that elders are laymen, or that there is any difference in respect of *office* between the minister and ruling elder, although their functions vary, *rule* being common to both, while *teaching*, is the duty of the pastor; and on this point Owen was no more chargeable with inconsistency as an Independent than other eminent men of the same denomination, — Thomas Hooker, Cotton Mather, and Timothy Dwight, — who contend for the office of the ruling elder. Some Presbyterians would homologate implicitly the exposition which our author gives of the nature and objects of synodical action; but here his agreement with Presbyterian principles is, on the whole, not so clear and decided as in the case of the ruling elder. He objects to synods determining articles of faith, and issuing orders and decrees on their own authority; but asserts their “authority” to declare the mind of God from the Scripture in doctrine or give counsel as unto practice.” There is nothing in this view from which Presbyterians would dissent.

That he should differ from both parties on some points is not surprising when we mark how carefully he has thought out his own views, from Scripture, giving a freshness and originality of coloring to his treatises on church-government which render them to the present day peculiarly interesting and worthy of consultation. It is only, however, by a process of torture to which no man’s language should be subjected that Owen can be claimed as a Presbyterian. We may gladly accept his decision on some points, — not as confirming Presbyterianism so much as affording room for the hope that, on matters of polity, evangelical churches may yet be united in common action and under the same forms. But the opinions, of Owen can only be understood by reading the former part of this treatise in Connection with this which follows, and “which,” says Chauncey, “he esteemed as his legacy to the church of Christ.” In the latter part there is

no recantation of the principle so copiously urged in the former, that “the visible church-state winch Christ hath instituted under the new testament consists in an especial society or congregation of professed, believers;” and that for two hundred years after Christ there is no mention “of any other organical, visibly professing church, but only that which is parochial or congregational.” That Owen might deem it possible to accomplish and secure all the ends of congregational duty under the system of Presbytery may be true; but that, in regard to the spirit and substance of the ecclesiastical system for which he pleaded, he was a Congregationalist, it would be hardihood to question. To the story of Redpath must be opposed the assertion of Chauncey, by whom this treatise was edited, that it was corrected by Owen immediately before his death. Had he undergone a change of view so complete as is represented, he was not the man to quit the world in a spirit of dishonorable reticence, but would have frankly avowed to what extent his previous convictions had been modified or abandoned.

Edmund Blys, son of a clergyman in Devonshire, author of some Latin productions in prose and poetry, replied to this work in 1690, by the publication of “Animadversions upon some passages in a book entitled ‘The True Nature of a Gospel Church, etc.’” — ED.

THE PREFACE TO THE READER.

THE church of Christ, according as it is represented unto us, or described by the Holy Spirit of God, in the Old and New Testament, hath but a twofold consideration, — as catholic and mystical, or as visible and organized in particular congregations. The catholic church is the whole mystical body of Christ, consisting of all the elect which are purchased and redeemed by his blood, whether already called or uncalled, militant or triumphant; and this is the church that God gave him to be head unto, which is his body and his fullness, and, by union with him, Christ mystical, ⁴¹¹¹Ephesians 2:23; and this is that **πανήγυρις** (the only word most fully expressing the catholic church used in Scripture),

“the church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven;”

⁴¹²²Hebrews 12:23,

that is, in the Lamb’s book of life; and they shall all appear one day gathered together to their Head, in the perfection and fullness of the New Jerusalem state, where they will make a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing, but holy and without blemish. The day of grace which the saints have passed in the respective ages of the church was but the day of its espousals, wherein the bride hath made herself ready; but then will be her full married state unto Christ, then will be the perfection not only of every particular member of Christ, but of the whole body of Christ, called “a perfect man,” and “the measure of the stature of the fullness of Christ,” to which we are called, edifying and building up by the ministry and ordinances of Christ, whilst we are “in via,” in our passage unto this country, a city with a more durable fixed foundation, which we seek.

In order, therefore, unto the completing this great and mystical body, Christ hath his particular visible churches and assemblies in this world; wherein he hath ordained ordinances and appointed officers for the forementioned glorious ends and purposes.

There is no other sort of visible church of Christ organized, the subject of the aforesaid institutions spoken of, but a particular church or congregation (either in the Old or New Testament), where all the members

thereof do ordinarily meet together in one place to hold communion one with another in some one or more great ordinances of Christ. The first churches were economic, when the worship of God was solemnly performed in the large families of the antediluvian and postdiluvian patriarchs, where, no doubt, all frequently assembled to the sacrifices as then offered, and other parts of worship then in use.

After the descent of a numerous progeny from Abraham's loins, God takes them to himself in one visible body, a national but congregational church, into which he forms them four hundred and thirty years after the promise, in the wilderness; and although all Abraham's natural posterity, according to the external part of the promise made to him, were taken into visible church fellowship, so that it became a national church, yet it was such a national church always, in the wilderness and in the Holy Land, as was congregational, for it was but one congregation during the tabernacle or temple state, first or second. They were always bound to assemble at the tabernacle or temple thrice at least every year; hence the tabernacle was still called "The tabernacle of the congregation." They were to have but one altar for burnt-offerings and sacrifices; what others were at any time elsewhere, called "high places," were condemned by God as sin.

Lastly, When Christ had divorced this people, abolished their Mosaical constitution by breaking their staff of *beauty* and their staff of *bands*, he erects his gospel church, calls in disciples by his ministry, forms them into a body, furnisheth them with officers and ordinances, and after he had suffered, rose again, and continued here forty days, — in which time he frequently appeared to them and acquainted them with his will, — ascends unto his Father, sends his Spirit in a plentiful manner at Pentecost, whereby most of them were furnished with all necessary miraculous gifts, to the promoting the glory and interest of Christ among Jews and Gentiles.

Hence the whole evangelical ministry was first placed in the church of Jerusalem (so far as extraordinary, or such a part of it as was [not] to descend to churches of after ages); neither were they placed as abiding or standing officers in any other church, as we find. In this church they acted as the elders thereof; and from this church they were, it is very likely, solemnly sent, by fasting and prayer, to the exercise of their apostolic function in preaching, healing, and working miracles, gathering churches,

and settling officers in them, even so as Paul and Barnabas were sent forth by the church of Antioch.

Their distinguishing apostolic office and charge (from which the evangelist differed but little) was to take care of all the churches, — not to sit down as standing pastors to all or any particular congregation, but at the first planting to gather, to direct, and confirm them, in practice of their doctrine, fellowship, breaking of bread, and in prayer. Wherefore this apostolic care committed to them proves nothing either of the catholic authority claimed by an oecumenic pastor, or that charge of many congregations claimed by diocesan bishops.

Whence it is most evident that all church-officers, so far as they had any pastoral or episcopal office, were given to a particular congregation as the *πρῶτον δεκτικόν*. We read of no pastors of many congregations, nor of any church made up of many congregations, to which officers were annexed, nor of any representative church, as some would have.

That apostolic power did descend to successors we utterly deny, it being not derivable; for none after them could say they had been eye-witnesses of our Lord before or after his resurrection, none since so qualified by an extraordinary measure of the Spirit for preaching and working miracles, and none but the pope challenges such an extensive care for and power over all churches. That which descends from them to the ordinary ministry is a commission to preach and baptize: and why not to head, it being always, in the commission that Christ gave, a pastoral relation or presbytership which was included in their apostleship, and exercised toward the church of Jerusalem? Such presbytership John and Peter both had. Hence there remains no other successors “jure” to the apostles but ordinary pastors and teachers.

These are relative officers, and are always in and to some particular congregations; we know of no catholic visible church that any pastors are ordained to.

1. The Scripture speaks of no church as catholic visible.
2. The thing itself is but a chimera of some men’s brains, it is not “in rerum natura;” for if a catholic visible church be all the churches that I see at a time, I am not capable of seeing many more than what can assemble in

one place. And if it be meant of all the churches actually in being, how are they visible to me? where can they be seen in one place? I may as well call all the cities and corporations in the world the catholic visible city or corporation, which all rational men would call nonsense. Besides, if all organized churches could be got together, it is not catholic in respect of saints militant, much less of triumphant; for many are no church members that are Christ's members, and many visible members are no true members of Christ Jesus. Where is any such church capable of communion in all ordinances in one place? and the Scripture speaks of no other organized visible church.

Again: to a catholic visible church constituted should be a catholic visible pastor or pastors; for as the church is, such is the pastor and officers. To the mystical church Christ is the mystical head and pastor; he is called "The chief Pastor," ¹1 Peter 5:4; and "The Shepherd of our souls," chap. ²2:25. Hence the uncalled are his sheep, as ³John 10:16. But to all visible churches Christ hath appointed a visible pastor or pastors; and where is the pastor of the catholic visible church? he is not to be found, unless it suffice us to take him from Rome. To say that all individual pastors are pastors to the catholic church is either to say that they are invested with as much pastoral power and charge in one church as in another, and then they are indefinite pastors, and therefore all pastors have mutual power in each other's churches; and so John may come into Thomas' church and exercise all parts of jurisdiction there, and Thomas into John's; or a minister to the catholic church hath an universal catholic power over the catholic church, — if so, the power and charge which every ordinary pastor hath is apostolic; or, lastly, he is invested with an arbitrary power, at least as to the taking up a particular charge where he pleaseth, with a "non obstante" to the suffrages of the people, for if he hath an office whereby he is equally related to all churches, it is at his liberty, by virtue of this office, to take [himself] where he pleaseth.

But every church-officer under Christ is a visible relate, and the correlate must be such, whence the church must be visible to which he is an officer. It is absurd to say a man is a visible husband to an invisible wife; the relate and correlate must be "ejusdem naturae." It is true, Christ is related to the church as mystical head, but it is in respect of the church in its mystical nature, for Christ hath substituted no mystical officers in his church.

There is a great deal of difference between the mystical and external visible church, though the latter is founded upon it and for the sake of it. It is founded upon it as taking its true spiritual original from it, deriving vital spirits from it by a mystical union to and communion with Christ and his members; — and it is for the sake of it; all external visible assemblies, ministers, ordinances, are for the sake of the mystical body of Christ, for calling in the elect, and the edifying of them to that full measure of stature they are designed unto.

But the different consideration lies in these things, —

That the mystical church doth never fail, neither is diminished by any shocks of temptation or suffering that, in their visible profession, any of them undergo; whereas visible churches are often broken, scattered, yea, unchurched, and many members fall of the grace of God by final apostasy. Likewise Christ's mystical church is many times preserved in that state only, or mostly, when Christ hath not a visible organized church, according to institution, to be found on the face of the earth. So it was with his church often under the old testament dispensation: as in Egypt; in the days of the judges, when the ark was carried away by the Philistines; in the days of Manasseh and other wicked kings; and especially in Babylon. In such times the faithful ones were preserved without the true sacrifices, the teaching priest, and the law. So hath it been in the days of the new testament, in divers places, under the draconic heathen persecutions, and afterward in the wilderness state of the church, under the antichristian usurpations and false worship. Which mystical state is the place prepared of God to hide the seed of the woman in from the dragon's rage for the space of one thousand two hundred and sixty days.

Again: unto this mystical church is only essentially necessary a mystical union unto the Lord Jesus Christ, by the gift of the Father, acceptation and covenant-undertaking of the Son: the powerful and efficacious work of the Spirit of the Father and the Son working true saving faith in the Lord Jesus Christ, and sincere love to him and all his true members; whereby, as they have a firm and unshaken union, so they have a spiritual communion, though without those desirable enjoyments of external church privileges and means of grace which they are providentially often hindered from, visible churches being but Christ's tents and tabernacles, which he

sometimes setteth up and sometimes takes down and removes at his pleasure, as he sees best for his glory in the world.

But of these he hath a special regard, as to their foundation, matter, constitution, and order. He gives forth an exact pattern from mount Zion, as of that typical tabernacle from mount Sinai of old.

1. The foundation part of a visible church is the credible profession of faith and holiness, wherein the Lord Jesus Christ is the corner-stone, ~~ⲉⲩⲙⲉ~~ Ephesians 2:20; ~~ⲉⲩⲙⲉ~~ Matthew 16:18. This profession is the foundation, but not the church itself. It is not articles of faith, or profession of them in Particular individual persons, that make an organized visible church. We are the “household of faith, built upon the foundation,” etc.

2. It is men and women, not doctrine, that are the matter of a church, and these professing the faith and practicing holiness. The members of churches are always called in the New Testament, “saints, faithful, believers.” They were such that were added to the churches. Neither is every believer so, as such, but as a professing believer; for a man must appear to be fit matter of a visible church before he can challenge church privileges or they can be allowed him.

3. It is not many professing believers that make a particular church; for though they are fit matter for a church, yet they have not the form of a church without a mutual agreement and combination (explicit, or at least implicit), whereby they become, by virtue of Christ’s charter, a spiritual corporation, and are called a” city, household, house,” being united together by joints and bands, not only by internal bonds of the Spirit, but external. The bonds of union must be visible, as the house is by profession.

This is a society that Christ hath given power to, to choose a pastor and other officers of Christ’s institution, and enjoy all ordinances, the word, sacraments, and prayer, as Christ hath appointed.

Hence a visible church must needs be a separate congregation; separation is a proper and inseparable adjunct thereof. The apostle speaks of church-member-ship, ~~ⲉⲩⲙⲉ~~ 2 Corinthians 6:14, “Be not unequally yoked together,” ~~ⲉⲩⲙⲉ~~ **ἑτεροζυγοῦντες**, yoked with those of another kind (the ploughing with an ox and ass together being forbidden under the law), “with unbelievers,”

ἀπίστοις, — that is, visible unbelievers of any sort or kind: “for what participation, μετοχή, hath righteousness with unrighteousness? what κοινωνία, communion or fellowship, hath light with darkness. Verse 15, Τίς δὲ συμφώνησις, What harmony hath Christ with Belial?” men of corrupt lives and conversation; “or what part μερὶς πιστῷ μετὰ ἀπίστου, hath a believer;” that is, a visible believer, “with an unbeliever?” It ought not to be tendered “infidel,” but it was done by our translators to put a blind upon this place as to its true intention, and to countenance parish communion; for why did they not here, verse 14, and everywhere else, render ἄπιστος, “an infidel?” Verse 16, “Τίς δὲ συγκατάθεσις ναῶ Θεοῦ μετὰ εἰδώλων, What consistency hath the temple of God,” that is, the gospel church, “with idols?” etc. I take this place to be a full proof of what is before spoken, — that a gospel church is a company of faithful professing people, walking together by mutual consent or confederation to the Lord Jesus Christ and one to another, in subjection to and practice of all his gospel precepts and commands, whereby they are separate from all persons and things manifestly contrary or disagreeing thereunto.

Hence, as it is separate from all such impurities as are without, so Christ hath furnished it with sufficient power and means to keep itself pure, and therefore hath provided ordinances and ministers for that end and purpose; for the great end of church-edification cannot be obtained without purity be also maintained in doctrine and fellowship.

Purity cannot be maintained without order. A disorderly society will corrupt within itself; for by disorder it is divided. By divisions the joints and bands are broken, not only of love and affection, but of visible conjunction; so that, roots of bitterness and sensual separation arising, many are defiled.

It is true, there may be a kind of peace and agreement in a society that is a stranger to gospel order; when men agree together to walk according to a false rule, or in a supine and negligent observation of the true rule. There may be a common connivance at each one to walk as he listeth; but this is not order, but disorder by consent. Besides, a church may, for the most part, walk in order when there are breaches and divisions. Some do agree to walk according to the rule, when others will deviate from it. It is orderly to endeavor to reduce those that walk not orderly, though such just

undertakings seem sometimes grounds of disturbance and causes of convulsion in the whole body, threatening even its breaking in pieces; but yet this must be done to preserve the whole.

The word translated “order,” ^{<GREEK>}Colossians 2:5, τάξις, is a military word; it is the order of soldiers in a hand, keeping rank and file, where every one keeps his place, follows his leader, observes the word of command, and his right-hand man. Hence the apostle joys to see their close order and steadfastness in the faith, their firmness, valor, and resolution, in fighting the good fight of faith; and the order in so doing, not only in watching as single professors, but in marching orderly together, as an army with banners. There is nothing more comely than a church walking in order; when every one keeps his place, knows and practiseth his duty according to the rule, each submitting to the other in the performance of duty; when the elders know their places, and the people theirs. Christ hath been more faithful than Moses, and therefore hath not left his churches without sufficient rules to walk by.

That order may be in a church of Christ, the rules of the gospel must be known, and that by officers and people. They that are altogether ignorant of the rule, or negligent in attending it, or doubtful, and therefore always contending about it, will never walk according to it. Hence it is the great duty of ministers to study order well, and acquaint the people with it. It is greatly to be bewailed that so few divines bend their studies that way. They content themselves only with studying and preaching the truths that concern faith in the Lord Jesus, and the mere moral part of holiness; but as to gospel churches or instituted worship, they generally in their doctrine and practice let it alone, and administer sacraments as indefinitely as they preach, and care not to stand related to one people more than another, any further than maintained by them. Likewise many good people are as great strangers to gospel churches and order, and, as their ministers, have a great averseness to both, and look upon it as schism and faction. And this is the great reason of the readiness of both to comply with rules of men for making churches (canons established by human laws), being carried away (if they would speak the truth) by corrupt, Erastian principles, that Christ hath left the church to be altogether guided and governed by laws of magistratic sanction. Reformation from the gross, idolatrous part of antichristianism was engaged in with some heroic courage and resolution;

but the coldness and indifference of Protestants to any farther progress almost ever since is not a little to be lamented. Many think it enough that the foundation of the house is laid in purity of doctrine (and it is well if that were not rather written in the books than preached in pulpits at this day), but how little do they care to set their hands to building the house! Sure a great matter it is, from that spiritual slothfulness that many are fallen under, as likewise from being ready to sink under the great discouragements laid before them by the adversaries of Judah, when they find the children of the spiritual captivity are about to build a gospel church unto the Lord. And how long hath this great work ceased? And will the Lord's ministers and people yet say, "The time is not come, the time that the LORD's house should be built?" Is it time to build our own houses, and not the house of the Lord? Surely it is time to build; for we understand by books the number of years whereof the word of the Lord came to Daniel the prophet, and to John the beloved disciple and new testament prophet, that he would accomplish twelve hundred and sixty years in the desolation of our Jerusalem and the court which is without the temple, namely, the generality of visible professors, and the external part of worship, which hath been so long trod down by Gentilism. Wherefore,

"Consider your ways. Go up to the mountain, and bring wood, and build the house; and I will take pleasure in it, and I will be glorified, saith the LORD," ~~3008~~ Haggai 1:8.

Men, it may be, have thought they have got, or at least saved, by not troubling themselves with the care, charge, and trouble of gathering churches and walking in gospel order; but God saith, "Ye looked for much, and, lo, it came to little; and when ye brought it home, I did blow upon it. Why? saith the LORD of hosts. Because of mine house that is waste, and ye run every man unto his own house," verse 9. I doubt not but the time is nigh at hand that the gospel temple must be built with greater splendor and glory than ever Solomon's or Zerubbabel's was; and though it seems to be a great mountain of difficulties, yet it shall become a plain before Him that is exalted far above all principalities and powers; and as he hath laid the foundation thereof in the oppressed state of his people, so his hands shall finish it, and bring forth the headstone thereof with shouting in the New Jerusalem State, crying now, "Grace, grace," but then, "Glory, glory to it."

This hastening glory we should endeavor to meet and fetch in by earnest prayers and faithful endeavors to promote the great work of our day. The pattern is of late years given forth with much clearness by models such as God hath set up in this latter age in the wilderness, and sheltered by “cloud and smoke by day, and the shining of a flaming fire by night; for upon all the glory hath been a defence,” yea, and it hath been “a tabernacle for a shadow in the daytime from the heat, and for a place of refuge, and for a covert from the storm and from the rain.” Neither have we been left to act by the examples or traditions of men. We have had a full manifestation of the revealed mind and will of Christ, with the greatest evidence and conviction, God having in these latter times raised up many most eminent instruments for direction and encouragement unto his people, which he furnished accordingly with great qualifications to this end and purpose, that the true original, nature, institution, and order, of evangelical churches might be known, distinguished, prized, and adhered to, by all that know the name of Christ, and would be followers of him as his disciples, in obedience to all his revealed mind and will; amongst which faithful and renowned servants of Christ the late author of this most useful and practical treatise hath approved himself to be one of the chief. I need say nothing of his steadfast piety, universal learning, indefatigable labors, in incessant vindication of the doctrines of the gospel (of greatest weight) against all oppositions made thereto by men of corrupt minds. His surviving works will always be bespeaking his honorable remembrance amongst all impartial lovers of the truth. They that were acquainted with him, knew how much the state and standing of the churches of Christ under the late sufferings and strugglings for reformation were laid to heart by him, and therefore how he put forth his utmost strength to assist, aid, comfort, and support the sinking spirits of the poor saints and people of God, even wearied out with long and repeated persecutions. It is to be observed that this ensuing treatise was occasioned by one of the last and most vigorous assaults made upon separate and congregational churches by a pen dipped in the gall of that persecuting spirit under which God’s people groaned throughout this land. He then wrote an elaborate account of evangelical churches, their original, institution, etc., with a vindication of them from the charges laid in against them by the author of “The Unreasonableness of Separation.” This he lived to print, and promised to handle the subject more particularly; which is here performed. He lived to

finish it under his great bodily infirmities, whereby he saw himself hastening to the end of his race; yet so great was his love to Christ, that whilst he had life and breath he drew not back his hand from his service. This work he finished, with others, through the gracious support and assistance of divine power, and corrected the copy before his departure. So that, reader, thou mayst be assured that what thou hast here was his (errata of the press only excepted), and likewise that it ought to be esteemed as his legacy to the church of Christ, being a great part of his dying labors; and therefore it is most uncharitable to suppose that the things here wrote were penned with any other design than to advance the glory and interest of Christ in the world, and that they were not matters of great weight on his own spirit. And upon the perusal that I have had of these papers, I cannot but recommend them to all diligent inquirers after the true nature, way, order, and practice, of evangelical churches, as a true and faithful account, according to what understanding the professors thereof, for the most part, have had and practiced. Whoever is otherwise minded, he hath the liberty of his own light and conscience. Lastly, whereas many serious professors of the faith of the Lord Jesus, it may be well grounded in the main saving truths of the gospel, are yet much to seek of these necessary truths for want of good information therein, and therefore walk not up to all the revealed mind of Christ, as they sincerely desire, let such, with unprejudiced minds, read and consider what is here offered to them, and receive nothing upon human authority, follow no man in judgment or practice any farther than he is a follower of Christ. And this is all the request of him that is a lover of all them that love the Lord Jesus Christ. J.C.^{f1}

CHAPTER 1.

THE SUBJECT-MATTER OF THE CHURCH.

THE church may be considered either as unto its *essence*, constitution, and being, or as unto its *power* and order, when it is organized. As unto its essence and being, its constituent parts are its *matter* and *form*. These we must inquire into.

By the matter of the church, we understand the persons whereof the church doth consist, with their qualifications; and by its form, the reason, cause, and way of that kind of relation among them which gives them the being of a church, and therewithal an interest in all that belongs unto a church, either privilege or power, as such.

Our first inquiry being concerning what sort of persons our Lord Jesus Christ requireth and admitteth to be the visible subjects of his kingdom, we are to be regulated in our determination by respect unto his honor, glory, and the holiness of his rule. To reckon such persons to be subjects of Christ, members of his body, such as he requires and owns (for others are not so), who would not be tolerated, at least not approved, in a well-governed kingdom or commonwealth of the world, is highly dishonorable unto him, ^{<BETH>}Psalm 15:1-5, ^{<BETH>}24:3, 4, 93:5; ^{<BETH>}2 Corinthians 8:23;

^{<BETH>}Ephesians 5:27. But it is so come to pass, that let men be never so notoriously and flagitiously wicked, until they become pests of the earth, yet are they esteemed to belong to the church of Christ; and not only so, but it is thought little less than schism to forbid them the communion of the church in all its sacred privileges. Howbeit, the Scripture doth in general represent the kingdom or church of Christ to consist of persons called *saints*, separated from the world, with many other things of an alike nature, as we shall see immediately. And if the honor of Christ were of such weight with us as it ought to be, — if we understood aright the nature and ends of his kingdom, and that the peculiar glory of it above all the kingdoms in the world consists in the holiness of its subjects, such a holiness as the world in its wisdom knoweth not, — we would duly consider whom we avow to belong thereunto. Those who know aught of these things will not profess that persons openly profane, vicious,

sensual, wicked, and ignorant, are approved and owned of Christ as the subjects of his kingdom, or that it is his will that we should receive them into the communion of the church, ^{
}2 Timothy 3:1-5. But an old opinion of the unlawfulness of separation from a church on the account of the minute of wicked men in it is made a scare-crow to frighten men from attempting the reformation of the greatest evils, and a covert for the composing churches of such members only.

Some things, therefore, are to be premised unto what shall be offered unto the right stating of this inquiry; as, —

1. That if there be no more required of any, as unto *personal qualifications*, in a visible, uncontrollable profession, to constitute them subjects of Christ's kingdom and members of his church, ^{
}Ezekiel 22:26, but what is required by the most righteous and severe laws of men to constitute a good subject or citizen, the distinction between his visible kingdom and the kingdoms of the world, as unto the principal causes of it, is utterly lost. Now, all negative qualifications, as, that men are not oppressors, drunkards, revilers, swearers, adulterers, etc., are required hereunto; but yet it is so fallen out that generally more is required to constitute such a citizen as shall represent the righteous laws he liveth under than to constitute a member of the church of Christ.
2. That whereas *regeneration* is expressly required in the gospel to give a right and privilege unto an entrance into the church or kingdom of Christ, ^{
}John 3:3, ^{
}Titus 3:3-5, whereby that kingdom of his is distinguished from all other kingdoms in and of the world, unto an interest wherein never any such thing was required, it must of necessity be something better, more excellent and sublime, than any thing the laws and polities of men pretend unto or prescribe. Wherefore it cannot consist in any outward rite, easy to be observed by the worst and vilest of men. Besides, the Scripture gives us a description of it in opposition unto its Consisting in any such rite, ^{
}1 Peter 3:21; and many things required unto good citizens are far better than the mere observation of such a rite.
3. Of this regeneration baptism is the symbol, the sign, the expression, and representation, ^{
}John 3:5; ^{
}Acts 2:38; ^{
}1 Peter 3:21. Wherefore, unto those who are in a due manner partakers of it, it giveth all the external rights and privileges which belong unto them that are regenerate, until they

come unto such seasons wherein the personal performance of those duties whereon the continuation of the estate of visible regeneration doth depend is required of them. Herein if they fail, they lose all privilege and benefit by their baptism.

So speaks the apostle in the case of circumcision under the law: ^{<102>}Romans 2:25, “For circumcision verily profiteth, if thou keep the law; but if thou be a breaker of the law, thy circumcision is made uncircumcision.” It is so in the case of baptism. Verily it profiteth, if a man stand unto the terms of the covenant which is tendered therein between God and his soul, for it will give him a right unto all the outward privileges of a regenerate state; but if he do not, as in the sight of God, his baptism is no baptism, as unto the real communication of grace and acceptance with him, ^{<108>}Philippians 3:18, 19; ^{<101>}Titus 1:15, 16. So, in the sight of the church, it is no baptism, as unto a participation of the external rights and privileges of a regenerate state.

4. God alone is judge concerning this regeneration, as unto its *internal, real principle and state* in the souls of men, ^{<418>}Acts 15:8, ^{<102>}Revelation 2:23, whereon the participation of all the spiritual advantages of the covenant of grace doth depend. The church is judge of its evidences and fruits in their external demonstration, as unto a participation of the *outward privileges of a regenerate state*, and no farther, ^{<418>}Acts 8:13. And we shall hereon briefly declare what belongs unto the forming of a right judgment herein, and who are to be esteemed fit members of any gospel church-state, or have a right so to be: —

1. Such as from whom we are obliged to *withdraw* or *withhold communion* can be no part of the matter constituent of a church, or are not meet members for the first constitution of it, ^{<409>}1 Corinthians 6:9-11; ^{<108>}Philippians 3:18, 19; ^{<306>}2 Thessalonians 3:6; ^{<305>}2 Timothy 3:5; ^{<409>}Romans 9:6, 7; ^{<101>}Titus 1:16. But such are all habitual sinners, those who, having prevalent habits and inclinations unto sins of any kind unmortified, do walk according unto them. Such are profane swearers, drunkards, fornicators, covetous, oppressors, and the like, “who shall not inherit the kingdom of God,” ^{<409>}1 Corinthians 6:9-11; ^{<108>}Philippians 3:18, 19; ^{<306>}2 Thessalonians 3:6; ^{<305>}2 Timothy 3:5. As a man living and dying in any known sin, that is, habitually, without repentance, cannot be saved, so

a man known to live in sin cannot regularly be received into any church. To compose churches of habitual sinners, and that either as unto sins of commission or sins of omission, is not to erect temples to Christ, but chapels unto the devil.

2. Such as, being in the fellowship of the church, are to be *admonished of any scandalous sin*, which if they repent not of they are to be cast out of the church, are not meet members for the original constitution of a church, ~~ANS~~ Matthew 18:15-18; ~~ANS~~ 1 Corinthians 5:11. This is the state of them who abide obstinate in any known sin, whereby they have given offense unto others, without a professed repentance thereof, although they have not lived in it habitually.

3. They are to be such as *visibly answer* the description given of gospel churches in the Scripture, so as the titles assigned therein unto the members of such churches may on good grounds be appropriated unto them. To compose churches of such persons as do not visibly answer the character given of what they were of old, and what they were always to be by virtue of the law of Christ or gospel constitution, is not church edification but destruction. And those who look on the things spoken of all church-members of old, as that they were saints by calling, lively stones in the house of God, justified and sanctified, separated from the world, etc., as those which were in them, and did indeed belong unto them, but even deride the necessity of the same things in present church-members, or the application of them unto those who are so, are themselves no small part of that woful degeneracy which Christian religion is fallen under. Let it then be considered what is spoken of the church of the Jews in their dedication unto God, as unto their typical holiness, with the application of it unto Christian churches in real holiness, ~~ANS~~ 1 Peter 2:5, 9, with the description given of them constantly in the Scripture, as faithful, holy, believing, as the house of God, as his temple wherein he dwells by his Spirit, as the body of Christ united and compacted by the communication of the Spirit unto them, as also what is said concerning their, ways, walkings, and duties, and it will be uncontrollably evident of what sort our church-members ought to be. Nor are those of any other sort able to discharge the duties which are incumbent on all church-members, nor to use the privileges they are intrusted withal. Wherefore, I say, to suppose churches regularly to consist of such persons, for the greater part

of them, as no way answer the description given of church-members in their original institution, nor capable to discharge the duties prescribed unto them, but giving evidence of habits and actions inconsistent therewithal, is not only to disturb all church-order, but utterly to overthrow the ends and being of churches. Nor is there any thing more scandalous unto Christian religion than what Bellarmine affirms to be the judgment of the Papists, in opposition unto all others, namely, “That no internal virtue or grace is required unto the constitution of a church in its members,” *De Ecclesiastes lib. 3 cap. 2.*

4. They must be such as do *make an open profession of the subjection of their souls and consciences unto the authority of Christ in the gospel, and their readiness to yield obedience unto all his commands,* ^{ROM} Romans 10:10; ^{2COR} 2 Corinthians 8:5, 9:13; ^{MAT} Matthew 10:32, 33; ^{LUK} Luke 9:26; ^{2TIM} 2 Timothy 2:12; ^{ROM} Romans 15:9; ^{JOH} John 12:42; ^{1JOH} 1 John 4:2, 3, 15. This, I suppose, will not be denied; for not only doth the Scripture make this profession necessary unto the participation of any benefit or privilege of the gospel, but the nature of the things themselves requires indispensably that so it should be: for nothing can be more unreasonable than that men should be taken into the privileges attending obedience unto the laws and commands of Christ, without avowing or professing that obedience. Wherefore our inquiry is only [about] what is required unto such a profession as may render men meet to be members of a church, and give them a right thereunto; for to suppose such a confession of Christian religion to be compliant with the gospel which is made by many who openly live in sin, “being disobedient, and unto every good work reprobate,” is to renounce the gospel itself. Christ is not the high priest of such a profession. I shall therefore declare briefly what is necessary unto this profession, that all may know what it is which is required unto the entrance of any into our churches, wherein our practice hath been sufficiently traduced: —

(1.) There is required unto it *a competent knowledge of the doctrines and mystery of the gospel, especially concerning the person and offices of Christ.* The confession hereof was the ground whereon he granted the keys of the kingdom of heaven, or all church-power, unto believers, ^{MAT} Matthew 16:15-19. The first instruction which he gave unto his apostles was that they should teach men, by the preaching of the gospel, in the knowledge of

the truth revealed by him. The knowledge required in the members of the Judaical church, that they might be translated into the Christian, was principally, if not solely, that of his person, and the acknowledgment of him to be the true Messiah, the Son of God; for as on their unbelief thereof their eternal ruin did depend, as he told them, “If ye believe not that I am he, ye shall die in your sins,” so the confession of him was sufficient on their part unto their admission into the gospel church-state. And the reasons of it are apparent. With others, an instruction in all the mysteries of religion, especially in those that are fundamental, is necessary unto the profession we inquire after. So Justin Martyr tells us what pains they took in those primitive times to instruct those in the mysteries of religion who, upon a general conviction of its truth, were willing to adhere unto the profession of it. And what was their judgment herein is sufficiently known from the keeping a multitude in the state of catechumens before they would admit them into the fellowship of the church. They are not therefore to be blamed, they do but discharge their duty, who refuse to receive into church-communion such as are ignorant of the fundamental doctrines and mysteries of the gospel, or if they have learned any thing of them from a form of words, yet really understand nothing of them. The promiscuous driving of all sorts of persons who have been baptized in their infancy unto a participation of all church-privileges is a profanation of the holy institutions of Christ. This knowledge, therefore, belonging unto profession is itself to be professed.

(2.) There is required unto it a *professed subjection of soul and conscience unto the authority of Christ in the church*, ^{<1088>}Matthew 28:18-20; ^{<1085>}2 Corinthians 8:5. This in general is performed by all that are baptized when they are adult, as being by their own actual consent baptized in the name of Christ; and it is required of all them who are baptized in their infancy, when they are able with faith and understanding to profess their consent unto and abiding in that covenant whereinto they were initiated.

(3.) An instruction in and consent unto *the doctrine of self-denial and bearing of the cross*, in a particular manner; for this is made indispensably necessary by our Savior himself unto all that will be his disciples, ^{<1087>}Matthew 10:37-39; ^{<1084>}Mark 8:34, 38; ^{<1023>}Luke 9:23; ^{<1088>}Philippians 3:18; ^{<1040>}Acts 4:10, 11, 20, ^{<1044>}24:14. And it hath been a great disadvantage unto the glory of Christian religion that men have not been more and better

instructed therein. It is commonly thought that whoever will may be a Christian at an easy rate, — it will cost him nothing. But the gospel gives us another account of these things; for it not only warns us that reproaches, hatred, sufferings of all sorts, oftentimes to death itself, are the common lot of all its professors who will live godly in Christ Jesus, but also requires that at our initiation into the profession of it, we consider aright the dread of them all, and engage cheerfully to undergo them. Hence, in the primitive times, whilst all sorts of miseries were continually presented unto them who embraced the Christian religion, their willing engagement to undergo them who were converted was a firm evidence of the sincerity of their faith, as it ought to be unto us also in times of difficulty and persecution. Some may suppose that the loath and confession of this doctrine of self-denial and readiness for the cross is of use only in time of persecution, and so doth not belong unto them who have continually the countenance and favor of public authority. I say, it is, at least as they judge, well for them; with others it is not so, whose outward state makes the public avowing of this duty indispensably necessary unto them. And I may add it as my own thoughts (though they are not my own alone), that notwithstanding all the countenance that is given unto any church by the public magistracy, yet whilst we are in this world, those who will faithfully discharge their duty, as ministers of the gospel especially, shall have need to be prepared for sufferings. To escape sufferings, and enjoy worldly advantages by sinful compliances, or bearing with men in their sins, is no gospel direction.

(4.) *Conviction and confession of sin, with the way of deliverance by Jesus Christ*, is that “answer of a good conscience” that is required in the baptism of them that are adult, ^{<1021>}1 Peter 3:21.

(5.) Unto this profession is required *the constant performance of all known duties of religion*, both of piety in the public and private worship of God, as also of charity with respect unto others, ^{<1029>}Matthew 28:19, 20. “Show me thy faith by thy works,” ^{<1028>}James 2:18.

(6.) A careful *abstinence from all known sins*, giving scandal or offense either unto the world or unto the church of God, ^{<1031>}1 Corinthians 10:32; ^{<1010>}Philippians 1:10.

And the gospel requires that this confession be made (“with the mouth confession is made unto salvation”) against, —

- (1.) Fear;
- (2.) Shame;
- (3.) The course of the world;
- (4.) The opposition of all enemies whatever.

Hence it appears that there are none excluded from an entrance into the church-state but such as are either, —

- (1.) *Grossly ignorant*; or,
- (2.) *Persecutors* or reproachers of those that are good, or of the ways of God wherein they walk; or,
- (3.) *Idolaters*; or,
- (4.) Men *scandalous in their lives*, in the commission of sins or omission of duties, through vicious habits or inclinations; or,
- (5.) Such as would partake of gospel privileges and ordinances, yet openly avow that *they will not submit unto the law and commands of Christ in the gospel*; concerning whom and the like the Scripture rule is peremptory, “From such turn away.”

And herein we are remote from exceeding the example and care of the primitive churches; yea, there are but few, if any, that arrive unto it. Their endeavor was to preach unto all they could, and they rejoiced in the multitudes that came to hear the word; but if any did essay to join themselves unto the church, their diligence in their examination and instruction, their severe inquiries into their conversation, their disposing of them for a long time into a state of expectation for their trial, before their admittance, were remarkable; and some of the ancients complain that the promiscuous admittance of all sorts of persons that would profess the Christian religion into church-membership, which took place afterward, ruined all the beauty, order, and discipline of the church.

The things ascribed unto those who are to be esteemed the proper subject-matter of a visible church are such as, in the judgment of charity, entitle them unto all the appellations of “saints, called, sanctified,” — that is, visibly and by profession, — which are given unto the members of all the churches in the New Testament, and which must be answered in those who are admitted into that privilege, if we do not wholly neglect our only patterns. By these things, although they should any of them not be real living members of the mystical body of Christ, unto whom he is a head of spiritual and vital influence, yet are they meet members of that body of Christ unto which he is a head of rule and government, as also meet to be esteemed subjects of his kingdom; and none are excluded but such as concerning whom rules are given either to withdraw from them or to cast them out of church-society, or are expressly excluded by God himself from any share in the privileges of his covenant, ^{Psalm} Psalm 1:16, 17.

Divines of all sorts do dispute, from the Scripture and the testimonies of the ancients, that hypocrites and persons unregenerate may be true members of visible churches; and it is a matter very easy to be proved, nor do I know any by whom it is denied: but the only question is, that whereas, undoubtedly, profession is necessary unto all church-communion, whether, if men do profess themselves hypocrites in state and unregenerate in mind, that *profession* do sufficiently qualify them for church-communion; and whereas there is a double profession, one by words, the other by works, as the apostle declares, ^{Titus} Titus 1:16, whether the latter be not as interpretative of the mind and state of men as the former. Other contest we have with none in this matter.

Bellarmino, De Ecclesiastes lib. 3 cap. 2, gives an account out of Augustine, and that truly, from Brevis. Collat. Col. 3, of the state of the church. “It doth,” saith he, “consist of a soul and body. The soul is the internal graces of the Spirit; the body is the profession of them, with the sacraments. All true believers making profession belong to the soul and body of the church. Some (as believing catechumens) belong to the soul, but not to the body; others are of the body, but not of the soul, — namely, such as have no internal grace or true faith, — and they are like the hair, or the nails, or evil humors in the body.” And thereunto adds, that his definition of the church compriseth this last sort only; which is all one as if we should define a man to be a thing constituted and made up of hair,

nails, and ill humors: and let others take heed that they have no such churches.

There is nothing more certain in matter of fact than that evangelical churches, at their first constitution, were made up and did consist of such members as we have described, and no others; nor is there one word in the whole Scripture intimating any concession or permission of Christ to receive into his church those who are not so qualified. Others have nothing to plead for themselves but possession; which, being “*malae fidei*,” ill obtained and ill continued, will afford them no real advantage when the time of trial shall come. Wherefore it is certain that such they ought to be. No man, as I suppose, is come unto that profligate sense of spiritual things as to deny that the members of the church ought to be *visibly holy*: for if so, they may affirm that all the promises and privileges made and granted to the church do belong unto them who visibly live and die an their sins; which is to overthrow the gospel And if they ought so to be, and were so at first, when they are not so *openly* and *visibly*, there is a declension from the original constitution of churches, and a sinful deviation in them from the rule of Christ.

This original constitution of churches, with respect unto their members, was, for the substance of it, as we observed, preferred in the primitive times, whilst persecution from without was continued and discipline preserved within. I have in part declared before what great care and circumspection the church then used in the admission of any into their fellowship and order, and what trial they were to undergo before they were received; and it is known also with what severe discipline they watched over the faith, walking, conversation, and manners of all their members, Indeed, such was their care and diligence herein that there is scarce left, in some churches at present, the least resemblance or appearance of what was their state and manner of rule. Wherefore some think it meet to ascend no higher in the imitation of the primitive churches than the times of the Christian emperors, when all things began to rush into the fatal apostasy, which I shall here speak a little farther unto; for,

Upon the Roman emperors’ embracing Christian religion, whereby not only outward peace and tranquillity was secured unto the church, but the

profession of Christian religion was countenanced, encouraged, honored, and rewarded, the rule, care, and diligence of the churches, about the admission of members, were in a great measure relinquished and forsaken. The rulers of the church began to think that the glory of it consisted in its *numbers*, finding both their own power, veneration, and revenue increased thereby. In a short time, the inhabitants of whole cities and provinces, upon a bare, outward profession, were admitted into churches. And then began *the outward court*, — that is, all that which belongs unto the outward worship and order of the church, — to be trampled on by the Gentiles, not kept any more to the measure of Scripture rule, which thenceforth was applied only to the temple of God and them that worshipped therein: for this corruption of the church, as to the matter of it, was the occasion and means of introducing all that corruption in doctrine, worship, order, and rule, which ensued, and ended in the great apostasy; for whatever belonged unto any of these things, especially those that consist in practice, were accommodated unto the state of the members of the churches. And such they were as stood in need of superstitious rites to be mixed with their worship, as not understanding the power and glory of that which is spiritual; such as no interest in church-order could be committed unto, seeing they were not qualified to bear any share in it; such as stood in need of a rule over them with grandeur and power, like unto that among the Gentiles, Wherefore, the accommodation of all church concerns unto the state and condition of such corrupt members as churches were filled with, and at length made up of, proved the ruin of the church in all its order and beauty.

But so it fell out, that in the protestant reformation of the church very little regard was had thereunto. Those great and worthy persons who were called unto that work did set themselves principally, yea, solely, for the most part, against the false doctrine and idolatrous worship of the church of Rome, as judging that if they were removed and taken away, the people, by the efficacy of truth and order of worship, would be retrieved from the evil of their ways, and primitive holiness be again reduced among them; for they thought it was the doctrine and worship of that church which had filled the people with darkness and corrupted their conversations. Nor did they absolutely judge amiss therein: for although they were themselves at first introduced in compliance with the ignorance and wickedness of the

people, yet they were suited to promote them as well as to countenance them; which they did effectually. Hence it came to pass that the reformation of the church, as unto the matter of it, or the purity and holiness of its members, was not in the least attempted, until Calvin set up his discipline at Geneva; which hath filled the world with clamors against him from that day to this. In most other places, churches, in the matter of them, continued the same as they were in the Papacy, and in many places as bad in their lives as when they were Papists.

But this method was designed, in the holy, wise providence of God, for the good and advantage of the church, in a progressive reformation, as it had made a gradual progress into its decay; for had the reformers, in the first place, set themselves to remove out of the church such as were unmeet for its communion, or to have gathered out of them such as were meet members of the church, according to its original institution, it would, through the paucity of the number of those who could have complied with the design, have greatly obstructed, if not utterly defeated, their endeavor for the reformation of doctrine and worship. This was that which, in the preaching of the gospel and the profession of it, God hath since made effectual, in these nations especially, and in other places, to turn multitudes “from darkness to light, and from the power of Satan unto himself, translating them into the kingdom of his dear Son.” Hereby way is made for a necessary addition unto the work of reformation, if not to the closing of it, which could not at first be attained unto nor well attempted, — namely, the reduction of churches, as unto their matter, or the members of them, unto the primitive institution.

The sum of what is designed in this discourse is this only: — We desire no more to constitute church-members, and we can desire no less, than what, in the judgment of charity, may comply with the union that is between Christ the head and the church, ^{<4127>}1 Corinthians 12:27, ^{<4122>}Ephesians 2:22, ^{<4136>}1 Corinthians 3:16, 17, ^{<4135>}2 Corinthians 8:5, ^{<5100>}1 Thessalonians 1:1, 2, etc.; than may, in the same judgment, answer the way of the beginning and increase of the church, according unto the will of God, who adds unto the church such as shall be saved, ^{<4137>}Acts 2:47, the rule of our receiving of them being because he hath received them, ^{<6140>}Romans 14:1-3; than may answer that profession of faith which was the foundation of the church, which was not what flesh and blood, but what God himself revealed,

Matthew 16:16, 17, and not such as have a form of godliness, but deny the power thereof, 2 Timothy 3:5. We acknowledge that many church-members are not what they ought to be, but that many hypocrites may be among them; that the judgment which is passed on the confession and profession of them that are to be admitted into churches is *charitative*, proceeding on evidence of moral probability, not determining the reality of the things themselves; that there are sundry measures of light, knowledge, experience, and abilities and readiness of mind, in those that are to be admitted, all whose circumstances are duly to be considered, with indulgence unto their weakness; and if the Scripture will allow us any further latitude, we are ready to embrace it.

Our present inquiry yet remaining on these considerations is, What is our duty *in point of communion* with such churches as are made up or composed of members *visibly unholy*, or such as comply not with the qualifications that are, by the rules of the gospel, indispensably required to give unto any a regular entrance into the church, with a participation of its privileges; for it is in vain to expect that such churches will reform themselves by any act, duty, or power of their own, seeing the generality of them are justly supposed averse from and enemies unto any such work. I answer, therefore, —

1. It must be remembered that *communion with particular churches is to be regulated absolutely by edification*. No man is or can be obliged to abide in or confine himself unto the communion of any particular church any longer than it is for his edification. And this liberty is allowed unto all persons by the church of England; for allow a man to be born in such a parish, to be baptized in it, and there educated, yet if at any time he judge that the ministry of the parish is not useful unto his edification, he may withdraw from the communion in that parish by the removal of his habitation, it may be to the next door. Wherefore —

2. If the corruption of a church, as to the matter of it, be such as that, —

(1.) It is *inconsistent* with and overthroweth all that communion that ought to be among the members of the same church, in love without dissimulation (whereof we shall treat afterward);

(2.) If the *scandals* and *offenses* which must of necessity abound in such churches be really obstructive of edification;

(3.) If the *ways and walking* of the generality of their members be dishonorable unto the gospel and the profession of it, giving no representation of the holiness of Christ or his doctrine;

(4.) If such churches *do not, can not, will not* reform themselves: then, —

It is the duty of every man who takes care of his own present edification and the future salvation of his soul *peaceably to withdraw from the communion of such churches*, and to join in such others where all the ends of church-societies may in some measure be obtained. Men may not only do so, because all obligation unto the use of means for the attaining of such an end doth cease when the means are not suited thereunto, but obstructive of its attainment, but also because the giving of a testimony hereby against the declension from the rule of Christ in the institution of churches, and the dishonor that by this means is inflicted on the gospel, is necessary unto all that desire to acquit themselves as loyal subjects unto their Lord and King. And it cannot be questioned, by any who understand the nature, use, and end of evangelical churches, but that a relinquishment of the rule of the gospel in any of them, as unto the practice of holiness, is as just a cause of withdrawing communion from them as their forsaking the same rule in doctrine and worship.

It may be some will judge that sundry inconveniencies will ensue on this assertion, when any have a mind to practice according unto it; but when the matter of fact supposed is such as is capable of an uncontrollable evidence, no inconvenience can ensue on the practice directed unto, any way to be compared unto the mischief of obliging believers to abide always in such societies, to the ruin of their souls.

Two things may be yet inquired into, that relate unto this part of the state of evangelical churches; as, —

1. Whether a church may not, ought not, to *take under its conduct*, inspection, and rule, such as are not yet meet to be received into full communion, such as are the children and servants of those who are complete members of the church? *Ans.* No doubt the church, in its officers, may and ought so to do, and it is a great evil when it is neglected. For, —

(1.) They are to take care of *parents* and *masters* as such, and as unto the discharge of their duty in their families; which without an inspection into the condition of their *children* and *servants*, they cannot do.

(2.) *Households* were constantly reckoned unto the church when the heads of the families were entered into covenant, ^{<2949>}Luke 19:9; ^{<4165>}Acts 16:15; ^{<5100>}Romans 16:10, 11; ^{<4116>}1 Corinthians 1:16; ^{<5049>}2 Timothy 4:19.

(3.) *Children* do belong unto and have an interest in their *parents'* covenant; not only in the promise of it, which gives them right unto baptism, but in the profession of it in the church covenant, which gives them a right unto all the privileges of the church whereof they are capable, until they voluntarily relinquish their claim unto them.

(4.) *Baptizing the children of church members*, giving them thereby an admission into the visible catholic church, puts an obligation on the officers of the church to take care, what in them lieth, that they may be kept and preserved meet members of it, by a due watch over them and instruction of them.

(5.) Though neither the church nor its privileges be continued and preserved, as of old, by *carnal generation*, yet, because of the nature of the dispensation of God's covenant, wherein he hath promised to be a God unto believers and their seed, the advantage of the means of a gracious education in such families, and of conversion and edification in the ministry of the church, ordinarily the continuation of the church is to depend on the addition of members out of the families already incorporated in it. The church is not to be like the kingdom of the Mamalukes, wherein there was no regard unto natural successors, but it was continually made up of strangers and foreigners incorporated into it; nor like the beginning of the Roman commonwealth, which, consisting of men only, was like to have been the matter of one age alone.

The duty of the church towards this sort of persons consists, —

(1.) In *prayer* for them;

(2.) *Catechetical instruction* of them according unto their capacities;

(3.) *Advice* to their parents concerning them;

- (4.) *Visiting* of them in the families whereunto they do belong;
- (5.) *Encouragement* of them, or *admonition*, according as there is occasion;
- (6.) *Direction* [of them] for a due preparation unto the joining themselves unto the church in full communion;
- (7.) *Exclusion* of them from a claim unto the participation of the especial privileges of the church, where they render themselves visibly unmeet for them and unworthy of them.

The neglect of this duty brings inconceivable prejudice unto churches, and if continued in will prove their ruin; for they are not to be preserved, propagated, and continued, at the easy rate of a constant supply by the carnal baptized posterity of those who do at any time, justly or unjustly, belong unto them, but they are to prepare a meet supply of members by all the spiritual means whose administration they are intrusted withal And, besides, one end of churches is to preserve the covenant of God in the families once graciously taken thereinto. The neglect, therefore, herein is carefully to be watched against. And it doth arise, —

- (1.) From an *ignorance* of the duty in most that are concerned in it.
- (2.) From the *paucity* of officers in most churches, both teaching and ruling, who are to attend unto it.
- (3.) The *want of a teacher or catechist* in every church, who should attend only unto the instruction of this sort of persons.
- (4.) *Want of a sense of their duty* in parents and masters, —
 - [1.] In not valuing aright the *great privilege* of having their children and servants under the inspection, care, and blessing of the church;
 - [2.] In not *instilling* into them a sense of it, with the duties that are expected from them on the account of their relation unto the church;
 - [3.] In not *bringing them* duly into the church assemblies;
 - [4.] In not *preparing* and disposing them unto an actual entrance into full communion with the church;
 - [5.] In not *advising* with the elders of the church about them; and,

[6.] Especially by an *indulgence* unto that loose and careless kind of education, in conformity unto the world, which generally prevails. Hence it is that most of them, on various accounts and occasions, drop off here and there from the communion of the church and all relation thereunto, without the least respect unto them or inquiry after them, churches being supplied by such as are occasionally converted in them.

Where churches are complete in the kind and number of their officers, sufficient to attend unto all the duties and occasions of them; where whole families, in the conjunction of the heads of them unto the church, are dedicated unto God, according unto the several capacities of those whereof they do consist; where the design of the church is to provide for its own successive continuation, in the preservation of the interest of God's covenant in the families taken thereinto; where parents esteem themselves accountable unto God and the church as unto the relation of their children thereunto, — there is provision for church-order, usefulness, and beauty, beyond what is usually to be observed.

2. The especial duty of the church in *admission of members* in the time of great persecution may be a little inquired into. And, —

(1.) It is evident that, in the *apostolical* and *primitive* times, the churches were exceeding careful not to admit into their society such as by whom they might be betrayed unto the rage of their persecuting adversaries; yet, notwithstanding all their care, they could seldom avoid it, but that when persecution grew severe some or other would fall from them, either out of fear, with the power of temptation, or by a discovery of their latent hypocrisy and unbelief, unto their great trial and distress. However, they were not so scrupulous herein, with respect unto their own safety, as to exclude such as gave a tolerable account of their sincerity, but, in the discharge of their duty, committed themselves unto the care of Jesus Christ. And this is the rule whereby we ought to walk on such occasions. Wherefore,

(2.) On supposition of the establishment of idolatry and persecution here, or in any place, as it was of old, under first the pagan, and afterward the antichristian tyranny, the church is obliged to receive into its care and communion all such as, —

[1.] *Flee from idols*, and are ready to confirm their testimony against them with suffering;

[2.] *Make profession of the truth* of the gospel of the doctrine of Christ, especially as unto his person and offices; are,

[3.] Free from *scandalous sins*; and,

[4.] Are *willing to give up themselves* unto the rule of Christ in the church, and a subjection unto all his ordinances and institutions therein: for in such a season, these things are so full an indication of sincerity as that, in the judgment of charity, they render men meet to be members of the visible church. And if any of this sort of persons, through the severity of the church in their non-admission of them, should be cast on a conjunction in superstitious and idolatrous worship, or be otherwise exposed unto temptations and discouragements prejudicial unto their souls, I know not how such a church can answer the refusal of them unto the great and universal Pastor of the whole flock.

CHAPTER 2.

OF THE FORMAL CAUSE OF A PARTICULAR CHURCH.

THE way or means whereby such persons as are described in the foregoing chapter may become a church, or enter into a church-state, is by *mutual confederation* or solemn agreement for the performance of all the duties which the Lord Christ hath prescribed unto his disciples in such churches, and in order to the exercise of the power wherewith they are intrusted according unto the rule of the word.

For the most part, the churches that are in the world at present know not *how they came so to be*, continuing only in that state which they have received by tradition from their fathers, Few there are who think that any act or duty of their own is required to instate them in church order and relation. And it is acknowledged that there is a difference between the continuation of a church and its first erection; yet that that continuation may be regular, it is required that its first congregating (for the church is a congregation) was so, as also that the force and efficacy of it be still continued. Wherefore the causes of that first gathering must be inquired into.

The churches mentioned in the New Testament, planted or gathered by the apostles, were particular churches, as hath been proved. These churches did consist each of them of many members; who were so members of one of them as that they were not members of another. The saints of the church of Corinth were not members of the church at Philippi. And the inquiry is, how those believers in one place and the other became to be a church, and that distinct from all others? The Scripture affirms in general that *they gave up themselves unto the Lord and unto the apostles*, who guided them in these affairs, by the will of God, ~~<4115>~~ 2 Corinthians 8:5; and that other believers were added unto the church, ~~<4127>~~ Acts 2:47.

That it is the will and command of our Lord Jesus Christ that all his disciples should be joined in such societies, for the duties and ends of them prescribed and limited by himself, hath been proved sufficiently before.

All that are disciplined by the word are to be taught to do and observe all his commands, ~~488~~ Matthew 28:19, 20.

This could *originally* be no otherwise done but by their own *actual, express, voluntary consent*. There are sundry things which concur as remote causes, *or pre-requisite conditions*, unto this conjunction of believers in a particular church, and without which it cannot be; such are baptism, profession of the Christian faith, convenient cohabitation, resorting to the preaching of the word in the same place: but neither any of these distinctly or separately, nor all of them in conjunction, are or can be the constitutive form of a particular church; for it is evident that they may all be, and yet no such church-state ensue. They cannot all together engage unto those duties nor communicate those powers which appertain unto this state.

Were there no other order in particular churches, no other discipline to be exercised in them, nor rule over them, no other duties, no other ends assigned unto them, but what are generally owned and practiced in parochial assemblies, the preaching of the word within such a precinct of cohabitation, determined by civil authority, might constitute a church. But if a church be such a society as is intrusted in itself with sundry powers and privileges depending on sundry duties prescribed unto it; if it constitute new relations between persons that neither naturally nor morally were before so related, as marriage doth between husband and wife; if it require new mutual duties and give new mutual rights among themselves, not required of them either as unto their matter or as unto their manner before, — it is vain to imagine that this state can arise from or have any other formal cause but the joint consent and virtual confederation of those concerned unto these ends: for there is none of them can have any other foundation; they are all of them resolved into the wills of men, bringing themselves under an obligation unto them by their voluntary consent. I say, unto the wills of men, as their formal cause; the supreme efficient cause of them all being the will, law, and constitution of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Thus it is in all societies, in all relations that are not merely natural (such as between parents and children, wherein the necessity of powers and mutual duties is predetermined by a superior law, even that of nature),

wherein powers, privileges, and mutual duties, are established, as belonging unto that society. Nor, after its first institution, can any one be incorporated into it, but by his own consent and engagement to observe the laws of it: nor, if the nature and duties of churches were acknowledged, could there be any couldst in this matter; for the things ensuing are clear and evident: —

1. The Lord Christ, by his authority, hath appointed and *instituted this church-state*, as that there should be such churches; as we have proved before.
2. That, by his word or law, he hath *granted powers and privileges* unto this church, and prescribed duties unto all belonging unto it; wherein they can have no concernment who are not incorporated into such a church.
3. That therefore he doth *require* and *command* all his disciples to join themselves in such church-relations as we have proved, warranting them so to do by his word and command. Wherefore, —
4. This *joining of themselves*, whereon depend all their interest in church powers and privileges, all their obligation unto church duties, is a *voluntary act* of the obedience of faith unto the authority of Christ; nor can it be any thing else.
5. Herein do they *give themselves unto the Lord* and to *one another*, by their officers, in a peculiar manner, according to the will of God, ⁴¹⁸⁵2 Corinthians 8:5.
6. To “give ourselves unto the Lord,” — that is, unto the Lord Jesus Christ, — is expressly *to engage to do and observe all that he hath appointed and commanded* in the church, as that phrase everywhere signifieth in the Scripture; as also “joining ourselves unto God,” which is the same.
7. This resignation of ourselves unto the will, power, and authority of Christ, with an express engagement made unto him of doing and observing all his commands, hath *the nature of a covenant on our part*; and it hath so on his, by virtue of the promise of his especial presence annexed unto this engagement on our part, ⁴¹⁸⁸Matthew 28:18-20.

8. For whereas there are three things required unto a covenant between God and man, —

(1.) That it be of *God's appointment* and institution;

(2.) That upon a prescription of duties there be a *solemn engagement* unto their performance on the part of men;

(3.) That there be *especial promises of God* annexed thereunto, in which consists the matter of confederation, whereof mutual express restipulation is the form, — they all concur herein.

9. This covenant which we intend is not the covenant of grace absolutely considered; nor are all the duties belonging unto that covenant prescribed in it, but the principal of them, as faith, repentance, and the like, are presupposed unto it; nor hath it annexed unto it all the promises and privileges of the new covenant absolutely considered: but it is that which is prescribed as a *gospel duty in the covenant of grace*, whereunto do belong all the duties of evangelical worship, all the powers and privileges of the church, by virtue of the *especial promise* of the peculiar presence of Christ in such a church.

10. Whereas, therefore, in the constitution of a church, believers do give up themselves unto the Lord, and are bound solemnly to engage themselves to *do and observe all the things which Christ hath commanded* to be done and observed in that state, whereon he hath promised to be present with them and among them in an especial manner, — which presence of his doth interest them in all the rights, powers, and privileges of the church, — their so doing hath the nature of a divine covenant included in it; which is the formal cause of their church-state and being.

11. Besides, as we have proved before, there are many *mutual duties* required of all which join in church-societies, and powers to be exercised and submitted unto, whereunto none can be obliged without their own consent. They must give up themselves unto one another, by the will of God; that is, they must agree, consent, and engage among themselves, to observe all those mutual duties, to use all those privileges, and to exercise all those powers, which the Lord Christ hath prescribed and granted unto his church. See Jeremiah 1. 4, 5.

12. This completes the *confederation intended*, which is the formal cause of the church, and without which, either expressly or virtually performed, there can be no church-state.

13. Indeed, herein most men deceive themselves, and think they do not that, and that it ought to be done, and dispute against it as unlawful or unnecessary, which for the substance of it they do themselves, and would condemn themselves in their own consciences if they did it not. For unto what end do they join themselves unto parochial churches and assemblies? to what end do they require all professors of the protestant religion so to do, declaring it to be their duty by penalties annexed unto its neglect? Is it not that they might yield obedience unto Christ in their so doing? is it not to profess that they will do and observe all whatsoever he commands them? is it not to do it in that society, in those assemblies, whereunto they do belong? is there not therein virtually a mutual agreement and engagement among them unto all those ends? It must be so with them who do not in all things in religion fight uncertainly, as men beating the air.

14. Now, whereas these things are, in themselves and for the substance of them, known gospel duties, which all believers are indispensably obliged unto, the *more express our engagement is* concerning them, the more do we glorify Christ in our profession, and the greater sense of our duty will abide on our consciences, and the greater encouragement be given unto the performance of mutual duties, as also the more evident will the warranty be for the exercise of church-power. Yet do I not deny the being of churches unto those societies wherein these things are virtually only observed, especially in churches of some continuance, wherein there is at least an implicit consent unto the first covenant constitution.

15. The Lord Christ having instituted and appointed officers, rulers, or leaders, in his church (as we shall see in the next place), to look unto the discharge of all church-duties among the members of it, to administer and dispense all its privileges, and to exercise all its authority, *the consent and engagement insisted on* is expressly required unto the constitution of this order and the preservation of it; for without this no believer can be brought into that relation unto another as his pastor, guide, overseer, ruler, unto the ends mentioned, wherein he must be subject unto him, [and] partake of all ordinances of divine worship administered by him with authority, in

obedience unto the will of Christ. “They gave their own selves to us,” saith the apostle, “by the will of God.”

16. Wherefore *the formal cause of a church* consisteth in an obediential act of believers, in such numbers as may be useful unto the ends of church-edification, jointly giving up themselves unto the Lord Jesus Christ, to do and observe all his commands, resting on the promise of his especial presence thereon, giving and communicating, by his law, all the rights, powers, and privileges of his church unto them; and in a mutual agreement among themselves jointly to perform all the duties required of them in that state, with an especial subjection unto the spiritual authority of rules and rulers appointed by Christ in that state.

17. There is nothing herein which any man who hath a conscientious sense of his duty, in a *professed subjection unto the gospel*, can question, for the substance of it, whether it be according to the mind of Christ or no; and whereas the nature and essential properties of a divine covenant are contained in it, as such it is a foundation of any church-state.

18. Thus under the old testament, when God would take the posterity of Abraham into a *new, peculiar church-state*, he did it by a *solemn covenant*. Herein, as he prescribed all the duties of his worship to them, and made them many blessed promises of his presence, with powers and privileges innumerable, so the people solemnly covenanted and engaged with him that they would do and observe all that he had commanded them; whereby they coalesced into that church-state which abode unto the time of reformation. This covenant is at large declared, Exodus 24: for the covenant which God made there with the people, and they with him, was not the covenant of grace under a legal dispensation, for that was established unto the seed of Abraham four hundred years before, in the promise with the seal of circumcision; nor was it the covenant of works under a gospel dispensation, for God never renewed that covenant under any consideration whatever; but it was a peculiar covenant which God then made with them, and had not made with their fathers,

~~CHRIST~~ Deuteronomy 5:2, 3, whereby they were raised and erected into a church-state, wherein they were intrusted with all the privileges and enjoined all the duties which God had annexed thereunto. This covenant was the sole formal cause of their church-state, which they are charged so

often to have broken, and which they so often solemnly renewed unto God.

19. This was that covenant which was to be *abolished*, whereon the church-state that was built thereon was utterly taken away; for hereon the Hebrews ceased to be the peculiar church of God, because the covenant whereby they were made so was abolished and taken away, as the apostle disputes at large, Hebrews 7-9. The covenant of grace in the promise will still continue unto the true seed of Abraham, ~~418~~ Acts 2:38, 39; but the church-covenant was utterly taken away.

20. Upon the removal, therefore, of this covenant, and the church-state founded thereon, all duties of worship and church-privileges were also taken away (the things substituted in their room being totally of another kind). But the covenant of grace, as made with Abraham, being continued and transferred unto the gospel worshippers, the *sign or token of it* given unto him is changed, and another substituted in the room thereof. But whereas the privileges of this church-covenant were in themselves carnal only, and no way spiritual but as they were typical, and the duties prescribed in it were burdensome, yea, a yoke intolerable, the apostle declares in the same place that the new church-state, whereinto we are called by the gospel, hath no duties belonging unto it but such as are spiritual and easy, but withal hath such holy and eminent privileges as the church could no way enjoy by virtue of the first church-covenant, nor could believers be made partakers of them before that covenant was abolished. Wherefore, —

21. The same way for the erection of a church-state for the participation of the more excellent privileges of the gospel, and performance of the duties of it, for the substance of it, must still be continued; for the constitution of such a society as a church is, intrusted with powers and privileges by a covenant or mutual consent, with an engagement unto the performance of the duties belonging unto it, hath its foundation in the light of nature, so far as it hath any thing in common with other voluntary relations and societies, was instituted by God himself as the way and means of erecting the church-state of the old testament, and consisteth in the performance of such duties as are expressly required of all believers.

CHAPTER 3.

OF THE POLITY, RULE, OR DISCIPLINE OF THE CHURCH IN GENERAL.

I. THE things last treated of concern the essence of the church, or *the essential constituent parts of it*, according unto the appointment of Christ. It remains, in the next place, that we should treat of it as it is *organical*, or a body corporate, a spiritually *political* society, for the exercise of the powers wherewith it is intrusted by Christ, and the due performance of the duties which he requires. Now, whereas it is brought into this estate by the setting, fixing, or placing *officers* in it, method would require that we should first treat of them, their nature, names, power, and the ways of coming unto their *offices*; but whereas all things concerning them are founded in the grant of power unto the church itself, and the institution of polity and rule therein by Jesus Christ, I shall first treat somewhat thereof in general.

That which we intend, on various considerations and in divers respects, is called the power or authority, the polity, the rule, the government, and the discipline of the church. The *formal nature* of it is its authority or power; its *polity* is skill and wisdom to act that power unto its proper ends; its *rule* is the actual exercise of that power, according unto that skill and wisdom; its *government* is the exercise and application of that authority, according unto that skill, towards those that are its proper objects; and it is called its *discipline* principally with respect unto its end. Yet is it not material whether these things are thus accurately distinguished; the same thing is intended in them all, which I shall call *the rule of the church*.

II. The rule of the church is, in general, *the exercise of the power or authority of Jesus Christ, given unto it, according unto the laws and directions prescribed by himself, unto its edification*. This power in *actu primo*, or fundamentally, is in the church itself; in *actu secundo*, or its exercise, in them that are especially called thereunto. Whether that which is now called the rule of the church by some, being a plain secular dominion, have any affinity hereunto, is justly doubted. That it is in itself

the acting of the authority of Christ, wherein the power of men is ministerial only, is evident: for, —

1. All this authority in and over the church is vested in him alone;
2. It is over the souls and consciences of men only, which no authority can reach but his, and that as it is his; whereof we shall treat more afterward.

The sole end of the ministerial exercise of this power and rule, by virtue thereof, unto the church, is the edification of itself, ~~☞~~ Romans 15:1-3; ~~☞~~ 2 Corinthians 10:8, 13:10; ~~☞~~ Ephesians 4:14, 15.

III. This is the especial nature and especial end of all power granted by Jesus Christ unto the church, namely, *a ministry unto edification*, in opposition unto all the ends whereunto it hath been abused; for it hath been so unto the usurpation of a dominion over the persons and consciences of the disciples of Christ, accompanied with secular grandeur, wealth, and power. The Lord Christ never made a grant of any authority for any such ends, yea, they are expressly forbidden by him, ~~☞~~ Luke 22:25, 26; ~~☞~~ Matthew 20:25-28, “Jesus called his disciples unto him, and said, Ye know that the princes of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, and they that are great exercise authority upon them. But it shall not be so among you: but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your minister; and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your servant: even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister.”


All the pleas of the Romanists are utterly insufficient to secure their papal domination from this sword of the mouth of the Lord Jesus; for whereas their utmost pretense and defense consists in this, that it is not dominion and power absolutely that is forbidden, but the unlawful, tyrannical, oppressive exercise of power, such as was in use among the princes of the Gentiles, never was there any dominion in the world, no, not among the Gentiles, more cruel, oppressive, and bloody than that of the pope’s hath been. But it is evident that our Lord Jesus Christ doth not in the least reflect on the rule or government of the kings and princes of the Gentiles, which was good and gracious; yea, he speaks of them in an especial manner whom their subjects, for their moderate and equal rule, with their usefulness unto their countries, called *εὐεργέται*, or “benefactors.” Their rule, as unto the kind and administration of it in the kingdoms of the

world, he approves of. And such a power or pre-eminence it was, — namely, good and just in itself, not tyrannical and oppressive, — that the two disciples desired in his kingdom; which gave occasion unto this declaration of the nature of his kingdom and the rule thereof. For in this power or dominion two things may be considered: —

1. The exercise of it over the persons, goods, and lives of men, by courts, coercive jurisdictions, processes of law, and external force in punishments;
2. The state, grandeur, pre-eminence, wealth, exaltation above others, which are necessary unto the maintenance of their authority and power. Both these, in the least participation of them, in the least degree whatever, are forbidden by our Savior to be admitted in his kingdom, or to have any place therein, on what pretense soever. He will have nothing of lordship, domination, pre-eminence in lordly power, in his church. No courts, no coercive jurisdictions, no exercise of any human authority, doth he allow therein; for by these means do the princes of the Gentiles, those that are the benefactors of their countries, rule among them. And this is most evident from what, in opposition hereunto, he prescribes unto his own disciples, the greatest, the best in office, grace, and gifts, namely, a ministry only to be discharged in the way of service. How well this great command and direction of our Lord Jesus Christ hath been, and is, complied withal by those who have taken on them to be rulers in the church is sufficiently known.

Wherefore there is no rule of the church but what is *ministerial*, consisting in an *authoritative declaration* and application of the commands and will of Christ unto the souls of men; wherein those who exercise it are servants unto the church for its edification, for Jesus' sake, ~~4005~~ 2 Corinthians 4:5.

It hence follows that the introduction of human authority into the rule of the church of Christ, in any kind, destroyeth the nature of it, and makes his kingdom to be of this world, and some of his disciples to be, in their measure, like the princes of the Gentiles; nor is it, oftentimes, from themselves that they are not more like them than they are. The church is the house of Christ, his family, his kingdom. To act any power, in its rule, which is not his, which derives not from him, which is not communicated by his legal grant; or to act any power by ways, processes, rules, and laws, not of his appointment, — is an invasion of his right and dominion.

It can no otherwise be, if the church be his family, his house, his kingdom; for what father would endure that any power should be exercised in his family, as to the disposal of his children and estate, but his own? what earthly prince will bear with such an intrusion into his rights and dominion? Foreign papal power is severely excluded here in England, because it intrenches on the rights of the crown, by the exercise of an authority and jurisdiction not derived from the king, according unto the law of the land; and we should do well to take care that at the same time we do not encroach upon the dominion of Christ by the exercise of an authority not derived from him, or by laws and rules not enacted by him, but more foreign unto his kingdom than the canon law or the pope's rule is unto the laws of this nation, lest we fall under the statute of praemunire,  Matthew 20:25-28. The power of rule in the church, then, is nothing but a right to yield obedience unto the commands of Christ, in such a way, by such rules, and for such ends, as wherein and whereby his authority is to be acted.

The persons concerned in this rule of the church, both those that rule and those that are to be ruled, as unto all their civil and political concerns in this world, are subject unto the civil government of the kingdoms and places wherein they inhabit, and there are sundry things which concern the outward state and condition of the church that are at the disposal of the governors of this world; but whereas the power to be exercised in the church is merely spiritual as unto its objects, which are the consciences of men, and as unto its ends, which are the tendency of their souls unto God, their spiritual obedience in Christ, and eternal life, it is a frenzy to dream of any other power or authority in this rule but that of Christ alone.

To sum up this discourse: If the rulers of the church, the greatest of them, have only a ministerial power committed unto them, and are precisely limited thereunto; if in the exercise thereof they are servants of the church unto its edification; if all lordly domination, in an exaltation above the church or the members of it in dignity and authority of this world, and the exercise of power by external, coercive jurisdiction, be forbidden unto them; if the whole power and rule of the church be spiritual and not carnal, mighty through God and not through the laws of men, and be to be exercised by spiritual means for spiritual ends only, — it is apparent how it hath been cast in or cast out of the world, for the introduction of a lordly

domination, a secular, coercive jurisdiction, with laws and powers no way derived from Christ, in the room thereof. Neither is it possible for any man alive to reconcile the present government of some churches, either as unto the officers who have the administration of that rule, or the rules and laws whereby they act and proceed, or the powers which they exercise, or the jurisdiction which they claim, or the manner of their proceeding in its administration, unto any tolerable consistency with the principles, rules, and laws of the government of the church given by Christ himself. And this alone is a sufficient reason why those who endeavor to preserve their loyalty entire unto Jesus Christ should, in their own practice, seek after the reduction of the rule of the church unto his commands and appointments. In the public disposals of nations we have no concernment.

IV. Whereas, therefore, there is a power and authority for its rule unto edification given and committed by the Lord Christ unto his church, I shall proceed to inquire *how this power is communicated*, what it is, and to whom it is granted; which shall be declared in the ensuing observations: —

1. There was an *extraordinary church-power* committed by the Lord Jesus Christ unto his apostles, who in their own persons were the first and only subject of it. It was *not granted unto the church*, by it to be communicated unto them, according unto any rules prescribed thereunto; for their office, as it was apostolical, was antecedent unto the existence of any gospel church-state, properly so called, neither had any church the least concurrence or influence into their call or mission. Howbeit, when there was a church-state, the churches being called and gathered by their ministry, they were given unto the church, and placed in the church for the exercise of all office with power, unto their edification, according to the rules and laws of their constitution, ⁴⁰¹⁴Acts 1:14, 15, etc., 6:1-4; ⁴⁰²²1 Corinthians 3:22, 12:28; ⁴⁰¹¹Ephesians 4:11-15.

2. This power is *ceased in the church*. It is so, not by virtue of any law or constitution of Christ, but by a cessation of those actings whence it did flow and whereon it did depend. For unto this apostolical office and power there were required, —

(1.) An immediate *personal call* from Christ himself;

(2.) A *commission equally extensive unto all nations*, for their conversion, and *unto all churches* equally, for their edification;

(3.) An *authority in all churches*, comprehensive of all that power which is, in the ordinary constitution of them, distributed among many;

(4.) A *collation of extraordinary gifts*, as of infallibility in teaching, of working miracles, speaking with tongues, and the like. Whereas, therefore, all these things do cease, and the Lord Christ doth not act in the same manner towards any, this office and power doth absolutely cease. For any to pretend themselves to be successors unto these apostles, as some with a strange confidence and impertinency have done, is to plead that they are personally and immediately called by Christ unto their office, that they have authority with respect unto all nations and all churches, and are endued with a spirit of infallibility and a power of working miracles; whereof outward pomp and ostentation are no sufficient evidences: and certainly when some of them consider one another, and talk of being the apostles' successors, it is but "Aruspex aruspicem."^{f2}

3. Least of all, in the ordinary state of the church, and the continuation thereof, hath the Lord Christ appointed a *vicar*, or rather, as is pretended, a successor, with a plenitude of all church-power, to be by him parceled out unto others, This is that which hath overthrown all church rule and order, introducing Luciferian pride and antichristian tyranny in their room. And whereas the only way of Christ's acting his authority over the churches, and of communicating authority unto them, to be acted by them in his name, is by his word and Spirit, which he hath given to continue in his church unto that end unto the consummation of all things, the pope of Rome placing himself in his stead for these ends, doth thereby "sit in the temple of God, and show himself to be God." But this is sufficiently confuted among all sober Christians; and those who embrace it may be left to contend with the Mohammedans, who affirm that Jesus left John the Baptist to be his successor, as Ali succeeded unto Mohammed.

4. All those by whom the ordinary rule of the church is to be exercised unto its edification are, as unto their office and power, *given unto the church*, set or placed in it, not as "lords of their faith, but as helpers of their joy," ^{400B}1 Corinthians 2:3, 3:21-23; ^{402B}2 Corinthians 1:24; ^{400B}Ephesians 4:11-15; ^{400B}1 Peter 5:1, 2: for the church is the spouse of

Christ, the Lamb's wife, and, by virtue of that relation, the enfeoffment into this power is her due and dowry. All particular persons are but her servants for Christ's sake; for though some of them be stewards, and set over all their fellow-servants, yet he hath not given them the trust of power to rule his spouse at their own will, and to grant what they please unto her.

5. But as this *whole church-power* is committed unto the whole church by Christ, so all that are called unto the peculiar exercise of any part of it, by virtue of office-authority, do receive that authority from him by the only way of the communication of it, — namely, by his word and Spirit, through the ministry of the church; whereof we shall treat afterward.

V. These things being thus premised in general concerning church-power, we must treat yet particularly of the communication of it from Christ, and of its distribution as unto its residence in the church: —

1. Every *individual believer* hath *power* or right given unto him, upon his believing, to become a son of God, ^{ROM} John 1:12. Hereby, as such, he hath a right and title radically and originally unto, with an interest in, all church-privileges, to be actually possessed and used according to the rules by him prescribed; for he that is a son of God hath a right unto all the privileges and advantages of the family of God, as well as he is obliged unto all the duties of it. Herein lies the foundation of all right unto Church-power; for both it and all that belongs unto it are a part of the purchased inheritance, whereunto right is granted by adoption. Wherefore the first, original grant of all church power and privileges is made unto believers as such. Theirs it is, with these two limitations: —

(1.) That as such only they cannot exercise any church-power but upon their due observation of all rules and duties given unto this end; such are *joint confession and confederation*.

(2.) That each individual do actually participate therein, according to the especial rules of the church, which peculiarly respects *women* that do believe.

2. Wherever there are “two or three” of these believers (the smallest number), *right or power* is granted unto them actually to meet together in the name of Christ for their mutual edification; whereunto he hath

promised his presence among them, ~~1889~~ Matthew 18:19, 20. To meet and to do any thing in the name of Christ, as to exhort, instruct, and admonish one another, or to pray together, as verse 19, there is an especial right or power required thereunto. This is granted by Jesus Christ unto the least number of consenting believers. And this is a second preparation unto the communication of church-power. Unto the former faith only is required; unto this, profession, with mutual consent unto and agreement in the evangelical duties mentioned, are to be added.

3. Where the number of believers is increased so as that they are sufficient, as unto their number, to observe and perform all church-duties in the way and manner prescribed for their performance, they have right and power granted unto them to make a *joint solemn confession of their faith*, especially as unto the person of Christ and his mediation, ~~1889~~ Matthew 16:16-18; as also to give up themselves unto him and to one another, in a holy agreement or confederation to do and observe all things whatever that he hath commanded. Hereon, by virtue of his laws in his institutions and commands, he gives them power to do all things in their order which he grants unto his church, and instates them in all the rights and privileges thereof. These believers, I say, thus congregated into a church-state, have immediately, by virtue thereof, power to take care that all things be done among them as by the Lord Christ they are commanded to be done in and by his church.

This, therefore, is the church *essential* and *homogeneous*, unto which the Lord Christ hath granted all that church-power which we inquire after, made it the seat of all ordinances of his worship, and the tabernacle wherein he will dwell; nor, since the ceasing of extraordinary officers, is there any other way possible for the congregating of any church than what doth virtually include the things we have mentioned.

4. But yet this church-state is not complete, nor are the ends of its institution attainable in this state, for the Lord Christ hath appointed such things in and unto it which in this state it cannot observe; for he hath given authority unto his church, to be exercised both in its rule and in the administration of his solemn ordinances of worship. The things before mentioned are all of them acts of right and power, but not of authority.

5. Wherefore the Lord Christ hath ordained *offices*, and appointed officers to be established in the church, ¹⁴⁰¹¹Ephesians 4:11-15. Unto these is all church authority granted; for all authority is an act of office-power, which is that which gives unto what is performed by the officers of the church the formal nature of authority.

6. Therefore unto the church, in the state before described, right and power is granted by Christ to *call, choose, appoint, and set apart, persons* made meet for the work of the offices appointed by him, in the ways and by the means appointed by him. Nor is there any other way whereby ordinary officers may be fixed in the church, as we have proved before, and shall farther confirm afterward.

That which hereon we must inquire into is, How, or by what means, or by what acts of his sovereign power, the Lord Christ doth communicate *office-power*, and therewith the office itself, unto any persons, whereon their authority is directly from him; and what are the acts or duties of the church in the collation of this authority.

The *acts* of Christ herein may be reduced unto these heads: —

1. He hath instituted and appointed the offices themselves, and made a *grant* of them unto the church, for its edification; as also, he hath determined and limited the powers and duties of the officers. It is not in the power of any, or of all the churches in the world, to appoint any office or officer in the church that Christ hath not appointed; and where there are any such, they can have no church-authority, properly so called, for that entirely ariseth from, and is resolved into, the institution of the office by Christ himself. And hence, in the first place, all the authority of officers in the church proceeds from the authority of Christ in the institution of the office itself; for that which gives being unto any thing gives it also its essential properties.

2. By virtue of his relation unto the church as its head, of his kingly power over it and care of it, whereon the continuation and edification of the church in this world do depend, wherever he hath a church called, he furnisheth some persons with such gifts, abilities, and endowments as are necessary to the discharge of such offices, in the powers, works, and duties of them; for it is most unquestionably evident, both in the nature of

the thing itself and in his institution, that there are some especial abilities and qualifications required to the discharge of every church-office. Wherefore, where the Lord Christ doth not communicate of these abilities in such a measure as by virtue of them church-order may be observed, church-power exercised, and all church-ordinances administered according to his mind, unto the edification of the church, it is no more in the power of men to constitute officers than to erect and create an office in the church, ^{<4001>}Ephesians 4:11-15; ^{<4001>}1 Corinthians 12:4-10, etc.; ^{<4001>}Romans 12:6-8.

This collation of spiritual gifts and abilities for office by Jesus Christ unto any doth not immediately constitute all those, or any of them, officers in the church, on whom they are collated, without the observation of that method and order which he hath appointed in the church for the communication of office-power; yet is it so prerequisite thereunto, that no person not made partaker of them in the measure before mentioned can, by virtue of any outward rite, order, or power, be really vested in the ministry.

3. This communication of office-power on the part of Christ consists in his institution and appointment of the *way and means* whereby persons gifted and qualified by himself ought to be actually admitted into their offices, so as to administer the powers and perform the duties of them; for the way of their call and ordination, whereof we shall speak afterward, is efficacious unto this end of communicating office-power merely from his institution and appointment of it, and what is not so can have no causal influence into the communication of this power. For although sundry things belonging hereunto are directed by the light of nature, as it is that where one man is set over others in power and authority, which before he had no natural right unto, it should be by their own consent and choice; and some things are of a moral nature, as that especial prayer be used in and about affairs that need especial divine assistance and favor; and there may be some circumstances of outward actions herein not to be determined but by the rule of reason on the present posture of occasions, — yet nothing hath any causal influence into the communication of office-power but what is of the institution and appointment of Christ. By virtue hereof, all that are called unto this office do derive all their power and authority from him alone.

4. He hath hereon given *commands* unto the whole church to *submit themselves* unto the authority of these officers in the discharge of their office, who are so appointed, so prepared or qualified, so called by himself, and to obey them in all things, according unto the limitations which himself also hath given unto the power and authority of such officers; for they who are called unto rule and authority in the church by virtue of their office are not thereon admitted unto an unlimited power, to be exercised at their pleasure in a lordly or despotical manner, but their power is stated, bounded, limited, and confined, as to the objects of it, its acts, its manner of administration, its ends, and as unto all things wherein it is concerned. The swelling over these banks by ambition, the breaking up of these bounds by pride and love of domination, by the introduction of a power over the persons of men in their outward concerns, exercised in a legal, coercive, lordly manner, are sufficient to make a forfeiture of all church-power in them who are guilty of them. But after that some men saw it fit to transgress the bounds of power and authority prescribed and limited unto them by the Lord Christ, — which was really exclusive of lordship, dominion, and all elation above their brethren, leaving them servants to the church for Christ's sake, — they began to prescribe bounds unto themselves, such as were suited unto their interest, which they called rules or canons, and never left enlarging them at their pleasure until they instated the most absolute tyranny in and over the church that ever was in the world.

By these ways and means doth the Lord Christ communicate office-power unto them that are called thereunto; whereon they become not the officers or ministers of men, no, not of the church, as unto the actings and exercise of their authority, but only as the good and edification of the church is the end of it, but the officers and ministers of Christ himself.

It is hence evident, that, in the communication of church-power in office unto any persons called thereunto, the work and duty of the church consists formally in acts of obedience unto the commands of Christ. Hence it doth not give unto such officers a power or authority that was formally and actually in the body of the community by virtue of any grant or law of Christ, so as that they should receive and act the power of the church by virtue of a delegation from them; but only they design, choose, and set apart the individual persons, who thereon are intrusted with office-power

by Christ himself, according as was before declared. This is the power and right given unto the church, essentially considered, with respect unto their officers, — namely, to design, call, choose, and set apart, the persons, by the ways of Christ’s appointment, unto those offices whereunto, by his laws, he hath annexed church power and authority.

We need not, therefore, trouble ourselves with the disputes about the first subject of church-power, or any part of it; for it is a certain rule, that, *in the performance of all duties which the Lord Christ requires, either of the whole church or of any in the church, especially of the officers, they are the first subject of the power needful unto such duties who are immediately called unto them.* Hereby all things come to be done in the name and authority of Christ; for the power of the church is nothing but a right to perform church-duties in obedience unto the commands of Christ and according unto his mind. Wherefore all church-power is originally given unto the church essentially considered, which hath a double exercise; — first, in the call or choosing of officers; secondly, in their voluntary acting with them and under them in all duties of rule.

1. All authority in the church is committed by Christ unto the officers or rulers of it, as unto all acts and duties whereunto office-power is required; and,

2. Every individual person hath the liberty of his own judgment as unto his own consent or dissent in what he is himself concerned.

That this power, under the name of “the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” was originally granted unto the whole professing church of believers, and that it is utterly impossible it should reside in any other, who is subject unto death, or if so, be renewed upon any occasional intermission, is so fully proved by all Protestant writers against the Papists that it needs not on this occasion be again insisted on.

VI. These things have been spoken concerning the polity of the church in general, as it is taken *objectively* for the constitution of its state and the laws of its rule. We are in the next place to consider it *subjectively*, as it is *a power or faculty of the minds of men unto whom the rule of the church is committed*; and in this sense it is the wisdom or understanding of the

officers of the church to exercise the government in it appointed by Jesus Christ, or to rule it according to his laws and constitutions. Or,

This wisdom is a spiritual gift, ^{<4218>}1 Corinthians 12:8, whereby the officers of the church are enabled to make a due application of all the rules and laws of Christ, unto the edification of the church and all the members of it.

Unto the attaining of this wisdom are required, —

1. *Fervent prayer* for it, ^{<5005>}James 1:5.
2. *Diligent study* of the Scripture, to find out and understand the rules given by Christ unto this purpose, ^{<4370>}Ezra 7:10; ^{<5111>}2 Timothy 2:1, 15.
3. *Humble waiting on God* for the revelation of all that it is to be exercised about, ^{<4641>}Ezekiel 43:11.
4. *A conscientious exercise* of the skill which they have received; talents traded with duly will increase.
5. *A continual sense of the account* which is to be given of the discharge of this great trust, being called to rule in the house of God, ^{<4837>}Hebrews 13:17.

How much this wisdom hath been neglected in church-government, yea, how much it is despised in the world, is evident unto all. It is skill in the canon law, in the proceedings of vexatious courts, with the learning, subtilty, and arts, which axe required thereunto, that is looked on as the only skill to be exercised in the government of the church. Without this a man is esteemed no way meet to be employed in any part of the church-government; and according as any do arrive unto a dexterity in this polity, they are esteemed eminently useful. But these things belong not at all unto the government of the church appointed by Christ; nor can any sober man think in his conscience that so they do. What is the use of this art and trade as unto political ends we inquire not. Nor is the true wisdom required unto this end, with the means of attaining of it, more despised, more neglected, by any sort of men in the world, than by those whose pretences unto ecclesiastical rule and authority would make it most necessary unto them.

Two things follow on the supposition laid down: —

1. That the wisdom intended is not promised unto *all the members of the church in general*, nor are they required to seek for it by the ways and means of attaining it before laid down, but respect is had herein only unto the officers of the church. Hereon dependeth the equity of the obedience of the people unto their rulers; for wisdom for rule is peculiarly granted unto them, and their duty it is to seek after it in a peculiar manner. Wherefore those who, on every occasion, are ready to advance their own wisdom and understanding in the affairs and proceedings of the church against the wisdom of the officers of it are proud and disorderly.

I speak not this to give any countenance unto the outcries of some, that all sorts of men will suppose themselves wiser than their rulers, and to know what belongs unto the government of the church better than they; whereas the government which they exercise belongs not at all unto the rule of the church, determined and limited in the Scripture, as the meanest Christian can easily discern; nor is it pretended by themselves so to do: for they say that the Lord Christ hath prescribed nothing herein, but left it unto the will and wisdom of the church to order all things as they see necessary, which church they are. Wherefore, if that will please them, it shall be granted, that in skill for the management of ecclesiastical affairs according to the canon law, with such other rules of the same kind as they have framed, and in the legal proceedings of ecclesiastical courts, as they are called, there are none of the people that are equal unto them or will contend with them.

2. It hence also follows that those *who are called unto rule in the church of Christ* should diligently endeavor the attaining of and increasing in this wisdom, giving evidence thereof on all occasions, that the church may safely acquiesce in their rule. But hereunto so many things do belong as cannot in this place be meetly treated of; somewhat that appertains to them shall afterward be considered.

CHAPTER 4.

THE OFFICERS OF THE CHURCH.

THE church is considered either as it is essential, with respect unto its nature and being, or as it is organical, with respect unto its order. The constituent causes and parts of the church, as unto its essence and being, are its institution, matter, and form, whereof we have treated.

Its order as it is organical is founded in that communication of power unto it from Christ which was insisted on in the foregoing chapter.

The organizing of a church is the placing or implanting in it those officers which the Lord Jesus Christ hath appointed to act and exercise his authority therein. For the rule and government of the church are the exertion of the authority of Christ in the hands of them unto whom it is committed, that is, the officers of it; not that all officers are called to rule, but that none are called to rule that are not so.

The officers of the church in general are of two sorts, “bishops and deacons,” ~~and~~ ^{Philippians 1:1;} and their work is distributed into “prophecy and ministry,” Romans 12: 6,7.

The bishops or elders are of two sorts: —

1. Such as have authority to *teach* and administer the sacraments, which is commonly called the *power of order*; and also of *ruling*, which is called a power of jurisdiction, corruptly: and,
2. Some have only *power for rule*; of which sort there are some in all the churches in the world.

Those of the first sort are distinguished into *pastors and teachers*.

The distinction between the elders themselves is not like that between elders and deacons, which is as unto the whole kind or nature of the office, but only with respect unto work and order, whereof we shall treat distinctly.

The first sort of officers in the church are bishops or elders, concerning whom there have been mighty contentions in the late ages of the church. The principles we have hitherto proceeded on discharge us from any especial interest or concernment in this controversy; for if there be no church of divine or apostolical constitution, none in being in the second or third century, but only a particular congregation, the foundation of that contest, which is about pre-eminence and power in the same person over many churches, falls to the ground.

Indeed, strife about power, superiority, and jurisdiction over one another, amongst those who pretend to be ministers of the gospel, is full of scandal. It started early in the church, was extinguished by the Lord Christ in his apostles, rebuked by the apostles in all others, ~~and~~ Matthew 18:1-4, 23:8-11; ~~and~~ Luke 22:24-26; ~~and~~ 1 Peter 5:1-5; ~~and~~ 2 John 9, 10; yet, through the pride, ambition, and avarice of men, it hath grown to be the stain and shame of the church in most ages: for neither the sense of the authority of Christ forbidding such ambitious designs, nor the proposal of his own example in this particular case, nor the experience of their own insufficiency for the least part of the work of the gospel ministry, have been able to restrain the minds of men from coveting after and contending for a prerogative in church-power over others; for though this ambition, and all the fruits or rewards of it, are laid under a severe interdict by our Lord Jesus Christ, yet when men (like Achan) saw “the wedge of gold and the goodly Babylonish garment” that they thought to be in power, domination, and wealth, they coveted them and took them, to the great disturbance of the church of God.

If men would but a little seriously consider what there is in that care of souls, even of all them over whom they pretend church power, rule, or jurisdiction, and what it is to give an account concerning them before the judgment-seat of Christ, it may be it would abate of their earnestness in contending for the enlargement of their cures.

The claim of episcopacy, as consisting in a rank of persons distinct from the office of presbyters, is managed with great variety. It is not agreed whether they are distinct in order above them, or only as unto a certain degree among them of the same order. It is not determined what doth constitute that pretended distinct order, nor wherein that degree of pre-

eminence in the same order doth consist, nor what basis it stands upon. It is not agreed whether this order of bishops hath any church-power appropriated unto it, so as to be acted singly by themselves alone, without the concurrence of the presbyters, or how far that concurrence is necessary in all acts of church order or power. There are no bounds or limits of the dioceses which they claim the rule in and over, as churches whereunto they are peculiarly related, derived either from divine institution or tradition, or general rules of reason respecting both or either of them, or from the consideration of gifts and abilities, or any thing else wherein church-order or edification is concerned. Those who plead for diocesan episcopacy will not proceed any farther but only that there is, and ought to be, a superiority in bishops over presbyters in order or degree; but whether this must be over presbyters in one church only, or in many distinct churches, — whether it must be such as not only hinders them utterly from the discharge of any of the duties of the pastoral office towards the most of them whom they esteem their flocks, and necessitates them unto a rule by unscriptural church officers, laws, and power, — they suppose doth not belong unto their cause, whereas, indeed, the weight and moment of it doth lie in and depend on these things. Innumerable other uncertainties, differences, and variances there are about this singular episcopacy, which we are not at present concerned to inquire into, nor shall I insist on any of those which have been already mentioned.

But yet, because it is necessary unto the clearing of the evangelical pastoral office, which is now under consideration, unto what hath been pleaded before about the non-institution of any churches beyond particular congregations, which is utterly exclusive of all pretences of the present episcopacy, I shall briefly, as in a diversion, add the arguments which undeniably prove that in the whole New Testament bishops and presbyters, or elders, are every way the same persons, in the same office, have the same function, without distinction in order or degree; which also, as unto the Scripture, the most learned advocates of prelacy begin to grant:

1. The apostle describing what ought to be the qualifications of *presbyters* or elders, gives this reason of it, Because a *bishop* must be so: ^{<500>} Titus 1:5-9, “Ordain elders in every city, if any be blameless,” etc., “for a bishop must be blameless.” He that would prove of what sort a presbyter, that is

to be ordained so, ought to be, [and] gives this reason for it, that “such a bishop ought to be,” intends the same person and office by presbyter and bishop, or there is no congruity of speech or consequence of reason in what he asserts. To suppose that the apostle doth not intend the same persons and the same office by “presbyters” and “bishops,” in the same place, is to destroy his argument and render the context of his discourse unintelligible. He that will say, “If you make a justice of peace or a constable, he must be magnanimous, liberal, full of clemency and courage, for so a king ought to be,” will not be thought to argue very wisely; yet such is the argument here, if by “elders” and “bishops” distinct orders and offices are intended.

2. There were *Many bishops* in one city, in one particular church:

~~1000~~ Philippians 1:1, “To all the saints in Christ Jesus which are at Philippi, with the bishops and deacons.” That the church then at Philippi was one particular church or congregation was proved before. But to have many bishops in the same church, whereas the nature of the episcopacy pleaded for consists in the superiority of one over the presbyters of many churches, is absolutely inconsistent. Such bishops whereof there may be many in the same church, of the same order, equal in power and dignity with respect unto office, will easily be granted; but then they are presbyters as well as bishops. There will, I fear, be no end of this contest, because of the prejudices and interests of some; but that the identity of bishops and presbyters should be more plainly expressed can neither be expected nor desired.

3. The apostle, being at Miletus, sent to Ephesus for the elders of the church to come unto him; that is, the elders of the church at Ephesus, as hath been elsewhere undeniably demonstrated, ~~4007~~ Acts 20:17, 18: unto these elders he says, “Take heed unto yourselves, and to all the flock over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you bishops, to feed the church of God,” verse 28. If “elders” and “bishops” be not the same persons, having the same office, the same function, and the same duties, and the same names, it is impossible, So far as I understand, how it should be expressed: for these *elders* are they whom the Holy Ghost made *bishops*, they were many of them in the same church, their duty it was to attend unto the flock and to feed the church, which comprise all the duties, the whole function of elders and bishops; which must therefore be the same. This

plain testimony can no way be evaded by pretences and conjectures, unwritten and uncertain; the only answer unto it is, “It was indeed so then, but it was otherwise afterward;” which some now betake themselves unto. But these elders were either elders only, and not bishops; or bishops only, and not elders; or the same persons were elders and bishops, as is plainly affirmed in the words The last is that which we plead. if the first be asserted, then was there no bishop then at Ephesus, for these elders had the whole oversight of the flock; if the second, then were there no elders at all, which is no good exposition of those words, that “Paul called unto him the elders of the church.”

4. The apostle Peter writes unto the “*elders*” of the churches that they should “feed the flock,” ἐπισκοποῦντες, “taking the oversight,” or exercising the office and function of bishops over it; and that not as “lords,” but as “ensamples” of humility, obedience, and holiness, to the whole flock, ~~1~~ 1 Peter 5:1-3. Those on whom it is incumbent to feed the flock and to superintend it, as those who in the first place are accountable unto Jesus Christ, are bishops, and such as have no other bishop over them, unto whom this charge should be principally committed; but such, according unto this apostle, are the elders of the church: therefore these elders and bishops are the same. And such were the ἡγούμενοι, the guides of the church at Jerusalem, whom the members of it were bound to obey, as those that did watch for and were to give an account of their souls, ~~Heb~~ Hebrews 13:17.

5. The substance of these and all other instances or testimonies of the same kind is this: Those whose names are the same, equally common and applicable unto them all, whose function is the same, whose qualifications and characters are the same, whose duties, account, and reward are the same, concerning whom there is in no one place of Scripture the least mention of inequality, disparity, or preference in office among them, they are essentially and every way the same. That thus it is with the elders and bishops in the Scripture cannot modestly be denied.

I do acknowledge, that where a church is greatly increased, so as that there is a necessity of *many elders* in it for its instruction and rule, decency and order do require that one of them do, in the management of all church-affairs, preside, to guide and direct the way and manner thereof: so the

presbyters at Alexandria did choose one from among themselves that should have the pre-eminence of a president among them. Whether the person that is so to preside be directed unto by being first converted, or first ordained, or on the account of age, or of gifts and abilities, whether he continue for a season only, and then another be deputed unto the same work, or for his life, are things in themselves indifferent, to be determined according unto the general rules of reason and order, with respect unto the edification of the church.

I shall never oppose this *order*, but rather desire to see it in practice, — namely, that particular churches were of such an extent as necessarily to require *many elders*, both teaching and ruling, for their instruction and government; for the better observation of order and decency in the public assemblies; for the fuller representation of the authority committed by Jesus Christ unto the officers of his church; for the occasional instruction of the members in lesser assemblies, which, as unto some ends, may be stated also; with the due attendance unto all other means of edification, as watching, inspecting, warning, admonishing, exhorting, and the like: and that among these elders one should be chosen by themselves, with the consent of the church, not into a new order, not into a degree of authority above his brethren, but only unto his part of the common work in a peculiar manner, which requires some kind of precedency. Hereby no new officer, no new order of officers, no new degree of power or authority, is constituted in the church; only the work and duty of it is cast into such an order as the very light of nature doth require.

But there is not any intimation in the Scripture of the least imparity or inequality, in order, degree, or authority, among officers of the same sort, whether extraordinary or ordinary. The apostles were all equal; so were the evangelists, so were elders or bishops, and so were deacons also. The Scripture knows no more of an archbishop, such as all diocesan bishops are, nor of an archdeacon, than of an arch-apostle, or of an archevangelist, or an archprophet. Howbeit it is evident that in all their assemblies they had one who did preside in the manner before described; which seems, among the apostles, to have been the prerogative of Peter.

The brethren also of the church may be so multiplied as that the constant meeting of them all in one place may not be absolutely best for their

edification; howbeit, that on all the solemn occasions of the church whereunto their consent was necessary, they did of old, and ought still, to meet in the same place, for advice, consultation, and consent, was proved before. This is so fully expressed and exemplified in the two great churches of Jerusalem and Antioch, Acts 15, that it cannot be gainsaid. When Paul and Barnabas, sent by the “brethren” or church at Antioch, verses 1-3, were come to Jerusalem, they were received by “the church,” as the brethren are called, in distinction from the “apostles and elders,” verse 4. So when the apostles and elders assembled to consider of the case proposed unto them, the whole “multitude” of the church, that is, the brethren, assembled with them, verses 6, 12; neither were they mute persons, mere auditors and spectators in the assembly, but they concurred both in the debate and determination of the question, insomuch that they are expressly joined with the apostles and elders in the advice given, verses 22, 23. And when Paul and Barnabas returned unto Antioch, the “multitude,” unto whom the letter of the church at Jerusalem was directed, came together about it, verses 23, 30. Unless this be observed, the primitive church-state is overthrown. But I shall return from this digression.

The first officer or elder of the church is the *pastor*. A pastor is the elder that feeds and rules the flock, ~~AND~~ 1 Peter 5:2; that is, who is its teacher and its bishop: Ποιμάνετε, ἐπισκοποῦντες, “Feed, taking the oversight.”

It is not my present design or work to give a full account of the qualifications required in persons to be called unto this office, nor of their duty and work, with the qualities or virtues to be exercised therein; it would require a large discourse to handle them practically, and it hath been done by others. It were to be wished that what is of this kind expressed in the rule, and which the nature of the office doth indispensably require, were more exemplified in practice than it is. But some things relating unto this officer and his office, that are needful to be well stated, I shall treat concerning.

The name of a *pastor* or *shepherd* is metaphorical. It is a denomination suited unto his work, denoting the same office and person with a bishop or elder, spoken of absolutely, without limitation unto either teaching or ruling; and it seems to be used or applied unto this office because it is

more comprehensive of and instructive in all the duties, that belong unto it than any other name whatever, nay, than all of them put together. The grounds and reasons of this metaphor, or whence the church is called a flock, and whence God termeth himself the shepherd of the flock; whence the sheep of this flock are committed unto Christ, whereon he becomes “the good shepherd that lays down his life for the sheep,” and the prince of shepherds; what is the interest of men in a participation of this office, and what their duty thereon, — are things well worth the consideration of them who are called unto it. “Hirelings,” yea, “wolves” and “dumb dogs,” do in many places take on themselves to be shepherds of the flock, by whom it is devoured and destroyed, ^{<408>}Acts 20:18, 19, etc.; ^{<418>}1 Peter 5:2-4; Cant. 1:7; ^{<417>}Jeremiah 13:17, 23:2; ^{<347>}Ezekiel 34:3; ^{<442>}Genesis 49:24; ^{<424>}Psalms 23:1, 80:1; ^{<401>}John 10:11, 14-16; ^{<333>}Hebrews 13:20; ^{<402>}1 Peter 2:25, 5:4.

Whereas, therefore, this name or appellation is taken from and includes in it *love, care, tenderness, watchfulness*, in all the duties of going before, preserving, feeding, defending the flock, the sheep and the lambs, the strong, the weak, and the diseased, with accountableness, as servants, unto the chief Shepherd, it was generally disused in the church, and those of bishops or overseers, guides, presidents, elders, which seem to include more of honor and authority, were retained in common use; though one of them at last, namely, that of bishops, with some elating compositions and adjuncts of power, obtained the pre-eminence. Out of the corruption of these compositions and additions, in archbishops, metropolitans, patriarchs, and the like, brake forth the cockatrice of the church, — that is, the pope.

But this name is by the Holy Ghost appropriated unto the principal ministers of Christ in his church, ^{<4011>}Ephesians 4:11; and under that name they were promised unto the church of old, ^{<4085>}Jeremiah 3:15. And the work of these pastors is to feed the flock committed to their charge, as it is constantly required of them, ^{<408>}Acts 20:28; ^{<408>}1 Peter 5:2.

Of pastoral feeding there are two parts: —

1. Teaching or instruction;

2. Rule or discipline. Unto these two heads may all the acts and duties of a shepherd toward his flock be reduced; and both are intended in the term of “feeding,” ~~<31D>~~1 Chronicles 11:2, 17:6; ~~<23D>~~Jeremiah 23:2; ~~<30D>~~Micah 5:4, 7:14; ~~<81D>~~Zechariah 11:7; ~~<40D>~~Acts 20:28; ~~<215>~~John 21:15-17; ~~<10D>~~1 Peter 5:2, etc.

Wherefore he who is the pastor is the bishop, the elder, the teacher of the church.

These works of teaching and ruling may be distinct in several officers, namely, teachers and rulers; but to divide them in the same office of pastors, that some pastors should feed by teaching only, but have no right to rule by virtue of their office, and some should attend in exercise unto rule only, not esteeming themselves obliged to labor continually in feeding the flock, is almost to overthrow this office of Christ’s designation, and to set up two in the room of it, of men’s own projection.

Of the call of men unto this office so many things have been spoken and written by others at large that I shall only insist, and that very briefly, on some things which are either of the most important consideration or have been omitted by others; as, —

1. Unto the *call* of any person unto this office of a pastor in the church there are certain *qualifications* previously required in him, disposing and making him fit for that office. The outward call is an act of the church, as we shall show immediately; but therein is required an obediential acting of him also who is called. Neither of these can be regular, neither can the church act according to rule and order, nor the person called act in such a due obedience, unless there are in him some previous indications of the mind of God, designing the person to be called by such qualifications as may render him meet and able for the discharge of his office and work; for ordinary vocation is not a collation of gracious spiritual abilities, suiting and making men meet for the pastoral office, but it is the communication of right and power for the regular use and exercise of gifts and abilities received antecedently unto that call, unto the edification of the church, wherein the office itself doth consist. And if we would know what these qualifications and endowments are, for the substance of them, we may learn them in their great example and pattern, our Lord Jesus Christ himself. Our Lord Jesus Christ, being the good Shepherd, whose the sheep are, the Shepherd and Bishop of our souls, the chief Shepherd, did design,

in the undertaking and exercise of his pastoral office, to give a type and example unto all those who are to be called unto the same office under him; and if there be not a conformity unto him herein, no man can assure his own conscience or the church of God that he is or can be lawfully called unto this office.

The qualifications of Christ unto, and the gracious qualities of his mind and soul in, the discharge of his pastoral office, may be referred. unto five heads: —

(1.) *That furniture with spiritual gifts and abilities* by the communication of the Holy Ghost unto him in an unmeasurable fullness, whereby he was fitted for the discharge of his office. This is expressed with respect unto his undertaking of it, <sup>Isaiah 11:2, 3, <sup>61:1-3; <sup>Luke 4:14. Herein was he “anointed with the oil of gladness above his fellows,” <sup>Hebrews 1:9. But this unction of the Spirit is, in a certain measure, required in all who are called, or to be called, unto the pastoral office, <sup>Ephesians 4:7. That there are spiritual powers, gifts, and abilities, required unto the gospel ministry, I have at large declared in another treatise, as also what they are; and where there are none of those spiritual abilities which are necessary unto the edification of the church in the administration of gospel ordinances, as in prayer, preaching, and the like, no outward call or order can constitute any man an evangelical pastor. As unto particular persons, I will not contend as unto an absolute nullity in the office by reason of their deficiency in spiritual gifts, unless it be gross, and such as renders them utterly useless unto the edification of the church. I only say, that no man can in an orderly way and manner be called or set apart unto this office in whom there are not some indications of God’s designation of him thereunto by his furniture with spiritual gifts, of knowledge, wisdom, understanding, and utterance for prayer and preaching, with other ministerial duties, in some competent measure.

(2.) *Compassion and love to the flock* were gloriously eminent in this “great Shepherd of the sheep.” After other evidences hereof, he gave them that signal confirmation in laying down his life for them. This testimony of his love he insists upon himself, John 10. And herein also his example ought to lie continually before the eyes of them who are called unto the pastoral office. Their entrance should be accompanied with love to the

souls of men; and if the discharge of their office be not animated with love unto their flocks, wolves, or hirelings, or thieves, they may be, but shepherds they are not. Neither is the glory of the gospel ministry more lost or defaced in any thing, or by any means, than by the evidence that is given among the most of an inconformity unto Jesus Christ in their love unto the flock. Alas! it is scarce once thought of amongst the most of them who, in various degrees, take upon them the pastoral office. Where are the fruits of it? what evidence is given of it in any kind? is well if some, instead of laying down their lives for them, do not by innumerable ways destroy their souls.

(3.) There is and was in this great Shepherd a *continual watchfulness over the whole flock*, to keep it, to preserve it, to feed, to lead, and cherish it, to purify and cleanse it, until it be presented unspotted unto God. He doth never slumber nor sleep; he watereth his vineyard every moment; he keeps it night and day, that none may hurt it; he loseth nothing of what is committed to him. See ²³⁰¹Isaiah 40:11. I speak not distinctly of previous qualifications unto an outward call only, but with a mixture of those qualities and duties which are required in the discharge of this office; and herein also is the Lord Christ to be our example. And hereunto do belong,

[1.] *Constant prayer* for the flock;

[2.] *Diligence* in the dispensation of the word with wisdom, as unto times, seasons, the state of the flock in general, their light, knowledge, ways, walking, ignorance, temptations, trials, defections, weaknesses of all sorts, growth, and decays, etc;

[3.] Personal admonition, exhortation, consolation, instruction, as their particular cases do require;

[4.] All with a design to keep them from evil, and to present them without blame before Christ Jesus at the great day. But these and things of the like nature presenting themselves with some earnestness unto my mind, I shall at present discharge myself of the thoughts of them, hoping for a more convenient place and season to give them a larger treatment; and somewhat yet further shall be spoken of them in the next chapter.

(4.) *Zeal for the glory of God*, in his whole ministry and in all the ends of it, had its continual residence in the holy soul of the great Shepherd. Hence it is declared in an expression intimating that it was *inexpressible*: “The zeal of thine house hath eaten me up,” ^{<4017>}John 2:17. This also must accompany the discharge of the pastoral office, or it will find no acceptance with him; and the want of it is one of those things which hath filled the World with a dead, faithless, fruitless ministry.

(5.) As he was absolutely in himself “holy, harmless, undefiled, separate from sinners,” so a conformity unto him in these things, and that in *some degree of eminency* above others, is required in them who are called unto this office.

2. Again; none can or may *take this office upon him*, or discharge the duties of it, which are peculiarly its own, with authority, but he who is called and set apart thereunto according to the mind of Jesus Christ. The continuation of all church order and power, of the regular administration of all sacred ordinances, yea, of the very being of the church as it is organical, depends on this assertion. Some deny the continuation of the office itself, and of those duties which are peculiar unto it, as the administration of the sacraments; some judge that persons neither called nor set apart unto this office may discharge all the duties and the whole work of it; some, that a temporary delegation of power unto any by the church is all the warranty necessary for the undertaking and discharge of this office. Many have been the contests about these things, occasioned by the ignorance and disorderly affections of some persons. I shall briefly represent the truth herein, with the grounds of it, and proceed to the consideration of the call itself, which is so necessary: —

(1.) Christ himself, in his own person and by his own authority, was *the author of this office*. He gave it, appointed it, erected it in the church, by virtue of his sovereign power and authority, ^{<4011>}Ephesians 4:11, 12; ^{<4028>}1 Corinthians 12:28. As he gave, appointed, ordained, an extraordinary office of apostleship, so he ordained, appointed, and gave, the ordinary office of pastorship or teaching. They have both the same divine original.

(2.) He appointed this *office for continuance*, or to abide in the church unto the consummation of all things, ^{<4013>}Ephesians 4:13, ^{<4039>}Matthew 28:19, 20; and therefore he took order by his apostles that, for the continuation of

this office, pastors, elders, or bishops, should be called and ordained unto the care and discharge of it in all churches; which was done by them accordingly, ^{<4442>}Acts 14:22, 23, 20:28, ^{<5401>}1 Timothy 3:1-7, ^{<5001>}Titus 1:5-9: wherein he gave rule unto all churches unto the end of the world, and prescribed them their duty.

(3.) On this office and the discharge of it he hath laid the whole weight of *the order, rule, and edification of his church*, in his name and by virtue of his authority, ^{<4008>}Acts 20:28; ^{<5007>}Colossians 4:17; ^{<5405>}1 Timothy 3:15; 1 Peter, 5:1-4; ^{<6001>}Revelation 2:1-5, etc. Hereon a double necessity of the continuation of this office doth depend, — first, That which ariseth from the *precept* or command of it, which made it necessary to the church on the account of the obedience which it owes to Christ; and, secondly, From its being the principal *ordinary means* of all the ends of Christ in and towards his church. Wherefore, although he can himself feed his church in the wilderness, when it is deprived of all outward instituted means of edification, yet where this office fails through its neglect, there is nothing but disorder, confusion, and destruction, will ensue thereon; no promise of feeding or edification.

(4.) The Lord Christ hath given *commands* unto the church for obedience unto those who enjoy and exercise this office among them. Now, all these commands are needless and superfluous, nor can any obedience be yielded unto the Lord Christ in their observance, unless there be a continuation of this office. And the church loseth as much in grace and privilege as it loseth in commands; for in obedience unto the commands of Christ doth grace in its exercise consist, ^{<5007>}1 Timothy 5:17; ^{<5801>}Hebrews 13:7, 17.

(5.) This office is accompanied with *power* and *authority*, which none can take or assume to themselves. All power and authority, whether in things spiritual or temporal, which is not either founded in the law of nature or collated by divine ordination, is usurpation and tyranny; no man can of himself take either sword. To invade an office which includes power and authority over others is to disturb all right, natural, divine, and civil. That such an authority is included in this office is evident, —

[1.] From the *names* ascribed unto them in whom it is vested; as pastors, bishops, elders, rulers, all of them requiring it.

[2.] From the *work* prescribed unto them, which is feeding by rule and teaching.

[3.] From the execution of church-power in *discipline*, or the exercise of the keys of the kingdom of heaven committed unto them.

[4.] From the commands given for *obedience* unto them, which respect authority.

[5.] From their appointment to be *the means and instruments* of exerting the authority of Christ in the church, which can be done no other way.

(6.) Christ hath appointed *a standing rule of the calling of men unto this office*, as we shall see immediately; but if men may enter upon it and discharge it without any such call, that rule, with the way of the call prescribed, is altogether in vain; and there can be no greater affront unto the authority of Christ in his church than to act in it in neglect of or in opposition unto the rule that he hath appointed for the exercise of power in it.

(7.) There is *an accountable trust* committed unto those who undertake this office. The whole flock, the ministry itself, the truths of the gospel, as to the preservation of them, all are committed to them, ^{<4047>}Colossians 4:17; ^{<4048>}1 Timothy 6:20; ^{<4049>}2 Timothy 2:2, 16, 23; ^{<4050>}Acts 20:28; ^{<4051>}1 Peter 5:1-4; ^{<4052>}Hebrews 13:17, “They that must give account.” Nothing can be more wicked or foolish than for a man to intrude himself into a trust which is not committed unto him. They are branded as profligately wicked who attempt any such thing among men, which cannot be done without falsification; and what shall he be esteemed who intrudes himself into the highest trust that any creature is capable of in the name of Christ, and takes upon him to give an account of its discharge at the last day, without any divine call or warranty?

(8.) There are, unto the discharge of this office, *especial promises* granted and annexed of present assistances and future eternal rewards, ^{<4053>}Matthew 28:19, 20; ^{<4054>}1 Peter 5:4. Either these promises belong unto them who take this office on themselves without any call, or they do not. If they do not, then have they neither any especial assistance in their work nor can expect any reward of their labors. If it be said they have an interest in them, then

the worst of men may obtain the benefit of divine promises without any divine designation.

(9.) The general force of *the rule*, ^{<300>}Hebrews 5:4, includes a prohibition of undertaking any sacred office without a divine call; and so the instances of such prohibitions under the old testament, as unto the duties annexed unto an office, as in the case of Uzziah invading the priesthood, ^{<300>}2 Chronicles 26:16-21; or of taking a ministerial office without call or mission, as ^{<300>}Jeremiah 27:9, 10, 14, 15, having respect unto the order of God's institutions, may be pleaded in this case.

(10.) Whoever, therefore, takes upon him the pastoral office without a lawful outward call, *doth take unto himself power and authority* without any divine warranty, which is a foundation of all disorder and confusion; interests himself in an accountable trust no way committed unto him; hath no promise of resistance in or reward for his work, but engageth in that which is destructive of all church-order, and consequently of the very being of the church itself.

(11.) Yet there are *three things* that are to be annexed unto this assertion, by way of limitation; as, —

[1.] Many things performed by virtue of *office*, in a way of authority, may be performed by others not called to office, in a way of *charity*. Such are the moral duties of exhorting, admonishing, comforting, instructing, and praying with and for one another.

[2.] *Spiritual gifts* may be exercised unto the edification of others without office-power, where order and opportunity do require it. But the constant exercise of spiritual gifts in preaching, with a refusal of undertaking a ministerial office, or without design so to do upon a lawful call, cannot be approved.

[3.] The *rules* proposed concern only ordinary cases, and the ordinary state of the church; extraordinary cases are accompanied with a warranty in themselves for extraordinary actings and duties.

(12.) The *call* of persons unto the pastoral office is an act and duty of the church. It is not an act of the political magistrate, not of the pope, not of any single prelate, but of the whole church, unto whom the Lord Christ

hath committed the keys of the kingdom of heaven. And, indeed, although there be great differences about the nature and manner of the call of men unto this office, yet none who understands aught of these things can deny but that it is an act and duty of the church, which the church alone is empowered by Christ to put forth and exert. But this will more fully appear in the consideration of the nature and manner of this call of men unto the pastoral office, and the actings of the church therein.

The call of persons unto the pastoral office in the church consists of two parts, — first, *Election*; secondly, *Ordination*, as it is commonly called, or sacred separation by fasting and prayer. As unto the former, four things must be inquired into: —

- I.** What is *previous* unto it, or preparatory for it;
 - II.** *Wherein* it doth consist;
 - III.** Its *necessity*, or the demonstration of its truth and institution;
 - IV.** What influence it hath into *the communication of pastoral office-power* unto a pastor so chosen.
- I.** That which is previous unto it is the *meetness* of the person for his office and work that is to be chosen. It can never be the duty of the church to call or choose an unmeet, an unqualified, an unprepared person unto this office. No pretended necessity, no outward motives, can enable or warrant it so to do; nor can it by any outward act, whatever the rule or solemnity of it be, communicate ministerial authority unto persons utterly unqualified for and incapable of the discharge of the pastoral office according to the rule of the Scripture. And this has been one great means of debasing the ministry and of almost ruining the church itself, either by the neglect of those who suppose themselves intrusted with the whole power of ordination, or by impositions on them by secular power and patrons of livings, as they are called, with the stated regulation of their proceedings herein by a defective law, whence there hath not been a due regard unto the antecedent preparatory qualifications of those who are called unto the ministry.

Two ways is the meetness of any one made known and to be judged of: —

1. By *an evidence* given of the qualifications in him before mentioned. The church is not to call or choose any one to office who is not known unto them, of whose frame of spirit and walking they have not had some experience; not a novice, or one lately come unto them. He must be one who by his ways and walking hath obtained a good report, even among them that are without, so far as he is known, unless they be enemies or scoffers; and one that hath in some good measure evidenced his faith, love, and obedience unto Jesus Christ in the church. This is the chief trust that the Lord Christ hath committed unto his churches; and if they are negligent herein, or if at all adventures they will impose an officer in his house upon him without satisfaction of his meetness upon due inquiry, it is a great dishonor unto him and provocation of him. Herein principally are churches made the overseers of their own purity and edification. To deny them an ability of a right judgment herein, or a liberty for the use and exercise of it, is error and tyranny. But that flock which Christ purchased and purified with his own blood is thought by some to be little better than a herd of brute beasts. Where there is a defect of this personal knowledge, from want of opportunity, it may be supplied by testimonies of unquestionable authority.

2. By *a trial of his gifts for edification*. These are those spiritual endowments which the Lord Christ grants and the Holy Spirit works in the minds of men, for this very end that the church may be profited by them, ⁴³⁷⁷1 Corinthians 12:7-11. And we must at present take it for granted that every true church of Christ, that is so in the matter and form of it, is able to judge in some competent measure what gifts of men are suited unto their own edification. But yet, in making a judgment hereof, one *directive means* is the advice of other elders and churches; which they are obliged to make use of by virtue of the communion of churches, and for the avoidance of offense in their walk in that communion.

II. As to *the nature of this election*, call, or choice of a person known, tried, and judged meetly qualified for the pastoral office, it is an act of the whole church; that is, of the fraternity with their elders, if they have any; for a pastor may be chosen unto a church which hath other teachers, elders, or officers, already instated in it. In this case their concurrence in the choice intended is necessary, by way of common suffrage, not of authority or office-power; for election is not an act of authority, but of

liberty and power, wherein the whole church in the fraternity is equal. If there be no officers stated in the church before, as it was with the churches in the primitive times, on the first ordination of elders among them, this election belongs unto the fraternity.

III. That, therefore, which we have now to prove is this, that it is the mind and will of Jesus Christ that meet persons should be called unto the pastoral office (or any other office in the church) *by the election and choice of the church* itself whereunto they are called, antecedently unto a sacred, solemn separation unto their respective offices; for under the old testament there were three ways whereby men were called unto office in the church: —

- 1.** They were so extraordinarily and immediately, by the *nomination and designation of God* himself: so Aaron was called unto the priesthood; and others afterward, as Samuel, to be prophets.
- 2.** By a *law of carnal generation*: so all the priests of the posterity of Aaron succeeded into the office of the priesthood without any other call.
- 3.** By the *choice of the people*, which was the call of all the ordinary elders and rulers of the church: ^{<4113>}Deuteronomy 1:13, **הָבֹנוּ לָכֶם**, “Give to yourselves.” It was required of the people that they should in the first place make a judgment on their qualifications for the office whereunto they were called. Men known unto them for wise, understanding, righteous, walking in the fear of God, they were to look out, and then to present them unto Moses, for their separation unto office; which is election. It is true that, ^{<4182>}Exodus 18:25, it is said that Moses chose the elders; but it is frequent in the Scripture that where any thing is done by many, where one is chief, that is ascribed indifferently either to the many or to the chief director. So is it said, “Israel sent messengers,” ^{<4027>}Numbers 21:21. Moses, speaking of the same thing, says, “I sent messengers,” ^{<4123>}Deuteronomy 2:26. So, ^{<4369>}1 Chronicles 19:19, “They made peace with David and became his servants;” which is, ^{<4009>}2 Samuel 10:19, “They made peace with Israel and served them.” See also ^{<4212>}2 Kings 11:12, with ^{<4231>}2 Chronicles 23:11; as also ^{<4361>}1 Chronicles 16:1, with ^{<4067>}2 Samuel 6:17; and the same may be observed in other places. Wherefore the people chose these elders under the conduct and guidance of Moses: which directs us unto the right interpretation of ^{<4423>}Acts 14:23, whereof we shall speak immediately.

The first of these ways was repeated in the foundation of *the evangelical church*. Christ himself was called unto his office by the Father, through the unction of the Spirit, ~~2001~~ Isaiah 61:1-3, ~~2001~~ Hebrews 5:5; and he himself called the apostles and evangelists, in whom that call ceased. The second, ordinary way, by the privilege of natural generation of the stock of the priests, was utterly abolished. The third way only remained for the ordinary continuation of the church, — namely, by the choice and election of the church itself, with solemn separation and dedication by officers extraordinary or ordinary.

The first instance of the choice of a church-officer had a mixture in it of the first and last ways, in *the case of Matthias*. As he was able to be a church-officer, he had the choice and consent of the church; as he was to be an apostle or an extraordinary officer, there was an immediate divine disposition of him into his office; — the latter, to give him apostolical authority; the former, to make him a precedent of the future actings of the church in the call of their officers.

I say, this being the *first example* and pattern of the calling of any person unto office in the Christian church-state, wherein there was an interposition of the ordinary actings of men, is established as a rule and precedent, not to be changed, altered, or departed from, in any age of the church whatever. It is so as unto what was of common right and equity, which belonged unto the whole church. And I cannot but wonder how men durst ever reject and disannul this divine example and rule. It will not avail them to say that it is only a matter of fact, and not a precept or institution, that is recorded; for, —

- 1.** It is a *fact* left on record in the holy Scripture for our instruction and direction.
- 2.** It is an *example* of the apostles and the whole church proposed unto us; which, in all things not otherwise determined, hath the force of an institution.
- 3.** If there were no more in it but this, that we have a matter of common right determined and applied by the wisdom of the apostles and the entire church of believers at that time in the world, it were an impiety to depart from it, unless in case of the utmost necessity.

Whereas what is here recorded was in the call of an apostle, it strengthens the argument which hence we plead; for if in the extraordinary call of an apostle it was the mind of Christ that the fraternity or multitude should have the liberty of their suffrage, how much more is it certainly his mind, that in the ordinary call of their own peculiar officers, in whom, under him, the concernment is their own only, this right should be continued unto them!

The order of the proceeding of the church herein is distinctly declared; for,

1. The number of the church at that time, — that is, of the men, — was about an hundred and twenty, ^{<4115>}Acts 1:15.
2. They were assembled all together in one place, so as that Peter stood up in the midst of them, verse 15.
3. Peter, in the name of the rest of the apostles, declares unto them the necessity of choosing one to be substituted in the room of Judas, verses 16-22.
4. He limits the choice of him unto the especial qualification of being a meet witness of the resurrection of Christ, or unto those who constantly accompanied him with themselves from the baptism of John; that is, from his being baptized by him, whereon he began his public ministry.
5. Among these they were left at their liberty to nominate any two, who were to be left unto the lot for a determination whether of them God designed unto the office.
6. Hereon the whole multitude **ἔστησαν δύο**, “appointed two;” that is, the **ἄνδρες ἀδελφοί**, the “men and brethren,” unto whom Peter spoke, verse 16, did so.
7. The same persons, to promote the work, “prayed and gave forth their lots,” verses 24-26.
8. **Συγκατεψηφίσθη Μαθθίας**, — Matthias was, by the common suffrage of the whole church, reckoned unto the number of the apostles.

I say not that these things were done by the disciples in distinction from Peter and the rest of the apostles, but in conjunction with them. Peter did nothing without them, nor did they any thing without him.

The exceptions of Bellarmine and others against this testimony, that it was a grant and a condescension in Peter, and not a declaration of the right of the church, that it was an extraordinary case, that the determination of the whole was by lot, are of no validity. The pretended concession of Peter is a figment; the case was so extraordinary as to include in it all ordinary cases, for the substance of them; and although the ultimate determination of the individual person (which was necessary unto his apostleship) was immediately divine, by lot, yet here is all granted unto the people, in their choosing and appointing two, in their praying, in their casting lots, in their voluntary approbatory suffrage, that is desired.

This blessed example, given us by the wisdom of the apostles, yea, of the Spirit of God in them, being eminently suited unto the nature of the thing itself, as we shall see immediately, and compliant with all other directions and apostolical examples in the like case, is rather to be followed than the practice of some degenerate churches, who, to cover the turpitude of their acting in deserting this example and rule, do make use of a mock show and pretense of that which really they deny, reject, and oppose.

The second example we have of the practice of the apostles in this case, whereby the preceding rule is confirmed, is given us Acts 6, in *the election of the deacons*. Had there ensued, after the choice of Matthias, an instance of a diverse practice, by an exclusion of the consent of the people, the former might have been evaded as that which was absolutely extraordinary, and not obliging unto the church: but this was the very next instance of the call of any church-officer, and it was the first appointment of any ordinary officers in the Christian church; for, it falling out in the very year of Christ's ascension, there is no mention of any ordinary elders, distinct from the apostles, ordained in that church; for all the apostles themselves yet abiding there for the most part of this time, making only some occasional excursions unto other places, were able to take care of the rule of the church and the preaching of the word. They are, indeed, mentioned as those who were well known in the church not long afterward, chap. 11:30; but the first instance of the call of ordinary

teaching elders or pastors is not recorded. That of deacons is so by reason of the occasion of it; and we may observe concerning it unto our purpose,

- 1.** That the institution of the office itself was of apostolical authority, and that fullness of church-power wherewith they were furnished by Jesus Christ.
- 2.** That they did not exert that authority but upon such reasons of it as were satisfactory to the church; which they declare, chap. 6:2.
- 3.** That the action is ascribed to the twelve in general, without naming any person who spake for the rest; which renders the pretence of the Romanists from the former place, where Peter is said to have spoken unto the disciples, — whereon they would have the actings of the church which ensued thereon to have been by his concession and grant, not of their own right, — altogether vain; for the rest of the apostles were as much interested and concerned in what was then spoken by Peter as they were at this time, when the whole is ascribed unto the twelve.
- 4.** That the church was greatly multiplied [at] that time, on the account of the conversion unto the faith recorded in the foregoing chapter. It is probable, indeed, that many, yea, the most of them, were returned unto their own habitations; for the next year there were churches in all Judea, Galilee, and Samaria, chap. ~~408~~9:31. And Peter went about “throughout all quarters,” to visit the saints that dwelt in them, verse 32, of whose conversion we read nothing but that which fell out at Jerusalem at Pentecost; but a great multitude they were, chap. ~~409~~6:1, 2.
- 5.** This whole multitude of the church, — that is, the “brethren,” verse 3, — assembled in one place, being congregated by the apostles, verse 2; who would not ordain any thing, wherein they were concerned, without their own consent.
- 6.** They judged on the whole matter proposed unto them, and gave their approbation thereof, before they entered upon the practice of it: Verse 5, “The saying pleased the whole multitude.”

- 7.** The qualifications of the persons to be chosen unto the office intended are declared by the apostles: Verse 3, “Of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom.”
- 8.** These qualities the multitude were to judge upon; and so, absolutely, of the meetness of any for this office.
- 9.** The choice is wholly committed and left unto them by the apostles, as that which of right did belong unto them, “Look ye out among you;” which they made use of, choosing them unto the office by their common suffrage, verse 5.
- 10.** Having thus chosen them, they presented them as their chosen officers unto the apostles, to be by them set apart unto the exercise of their office by prayer and imposition of hands, Verse 6.

It is impossible there should be a more evident, convincing instance and example of the free choice of ecclesiastical officers by the multitude or fraternity of the church than is given us herein, Nor was there any ground or reason why this order and process should be observed, why the apostles would not themselves nominate and appoint persons whom they saw and knew meet for this office to receive it, but that it was the right and liberty of the people, according to the mind of Christ, to choose their own officers, which they would not abridge nor infringe.

So was it then, οὕτω καὶ νῦν γίνεσθαι ἔδει, saith Chrysostom on the place, “and so it ought now to be;” but the usage began then to decline. It were well if some would consider how the apostles at that time treated that multitude of the people, which is so much now despised, and utterly excluded from all concern in church affairs but what consists in servile subjection; but they have, in this pattern and precedent for the future ordering of the calling of meet persons to office in the church, their interest, power, and privilege secured unto them, so as that they can never justly be deprived of it. And if there were nothing herein but only a record of the wisdom of the apostles in managing church affairs, it is marvellous to me that any who would be thought to succeed them in any part of their trust and office should dare to depart from the example set before them by the Holy Ghost in them, preferring their own ways and inventions above it. I shall ever judge that there is more safety in a strict adherence unto this

apostolical practice and example than in a compliance with all the canons of councils or churches afterward.

The only objection usually insisted on, — that is, by Bellarmine and those that follow him, — is, “That this being the election of deacons to manage *the alms of the church*, that is, somewhat of their temporals, nothing can thence be concluded unto the right or way of calling bishops, pastors, or elders, who are to take care of the souls of the people. They may, indeed, be able to judge of the fitness of them who are to be intrusted with their purses, or what they are willing to give out of them; but it doth not thence follow that they are able to judge of the fitness of those who are to be their spiritual pastors, nor to have the choice of them.”

Nothing can be weaker than this pretense or evasion; for, —

- (1.) The question is concerning *the calling of persons* unto office in the church in general, whereof we have here a rule whereunto no exception is any way entered.
- (2.) This cannot be fairly pleaded by them *who appoint deacons to preach, baptize, and officiate publicly* in all holy things, excepting only the administration of the eucharist.
- (3.) If the people are meet and able to judge of them who are of “honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom,” which is here required of them, they are able to judge who are meet to be their pastors.
- (4.) The argument holds strongly on the other side, namely, that if it be right and equal, if it be of divine appointment and apostolical practice, that the people should choose those who were to collect and distribute their charitable benevolence because of their concernment therein, much more are they to enjoy the same liberty, right, and privilege, in the choice of their pastors, unto whom they commit the care of their souls, and submit themselves unto their authority in the Lord.

Thirdly. Accordingly they did use the same liberty in the choice of *their elders*: ⁴⁴¹²³Acts 14:23, *Χειροτονήσαντες αὐτοῖς πρεσβυτέρους κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, προσευξάμενοι μετὰ νηστειῶν*, — that is, say Erasmus, Vatablus, Beza, all our old English translations, appointing, ordaining, creating elders by *election, or the suffrage of the disciples*, having prayed

with fasting. The whole order of the sacred separation of persons qualified unto the office of the ministry, — that is, to be bishops, elders, or pastors, — is here clearly represented; for, —

1. They were *chosen by the people*, the apostles who were present, namely, Paul and Barnabas, presiding in the action, directing of it and confirming that by their consent with them.
2. A *time of prayer and fasting* was appointed for the action or discharge of the duty of the church herein.
3. When they were so *chosen*, the apostles present *solemnly prayed*, whereby their ordination was completed. And those who would have **χειροτονία** here mentioned to be **χειροθεσία**, or an authoritative imposition of hands, wherein this ordination did consist, do say there is an **ὑστερολογία** in the words, — that is, they feign a disorder in them to serve their own hypothesis; for they suppose that their complete ordination was effected before there was any prayer with fasting, for by imposition of hands in their judgment ordination is completed: so Bellarmine and a Lapide on the place, with those that follow them. But first to pervert the true signification of the Word, and then to give countenance unto that wresting of it by assigning a disorder unto the words of the whole sentence, and that such a disorder as makes, in their judgment, a false representation of the matter of fact related, is a way of the interpretation of Scripture which will serve any turn.
4. This was done in *every church*, or in every congregation, as Tindal renders the word, namely, in all the particular congregations that were gathered in those parts; for that collection and constitution did always precede the election and ordination of their officers, as is plain in this place, as also ~~ROM~~ Titus 1:5. So far is it from truth that the being of churches dependeth on the successive ordination of their officers, that the church, essentially considered, is always antecedent unto their being and call.

But because it is some men's interest to entangle things plain and clear enough in themselves, I shall consider the objection unto this reddition of the words. The whole of it lies against the signification, use, and application of **χειροτονήσαντες**. Now, although we do not here argue merely from the signification of the word, but from the representation of

the matter of fact made in the context, yet I shall observe some things sufficient for the removal of that objection; as, —

1. The native signification of **χειροτονέω**, by virtue of its composition, is to “lift up” or “stretch forth the hands,” or a hand. And hereunto the LXX. have respect, ^{288D} Isaiah 58:9, where they render **הִלָּחַץ אֶצְבָּעוֹ**, “the putting forth of the finger,” which is used in an ill sense, by **χειροτονία**. **Χειροτονεῖν** is the same with **τὰς χεῖρας αἶρειν**, nor is it ever used in any other signification.

2. The first constant use of it in things political or civil, and so consequently ecclesiastical, is to choose, elect, design, or create any person an officer, magistrate, or ruler, by suffrage or common consent of those concerned. And this was usually done with making bare the hand and arm with lifting up, as Aristophanes witnesseth: —

— “Ὅμως δὲ χειροτονητέον
Ἐξωμισάσαις τὸν ἕτερον βραχίονα. — Ecclesiastes 266.

He is a great stranger unto these things who knoweth not that among the Greeks, especially the Athenians, from whom the use of this word is borrowed or taken, **χειροτονία** was an act **ὅλης τῆς ἐκκλησίας** “of the whole assembly” of the people in the choice of their officers and magistrates. **Χειροτονέω** is “by common suffrage to decree and determine of any thing, law, or order;” and when applied unto persons, it signifies their choice and designation to office. So is it used in the first sense by Demosthenes, Orat. De Corona, **οἱ**, — “The people confirmed my sayings by their suffrage;” and in the other, Philippians 1, **Οὔτε βουλῆς, οὔτε δήμου χειροτονήσαντος αὐτόν**,^{f3} — “Neither the senate nor the people choosing him to his office.” So is the passive verb used, “to be created by suffrages.” **Χειροτονία** was the act of choosing; whose effect was **ψήφισμα**, the determining vote or suffrage. “Porrexerunt manus: psephisma natum est,” saith Cicero, speaking of the manner of the Greeks, Pro Flacco, 7. And when there was a division in choice, it was determined by the greater suffrage: Thucyd. lib. 3 cap. 49 **Καὶ ἐγένοντο ἐν τῇ χειροτονίᾳ ἀγχώμαλοι· ἐκράτησε δὲ ἡ τοῦ Διοδότου**. As many instances of this nature may be produced as there are reports of calling men unto magistracy by election in the Greek historians; and all the further

compositions of the word do signify to choose, confirm, or to abrogate, by common suffrage.

3. The word is but once more used in the New Testament, ^{<418>}2 Corinthians 8:19, where it plainly signifies election and choice of a person to an employment: *Χειροτονηθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν συνέκδημος ἡμῶν*. — “He was chosen of the churches to travel with us.”

4. It is acknowledged that after this was the common use of the word, it was applied to signify the thing itself, and not the manner of doing it. Hence it is used sometimes for the obtaining or collation of authority, or dignity, or magistracy, any manner of way, though not by election: “to appoint, to create.” But this was, by an abusive application of the word, to express the thing itself intended without regard unto its signification and proper use. Why such a use of it should be here admitted no reason can be given; for in all other places on such occasions, the apostles did admit and direct the churches to use their liberty in their choice. So ^{<4152>}Acts 15:22, “The apostles and elders, with the whole church, sent chosen men of their own company to Antioch,” such as they chose by common suffrage for that end; so again, verse 25. “Whomsoever ye shall approve, them will I send,” ^{<4161>}1 Corinthians 16:3: the church chose them, the apostle sent them. “Who was chosen of the churches to travel with us,” ^{<418>}2 Corinthians 8:19. “Look ye out among you,” ^{<418>}Acts 6:3. if on all these and the like occasions, the apostles did guide and direct the people in their right and use of their liberty, as unto the election of persons unto offices and employments when the churches themselves were concerned, what reason is there to depart from the proper and usual signification of the word in this place, denoting nothing but what was the common, practice of the apostles on the like occasions?

5. That which alone is objected hereunto, by Bellarmine and others who follow him and borrow their whole [argument] in this case from him, namely, that *χειροτονήσαντες*, grammatically agreeing with and regulated by Paul and Barnabas, denotes their act, and not any act of the people, is of no force; for, —

(1.) Paul and Barnabas did preside in the whole action, helping, ordering, and disposing of the people in the discharge of their duty, as is meet to be

done by some on all the like occasions; and therefore it is truly said of them that “they appointed elders by the suffrage of the people.”

(2.) I have showed instances before out of the Scripture, that when a thing is done by the people, it is usual to ascribe it unto him or them who were chief therein, as elsewhere the same thing is ascribed unto the whole people.

The same authors contend that the liberty of choosing their own officers or elders, such as it was, was granted unto them or permitted by way of *condescension for a season*, and not made use of by virtue of any right in them thereunto. But this permission is a mere imagination. It was according to the mind of Christ that the churches should choose their own elders, or it was not. If it were not, the apostles would not have permitted it; and if it were, they ought to ordain it and practice according to it, as they did. Nor is such a constant apostolical practice, proposed for the direction of the church in all ages, to be ascribed unto such an original as condescension and permission: yea, it is evident that it arose from the most fundamental principles of the constitution and nature of the gospel churches, and was only a regular pursuit and practice of them; for, —

First, The calling of bishops, pastors, or elders, is an act of *the power of the keys* of the kingdom of heaven. But these keys are originally and properly given unto the whole church, unto the elders of it only ministerially, and as unto exercise. Pastors are eyes to the church. But God and nature design, in the first place, light to the whole body, to the whole person; thereunto it is granted both subjectively and finally, but actually it is peculiarly seated in the eye. So is it in the grant of church-power; it is given to the whole church, though to be exercised only by its elders.

That the grant of the keys unto Peter was in the person and as the representative of the whole confessing church is the known judgment of Austin and a multitude of divines that follow him: so he fully expresseth himself, Tractat. 124. in Johan.: “Peter the apostle bare, in a general figure, the person of the church; for as unto what belonged unto himself, he was by nature one man, by grace one Christian, and of special, more abounding grace one and the chief apostle. But when it was said unto him, ‘I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven,’ etc., He signified the whole church,” etc. Again: “The church, which is founded in Christ, received

from him, in (the person of) Peter, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, which is the power of binding and loosing.”

Unto whom these keys are granted, they, according to their distinct interests in that grant, have the right and power of calling their bishops, pastors, or elders; for in the exercise of that trust and power it doth consist. But this is made unto the whole church; and as there are in a church already constituted several sorts of persons, as some are elders, others are of the people only, this right resideth in them and is acted by them according to their respective capacities, as limited by the light of nature and divine institution; which is, that the election of them should belong unto the body of the people, and their authoritative designation or ordination unto the elders. And when in any place the supreme magistrate is a member or part of the church, he hath also his peculiar right herein.

That the power of the keys is thus granted originally and fundamentally unto the whole church is undeniably confirmed by two arguments: —

1. The church itself is the wife, the spouse, the bride, the queen of the husband and king of the church, Christ Jesus, ^{<1981>}Psalm 45:9; ^{<1982>}John 3:29; ^{<1983>}Revelation 21:9, 22:17; ^{<1984>}Matthew 25:1, 5, 6. Other wife Christ hath none; nor hath the church any Other husband. Now, to whom should the keys of the house be committed but unto the bride? There is, I confess, another who claims the keys to be his own; but withal he makes himself the head and husband of the church, proclaiming himself not only to be an adulterer with that harlot which he calleth the church, but a tyrant also, in that, pretending to be her husband, he will not trust her with the keys of his house, which Christ hath done with his spouse. And whereas, by the canon law, every bishop is the husband or spouse of his diocesan church, for the most part they commit an open rape upon the people, taking them without their consent; at least they are not chosen by them, which yet is essential unto a lawful marriage. And the bride of Christ comes no otherwise so to be but by the voluntary choice of him to be her husband. For the officers or rulers of the church, they do belong unto it as hers, ^{<1985>}1 Corinthians 3:21, 22, and as stewards in the house, chap. 4:1; the servants of the church for Jesus’ sake, ^{<1986>}2 Corinthians 4:5.

If the Lord Christ have the keys of the kingdom of heaven, that is, of “his own house,” ^{<1987>}Hebrews 3:6; if the church itself be the spouse of Christ,

the mother of the family, the bride, the Lamb's wife, ^{<620>}Revelation 21:9; and if all the officers of the church be but stewards and servants in the house and unto the family; if the Lord Christ do make a grant of these keys unto any, whereon the disposal of all things in this house and family doth depend, the question is, whether he hath originally granted them unto his holy spouse, to dispose of according unto her judgment and duty, or unto any servants in the house, to dispose of her and all her concernments at their pleasure?

2. The power of the keys as unto binding and loosing, and consequently as unto all other acts thence proceeding, is expressly granted unto the whole church: ^{<687>}Matthew 18:17, 18, "If he shall neglect to hear them, tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as an heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven." What church it is that is here intended we have proved before, and that the church is intrusted with the power of binding and loosing; and what is the part of the body of the people herein the apostle declares, ^{<688>}1 Corinthians 5:4, 5; ^{<689>}2 Corinthians 2:6.

Secondly, This right, exemplified in *apostolical practice*, is comprehended in the commands given unto the church or body of the people with respect unto teachers and rulers of all sorts: for unto them it is in a multitude of places given in charge that they should discern and try false prophets, flee from them, try spirits, or such as pretend spiritual gifts or offices, reject them who preach false doctrine, to give testimony unto them that are to be in office, with sundry other things of the like nature; which all of them do suppose, or cannot be discharged without, a right in them to choose the worthy and reject the unworthy, as Cyprian speaks. See ^{<690>}Matthew 7:15-20; ^{<691>}John 5:39; ^{<692>}Galatians 2:9; ^{<693>}1 Thessalonians 5:21; ^{<694>}1 John 4:1; 2 John 10, 11.

What is objected hereunto from the unfitness and disability of the people to make a right judgment concerning them who are to be their pastors and rulers labors with a threefold weakness: for, —

1. It reflects dishonor upon the *wisdom* of Christ, in commanding them the observance and discharge of such duties as they are no way meet for.

2. It proceeds upon a supposition of *that degenerate state* of churches in their members, as to light, knowledge, wisdom, and holiness, which they are for the most part fallen into; which must not be allowed to have the force of argument in it, when it is to be lamented and ought to be reformed.

3. It supposeth that there is no *supply of assistance* provided for the people in the discharge of their duty, to guide and direct them therein; which is otherwise, seeing the elders of the church wherein any such election is made, and those of other churches in communion with that church, are, by the common advice and declaration of their judgment, to be assistant unto them.

Thirdly, The church is a *voluntary society*. Persons otherwise absolutely free, as unto all the rules, laws, and ends of such a society, do of their own wills and free choice coalesce into it. This is the original of all churches, as hath been declared.

“They first gave their own selves to the Lord, and unto us by the will of God,” ~~405~~ 2 Corinthians 8:5.

Herein neither by prescription, nor tradition, nor succession, hath any one more power or authority than another, but they are all equal. It is gathered into this society merely by the authority of Christ; and where it is so collected, it hath neither right, power, privilege, rules, nor bonds, as such, but what are given, prescribed, and limited, by the institution and laws of Christ. Moreover, it abides and continues on the same grounds and principles as whereon it was collected, namely, the wills of the members of it, subjected unto the commands of Christ. This is as necessary unto its present continuance in all its members as it was in its first plantation. It is not like the political societies of the world, which, being first established by force or consent, bring a necessity on all that are born in them and under them to comply with their rule and laws. For men may, and in many cases ought to submit unto the disposal of temporal things in a way, it may be, not convenient for them, which they judge not well of, and which in many things is not unto their advantage; and this may be just and equal, because the special good which every one would aim at, being not absolutely so, may be outbalanced by a general good, nor alterable^{f4} but by the prejudice of that which is good in particular. But with reference unto things spiritual and eternal it is not so. No man can by any previous law

be concluded as unto his interest in such things; nor is there any general good to be attained by the loss of any of them. None, therefore, can coalesce in such a society, or adhere unto it, or be any way belonging unto it, but by his own free choice and consent. And it is inquired, how it is possible that any rule, authority, power; or office, should arise or be erected in such a society? We speak of that which is ordinary; for He by whom this church-state is erected and appointed may and did appoint in it and over it extraordinary officers for a season. And we do suppose that as he hath, by his divine authority, instituted and appointed that such societies shall be, he hath made grant of privileges and powers to them proper and sufficient for this end; as also, that he hath given laws and rules, by the observance whereof they may be made partakers of those privileges and powers, with a right unto their exercise.

On these suppositions, in a society absolutely *voluntary*, among those who in their conjunction into it by their own consent are every way *equal*, there can but three things be required unto the actual constitution of rule and office among them: —

And the first is, That there be some among them that are *fitted and qualified* for the discharge of such an office in a peculiar manner above others. This is previous unto all government, beyond that which is purely natural and necessary: “Principio rerum, gentium nationumque imperium penes reges erat; quos ad fastigium hujus majestatis, non ambitio popularis, sed spectata inter bonos moderatio provehebat,” Just., lib. 1 cap. 1. So it was in the world, so it was in the church: “Praesident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti,” Tertul. This preparation and furniture of some persons with abilities and meet qualifications for office and work in the church the Lord Christ hath taken on himself, and doth and will effect it in all generations. Without this there can be neither office, nor rule, nor order in the church.

Secondly, Whereas there is a new relation to be made or created between a pastor, bishop, or elder, and the church, which was not before between them (a bishop and a church, a pastor and a flock, are *relata*), it must be introduced at the same time by the *mutual voluntary acts* of one another, or of each party; for one of the *relata* can, as such, have no being or existence without the other. Now, this can no otherwise be but by the

consent and voluntary subjection of the church unto persons so antecedently qualified for office, according to the law and will of Christ; for it cannot be done by the delegation of power and authority from any other superior or equal unto them that do receive it. Neither the nature of this power, which is incapable of such a delegation, nor the relation unto Christ of all those who are pastors of the church, will admit of an interposition of authority by way of delegation of power from themselves in other men; which would make them their ministers and not Christ's. Nor is it consistent with the nature of such a voluntary society. This, therefore, can no way be done but by free choice, election, consent, or approbation. It cannot, I say, be so regularly. How far an irregularity herein may vitiate the whole call of a minister we do not now inquire.

Now, this choice or election doth not communicate a power from them that choose unto them that are chosen, as though such a power as that whereunto they are called should be formally inherent in the choosers antecedent unto such choice; for this would make those that are chosen to be their ministers only, and to act all things in their name and by virtue of authority derived from them. It is only an instrumental, ministerial means to instate them in that power and authority which is given unto such officers by the constitution and laws of Christ, whose ministers thereon they are. These gifts, offices, and officers, being granted by Christ unto the churches, ~~and~~ Ephesians 4:11, 12, wherever there is a church called according to his mind, they do, in and by their choice of them, "submit themselves unto them in the Lord," according unto all the powers and duties wherewith they are by him intrusted and whereunto they are called.

Thirdly, It is required that persons so chosen, so submitted unto, be [al]so *solemnly separated, dedicated unto, and confirmed in their office by fasting and prayer*. As this is consonant unto the light of nature, which directs unto a solemnity in the susception of public officers, whence proceeds the coronation of kings, which gives them not their title, but solemnly proclaims it, which on many accounts is unto the advantage of government, — so it is prescribed unto the church in this case by especial institution. But hereof I shall speak further immediately.

This order of calling men unto the pastoral once, namely, by their previous qualifications for the ministry, whereby a general designation of the

persons to be called is made by Christ himself, the *orderly choice or election* of them in a voluntary subjection unto them in the Lord, according to the mind of Christ, by the church itself, followed with solemn ordination, or setting apart unto the office and discharge of it by prayer with fasting, all in obedience unto the commands and institution of Christ, whereunto the communication of office-power and privilege is by law-constitution annexed, is suited unto the light of reason in all such cases, the nature of gospel societies in order or churches, the ends of the ministry, the power committed by Christ unto the church, and confirmed by apostolical practice and example.

Herein we rest, without any further dispute, or limiting the formal cause of the communication of office-power unto any one act or duty of the church, or of the bishops or elders of it. All the three things mentioned are essential thereunto; and when any of them are utterly neglected, — where they are neither formally nor virtually, — there is no lawful, regular call unto the ministry according to the mind of Christ.

This order was a long time observed in the ancient church inviolate, and the footsteps of it may be traced through all ages of the church, although it first gradually decayed, then was perverted and corrupted, until it issued (as in the Roman church) in a pageant and show, instead of the reality of the things themselves: for the trial and approbation of spiritual endowments, previously necessary unto the call of any, was left unto the pedantic examination of the bishop's domestics, who knew nothing of them in themselves; the election and approbation of the people was turned into a mock show in the sight of God and men, a deacon calling out that if any had objections against him who was to be ordained, they should come forth and speak, whereunto another cries out of a corner, by compact, "He is learned and worthy;" and ordination was esteemed to consist only in the outward sign of imposition of hands, with some other ceremonies annexed thereunto, whereby, without any other consideration, there ensued a flux of power from the ordainers unto the ordained!

But from the beginning it was not so. And some few instances of the right of the people, and the exercise of it in the choice of their own pastors, may be touched on in our passage: —

CLEMENS, Epist. ad Corinth., affirms that the apostles themselves appointed approved persons unto the office of the ministry, **συνευδοκησάσης τῆς ἐκκλησίας πάσης**, “by (or with) the consent (or choice) of the whole church.” **Συνευδοκεῖν** is “to enact by common consent:” which makes it somewhat strange that a learned man should think that the right of the people in election is excluded in this very place by Clemens, from what is assigned unto the apostles in ordination.

IGNATIUS, Epist. ad Philadelph., cap. 10, **Πρέπον ἐστὶν ὑμῖν, ὡς ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ, χειροτονήσαι ἐπίσκοπον**, writing to the fraternity of the church, — “It becomes you, as a church of God, to choose or (ordain) a bishop.”

TERTULLIAN, Apol., “Praesident probati quique seniores, honorem istum non pretio, sed testimonio adepti,” — “The elders came unto their honor (or office) by the testimony of the people;” that is, by their suffrage in their election.

ORIGEN, in the close of his last book against Celsus, discoursing expressly of the calling and constitution of churches or cities of God, speaking of the elders and rulers of them, affirms that they are **ἐκλεγόμενοι**, “chosen to their office” by the churches which they do rule.

The testimony given by CYPRIAN in sundry places unto this right of the people, especially in Epist. 67, unto the elders and people of some churches in Spain, is so known, so frequently urged, and excepted against to so little purpose, as that it is no way needful to insist again upon it. Some few things I shall only observe concerning and out of that epistle; as,

1. It was not a simple epistle of his own more ordinary occasions, but a determination upon a weighty question, made by a synod of bishops or elders, in whose name, as well as that of Cyprian, it was written and sent unto the churches who had craved their advice.

2. He doth not only assert the right of the people to choose worthy persons to be their bishops, and reject those that are unworthy, but also industriously proves it so to be their right by divine institution and appointment.

3. He declares it to be the sin of the people, if they neglect the use and exercise of their right and power in rejecting and withdrawing themselves from the communion of unworthy pastors, and choosing others in their room.

4. He affirms that this was the practice not only of the churches of Africa, but of those in most of the other provinces of the empire. Some passages in his discourse, wherein all these things are asserted, I shall transcribe, in the order wherein they lie in the epistle: —

“Nec sibi plebs blandiatur, quasi immunis esse a contagio delicti possit cure sacerdote peccatore communicans, et ad injustum et citum praepositi sui episcopatum consensum suum commodans.... Propter quod plebs obsequens praeceptis Dominicis et Deum metuens, a peccatore praeposito separare se debet, nec se ad sacrilegi sacerdotis sacrificia miscere; quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos sacerdotes vel indignos recusandi, quod et ipsum videmus de divina autoritate descendere;” —

“For this cause the people, obedient to the commands of our Lord and fearing God, ought to separate themselves from a wicked bishop, nor mix themselves with the worship of a sacrilegious priest; for they principally have the power of choosing the worthy priests and rejecting the unworthy, which comes from divine authority (or appointment),” as he proves from the Old and New Testament. Nothing can be spoken more fully representing the truth which we plead for. He assigns unto the people a right and power of separating from unworthy pastors, of rejecting or deposing them, and that granted to them by divine authority.

And this power of election in the people he proves from the apostolical practice before insisted on: “Quod postea secundum divina magisteria observatur in Actis Apostolorum, quando in ordinando in locum Judae apostolo, Petrus ad plebem loquitur. ‘Surrexit,’ inquit, ‘Petrus in medio discentium, fuit autem turba hominum forte centum viginti.’ Nec hoc in episcoporum tantum et sacerdotum, sed in diaconorum ordinationibus observasse apostolos animadvertimus de quo et ipso in actis eorum scriptum est. ‘Et convocarunt,’ inquit, ‘illi duodecim totam plebem discipulorum, et dixerunt eis,’” etc.; — “According unto the divine commands, the same course was observed in the Acts of the Apostles;”

whereof he gives instances in the election of Matthias, Acts 1, and of the deacons, chap. 6.

And afterward, speaking of ordination “*de universe fraternitatis suffragio*,” “by the suffrage of the whole brotherhood of the church,” he says, “*Diligenter de traditione divina, et apostolica observatione servandum estet tenendum apud nes quoque et fete per universas provincias tenetur;*” — “According to which divine tradition and apostolical practice, this custom is to be preserved and kept amongst us also, as it is almost through all the provinces.”

Those who are not moved with his authority, yet I think have reason to believe him in a matter of fact of what was done everywhere, or almost everywhere, in his own days; and they may take time to answer his reasons when they can, which comprise the substance of all that we plead in this case.

But the testimonies in following ages given unto this right and power of the people in choosing their own church-officers, bishops and others, recorded in the decrees of councils, the writings of the learned men in them, the rescripts of popes, and constitutions of emperors, are so fully and faithfully collected by Blondellus, in the third part of his apology for the judgment of Jerome about episcopacy, as that nothing can be added unto his diligence, nor is there any need of further confirmation of the truth in this behalf.

The pretense also of Bellarmine, and others who follow him and borrow their conceits from him, that this liberty of the people in choosing their own bishops and pastors was granted unto them at first by way of indulgence or connivance, and that, being abused by them and turned into disorder, it was gradually taken from them, until it issued in that shameful mocking of God and man which is in use in the Roman church, when, at the ordination of a bishop or priest, one deacon makes a demand, “Whether the person to be ordained be approved by the people,” and another answers out of a corner, “That the people approve him,” has been so confuted by protestant writers of all sorts, that it is needless to insist any longer on them.

Indeed, the concessions that are made, that this ancient practice of the church in the people's choosing their own officers (which to deny is all one as to deny that the sun gives light at noon-day), is, as unto its right, by various degrees transferred unto popes, patrons, and bishops, with a representation in a mere pageantry of the people's liberty to make objections against them that are to be ordained, are as fair a concession of the gradual apostasy of churches from their original order and constitution as need be desired.

This power and right which we assign unto the people is not to act itself only in a subsequent consent unto one that is ordained, in the acceptance of him to be their bishop or pastor. How far that may salve the defect and disorder of the omission of previous election, and so preserve the essence of the ministerial call, I do not now inquire. But that which we plead for is the power and right of election, to be exercised previously unto the solemn ordination or setting apart of any unto the pastoral office, communicative of office-power in its own kind unto the person chosen.

This is part of that contest which for sundry ages filled most countries of Europe with broils and disorders; neither is there yet an end put unto it. But in this present discourse we are not in the least concerned in these things; for our inquiry is, what state and order of church-affairs is declared and represented to us in the Scripture; and therein there is not the least intimation of any of those things from whence this controversy did arise and whereon it doth depend. Secular endowments, jurisdictions, investiture, rights of presentation, and the like, with respect unto the evangelical pastoral office and its exercise in any place, which are the subjects of these contests, are foreign unto all things that are directed in the Scriptures concerning them, nor can be reduced unto any thing that belongs unto them. Wherefore, whether this "jus patronatus" be consistent with gospel institutions; whether it may be continued with respect unto lands, tithes, and benefices; or how it may be reconciled unto the right of the people in the choice of their own ecclesiastical officers, from the different acts, objects, and ends required unto the one and the other, — are things not of our present consideration.

And this we affirm to be agreeable unto natural reason and equity, to the nature of churches in their institution and ends, to all authority and office-

power in the church necessary unto its edification, with the security of the consciences of the officers themselves and the preservation of due respect and obedience unto them, and constituted by the institution of Christ himself in his apostles and the practice of the primitive church. Wherefore, the utter despoiling of the church, of the disciples, of those gathered in church-societies by his authority and command, of this right and liberty, may be esteemed a sacrilege of a higher nature than sundry other things which are reproached as criminal under that name.

And if any shall yet further appear to justify this deprivation of the right laid claim unto, and the exclusion of the people from their ancient possession, with sobriety of argument and reason, the whole cause may be yet further debated, from principles of natural light and equity, from maxims of law and policy, from the necessity of the ends of church-order and power, from the moral impossibility of any other way of the conveyance of ecclesiastical office-power, as well as from evangelical institution and the practice of the first churches.

It will be objected, I know, that the restoration of this liberty unto the people will overthrow that *jus patronatus*, or right of presenting unto livings and preferments which is established by law in this nation, and so, under a pretense of restoring unto the people their right in common, destroy other men's undoubted rights in their own enclosures.

IV. But this election of the church doth not actually and immediately institute the person chosen in the office whereunto he is chosen, nor give actual right unto its exercise. It is required, moreover, that he be solemnly set apart unto his office in and by the church with fasting and prayer. That there should be some kind of peculiar prayer in the dedication of any unto the office of the ministry is a notion that could never be obliterated in the minds of men concerned in these things, nor cast out of their practice. Of what sort they have been amongst many we do not now inquire. But there hath been less regard unto the other duty, namely, that these prayers should be accompanied with fasting; but this also is necessary by virtue of apostolical example, ~~44~~⁴² Acts 14:23.

The conduct of this work belongs unto *the elders or officers of the church* wherein any one is to be so ordained. It did belong unto extraordinary officers whilst they were continued in the church, and upon the cessation

of their office it is devolved on the ordinary stated officers of the church. It is so, I say, in case there be any such officer before fixed in the church whereunto any one is to be only ordained; and in case there be none, the assistance of pastors or elders of other churches may and ought to be desired unto the conduct and regulation of the duty.

It is needless to inquire what is the authoritative influence of this ordination into the communication of office or office-power, whilst it is acknowledged to be indispensably necessary, and to belong essentially unto the call unto office; for when sundry duties, as these of election and ordination, are required unto the same end, by virtue of divine institution, it is not for me to determine what is the peculiar efficacy of the one or the other, seeing neither of them without the other hath any at all.

Hereunto is added, as an external adjunct, imposition of hands, significant of the persons so called to office in and unto the church; for although it will be difficultly proved that the use of this ceremony was designed unto continuance, after a cessation of the communication of the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost, whereof it was the sign and outward means in extraordinary officers, yet we do freely grant it unto the ordinary officers of the church, provided that there be no apprehension of its being the sole authoritative conveyance of a successive flux of office-power, which is destructive of the whole nature of the institution.

And this may at present suffice, as unto the call of meet persons unto the pastoral office; and, consequently, any other office in the church. The things following are essentially necessary unto it, so as that authority and right to feed and rule in the church in the name of Christ, as an officer of his house, may be given unto any one thereby, by virtue of his law and the charter granted by him unto the church itself. The first, is, That antecedently unto any actings of the church towards such a person with respect unto office, he be furnished by the Lord Christ himself with *graces*, and *gifts*, and *abilities*, for the discharge of the office whereunto he is to be called. This divine designation of the person to be called rests on the kingly office and care of Christ towards his church. Where this is wholly wanting, it is not in the power of any church under heaven, by virtue of any outward order or act, to communicate pastoral or ministerial power unto any person whatever. Secondly, There is to be *an exploration*

or trial of those gifts and abilities as unto their accommodation unto the edification of that church whereunto any person is to be ordained a pastor or minister. But although the right of judging herein doth belong unto and reside in the church itself (for who else is able to judge for them, or is intrusted so to do?), yet is it their wisdom and duty to desire the assistance and guidance of those who are approved in the discharge of their office in other churches. Thirdly, The *first act of power committed* unto the church by Jesus Christ, for the constitution of ordinary officers in it, is that election of a person qualified and tried unto his office which we have now vindicated. Fourthly, There is required hereunto the *solemn ordination*, inauguration, dedication, or setting apart, of the person so chosen, by the presbytery of the church, with fasting and prayer and the outward sign of the imposition of hands.

This is that order which the rule of the Scripture, the example of the first churches, and the nature of the things themselves, direct unto; and although I will not say that a defect in any of these, especially if it be from unavoidable hindrances, doth disannul the call of a person to the pastoral office, yet I must say that where they are not all duly attended unto, the institution of Christ is neglected, and the order of the church infringed. Wherefore, —

The plea of the communication of all authority for office, and of office itself, solely by a *flux of power from the first ordainers*, through the hands of their pretended successors in all ages, under all the innumerable miscarriages whereunto they are subject, and have actually fallen into, without any respect unto the consent or call of the churches, by rules, laws, and orders foreign to the Scripture, is contrary to the whole nature of evangelical churches and all the ends of their institution, as shall be manifested, if it be needful.

CHAPTER 5.

THE ESPECIAL DUTY OF PASTORS OF CHURCHES.

WE have declared the way whereby pastors are given unto and instated in the church; that which should ensue is an account of their work and duty in the discharge of their office: but this hath been the subject of many large discourses, both among the ancient writers of the church and of late; I shall therefore only touch on some things that are of most necessary consideration: —

1. The first and principal duty of a pastor is to *feed the flock* by diligent preaching of the word. It is a promise relating to the new testament, that God would give unto his church “*pastors according to his own heart, which should feed them with knowledge and understandings*” ^{<4185>}Jeremiah 3:15. This is by teaching or preaching the word, and no otherwise. This feeding is of the essence of the office of a pastor, as unto the exercise of it; so that he who doth not, or can not, or will not feed the flock is no pastor, whatever outward call or work he may have in the church. The care of preaching the gospel was committed to Peter, and in him unto all true pastors of the church, under the name of “feeding,” ^{<4015>}John 21:15-17. According to the example of the apostles, they are to free themselves from all encumbrances, that they may give themselves wholly unto the word and prayer, ^{<4161>}Acts 6:1-4. Their work is “to labor in the word and doctrine,” ^{<5187>}1 Timothy 5:17; and thereby to “feed the flock over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers,” ^{<4018>}Acts 20:28: and it is that which is everywhere given them in charge.

This work and duty, therefore, as was said, is essential unto the office of a pastor. A man is a pastor unto them whom he leads by pastoral teaching, and to no more; and he that doth not so feed is no pastor. Nor is it required only that he preach now and then at his leisure, but that he lay aside all other employments, though lawful, all other duties in the church, as unto such a constant attendance on them as would divert him from this work, that he give himself unto it, — that he be in these things laboring to the utmost of his ability. Without this no man will be able to give a comfortable account of the pastoral office at the last day.

There is, indeed, no more required of any man than God giveth him ability for. Weakness, sickness, bodily infirmities, may disenable men from the actual discharge of this duty in that assiduity and frequency which are required in ordinary cases; and some may, through age or other incapacitating distempers, be utterly disabled for it, — in which case it is their duty to lay down and take a dismission from their office, or, if their disability be but partial, provide a suitable supply, that the edification of the church be not prejudiced; — but for men to pretend themselves pastors of the church, and to be unable for, or negligent of, this work and duty, is to live in open defiance of the commands of Christ.

We have lived to see and hear of reproachful scorn and contempt cast upon laborious preaching, — that is, “laboring in the word and doctrine,” and all manner of discouragements given unto it, with endeavors for its suppression in sundry instances; yea, some have proceeded so far as to declare that the work of preaching is unnecessary in the church, so to reduce all religion to the reading and rule of the liturgy. The next attempt, so far as I know, may be to exclude Christ himself out of their religion; which the denial of a necessity of preaching the gospel makes an entrance into, yea, a good progress towards.

Sundry things are required unto this work and duty of pastoral preaching; as, —

(1.) *Spiritual wisdom* and understanding in the mysteries of the gospel, that they may declare unto the church “all the counsel of God” and “the unsearchable riches of Christ:” see ~~ROM~~ Acts 20:2 7; ~~ROM~~ 1 Corinthians 2:4-7; ~~ROM~~ Ephesians 3:8-11. The generality of the church, especially those who are grown in knowledge and experience, have a spiritual insight into these things, and the apostle prays that all believers may have so, ~~ROM~~ Ephesians 1:15-19; and if those that instruct them, or should do so, have not some degree of eminency herein, they cannot be useful to lead them on to perfection. And the little care hereof or concernment herein is that which in our days hath rendered the ministry of many fruitless and useless.

(2.) *Experience of the power of the truth* which they preach in and upon their own souls. Without this they will themselves be lifeless and heartless in their own work, and their labor for the most part will be unprofitable towards others. It is, to such men, attended unto as a task for their

advantage, or as that which carries some satisfaction in it from ostentation and supposed reputation wherewith it is accompanied. But a man preacheth that sermon only well unto others which preacheth itself in his own soul. And he that doth not feed on and thrive in the digestion of the food which he provides for others will scarce make it savory unto them; yea, he knows not but the food he hath provided may be poison, unless he have really tasted of it himself. If the word do not dwell with power in us, it will not pass with power *from* us. And no man lives in a more woful condition than those who really believe not themselves what they persuade others to believe continually. The want of this experience of the power of gospel truth on their own souls is that which gives us so many lifeless, sapless orations, quaint in words and dead as to power, instead of preaching the gospel in the demonstration of the Spirit. And let any say what they please, it is evident that some men's preaching, as well as others' not-preaching, hath lost the credit of their ministry.

(3.) *Skill to divide the word aright*, ² Timothy 2:15; and this consists in a practical wisdom, upon a diligent attendance unto the word of truth, to find out what is real, substantial, and meet food for the souls of the hearers, — to give unto all sorts of persons in the church that which is their proper portion. And this requires,

(4.) *A prudent and diligent consideration of the state of the flock* over which any man is set, as unto their strength or weakness, their growth or defect in knowledge (the measure of their attainments requiring either milk or strong meat), their temptations and duties, their spiritual decays or thrivings; and that not only in general, but, as near as may be, with respect unto all the individual members of the church. Without a due regard unto these things, men preach at random, uncertainly fighting, like those that beat the air. Preaching sermons not designed for the advantage of them to whom they are preached; insisting on general doctrines not levelled to the condition of the auditory; speaking what men can, without consideration of what they ought, — are things that will make men weary of preaching, when their minds are not influenced with outward advantages, as much as make others weary in hearing of them. And,

(5.) All these, in the whole discharge of their duty, are to be constantly accompanied with the evidence of *zeal for the glory of God* and

compassion for the souls of men. Where these are not in vigorous exercise in the minds and souls of them that preach the word, giving a demonstration of themselves unto the consciences of them that hear, the quickening form, the life and soul of preaching, is lost.

All these things seem common, obvious, and universally acknowledged; but the ruin of the ministry of the most for the want of them, or from notable defects in them, is or may be no less evidently known. And the very naming of them (which is all at present which I design) is sufficient to evidence how great a necessity there is incumbent on all pastors of churches to give themselves unto the word and prayer, to labor in the word and doctrine, to be continually intent on this work, to engage all the faculties of their souls, to stir up all their graces and gifts, unto constant exercise in the discharge of their duty; for “who is sufficient for these things?” And as the consideration of them is sufficient to stir up all ministers unto fervent prayer for supplies of divine aid and assistance for that work which in their own strength they can no way answer, so is it enough to warn them of the avoidance of all things that would give them a diversion or avocation from the constant attendance unto the discharge of it.

When men undertake the pastoral office, and either judge it not their duty to preach, or are not able so to do, or attempt it only at some solemn seasons, or attend unto it as a task required of them, without that wisdom, skill, diligence, care, prudence, zeal, and compassion, which are required thereunto, the glory and use of the ministry will be utterly destroyed.

2. The second duty of a pastor towards his flock is *continual fervent prayer for them*, James 5:16; ^{<872>}John 17:20; ^{<891>}Exodus 32:11; ^{<898>}Deuteronomy 9:18; ^{<893>}Leviticus 16:24; ^{<923>}1 Samuel 12:23; ^{<737>}2 Corinthians 13:7, 9; ^{<915>}Ephesians 1:15-19, 3:14; ^{<1000>}Philippians 1:4; ^{<5009>}Colossians 1:3; ^{<5011>}2 Thessalonians 1:11. “We will give ourselves continually to prayer,” ^{<4064>}Acts 6:4. Without this, no man can or doth preach to them as he ought, nor perform any other duty of his pastoral office. From hence may any man take the best measure of the discharge of his duty towards his flock. He that doth constantly, diligently, fervently, pray for them, will have a testimony in himself of his own sincerity in the discharge of all other pastoral duties, nor can he voluntarily omit or neglect

any of them. And as for those who are negligent herein, be their pains, labor, and travail in other duties never so great, they may be influenced from other reasons, and so give no evidence of sincerity in the discharge of their office. In this constant prayer for the church, which is so incumbent on all pastors as that whatever is done without it is of no esteem in the sight of Jesus Christ, respect is to be had, —

(1.) Unto *the success of the word*, unto all the blessed ends of it, among them. These are no less than the improvement and strengthening of all their graces, the direction of all their duties, their edification in faith and love, with the entire conduct of their souls in the life of God, unto the enjoyment of him. To preach the word, therefore, and not to follow it with constant and fervent prayer for its success, is to disbelieve its use, neglect its end, and to cast away the seed of the gospel at random.

(2.) Unto *the temptations that the church is generally exposed unto*. These greatly vary, according unto the outward circumstances of things. The temptations in general that accompany a state of outward peace and tranquillity are of another nature than those that attend a time of trouble, persecution, distress, and poverty; and so it is as unto other occasions and circumstances. These the pastors of churches ought diligently to consider, looking on them as the means and ways whereby churches have been ruined, and the souls of many lost for ever. With respect unto them, therefore, ought their prayers for the church to be fervent.

(3.) Unto *the especial state and condition of all the members*, so far as it is known unto them. There may be of them who are spiritually sick and diseased, tempted, afflicted, bemisted, wandering out of the way, surprised in sins and miscarriages, disconsolate and troubled in spirit in a peculiar manner. The remembrance of them all ought to abide with them, and to be continually called over in their daily pastoral supplications.

(4.) Unto *the presence of Christ in the assemblies of the church*, with all the blessed evidences and testimonies of it. This is that alone which gives life and power unto all church assemblies, without which all outward order and forms of divine worship in them are but a dead carcase. Now, this presence of Christ in the assemblies of his church is by his Spirit, accompanying all ordinances of worship with a gracious, divine efficacy, evidencing itself by blessed operations on the minds and hearts of the

congregation. This are pastors of churches continually to pray for; and *they* will do so who understand that all the success of their labors, and all the acceptance of the church with God in their duties, do depend hereon.

(5.) To *their preservation in faith*, love, and fruitfulness, with all the duties that belong unto them, etc.

It were much to be desired that all those who take upon them this pastoral office did well consider and understand how great and necessary a part of their work and duty doth consist in their continual fervent prayer for their flocks; for besides that it is the only instituted way whereby they may, by virtue of their office, bless their congregations, so will they find their hearts and minds, in and by the discharge of it, more and more filled with love, and engaged with diligence unto all other duties of their office, and excited unto the exercise of all grace towards the whole church on all occasions. And where any are negligent herein, there is no duty which they perform towards the church but it is influenced with false considerations, and will not hold weight in the balance of the sanctuary.

3. *The administration of the seals of the covenant* is committed unto them, as the stewards of the house of Christ; for unto them the authoritative dispensation of the word is committed, whereunto the administration of the seals is annexed; for their principal end is the peculiar confirmation and application of the word preached. And herein there are three things that they are to attend unto: —

(1.) The *times* and seasons of their administration unto the church's edification, especially that of the Lord's supper, whose frequency is enjoined. It is the duty of pastors to consider all the necessary circumstances of their administration, as unto time, place, frequency, order, and decency.

(2.) To keep *severely* unto the institution of Christ, as unto the way and manner of their administration. The gradual introduction of uninstituted rites and ceremonies into the church celebration of the ordinance of the Lord's supper ended at length in the idolatry of the mass. Herein, then, alone, and not in bowing, cringing, and vestments, lies the glory and beauty of these administrations, namely, that they are compliant with and expressive of the institution of Christ, nor is any thing done in them but in

express obedience unto his authority. “I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you,” saith the apostle in this case, ^{<412>}1 Corinthians 11:23.

(3.) To take care that these holy things be administered *only unto those who are meet and worthy*, according unto the rule of the gospel Those who impose on pastors the promiscuous administration of these divine ordinances, or the application of the seals unto all without difference, do deprive them of one-half of their ministerial office and duty.

But here it is inquired by some, “Whether, in case a church have no pastor at present, or a teaching elder with pastoral power, it may not delegate and appoint the administration of these especial ordinances unto some member of the church at this or that season, who is meetly qualified for the outward administration Of them?” which, for the sake of some, I shall examine.

No church is complete in order *without teaching officers*, ^{<404>}Ephesians 4:11, 12; ^{<412>}1 Corinthians 12:27, 28.

A church not complete in order cannot be complete in administrations, because the power of administrations depends upon the power of order proportionably; that is, the power of the church depends upon the being of the church. Hence the first duty of a church without officers is to obtain them, according to rule. And to endeavor to complete administrations without an antecedent completing of order is contrary unto the mind of Christ, ^{<412>}Acts 14:23; ^{<500>}Titus 1:5, “That thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every church.” The practice therefore proposed is irregular, and contrary to the mind of Christ.

The order of the church is twofold, — as *essential*, and as *organical*. The order of the church as essential, with its power thence arising, is, — first, For its preservation; secondly, For its perfection.

(1.) For its preservation in admission and exclusion of members;

(2.) For its perfection in the election of officers.

No part of this power, which belongs to the church as essentially considered, can be delegated, but must be acted by the whole church. They cannot delegate power to some to admit members, so as it should not be an

act of the whole church. They cannot delegate power to any to elect officers, nor any thing else which belongs to them as a church essentially. The reason is, things that belong unto the essence of any thing belong unto it formally as such, and so cannot be transferred.

The church, therefore, cannot delegate the power and authority inquired after, should it be supposed to belong to the power of order as the church is essentially considered; which yet it doth not.

If the church may delegate or substitute others for the discharge of all ordinances whatsoever without elders or pastors, then it may perfect the saints and complete the work of the ministry without them, which is contrary to ~~400~~ Ephesians 4:11, 12; and, secondly, it would render the ministry only convenient, and not absolutely necessary to the church, which is contrary to the institution of it.

A particular church, in order as organical, is the adequate subject of all ordinances, and not as essential; because as essential it never doth nor can enjoy all ordinances, namely, the ministry in particular, whereby it is constituted organical. Yet, on this supposition, the church, as essentially considered, is the sole adequate subject of all ordinances.

Though the church be the only subject, it is not the only object of gospel ordinances, but that is various. For instance, —

(1.) The *preaching of the word*: its first object is the *world*, for conversion; its next, *professors*, for edification.

(2.) *Baptism*: its only object is neither the *world* nor the *members of a particular church*, but *professors*, with those that are reckoned to them by God's appointment, — that is, their infant seed.

(3.) The *supper*: its object is a *particular church only*, which is acknowledged, and may be proved by the institution, one special end of it, and the necessity of discipline thereon depending.

Ordinances, whereof the church is the only subject and the only object, cannot be administered authoritatively but by officers only, —

(1.) Because none but Christ's stewards have authority in and wards his house as such, ~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 4:1; ~~505~~ 1 Timothy 3:15; ~~405~~ Matthew 24:45;

(2.) Because it is an act of office-authority to represent Christ to the whole church, and to feed the whole flock thereby, ~~Acts~~ Acts 20:28; ~~1~~ 1 Peter 5:2.

There are no footsteps of any such practice among the churches of God who walked in order, neither in the Scripture nor in all antiquity.

But it is objected, by those who allow this practice, “That if the church may appoint or send a person forth to preach, or appoint a brother to preach unto themselves, then they may appoint him to administer the ordinance of the supper.”

Ans. Here is a mistake in the supposition. The church, — that is, the body of it, — cannot send out any brother authoritatively to preach. Two things are required thereunto, collation of gifts and communication of office; neither of which the church, under that consideration, can do to one that is sent forth. But where God gives gifts by his Spirit and a call by his providence, the church only complies therewith, not in communicating authority to the person, but in praying for a blessing upon his work.

The same is the case in desiring a brother to teach among them. The duty is moral in its own nature; the gifts and call are from God alone; the occasion of his exercise is only administered by the church.

It is further added, by the same persons, “That if a brother, or one who is a disciple only, may baptize, then he may also administer the Lord’s supper, being desired of the church.”

Ans. The supposition is not granted nor proved; but there is yet a difference between these ordinances, — the object of the one being professors, as such, at large; the object of the other being professors, as members of a particular church. But to return, —

4. It is incumbent on them *to preserve the truth or doctrine of the gospel* received and professed in the church, and to defend it against all opposition. This is one principal end of the ministry, one principal means of the preservation of the faith once delivered unto the saints. This is committed in an especial manner unto the pastors of the churches, as the apostle frequently and emphatically repeats the charge of it unto Timothy, and in him unto all to whom the dispensation of the word is committed,

^{<5008>}1 Epist. 1:3, 4, ^{<5006>}4:6, 7, 16, 6:20; ^{<5014>}2 Epist. 1:14, 2:25, 3:14-17. The same he giveth in charge unto the elders of the church of Ephesus, ^{<4018>}Acts 20:28-31. What he says of himself, that the “glorious gospel of the blessed God was committed unto his trust,” ^{<5011>}1 Timothy 1:11, is true of all pastors of churches, according to their measure and call; and they should all aim at the account which he gives of his ministry herein: “I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith,” ^{<5012>}2 Timothy 4:7. The church is the “pillar and ground of the truth;” and it is so principally in its ministry. And the sinful neglect of this duty is that which was the cause of most of the pernicious heresies and errors that have infested and ruined the church. Those whose duty it was to preserve the doctrine of the gospel entire in the public profession of it have, many of them, “spoken perverse things, to draw away disciples after them.” Bishops, presbyters, public teachers, have been the ringleaders in heresies, Wherefore this duty, especially at this time, when the fundamental truths of the gospel are on all sides impugned, from all sorts of adversaries, is in an especial manner to be attended unto.

Sundry things are required hereunto; as, —

(1.) *A clear, sound, comprehensive knowledge of the entire doctrine of the gospel*, attained by all means useful and commonly prescribed unto that end, especially by diligent study of the Scripture, with fervent prayer for illumination and understanding. Men cannot preserve that for others which they are ignorant of themselves. Truth may be lost by weakness as well as by wickedness. And the defect herein, in many, is deplorable.

(2.) *Love of the truth* which they have so learned and comprehended. Unless we look on truth as a pearl, as that which is valued at any rate, bought with any price, as that which is better than all the world, we shall not endeavor its preservation with that diligence which is required. Some are ready to part with truth at an easy rate, or to grow indifferent about it; whereof we have multitudes of examples in the days wherein we live. It were easy to give instances of sundry important evangelical truths, which our forefathers in the faith contended for with all earnestness, and were ready to seal with their blood, which are now utterly disregarded and opposed, by some who pretend to succeed them in their profession. If ministers have not a sense of that power of truth in their own souls, and a

taste of its goodness, the discharge of this duty is not to be expected from them.

(3.) *A conscientious care and fear of giving countenance or encouragement unto novel opinions*, especially such as oppose any truth of whose power and efficacy experience hath been had among them that believe. Vain curiosity, boldness in conjectures, and readiness to vent their own conceits, have caused no small trouble and damage unto the church.

(4.) *Learning and ability of mind to discern and disprove the oppositions of the adversaries* of the truth, and thereby to stop their mouths and convince gainsayers.

(5.) *The solid confirmation of the most important truths* of the gospel, and whereinto all others are resolved, in their teaching and ministry. Men may and do oftentimes prejudice, yea, betray the truth, by the weakness of their pleas for it.

(6.) *A diligent watch over their own flocks* against the craft of seducers from without, or the springing up of any bitter root of error among themselves.

(7.) *A concurrent assistance with the elders and messengers* of other churches with whom they are in communion, in the declaration of the faith which they all profess; whereof we must treat afterward more at large.

It is evident what learning, labor, study, pains, ability, and exercise of the rational faculties, are ordinarily required unto the right discharge of these duties; and where men may be useful to the church in other things, but are defective in these, it becomes them to walk and act both circumspectly and humbly, frequently desiring and adhering unto the advices of them whom God hath intrusted with more talents and greater abilities.

5. It belongs unto their charge and office diligently to *labor for the conversion of souls unto God*. The ordinary means of conversion is left unto the church, and its duty it is to attend unto it; yea, one of the principal ends of the institution and preservation of churches is the conversion of souls, and when there are no more to be converted, there shall be no more church on the earth. To enlarge the kingdom of Christ, to diffuse the light and savor of the gospel, to be subservient unto the calling

of the elect, or gathering all the sheep of Christ into his fold, are things that God designs by his churches in this world. Now, the principal instrumental cause of all these is the preaching of the word; and this is committed unto the pastors of the churches. It is true, men may be, and often are, converted unto God by their occasional dispensation of the word who are not called unto office; for it is the gospel itself that is the “power of God unto salvation,” by whomsoever it is administered, and it hath been effectual unto that end even in the necessary occasional teaching of women: but it is so, frequently, in the exercise of spiritual gifts by them who are not stated officers of the church, ^{<1414>}1 Corinthians 14:24, 25; ^{<1014>}Philippians 1:14, 15, 18; ^{<1010>}1 Peter 4:10, 11. But yet this hinders not but that the administration of the glorious gospel of the blessed God, as unto all the ends of it, is committed unto the pastors of the church. And the first object of the preaching of the gospel is the world, or the men of it, for their conversion; and it is so in the preaching of all them unto whom that work is committed by Christ. The work of the apostles and evangelists had this order in it: — First, they were to make disciples of men, by the preaching of the gospel unto conversion; and this was their principal work, as Paul testifieth, ^{<1017>}1 Corinthians 1:17: and herein were they gloriously instrumental in laying the foundation of the kingdom of Christ all the world over. The second part of their work was to teach them that were converted, or made disciples, to do and observe all that he did command them. In the pursuit of this part of their commission, they gathered the disciples of Christ into churches, under ordinary officers of their own. And although the work of these ordinary officers, pastors and teachers, be of the same nature with theirs, yet the method of it is changed in them; for their first ordinary work is to conduct and teach all the disciples of Christ to do and observe all things appointed by him, — that is, to preach unto and watch over the particular flocks unto whom they do relate. But they are not hereby discharged from an interest in the other part of the work, — in preaching the word unto the conversion of souls. They are not, indeed, bound unto the method of the apostles and evangelists; yea, they are, by virtue of their office, ordinarily excluded from it. After a man is called to be a pastor of a particular church, it is not his duty to leave that church, and go up and down to preach for the conversion of strangers. It is not, I say, *ordinarily* so; for many cases may fall out wherein the edification of any particular church is to give way unto

the glory of Christ with respect unto the calling of all the members of the church catholic. But in the discharge of the pastoral office there are many occasions of preaching the word unto the conversion of souls; as, —

(1.) When any that are unconverted *do come into the assemblies of the church*, and are there wrought upon by the power of the word; whereof we have experience every day. To suppose that a man, at the same time, and in the same place, preaching unto one congregation, should preach to some of them, namely, those that are of the church whereunto he relates, as a minister, with ministerial authority, and to others only by virtue of a spiritual gift which he hath received, is that which no man can distinguish in his own conscience; nor is there any color of rule or reason for it: for though pastors, with respect unto their whole office and all the duties of it, whereof many can have the church only for their object, are ministers in office unto the church, and so ministers of the church, yet are they ministers of Christ also; and by him it is, and not by the church, that the preaching of the gospel is committed unto them. And it is so committed as that, by virtue of their office, they are to use it unto all its ends, in his way and method; whereof the conversion of sinners is one. And for a man to conceive of himself in a double capacity, whilst he is preaching to the same congregation, is that which no man's experience can reach unto.

(2.) *In occasional preaching* in other places, whereunto a pastor of a church may be called and directed by divine providence; for although we have no concernment in the figment of an indelible character accompanying sacred orders, yet we do not think that the pastoral office is such a thing as a man must leave behind him every time he goes from home, or that it is in his own power, or in the power of all men in the world, to divest him of it, unless he be dismissed or deposed from it by Christ himself, through the rule of his word. Wherever a true minister preacheth, he preacheth as a minister, for as such the administration of the gospel is committed unto him, as unto all the ends of it, whereof the chief, as was said, is the conversion of souls; yea, of such weight it is that the conveniency and edification of particular churches ought to give place unto it. When, therefore, there are great opportunities and providential calls for the preaching of the gospel unto the conversion of souls, and, the harvest being great, there are not laborers sufficient for it, it is lawful, yea, it is the duty of pastors of particular churches to leave their constant attendance

on their pastoral charge in those churches, at least for a season, to apply themselves unto the more public preaching of the word unto the conversion of the souls of men. Nor will any particular church be unwilling hereunto which understands that even the whole end of particular churches is but the edification of the church catholic, and that their good and advantage is to give place unto that of the glory of Christ in the whole. The good shepherd will leave the ninety and nine sheep, to seek after one that wanders; and we may certainly leave a few for a season, to seek after a great multitude of wanderers, when we are called thereunto by divine providence: and I could heartily wish that we might have a trial of it at this time.


The ministers who have been most celebrated, and that deservedly, in the last ages, in this and the neighbor nations, have been such as whose ministry God made eminently successful unto the conversion of souls. To affirm that they did not do their work as ministers, and by virtue of their ministerial office, is to cast away the crown and destroy the principal glory of the ministry. For my own part, if I did not think myself bound to preach as a minister, and as a minister authorized in all places and on all occasions, when I am called thereunto, I think I should never preach much more in this world. Nor do I know at all what rule they walk by who continue public constant preaching for many years, and yet neither desire nor design to be called unto any pastoral office in the church. But I must not here insist on the debate of these things.

6. It belongs unto them, on the account of their pastoral office, to be *ready, willing, and able, to comfort, relieve, and refresh, those that are tempted*, tossed, wearied with fears and grounds of disconsolation, in times of trial and desertion. “The tongue of the learned” is required in them, “that they should know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary.” One excellent qualification of our Lord Jesus Christ, in the discharge of his priestly office now in heaven, is, that he is touched with a sense of our infirmities, and knows how to succor them that are tempted. His whole flock in this world are a company of tempted ones; his own life on the earth he calls “the time of his temptation;” and those who have the charge of his flock under him ought to have a sense of their infirmities, and endeavor in an especial manner to succor them that are tempted. But amongst them there are some always that are cast under darkness and

disconsolations in a peculiar manner: some at the entrance of their conversion unto God, whilst they have a deep sense of the terror of the Lord, the sharpness of conviction, and the uncertainty of their condition; some are relapsed into sin or omissions of duties; some under great, sore, and lasting afflictions; some upon pressing, urgent, particular occur; some on sovereign, divine *desertions*; some through the *buffetings of Satan* and the injection of blasphemous thoughts into their minds, with many other occasions of an alike nature. Now, the troubles, disconsolations, dejections, and fears, that arise in the minds of persons in these exercises and temptations are various, oftentimes urged and fortified with subtle arguings and fair pretences, perplexing the souls of men almost to despair and death. It belongs unto the office and duty of pastors, —

(1.) To be able *rightly to understand the various cases that will occur of this kind*, from such principles and grounds of truth and experience as will bear a just confidence in a prudent application unto the relief of them concerned; [to have] “the tongue of the learned, to know how to speak a word in season to him that is weary.” It will not be done by a collection and determination of cases, which yet is useful in its place; for hardly shall we meet with two cases of this kind that will exactly be determined by the same rule, all manner of circumstances giving them variety: but a skill, understanding, and experience, in the whole nature of the work of the Spirit of God on the souls of men, of the conflict that is between the flesh and the Spirit, of the methods and wiles of Satan, of the wiles of principalities and powers or wicked spirits in high places, of the nature, and effects, and ends of divine desertions, with wisdom to make application out of such principles, or fit medicines and remedies unto every sore and distemper, are required hereunto. These things are by some despised, by some neglected, by some looked after only in stated cases of conscience, in which work it is known that some have horribly debauched their own consciences and [those of] others, to the scandal and ruin of religion, so far as they have prevailed. But not to dispute how far such helps as books written on cases of conscience may be useful herein, — which they may be greatly unto those who know how to use them aright, — the proper ways whereby pastors and teachers must obtain this skill and understanding are, by diligent study of the Scriptures, meditation thereon, fervent prayer, experience of spiritual things, and temptations in

their own souls, with a prudent observation of the manner of God's dealing with others, and the ways of the opposition made to the work of his grace in them. Without these things, all pretences unto this ability and duty of the pastoral office are vain; whence it is that the whole work of it is much neglected.


(2.) To be ready and willing to *attend unto the especial cases that may be brought unto them*, and not to look on them as unnecessary diversions, whereas a due application unto them is a principal part of their office and duty. To discountenance, to discourage any from seeking relief in perplexities of this nature, to carry it towards them with a seeming moroseness and unconcernedness, is to turn that which is lame out of the way, to push the diseased, and not at all to express the care of Christ towards his flock,  Isaiah 40:11. Yea, it is their duty to hearken after them who may be so exercised, to seek them out, and to give them their counsel and direction on all occasions.

(3.) To *bear patiently and tenderly with the weakness, ignorance, dulness, slowness to believe and receive satisfaction*, yea, it may be, impertinencies, in them that are so tempted. These things will abound amongst them, partly from their natural infirmities, many being weak, and perhaps froward, but especially from the nature of their temptations, which are suited to disorder and disquiet their minds, to fill them with perplexed thoughts, and to make them jealous of every thing wherein they are spiritually concerned; and if much patience, meekness, and condescension, be not exercised towards them, they are quickly turned out of the way.

In the discharge of the whole pastoral office, there is not any thing or duty that is of more importance, nor wherein the Lord Jesus Christ is more concerned, nor more eminently suited unto the nature of the office itself, than this is. But whereas it is a work or duty which, because of the reasons mentioned, must be accompanied with the exercise of humility, patience, self-denial, and spiritual wisdom, with experience, with wearisome diversions from other occasions, those who had got of old the conduct of the souls of men into their management turned this whole part of their office and duty into an engine they called “auricular confession;”

whereby they wrested the consciences of Christians to the promotion of their own ease, wealth, authority, and oftentimes to worse ends.

7. *A compassionate suffering* with all the members of the church in all their trials and troubles, whether internal or external, belongs unto them in the discharge of their office; nor is there any thing that renders them more like unto Jesus Christ, whom to represent unto the church is their principal duty. The view and consideration, by faith, of the glory of Christ in his compassion with his suffering members, is the principal spring of consolation unto the church in all its distresses. And the same spirit, the same mind herein, ought, according to their measure, to be in all that have the pastoral office committed unto them. So the apostle expresseth it in himself,

“Who is weak, and I am not weak? who is offended, and I burn not?”  2 Corinthians 11:29.

And unless this compassion and goodness do run through the discharge of their whole office, men cannot be said to be evangelical shepherds, nor the sheep said in any sense to be their own. For those who pretend unto the pastoral office to live, it may be, in wealth and pleasure, regardless of the sufferings and temptations of their flock, or of the poor of it, or related unto such churches as wherein it is impossible that they should so much as be acquainted with the state of the greatest part of them, is not answerable unto the institution of their office, nor to the design of Christ therein.

8. *Care of the poor and visitation of the sick* are parts of this duty, commonly known, though commonly neglected.

9. *The principal care of the rule of the church* is incumbent on the pastors of it. This is the second general head of the power and duty of this office, whereunto many things in particular do belong. But because I shall treat afterward of the rule of the church by itself distinctly, I shall not here insist upon it.

10. *There is a communion to be observed among all the churches of the same faith and profession in any nation.* Wherein it doth consist, and what is required thereunto, shall be afterward declared. The principal care hereof, unto the edification of the churches, is incumbent on the pastors of

them. Whether it be exercised by letters of mutual advice, of congratulation or consolation, or in testimony of communion with those who are called to office in them, or whether it be by convening in synods for consultation of their joint concernments (which things made up a great part of the primitive ecclesiastical polity), their duty it is to attend unto it and to take care of it.

11. That wherewith I shall close these few instances of the pastoral charge and duty is that without which all the rest will neither be useful unto men nor be accepted with the great shepherd, Christ Jesus; and that is, *a humble, holy, exemplary conversation, in all godliness and honesty*. The rules and precepts of the Scripture, the examples of Christ and his apostles, with that of the bishops or pastors of the primitive churches, and the nature of the thing itself, with the religion which we do profess, do undeniably prove this duty to be necessary and indispensable in a gospel ministry. It were an easy thing to fill up a volume with ancient examples unto this purpose, with testimonies of the Scripture and first writers among Christians, with examples of public and private miscarriages herein, with evident demonstration that the ruin of Christian religion in most nations where it hath been professed, and so of the nations themselves, hath proceeded from the ambition, pride, luxury, uncleanness, profaneness, and otherwise vicious conversations, of those who have been called the “clergy.” And in daily observation, it is a thing written with the beams of the sun, that whatever else be done in churches, if the pastors of them, or those who are so esteemed, are not exemplary in gospel obedience and holiness, religion will not be carried on and improved among the people. If persons light or profane in their habits, garbs, and converse, corrupt in their communication, unsavory and barren as unto spiritual discourse; if such as are covetous, oppressive, and contentious; such as are negligent in holy duties in their own families, and so cannot stir up others unto diligence therein; much more, if such as are openly sensual, vicious, and debauched, — are admitted into this office, we may take our leave of all the glory and power of religion among the people committed unto their charge.

To handle this property or adjunct of the pastoral office, it were necessary distinctly to consider and explain all the qualifications assigned by the apostle as necessary unto bishops or elders, evidenced as previously

necessary unto the orderly call of them unto this office, ~~SCRP~~1 Timothy 3:2-7, ~~SCRP~~Titus 2:6-9; which is a work not consistent with my present design to engage in.

These are some instances of the things wherein the office-duty of pastors of the church doth consist They are but *some* of them, and these only proposed, not pursued and pressed with the consideration of all those particular duties, with the manner of their performance, way of management, motives and enforcements, defects and causes of them; which would require a large discourse. These may suffice unto our present purpose; and we may derive from them the ensuing brief considerations:

1. A due meditation and view of these things, as proposed in the Scripture, is enough to make the wisest, the best of men, and the most diligent in the discharge of the pastoral office, to cry out with the apostle, “Who is sufficient for these things?” This will make them look well to their call and entrance into this office, as that alone which will bear them out and justify them in the susception of it; for no sense of insufficiency can utterly discourage any in the undertaking of a work which he is assured that the Lord Christ calls him unto, for where he calls to a duty, he gives competent strength for the performance of it. And when we say, under a deep sense of our own weakness, “Who is sufficient for these things?” he doth say, “My grace is sufficient for you.”

2. Although all the things mentioned do plainly, evidently, and undeniably, belong unto the discharge of the pastoral office, yet, in point of fact, we find, by the success, that they are very little considered by the most that seek after it. And the present ruin of religion, as unto its power, beauty, and glory, in all places, ariseth principally from this cause, that multitudes of those who undertake this office are neither in any measure fit for it, nor do either conscientiously attend unto or diligently perform the duties that belong unto it. It ever was and ever will be true in general, “Like priest, like people.”

3. Whereas the account which is to be given of this office and the discharge of it at the last day unto Jesus Christ, the consideration whereof had a mighty influence upon the apostles themselves and all the primitive pastors of the churches, is frequently proposed unto us, and many

warnings given us thereon in the Scripture, yet it is apparent they are but few who take it into due consideration. In the great day of Christ's visitation, he will proceed on such articles as those here laid down, and others expressed in the Scripture, and not at all on those which are now inquired upon in our episcopal visitations. And if they may be minded of their true interest and concern, whilst they possess the places they hold in the church, without offense, I would advise them to conform their inquiries, in their visitations, unto those which they cannot but know the Lord Christ will make in the great day of his visitation, which doth approach. This I think but reasonable. In the meantime, for those who desire to give up their account with joy and confidence, and not with grief and confusion, it is their wisdom and duty continually to bear in mind what it is that the Lord Christ requires of them in the discharge of their office. To take benefices, to perform legal duties, by themselves or others, is not fully compliant with what pastors of churches are called unto.

4. It is manifest also from hence how inconsistent it is with this office, and the due discharge of it, for any one man to undertake the relation of a pastor unto more churches than one, especially if far distant from one another. An evil this is like that of *mathematical prognostications at Rome*, — *always condemned and always retained*. But one view of the duties incumbent on each pastor, and of whose diligent performance he is to give an account at the last day, will discard this practice from all approbation in the minds of them that are sober. However, it is as good to have ten churches at once, as, having but one, never to discharge the duty of a pastor towards it.

5. All churches may do well to consider the weight and burden that lies upon their pastors and teachers in the discharge of their office, that they may be constant in fervent prayers and supplications for them; as also to provide, what lies in them, that they may be without trouble and care about the things of this life.

6. "There being so many duties necessary unto the discharge of this office, and those of such various sorts and kinds as to require various gifts and abilities unto their due performance, it seems very difficult to find a concurrence of them in any one person in any considerable degree, so that

it is hard to conceive how the office itself should be duly discharged.” I answer, —

(1.) The end both of the office and of the discharge of it is the due edification of the church; this, therefore, gives them their measure. Where that is attained, the office is duly discharged, though the gifts whereby men are enabled thereunto be not eminent

(2.) Where a man is called unto this office, and applieth himself sincerely unto the due discharge of it, if he be evidently defective with respect to any especial duty or duties of it, that defect is to be supplied by calling any other unto his assistance in office who is qualified to make that supply unto the edification of the church. And the like must be said concerning such pastors as, through age or bodily weakness, are disabled from attendance unto any part of their duty; for still the edification of the church is that which, in all these things, is in the first place to be provided for.

7. It may be inquired what is the state of those churches, and what relation with respect unto communion we ought to have unto them, whose pastors are evidently defective in or neglective of these things, so as that they are not in any competent measure attended unto; and we may, in particular, instance in the first and last of the pastoral duties before insisted on. Suppose a man be no way able to preach the word unto the edification of them that are pleaded to be his flock, or, having an ability, yet doth not, will not, give himself unto the word and prayer, or will not labor in the word and doctrine, unto the great prejudice of edification; and suppose the same person be openly defective as unto an exemplary conversation, and on the contrary layeth the stumbling-block of his own sins and follies before the eyes of others, — what shall we judge of his ministry, and of the state of that church whereof he is a constituent part as its ruler? I answer: —

(1.) I do not believe it is in the power of any church really to confer the posteral office, by virtue of any ordination whatever, unto any who are openly and evidently destitute of all those previous qualifications which the Scripture requireth in them who are to be called unto this office. There is, indeed, a latitude to be allowed in judging of them in times of necessity and great penury of able teachers, so that persons in holy ministry design

the glory of God and the edification of the church according to their ability; but otherwise there is a nullity in the pretended office.

(2.) Where any such are admitted, through ignorance or mistake, or the usurpation of undue power over churches in imposing ministers on them, there is not an absolute nullity in their administrations until they are discovered and convicted by the rule and law of Christ. But if, on evidence hereof, the people will voluntarily adhere unto them, they are partakers of their sins, and do what in them lies to unchurch themselves.

(3.) Where such persons are, by any means, placed as pastors in or over any churches, and there is no way for their removal or reformation, it is lawful unto, it is the duty of every one who takes care of his own edification and salvation to withdraw from the communion of such churches, and to join with such as wherein edification is better provided for; for whereas this is the sole end of churches, of all their offices, officers, and administrations, it is the highest folly to imagine that any disciple of Christ can be or is obliged, by his authority, to abide in the communion of such churches, without seeking relief in the ways of his appointment, wherein that end is utterly overthrown.

(4.) Where the generality of churches, in any kind of association, are headed by pastors defective in these things, in the matter declared, there all public church-reformation is morally impossible, and it is the duty of private men to take care of their own souls, let churches and churchmen say what they please.

Some few things may yet be inquired into with reference unto the office of a pastor in the church; as, —

1. Whether a man may be ordained a pastor or a minister without relation unto any particular church, so as to be invested with office power thereby?

It is usually said that a man may be ordained a minister unto or of the catholic church, or to convert infidels, although he be not related unto any particular flock or congregation.

I shall not at present discuss sundry things about the power and way of ordination which influence this controversy, but only speak briefly unto the thing itself. And, —

(1.) It is granted that a man *endowed with spiritual gifts* for the preaching of the gospel may be set apart *by fasting and prayer* unto that work, when he may be orderly called unto it in the providence of God; for, —

[1.] Such an one hath a call unto it materially in the gifts which he hath received, warranting him unto the exercise of them for the edification of others as he hath occasion, ⁴⁰⁰1 Peter 4:10, 11; ⁴⁰²1 Corinthians 14:12. Setting apart unto an important work by prayer is a moral duty, and useful in church-affairs in an especial manner, ⁴⁰³Acts 13:1-3.

[2.] A *public testimony* unto the approbation of a person undertaking the work of preaching is necessary, —

1st. Unto the *communion of churches*, that he may be received in any of them as is occasion; of which sort were the letters of recommendation in the primitive church, ⁴⁰⁶1 Corinthians 16:3; ⁴⁰⁸2 Corinthians 3:1; 3 John 9; —

2dly. Unto *the safety of them* amongst whom he may exercise his gifts, that they be not imposed on by false teachers or seducers. Nor would the primitive church allow, nor is it allowable in the communion of churches, that any person not so testified unto, not so sent and warranted, should undertake constantly to preach the gospel.

(2.) Such persons, so *set apart and sent*, may be esteemed ministers in the general notion of the word, and may be useful in the calling and planting of churches, wherein they may be instated in the pastoral office. This was originally the work of evangelists, which office being ceased in the church (as shall be proved elsewhere), the work may be supplied by persons of this sort.

(3.) No church whatever hath power to *ordain* men ministers *for the conversion of infidels*. Since the cessation of extraordinary officers and offices, the care of that work is devolved merely on the providence of God, being left without the verge of church-institutions. God alone can send and warrant men for the undertaking of that work; nor can any man know or be satisfied in a call unto that work without some previous guidance of divine providence leading him thereunto. It is, indeed, the duty of all the ordinary ministers of the church to diffuse the knowledge of Christ and the gospel unto the heathen and infidels, among whom, or near

unto whom, their habitation is cast, and they have all manner of divine warranty for their so doing, as many worthy persons have done effectually in New England; and it is the duty of every true Christian who may be cast among them by the providence of God to instruct them according unto his ability in the knowledge of the truth: but it is not in the power of any church, or any sort of ordinary officers, to ordain a person unto the office of the ministry for the conversion of the heathen antecedently unto any designation by divine providence thereunto.

(4.) No man can be properly or completely ordained unto the ministry, but he is ordained unto a determinate office, as a bishop, an elder, a pastor. But this no man can be but he who is ordained in and unto a particular church; for the contrary practice, —

[1.] Would be contrary to the constant practice of the apostles, *who ordained no ordinary officers* but in and unto particular churches, which were to be their proper charge and care, ^{<4443>}Acts 14:23; ^{<4408>}Titus 1:5. Nor is there mention of any ordinary officers in the whole Scripture but such as were fixed in the particular churches whereunto they did relate, ^{<4408>}Acts 20:28; ^{<4400>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<4408>}Revelation 2:3; nor was any such practice known or heard of in the primitive church: yea, —

[2.] It was *absolutely forbidden in the ancient church*, and all such ordinations declared null, so as not to communicate office-power or give any ministerial authority. So it is expressly in the first canon of the council of Chalcedon, and the council decrees, “That all imposition of hands in such cases is invalid and of no effect.” Yea, so exact and careful were they in this matter, that if any one, for any just cause, as he judged himself, did leave his particular church or charge, they would not allow him the name or title of a bishop, or to officiate occasionally in that church, or anywhere else. This is evident in the case of Eustathius, a bishop of Pamphylia. The good man finding the discharge of his office very troublesome, by reason of secular businesses that it was encumbered withal, and much opposition with reproach that befell him from the church itself, of his own accord laid down and resigned his charge, the church choosing one Theodorus in his room. But afterward he desired that, though he had left his charge, he might retain the name, title, and honor of a bishop. For this end he made a petition unto the council of Ephesus; who, as themselves express it, in

mere commiseration unto the old man, condescended unto his desire as unto the name and title, but not as unto any office-power, which, they judged, related absolutely unto a particular charge, Epist. Conc. Ephesians 1, ad Synod. in Pamphyl.

[3.] Such ordination wants an *essential constitutive cause*, and part of the collation of office-power, which is the election of the people; and is therefore invalid. See what hath been proved before unto that purpose.

[4.] A bishop, an elder, a pastor, being terms of relation, to make any one so without relation unto a church, a people, a flock, is to make him a father who hath no child, or a husband who hath no wife, a *relate* without a *correlate*, which is impossible, and implies a contradiction.

[5.] It is inconsistent with the whole *nature* and *end* of the pastoral office. Whoever is duly called, set apart, or ordained unto that office, he doth therein and thereby take on himself the discharge of all the duties belonging thereunto, and is obliged to attend diligently unto them. If, then, we will take a view of What hath been proved before to belong unto this office, we shall find that not the least part, scarce any thing of it, can be undertaken and discharged by such as are ordained absolutely without relation unto particular churches. For any to take upon them to commit an office unto others, and not at the same time charge them with all the duties of that office and their immediate attendance on them, or for any to accept of an office and office-power not knowing when or where to exert the power or perform the duties of it, is irregular. In particular, ruling is an essential part of the pastoral office, which they cannot attend unto who have none to be ruled by them.

2. *May a pastor remove from one congregation unto another?* This is a thing also which the ancient church made great provision against; for when some churches were increased in members, reputation, privileges, and wealth, above others, it grew an ordinary practice for the bishops to design and endeavor their own removal from a less unto a greater benefice. This is so severely interdicted in the councils of Nice and Chalcedon as that they would not allow that a man might be a bishop or presbyter in any other place but only in the church wherein he was originally ordained; and, therefore, if any did so remove themselves, decreed that they should be sent home again, and there abide, or cease to be church-officers, Conc.

Nicae. can. 15, 16; Chalced., can. 5, 20. Pluralities, as they are called, and open contending for ecclesiastical promotions, benefices, and dignities, were then either unknown or openly condemned.

Yet it cannot be denied but that there may be just causes of the removal of a pastor from one congregation unto another; for whereas the end of all particular churches is to promote the edification of the catholic church in general, where, in any especial instance, such a removal is useful unto that end, it is equal it should be allowed. Cases of this nature may arise from the consideration of persons, places, times, and many other circumstances that I cannot insist on in particular. But that such removals may be without offense, it is required that they be made, —

(1.) With the free consent of the churches concerned;

(2.) With the advice of other churches, or their elders, with whom they walk in communion. And of examples of this kind, or of the removal of bishops or pastors from one church to another in an orderly manner, by advice and counsel, for the good of the whole church, there are many instances in the primitive times. Such was that of Gregory Nazianzen, removed from Casima to Constantinople; though I acknowledge it had no good success,

3. *May a pastor voluntarily, or of his own accord, resign and lay down his office, and remain in a private capacity?*

This also was judged inconvenient, if not unlawful, by the first synod of Ephesus, in the case of Eustathius. He was, as it appears, an aged man, one that loved his own peace and quietness, and who could not well bear the oppositions and reproaches which he met withal from the church, or some in it, and thereon solemnly, upon his own judgment, without advice, laid down and renounced his office in the church; who thereupon chose a good man in his room. Yet did the synod condemn this practice, and that not without weighty reasons, whereby they confirmed their judgment.

But yet no general rule can be established in this case; nor was the judgment or practice of the primitive church precise herein. Clemens, in his epistle to the church of Corinth, expressly adviseth those on whose occasion there was disturbance and divisions in the church to lay down their office and withdraw from it. Gregory Nazianzen did the same at

Constantinople; and protested openly that although he were himself innocent and free from blame, as he truly was, and one of the greatest men of his age, yet he would depart or be cast out, rather than they should not have peace among them; which he did accordingly, Orat. 52, et Vit. Greg. Nazian. And afterward a synod at Constantinople, under Photius, concluded that in some cases it is lawful, can. 5. Wherefore, —

(1.) It seems not to be lawful so to do merely on the account of *weakness for work* and labor, though occasioned by age, sickness, or bodily distemper: for no man is any way obliged to do more than he is able with the regular preservation of his life; and the church is obliged to be satisfied with the conscientious discharge of what abilities a pastor hath, otherwise providing for itself in what is wanting.

(2.) It is not lawful merely on a *weariness of and despondency under* opposition and reproaches, which a pastor is called and obliged to undergo for the good and edification of the flock, and not to faint in the warfare whereto he is called.

These two were the reasons of Eustathius at Perga, which were disallowed in the council at Ephesus. But, —

(3.) It is lawful in *such an incurable decay of intellectual abilities* as whereon a man can discharge no duty of the pastoral office unto the edification of the church.

(4.) It is lawful in case of *insurable divisions* in the church, constantly obstructing its edification, and which cannot be removed whilst such a one continues in his office, though he be no way the cause of them. This is the case wherein Clemens gives advice, and whereof Gregory gave an example in his own practice.

But this case and its determination will hold only where the divisions are incurable by any other ways and means; for if those who cause such divisions may be cast out of the church, or the church may withdraw communion from them, or if there be divisions in fixed parties and principles, opinions or practices, they may separate into distinct communions. In such cases this remedy, by the pastor's laying down his office, is not to be made use of; otherwise all things are to be done for edification.

(5.) It may be lawful where the church is *wholly negligent in its duty*, and persists in that negligence, after admonition, in providing, according to their abilities, for the outward necessity of their pastor and his family. But this case cannot be determined without the consideration of many particular circumstances.

(6.) Where all or many of these causes concur, so as that a man cannot cheerfully and comfortably go on in the discharge of his office, especially if he be pressed *in point of conscience*, through the church's noncompliance with their duty with respect unto any of the institutions of Christ, and if the edification of the church, which is at present obstructed, may be provided for, in their own judgment, after a due manner, there is no such grievous yoke laid by the Lord Christ on the necks of any of his servants but that such a person may peaceably lay down his office in such a church, and either abide in a private station, or take the care of another church, wherein he may discharge his office (being yet of ability) unto his own comfort and their edification.

CHAPTER 6.

OF THE OFFICE OF TEACHERS IN THE CHURCH, OR AN INQUIRY INTO THE STATE, CONDITION, AND WORK OF THOSE CALLED TEACHERS IN THE SCRIPTURE.

THE Lord Christ hath given unto his church “pastors and teachers,” ~~◀1011~~ Ephesians 4:11. He hath “set in the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers,” ~~◀1028~~ 1 Corinthians 12:28. In the church that was at Antioch there were “prophets and teachers,” ~~◀1011~~ Acts 13:1; and their work is both described and assigned unto them, as we shall see afterward.

But the thoughts of learned men about those who in the Scripture are called teachers are very various, nor is the determination of their state and condition easy or obvious, as we shall find in our inquiry.

If there were originally a distinct office of teachers in the church, it was lost for many ages; but yet there was always a shadow or appearance of it retained, first in public catechists, and then in doctors or professors of theology in the schools belonging unto any church. But this, as unto the title of *doctor* or teacher, is but a late invention; for the occasion of it rose about the year of Christ 1135. Lotharius the emperor having found in Italy a copy of the Roman civil law, and being greatly taken with it, he ordained that it should be publicly read and expounded in the schools. This he began, by the direction of Imerius his chancellor, at Bononia; and to give encouragement unto this employment, they ordained that those who were the public professors of it should be solemnly created doctors; of whom Bulgarus Hugolinus, with others, were the first. Not long after, this rite of creating doctors was borrowed of the lawyers by divines who publicly taught divinity in their schools; and this imitation first took place in Bononia, Paris, and Oxford. But this name is since grown a title of honor to sundry sorts of persons, whether unto any good use or purpose or no I know not; but it is in use, and not worth contending about, especially if, as unto some of them, it be fairly reconcilable unto that of our Savior, ~~◀1018~~ Matthew 23:8.

But the custom of having in the church teachers that did publicly explain and vindicate the principles of religion is far more ancient, and of known usage in the primitive churches. Such was the practice of the church of Alexandria in their school, wherein the famous Pansenus, Origen, and Clemens, were teachers; an imitation whereof has been continued in all ages of the church.

And, indeed, the continuation of such a peculiar work and employ-merit, to be discharged in manner of an office, is an evidence that originally there was such a distinct office in the church; for although in the Roman church they had instituted sundry orders of sacred officers, borrowed from the Jews or Gentiles, which have no resemblance unto any thing mentioned in the Scripture, yet sundry things abused and corrupted by them in church-officers took their occasional rise from what is so mentioned.

There are four opinions concerning those who are called by this name in the New Testament: —

- 1.** Some say that no office at all is denoted by it, it being only a general appellation of those that taught others, whether constantly or occasionally. Such were the prophets in the church of Corinth, that spake occasionally and in their turns, 1 Corinthians 14; which is that which all might do who had ability for it, verses 5, 24, 25.
- 2.** Some say it is only another name for the same office with that of a pastor, and so not [intended] to denote any distinct office; of which mind Jerome seems to be, Ephesians 4.
- 3.** Others allow that it was a distinct office, whereunto some were called and set apart in the church, but it was only to teach (and that in a peculiar manner) the principles of religion, but had no interest in the rule of the church or the administration of the sacred mysteries. So the pastor in the church was to rule, and teach, and administer the sacred mysteries; the teacher to teach or instruct only, but not to rule nor dispense the sacraments; and the ruling elder to rule only, and neither to teach nor administer sacraments; — which hath the appearance of order, both useful and beautiful.
- 4.** Some judge that it was a *distinct office*, but of the same nature and kind with that of the pastor, endowed with all the same powers, but differenced

from it with respect unto gifts and a peculiar kind of work allotted unto it. But this opinion hath this seeming disadvantage, that the difference between them is so small as not to be sufficient to give a distinct denomination of officers or to constitute a distinct office; and, it may be, such a distinction in gifts will seldom appear, so that the church may be guided thereby in the choice of meet persons unto distinct offices.

But Scripture testimony and rule must take place, and I shall briefly examine all these opinions.

The FIRST is, That this is *not the name of any officer, nor is a teacher, as such, any officer in the church*, but it is used only as a general name for any that teach, on any account, the doctrine of the gospel. I do not, indeed, know of any who have in particular contended for this opinion, but I observe that very many expositors take no further notice of them but as such. This seems to me to be most remote from the truth.

It is true, that in the first churches not only some, but all who had received spiritual light in the gifts of knowledge and utterance, did teach and instruct others as they had opportunity, ⁴⁰⁰⁸ 1 Peter 4:8-11. Hence the heathen philosophers, as Celsus in particular, objected to the Christians of old that they suffered sutlers, and weavers, and cobblers, to teach among them; which they who knew that Paul himself, their great apostle, wrought at a trade not much better, were not offended at. Of this sort were the disciples mentioned ⁴⁰⁰⁶ Acts 8:4; so was Aquila, chap. 18:26, and the many prophets in the church of Corinth, ⁴⁰⁰⁹ 1 Corinthians 14:29. But, —

1. The name **διδάσκαλος**; is not used in the New Testament but for a teacher with authority. The apostle John tells us that **διδάσκαλος** is the same with **ῥαζζουνί**, chap. 20:16, or as it is written, **ῥαζζονί**, ^{f5} ⁴⁰⁰⁵ Mark 10:51; which, in their mixed dialect, was the same with **rabbi**. And **רַבִּי**, ⁴⁰⁰⁷ **רַבִּי**, and **רַבֵּנִי**, were then in use for the Hebrew **מורה**: of which see ⁴⁰⁰² Job 36:22; ⁴⁰⁰³ Isaiah 30:20. Now, the constant signification of these words is “a master in teaching,” a teacher with authority;” nor is **διδάσκαλος** used in the New Testament but for such a one. And therefore those who are called teachers were such as were set apart unto the office of teaching, and not such as were so called from an occasional work or duty.

2. Teachers are numbered among the officers which Christ hath given unto and set in the church, ^{<4041>}Ephesians 4:11; ^{<4128>}1 Corinthians 12:28: so that originally church-officers were intended by them is beyond contradiction.
3. They are mentioned as those who, with others, did preside in the church, and join in the public ministrations of it, ^{<4131>}Acts 13:1, 2.
4. They are charged to attend unto the work of teaching; which none can be but they whose office it is to teach, ^{<6127>}Romans 12:7.

It is therefore undeniable that there is such an office as that of a teacher mentioned in the Scripture.

The SECOND opinion is, That *although a teacher be a church-officer, yet no distinct office is intended in that denomination*. It is, say they, only another name for a pastor, the office being one and the same, the same persons being both pastors and teachers, or called by these several names, as they have other titles also ascribed unto them.

So it is fallen out, and so it is usual in things of this nature, that men run into extremes; truth pleaseth them not. In the first deviation of the church from its primitive institution, there were introduced sundry offices to the church that were not of divine institution, borrowed partly of the Jews and partly of the Gentiles; which issued in the seven orders of the church of Rome. They did not utterly reject any that were of a divine original, but retained some kind of figure, shadow, or image of them; but they brought in others that were merely of their own invention. In the rejection of this exorbitancy, some are apt to run into the other extreme; they will deny and reject some of them that have a divine warranty for their original. Howbeit they are not many nor burdensome; yea, they are all such as without the continuation of them, the edification of the church cannot be carried on in a due manner: for unto the beauty and order of the church, in its rule and worship, it is required not only that there be many officers in each church, but also that they be of sundry sorts; all harmony in things natural, political, and ecclesiastical, arising from variety with proportion. And he that shall with calmness and without prejudice consider the whole work that is to be done in churches, with the end of their institution, will be able to understand the necessity of pastors, teachers, ruling-elders, and deacons, for those ends, and no other. And this I hope I shall demonstrate

in the consideration of these respective offices, with the duties that belong unto them, as I have considered one of them already. Wherefore, as unto the opinion under present consideration, I say, —

1. In the primitive church, about the end of the second century, before there was the least attempt to introduce new officers into the church, there were persons called unto the office and work of public teaching who were not pastors, nor called unto the administration of other ordinances. Those of this sort in the church of Alexandria were, by reason of their extraordinary abilities, quickly of great fame and renown. Their constant work was, publicly unto all comers, believers and unbelievers, to explain and teach the principles of Christian religion, defending and vindicating it from the opposition of its heathen adversaries, whether atheists or philosophers. This had never been so exactly practiced in the church if it had not derived from divine institution. And of this sort is the ὁ κατηχῶν, “the catechist,” intended by the apostle, ✠ ROM Galatians 6:6; for it is such a one as constantly labors in the work of preaching, and hath those who depend upon his ministry therein, οἱ κατηχούμενοι, those that are taught or catechised by him; for hence alone it is that maintenance is due unto him for his work: “Let the catechised communicate unto the catechist,” the taught unto the teacher, “in all good things.” And it is not the pastor of the church that he intends; for he speaks of him in the same case in another manner, and nowhere only with respect unto teaching alone.

2. There is a plain distinction between the offices of a pastor and a teacher: ✠ EPM Ephesians 4:11, “Some pastors and teachers.” This is one of the instances wherein men try their wits in putting in exceptions unto plain Scripture testimonies, as some or other do in all other cases; which if it may be allowed, we shall have nothing left us certain in the whole book of God. The apostle enumerates distinctly all the teaching officers of the church, both extraordinary and ordinary. “It is granted that there is a difference between apostles, prophets, and evangelists; but there is none,” say some, “between pastors and teachers,” which are also named distinctly. Why so? “Because there is an interposition of the article τούς between those of the former sort, and not between ‘pastors and teachers;’ “ — a very weak consideration to control the evidence of the design of the apostle in the words. We are not to prescribe unto him how he shall express himself. But this I know, that the discretive and copulative

conjunction καί, “and,” between “pastors” and “teachers,” doth no less distinguish them the one from the other than the τοὺς and τοὺς δέ before made use of; and this I shall confirm from the words themselves: —

(1.) The apostle doth not say “pastors *or* teachers,” which, in congruity of speech, should have been done if the same persons and the same office were intended; and the discretive particle in the close of such an enumeration of things distinct as that in this place is of the same force with the other notes of distinction before used.

(2.) After he hath named *pastors* he nameth *teachers*, with a note of distinction. This must either contain the addition of a new office, or be an interpretation of what went before, as if he had said, “Pastors, that is, teachers.” If it be the latter, then the name of teachers must be added as that which was better known than that of pastors, and more expressive of the office intended (it is declared who are meant by pastors in calling them teachers), or else the addition of the word is merely superfluous. But this is quite otherwise, the name of pastor being more known as unto the indigitation of office power and care, and more appropriated thereunto, than that of teacher, which is both a common name, not absolutely appropriated unto office, and respective of one part of the pastoral office and duty only.

(3.) No instance can be given, in any place where there is an *enumeration of church-officers*, either by their names, as ^{<428>}1 Corinthians 12:28, or by their work, as ^{<506>}Romans 12:6-8, or by the offices themselves, as ^{<100>}Philippians 1:1, of the same officer, at the same time, being expressed under various names; which, indeed, must needs introduce confusion into such an enumeration. It is true, the same officers are in the Scriptures called by several names, as pastors, bishops, presbyters; but if it had been said anywhere that there were in the church bishops *and* presbyters, it must be acknowledged that they were distinct officers, as bishops and deacons are, ^{<100>}Philippians 1:1.

(4.) The words in their first notion are *not synonymous*; for all pastors are teachers, but all teachers are not pastors: and therefore the latter cannot be exegetical of the former.

3. As these teachers are so called and named in contradistinction unto pastors in the same place, so they have *distinct office-works* and duties assigned unto them in the same place also: ~~6110~~ Romans 12:7, 8, “He that teacheth on teaching, he that exhorteth on exhortation.” If they have especial works to attend unto distinctly by virtue of their offices, then are their offices distinct also; for from one there is an especial obligation unto one sort of duties, and to another sort from the other.

4. These teachers are set in the church as in a distinct office from that of prophets, “secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers,” ~~6128~~ 1 Corinthians 12:28. And so they are mentioned distinctly in the church of Antioch, ~~6131~~ Acts 13:1, “There were in the church that was at Antioch certain prophets and teachers.” But in both places pastors are comprised under the name of prophets, exhortation being an especial branch of prophesy, ~~6120~~ Romans 12:6-8.

5. There is a peculiar *institution of maintenance* for these teachers, which argues a distinct office, ~~6106~~ Galatians 6:6.

From all these considerations it appears that the teachers mentioned in the Scripture were officers in the church distinct from pastors: for they are distinguished from them, —

- (1.) By their *name*, declarative of the especial nature of their office;
- (2.) By their *peculiar work* which they are to attend unto, in teaching by virtue of office;
- (3.) By their *distinct placing* in the church as peculiar officers in it, distinct from prophets or pastors;
- (4.) By the *especial constitution* of their necessary maintenance;
- (5.) By the *necessity of their work*, to be distinctly carried on in the church. Which may suffice for the removal of the second opinion.

The THIRD is, that teachers *are a distinct office* in the church, but such whose office, work, and power, is confined unto *teaching only*, so as that they have no interest in rule or the administration of the sacraments. And,

1. I acknowledge that this seems to have been the way and practice of the churches after the apostles; for they had ordinarily catechists and teachers in assemblies like schools, that were not called unto the whole work of the ministry.
2. The name of a teacher, neither in its native signification nor in its ordinary application, as expressive of the work of this office, doth extend itself beyond or signify any thing but the mere power and duty of teaching. It is otherwise as unto the names of pastors, bishops or overseers, elders; which, as unto the two former, their constant use in the Scripture, suited unto their signification, include the whole work of the ministry, and the latter is a name of dignity and rule. Upon the proposal of church-officers under these names, the whole of office-power and duty is apprehended as included in them. But the name of a teacher, especially as significant of that of rabbi among the Jews, carries along with it a confinement unto an especial work or duty.
3. I do judge it lawful for any church, from the nature of the thing itself, Scripture, general rules and directions, to choose, call, and set apart, meet persons unto the office, work, and duty of teachers, without an interest in the rule of the church, or the administration of the holy ordinances of worship. The same thing is practiced by many, for the substance of it, though not in due order; and, it may be, the practice hereof, duly observed, would lead us unto the original institution of this office. But, —
4. Whereas a teacher, merely as such, hath no right unto rule or the administration of ordinances, no more than the doctors among the Jews had right to offer sacrifices in the temple, yet he who is called to be a teacher may also at the same time be called to be an elder, and a teaching elder hath the power of all holy administrations committed to him.
5. But he that is called to be a teacher in a peculiar manner, although he be an elder also, is to attend peculiarly unto that part of his work from whence he receiveth his denomination.

And so I shall at present dismiss this third opinion unto further consideration, if there be any occasion for it.

The FOURTH opinion I rather embrace than any of the others, namely, upon a supposition that a teacher is a distinct officer in the church, his

office is of *the same kind with that of the pastor*, though distinguished from it as unto degrees, both materially and formally; for, —

1. They are joined with pastors in the same order, as their associates in office, ^{<4011>}Ephesians 4:11: so they are with prophets, and set in the church as they are, ^{<4128>}1 Corinthians 12:28; ^{<4131>}Acts 13:1.
2. They have a peculiar work, of the same general nature with that of pastors, assigned unto them, ^{<4127>}Romans 12:7. Being to teach or preach the gospel by virtue of office, they have the same office for substance with the pastors.
3. They are said **λειτουργῆσαι** in the church, Acts. 13:1, 2, which compriseth all sacred administrations.

Wherefore, upon the consideration of all that is spoken in the Scripture concerning church-teachers, with the various conjectures of all sorts of writers about them, I shall conclude my own thoughts in some few observations, and then inquire into the state of the church with reference unto these “pastors and teachers.” And I say, —

1. There *may be teachers* in a church called only unto the work of teaching, without any further interest in rule or right unto the administration of the sacraments. Such they seem to be who are mentioned, ^{<4106>}Galatians 6:6. They are there called peculiarly **κατηχοῦντες** “catechists;” and **παιδαγωγοί**, “instructors of those that are young” in the rudiments of religion, ^{<4115>}1 Corinthians 4:15. And such there were in the primitive churches; some whereof were eminent, famous, and useful. And this was very necessary in those days when the churches were great and numerous; for whereas the whole rule of the church, and the administration of all ordinances in it, are originally committed unto the pastor, as belonging entirely unto his office, the discharge of it in all its parts, unto the edification of the church, especially when it is numerous, being impossible for any one man, or it may be more, in the same office, where all are obliged unto an especial attendance on one part of it, namely, the word and prayer, it pleased the Lord Christ to appoint such as, in distinct offices, should be associated with them for the discharge of sundry parts of their duty. So were deacons ordained to take care of the poor and the outward concerns of the church, without any interest in rule or right to teach. So

were, as we shall prove, elders ordained to assist and help in rule, without any call to preach or administer the sacraments. And so were teachers appointed to instruct the church and others in the truth, who had no right to rule or the administration of other ordinances. And thus, although the whole duty of the edification of the church be still incumbent on the pastors, yet being supplied with assistance to all the parts of it, it may be comfortably discharged by them. And if this order were observed in all churches, not only many inconveniencies would be prevented, but the order and edification of the church greatly promoted.

2. He who is *peculiarly called to be a teacher*, with reference unto a distinction from a pastor, may yet at the same time be called to *be an elder also*; that is, to be a teaching elder. And where there is in any officer a concurrence of both these, — a right unto rule as an elder and power to teach or preach the gospel, — there is the same office and office-power, for the substance of it, as there is in the pastor.

3. On the foregoing supposition, there yet remains *a distinction between the office of a pastor and teacher*; — which, as far as light may be taken from their names and distinct ascriptions unto them, consists materially in the different gifts which those to be called unto office have received, which the church in their call ought to have respect unto; and formally in the peculiar exercise of those gifts in the discharge of their office, according unto the assignation of their especial work unto them, which themselves are to attend unto.

Upon what hath been before discoursed concerning the office of pastors and teachers, it may be inquired whether there may be many of them in a particular church, or whether there ought only to be of one of each sort? And I say, —

1. Take teachers in the third sense, for those who are only so, and have no further interest in office-power, and there is no doubt but that there may be as many of them in any church as axe necessary unto its edification, and ought so to be. And a due observation of this institution would prevent the inconvenience of men's preaching constantly who are in no office of the church; for although I do grant that those who have once been regularly and solemnly set apart or ordained unto the ministry have the right of Constant preaching inherent in them, and the duty of it incumbent on

them, though they may be separated from those churches wherein and unto whom they were peculiarly ordained, yet for men to give themselves up constantly unto the work of teaching by preaching the gospel who never were set apart by the church thereunto, I know not that it can be justified.

2. If there be but one sort of elders mentioned in the Scripture, it is out of all question that there may be many pastors in the same church; for there were many elders in every church, ^{<44423>}Acts 14:23, 20:17, 28; ^{<5000>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<5000>}Titus 1:5: but if there are sundry sorts of elders mentioned in the Scripture, as pastors who peculiarly feed the flock, those teaching elders of whom we have spoken, and those rulers concerning whom we shall treat in the next place, then no determination of this inquiry can be taken from the multiplication of them in any church.

3. It is certain that the order very early observed in the church was one pastor, ὁ προεστώς, “praeses,” quickly called “episcopus,” by way of distinction, with many elders assisting in rule and teaching, and deacons ministering in the things of this life, whereby the order of the church was preserved and its authority represented; yet I will not deny but that in each particular church there may be many pastors with an equality of power, if the edification of the church do require it.

4. It was the alteration of the state of the church from its primitive constitution, and deviation from its first order, by an occasional coalescency of many churches into one, by a new form of churches never appointed by Christ, which came not in until after the end of the second century, that gave occasion to corrupt this order into an episcopal pre-eminence, which degenerated more and more into confusion under the name of *order*. And the absolute equality of many pastors in one and the same church is liable unto many inconveniencies if not diligently watched against.

5. Wherefore let the state of the church be preserved and kept unto its original constitution, which is congregational, and no other, and I do judge that the order of the officers which was so early in the primitive church, — namely, of one pastor or bishop in one church, assisted in rule and all holy administrations with many elders teaching or ruling only, — doth not so overthrow church order as to render its rule or discipline useless.

6. But whereas there is no difference in the Scripture, as unto office or power, intimated between bishops and presbyters, as we have proved, when there are many teaching elders in any church, an equality in office and power is to be preserved. But yet this takes not off from the due preference of the pastoral office, nor from the necessity of precedence for the observation of order in all church assemblies, nor from the consideration of the peculiar advantages which gifts, age, abilities, prudence, and experience, which may belong unto some, according to rule, may give.

CHAPTER 7.

OF THE RULE OF THE CHURCH, OR OF RULING ELDERS.

1. THE rule, and government of the church, or *the execution of the authority of Christ* therein, is in the hand of the elders in office have rule, and none have rule in the church but elders. As such, rule doth belong unto them. The apostles, by virtue of their especial office, were intrusted, with all church-power; but ‘therefore they were elders also,’ ~~4081~~ 1 Peter 5:1; 2 John 1; 3 John 1. See ~~4018~~ Acts 21:18; ~~5057~~ 1 Timothy 5:17. There are some of them, on other accounts, called “bishops, pastors, teachers, ministers, guides;” but what belongs unto any of them in point of rule, or what interest they have therein, it belongs unto them as elders, and not otherwise, ~~4017~~ Acts 20:17, 28.

So under the old testament, where the word doth not signify a difference in age, but is used in a moral sense, elders are the same with rulers or governors, whether in offices civil or ecclesiastical; especially the rulers of the church were constantly called its elders. And the use of the word, with the abuse of the power or office intended by it, is traduced to signify men in authority (“seniores, aldermanni”) in all places.

2. Church-power, acted in its rule. is called “The keys of the kingdom of heaven,” by an expression derived from the keys that were a sign of office-power in the families of kings, ~~2022~~ Isaiah 22:22; and it is used by our Savior himself to denote the communication of church-power unto others, which is absolutely and universally vested in himself, under the name of “The key of David,” ~~4117~~ Revelation 3:7; ~~4165~~ Matthew 16:19.

3. These keys are usually referred unto two heads, — namely, the one of *order*, the other of *jurisdiction*.

4. By the “key of order,” the *spiritual right, power, and authority of bishops* or pastors to preach the word, to administer the sacraments, and doctrinally to bind and loose the consciences of men, are intended.

5. By “jurisdiction,” *the rule, government, or discipline of the church is designed*; though it was never so called or esteemed in the Scripture, or the

primitive church until the whole nature of church rule or discipline was depraved and changed. Therefore, neither the word, nor any thing that is signified by it or which it is applied unto, ought to be admitted unto any consideration in the things that belong unto the church or its rule, it being expressive of and directing unto that corrupt administration of things ecclesiastical, according unto the canon law, by which all church rule and order is destroyed. I do therefore at once dismiss all disputes about it, as of things foreign to the gospel and Christian religion; I mean as unto the institutions of Christ in his church. The civil jurisdiction of supreme magistrates about the externals of religion is of another consideration; but that these keys do include the twofold distinct powers of teaching and rule, of doctrine and discipline, is freely granted.

6. In the church of England (as in that of Rome) there is a peculiar distribution made of these keys. Unto some, — that is, unto one special sort or order of men, — they are both granted, *both the key of order and of jurisdiction*; which is unto diocesan bishops, with some others, under various canonical restrictions and limitations, as deans and archdeacons. Unto some is granted *the key of order only*, without the least interest in jurisdiction or rule by virtue of their office; which are the parochial ministers, or mere presbyters, without any additional title or power, as of commissary surrogates, or the like. And unto a third sort there is granted *the key of rule or jurisdiction almost plenipotent*, who have no share in the key of order, — that is, were never ordained, separated, dedicated unto any office in the church, — such as are the chancellors, etc.

7. These chancellors are the *only lay elders* that I know anywhere in any church; that is, persons intrusted with the rule of the church and the disposition of its censures, who are not ordained unto any church-office, but in all other things continue in the order of the laity or the people. All church-rulers by institution are elders; to be an elder of the church and a ruler in it is all one: wherefore these persons being rulers in the church, and yet thus continuing in the order of the people, are lay elders; whom I wonder how so many of the church came so seriously to oppose, seeing this order of men is owned by none but themselves. The truth is, and it must be acknowledged, that there is no known church in the world (I mean, whose order is known unto us, and is of any public consideration) but they do dispose the rule of the church, in part, into the hands of

persons who have not the power of authoritative preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments committed unto them; for even those who place the whole external rule of the church in the civil magistrate do it as they judge him an officer of the church, intrusted by Christ with church-power. And those who deny any such officers as are usually called “ruling elders” in the reformed churches to be of divine institution, yet maintain that it is very necessary that there should be such officers in the church, either appointed by the magistrate or chosen by the people, and that with cogent arguments. See Imp. Sum. Pot. circ. sacra.

8. But this distribution mentioned of church-power is *unscriptural*, nor is there any footsteps of it in *antiquity*. It is so as unto the two latter branches of it. That any one should have the power of order to preach the word, to administer the seals, to bind and loose the conscience doctrinally, or ministerially to bind and loose in the court of conscience, and yet by the virtue of that office which gives him this power not to have a right and power of rule or discipline, to bind and loose in the court of the church, is that which neither the Scripture nor any example of the primitive church doth give countenance unto. And as by this means those are abridged and deprived of their power to whom it is granted by the institution and law of Christ (as it is with all elders duly called unto their office), so in the third branch there is a grant of church-power unto such as by the law of Christ are excluded from any interest therein; the enormity of which constitution I shall not at present insist upon.

But inquiry must be made what the Scripture directs unto herein. And, —

1. There is *a work and duty of rule in the church* distinct from the work and duty of pastoral feeding by the preaching of the word and administration of the sacraments. All agree herein, unless it be Erastus and those that follow him, who seem to oppose it; but their arguments lie not against rule in general, which were brutish, but only a rule by external jurisdiction in the elders of the church. So they grant the general assertion of the necessity of rule, for who can deny it? only they contend about the subject of power required thereunto. A spiritual rule, by virtue of mutual voluntary confederation, for the preservation of peace, purity, and order in the church, few of that opinion deny, at least it is not that which they do oppose; for to deny all rule and discipline in the church, with all

administration of censures, in the exercise of a spiritual power internally inherent in the church, is to deny the church to be a spiritual political society, overthrow its nature, and frustrate its institution, in direct opposition unto the Scripture. That there is such a rule in the Christian church, see ^{<40B>}Acts 20:28; ^{<60B>}Romans 12:8; ^{<42B>}1 Corinthians 12:28; ^{<50B>}1 Timothy 3:5, 5:17; ^{<30B>}Hebrews 13:7, 17; ^{<60B>}Revelation 2:3.

2. *Different and distinct gifts* are required unto the discharge of these *distinct works and duties*. This belongs unto the harmony of the dispensation of the gospel. Gifts are bestowed to answer all duties prescribed. Hence they are the first foundation of all power, work, and duty in the church: “Unto every one of us is given grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ;” that is, ability for duty according to the measure wherein Christ is pleased to grant it, ^{<40B>}Ephesians 4:7. “There are diversities of gifts, but the same Spirit;..... but the manifestation of the Spirit is given to every man to profit withal,” ^{<40B>}1 Corinthians 12:4, 7-10. “Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us,” etc., ^{<60B>}Romans 12:6-8.

“As every man hath received the gift, so minister the same one to another, as good stewards of the manifold grace of God,”

^{<40B>}1 Peter 4:10.

Hence are they called “The powers of the world to come,” ^{<30B>}Hebrews 6:4, 5. Wherefore, differing gifts are the first foundation of differing offices and duties.

3. That *differing gifts* are required unto the different works of *pastoral teaching* on the one hand, and *practical rule* on the other, is evident, —

(1.) From *the light of reason*, and the nature of the works themselves being so different; and,

(2.) From *experience*. Some men are fitted by gifts for the dispensation of the word and doctrine in a way of pastoral feeding who have no useful ability for the work of rule, and some are fitted for rule who have no gifts for the discharge of the pastoral work in preaching; yea, it is very seldom that both these sorts of gifts do concur in any eminency in the same person, or without some notable defect. Those who are ready to assume all things unto themselves are, for the most part fit for nothing at all. And

hence it is that most of those who esteem both these works to belong principally unto themselves do almost totally decline the one, or that of pastoral preaching, under a pretense of attending unto the other, that is, rule, in a very preposterous way; for they omit that which is incomparably the greater and more worthy for that which is less and inferior unto it, although it should be attended unto in a due manner.

But this, and sundry other things of the like nature, proceed from the corruption of that traditional notion, which is true in itself and continued among all sorts of Christians, namely, that there ought to be some on whom the rule of the church is in an especial manner incumbent, and whose principal work it is to attend thereunto; for the great depravations of all church-government proceed from the corruption and abuse of this notion, which in itself and its original is true and sacred. Herein also, “*Malum habitat in alieno fundo;*” there is no corruption in church order or rule but is corruptly derived from or set up as an image of some divine institution.

4. The work of rule, as distinct from teaching, is in general to *watch over the walking or conversation of the members of the church with authority*, exhorting, comforting, admonishing reproving, encouraging, directing of them, as occasion shall require. The gifts necessary hereunto are diligence, wisdom, courage, and gravity; as we shall see afterward. The pastoral work is principally to “declare the whole counsel of God,” to “divide the word aright,” or to “labor in the word and doctrine,” both as unto the general dispensation and particular application of it, in all seasons and on all occasions. Hereunto spiritual wisdom, knowledge, sound judgment, experience, and utterance, are required, all to be improved by continual study of the word and prayer. But this difference of gifts unto these distinct works doth not of itself constitute distinct offices, because the same persons may be meetly furnished with those of both sorts.

5. Yet distinct works and duties, though some were furnished with gifts for both, were a ground, in the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, *for distinct offices* in the church, where one sort of them was as much as those of one office could ordinarily attend unto, ⁴⁰²Acts 6:2-4. Ministration unto the poor of the church for the supply of their temporal necessities is an ordinance of Christ. For the administration hereof the apostles were

furnished with gifts and wisdom above all others; but yet, because there was another part of their work and duty superior hereunto, and of greater necessity unto the propagation of the gospel and edification of the church, — namely, a diligent attendance unto the word and prayer, — the wisdom of the Holy Ghost in them thought meet to erect a new office in the church for the discharge of that part of the ministerial duty, which was to be attended unto, yet not so as to be any obstruction unto the other. I do not observe this as if it were lawful for any others after them to do the same, — namely, upon a supposition of an especial work to erect an especial office. Only, I would demonstrate from hence the equity and reasonable ground of that institution, which we shall afterward evince.

6. *The work of the ministry in prayer and preaching of the word*, or labor in the word and doctrine, whereunto the administration of the seals of the covenant is annexed, with all the duties that belong unto the especial application of these things (before insisted on) unto the flock, are ordinarily sufficient *to take up the whole man*, and the utmost of their endowments who are called unto the pastoral office in the church. The very nature of the work in itself is such as that the apostle, giving a short description of it, adds, as an intimation of its greatness and excellency, “Who is sufficient for these things?” ~~<400>~~ 2 Corinthians 2:16. And the manner of its performance adds unto its weight; for, — not to mention that intension of mind, in the exercise of faith, love, zeal, and compassion, which is required of them in the discharge of their whole office, — the diligent consideration of the state of the flock, so as to provide spiritual food convenient for them, with a constant attendance unto the issues and effects of the word in the consciences and lives of men, is enough, for the most part, to take up their whole time and strength.

It is gross ignorance or negligence that occasioneth any to be otherwise minded. As the work of the ministry is generally discharged, as consisting only in a weekly provision of sermons and the performance of some stated offices by reading, men may have time and liberty enough to attend unto other occasions; hut in such persons we are not at present concerned. Our rule is plain, ~~<500>~~ 1 Timothy 4:12-16.

7. It doth not hence follow that those who are called unto the ministry of the word, as pastors and teachers, who are elders also, are *divested of the*

right of rule in the church, or discharged from the exercise of it, because others not called unto their office are appointed to be assistant unto them, that is, *helps in the government*; for the right and duty of rule is inseparable from the office of elders, which all bishops or pastors are. The right is still in them, and the exercise of it, consistently with their more excellent work, is required of them. So was it in the first institution of the sanhedrim in the church of Israel, ^{<4817>}Exodus 18:17-23. Moses had before the sole rule and government of the people. In the addition that was made of an eldership for his assistance, there was no diminution of his right or the exercise of it according to his precedent power. And the apostles, in the constitution of elders in every church, derogated nothing from their own authority, nor discharged themselves of their care. So when they appointed deacons to take care of supplies for the poor, they did not forego their own right nor the exercise of their duty, as their other work would permit them, ^{<4817>}Galatians 2:9, 10; and in particular, the apostle Paul manifested his concernment herein in the care he took about a collection for the poor in all churches.

8. As we observed at the entrance of this chapter, *the whole work of the church*, as unto authoritative teaching and rule, is committed unto the *elders*; for authoritative teaching and ruling is teaching and ruling by virtue of office, and this office whereunto they do belong is that of elders, as it is undeniably attested, ^{<4817>}Acts 20:17, etc. All that belongs unto the care, inspection, oversight, rule, and instruction of the church, is committed unto the elders of it expressly; for “elders” is a name derived from the Jews, denoting them that have authority in the church. The first signification of the word, in all languages, respects age. Elders are old men, well stricken in years; unto whom respect and reverence is due by the law of nature and Scripture command, unless they forfeit their privilege by levity or wickedness, — which they often do. Now, ancient men were originally judged, if not the only, yet the most meet for rule, and were before others constantly called thereunto. Hence the name of “elders” was appropriated unto them who did preside and rule over others in any kind.

Only, it may be observed that there is in the Scripture no mention of rulers that are called elders, but such as are in a subordinate power and authority only. Those who were in supreme, absolute power, as kings and princes, are never called “elders;” but elders by office were such only as had

ministerial power under others. Wherefore, the highest officers in the Christian church being called elders, even the apostles themselves, and Peter in particular, ~~1~~ 1 Epist. 5:1, 2, it is evident that they have only a ministerial power; and so it is declared, verse 4. The pope would now scarce take it well to be esteemed only an elder of the church of Rome, unless it be in the same sense wherein the Turkish monarch is called the Grand Seignior. But those who could be in the church above elders have no office in it, whatever usurpation they may make over it.

9. To the complete constitution of any particular church, or the protection of its organical state, it is required that there be *many elders* in it, at least more than one. In this proposition is the next foundation of the truth which we plead for; and therefore it must be distinctly considered. I do not determine what their number ought to be, nor is it determinable, as unto all churches; for the light of nature sufficiently directs that it is to be proportioned unto the work and end desired. Where a church is numerous, there is a necessity of increasing their number proportionably unto their work. In the days of Cyprian there were in the church of Carthage ten or twelve of them, that are mentioned by name; and at the same time there were a great many in the church of Rome, under Cornelius. Where the churches are small, the number of elders may be so also; for no office is appointed in the church for pomp or show, but for labor only, and so many are necessary in each office as are able to discharge the work which is allotted unto them. But that church, be it small or great, is not complete in its state, is defective, which hath not more elders than one, which hath not so many as are sufficient for their work.

10. The government of the church, in the judgment and practice of some, is absolutely *democratical or popular*. They judge that all church power or authority is seated and settled in the community of the brethren, or body of the people; and they look on elders or ministers only as secants of the church, not only materially in the duties they perform, and finally for their edification, serving for the good of the church in the things of the church, but formally also, as acting the authority of the church by a mere delegation, and not any of their own received directly from Christ by virtue of his law and institution. Hence they do occasionally appoint persons among themselves, not called unto, not vested with any office, to administer the supper of the Lord, or any other solemn office of worship.

On this principle and supposition I see no necessity for any elders at all though usually they do confer this office on some with solemnity. But as among them there is no direct necessity of any elders for rule, so we treat not at present concerning them.

11. Some place the government of many particular churches in a *diocesan bishop*, with those that act under him and by his authority, according unto the rule of the canon law and the civil constitution of the land. These are so far from judging it necessary that there should be many elders for rule in every particular church, as that they allow no rule in them at all, but only assert a rule over them. But a church where there is no rule in itself, to be exercised in the name of Christ by its own rulers, officers, guides, immediately presiding in it, is unknown to Scripture and antiquity. Wherefore with these we deal not in this discourse, nor have any apprehension that the power of presenting men, for any pretended disorder, unto the bishop's or chancellor's court is any part of church power or rule.

12. Others place the rule of particular churches, especially in cases of greatest moment, in an *association, conjunction, or combination of all the elders* of them in one society; which is commonly called a *classis*. So in all acts of rule there will be a conjunct acting of many elders. And no doubt it is the best provision that can be made, on a supposition of the continuance of the present parochial distribution. But those also of this judgment who have most weighed and considered the nature of these things, do assert the necessity of many elders in every particular church; which is the common judgment and practice of the reformed churches in all places.

13. And some there are who begin to maintain that there is no need of any more, but one *pastor, bishop, or elder* in a particular church, which hath its rule in itself, other elders for rule being unnecessary. This is a novel opinion, contradictory to the sense and practice of the church in all ages;

(1.) The pattern of the first churches constituted by the apostles, which it is our duty to imitate and follow as our rule, constantly expresseth and declares that *many elders* were appointed by them in every church, ^{<4113>}Acts 11:30, ^{<4143>}14:23, 15:2, 4, 6, 22, ^{<4164>}16:4, ^{<4177>}20:17, etc.; ^{<5417>}1 Timothy 5:17; ^{<5001>}Philippians 1:1; ^{<5001>}Titus 1:5; ^{<4011>}1 Peter 5:1. There is no mention in the Scripture, no mention in antiquity, of any church wherein there were

not more elders than one; nor doth that church answer the original pattern where it is otherwise.

(2.) Where there is but one elder in a church, there cannot be an *eldership* or *presbytery*, as there cannot be a senate where there is but one senator; which is contrary unto ~~5044~~ 1 Timothy 4:14.

(3.) The *continuation* of every church in its original state and constitution is, since the ceasing of extraordinary offices and powers, committed to the care and power of the church itself. Hereunto the calling and ordaining of ordinary officers, pastors, rulers, elders, teachers, do belong; and therein, as we have proved, both the election of the people, submitting themselves unto them in the Lord, and the solemn setting of them apart by imposition of hands, do concur. But if there be but one elder only in a church, upon his death or removal, this imposition of hands must either be left unto the people, or be supplied by elders of other churches, or be wholly omitted; all which are irregular: and that church-order is defective which wants the symbol of authoritative ordination.

(4.) It is difficult, if not impossible, on a supposition of one elder only in a church, to preserve the rule of the church from being *prelatical* or *popular*. There is nothing more frequently objected unto those who dissent from diocesan bishops, than that they would every one be bishops in their own parishes and unto their own people. All such pretences are excluded on our principles, of the liberty of the people, of the necessity of many elders in the same church in an equality of power, and the communion of other churches in association; but practically, where there is but one elder, one of the extremes can hardly be avoided. If he rule by himself, without the previous advice, in some cases, as well as the subsequent consent of the church, it hath an eye of unwarrantable prelacy in it. If every thing be to be originally transacted, disposed, ordered by the whole society, the authority of the elder will quickly be insignificant, and he will be little more, in point of rule, than any other brother of the society. But all these inconveniencies are prevented by the fixing of many elders in each church, which may maintain the authority of the presbytery, and free the church from the despotical rule of any Diotrephes. But in case there be but one in any church, unless he have wisdom to maintain the authority of the eldership in his own person and actings, there is no rule, but confusion.

(5.) The nature of the work whereunto they are called requires that, in every church consisting of any considerable number of members, there should be *more elders than one* (when God first appointed rule in the church under the old testament, he assigned unto every ten persons or families a distinct ruler, ^{Deuteronomy 1:15}); for the elders are to take care of the walk or conversation of all the members of the church, that it be according unto the rule of the gospel This rule is eminent, as unto the holiness that it requires, above all other rules of moral conversation whatever; and there is, in all the members of the church, great accuracy and circumspection required in their walking after it and according unto it. The order also and decency which is required in all church-assemblies stands in need of exact care and inspection. That all these things can be attended unto and discharged in a due manner in any church, by one elder, is for them only to suppose who know nothing of them. And although there may be an appearance for a season of all these things in such churches, yet, there being not therein a due compliance with the wisdom and institution of Christ, they have no present beauty, nor will be of any long continuance.

These considerations, as also those that follow, may seem jejune and contemptible unto such as have another frame of church rule and order drawn in their minds and interests. A government vested in some few persons, with titles of pre-eminence, and legal power, exercised in courts with coercive jurisdiction, by the methods and processes of canons of their own framing, is that which they suppose doth better become the grandeur of church-rulers and the state of the church than these creeping elders with their congregations. But whereas our present inquiry after these things is only in and out of the Scripture, wherein there is neither shadow nor appearance of any of these practices, I beg their pardon if at present I consider them not.

We shall now make application of these things unto our present purpose. I say, then, —

1. Whereas there is a *work of rule* in the church distinct from that of *pastoral feeding*; and,
2. Whereas this work is to be attended unto with *diligence*, which includes the whole duty of him that attends unto it; and,

3. Whereas the *ministry of the word and prayer*, with all those duties that accompany it, is a *full employment* for any man, and so, consequently, his principal and proper work, which it is unlawful for him to be remiss in by attending on another with diligence; and,

4. Whereas there ought to be many elders in every church, that both the works of *teaching* and *ruling* may be constantly attended unto; and,

5. Whereas, in the wisdom of the Holy Ghost, *distinct works* did require *distinct offices* for their discharge (all which we have proved already), our inquiry hereon is, —

Whether the same Holy Spirit hath not distinguished this office of elders into these two sorts, — namely, those who are called unto teaching and rule also, and those who are called unto rule only? which we affirm.

The testimonies whereby the truth of this assertion is confirmed are generally known and pleaded. I shall insist on some of them only, beginning with that which is of uncontrollable evidence, if it had any thing to conflict withal but prejudices and interest; and this is ^{<S187>}1 Timothy 5:17: Οἱ καλῶς προεστῶτες πρεσβύτεροι διπλῆς τιμῆς ἀξιούσθωσαν, μάλιστα οἱ κοπιῶντες ἐν λόγῳ καὶ διδασκαλίᾳ. Προΐστημι, or προΐταμαι, is “praesum, praesideo,” to preside, to rule: “Praesident probati seniores,” Tertul. And the bishop or pastor in Justin Martyr is ὁ προεστῶς. So is the word constantly used in the New Testament: ^{<S188>}Romans 12:8, Ὁ προϊστάμενος, — “That ruleth;” ^{<S189>}1 Thessalonians 5:12, Προϊσταμένους ὑμῶν, — “That are over you,” that is, in place of rule; ^{<S190>}1 Timothy 3:4, 5, 12, it is applied unto family rule and government; as it is also unto care and diligence about good works, Titus, 3:8, 14. Προστασία is the whole presidency in the church, with respect unto its rule. Translators agree in the reading of these words: so the Hebrew of Munster, זְקֵנֵי-הָעֵדָה אֲשֶׁר מְטִיבִים לָהֶם — “The elders of the congregation who well discharge their rule or conduct;” so the Syriac, קְשֵׁא אֵלִין, — “Those elders;” “Qui bene praesunt presbyteri,” Vulg. Lat.; “Seniori che governano bene,” Ital. All agree that it is the governors and government of the church in general that are here intended. Μάλιστα is the word most controverted; all translators esteem it distinctive: Hebrews נֶעְלָה, “eminently;” Syr. יְתִרְאִית “chiefly,

principally;” “maxime;” οἱ κοπιῶντες הַיֹּגְעִים, — “who labor painfully,” labor to weariness, travail in the *word and doctrine*.

“*The elders*, or presbyters in office, elders of the church, *that rule well*, or discharge their presidency for rule in due manner, are to *be counted worthy*, or ought to be reputed worthy, of *double honor*, especially those of them *who labor* or are engaged in the great labor and travail of *the word and doctrine*.”

And some things may be observed in general concerning these words: —

1. This testimony relates directly unto the *rules and principles* before laid down, directing unto the practice of them. According unto the analogy of those principles these words are to be interpreted; and unless they are overthrown, it is to no purpose to put in exceptions against the sense of this or that word. The interpretation of them is to be suited unto the analogy of the things which they relate unto. If we consider not what is spoken here in consent with other scriptures treating of the same matter, we depart from all sober rules of interpretation.

2. On this supposition, the words of the text have a *plain and obvious signification*, which at first view presents itself unto the common sense and understanding of all men; and where there is nothing contrary unto any other divine testimony or evident reason, such a sense is constantly to be embraced. There is nothing here of any spiritual mystery, but only a direction concerning outward order in the church. In such cases the literal sense of the words, rationally apprehended, is all that we are concerned in. But on the first proposal of this text, “That the elders that rule well are worthy of double honor, especially those who labor in the word and doctrine,” a rational man who is unprejudiced, who never heard of the controversy about ruling elders, can hardly avoid an apprehension that there are two sorts of elders, some that labor in the word and doctrine, and some who do not so do. The truth is, it was interest and prejudice that first caused some learned men to strain their wits to find out evasions from the evidence of this testimony. Being so found out, some others of meaner abilities have been entangled by them; for there is not one new argument advanced in this cause, not one exception given in unto the sense of the place which we plead for, but what was long since coined by Papists and

Prelatists, and managed with better colors than some now are able to lay on them who pretend unto the same judgment.

3. This is the substance of the truth in the text: — There are *elders in the church*; there are or ought to be so in every church. With these elders *the whole rule of the church* is intrusted; all these, and only they, do rule in it. Of these elders there are *two sorts*; for a description is given of one sort *distinctive* from the other, and *comparative* with it. The first sort doth *rule* and also *labor in the word and doctrine*. That these works are distinct and different was before declared; yet as distinct works they are not incompatible, but are committed unto the same person. They are so unto them who axe not elders only, but moreover pastors or teachers. Unto pastors and teachers, as such, there belongs no rule; although by the institution of Christ the right of rule be inseparable from their office, for all that are rightfully called thereunto are elders also, which gives them an interest in rule. They are elders, with the addition of pastoral or teaching authority. But there are elders which are not pastors or teachers; for there are some who rule well, but labor not in the word and doctrine, — that is, who are not pastors or teachers.

Elders that rule well, but labor not in the word and doctrine, are ruling elders only; and such are they in the text.

The most learned of our protestant adversaries in this case are Erastus, Bilson, Saravia, Downham, Scultetus, Mede, Grotius, Hammond; who agree not at all among themselves about the sense of the words: for, —

1. Their whole design and endeavor is to *put in exceptions* against the obvious sense and interpretation of the words, not fixing on any determinate exposition of it themselves, such as they will abide by in opposition unto any other sense of the place. Now, this is a most sophistical way of arguing upon testimonies, and suited only to make controversies endless. Whose wit is so barren as not to be able to raise one exception or other against the plainest and most evident testimony? So the Socinians deal with us in all the testimonies we produce to prove the deity or satisfaction of Christ. They suppose it enough to evade their force if they can but pretend that the words are capable of another sense, although they will not abide by it that this or that is their sense; for if they would do so, when that is overthrown, the truth would be established. But every

testimony of the Scripture hath one determinate sense. When this is contended about, it is equal that those at difference do express their apprehensions of the mind of the Holy Spirit in the words which they will abide by. When this is done, let it be examined and tried whether of the two senses pretended unto doth best comply with the signification and use of the words, the context or scope of the place, other Scripture testimonies, and the analogy of faith. No such rule is attended unto in this case by our adversaries. They think it enough to oppose our sense of the words, but will not fix upon any of their own, which if it be disproved, ours ought to take place. And hence, —

2. They *do not in the least agree among themselves*, scarce any two of them, on what is the most probable sense of the words, nor are any of them singly well resolved what application to make of them, nor unto what persons, but only propose things as their *conjecture*. But of very many opinions or conjectures that are advanced in this case, all of them but one are accompanied with the modesty of granting that divers sorts of elders are here intended; which, without more than ordinary confidence, cannot be denied. But, —

Some, by “elders that rule well,” do understand *bishops that are diocesans*; and by “those that labor in the word and doctrine,” ordinary preaching presbyters; which plainly gives them the advantage of pre-eminence, reverence, and maintenance, above the others!

Some, by “elders that rule well,” understand *ordinary bishops and presbyters*; and by “those that labor in the word and doctrine,” evangelists; so carrying the text out of the present concernment of the church. Deacons are esteemed by some to have an interest in the rule of the church, and so to be intended, in the first place, and preaching ministers in the latter.

Some speak of *two sorts of elders*, both of the same order, or ministers; some that preach the word and administer the sacraments; and others that are employed about inferior offices, as reading and the like: which is the conceit of Scultetus.

Mr Mede weighs most of these conjectures, and at length prefers one of his own before them all, — namely, that by “elders that rule well” *civil*

magistrates are intended, and by “those that labor in the word and doctrine” the ministers of the gospel.

But some, discerning the weakness and improbability of all these conjectures, and how easily they may be disproved, betake themselves unto a direct denial of that which seems to be plainly asserted in the text, namely, that there are two sorts of elders here intended and described; which they countenance themselves in by exception unto the application of some terms in the text, which we shall immediately consider.

Grotius, as was before intimated, disputes against the divine institution of such temporary, lay-elders as are made use of in sundry of the reformed churches: but when he hath done, he affirms that it is highly necessary that such conjunct associates in ride from among the people should be in every church; which he proves by sundry arguments. And these he would have either nominated by the magistrate or chosen by the people.

Wherefore, emitting all contests about the forementioned conceits, or any other of the like nature, I shall propose one argument from these words, and vindicate it from the exceptions of those of the latter sort.

Preaching elders, although they rule well, are not worthy of double honor, unless they labor in the word and doctrine;

But there are elders who rule well that are worthy of double honor, though they do not labor in the word and doctrine:

Therefore there are elders that rule well who are not teaching or preaching elders, — that is, who are ruling elders only.

The proposition is evident in its own light, from the very terms of it; for to preach is to “labor in the word and doctrine.” Preaching or teaching elders, that do not labor in the word and doctrine, are preaching or teaching elders that do not preach or teach. And to say that preachers, whose office and duty it is to preach, are worthy of that double honor which is due on the account of preaching, though they do not preach, is uncouth and irrational. It is contrary to the Scripture and the light of nature, as implying a contradiction, that a man whose office it is to teach and preach should be esteemed worthy of double honor on the account of his office, who doth not as an officer teach or preach.

The assumption consists upon the matter in the very words of the apostle; for he who says, “The elders who rule well are worthy of double honor, especially they who labor in the word and doctrine,” saith there are, or may be, elders who rule well who do not labor in the word and doctrine, — that is, who are not obliged so to do.

The argument from these words may be otherwise framed, but this contains the plain sense of this testimony.

Sundry things are excepted unto this testimony and our application of it. Those which are of any weight consist in a contest about two words in the text, **μάλιστα** and **κοπιῶντες**. Some place their confidence of evasion in one of them, and some in another, the argument from both being inconsistent. If that sense of one of these words which is pleaded as a relief against this testimony be embraced, that which unto the same purpose is pretended to be the sense of the other must be rejected. Such shifts doth an opposition unto the truth put men to.

Some say that **μάλιστα**, “especially,” is not *distinctive*, but *descriptive* only; that is, it doth not distinguish one sort of elders from another, but only describes that single sort of them by an adjunct of their office, whereof the apostle speaks. The meaning of it, they say, is, *as much as*, or *seeing that*: “The elders that rule well are worthy of double honor, seeing that they also labor,” or “especially considering that they labor,” etc.

That this is the sense of the word, that it is thus to be interpreted, must be proved from the authority of ancient translations, or the use of it in other places of the New Testament, or from its precise signification and application in other authors learned in this language, or that it is enforced from the context or matter treated of.

But none of these can be pretended.

1. The rendering of the word in *old translations* we have before considered. They agree in “maxime illi qui,” which is distinctive.

2. The use of it in *other places of the New Testament* is constantly distinctive, whether applied to things or persons: ~~Acts~~ Acts 20:38, **Ὁδυῶμενοι μάλιστα ἐπὶ τῷ λόγῳ**, — “Sorrowing chiefly at the word” of seeing his face no more. Their sorrow herein was distinct from their

other trouble. ^{<800>}Galatians 6:10, “Let us do good unto all, **μάλιστα δὲ πρὸς τοὺς οἰκείους τῆς πίστεως**,” — “but chiefly,” especially, “unto the household of faith.” It puts a distinction between the household of faith and all other, by virtue of their especial privilege; which the direct use of the word in that place of the same apostle, ^{<500>}Philippians 4:22, “All the saints salute you, **μάλιστα δὲ οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος οἰκίας**,” — “especially they that are of Caesar’s house.” Two sorts of saints are plainly expressed, — first, such as were so in general; such were so also, but under this especial privilege and circumstance, that they were of Caesar’s house, which the others were not. So it is here with respect unto elders: all “rule well,” but some moreover “labor in the word and doctrine.” ^{<500>}1 Timothy 5:8, **Εἰ δέ τις τῶν ἰδίων, καὶ μάλιστα τῶν οἰκείων οὐ προνοεῖ**· — “If a man provide not for his own, especially those of his own house,” especially children or servants, which live in his own house, and are thereby distinguished from others of a more remote relation. ^{<500>}2 Timothy 4:13, “Bring the books, **μάλιστα τὰς μεμζράνας**,” — “especially the parchments;” not bemuse they are parchment, but among the books, the parchments in particular and in an especial manner. ^{<500>}2 Peter 2:9, 10, “The Lord knoweth how to reserve the unjust unto the day of judgment to be punished, **μάλιστα δὲ τοὺς ὀπίσω σαρκός**,” eta, — “especially thee that walk after the flesh,” who shall be singled out to exemplary punishment. It is but once more used in the New Testament, namely, ^{<500>}Acts 26:3, where it includes a distinction in the thing under consideration.

Whereas this is the constant use of the word in the Scripture (being principally used by this apostle in his writings), wherein it is distinctive and comparative of the things and persons that respect is had unto, it is to no purpose to pretend that it is here used in other sense or is otherwise applied, unless they can prove from the context that there is a necessity of their peculiar interpretation of it.

3. The use of the word in *other authors* is concurrent with that of it in the Scripture: Herodian, lib. 2, cap. 28, **Φιλέορτοι δὲ φύσει Σύροι· ὧν μάλιστα οἱ τὴν Ἀντιόχειαν κατοικοῦντες, κ. τ. λ.** — “The Syrians are naturally lovers of festivals, especially they that dwell at Antioch.” It is the same phrase of speech with that here used; for all they that dwelt at Antioch were Syrians, but all the Syrians dwelt not at Antioch. There is a

distinction and distribution made of the Syrians into two sorts, — such as were Syrians only, and such as, being Syrians, dwelt at Antioch, the metropolis of the country. If a man should say that all Englishmen were stout and courageous, especially the Londoners, he would both affirm the Londoners to be Englishmen and distinguish them from the rest of their countrymen. So, all that labor in the word and doctrine are elders. But all elders do not labor in the word and doctrine, nor is it their duty so to do; these we call “ruling elders,” and, as I judge, rightly.

4. The sense which the words will give, being so interpreted as that a distinction of elders is not made in them, is absurd, the subject and predicate of the proposition being terms convertible. It must be so if the proposition be not allowed to have a distinction in it. “One sort of elders only,” it is said, “is here intended.” I ask who they are, and of what sort? It is said, “The same with pastors and teachers, or ministers of the gospel;” for if the one sort of elders intended be of another sort, we obtain what we plead for as fully as if two sorts were allowed. Who, then, are these elders, these pastors and teachers, these ministers of the church? are they not those who labor in the word and doctrine? “Yes,” it will be said, “it is they, and no other.” Then this is the sense of the words, “Those who labor in the word and doctrine, that rule well, are worthy of double honor, especially if they labor in the word and doctrine;” for if there be but one sort of elders, then “elders” and “those that labor in the word and doctrine” are terms convertible. But “elders” and “labor in the word and doctrine” are subject and predicate in this proposition.

Wherefore there are few of any learning or judgment that make use of this evasion; but, allowing a distinction to be made, they say that it is as to work and employment, and not as unto of office, — those who, in the discharge of their office as elders, do so labor as is intended and included in the word **κοπιῶντες**, which denotes a peculiar kind of work in the ministry. Yea, say some, “This word denotes the work of an evangelist, who was not confined unto any one place, but traveled up and down the world to preach the gospel.” And those of this mind do allow that two sorts of elders are intended in the words. Let us see whether they have any better success in this their conjecture than the others had in the former answer.

1. I grant that **κοπιᾶν**, the word here used, signifies to *labor with pains* and diligence, “ad ultimum virinum, usque ad fatigationem,” — unto the utmost of men’s strength, and unto weariness. But, —

2. So to labor in the word and doctrine is *the duty of all pastors and teachers*, and whosoever doth not so labor is negligent in his office, and worthy of severe blame instead of double honor: for, —

(1.) **Κόπος**, whence is **κοπιᾶω**, is the labor of a minister, and so of any minister in his work of teaching and preaching the gospel: ^{<408>}1 Corinthians 3:8, “**Ἐκαστος δὲ τὸν ἴδιον μισθὸν λήσεται κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον**· — ‘Every one’ (that is, every one employed in the ministry, whether to plant or to water, to convert men or to edify the church) “shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor.” He that doth not strive, **κοπιᾶν**, in the ministry, shall never receive a reward **κατὰ τὸν ἴδιον κόπον**, according to his own labor, and so is not worthy of double honor.

(2.) It is a general word, used to express the work of any in the service of God; whereon it is applied unto the prophets and teachers under the old testament: ^{<408>}John 4:38, “I sent you to reap that whereon ye bestowed no labor: **ἄλλοι κεκοπιάκασι, καὶ ὑμεῖς εἰς τὸν κόπον αὐτῶν εἰσεληλύθατε**,” — “others have labored, and ye have entered into their labors;” that is, of the prophets and John the Baptist. Yea, it is so unto the labor that Women may take in the serving of the church: ^{<506>}Romans 16:6, “Salute Mary, **ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασε**,” — “who labored much;” which is more than simply **κοπιᾶν**. Verse 12, “Salute Tryphena and Tryphosa, **τὰς κοπιώσας ἐν Κυρίῳ**,” — “who labor in the Lord. Salute the beloved Persis, **ἥτις πολλὰ ἐκοπίασεν ἐν Κυρίῳ**,” — “who labored much in the Lord.” So wide from truth is it that this word should signify a labor peculiar to some sorts of ministers, which all are not in common obliged unto.

3. If the labor of evangelists, or of them who traveled up and down to preach the word, be intended, then it is so either because this is the *proper signification* of the word, or because it is *constantly used elsewhere* to express that kind of labor; but the contrary unto both of these is evident from all places wherein it is used. So is it expressly applied to fixed elders, ^{<512>}1 Thessalonians 5:12, “We exhort you, brethren, to know **τοὺς**

κοπιῶντας ἐν ὑμῖν,” — “them that labor among you,” who are the rulers and instructors.

It is therefore evident that this word expresseth no more but what is the ordinary, indispensable duty of every teaching elder, pastor, or minister; and if it be so, then those elders, — that is, pastors or teachers, — that do not perform and discharge it are not worthy of double honor, nor would the apostle give any countenance unto them who were any way remiss or negligent, in comparison of others, in the discharge of their duty. See ¹1 Thessalonians 5:12.

There are, therefore, *two sorts of duties* confessedly here mentioned and commanded; — the first is, *ruling well*; the other, *laboring in the word and doctrine*. Suppose that both these, ruling and teaching, are committed to one sort of persons only, having one and the same office absolutely, then are some commended who do not discharge their whole duty, at least not comparatively unto others; which is a vain imagination. That both of them are committed unto one sort of elders, and one of them only unto another, each discharging its duty with respect unto its work, and so both worthy of honor, is the mind of the apostle.

[To] that which is objected from the following verse, namely, “That maintenance belongs unto this double honor, and so, consequently, that if there be elders that are employed in the work of rule only, maintenance is due unto them from the church,” I answer, It is so, no doubt, if, —

1. The church be *able* to make them an allowance;
2. If their work be such as to take up *the whole or the greatest part of their industry*; and,
3. If they *stand in need of it*; — without which considerations it may be dispensed withal, not only in them, but in teaching elders also.

Our next testimony is from the same apostle: ¹Romans 12:6-8, “Having then gifts differing according to the grace that is given to us, whether prophecy, let us prophesy according to the proportion of faith; or ministry, let us wait on our ministry: or he that teacheth, on teaching; or he that exhorteth, on exhortation: he that giveth, let him do it with

simplicity; he that ruleth, with diligence; he that sheweth mercy, with cheerfulness.”

Our argument from hence is this: There is in the church ὁ προϊστάμενος, “one that ruleth.” Προϊστημι, is “to rule with authority by virtue of office;” whence is προεστώς and προϊστάμενος, one that presides over others with authority. For the discharge of their office, there is χάρισμα διάφορον, a “differing peculiar gift,” bestowed on some: Ἐχοντες χαρίσματα διάφορα, verse 6. And there is the especial manner prescribed for the discharge of this especial office, by virtue of that especial gift; ἐν σπουδῇ, it is to be done with peculiar “diligence.” And this ruler is distinguished from “him that exhorteth” and “him that teacheth,” with whose especial work, as such, he hath nothing to do; even as they are distinguished from those who “give” and “show mercy;” — that is, there is an elder by office in the church, whose work and duty it is to rule, not to exhort nor teach ministerially; which is our ruling elder.

It is answered, “That the apostle doth not treat in this place of offices, functions, or distinct officers, but of differing gifts in all the members of the church, which they are to exercise according as their different nature doth require.”

Sundry things I shall return hereunto, which will both explain the context and vindicate our argument: —

1. Those with whom we have to do principally allow no exercise of spiritual gifts in the church but by virtue of office. Wherefore, a distinct exercise of them is here placed in distinct officers, one, as we shall see, being expressly distinguished from another.
2. Give such a probable enumeration of the distinct offices in the church, which they assert, namely, of archbishops, bishops, presbyters, and chancellors, etc., and we shall yield the cause.
3. Gifts alone do no more, give no other warranty nor authority, but only render men meet for their exercise as they are called, and as occasion doth require. If a man hath received a gift of teaching, but is not called to office, he is not obliged nor warranted thereby to attend on public teaching, nor is it required of him in way of duty, nor given in charge unto him, as here it is.

4. There is in one “rule” required “with diligence.” He is ὁ προϊστάμενος, a “ruler;” and it is required of him that he attend unto his work with diligence. And there are but two things required unto the confirmation of our thesis, —

(1.) That this rule is an act of *office-power*;

(2.) That he unto whom it is ascribed is *distinguished from them unto whom the pastoral and other offices in the church are committed*.

For the first, it is evident that rule is an act of office or of office-power: for it requires, —

[1.] An especial *relation*; there is so between him that ruleth and them that are ruled; and this is the relation of office, or all confusion will ensue.

[2.] Especial *prelation*. He that rules is over, is above them that axe ruled: “Obey them that are over you in the Lord.” This, in the church, cannot be in any but by virtue of office.

[3.] Especial *authority*. All lawful rule is an act of authority; and there is no authority in the church but by virtue of office. Secondly, That this officer is distinct from all others in the church we shall immediately demonstrate, when we have a little farther cleared the context. Wherefore,

5. It is confessed that respect is had unto gifts, — “Having differing gifts,” verse 6, — as all office-power in the church is founded in them,

ⲉⲑⲁⲓⲁⲓ Ephesians 4:7, 8, 11, 12. But gifts absolutely, with reference unto common use, are not intended, as in some other places; but they axe spoken of with respect unto offices or functions, and the communication of them unto officers for the discharge of their office. This is evident from the text and context, with the whole design of the place; for, —

(1.) The analysis of the place directs unto this interpretation. Three sorts of duties are prescribed unto the church in this chapter, —

[1.] Such as are *universal*, belonging absolutely unto all and every one that appertains unto it; which are declared, ⲉⲑⲁⲓⲁⲓ Romans 12:1, 2.

[2.] Such as are *peculiar* unto some, by virtue of that especial place which they have in the church, verses 3-8. This can be nothing but office.

[3.] Such as are *general* or common, with respect unto occasions, from verse 8 to the end of the chapter. Hence the same duty is doubly prescribed, — to some in way of especial office, to others in the way of a gracious duty in general. So here, “*He* that giveth, let him do it with simplicity,” verse 8, is the same duty or work, for the substance of it, with “Distributing to the necessity of saints,” verse 13. And the apostle doth not repeat his charge of the same duty, in so few words, as required in the same manner and of the same persons; but in the first place, he speaks of the manner of its performance by virtue of office, and in the latter of its discharge, as to the substance of it, as a grace in all believers. The design of the apostle lies plain in the analysis of this discourse.

(2.) The context makes the same truth evident; for, —

[1.] The whole ordinary public work of the church is distributed into *προφητεία* and *διακονία*, — “prophecy and ministry;” for the extraordinary gift of prophecy is not here intended, but only that of the interpretation of the Scripture, whose rule is the “analogy of faith:” *Εἴτε προφητείαν, κατὰ τὴν ἀναλογίαν τῆς πίστεως*. It is such prophecy as is to be regulated by the Scripture itself, which gives the “proportion of faith.” And there is not any thing in any or both of these, prophecy and ministry, but it belongs unto office in the church; neither is there any thing belonging unto office in the church but may be reduced unto one of these, as they are all of them here by the apostle.

[2.] The gifts spoken of are, in general, referred unto all them who are intended. Now, these are either the whole church and all the members of it, or all the officers of the church only. Hence it is expressed in the plural number, *ἔχοντες χαρίσματα*, “We having;” that is, all we that are concerned herein. This cannot be “all of the church,” for all the church have not received the gifts of prophecy and ministry; nor can any distinction be made of who doth receive them and who doth not but with respect unto office. And therefore, —

[3.] In the distribution which ensues of prophecy into exhorting and teaching, and of ministry into showing mercy, rule, and giving, having stated these gifts in general, in the officers in general, making distinct application of them unto distinct officers, he speaks in the singular

number: ὁ διδάσκων, ὁ παρακαλῶν, ὁ προϊστάμενος — “He that teacheth, he that exhorteth, he that ruleth.”

6. It is, then, evident that *offices* are intended, and it is no less evident that distinct offices are so, which was to, be proved in the second place: for, —

(1.) The distributive particle εἴτε, and the indicative article ὁ, prefixed unto each office in particular, do show them [to be] distinct, so far as words can do it. As by the particle εἴτε, “whether,” they are distinguished in their nature, whether they be of this or that kind; so by the article prefixed to each of them in exercise, they are distinguished in their subjects.

(2.) The operations, works, and effects ascribed unto these gifts, require distinct offices and functions in their exercise. And if the distribution be made unto all promiscuously, without respect unto distinct offices, it were the only way to bring confusion into the church, whereas, indeed, here is an accurate. order in all church-administrations represented to us. And it is further evident that distinct offices are intended, —

(1.) From the comparison made unto the members of the body, verse 4, “All members have not the same office;” the eye hath one, the ear hath another.

(2.) Each of the duties mentioned and given in charge is sufficient for a distinct officer, as is declared ~~401~~ Acts 6:1-4.

7. In particular, “He that ruleth” is a distinct officer, — an officer, because rule is an act of office or office-power; and he is expressly distinguished from all others. But say some, “‘He that ruleth’ is he that doth so, be who he will, — that is, the pastor or teacher, the teaching elder.” But the contrary is evident: —

(1.) He that says, “He that exhorteth,” and then adds, “He that ruleth,” having distinguished before between prophecy, whereunto exhortation doth belong, and ministry, whereof rule is a part, and prefixing the prepositive indicative article to each of them, doth as plainly put a difference between them as can be done by words.

(2.) Rule is the principal work of him that ruleth, for he is to attend unto it ἐν σπουδῇ, “with diligence,” — that is, such as is peculiar unto rule, in

contradistinction unto what is principally required in other administrations. But rule is not the principal work of the pastor, requiring constant and continual attendance; for his labor in the word and doctrine is ordinarily sufficient for the utmost of his diligence and abilities.

8. We have, therefore, in this context, a beautiful order of things in and of the church, — all the duties of it, with respect unto its edification, derived from distinct differing spiritual gifts, exercised in and by distinct officers unto their peculiar ends, the distinction that is in the nature of those gifts, their use and end, being provided for in distinct subjects. The mind of no one man, at least ordinarily, is meet to be the seat and subject of all those differing gifts in any eminent degree. The person of no man being sufficient, meet, or able, to exercise them in a way of office towards the whole church, especially, “those who labor in the word and doctrine” being obliged to “give themselves wholly thereunto,” and those that “rule” to attend thereto with “diligence,” so many distinct works, duties, and operations, with the qualifications required in their discharge, being inconsistent in the same subject, all things are here distributed into their proper order and tendency unto the edification of the church. Every distinct gift, required to be exercised in a peculiar manner, unto the public edification of the church, is distributed unto peculiar officers, unto whom an especial work is assigned, to be discharged by virtue of the gifts received, unto the edification of the whole body. No man alive is able to fix on any thing which is necessary unto the edification of the church that is not contained in these distributions, under some of the heads of them; nor can any man find out any thing in these assignations of distinct duties unto distinct offices that is superfluous, redundant, or not directly necessary unto the edification of the whole, with all the parts and members of it; nor do I know any wise and sober man, who knows any thing how the duties enjoined are to be performed, with what care, diligence, circumspection, prayer, and wisdom, suited unto the nature, ends, and objects of them who can ever imagine that they can all of them belong unto one and the same office, or be discharged by one and the same person.

Let men advance any other church-order in the room of that here declared; so suited unto the principles of natural light, operations and duties of diverse natures, being distributed and assigned to such distinct gifts, acted in distinct offices, as renders those unto whom they are prescribed meet

and able for them; so correspondent to all institutions, rules, and examples of church-order in other places of Scripture; so suited unto the edification of the church, wherein nothing which is necessary thereunto is omitted, nor any thing added above what is necessary, — and it shall be cheerfully embraced.

The truth is, the ground of the different interpretations and applications of this [text and] context of the apostle ariseth merely from the prejudicate apprehensions that men have concerning the state of the church and its rule; for if the state of it be national or diocesan, if the rule of it be by arbitrary rules and canons, from an authority exerting itself in courts ecclesiastical, legal or illegal, the order of things here described by the apostle doth no way belong nor can be accommodated thereunto. To suppose that we have a full description and account in these words of all the offices and officers of the church, of their duty and authority, of all they have to do, and the manner how they are to do it, is altogether Unreasonable and senseless, unto them who have another idea of church affairs and rule conceived in their minds, or received by tradition, and riveted by interest. And, on the other hand, those who know little or nothing of what belongs unto the due edification of the church beyond preaching the word and reaping the advantage that is obtained thereby, cannot see any necessity of the distribution of these several works and duties unto several officers, but suppose all may be done well enough by one or two in the same office. Wherefore, it will be necessary that we treat briefly of the nature of the rule of the church in particular, and of what is required thereunto; which shall be done in the close of this discourse.

9. The *exceptions* which are usually put in unto this testimony have not the least countenance from the text or context, or the matter treated of, nor confirmation from any other divine testimony. It is therefore in vain to contend about them, being such as any man may multiply at his pleasure on the like occasion; and they are used by those who, on other considerations, are not willing that things should be as they are here declared to be by the apostle. Yet we may take a brief specimen of them. Some say it is *gifts absolutely*, without respect unto distinct offices, that the apostle treats of; which hath been disproved from the text and context before. Some say that rule is included in the pastoral office, so as that the pastor only is here intended. But, —

(1.) *Rule* is not his principal work, which he is to attend unto in a peculiar manner, with diligence above other parts of his duty.

(2.) The *care of the poor of the flock* belongs also to the pastoral office, yet is there another officer appointed to attend unto it in a peculiar manner, ~~☞~~ Acts 6:1-6.

(3.) “He that ruleth” is in this place expressly distinguished from “him that exhorteth” and “him that teacheth.” Some say that “He that ruleth” is he that ruleth his family; but this is disproved by the analysis of the chapter before declared; and this duty, which is common unto all that have families, and confined unto their families, is ill placed among those public duties which are designed unto the edification of the whole church. It is objected that “He that ruleth” is here placed after “Him that giveth,” that is, the deacon; I say, then, it cannot be the pastor that is intended, if we may prescribe methods of expressing himself unto the apostle. But he useth his liberty, and doth not oblige himself unto any order in the annumeration of the offices of the church. See ~~☞~~ 1 Corinthians 12:8-10, 28. And some other exceptions are insisted on of the same nature and importance, which indeed deserve not our consideration.

10. There is the same evidence given unto the truth argued for in another testimony of the same apostle: ~~☞~~ 1 Corinthians 12:28, “God hath set some in, the church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers, after that miracles, then gifts of healings, helps, governments, diversities of tongues.” I shall not insist on this testimony and its vindication in particular, seeing many things would be required thereunto which have been treated of already. Some things may be briefly observed concerning it. That there is here annumeration of officers and offices in the church, both extraordinary, for that season, and ordinary, for continuance, is beyond exception. Unto them is added the present exercise of some extraordinary gifts, as “miracles, healings, tongues.” That by “helps” the deacons of the church are intended, most do agree, because their original institution was as helpers in the affairs of the church. “Governments” are governors or rulers, the abstract for the concrete, — that is, such as are distinct from “teachers;” such hath God placed in the church, and such there ought to be. But it is said “That gifts, not offices, are intended, — the gift of government, or gift for government.” If so, then these gifts are either

ordinary or extraordinary. If ordinary, how come they to be reckoned among “miracles, healings, and tongues”? if extraordinary, what extraordinary gifts for government were then given distinct from those of the apostles, and what instance is anywhere given of them in the Scripture? Again: if God hath given gifts for government to abide in the church, distinct from those given unto teachers, and unto other persons than the teachers, then is there a distinct office of rule or government in the church; which is all we plead for.

11. The original order of these things is plain in the Scripture. The apostles had all church-power and church-office in themselves, with authority to exercise all acts of them everywhere on all occasions: but considering the nature of the church, with that of the rule appointed by the Lord Christ in it or over it, they did not, they would not, ordinarily exercise their power by themselves or in their own persons alone; and therefore, when the first church consisted of a small number, the apostles acted all things in it by the consent of the whole multitude, or the fraternity, as we have proved from ~~Acts~~ Acts 1:15-26. And when the number of believers increased, so as that the apostles themselves could not in their own persons attend unto all the duties that were to be performed towards the church by virtue of office, they added, by the direction of the Holy Ghost, the office of the deacons, for the especial discharge of the duty which the church oweth unto its poor members Whereas, herefore, it is evident that the apostles could no more personally attend unto the rule of the church, with all that belongs thereunto, without an intrenchment on that labor in the word and prayer which was incumbent on them, than they could attend unto the relief of the poor, they appointed elders to help and assist in that part of office-work, as the deacons did in the other.

These elders are first mentioned ~~Acts~~ Acts 11:30 where they are spoken of as those which were well known, and had now been of some time in the church. Afterward they are still mentioned in conjunction with the apostles, and in distinction from the church itself, ~~Acts~~ Acts 15:2, 4, 6, 22, 16:4, 21:18. Now, the apostles themselves were teaching elders, — that is, such as had the work of teaching and rule committed to them, ~~1 Peter~~ 1 Peter 5:1; 2 John 1, — and these elders are constantly distinguished from them; which makes it evident that they were not teaching elders: and therefore, in all the mention that is made of them, the work of teaching or preaching is

nowhere ascribed unto them, which, at Jerusalem, the apostles reserved to themselves, ~~and~~ Acts 6:2-4; but they are everywhere introduced as joining with the apostles in the rule of the church, and that in distinction from the church itself, or the brethren of it. Yea, it is altogether improbable that whilst the apostles were at Jerusalem, giving themselves wholly unto the word and prayer, they should appoint in the same church many more *teaching elders*, though it is plain that the elders intended were *many*.

I shall add, for a close of all, that there is no sort of churches in being but are of this persuasion, that there ought to be rulers in the church that are not in “sacred orders,” as some call them, or have no interest in the pastoral or ministerial office, as unto the dispensation of the word and administration of the sacraments; for as the government of the Roman church is in the hands of such persons in a great measure, so in the church of England much of the rule of it is managed by chancellors, officials, commissaries, and the like officers, who are absolutely laymen, and not at all in their holy orders. Some would place the rule of the church in the civil magistrate, who is the only ruling elder, as they suppose. But the generality of all Protestant churches throughout the world, both Lutheran and Reformed, do, both in their judgment and practice, assert the necessity of the ruling elders which we plead for; and their office lies at the foundation of all their order and discipline, which they cannot forego without extreme confusion, yea, without the ruin of their churches. And although some among us, considering particular churches only as small societies, may think there is no need of any such office or officers for rule in them, yet when such churches consist of some thousands, without any opportunity of distributing themselves into several congregations, as at Charenton in France, it is a weak imagination that the rule of Christ can be observed in them by two or three ministers alone. Hence, in the primitive times, we have instances often, twenty, yea, forty elders, in a particular church; wherein they had respect unto the institution under the old testament, whereby each ten families were to have a peculiar ruler. However, it is certain that there is such a reformation in all sorts of churches, that there ought to be some attending unto rule that are not called to labor in the word and doctrine.

CHAPTER 8.

THE NATURE OF CHURCH POLITY OR RULE, WITH THE DUTY OF ELDERS.

HAVING declared *who are the rulers of the church*, something must be added concerning the rule itself which is to be exercised therein. Hereof I have treated before in general; that which I now design is what in particular respects them who are called unto rule only, whereunto some considerations must be premised: —

1. There is power, authority, and rule, granted unto and residing in some persons of the church, and not in the body of the fraternity or community of the people. How far the government of the church may be denominated democratical from the necessary consent of the people unto the principal acts of it in its exercise, I shall not determine; but whereas this consent, and the liberty of it, are absolutely necessary, according to the law of obedience unto Christ, which is prescribed unto the church, requiring that all they do in compliance therewith be voluntary, as unto the manner of its exercise, being in dutiful compliance with the guidance of the rule, it changeth not the state of the government. And therefore, where any thing is acted and disposed in the church by suffrage, or the plurality of voices, the vote of the fraternity is not determining and authoritative, but only declarative of consent and obedience. It is so in all acts of rule where the church is organical or in complete order.

2. That there is such an authority and rule instituted by Christ in his church is not liable unto dispute. Where there are “bishops, pastors, elders, guides, rulers, stewards,” instituted, given, granted, called, ordained; and some to be ruled, “sheep, lambs, brethren,” obliged by command to “obey them, follow them, submit unto them in the Lord, regard them as over them,” — there is rule and authority in some persons, and that committed unto them by Jesus Christ; but all these things are frequently repeated in the Scripture. And when, in the practical part or exercise of rule, due respect is not had unto their authority, there is nothing but confusion and disorder. When the people judge that the power of the keys is committed unto them as such only, and in them doth the right of their

use and exercise reside; that their elders have no interest in the disposing of church-affairs or in acts of church-power, but only their own suffrages, or what they can obtain by reasoning; and think there is no duty incumbent on them to acquiesce in their authority in any thing (an evil apt to grow in churches), — it overthrows all that beautiful order which Jesus Christ hath ordained. And if any shall take advantage of this complaint, that where the people have their due liberty granted unto them, they are apt to *assume that power* unto themselves which belongs not unto them, an evil attended with troublesome impertinencies and disorder, tending unto anarchy, let them remember, on the other hand, how, upon the confinement of power and authority unto the guides, bishops, or rulers of the church, they have changed the nature of church-power, and enlarged their usurpation, until the whole rule of the church issued in absolute tyranny. Wherefore, no fear of consequents that may ensue and arise from the darkness, ignorance, weakness, lusts, corruptions, or secular interests of men, ought to entice us unto the least alteration of the rule by any prudential provisions of our own.

3. This authority in the rulers of the church is neither *autocratical* or sovereign, nor *nomothetical* or legislative, nor *despotical* or absolute, but *organical* and ministerial only. The endless controversies which have sprung out of the mystery of iniquity, about an autocratical and monarchical government in the church, about power to make laws to bind the consciences of men, yea, to kill and destroy them, with the whole manner of the execution of this power, we are not concerned in. A pretense of any such power in the church is destructive of the kingly office of Christ, contrary to express commands of Scripture, and condemned by the apostles, ^{<2332>}Isaiah 33:22; ^{<5002>}James 4:12; ^{<1175>}Matthew 17:5, 23:8-11; ^{<1025>}Luke 22:25, 26; ^{<1024>}2 Corinthians 1:24; ^{<1121>}1 Corinthians 3:21-23; ^{<1015>}2 Corinthians 4:5; ^{<1181>}1 Peter 5:1-3.

4. As the rule of the church, in those by whom it is exercised, is merely *ministerial*, with respect unto the authority of Christ, his law, and the liberty of the church, wherewith he hath made it free, so in its nature it is *spiritual*, purely and only; so the apostle affirms expressly, ^{<1004>}2 Corinthians 10:4-6. For its *object* is spiritual, — namely, the souls and consciences of men, whereunto it extends, which no other human power doth; nor doth it reach those other concerns of men that are subject unto

any political power. Its *end* is spiritual, — namely, the glory of God, in the guidance and direction of the minds and souls of men to live unto him, and come to the enjoyment of him. The *law* of it is spiritual, even the word, command, and direction of Christ himself alone. *The acts and exercise of it*, in binding and loosing, in remitting and retaining sin, in opening and shutting the kingdom of heaven, are all spiritual merely and only. Neither can there be an instance given of any thing belonging unto the rule of the church that is of another nature; yea, it is sufficient eternally to exclude any power or exercise of it, any act of rule or government, from any interest in church-affairs, that it can be proved to be carnal, political, despotical, of external operation, or not entirely spiritual.

5. The change of this government of the church fell out and was introduced gradually, upon an advantage taken from the unmeetness of the people to be laid under this spiritual rule; for the greatest part of them that made up Christian churches being become ignorant and carnal, that rule which consists in a spiritual influence on the consciences of men was no way able to retain them within the bounds of outward obedience, which was at last only aimed at. There was therefore another kind of rule and government judged necessary, to retain them in any order or decorum. And it must be acknowledged that where the members of the church are not in some degree spiritual, a rule that is merely spiritual will be of no great use unto them. But principally this change was introduced by those that were in possession of the rule itself, and that on two grounds: —

(1.) Their *unskilfulness* in the management of this spiritual rule, or weariness of the duties which are required thereunto, — this made them willing to desert it, — with that perpetual labor and exercise of all sorts of graces which are required in it, and to embrace another more easy and more suited unto their inclinations.

(2.) A *desire of the secular advantages* of profit, honor, and veneration, which tendered themselves unto them in another kind of rule. By these means was the original government of the church, which was of divine institution, utterly lost, and a worldly domination introduced in the room thereof. But the brief delineation given of it before, with what shall now be added, will demonstrate sufficiently that all those disputes and contests

which are in the world between the church of Rome and others about church power and rule are utterly foreign unto Christian religion.

I shall therefore briefly inquire into these three things: —

1. What is the skill and polity that are required unto the exercise or administration of the government of the church;
 2. What is the sole *law* and *rule* of it;
 3. What are the *acts and duties* of it, what it is conversant about, especially those wherein the office of ruling elders doth take place: —
1. The *polity* of church-government, subjectively considered, is generally supposed to consist, —
 - (1.) In a skill, learning, or understanding in the civil, and especially the canon law, with the additional canons accommodating that law unto the present state of things of the nation, to be interpreted according unto the general rules of it
 - (2.) Knowledge of and acquaintance with the constitution, power, jurisdiction, and practice, of some law-courts, which being, in their original, grant of power, manner of proceeding, pleas and censures, merely secular, are yet called ecclesiastical or spiritual
 - (3.) A good discretion to understand aright the extent of their power, with the bounds and limits of it; that on the one hand they let none escape whom they can reach by the discipline of their courts, and on the other not intrench so far on the civil power and the jurisdiction of other courts, according to the law of the land, as to bring themselves into charge or trouble.
 - (4.) An acquaintance with the table of fees, that they may neither lose their own profit nor give advantage unto others to question them for taking more than their due. But in these things we are not at present concerned.

The skill, then, of the officers of the church for the government of it is a spiritual wisdom and understanding in the law of Christ for that end, with an ability to make application of it in all requisite instances, unto the edification of the whole church and all its members, through a ministerial

exercise of the authority of Christ himself, and a due representation of his holiness, love, care, compassion, and tenderness, towards his church.

(1.) The sole *rule and measure* of the government of the church being the law of Christ, — that is, the intimation and declaration of his mind and will, in his institutions, commands, prohibitions, and promises, — an *understanding* herein, with wisdom from that understanding, is, and must be, the whole of the skill inquired after. How this wisdom is bestowed as a spiritual gift, how it is to be acquired in a way of duty, by prayer, meditation, and study of the word, hath been intimated before, and shall fully be declared in our discourse of Spiritual Gifts.^{f6} All decrees and decretals, canons and glosses, come properly in this matter under one title of them, namely, extravagant. The utmost knowledge of them and skill in them will contribute nothing unto this wisdom; neither are any sort of men more strangers unto it or unacquainted with it than they are, for the most part, who are eminently cunning in such laws and the jurisdiction of ecclesiastical courts. But in the knowledge of the will of Christ as revealed in the Scripture is that alone which is of use in the government of the church.

(2.) A part of this wisdom consisteth in an *ability of mind to make application of the law of Christ*, in all requisite instances, unto the edification of the church in general and all the members of it respectively. This wisdom is not notional only, but practical. It consists not in a speculative comprehension of the sense of the rule, or of the mind of Christ therein only, though that be required in the first place; but in an ability of mind to make application of it, whereunto diligence, care, watchfulness, and spiritual courage, are required. Some are to be admonished, some to be rebuked sharply, some to be cut off; in which and the like cases a spirit of government acting itself in diligence, boldness, and courage, is necessary. And this is one reason why the Lord Christ hath appointed many elders in each church, and those of several sorts; for it is seldom that any one man is qualified for the whole work of rule. Some may have a good understanding in the law of the church's government, yet, through a natural tenderness and an insuperable kind of modesty, not be so ready and prompt for that part of this discipline which consists in reproofs and severity of censures. Some may not have so great an ability for the indication of the sense of the law as others have, who yet, upon the

knowledge of it being discovered unto them, have readiness and boldness in Christ to apply it as occasion doth require. All elders, therefore, in their variety of gifts, are to be helpful to each other in the common work which they are called unto. But such as are utterly destitute of these gifts are not called unto this work, nor to any part of it.

(3.) The power that is exercised herein is *the power and authority of Christ, committed unto the elders*:

“Our authority which the Lord hath given us for edification, and not for destruction,” ~~4th~~ 2 Corinthians 10:8.

It is granted unto the rulers of the church, not formally to reside in them, as the power of a king is in his own person, but ministerially and instrumentally only; for it must be the authority of Christ himself, whereby the consciences of men are spiritually affected with reference unto spiritual ends, — whereby they are bound or loosed in heaven and earth, have their sins remitted or retained. And the consideration hereof is that alone which gives a due regard unto the ministry of the church, in the discharge of their office, among them that desire to commend their consciences unto the Lord Christ in what they do.

(4.) The especial design of the rule of the church in its government is, *to represent the holiness, love, compassion, care, and authority of Christ towards his church*. This is the great end of rule in the church, and of all the discipline which is to be exercised by virtue thereof. Whilst this is not attended unto, when the officers and rulers of the church do not endeavor, in all the actings of their power and office, to set forth these virtues of Christ, to exemplify that impression of them which he hath left in his laws and rule, with the divine testimonies which he gave of them in his own person, they utterly deviate from the principal end of all rule in the church. For men to act herein in a way of domination, with a visible elation of mind and spirit above their brethren; with anger, wrath, and passion; by rules, order, and laws of their own devising, without the least consideration of what the Lord Christ requires, and what is the frame of his heart towards all his disciples, — is to reflect the highest dishonor imaginable upon Christ himself. He who comes into the courts of the king in Westminster Hall, when filled with judges, grave, learned, and righteous, must ordinarily be allowed to judge of the king himself, his wisdom,

justice, moderation, and clemency, by the law which they proceed upon and their manner of the administration of it. But God forbid that Christians should make a judgment concerning the holiness, wisdom, love, and compassion of Christ by the representation which, as is pretended, is made of him and them in some courts wherein church rule and discipline is administered! When any had offended of old, their censure by the church was called *the bewailing of them*, ^{<47122>}2 Corinthians 12:21; and that because of the sorrow, pity, and compassion whereby, in that censure, they evidenced the compassion of the Lord Christ towards the souls of sinners. This is scarce answered by those pecuniary mulcts and other penalties, which, with indignation and contempt, are inflicted on such as are made offenders, whether they will or no. Certainly, those who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity, and have a due honor for the gospel, will, at one time or another, begin to think meet that this stain of our religion should be washed away.

2. The rule and law of the exercise of power in the elders of the church is *the holy Scripture only*. The Lord Christ is the only lawgiver of the church; all his laws unto this end are recorded in the Scripture; no other law is effectual, can oblige or operate upon the objects or unto the ends of church-rule. If the church make a thousand rules, or canons, or laws for government, neither any of them, nor all of them in general, have any the least power to oblige men unto obedience or compliance with them, but only so far as virtually, or materially they contain what is of the law of Christ and derive force from thence: as the judges in our courts of justice are bound to judge and determine in all cases out of and according to *the law of the land*; and when they do not, their sentence is of no validity, but may and ought to be reversed. But if, wilfully or of choice, they should introduce laws or rules not legally established in this nation, judging according unto them, it would render them highly criminal and punishable. It is no otherwise in the kingdom of Christ and the rule thereof. It is by his law alone that rule is to be exercised in it. There is nothing left unto the elders of the church but the application of his laws and the general rules of them unto particular cases and occasions. To make, to bring, to execute, any other rules, laws, or canons, in the government of his church, is to usurp on his kingly dominion, whereunto all legislative power in the church is appropriate. Nor is it possible that any thing can fall out in the

church, that any thug can be required in the rule of it, nor can any instance be given of any such thing, wherein, for the ends of church-rule, there is, or can be, any more left unto the rulers of it but only the application and execution of the laws of Christ. Unto this application, to be made in due manner, the wisdom and skill before described is requisite, and that alone. Where there are other laws, rules, or canons of the government of the church, and where the administration of them is directed by laws civil or politic, there is skill in them required unto that administration, as all will confess So is the wisdom we before described, and that alone, necessary unto that rule of the church which the Lord Christ hath ordained; the instrument and means whereof is his word and law alone.

3. The matter of this rule about which it is conversant, and so the acts and duties of it, may be reduced unto three heads: —

(1.) The *admission and exclusion of members*. Both these are acts of church power and authority, which are to be exercised by the elders only, in a church that is organical and complete in its officers. There is that in them both which is founded in and warranted from the light and law of nature and rules of equity. Every righteous voluntary society, coalescing therein rightfully, upon known laws and rules for the regulation of it unto certain ends, hath naturally a power inherent in it, and inseparable from it, to receive into its incorporation such as, being meet for it, do voluntarily offer themselves thereunto; as also to reject or withhold the privileges of the society from such as refuse to be regulated by the laws of the society. This power is inherent in the church essentially considered, antecedently unto the instating of officers in it. By virtue of their mutual confederation, they may receive into the privileges of the society those that are meet, and withdraw the same privileges from those that are unworthy. But in these actings of the church, essentially considered, there is no exercise of the power of the keys as unto authoritative rule but what is merely doctrinal There is in what it doth a declaration of the mind of Christ as unto the state of the persons whom they do receive or reject. But unto the church as organical, as there are elders or rulers instated in it according unto the mind of Christ, there is a peculiar authority committed for those acts of the admission and exclusion of members. Unto this end is the key of rule committed unto the elders of the church to be applied with the consent of the whole society, as we shall see afterward.

(2.) The *direction* of the church in all the members of it, unto the observance of the rule and law of Christ in all things, unto his glory and their own edification. And all these things may be reduced unto these four heads: — Mutual, intense, peculiar love among themselves, to be exercised continually in all the duties of it.

[2.] Personal holiness, in gracious moral obedience.

[3.] Usefulness towards the members of the same church, towards other churches, and all men absolutely, as occasion and opportunity do require.

[4.] The due performance of all those duties which all the members of the church owe mutually unto each other, by virtue of that place and order which they hold and possess in the body. About these things is church-rule to be exercised; for they all belong unto the preservation of its being and the attainment of its ends.

(3.) Hereunto also belongs the *disposal of the outward concernments* of the church in its assemblies, and in the management of all that is performed in them, that “all things may be done *decently* and in order.” The disposal of times, seasons, places, the way and manner of managing all things in church-assemblies, the regulation of speeches and actions, the appointment of seasons for extraordinary duties, according unto the general rules of the word and the reason of things from present circumstances, are acts of rule, whose right resides in the elders of the church.

These things being premised, we may consider what is the work and duty of that sort of elders which we have proved to be placed by Christ for rule in the church; for considering that which hath been spoken before concerning the pastoral office, or the duty of teaching elders of the church, and what hath now been added concerning its rule in general, I cannot but admire that any one man should have such a confidence in his own abilities as to suppose himself meet and able for the discharge of the duties of both sorts in the least church of Christ that can well be supposed. Yea, supposing more teaching elders in every church than one, yet if they are all and every one of them equally bound to give themselves unto the word and prayer, so as not to be diverted from that work by any inferior duties, if they are obliged to labor in the word and doctrine to the utmost of their

strength continually, it will appear at length to be necessary that there should be some whose peculiar office and duty is to attend unto rule with diligence. And the work of these elders consists in the things ensuing: —


1. They are joined unto the *teaching elders* in all acts and duties of church-power for the rule and government of the church; such are those before declared. This is plain in the text, ⁵⁴⁵⁷1 Timothy 5:17. Both sorts of elders are joined and do concur in the same rule and all the acts of it, one sort of them laboring also in the word and doctrine. Of both sorts is the presbytery or eldership composed, wherein resides all church-authority. And in this conjunction, those of both sorts are every way equal, determining all acts of rule by their common suffrage. This gives order, with a necessary representation of authority, unto the church in its government.

2. They are, in particular, to attend unto all things wherein *the rule or discipline* of the church is concerned, with a due care that the commands of Christ be duly observed by and among all the members of the church. This is the substance of the rule which Christ hath appointed, whatever be pretended unto the contrary. Whatever is set up in the world in opposition unto it or inconsistent with it, under the name of the government of the church, is foreign unto the gospel. Church-rule is a due care and provision that the institutions, laws, commands, and appointments of Jesus Christ be duly observed, and nothing else. And hereof, as unto the duty of the elders, we may give some instances; as, —

(1.) To *watch diligently* over the ways, walking and conversation of all the members of the church, to see that it be blameless, without offense, useful, exemplary, and in all things answering the holiness of the commands of Christ, the honor of the gospel, and the profession which in the world they make thereof; and upon the observation which they so make, in the watch wherein they are placed, to instruct, admonish, charge, exhort, encourage, comfort, as they see cause. And this are they to attend unto with courage and diligence.

(2.) To watch against all risings or appearances of such *differences* and divisions, on the account of things ecclesiastical or civil, as unto their names, rights, and proprieties in the world, as are contrary unto that love which the Lord Christ requireth in a peculiar and eminent manner to be

found amongst his disciples. This he calls his own “new commandment,” with respect unto his authority requiring it, his example first illustrating it in the world, and the peculiar fruits and effects of it which he revealed and taught. Wherefore, the due observance of this law of love, in itself and all its fruits, with the prevention, removal, or condemnation, of all that is contrary unto it, is that in which the rule of the church doth principally consist. And, considering the weakness, the passions, the temptations of men, the mutual provocations and exasperations that are apt to fall out even among the best, the influence that earthly occasions are apt to have upon their minds, the forwardness sometimes of men’s natural tempers, the attendance unto this one duty or part of rule requires the utmost diligence of them that are called unto it; and it is merely either the want of acquaintance with the nature of that law and its fruits which the Lord Christ requires among his disciples, or an undervaluation of the worth and glory of it in the church, or inadvertency unto the causes of its decays and of breaches made in it, or ignorance of the care and duties that are necessary unto its preservation, that induces men to judge that the work of an especial office is not required hereunto.

(3.) Their duty is to *warn all the members of the church* of their especial church-duties, that they be not found negligent or wanting in them. There are *especial duties* required respectively of all church-members, according unto the distinct talents, whether in things spiritual or temporal, which they have received. Some are rich, and some are poor; some are old, and some are young; some are in peace, some in trouble; some have received more spiritual gifts than others and have more opportunities for their exercise. It belongs unto the rule of the church that all be admonished, instructed, and exhorted to attend unto their respective duties, not only publicly in the *preaching of the word*, but *personally* as occasion doth require, according to the observation which those in rule do make of their forwardness or remissness in them. In particular, and in the way of instance, men are to be warned that they contribute unto the necessities of the poor and other occasions of the church, according unto the ability that God in his providence hath intrusted them withal, and to admonish them that are defective herein, in order to their recovery unto the discharge of this duty in such a measure as there may be an equality in the church,  2

Corinthians 8:14. And all other duties of an alike nature are they to attend unto.

(4.) They are to watch against the beginnings of any *church-disorders*, such as those that infested the church of Corinth, or any of the like sort, with remissness as unto [attending] the assemblies of the church and the duties of them, which some are subject unto, as the apostle intimates, ~~ROM~~ Hebrews 10:25. On the constancy and diligence of the elders in this part of their work and duty, the very being and order of the church do greatly depend. The want hereof hath opened a door unto all the troubles, divisions, and schisms, that in all ages have invaded and perplexed the churches of Christ from within themselves; and from thence also have decays in faith, love, and order insensibly prevailed in many, to the dishonor of Christ and the danger of their own souls. First one grows remiss in attending unto the assemblies of the church, and then another, first to one degree, then to another, until the whole lump be infected. A diligent watch over these things, as to the beginnings of them, in all the members of the church, will either heal and recover them that offend, or it will warn others, and keep the church from being either corrupted or defiled, ~~ROM~~ Hebrews 3:12, 12:15.

(5.) It belongs unto them also to *visit the sick*, especially such as whose inward or outward conditions do expose them unto more than ordinary trials in their sickness; that is, the poor, the afflicted, the tempted in any kind. This in general is a moral duty, a work of mercy; but it is moreover a peculiar church-duty by virtue of institution. And one end of the institution of churches is, that the disciples of Christ may have all that spiritual and temporal relief which is needful for them and useful to them in their troubles and distresses. And if this duty were diligently attended unto by the officers of the church, it would add much unto the glory and beauty of our order, and be an abiding reserve with relief in the minds of them whose outward condition exposeth them to straits and sorrows in such a season.

I add hereunto, as a duty of the same nature, the *visitation of those who suffer under restraint and imprisonment* upon the account of their profession, adherence unto church-assemblies, or the discharge of any pastoral or office duties in them. This is a case wherewith we are not

unacquainted, nor are like so to be. Some look on this as the duty of all the members of the church who yet enjoy their liberty; and so it is as their opportunities and abilities will allow them, provided the discharge of it be useful unto those whom they visit, and inoffensive unto others. But this duty diligently attended unto by the elders, representing therein the care and love of the whole church, yea, of Christ himself unto his prisoners, is a great spring of relief and comfort unto them. And by the elders may the church be acquainted what yet is required of them in a way of duty on their account. The care of the primitive churches herein was most eminent.

(6.) It belongs unto them and their office to *advise with and give direction unto the deacons* of the church as unto the making provision and distribution of the charity the church for the relief of the poor. The office of the deacons is principally execute, as we shall see afterward. Inquisition into the state of the poor, with all their circumstances, with the warning of all the members of the church unto liberality for their supply, belongs unto the elders.

(7.) When the state of the church is such, through suffering, persecution, and affliction, that *the poor be multiplied among them*, so as that the church itself is not able to provide for their relief in a due manner, if any *supply* be sent unto them from the love and bounty of other churches, it is to be deposited *with these elders*, and disposed according to their advice, with that of the teachers of the church, ⁴⁴¹³ Acts 11:30.

(8.) It is also their duty, according to the advantage which they have, by their peculiar inspection of all the members of the church, their ways and their walking, *to acquaint the pastors*, or teaching-elders of the church, *with the state of the flock*; which may be of singular use unto them for their direction in the present work of the ministry. He who makes it not his business to know the state of the church which he ministers unto in the word and doctrine, as to their knowledge, their judgment and understanding, their temptations and occasions, and applies not himself in his ministry to search out what is necessary and useful unto their edification, he fights uncertainly in his whole work, as a man beating the air. But whereas their obligation to attend unto the word and prayer confines them much unto a retirement for the greatest part of their time, they cannot by themselves obtain that acquaintance with the whole flock

but that others may greatly assist therein from their daily inspection, converse, and observation.

(9.) And it is their duty to *meet and consult with the teaching-elders* about such things of importance as are to be proposed in and unto the church, for its consent and compliance. Hence nothing crude or indigested, nothing unsuited to the sense and duty of the church, will at any time be proposed therein, so as. to give occasion unto contests or janglings, disputes contrary unto order or decency, but all things may be preserved in a due regard unto the gravity and authority of the rulers.

(10.) To take care of the *due liberties* of the church, that they be not imposed on by any Diotrephes, in office or without it.

(11.) It is incumbent on them, in times of difficulties and persecution, to *consult together with the other elders* concerning all those things which concern the present duty of the church from time to time, and their preservation from violence, according unto the will of Christ.

(12.) Whereas there may be, and ofttimes is, but one teaching-elder, pastor, or teacher in a church, upon his death or removal it is the work and duty of these elders to *preserve the church in peace and unity*, to take care of the continuation of its assemblies, to prevent irregularities in any persons or parties among them, and to go before, to direct and guide the church in the call and choice of some other meet person or persons in the room of the deceased or removed.

These few instances have I given of the work and duty of ruling-elders. They are all of them such as deserve a greater enlargement in their declaration and confirmation than I can here afford unto them, and sundry things of the like nature, especially with respect unto communion with other churches and synods; but what hath been spoken is sufficient unto my present purpose. And to manifest that it is so, I shall add the ensuing observations: —

1. All the things insisted on do undoubtedly and unquestionably belong unto the rule and order appointed by Christ in his church. There is no one of them that is liable unto any just exception from them by whom all church-order is despised. Wherefore, where there is a defect in them, or any of them, the church itself is defective as unto its own edification; and

where this defect is great in many of them, there can be no beauty, no glory, no order in any church, but only an outward show and appearance of them. And that all these things do belong unto the duty of these elders, there needs no other proof or confirmation but that they all undoubtedly and unquestionably belong unto that rule and order which the Lord Christ hath appointed in his church, and which the Scripture testifieth unto both in general and particular; for all the things which belong unto the rule of the church are committed to the care of the rulers of the church.

2. It is a vain apprehension, to suppose that one or two teaching officers in a church, who are obliged to “give themselves unto the word and prayer,” to “labor” with all their might “in the word and doctrine,” to “preach in season and out of season,” — that is, at all times, on all opportunities, as they are able, — to convince gainsayers, by word and writing pleading for the truth, to assist and guide the consciences of all under their temptations and desertions, with sundry other duties, in part spoken to before, should be able to take care of, and attend with diligence unto, those things that do evidently belong unto the rule of the church. And hence it is that churches at this day do live on the preaching of the word, the proper work of their pastors, which they greatly value, and are very little sensible of the wisdom, goodness, love, and care of Christ, in the institution of this rule in the church, nor are partakers of the benefits of it unto their edification. And the supply which many have had hitherto herein, by persons either unacquainted with their duty, or insensible of their own authority, or cold, if not negligent, in their work, doth not answer the end of their institution. And hence it is that the authority of government and the benefit of it are ready to be lost in most churches. And it is both vainly and presumptuously pleaded, to give countenance unto a neglect of their order, that some churches do walk in love and peace, and are edified without it, supplying some defects by the prudent aid of some members of them; for it is nothing but a preference of our own wisdom unto the wisdom and authority of Christ, or at best an unwillingness to make a venture on the warranty of his rule, for fear of some disadvantages that may ensue thereon.

3. Whereas sundry of the duties before mentioned are, as unto the substance of them, required of *the members of the church* in their several stations, without any especial obligation to attend unto them with

diligence, to look after them, or power to exercise any authority in the discharge of them, to leave them from under the office-care of the elders is to let confusion and disorder into the church, and gradually to remove the whole advantage of the discipline of Christ; as it is come to pass in many churches already.

It is therefore evident, that neither the purity, nor the order, nor the beauty or glory of the churches of Christ, nor the representation of his own majesty and authority in the government of them, can be long preserved without a multiplication of elders in them, according to the proportion of their respective members, for their rule and guidance. And for want hereof have churches, of old and of late, either degenerated into anarchy and confusion, their self-rule being managed with vain disputes and janglings, unto their division and ruin, or else given up themselves unto the domination of some prelatical teachers, to rule them at their pleasure, which proved the bane and poison of all the primitive churches; and they will and must do so in the neglect of this order for the future.

CHAPTER 9.

OF DEACONS.

THE original institution, nature, and use, of the office of *deacons* in the church, are so well known as that we need not much insist upon them; nor shall I treat of the name, which is common unto any kind of ministry, civil or sacred, but speak of it as it is appropriated unto that especial work for which this office was ordained.

The remote foundation of it lieth in that of our Savior, “The poor always ye have with you,” ^{<617>}John 12:8. He doth not only foretell that such there should be in the church, but recommends the care of them who should be so unto the church: for he maketh use of the words of the law,

^{<651>}Deuteronomy 15:11, “The poor shall never cease out of the land; therefore I command thee, saying, Thou shalt open thine hand wide unto thy brother, to thy poor, and to thy needy.” This legal institution, founded in the law of nature, doth the Lord Christ by his authority transfer and translate unto the use of gospel churches among his disciples.

And it may be observed, that at the same instant hypocrisy and avarice began to attempt their advance on the consideration of this provision for the poor, which they afterward effected unto their safety; for, on the pretense hereof, Judas immediately condemned an eminent duty towards the person of Christ, as containing a cost in it, which might have been better laid out in provision for the poor. The ointment poured on our Savior he thought might have been “sold for three hundred pence” (it may be about forty or fifty pounds^{<f7>}), “and given to the poor.” But “this he said, not that he cared for the poor, but because he was a thief, and had the bag,” out of which he could have made a good prey unto himself, ^{<610>}John 12:6. And it may be observed, that although Judas maliciously began this murmuring, yet at last some of the other disciples were too credulous of his insinuation, seeing the other evangelists ascribe it to them also. But the same pretense, on the same grounds, in following ages, was turned unto the greatest advantage of hypocrisy and covetousness that ever was in the world: for under this pretense of providing for the poor, the thieves who had got the bag, — that is, the rifling part of the clergy, with the priests,

friars, and monks, who served them, allowed men in the neglect of the greatest and most important duties of religion towards Christ himself, so as that they would give all that they had to the poor; not that they cared for the poor, but because they were thieves, and had the bag; by which means they possessed themselves of the greatest part of the wealth of the nations professing Christian religion. This was their compliance with the command of Christ, which they equally made use of in other things.

This foundation of their office was further raised by the preaching of the gospel among the poor. Many of them who first received it were of that state and condition, as the Scripture everywhere testifieth: “The poor are evangelized,” ~~4015~~ Matthew 11:5; “God hath chosen the poor,” ~~5015~~ James 2:5. And so it was in the first ages of the church, when the provision for them was one of the most eminent graces and duties of the church in those days. And this way became the original propagation of the gospel; for it was made manifest thereby that the doctrine and profession of it were not a matter of worldly design or advantage. God also declared therein of how little esteem with him the riches of this world are. And also provision was made for the exercise of the grace of the rich in their supply; the only way whereby they may glorify God with their substance. And it were well if all churches, and all the members of them, would wisely consider how eminent is this grace, how excellent is this duty, of making provision for the poor, — how much the glory of Christ and honor of the gospel are concerned herein; for whereas, for the most part, it is looked on as an ordinary work, to be performed transiently and cursorily, scarce deserving any of the time which is allotted unto the church’s public service and duties, it is indeed one of the most eminent duties of Christian societies, wherein the principal exercise of the second evangelical grace, namely, love, doth consist.

The care of making provision for the poor being made in the church an institution of Christ, was naturally incumbent on them who were *the first, only officers of the church*; that is, the *apostles*. This is plain from the occasion of the institution of the office of the deacons, ~~4015~~ Acts 6:1-6. The whole work and care of the church being in their hands, it was impossible that they should attend unto the whole, and all the parts of it in any manner. Whereas, therefore, they gave themselves, according to their duty, mostly unto those parts of their work which were incomparably more

excellent and necessary than the other, — namely, preaching of the word and prayer, — there was such a defect in this other part, of ministration unto the poor, as must unavoidably accompany the actings of human nature, not able to apply itself constantly unto things of diverse natures at the same time. And hereon those who were concerned quickly, as the manner of all is, expressed their resentment of a neglect in somewhat an undue order; there was “a murmuring” about it, verse 1. The apostles hereon declared that the principal part of the work of the ministry in the church, namely, the word and prayer, was sufficient for them constantly to attend unto. Afterward, indeed, men began to think that they could do *all* in the church themselves; but it was when they began to do *nothing* in a due manner. And whereas the apostles chose as their duty the work of prayer and preaching, as that which they would and ought entirely to give up themselves unto, and for the sake of that work would deposit the care of other things in other hands, they are a strange kind of successors unto them who lay aside that work, which they determined to belong unto them principally and in the first place, to apply themselves unto any thing else whatever.

Yet did not the apostles hereon utterly forego the care of providing for the poor, which being originally committed unto them by Jesus Christ, they would not divest themselves wholly of it; but, by the direction of the Holy Ghost, they provided such assistance in the work as that for the future it might require no more of their time or pains but what they should spare from their principal employment. And the same care is still incumbent on the ordinary pastors and elders of the churches, so far as the execution of it doth not interfere with their principal work and duty; from which those who understand it aright can spare but little of their time and strength.

Hereon the apostles, by the authority of Christ and direction of the Holy Spirit, under whose infallible guidance they were in all general concernments of the church, instituted the office of deacons, for the discharge of this necessary and important duty in the church, which they could not attend unto themselves. And whereas the Lord Christ had in an especial manner committed the care of the poor unto the disciples, there was now a declaration of his mind and will in what way and by what means he would have them provided for.

And it was *the institution of a new office*, and not a present supply *in a work of business*, which they designed; for the limitation of an especial ecclesiastical work, with the designation of persons unto that work, with authority for the discharge of it, set over this business, with a separation unto it, do completely constitute an office, nor is there any thing more required thereunto.

But whereas there are three things that concur and are required unto the ministration unto the poor of the church, —

1. The love, charity, bounty, and benevolence of the members of the church, in contribution unto that ministration;
2. The care and oversight of the discharge of it; and,
3. The actual exercise and application of it, — the last only belongs unto the office of the deacons, and neither of the first is discharged by the institution of it: for the first is both a duty of the light and law of nature, and in its moral part enforced by many especial commands of Christ, so as that nothing can absolve men from their obligation thereunto. The office and work of the deacons is to excite, direct, and help them, in the exercise of that grace and discharge of the duty therein incumbent on them. Nor is any man, by the intrusting a due proportion of his good things in the hands of the deacons for its distribution, absolved thereby from his own personal discharge of it also; for it being a moral duty, required in the law of nature, it receiveth peculiar obligations unto a present exercise by such circumstances as nature and providence do suggest. The care also of the whole work is, as was said, still incumbent on the pastors and elders of the church; only the ordinary execution is committed unto the deacons.

Nor was this a *temporary institution*, for that season, and so the officers appointed *extraordinary*, but it was to abide in the church throughout a!! generations; for, —

1. The *work itself*, as a distinct work of ministry in the church, was never to cease; it was to abide for ever: “The poor ye shall have always with you.”

2. The *reason of its institution* is perpetual, namely, that the pastors of the churches are not sufficient in themselves to attend unto the whole work of praying, preaching, and this ministration.
3. They are afterward, not only in this church at Jerusalem, but in all the churches of the Gentiles, reckoned among the *fixed officers* of the church, ~~1000~~ Philippians 1:1. And,
4. Direction is given for their *continuation* in all churches, with a prescription of the qualifications of the persons to be chosen and called unto this office, ~~5000~~ 1 Timothy 3:8-10, 12, 13.
5. The way of their call is directed, and an *office* committed unto them: "Let them be first proved, then let them use the office of a deacon."
6. A *promise of acceptance* is annexed unto the diligent discharge of this office, verse 13.

Hence those who afterward utterly perverted all church-order, taking out of the hands and care of the deacons that work which was committed to them by the Holy Ghost in the apostles, and for which end alone their office was instituted in the church, assigning other work unto them, whereunto they are not called nor appointed, yet thought meet to continue the name and the pretense of such an office, because of the evident institution of it unto a continuation. And whereas, when all things were swelling with pride and ambition in the church, no sort of its officers contenting themselves with their primitive institution, but striving by various degrees to somewhat in name and thing that was high and aloft, there arose from the name of this office the meteor of an archdeacon, with strange power and authority, never heard of in the church for many ages, this belongs unto the mystery of iniquity, whereunto neither the Scripture nor the practice of the primitive churches doth give the least countenance. But some think it not inconvenient even to sport themselves in matters of church order and constitution.

This office of deacons is an office of service, which gives not any authority or power in the rule of the church; but being an office, it gives authority with respect unto the special work of it, under a general notion of authority; that is, a right to attend unto it in a peculiar manner, and to perform the things that belong thereunto. But this right is confined unto

the particular church whereunto they do belong. Of the members of that church are they to make their collections, and unto the members of that church are they to administer. Extraordinary collections from or for other churches are to be made and disposed by the elders, ~~4413~~ Acts 11:30.

Whereas the reason of the institution of this office was, in general, to free the pastors of the churches who labor in the word and doctrine from avocations by outward things, such as wherein the church is concerned, it belongs unto the deacons not only to take care of and provide for the poor, but to manage all other affairs of the church of the same kind; such as are providing for the place of the church-assemblies, of the elements for the sacraments, of collecting, keeping, and disposing of the stock of the church for the maintenance of its officers and incidences, especially in the time of trouble or persecution. Hereon are they obliged to attend the elders on all occasions, to perform the duty of the church towards them, and receive directions from them. This was the constant practice of the church in the primitive times, until the avarice and ambition of the superior clergy enclosed all alms and donations unto themselves; the beginning and progress whereof is excellently described and traced by Paulus Sarpius in his treatise of matters beneficiary.

That maintenance of the poor which they are to distribute is to be collected by the voluntary contributions of the church, to be made ordinarily every first day of the week, and as occasion shall require in an extraordinary manner, ~~4401~~ 1 Corinthians 16:1, 2. And this contribution of the church ought to be, —

1. In a way of *bounty*, not sparingly, ~~4405~~ 2 Corinthians 9:5-7;
2. In a way of *equality*, as unto men's abilities, chap. 8:13, 14;
3. With respect unto *present successes* and thriving in affairs, whereof a portion is due to God, "As God hath prospered him," ~~4402~~ 1 Corinthians 16:2;
4. With *willingness* and freedom, ~~4402~~ 2 Corinthians 8:12.

Wherefore it belongs unto the deacons, in the discharge of their office, —

1. To acquaint the church with the present necessity of the poor;

2. To stir up the particular members of it unto a free contribution, according unto their ability;
3. To admonish those that are negligent herein, who give not according to their proportion, and to acquaint the elders of the church with those who persist in a neglect of their duty.

The consideration of the state of the poor, unto whom the contributions of the church are to be administered, belongs unto the discharge of this office; as, —

1. That they are *poor indeed*, and do not pretend themselves so to be for advantage;
2. What are the *degrees* of their poverty, with respect unto their relations and circumstances, that they may have suitable supplies;
3. That in other things they walk according unto rule;
4. In particular, that they *work and labor* according to their ability, for he that will not labor must not eat at the public charge;
5. To comfort, counsel, and exhort them unto *patience*, submission, contentment with their condition, and thankfulness: all which might be enlarged and confirmed, but that they are obvious.

The qualifications of persons to be called unto this office are distinctly laid down by the apostle, ^{<51B>}1 Timothy 3:8-13. Upon the trial, know]edge, and approbation of them, with respect unto these qualifications, their call to this office consists, —

1. In the *choice* of the church;
2. In a *separation* unto it by prayer and imposition of hands, ^{<41B>}Acts 6:3, 5, 6.

And the adjuncts of their ministration are, —

1. *Mercy*, to represent the tenderness of Christ towards the poor of the flock, ^{<51B>}Romans 12:8.
2. *Cheerfulness*, to relieve the spirits of them that receive against thoughts of being troublesome and burdensome to others.

3. *Diligence* and faithfulness, by which they “purchase to themselves a good degree, and great boldness in the faith which is in Christ Jesus.”

It remains only that we inquire into some few things relating unto this office and those that are called unto it; as, —

1. What is the meaning of the apostle where he affirms that the deacons, in the discharge of their office, **βαθμὸν ἑαυτοῖς καλὸν περιποιῶνται**,

⁵⁰⁸³ 1 Timothy 3:13, “purchase (or procure) to themselves a good degree.”

βαθμός is “a step, a degree, a seat a little exalted;” and metaphorically it is applied to denote dignity and authority. This good degree, which deacons may obtain, is, in the judgment of most, the office of presbytery. This they shall be promoted unto in the church; from deacons they shall be made presbyters. I cannot comply with this interpretation of the words: for, —

(1.) The office of presbytery is called **καλὸν ἔργον**, “a good work,” nowhere **καλὸς βαθμός**, “a good degree.”

(2.) The difference between a deacon and a presbyter is not in degree but in order. A deacon made a presbyter is not advanced unto a farther degree in his own order, but leaves it for another.

(3.) The diligent discharge of the work of a deacon is not a due preparation for the office of the presbytery, but a hinderance of it: for it lies wholly in the providing and disposal of earthly things, in a serving of the tables of the church, and those private, of the poor; but preparation for the ministry consists in a man’s giving himself unto study, prayer, and meditation.

I shall only give my conjecture on the words. The apostle seems to me to have respect unto church-order, with decency therein, in both these expressions, “Purchase to themselves a good degree,” and, “Great confidence in the faith.” **βαθμός**, is of the same signification with **βαθμός**, which is a seat raised in an assembly, to hear or speak. So saith the school on Soph. (Ed. Tyr. 142: **Ὁ τόπος ἔνθα ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐγίνετο, βαθμίσιν ἦν κύκλῳ διειλημμένος, ἄλλαις ἐπ’ ἄλλαις· ἔνθα ἡ ἐκκλησία ἐγίνετο, βαθμὶς ἦν κύκλῳ διειλημμένος, ἄλλαις ἐπ’ ἄλλαις· ἔνθα οἱ συνελθόντες πάντες καθήμενοι ἀνεμποδίστως ἡκροῶντο τοῦ ἱσταμένου ἐν μέσῳ** — “The place where the assembly (or church) met was divided round about with seats in degrees, some above

others, where all that met might without trouble hear him that stood in the midst as they sat.” And countenance is given hereunto by what is observed concerning the custom of sitting in the Jewish synagogues. So Ambrose: “*Traditio est synagogae, ut sedentes disputarent, soniores dignitate in cathedris, subsequentes in subseliis, novissimi in pavimento;*” — “It is the tradition (or order) of the synagogue, that the elders in dignity (or office) should discourse sitting in chairs, the next order on form; (or benches), and the last on the floor.” So speaks Philo before him: *Εἰς ἱεροῦς ἀφικνούμενοι τόπους καθ’ ἡλικίας ἐν τάξεσιν ὑπὸ πρεσβυτέρους νέοι καθίζονται.* — “When we meet in sacred places,” places of divine worship, “the younger sort, according to their quality, sit in orders under the elders.” And this James the apostle hath respect unto, in the primitive assemblies of the Christian Jew; for, reproving their partiality in accepting of men’s persons, preferring the rich immoderately before the poor, he instanceth in their disposing of them unto seats in their assemblies. They said unto the rich man, “*Σὺ κάθου ὧδε καλῶς,*” “Sit thou here in a good place,” — that is, in *βάθμῳ καλῷ* “in the best degree,” — and to the poor, “Stand thou there,” on the floor, or “Sit at my footstool,” without respect unto those other qualifications whereby they were to be distinguished. Wherefore, the apostle having respect unto church-assemblies, and the order to be observed in them, the *καλὸς βαθμός* here intended may signify no more but a place of some eminency in the church-assemblies, which is due unto such deacons, where with boldness and confidence they may assist in the management of the affairs of the church, which belongs unto the profession of the faith which is in Christ Jesus.

If any shall rather think that both of the expressions do signify an increase in gifts and grace, which is a certain consequence of men’s faithful discharge of their office in the church, wherein many deacons of old were eminent unto martyrdom, I shall not contend against it.

2. Whereas there are qualifications expressly required in the wives of deacons, as that they should be “grave, not slanderers, sober, faithful in all things,” ^{SCRI1} 1 Timothy 3:11, which are to be considered before their call to office, supposing that any of them do fall from the faith, as becoming Papists, Socinians, or Quakers, [it is asked] whether their husbands may be continued in their office?

Ans. **1.** He who in his own person faithfully dischargeth his office may be continued therein, yea, though his wife should be actually excommunicated out of the church. Every one of us must give an account of himself unto the Lord. He rejects us not for what we cannot remedy. The sinning person shall bear his own judgment.

2. Such an one ought to take care, by virtue of his *authority* as a husband, that as little offense as possible may be given to the church by his wife, when she loseth the qualification of not being a slanderer, which is inseparable from such apostates.

3. May a deacon be dismissed from his office wholly, after he hath been solemnly set apart unto it by prayer?

Ans. **1.** The very end of the office being only the convenience of the church and its accommodation, the continuation of men in this office is to be regulated by them; and if the church at any time stand not in need of the ministry of this or that person, they may, upon his desire, discharge him of his office.

2. Things may so fall out with men as unto their outward circumstances, with respect unto either their persons in bodily distempers and infirmities, or their condition in the world, as that they are not able any longer to attend unto the due discharge, of this office; in which case they ought to be released.

3. A man may be solemnly set apart unto a work and duty by prayer for a limited season, suppose for a year only; wherefore this doth not hinder but that a man may, on just reasons, be dismissed at any time from his office, though he be so set apart unto it.

4. A deacon, by unfaithfulness and other offenses, may forfeit his office and be justly excluded from it, losing all his right unto it and interest in it; and therefore, on just reasons, may be dismissed wholly from it.

5. For any one to desert his office, through frowardness, covetousness, sloth, or negligence, is an offense and scandal which the church ought to take notice of.

6. He who desires a dismission from his office ought to give an account of his desires and the reasons of them unto the church, that the ministry which he held may be duly supplied, and love continued between him and the church.

4. How many deacons may there be in one congregation?

Ans. As many as they stand in need of for the ends of that ministry, and they may be at all times increased as the state of the church doth require; and it is meet that there should always be so many as that none of the poor be neglected in the daily ministration, nor the work be made burdensome unto themselves.

5. What is the duty of the deacons towards the elders of the church?

Ans. Whereas the care of the whole church, in all its concernments, is principally committed unto the pastors, teachers, and ruling elders, it is the duty of the deacons, in the discharge of their office, —

1. To acquaint them from time to time with the state of the church, and especially of the poor, so far as it falls under their inspection;

2. To seek and take their advice in matters of greater importance relating unto their office;

3. To be assisting unto them in all the outward concerns of the church.

6. May deacons preach the word and baptize authoritatively by virtue of their office?

Ans. **1.** The deacons, whose office is instituted, Acts vi., and whose qualifications are fixed, 1 Timothy 3, have no call unto or ministerial power in these things. The limitation of their office, work, and power is so express as will not admit of any debate.

2. Persons once called unto this office might of old in an extraordinary manner, may at present in an ordinary way, be called unto the preaching of the word; but they were not then, they cannot be now, authorized thereunto by virtue of this office.

3. If a new *office* be erected under the name of deacons, it is in the will of them by whom it is erected to assign what power unto it they please.

CHAPTER 10.

OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

THE power of the church towards its members (for it hath nothing to do with them that are without) may be referred unto three heads: —

1. The *admission* of members into its society;
2. The rule and edification of them that belong unto it;
3. The *exclusion* out of its society of such as obstinately refuse to live and walk according unto the laws and rules of it. And these things belong essentially and inseparably unto every free society, and are comprehensive of all church-power whatever.

The second of these hath been treated of in the discourse concerning church offices and rule; and all that belongs unto the first of them is fully declared in the chapters of the essential constituent parts of gospel churches, namely, their matter and form. The third must be now spoken unto, which is the power of excommunication.

There is nothing in Christian religion about which the contest of opinions hath been more fierce than this of excommunication, most of them proceeding evidently from false assumptions and secular interests; and no greater instance can be given of what the serpentine wits of men, engaged by the desire of domination and wealth, and assisted by opportunities, may attain unto. For whereas, as we shall see immediately, there is nothing more plain, simple, and more exposed unto the common understanding of all Christians, yea of all mankind, than is this institution of Christ, both as unto its nature, form, and manner of administration; nothing more wholesome nor useful unto the souls of men; nothing more remote from giving the least disturbance or prejudice to civil society, to magistrates or rulers, unto the personal or political rights or concernments of any one individual in the world; — it hath been metamorphosed into a hideous monster, an engine of priestly domination and tyranny, for the deposition or assassination of kings and princes, the wasting of nations with bloody wars, the terror of the souls of men, and the destruction of their lives, with

all their earthly concerns, unto the erection of a tyrannical empire, no less pernicious unto the Christian world than those of the Saracens or the Turks. He is a stranger unto all that hath passed in the world for nearly a thousand years who knows not the truth of these things, And to this very day, the greatest part of them that are called Christians are so supinely ignorant and doting, or so infatuated and blinded by their prejudices and corrupt interests, as to suppose or to say that if the pope of Rome do excommunicate kings or princes, they may be lawfully deposed from their rule, and in some cases killed; and that other persons, being rightly excommunicated, according unto certain laws, rules, and processes, that some have framed, ought to be fined, punished, imprisoned, and so destroyed! And about these things there are many disputes and contests, when, if men were awakened out of their lethargy, they would be laughed at as the most ridiculous and contemptible morons that ever appeared in the world; though they are no laughing matter at present unto them that are concerned in them.

Supposing, then, ecclesiastical excommunication (as I at present suppose, and shall immediately prove it) to be an appointment of our Lord Jesus Christ, these things are plain and evident concerning it, not capable of any modest contradiction: —

1. That there is no divine evangelical institution that is more suited unto the light of nature, the rules of common equity, and principles of *unseared consciences*, as unto the nature, efficacy, and rule of it, than this is.
2. That the *way* of the administration and exercise of the power and acts of it is so determined, described, and limited in the Scripture and the light of nature, as that there can be no gross error or mistake about it but what proceeds from secular interests, pride, ambition, covetousness, or other vicious habits and inclinations of the minds of men.
3. That the whole *authority* of it, its sentence, power, and efficacy, are merely spiritual, with respect unto the souls and consciences of men only; and that to extend it, directly or indirectly, immediately or by consequences, unto the temporal hurt, evil, or damage of any, in their lives, liberties, estates, natural or legal privileges, is opposite unto and destructive of the whole government of Christ in and over his church. All these things will fully appear in the account which we shall give of it.

It is therefore evident, as was intimated, that nothing in Christian practice hath been or is more abused, corrupted, or perverted, than this of excommunication hath been and is. The residence of the supreme power of it, to be exercised towards and over all Christians, rulers and subjects, in the pope of Rome, or in other single persons absolutely, over less or greater distributions of them; the administration of it by citations, processes, pleadings, and contentions, in wrangling law-courts, according unto arbitrary canons and constitutions, whose original is either known or unknown; the application of it unto the hurt, damage, evil, or loss of men, in their temporal concerns, — are utterly and openly foreign unto the gospel, and expressly contrary unto what the Lord Christ hath appointed therein. It would require a whole volume to declare the horrible abuses both in point of right and in matter of fact, with the pernicious consequences that have issued thereon, which the corruption of this divine institution hath produced: but to make a declaration hereof doth not belong to my present design; besides, it hath in some good measure been done by others. In brief, it is so come to pass that it is made a mere political engine of an external, forcible government of the persons of men, unto the ends of the interests of some who have got a pretense of its power; administered by such ways and means as wherein the consciences of men, neither of those by whom it is administered nor of those unto whom it is applied, are any way concerned, with respect unto the authority of any institution of Jesus Christ.

From an observation hereof, and a desire to vindicate as well Christian religion from such a scandalous abuse as mankind from bondage to such a monstrous fiction as is the present power and exercise of it, some have fallen into another extreme, denying that there is any such thing as excommunication appointed or approved by the gospel. But this neither is nor ever will be a way to reduce religion, nor any thing in it, unto its primitive order and purity. To deny the being of any thing because it hath been abused, when there could have been no abuse of it but upon a supposition of its being, is not a rational way to reprove and convince that abuse. And when those who have corrupted this institution find the insufficiency of the arguments produced to prove that there never was any such institution, it makes them secure in the practice of their own abuses of it; for they imagine that there is nothing incumbent on them, to justify

their present possession and exercise of the power of excommunication, but that excommunication itself is appointed in the church by Christ: whereas the true consideration of this appointment is the only means to divest them of their power and practice; for the most effectual course to discharge and disprove all corruptions in the agenda or practicals of religion, as the sacraments, public worship, rule, and the like, is to propose and declare the things themselves in their original simplicity and purity, as appointed by Christ and recorded in the Scriptures. A real view of them in such a proposal will divest the minds of men, not corrupted and hardened by prejudice and interest, of those erroneous conceptions of them that, from some kind of tradition, they have been prepossessed withal; and this I shall now attempt in this particular of excommunication.

There hath been great inquiry about the nature and exercise of this ordinance under the old testament, with the account given of it by the later Jews; for the right and power of it in general belongs unto a church as such, — every church, and not to that which is purely evangelical only. This I shall not inquire into; it hath been sifted to the bran already, and intermixed with many rabbinical conjectures and mistakes. In general, there is nothing more certain than that there was a double removal of persons by church-authority from the communion of the whole congregation in divine worship, — the one for a season, the other for ever; whereof I have given instances elsewhere. But I intend only the consideration of what belongs unto churches under the new testament. And to this end we may observe, —

1. That all *lawful societies*, constituted such by voluntary confederation, according unto peculiar laws and rules of their own choice, unto especial duties and ends, have a right and power, by the light of nature, to receive into their society those that are willing and meet, engaging themselves to observe the rules, laws, and ends of the society, and to expel them out of it who wilfully deviate from those rules. This is the life and form of every lawful society or community of men in the world, without which they can neither coalesce nor subsist. But it is required hereunto, —

(1.) That those who so enter into such a society have *right or power so to do*. And many things are required unto this end; as, —

[1.] That those who enter into such a society be “*sui juris*,” *have a lawful right to dispose of themselves* as unto all the duties and ends of such a society. Hence children, servants, subjects, have no power in themselves to enter into such societies without the interposition of and obligation from a power superior unto that of parents, masters, or princes, — namely, that of God himself.

[2.] That the rules, laws, and ends of the society be *lawful*, good, and useful. Unto themselves and others; for there may be a confederation in and for evil, which is a combination that gives no right nor power over One another, or towards others that enter into it.

[3.] That it contains nothing that is *prejudicial* unto others, in things divine or human.

[4.] Nor obliges unto the *omission* or neglect of any duty that men, by virtue of any relations, natural, moral, or political, do owe unto others.

[5.] Nor is *hurtful* unto themselves, in their lives, liberties, names, reputation, usefulness in the world, or any thing else, unto whose preservation they are obliged by the law of nature.

[6.] Nor are nor can be such persons obliged to forsake *the conduct of themselves*, in things divine and human, by the light of their own consciences, by an engagement of blind obedience unto others; which would render every society unlawful by the law of God and light of nature.

[7.] Least of all have any persons right or power to oblige themselves in such societies unto things *evil, sinful, superstitious, or idolatrous*.

These things are plain and evident in themselves, and every way sufficient to divest all the religious societies and fraternities that are erected in the church of Rome of all that right and power which belong unto lawful societies, constituted by voluntary confederation. And if any thing inconsistent with these principles of natural light be pretended in churches, it divests them of all power, as to the exercise of it, by virtue of any compact or confederation whatsoever.

(2.) It is required that a society by *voluntary consent* vested with the right and power mentioned do neither give nor take away any right, privilege, or

advantage, to or from any members of the society which belongs unto them *naturally* or *politically*; but their power is confined unto those things alone wherein men may be benefited and advantaged by the society. And this is the foundation of all political societies. Men for the sake and benefit of them may and ought to forego many particular advantages, which without them they might make unto themselves; but they cannot forego any of those rights which, in their several relations, are inseparably annexed unto them by the law of nature, nor give power over themselves in such things unto the society. So is it with churches: the power of expulsion out of their society extends only unto the benefits and advantages which the society, as such, doth afford and communicate. Now, these are only things spiritual, if churches be an institution of Him whose kingdom is not of this world. The power, then, that is in churches, by virtue of their being what they are, extends not itself unto any outward concernments of men, as unto their lives, liberties, natural or political privileges, estates, or possessions; unless we shall say that men hold and possess these things by virtue of their relation unto the church, which is to overthrow all natural and human right in the world. “De facto,” men are now compelled, whether they will or no, to be esteemed to be of this or that church, and to be dealt withal accordingly; but if they had not been divested of their natural liberty, they know not how, without their own consent, and should be taught that by entering into a church, they must come under a new tenure of their lives, liberties, and estates, at the will of the lords of the society, according to the customs of their courts, there would not be so many wise men in churches as now there are thought to be.

But this is the true state of things in the church of Rome, and among others also. Christians are esteemed to be of them, and belong unto them, whether they will or no. Immediately hereon all the rights, liberties, privileges, and possessions which they enjoy by the law of God and nature, and by the just laws and constitutions of men in the civil governments under which they live, come to depend upon and be subject unto the especial laws and rules of the society which they are adjudged to belong unto; for upon expulsion out of that society by excommunication, according unto the laws and rules which it hath framed unto itself, all their rights and titles, and liberties and enjoyments, are forfeited and exposed to

ruin. Some, indeed, do earnestly and learnedly contend that the pope of Rome hath not power to excommunicate sovereign kings and princes, and that if he do, they make no forfeiture of life or dignity thereby; and there are good reasons why they do so. But, in the meantime, they deal with other poor men after the same manner; for if a poor man be excommunicated, immediately he loseth the free tenure of his goods, liberty, and life, by the law of the church and the land, and is committed to the jail without bail or mainprise.^{f8} So that, by this artifice, all men hold their natural and civil rights by the rules of the church-society whereto they are supposed to belong. And as this utterly overthrows the foundation of all that [right of] property according to the laws of the land, which is so much talked of and valued, so indeed it would be destructive of all order and liberty, but that the church is wise enough not to employ this engine unto great men and men in power, who may yet deserve excommunication as well as some of their poor neighbors, if the gospel be thought to give the rule of it; but those that are poor, helpless, and friendless, shall, in the pursuit of this excommunication, be driven from their houses, cast into prisons, and kept there until they and their families starve and perish. And it is apparent that we are beholden unto the greatness, authority, and wealth of many, whom the ecclesiastical courts care not to conflict withal, that the whole nation is not actually brought under this new tenure of their lives, liberties, and estates, which, on this presumption, they are obnoxious unto.

And all this evil ariseth from the neglect and contempt of this fundamental rule of all societies, apparent unto all in the light of nature itself, — namely, *That they have no power in or over any thing, right, privilege, or advantage, but what men are made partakers of by virtue of such societies, their rules and laws, whereunto they are obliged.* But of this sort are not the lives, the liberties, the houses and possessions of men, with respect unto the church. They receive them not from the church, and a man would certainly think that the church could not take them away.

Yea, we live and subsist in order upon the good nature and wisdom of men who judge it best neither to exert their power nor act their principles in this matter: for whereas they esteem all the inhabitants of the land to belong unto their church, if they should in the first place excommunicate all that ought to be excommunicated by the rule and law of the gospel, and

then all that ought to be so according to their own laws and canons, — both which a man would think they were obliged in point of conscience unto, — and in pursuit of their sentence send out the “*capias*” for them all, I very much question whether any of them would go to prison or no, and then in what a fine case would this government be and if they should all go to jail, I am persuaded the king would be in an ill state to defend his realms against his enemies.

(3.) Every society hath this power towards those who are incorporated in it *by their own consent*, and not towards others; for whence should they have such a power, or who should commit it unto them? Nor can any be cast out from those privileges which they never had an interest in nor a right unto. The apostle’s rule holds in this case, especially with respect unto churches, “What have we to do to judge them that are without?” And as unto the exercise of this power, they are all to be esteemed to be without who are not rightly incorporated into that particular church by which they may be ejected out of it. A power of excommunication at random, towards all that those who exercise it can extend force unto, hath no foundation either in the light of nature or authority of the Scripture; and it would be ridiculous in any corporation to disfranchise such as never belonged unto it, who were never members of it.

(4.) The only reason or cause for the expulsion of any person out of such a society is *a wilful deviation from the rules and laws of the society*, whose observance he had engaged unto upon his entrance into it. Nothing else can be required, unto the preservation of a man’s interest in any right or privilege, but what he took upon himself to perform in his admittance into it. And if the great rule of every church-society be, “That men observe and do whatsoever the Lord Christ hath commanded,” none can be justly ejected out of that society but upon a wilful disobedience unto his commands. And therefore the casting of men out of church-communion on light and trivial occasions, or for any reasons or causes whatever but such as essentially belong unto the rules and laws whereon the church doth originally coalesce into a society, is contrary unto natural light and the reason of the things themselves.

Thus far, I say, is every lawful confederate society enabled and warranted, by the light of nature, to remove from its communion, and from a

participation in its rights and privileges, any of its number who will not walk according to the rules and principles of its coalescency and constitution. Whereas, therefore, the rule of the constitution of the church is, “That men walk together in holy obedience unto the commands of Christ, and in the observance of all his institutions, without giving offense unto one another or those that are without by any sinful miscarriage, and do abide in the profession of the truth,” if any one shall wilfully and obstinately transgress in any of these things, it is the right and duty, and in the power, of the church to remove him from its society.

2. But this is not the entire nor the next immediate ground, reason, or warranty, of ecclesiastical excommunication; for this natural equity will not extend itself unto cases that are in things spiritual and supernatural, nor will the actings of the Church thereon reach unto the consciences of men for the proper ends of excommunication. Wherefore it was necessary that it should have a peculiar institution in the church by the authority of Jesus Christ; for, —

(1.) The church is such a society as no men have right or power either to enter into themselves or to exclude others from but by *virtue of the authority of Christ*. No warranty from the light of nature, nor from the laws of men, nor their own voluntary confederation, can enable any to constitute a church-society, unless they do all things expressly in obedience unto the authority of Christ; for his church is his kingdom, his house, which none can constitute or build but himself. Wherefore it is necessary that the power of admission into and exclusion from the church do arise from his grant and institution; nor is it in the power of any men in the world to admit into or exclude from this society but by virtue thereof.

(2.) *Excommunication* is an act of authority, as we shall see afterward. But no authority can be exercised in the church towards any person whatever but by virtue of the institution of Christ; for the authority itself, however ministerially exercised by others, is his alone, and he exerts it not but in the ways of his own appointment. So, in particular, the apostle directs that excommunication be exerted “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ;” that is, in and by his authority, ~~481~~ 1 Corinthians 5:4.

(3.) The *privileges* from which men are excluded by excommunication are not such as they have any natural or civil right unto (as hath been proved),

but merely such as are granted unto the church by Jesus Christ; and men cannot, by virtue of any agreement among themselves, without a warranty from him by his institution, expel others from the privileges which are merely of his grant and donation. He alone, therefore, hath given and granted this power unto the church, namely, of excluding any, by the rules and ways of his appointment, from the privileges of his grant; which is the peculiar power of excommunication inquired after.

(4.) There is such an *efficacy* assigned unto excommunication, in binding the consciences of men, in retaining their sins, in the destruction or mortification of the flesh, in the healing and recovery of sinners, as nothing but the authority of a divine institution can give unto it. By virtue of natural light and mutual consent, men may free themselves from the company and society of those who will not walk with them according to rules of communion agreed upon among them, but they cannot reach the minds and consciences of others with any of these effects.

(5.) That excommunication is an express ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ in his churches is fully declared in the Scripture; for, —

[1.] The power of it is contained in the authority given by Christ unto the church, under the name of “The keys of the kingdom of heaven;” for the power expressed therein is not merely *doctrinal* and declarative, as is the preaching of the gospel, — the consequent whereof, upon the faith or unbelief of them that hear it, is the remitting or retaining of their sins in heaven and earth, — but it is *disciplinary* also, as it is appropriated unto the house, whose keys are committed unto the stewards of it. And seeing the design of Christ was, to have his church holy, unblamable, and without offense in the world, that therein he might make a representation of his own holiness and the holiness of his rule; and whereas those of whom it is constituted are liable and subject unto sins scandalous and offensive, reflecting dishonor on himself and the church, in being the occasion of sinning unto others, — that design would not have been accomplished had he not given this authority unto his church to cast out and separate from itself all that do by their sins so give offense. And the neglect of the exercise of this authority in a due manner was the principal means whereby the glory, honor, and usefulness of the churches in the world were at length utterly lost.

[2.] It hath a direct institution: ^{CHR}Matthew 18:15-20, “If thy brother shall trespass,” etc., “tell it unto the church: but if he neglect to hear the church, let him be unto thee as a heathen man and a publican. Verily I say unto you, Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever ye shall loose on earth shall be loosed in heaven,” etc. After all the learned and unlearned contests that have been about this place, the sense of it is plain and obvious unto such as whose minds are not clouded with prejudices about such churches and such excommunications as are utterly foreign unto the Scripture. But that by “trespasses” in this place, sins against God, giving scandal or offense, are intended, hath been proved before; as also, that by “church” a particular Christian congregation is intended. This church hath the cognizance of the scandalous offenses of its members committed unto it, when brought before it in the due order described. Hereon it makes a determination, designing in the first place the recovery of the person offending from his sin, by his hearing of its counsel and advice; but, in case of obstinacy, it is to remove him from its communion, leaving him in the outward condition of a “heathen man and a publican:” so is he to be esteemed by them that were offended with his sin; and that because of the authority of the church binding him in heaven and earth unto the punishment due unto his sin, unless he doth repent. The rejection of an offending brother out of the society of the church, leaving him, as unto all the privileges of the church, in the state of a heathen, declaring him liable unto the displeasure of Christ and everlasting punishment, without repentance, is the excommunication we plead for; and the power of it, with its exercise, is here plainly granted by Christ and ordained in the church.

[3.] According unto this institution was the practice of the apostles, whereof we have several instances. I might insist on the excommunication of Simon the magician, a baptized professor, by Peter, who declared him to have “neither part nor lot” in the church, upon the discovery of his wickedness, ^{CHR}Acts 8:13, 20-23; yet because it was the single act of one apostle, and so may be esteemed extraordinary, I shall omit it. However, that fact of the apostle is sufficiently declarative of what is to be done in the church in like cases; and which if it be not done, it cannot be preserved in its purity, according unto the mind of Christ. But that which was

directed by the apostle Paul to be done towards the incestuous person in the church of Corinth is express, ~~4thly~~ 1 Corinthians 5:1-7: —

1st. He declares the sin whereof the person charged was guilty, with the ignominy and scandal of it, verse 1.

2dly. He blames the church that they had not been affected with the guilt and scandal of it, so as to have proceeded to his removal or expulsion out of the church, that he might be “taken away” or cut off from them, verse 2.

3dly. He declares his own judgment in the case, that he ought to be so taken away or removed; which yet was not actually effected by that judgment and sentence of his, verse 3.

4thly. He declares the causes of this excision: —

(1st.) The *supreme efficient cause* of it is the power or authority of the Lord Jesus Christ instituting this ordinance in his church, giving right and power unto it for its administration in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, and with his power;

(2dly.) The *declarative cause* of the equity of this sentence, which was the spirit of the apostle, or the authoritative declaration of his judgment in the case, “With my spirit;”

(3dly.) The *instrumental, ministerial cause* of it, which is the church, “Do it ‘in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, when ye are gathered together,’” verse 4; “and thereby ‘purge out the old leaven, that ye may be a new lump,’” verse 7; whence the punishment of this sentence is said to be “inflicted by many,” ~~4thly~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6; that is, all those who, on his repentance, were obliged to forgive and comfort him, — that is, the whole church, verse 7.

5thly. The nature of the sentence is, the “delivering of such an one unto Satan for the destruction of the flesh, that the spirit may be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus,” ~~4thly~~ 1 Corinthians 5:5; not the destruction of his body by death, but through the “mortification of the flesh,” whereby he was shortly afterward recovered and restored unto his former condition.

The whole of what we plead for is here exemplified; as, —

[1.] The *cause* of excommunication, which is a scandalous sin unrepented of.

[2.] The *preparation* for its execution, which is the church's sense of the sin and scandal, with humiliation for it.

[3.] The *warranty* of it, which is the institution of Christ, wherein his authority is engaged.

[4.] The *manner* and form of it, by an act of authority, with the consent of the whole church.

[5.] The *effect* of it, in a total separation from the privileges of the church.

[6.] The *end* of it, —

1st. With respect unto the *church*, its purging and vindication;

2dly. With respect unto the *person excommunicated*, his repentance, reformation, and salvation.

It is usually replied hereunto, “That this was an extraordinary act of apostolical power, and so not to be drawn by us into example; for he himself both determines the case and asserteth his presence in spirit, — that is, by his authority, — to be necessary unto what was done. Besides, it was a delivery of the man to Satan, — that is, into his power, — to be afflicted and cruciated by him, to be terrified in his mind and punished in his body to the destruction of the flesh, that is, unto death. Such was the delivery of a man to Satan by the apostle, mentioned here and ⁵⁰¹⁹1 Timothy 1:19, 20, in the judgment of many of the ancients. But there is no such power in any church at present to deliver an offender unto Satan, nor any appearing effects of such a pretense. Wherefore this is a matter which belongs not unto churches at present.”

I answer, —

1. What the apostles did in any church, whether present or absent, by their own authority, did not prejudice the right of the churches themselves, nor their power, acted in subordination unto them and their guidance. So it is evident in this place, that, notwithstanding the exerting of any

apostolical power intimated, the church itself is charged with its duty, and directed to exercise its authority in the rejection of the offender.

2. There is nothing extraordinary in the case: —

(1.) It is not so that a member of a church should fall into a scandalous sin, unto the dishonor of Christ and the church, giving offense unto persons of all sorts,

(2.) It is an ordinary rule, founded in the light of nature, confirmed here and elsewhere by express divine commands, that such an one be rejected from the society and communion of the church, until he give satisfaction by repentance and reformation.

(3.) It is that without which the church cannot be preserved in its purity, nor its being be continued, as both reason and experience do manifest.

(4.) The judgment both of the fact and right was left unto the church itself; whence it was afterward highly commended by the apostle for the diligent discharge of its duty herein, ~~and~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6-8. In brief, it is such a divine order that is here prescribed as without the observance whereof no church can long subsist.

(5.) There is no difficulty in the other part of the objection, about the delivery unto Satan; for, —

[1.] It cannot be proved that hereon the offender was delivered so into the power of Satan, to be cruciated, agitated, and at length killed, as some imagine; nor can any instance of any such thing be given in the Scripture or antiquity, though there be many of them who, upon their rejection out of the church, were enraged unto an opposition against it, as it was with Simon Magus, Marcion, and others,

[2.] Yea, it is evident that there was no such thing included in their delivery unto Satan as is pretended: for the design and end of it was the man's humiliation, recovery, and salvation, as is expressly affirmed in the text; and this effect it actually had, for the man was healed and restored. Wherefore this delivery unto Satan is an ordinance of Christ for the exciting of saving grace in the souls of men, adapted unto the case of falling by scandalous sins, peculiarly effectual, above any other gospel ordinance.

Now, this cannot be such a delivery unto Satan as that pretended, which can have no other end but destruction and death.

[3.] This delivery unto Satan is no more but the casting of a man out of the visible kingdom of Christ, so giving him up, as unto his outward condition, into the state of heathens and publicans, which belonged unto the kingdom of Satan; for he who, by the authority of Christ himself, according unto his law and institution, is not only debarred from a participation of all the privileges of the gospel, but also visibly and regularly divested of all present right to them and interest in them, he belongs unto the visible kingdom of Satan. The gathering of men into the church by conversion is the “turning of them from the power of Satan unto God,” ~~408~~ Acts 26:18; a “delivery from the power of darkness,” — that is, the kingdom of Satan, — and a translation into the kingdom of Christ, ~~409~~ Colossians 1:13.

Wherefore, after a man hath, by faith and his conjunction unto a visible church, been translated into the kingdom of Christ, his just rejection out of it is the re-delivery of him into the visible kingdom of Satan; which is all that is here intended. And this is an act suited unto the end whereunto it is designed; for a man hereby is not taken out of his own power and the conduct of his own mind, not acted or agitated by the devil, but is left unto the sedate consideration of his present state and condition. And this, if there be any spark of ingenuous grace left in him, will be effectually operative, by shame, grief, and fear, unto his humiliation, especially understanding that the design of Christ and his church herein is only his repentance and restoration.

Here is, therefore, in this instance, an everlasting rule given unto the church in all ages, the ordinary occurrence of the like cases requiring an ordinary power for relief in them; without which the church cannot be preserved. That it is the duty of the church, enjoined unto it by the Lord Jesus Christ, and that necessary unto its glow, its own honor, and edification, to reject scandalous offenders out of its communion, is evidently declared in this place; and to suppose that to be the duty of the church which it hath no power and authority to discharge (seeing without them it cannot be discharged) is a wild imagination.

The *duty of the church* herein, with such other particular duties as suppose the institution hereof, are in many places directed and enjoined. It is so in

that insisted on, 1 Corinthians 5. The foundation of the whole discourse and practice of the apostle there recorded lies in this, that *churches ought to cut off from among them scandalous offenders*, and that to the end they may preserve themselves pure; and that this they ought to do in the name of Christ, and by virtue of his authority, ~~AND~~ 1 Corinthians 5:2-5, 7. And this is the whole of that excommunication which we plead for. The manner of its administration we shall consider afterward. ~~AND~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6-8, the apostle commends the church for what they had done in the excommunication of the incestuous person, calling it a punishment inflicted on him by them, verse 6. He gives also an account of the effect of this sentence against him; which was his humiliation and repentance, verse 7: and hereon he gives direction for his restoration, by an act of the church forgiving him and confirming their love unto him. Men may fancy to themselves strange notions of excommunication, With reference unto its power, the residence of that power, its effects, extent, and ends; and so either, on the one hand, erect it into an engine of arbitrary domination over the church and all the members of it, or deny, on the other, that there is any such institution of Christ in force in his churches: but we can be taught nothing more plainly of the mind of Christ than that he hath given power unto his church to cast out of their communion obstinate, scandalous offenders, and to restore them again upon their repentance, enjoining it unto them as their duty. And it is an evidence of a woful degeneracy in churches from their primitive institution, when the sentence is so administered as that it hath an effect by virtue of human laws or the outward concerns of men, but no influence on their consciences unto humiliation and repentance; which is the principal end of its appointment. The apostle treats of the same matter, ~~AND~~ Galatians 5:7-12. He speaks of those false teachers who opposed and overthrew, what lay in them, the fundamental doctrine of the gospel. These at that time were in great power and reputation in the churches of the Galatians, which they had corrupted with their false opinions, so that the apostle cloth not directly enjoin their immediate excision; yet he declares what they did deserve, and what was the duty of the church towards them when freed from their delusions: Verse 12, "I would they were even cut off that trouble you." Men have exercised their minds in curious conjectures about the sense of these words, altogether in vain and needlessly. The curiosity of some of the best of the ancients, applying it unto a forcible eunuchism, is extremely fond.

No other excision is intended but that which was *from the church*, and to be done by the church, in obedience unto the truth. Neither the subject-matter treated of, the nature of the crime condemned, nor the state of the church or design of the apostle, will admit of any other exposition. ^{<STR>}2 Thessalonians 3:6, the apostle gives command unto the brethren of the church, and that “in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ,” to “withdraw from every brother that walketh disorderly.” What it is to “walk disorderly” he declares immediately, — namely, to live in an open disobedience unto any of the commands of Christ, and “not after the tradition which he received of us;” that is, the doctrine of the gospel which he had delivered unto them. This withdrawing is as unto church-communion; which cannot be done but upon some act of the church depriving him of the right of it: for if every member of the church should be left unto his own judgment and practice herein, it would bring all things into confusion. And therefore, verse 14, he requires that a note be set on such a person by the church, — that is, a sentence be denounced against him, — before the duty of withdrawing from him by the brethren be incumbent on them. See to the same purpose ^{<STR>}Titus 3:10, 11; ^{<STR>}1 Timothy 5:20; ^{<STR>}Revelation 2:2, 14, 15, 20, 21.

It is therefore evident that this censure, judgment, spiritual punishment, is an institution of Christ, for whose administration he hath given authority unto his church, as that which is necessary unto its edification, with its preservation in honor, purity, and order.

There have been many disputes about it, as unto its order and kinds. Some suppose that there are two sorts of excommunication, — the one they call the “lesser,” and the other the “greater;” some, three sorts, as it is supposed there were among the Jews. There is no mention in the Scripture of any more sorts but one, or of any degrees herein. *A segregation from all participation in church-order*, worship, and privileges, is the only excommunication spoken of in the Scripture. But whereas an offending person may cause great disorder in a church, and give great scandal unto the members of it, before he can be regularly cut off or expelled the society, some do judge that there should *a suspension of him from the Lord’s table at least* precede total or complete excommunication in case of impenitency; and it ought in some cases so to be. But this suspension in not properly an especial institution, but only an act of prudence in church-

rule, to avoid offense and scandal And no men question but that this is lawful unto, yea, the duty of the rulers of the church, to require any one to forbear for a season from the use of his privilege in the participation of the supper of the Lord, in case of scandal and offense which would be taken at it and ensue thereon. And if any person shall refuse a submission unto them in this act of rule, the church hath no way for its relief but to proceed unto the *total removal* of such a person from their whole communion; for the edification of the whole church must not be obstructed by the refractoriness of any one among them.

This excommunication, as we have proved before, is *an act of church-authority* exerted in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if so, then it is an act of the officers of the church, — namely, so far as it is authoritative, — for there is no authority in the church, properly so called, but what resides in the officers of it. There is an office in the church which is merely ministerial, without any formal authority, — that is, of the deacons; but there is no authority in exercise but what is in the elders and rulers of the church. And there are two reasons which prove that the power of excommunication, as to the authoritative exercise of it, is in the elders of the church: —

1. Because the apostles, by virtue of their office-power in every church, did join in *the authoritative excommunication*, as is plain in the case insisted on, 1 Corinthians 5; and there is no office-power now remaining but what is in the elders of the church.

2. It is *an act of rule*; but all rule, properly so called, is in the hands of rulers only. We may add hereunto, that the care of the preservation of the church in its purity, of the vindication of its honor, of the edification of all its members, of the correction and salvation of offenders, is principally incumbent on them, or committed unto them, as we have declared; as also, that they are best able to judge when and for what the sentence ought to be denounced against any, which requires their best skill in the wisdom of spiritual rule. And therefore the omission of the exercise of it, when it was necessary, is charged as a neglect on the angels or rulers of the churches, as the due execution of it is commended in them; and therefore unto them it doth belong, with respect unto their office, and is thereon an office-act or an act of authority.

Howbeit, it cannot be denied but that the interest, yea, the power of the whole church, in the fraternity of it, is greatly to be considered herein; for indeed wherever the apostle treats of it, he doth not anywhere recommend it unto *the officers of the church* in a peculiar manner, but unto the whole church or the brethren therein. This is evident in the places before quoted. Wherefore the whole church is concerned herein, both in point of duty, interest, and power: —

1. In point of duty; for by virtue of the *mutual watch* of all the members of the church over each other, and of the care incumbent on every one of them, for the good, the honor, the reputation, and edification of the whole, it is their duty, jointly and severally, to endeavor the purging out from among them of every thing that is contrary unto these ends. And they who are not concerned in these things are dead and useless members of the church.

2. In *interest* they have also a concernment therein. They are to look that no root of bitterness spring up amongst them, lest themselves be at length defiled thereby. It is usually said that the good are not defiled by holding communion with them that are wicked in a participation of holy ordinances; and there is some truth in what is said, with reference unto wicked, undiscovered hypocrites, or such as are not scandalously flagitious: but to promote this persuasion, so as to beget an opinion in church-members that they are no way concerned in the scandalous sins and lives of those with whom they walk in all duties of spiritual communion, openly avowing themselves members of the same body with them, is a diabolical engine, invented to countenance churches in horrible security, unto their ruin. But yet, besides that defilement which may be contracted in a joint participation of the same ordinances with such persons, there axe other ways, almost innumerable, whereby their example, if passed by without animadversion, may be pernicious unto their faith, love, and obedience. Wherefore they are obliged in point of spiritual interest, as they take care of their own souls, to concur in the ejection out of the church of obstinate offenders.

3. In point of *power*; for the execution of this sentence is committed unto and rests in the body of the church. According as they concur and practice, so it is put in execution or suspended; for it is they who must withdraw

communion from them, or the sentence is of no use or validity. This punishment must be inflicted by the “many;” who also axe to restore him who is so rebuked. Wherefore, excommunication without the consent of the church is a mere nullity.

But if any one shall say that excommunication is not an act of authority or of office, but of power residing in the community, resulting from their common suffrage, guided and directed by the officers or elders of the church, I shall again take up this inquiry immediately, and speak unto it more distinctly, lest what is here spoken should not be sufficient unto the satisfaction of any.

Our next inquiry is concerning the *objects* of this church-censure, or who they are that ought to be excommunicated. And, —

1. They must be *members of that church* by which the sentence is to be denounced against, them; and this, as we have proved before, they cannot be without their *own consent*. One church cannot excommunicate the members of another. They are unto them, as unto this matter, “without,” and they have no power to judge them. The foundation of the right to proceed against any herein is in their own voluntary engagement to observe and keep the rules and laws of the society whereunto they are admitted. The offense is given unto that church in the first place, if not only; and it is an act of that church for its own edification. And there is a nullity in the sentence which is ordained, decreed, or denounced, by any who axe not officers of that church in particular wherein the sin is committed.

2. These church-members that may be justly excommunicated are of two sorts: — ^{f9}

(1.) Such as continue *obstinate* in the practice of any *scandalous sin* after private and public admonition. The process from the first offense in admonition is so stated, in ordinary cases, ⁴⁸⁵ Matthew 18:15-20, that there is no need further to declare it. The time that is to be allotted unto the several degrees of it shall be spoken unto afterward. And unto a right judgment of obstinacy in any scandalous sin, it is required, —

[1.] That the sin, considered in itself, be such as is *owned to be such by all*, without doubting, dispute, or hesitation. It must be some sin that is judged

and condemned in the light of nature or in the express testimony of Scripture; yea, such as the Holy Ghost witnesseth, that, continued in without repentance, it is inconsistent with salvation. If the thing itself to be animadverted on be dubious, or disputable whether it be a sin or no, especially such a sin, either from the nature of the fact, or the qualifications of the person offending, or from other circumstances, so as that the guilty person is not self-condemned, nor are others fully satisfied in their minds about the nature of it, there is no room for excommunication in such case. And if it be once allowed to be applied towards any sins but such as are evident to be so (as the apostle says, “The works of the flesh are manifest”) in the light of nature and express testimony of Scripture, not only will the administration of it be made difficult, a matter of dispute, unfit for the determination of the body of the church, but it will leave it unto the wills of men to prostitute it unto litigious brawls, quarrels, and differences, wherein interest and partiality may take place; which is to profane this divine institution. But confine it, as it ought to be, unto such sins as are condemned in the light of nature or by express testimony of Scripture, as inconsistent with salvation by Jesus Christ, if persisted in, and all things that belong unto the administration of it will be plain and easy.

From the neglect of this rule proceeded that horrible confusion and disorder, in excommunication and the administration of it, which for sundry ages prevailed in the world; for as it was mostly applied unto things holy, just, and good, or the performance of such gospel duties as men owed to Christ and their own souls, so being exercised with respect unto irregularities that are made such merely by the arbitrary constitutions and laws of men, and that in cases frivolous, trifling, and of no importance, it was found necessary to be managed in and by such courts, such processes, such forms of law, such pleadings and intricacies of craft, such a burden of cost and charge, as it is uncertain whether it ought to be more bewailed or derided.

[2.] It is required hereunto that *the matter of fact* as unto the relation of the sin unto the particular offender be *confessed*, or *not denied*, or *clearly proved*. How far this is to extend, and what ground of procedure there may be in reports or fame concurring with leading circumstances, we shall inquire afterward. And although in such cases of public fame, a good

testimony, from those of credit and repute in the church, given unto the supposed guilty person is of use, and sufficient, in some cases, singly to oppose unto public reports, yet to require a man to purge himself by others from any feigned scandalous imputation is an unwarrantable tyranny.

[3.] It is also required that the previous process, in and by private and public admonition, and that repeated, with *patient waiting* the success of each of them, be duly premised. Whether this extend itself unto all Causes of excommunication shall be afterward inquired into. Ordinarily it is so necessary unto the conviction of the mind and conscience of the offender, and to leave him without either provocation from the church or excuse in himself, so suited to be expressive of the grace and patience of Christ toward sinners, so requisite unto the satisfaction of the church itself in their procedure, as that the omission of it will probably render the sentence useless and ineffectual. A crying out, “I admonish a first, a second, a third time,” and so, to excommunication, is a very absurd observation of a divine institution.

[4.] It is required that *the case* of the person to be censured, as unto his profession of repentance on the one hand, or obstinacy on the other, be judged and determined by the whole church in love and compassion. There are few who are so profligately wicked but that, when the sin wherewith they are charged is evidently such in the light of nature and Scripture, and when it is justly proved against them, they will make some profession of sorrow and repentance. Whether this be sufficient, as in most cases it is, to suspend the present proceeding of the church, or quite to lay it aside, is left unto the judgment of the church itself, upon consideration of present circumstances and what is necessary unto its own edification. Only, this rule must be continually observed, that the least appearance of haste or undue precipitation herein is to be avoided in all these cases, as the bane of church rule and order.

Again; the manner of its administration according to the mind of Christ may be considered. And hereunto are required, —

1. Prayer, without which it can no way be administered in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. The administration of any solemn ordinance of the gospel without prayer is a horrible profanation of it; and the neglect or

contempt hereof, in any who take upon them to excommunicate others, is an open proclamation of the nullity of their act and sentence. And the observation of the administration of it without any due reverence of God, without solemn invocation of the name of Christ, thereby engaging his presence and authority in what they do, is that principally which hath set the consciences of all mankind at liberty from any concernment in this ecclesiastical censure, and whence those that administer it expect no other success of what they do but what they can give it by outward force: and where this fails, excommunication is quickly laid aside; as it was when the pope threatened the cantons of the Swiss, that if they complied not with some of his impositions, he would excommunicate them; whereon they sent him word “They would not be excommunicated;” which ended the matter. Wherefore, when our Lord Jesus Christ gives unto his church the power of binding and loosing, directing them in the exercise of that power, he directs them to ask assistance by prayer when they are gathered together, ~~4188~~ Matthew 18:18-20: and the apostle directs the church of Corinth that they should proceed unto this sentence when they were gathered together in the name of the Lord Jesus Christ, ~~4184~~ 1 Corinthians 5:4; which could not be without calling on his name. In brief, without prayer, neither is the ordinance itself sanctified unto the church, nor are any meet to administer it, nor is the authority of Christ either owned or engaged, nor divine assistance obtained, neither is what is done any more excommunication than any rash curse is; so that many [such] proceed inordinately out of the mouths of men.

And the prayer required herein is of three sorts: —

- (1.) That which is previous, for guidance and direction in a matter of so great weight and importance. It is no small thing to fall into mistakes when men act in the name of Christ, and so engage his authority in what he will not own; and the best of men, the best of churches, are liable unto such mistakes, when they are not under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, which is to be obtained by prayer only.
- (2.) In or together with the administration of it, that what is done on earth may be ratified in heaven, by the approbation of Christ, and be made effectual unto its proper end.

(3.) It must be followed with the prayer of the church unto the same purpose; all with respect unto the humiliation, repentance, healing, and recovery, of the offender.

2. It is to be accompanied with *lamentation* or mourning. So the apostle, reproving the church of Corinth for the omission of it when it was necessary, tells them that they had not “mourned,” that the offender might be taken away from among them, ^{<488>}1 Corinthians 5:2. It is not to be done without mourning. And himself calls the execution of this sentence, from this adjunct, his bewailing of them: “I shall bewail many that have sinned already,” ^{<4722>}2 Corinthians 12:21. Compassion for the person offending, with respect unto that dangerous condition whereinto he hath cast himself, the excision of a member of the same body, with whom they have had communion in the most holy mysteries of divine worship and sat down at the table of the Lord, with a due sense of the dishonor of the gospel by his fall, ought to ingenerate this mourning or lamentation in the minds of them who are concerned in the execution of the sentence; nor is it advisable for any church to proceed thereunto before they are so affected.

3. It is to be accompanied with a *due sense of the future judgment of Christ*; for we herein judge for Christ in the matters of his house and kingdom. And woe to them who dare pronounce this sentence without a persuasion, on good grounds, that it is the sentence of Christ himself! And there is a representation also in it of the future judgment, when Christ will eternally cut off and separate from himself all hypocrites and impenitent sinners. This is well expressed by Tertullian: “Ibidem etiam exhortationes, castigationes et censura divina” (speaking of the assemblies of the church), “ham et judicatur magno cum pondere, ut spud certos de Dei conspectu; summumque futuri iudicii praejudicium eat, si quis ira deliquerit ut a communicatione orationis et conventus, et omnis sancti commercii relegetur,” Apol. cap. 39. Were this duty observed, it would be a preservative against that intermixture of corrupt affections and corrupt ends which often impose themselves on the minds of men in the exercise of this power.

Lastly, The *nature and end* of this judgment or Sentence being *corrective*, not *vindictive*, — for healing, not destruction, — what is the duty of the church and those principally concerned in the pursuit of it, to render it

effectual, is plainly evident. Of what use a “significabit” and “capias”^{f10} may be in this case I know not; they belong not unto Christian religion, — much less do fire and fagot do so. Prayer for the person cut off, admonition as occasion is offered, compassion in his distressed estate (which is so much the more deplorable if he know it not), forbearance from common converse, with readiness for the restoration of love in all the fruits of it, contain the principal duties of the church and all the members of it towards them that are justly excommunicated.

What further belongeth unto this head of church ride or order shall be spoken unto in the resolution of some cases or inquiries, wherein some things only mentioned already shall be more fully explained.

I have made some inquiry before whether excommunication be an act of authority and jurisdiction in the officers of the church, or an act of power in the fraternity of the church; but, for the sake of some by whom it is desired, I shall a little more distinctly inquire after the truth herein, though I shall alter nothing of what was before laid down. And, —

1. It is certain, it hath been proved, and I now take it for granted, that the Lord *Christ hath given this power unto the church*. Wherefore, in the exercise of this power, both the officers and members of the church are to act according unto their respective interests; for that exercise of power in the church towards any which is not an act of obedience unto Christ in them that exercise it, is in itself null. There is, therefore, no distinction or distribution of power in the church, but by the interposition of especial duty.

2. The institution of Christ with respect unto a church as it is a *peculiar society*, for its *especial ends*, doth not deprive it of its natural right as it is a society. There is in every community, by voluntary confederation, a natural right and power to expel those from its society who will not be ruled by the laws of its constitution. And if the church should, by the institution of a power new as unto the way, manner, and ends of its exercise, be deprived of its original, radical power, with respect unto the general end of its own preservation, it would not be a gainer by that institution. It may be easily understood that the Lord Christ should, in particular, appoint the way and manner of the exercise of this power, or administration of this sentence, committing the care thereof unto the

officers of the church; but it cannot be well understood that thereby he should deprive the church of its right, and forbid them their duty in preserving their society entire and pure. Neither can it be in so an especial manner committed unto any, as that upon their neglect, whereby those who by the law and rule of Christ ought to be cast out of the church's communion are continued in it, unto its sin and defilement, the church itself should be free from guilt. Wherefore the apostle expressly chargeth the whole church of Corinth with sin and neglect of duty, in that the incestuous person was not put away from among them. This could not be, if so be the power of it were so in the hands of a few of the officers that the church had no right to act in it; for none can incur guilt merely by the defect of others in discharge of their duty.

3. The church, *essentially* considered, is before its ordinary officers; for the apostles ordained officers in every church. But the church in that state hath power to put away from among them and their communion an obstinate offender: they have it as they are a society by voluntary confederation. Wherein this comes short of authoritative excommunication will immediately appear.

4. Where a church is complete and *organized* with its stated rulers, as the church of Corinth was, yet rules, instructions, and commands, are given expressly unto the fraternity or community of the church, for their duty and acting in the administration of this sentence, and the cutting off of an offender, ~~¶~~ 1 Corinthians 5:1-7; ~~¶~~ 2 Corinthians 2:7, 8; yea, the ἐπιτιμία, or infliction of the sentence, is ascribed unto them, verse 6. All these things do suppose a right and duty thereon to act according to their interest in excommunication to reside in the whole church. Wherefore, —

5. There are *some acts* belonging hereunto that the church itself, in the body of the fraternity, cannot be excluded from without destroying the nature of the sentence itself and rendering it ineffectual. Such are, the previous cognizance of the cause, without which they cannot be blamed for any neglect about it; preparatory duties unto its execution, in prayer, mourning, and admonition, which are expressly prescribed unto them; and a testification of their consent unto it by their common suffrage. Without these things excommunication is but a name with a noise; it belongs not unto the order appointed by Christ in his church.

6. Hence arise the *duties* of the church towards an excommunicated person that are consequential unto his exclusion from among them. Such are, praying for him, as one noted by the church and under the discipline of Christ; avoiding communion with him in public and private, that he may be ashamed, and the like; — all which arise from their own voluntary actings in his exclusion, and such as without a judgment of the cause they cannot be obliged unto.

7. Yet, on the other side, unto the formal completeness of this sentence, an *authoritative act of office-power* is required: for, —

(1.) There is in it such an act of *rule* as is in the hands of the elders only;

(2.) The *executive* power of the keys in binding and loosing, so far as it compriseth authority to be acted in the name of Christ, is intrusted with them only.

8. Wherefore I shall say no more, in answer unto this inquiry, but that *excommunication* is an act of church-power in its officers and brethren, acting according unto their respective rights, interests, and duties, particularly prescribed unto them. The officers of the church act in it as officers, with authority; the brethren, or the body of the church, with power, yet so as that the officers are no way excluded from their power, consent, and suffrage, in the acting of the church, but have the same interest therein with all the other members of the church; — but the community of the church have no interest in those authoritative actings of the officers which are peculiar unto them. Where either of these is wanting, the whole duty is vitiated, and the sense of the sentence rendered ineffectual.

FIRST. It is inquired, *Whether excommunication, justly deserved, may and ought to be omitted in case of trouble or danger that may ensue unto the church thereon?*

It is usually granted that so it may and ought to be; which seems in general to have been the judgment of Austin.

The troubles and dangers intended are threefold: —

1. From the *thing* itself;

2. From the *persons* to be excommunicated;

3. From the *church*.

1. “Trouble may arise from the *thing* itself; for there being an exercise of authority or jurisdiction in it over the persons of men not granted from the civil magistrate by the law of the land, those that execute it may be liable unto penalties ordained in such cases.

2. “The *persons* to be excommunicated may be great, and of great interest in the world, so as that if they receive a provocation hereby, they may occasion or stir up persecution against the church, as it hath often fallen out.

3. “The *church* itself may be divided on these considerations, so as that lasting differences may be occasioned among them, which the omission of the sentence might prevent.”

For answer hereunto, some things must be premised; as, —

1. Here is no supposition of any thing sinful or morally evil in the church, its officers or any of its members, by refusing to omit the pronouncing of this sentence. Whether there be any sin in giving’ occasion unto the troubles mentioned, to be avoided by an omission of duty, is now to be inquired into.

2. We must suppose, —

(1.) That the *cause* of excommunication be clear and evident, both as unto the merit of the fact and the due application of it unto the person concerned, so as that no rational indifferent man shall be able to say that it is meet that such a one should be continued a member of such a society; as it ought to be wherever excommunication is administered.

(2.) That *sufficient time* and space for repentance, and for giving satisfaction unto the church (whereof afterward), hath been allowed unto the person after admonition.

(3.) That the church doth *really suffer in honor* and reputation by tolerating such a scandalous offender among them.

I answer, on these suppositions, I see no just reason to countenance the omission of the execution of this sentence, or to acquit the church from the guilt of sin in so doing; for, —

1. The first pretense of *danger* is vain. There is not the least shadow of jurisdiction in this act of the church. There is nothing in it that toucheth any thing which is under the protection and conservation of human laws. It reacheth not the persons of men in their lives, or liberties, or estates, or the least secular privileges that they do enjoy; it doth not expose them to the power or censures of others, nor prejudice them as unto office or advantage of life. There is, therefore, no concernment of the law of the land herein, — no more than in a parent's disinheriting a rebellious child.

2. As unto *danger of persecution* by the means of the person provoked, I say, —

(1.) The same may be pleaded as unto all other duties of obedience unto Jesus Christ wherewith the world is provoked, and so the whole profession of the church should give place to the fear of persecution. To testify against sin in the way of Christ's appointment is a case of confession.

(2.) The apostles were not deterred by this consideration from the excommunication of Simon Magus, the seducing Jews, Hymeneus and Alexander, with others.

(3.) The Lord Christ commendeth or reproveth his churches, according as they were strict in the observation of this duty or neglective of it, notwithstanding the fear of persecution thereon, Revelation 2, 3. And, —

(4.) He will take that care of his church, in all their obedience unto him, as shall turn all the consequences thereof unto their advantage.

3. As unto danger of *differences in the church* there is nothing to be said, but that if rule, order, love, and duty, will not prevent such differences, there is no way appointed of Christ for that end; and if they are sufficient for it (as they are abundantly), they must bear their own blame who occasion such differences.

SECONDLY. But it may be said, *What if such an offender as justly deserves to be excommunicated, and is under admonition in order thereunto in case*

of impenitency, should voluntarily withdraw himself from and leave the communion of the church, is there any necessity to proceed against him by excommunication?

Ans. 1. Some say it is enough if it be declared in the church that such a one hath cut off himself from the church, and is therefore no longer under their watch or care, but is left unto himself and the world. And this is sufficient with them who own no act of office-power or authority in excommunication, but esteem it only a noted cessation of communion; which destroys a principal branch of the power of the keys. Wherefore, —

2. Where the offense is plain, open, scandalous, persisted in, — where admonition is despised or not complied with, — it is the duty of the church to denounce the sentence of excommunication against such a person notwithstanding his voluntary departure; for, —

(1.) No man is to make an *advantage* unto himself, or to be freed from any disadvantage, censure, or spiritual penalty, by his own sin, such as is the voluntary relinquishment of the church by a person under admonition for scandalous offenses.

(2.) It is necessary unto the church, both as unto the discharge of its duty and the *vindication of its honor*, as also from the benefit and edification it will receive by those duties of humiliation, mourning, and prayer, which are necessary unto the execution of this sentence.

(3.) It is necessary for *the good and benefit of him* who so deserves to be excommunicated; for, —

[1.] The end of the institution of the ordinance is his correction, not his destruction; and may be effectual unto his repentance and recovery.

[2.] It is to be followed with sharp admonition and prayer; which in due time may reach the most profligate sinner.

(4.) It becomes not the *wisdom and order* of any society intrusted with authority for its own preservation, as the church is by Christ himself, to suffer persons obnoxious unto censure by the fundamental rules of that society to cast off all respect unto it, to break their order and relation, without animadverting thereon, according to the authority wherewith they are intrusted. To do otherwise is to expose their order unto contempt, and

proclaim a diffidence in their own authority for the spiritual punishment of offenders.

(5.) One end of the appointment of the power and sentence of excommunication in the church, is to give testimony unto *the future final judgment* of Christ against impenitent sinners, which none of them can run away from nor escape.

A THIRD inquiry may be, *Whether, in case of any great and scandalous sin, the church may proceed unto excommunication without any previous admonition?*

Ans. 1. Persons may be *falsely accused of* and charged with great sins, the greatest of sins, as well as those of a lesser degree, and that both by particular testimonies and public reports, as it was with the Lord Christ himself; which daily experience confirms. Wherefore all haste and precipitation, like that of David in judging the case of Mephibosheth, is carefully to be avoided, though they are pressed under the pretences of the greatness and notoriety of the sin.

2. There is no *individual actual sin* but is capable of great aggravation or alleviation from its circumstances, These the church is to inquire into, and to obtain a full knowledge of them, that all things being duly weighed, they may be affected with the sin in a due manner, or after a godly sort; which is essential unto the right administration of this ordinance.

3. This cannot be done without *personal conference* with the offender, who is to be allowed to speak for himself. This conference, in case guilt be discovered, cannot but have in it the nature of an admonition, whereon the church is to proceed, as in the case of previous solemn admonition, in the order and according to the rule which shall be immediately declared.

FOURTHLY. *Whether, on the first knowledge of an offense or scandalous sin, if it be known unto the church that the offending party is penitent, and willing to declare his humiliation and repentance for the satisfaction of the church, the church may proceed unto his excommunication, in case the sin be great and notorious?*

Ans. **1.** It is certain that, in an orderly progress, as unto more private sins, a compliance by repentance with the first or second admonition doth put a stop unto all further ecclesiastical procedure.

2. But whereas the inquiry is made concerning sins either in their own nature or in their circumstances great and of disreputation unto the church, I answer, —

If repentance be evidenced unto the consciences of the rulers of the church to be sincere, and proportionable unto the offense in its outward demonstration, according unto the rule of the gospel, so as that they are obliged to judge in charity that the person sinning is pardoned and accepted with Christ, as all sincerely penitent sinners undoubtedly are, the church cannot proceed unto the excommunication of such an offender; for,

—

(1.) It would be publicly to *reject them* whom they acknowledge that *Christ doth receive*. This nothing can warrant them to do; yea, so to do is to set up themselves against Christ, or at least to make use of his authority against his mind and will. Yea, such a sentence would destroy itself; for it is a declaration that Christ doth disapprove them whom he doth approve.

(2.) Their so doing would make *a misrepresentation of the gospel*, and of the Lord Christ therein; for whereas the principal design of the gospel, and of the representation that is made therein of Christ Jesus, is to evidence that all sincerely penitent sinners, that repent according unto the rule of it, are and shall be pardoned and accepted, by the rejection of such a person in the face of his sincere repentance, there is an open contradiction thereunto. Especially it would give an undue sense of the heart, mind, and will of Christ towards repenting sinners, such as may be dangerous unto the faith of believers, so far as the execution of this sentence is doctrinal; for such it is, and declarative of the mind of Christ according unto the judgment of the church. The image, therefore, of this excommunication which is set up in some churches, wherein the sentence of it is denounced without any regard unto the mind of Christ, as unto his acceptance or disapprobation of those whom they excommunicate, is a teacher of lies.

(3.) Such a procedure is *contrary unto the nature and end of this sentence*; for it is corrective and instructive, not properly punishing and vindictive.

The sole end of it, with respect whereunto it hath its efficacy from divine institution, is the humiliation, repentance, and recovery, of the sinner; and if this be attained before, the infliction of this sentence is contrary to the nature and end of it.

It will be said “That it hath another end also, — namely, the preservation of the purity of the church, and the vindication of its honor and reputation, wherein it suffers by the scandalous offenses of any of its members.” Whereunto I say, —

- (1.) No church is or can be made impure by them whom Christ hath purged, as he doth all those who are truly penitent;
- (2.) It is no dishonor unto any church to have sinners in it who have evidenced sincere repentance;
- (3.) The present offense and scandal may be provided against by an act of rectorial prudence, in causing the offending person to abstain from the Lord’s table for a season.

FIFTHLY. It is inquired, *Whether such as voluntarily, causelessly, and disorderly, do leave the communion of any church whereof they are members, though not guilty of any scandalous immoralities, may and ought to be excommunicated?*

Ans. **1.** Where persons are esteemed members of churches by *external causes, without their own consent*, or by parochial cohabitation, they may remove from one church unto another by the removal of their habitation, according unto their own discretion; for such cohabitation being the *only formal cause* of any relation to such a church in particular, upon the ceasing of that cause, the relation ceaseth of its own accord.

2. Where persons are members of churches by *mutual confederation* or express personal consent, causeless departure from them is an evil liable unto many aggravations.

3. But whereas the principal end of all particular churches is *edification*, there may be many just and sufficient reasons why a person may remove himself from *the constant communion of one church* unto that of another; and of these reasons he himself is judge, on whom it is incumbent to take care of his own edification above all other things. Nor ought the church to

deny unto any such persons their liberty, desired peaceably and according unto order.

4. It was declared before that where any persons guilty of, and under admonition for, any *scandalous sin* do withdraw from the communion of any church, their so doing is no impediment unto a further procedure against them.

5. Whereas there are amongst us churches, or those which are so esteemed in the consciences of men, so far differing in principles and practices as that they have not entire communion with one another in all parts of divine worship, it may be inquired, *Whether, if a man leave a church of one sort to join with one of another, as suppose he leave a select congregation to join in a parochial church constantly and totally, he may be justly excommunicated for so doing without the consent of the church whereunto he did belong?*

Ans. **1.** It is certain, on the one hand, that if any man leave the communion of parochial assemblies to join himself unto a select congregation, those who have power over those parishes will make no question whether they shall excommunicate him or no in their way. But, —

2. Supposing persons so departing from particular congregations, —

(1.) To be free from *scandalous sins*;

(2.) That they depart quietly, without attempting disorder or confusion in the church;

(3.) That they do *actually join themselves* unto the communion of some church, whose constitution, principles, and worship, they do approve, whereby their visible profession is preserved, — the church may not justly proceed unto their excommunication; it may suffice to declare that such persons have, of their own accord, forsaken the communion of the church, are no more under its watch and care, neither is the church further obliged towards them, but as unto Christian duties in general.

6. As for those whose departure is, as voluntary and causeless, so accompanied with other evils, such as are revilings, reproaches, and false accusations (as is usual in such cases), they may be proceeded against as obstinate offenders.

The SIXTH inquiry is, *What time is to be given after solemn admonition, before actual excommunication?*

Ans. 1. The manner of some, to run over the words, “I admonish you a first, second, and third time,” so immediately to make way for the sentence of excommunication, is that wherein men are greatly to be pitied, for their ignorance of the nature of those things which they take on themselves to act, order, and dispose of, — that we ascribe it not unto worse and more evil causes.

2. The nature of the thing itself requires a considerable season or *space of time* between solemn admonition and excommunication: for the end and design of the former is the repentance and recovery of the offender; nor doth its efficacy thereunto depend on or consist in the actual giving of it, but it is as other moral causes, which may work gradually upon occasional advantages. Want of light, some present exasperation and temptation, may seem to frustrate a present admonition, when they do but suspend its present efficacy, which it may afterward obtain on the conscience of the offender.

3. It being a *church-admonition* that is intended, it is the duty of the church to abide in prayer and waiting for the fruit of it, according to the appointment of Christ; and herein the case may possibly require some long time to be spent.

4. No present *appearance of obstinacy* or impenitence under admonition (which is usually pleaded) should cause an immediate procedure unto excommunication; for, —

(1.) It is contrary unto the *distinct institution* of the one and the other, wherein the former is to be allowed its proper season for its use and efficacy.

(2.) It doth not represent *the patience and forbearance of Christ towards his church* and all the members of it.

(3.) It is not suited unto the rule of that love which “hopeth nil things, beareth all things,” etc.

(4.) All grounds of hope for the recovery of sinners by repentance are to be attended unto, so as to defer the ultimate sentence.

“Nulla unquam de morte hominis cunctatio longa est.” — Juv. Sat. 6:220.

5. If new sins are added, of the same or any other kind, unto former scandals, whilst persons are under admonition, it is an indication of the necessity of a procedure.

SEVENTHLY. It may be further inquired, *Whether a man may be excommunicated for errors in matters of faith, or false opinions about them?*

Ans. **1.** The case is so plainly and positively stated, ^{<610>}Revelation 2:2, 6, 14, 15, 20, ^{<509>}1 Timothy 1:19, 20, ^{<508>}Titus 3:10, 11, and other places, that it needs no further determination. Wherefore, —

2. If the errors intended are about or against the *fundamental truths* of the gospel, so as that they that hold them cannot “hold the Head,” but really make “shipwreck of the faith,” no pretended usefulness of such persons, no peaceableness as unto outward deportment, which men guilty of such abominations will frequently cover themselves withal, can countenance the church in forbearing, after due admonition, to cut them off from their communion. The nature of the evil, the danger that is from it unto the whole church, as from a gangrene in any member unto the body, the indignation of Christ expressed against such pernicious doctrines, the opposition of them to the building of the church on the Rock, which inmost of them is opposed, do render a church altogether inexcusable who omit their duty herein.

3. *False opinions* in lesser things, when the foundation of faith and Christian practice is not immediately concerned, may be tolerated in a church; and sundry rules are given unto this end in the Scripture, as ^{<540>}Romans 14:1-3, etc., ^{<505>}Philippians 3:15, 16. Howbeit, in that low ebb of grace, love, and prudence, which we are come unto, it is best for edification that all persons peaceably dispose themselves into those societies with which they most agree in principles and opinions, especially such as relate or lead unto practice in any duties of worship. But, —

4. With respect unto such opinions, if men wilt, as is usual, *wrangle and contend*, to the disturbance of the peace of the church, or hinder it in any duty, with respect unto its own edification, and will neither peaceably

abide in the church nor peaceably depart from it, they may and ought to have proceeded against with the censures of the church.

EIGHTHLY. Whether persons excommunicated out of any church may be admitted unto the hearing of the word in the assemblies of that church?

Ans. **1.** They may be so, as also to be present at all duties of moral worship; for so may heathens and unbelievers, ⁴⁶¹²1 Corinthians 14:23, 24.

2. When persons are under this sentence, the church is in a state of expecting of their recovery and return, and therefore are not to prohibit them any means thereof, such as is preaching of the word.

NINTHLY. How far extends the rule of the apostle towards persons rejected of the church, ⁴⁶¹¹1 Corinthians 5:11, “*With such an one no not to eat;*” as that also, “*Note that man, and have no company with him, that he may be ashamed,*” ⁵⁰⁸⁴2 Thessalonians 3:14?

1. To “eat” compriseth all *ordinary converse* in things of this life: “Give us our daily bread.” To “note” is either the act of the church setting the mark of its censure and disapprobation on him, or the duty of the members of the church to take notice of him as unto the end of not keeping company with him. Wherefore, —

2. Herein all ordinary converse of *choice*, not made necessary by previous occasions, is forbidden. The rule, I say, forbids, —

(1.) All ordinary converse of choice, not that which is occasional;

(2.) Converse about earthly, secular things, not that which is spiritual, for such an one may and ought still to be admonished whilst he will hear the word of admonition;

(3.) It is such converse as is not made previously necessary by men’s mutual engagements in trade and the like, for that is founded on such rules of right and equity, with such obligations in point of truth, as excommunication cannot dissolve.

3. No *suspension* of duties antecedently necessary by virtue of natural or moral relation is allowed or countenanced by this rule; such are those of husband and wife, parents and children, magistrates and subjects, masters and servants, neighbors, relations in propinquity or blood. No duties


arising from or belonging unto any of these relations are released, or the obligation unto them weakened, by excommunication. Husbands may not hereon forsake their wives if they are excommunicated, nor wives their husbands; magistrates may not withdraw their protection from any of their subjects because they are excommunicated, much less may subjects withhold their obedience on any pretense of the excommunication of their magistrates as such. And the same is true as unto all other natural or moral relations.


4. The *ends* of this prohibition are, —

- (1.) To testify our condemnation of the sin and disapprobation of the person guilty of it, who is excommunicated;
- (2.) The preservation of ourselves from all kinds of participation in his sin;
- (3.) To make him ashamed of himself, that if he be not utterly profligate and given up unto total apostasy, it may occasion in him thoughts of returning.

TENTHLY. *How ought persons excommunicated to be received into the church upon their repentance?*

Ans. **1.** As unto the *internal manner*, with all readiness and cheerfulness, with, —

(1.) Meekness, to take from them all discouragement and disconsolation,  Galatians 6:1;

(2.) With compassion and all means of relief and consolation,  2 Corinthians 2:7;

(3.) With love in all the demonstrations of it, verse 8;

(4.) With joy, to represent the heart of Christ towards repenting sinners.

2. The *outward manner* of the restoration of such a person consists in, —

- (1.) His testification of his repentance unto the satisfaction of the church;
- (2.) The express consent of the church unto his reception;

(3.) His renewed engagement in the covenant of the church, whereby he is re-instated or jointed again in the body in his own proper place; — in all which the elders, by their authority, are to go before the church.

All sorts of persons do now condemn the opinions of the Novatians in refusing the re-admission of lapsed sinners into the church, upon repentance. But there may be an evil observed amongst some leading that way, or unto what is worse; and this is, that they seek not afar the recovery of those that are excommunicated, by prayer, admonition, exhortation, in a spirit of meekness and tenderness, but are well satisfied that they have quitted themselves of their society. It is better never to excommunicate any, than so to Carry it towards them when they are excommunicated. But there is a sort of men unto whom if a man be once an offender, he shall be so for ever.

ELEVENTHLY. Our last inquiry shall be, *Whether excommunication may be regular and valid when the matter of right is dubious and disputable, — as many such cases may fall out, especially with respect unto the occasions of life and mutual converse, — or when the matter of fact is not duly proved by positive witnesses on the one hand, and is denied on the other?*

Ans. 1. The foundation of the *efficacy* of excommunication, next and under its divine institution, lies in the light and conviction of the consciences of them that are to be excommunicated. If these are not affected with a sense of guilt, as in dubious, cases they may not be, the sentence will be of no force or efficacy.

2. A case wherein there is a difference in the judgment of *good and wise* men about it is to be esteemed such a dubious case as is exempted from this censure. Nothing is to be admitted here to take place but what is reprobable by natural light and the concurrent judgment of them that fear God.

3. If the case be about such a *right or wrong*, in pretended fraud, over-reaching, or the like, as is determinable by civil laws, the church is no judge in such cases, unless it be by way of arbitration, 1 Corinthians 6.

4. If the question be about *doctrines* that are not on points fundamental, so as those who dissent from the church do carry it peaceably and orderly, there can be no procedure unto ecclesiastical censure; but if men will dote

on their own opinions, wrangling, contending, and breaking the peace of the church about them, there are other rules given in that case.

5. If the *matter of fact* be to be determined and stated by *witness*, it is absolutely necessary, by virtue of divine institution, that there be two or three concurrent testimonies; one witness is not to be regarded. See ~~Deuteronomy~~ Deuteronomy 19:15; ~~Numbers~~ Numbers 35:30; ~~Matthew~~ Matthew 18:16, etc.

Wherefore the ensuing rules or directions are to be observed in the matter of excommunication: —

1. No excommunication is to be allowed in *cases dubious* and disputable, wherein right and wrong are not easily determinable unto all unprejudiced persons that know the will of God in such things; nor is it to be admitted when the matter of fact stands in need of testimony, and is not proved by two witnesses at the least.

2. All *prejudices*, all partiality, all provocations, all haste and precipitation, are most carefully to be avoided in this administration; for the judgment is the Lord's. Wherefore, —

3. We are continually, in all things that *tend unto this sentence*, and eminently in the sentence itself, to charge our consciences with the mind of Christ and what he would do himself in the case, considering his love, grace, mercy, and patience, with instances of his condescension which he gave us in this world.

4. There is also required of us herein a constant remembrance that we also are in the flesh and liable to temptation; which may restrain and keep in awe that forwardness and confidence which some are apt to manifest in such cases. In all these things a watchful eye is to be kept over the methods of Satan, who by all means seeks to pervert this ordinance unto the destruction of men, which is appointed for their edification; and he too often prevails in that design. And if, by the negligence of a church in the management and pursuit of this ordinance, he get advantage to pervert it unto the ruin of any, it is the fault of that church, in that they have not been careful of the honor of Christ therein.

Wherefore, —

1. As excommunication by a *cursed noise and clamor*, with bell, book, and candle (such as we have instances of in some papal councils), is a horrible antichristian abomination: so, —
2. It is an undue representation of Christ and his authority, for persons openly guilty of profaneness in sinning to excommunicate them who are blameless in all Christian obedience.
3. All excommunication is evangelically null where there is wanting an evangelical, frame of spirit in those by whom it is administered, and there is present an anti-evangelical order in its administration.
4. It is sufficiently evident that, after all the contests and disputes about this excommunication that have been in the world, the noise that it hath made, the horrible abuses that it hath been put unto, the wresting of all church order and rule to give countenance unto a corrupt administration of it, with the needless oppositions that have been made against its institution, there is nothing in it, nothing belongs unto it, nothing is required unto its administration, wherein men's outward interests are at all concerned, and which the smallest number of sincere Christians in any church-society may not perform and discharge unto the glory of Christ and their own edification.

It is the mystery of iniquity that hath traversed these things into such a state and posture as is unintelligible unto spiritual wisdom, unpracticable in the obedience of faith, and ruinous unto all evangelical order and discipline.

CHAPTER 11.

OF THE COMMUNION OF CHURCHES.

CHURCHES so appointed and established in order as hath been declared ought to hold communion among themselves, or with each other, as unto all the ends of their institution and order, for these are the same in all; yea, the *general end* of them is in order of nature considered antecedently unto their institution in *particular*. This end is, the edification of the body of Christ in general, or the *church catholic*. The promotion hereof is committed jointly and severally unto all *particular churches*. Wherefore, with respect hereunto, they are obliged unto mutual communion among themselves; which is their consent, endeavor, and conjunction, in and for the promotion of the edification of the catholic church, and therein their own, as they are parts and members of it.

This communion is incumbent on every church with respect unto all other churches of Christ in the world equally. And the duties and acts of it in all of them are of the same kind and nature; for there is, no such disparity between them or subordination among them as should make a difference between the acts of their mutual communion, so as that the acts of some should be acts of authority, and those of others acts of obedience or subjection. Wherever there is a church, whether it be at Rome or Eugubium, in a city or a village, the communion of them all is mutual, the acts of it of the same kind, however one church may have more advantages to be useful and helpful therein than another. And the abuse of those advantages was that which wrought effectually in the beginning of that disorder which at length destroyed the catholic church, with all church-communion whatever: for some churches, especially that of Rome, having many advantage, in gifts, abilities, numbers, and reputation above many, above most churches, for usefulness in their mutual communion, the guides of it insensibly turned and perverted the addresses made unto them, the advices and assistances desired of them in way of communion, or their pretences of such addresses and desires, into a usurpation, first of a primacy of honor, then of order, then of supremacy and jurisdiction, unto the utter overthrow of all Church order and communion, and at length of

the whole nature of the catholic church, as stated and subsisting in particular churches; as we shall see.

All churches, on their first institution, quickly found themselves indigent and wanting, though not as unto their being, power, and order, yet as unto their *well-being*, with their preservation in truth and order upon extraordinary occurrences, as also with respect unto their usefulness and serviceableness unto the general end of furthering the edification of the church catholic. The care hereof, and the making provision for this defect, was committed by our Lord Jesus Christ unto the apostles during their lives, which Paul calls *Ἡ μέριμνα πασῶν τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν*, ^{<112>2} Corinthians 11:28, “The care of all the churches;” yet what was only a pressing care and burden unto them was afterward contended for by others as a matter of dignity and power! the pretense of it, in one especially, being turned into a cursed domination, under the style and title of “*Servus servorum Dei*.”

But if a thousand pretences should be made of supplying churches’ defects, aider the decease of the apostles, by any other order, way, or means besides this of the equal communion of Churches among themselves, they will be all found destitute of any countenance from the Scripture, primitive antiquity, the nature, use, and end of churches, yea, of Christian religion itself. Yet the pretense hereof is the sole foundation of all that disposal of churches into several stories of subordination, with an authority and jurisdiction over one another, which now prevails in the world. But there is no place for such imagination, until it be proved either that our Lord Jesus Christ hath not appointed the mutual communion of churches among themselves by their own consent, or that it is not sufficient for the preservation of the union and furtherance of the edification of the church catholic, whereunto it is designed.

Wherefore, our Lord Jesus Christ, in his infinite wisdom, hath constituted his churches in such a state and order as wherein none of them are able of themselves, always and in all instances, to attain all the ends for which they are appointed, with respect unto the edification of the church catholic; and he did it for this end, that whereas the whole catholic church is animated by one spirit, which is the bond of union between all particular

churches (as we shall see), every one of them may act the gifts and graces of it unto the preservation and edification of the whole.

Herein then, we acknowledge, lieth the great difference which we have with others about the state of the church of Christ in this world. We do believe that *the mutual communion of particular churches* amongst themselves, in an equality of power and order, though not of gifts and usefulness, is the only way appointed by our Lord Jesus Christ, after the death of the apostles, for the attaining the general end of all particular churches, which is the edification of the church catholic, in faith, love, and peace. Other ways and means have been found out in the world for this end, which we must speak unto immediately. Wherefore it behoveth us to use some diligence in the consideration of the causes, nature, and use, of this communion of churches.

But it must be moreover premised, that whereas this communion of churches is *radically* and *essentially* the same among all churches in the world, yet, as unto the ordinary actual exercise of the duties of it, it is confined and limited by divine providence unto such churches as the natural means of the discharge of such duties may extend unto; that is, unto those which are planted within such *lines of communication*, such precincts or boundaries of places and countries, as may not render the mutual performance of such duties insuperably difficult. Yet is not the world itself so wide but that, all places being made pervious by navigation, this communion of churches may be visibly professed, and in some instances practiced, among all churches, “from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same,” where the name of Christ is known among the Gentiles; wherein the true nature of the catholic church and its union doth consist, which is utterly overthrown by the most vehement pretences that are made unto it, as those in the church of Rome.

Wherefore such a communion of churches is to be inquired after as from which no true church of Christ is or can be excluded; in whose actual exercise they may and ought all to live, and whereby the general end of all churches, in the edification of the catholic church, may be attained. This is the true and only *catholicism* of the church; which whosoever departs from, or substitutes any thing else in the room of it under that name,

destroys its whole nature, and disturbs the whole ecclesiastical harmony that is of Christ's institution.

However, therefore, we plead for the rights of particular churches, yet our real controversy with most in the world is for the being, union, and communion of the church catholic; which are variously perverted by many, separating it into parties, and confining it to rules, measures, and canons, of their own finding out and establishment: for such things as these belong neither to the internal nor external form of that catholic church whose being in the world we believe, and whose union we are obliged to preserve. And whosoever gives any description of or limitation to the catholic church besides what consists in the communion of particular churches intended, doth utterly overthrow it, and therein an article of our faith.

But this communion of churches cannot be duly apprehended unless we inquire and determine wherein their union doth consist, for *communion* is an *act of union* that receives both its nature and power from it or by virtue of it; for of what nature soever the union of things distinct in themselves be, of the same is the communion that they have among themselves.

In the church of Rome, the *person of the pope*, as he is pope, is the head and center of all church-union, nor is there allowed any union of particular churches with Christ or among themselves but in and through him. A universal subjection unto him and his authority is the original spring of all church-union among them: and if any one soul fail herein, — if, as unto things of faith and divine worship, he do not depend on the pope and live in subjection unto him — he is reputed a stranger and foreigner unto the catholic church; yea, they affirm that be a man never so willing for and desirous of an interest in Christ, he cannot have it but by the pope!

The communion of churches congenial and suited unto this union, proceeding from it and exercised by virtue of it, ariseth from a various *contignation of order*, or the erection of one story of church-interest upon another, until we come to the idol placed on the top of this Babel. So is this communion carried on from the obedience and subjection of the lowest rubbish of ecclesiastical order unto diocesans, of them to metropolitans, of them to patriarchs or cardinals, of them to the pope; or an ascent is made

from diocesan synods, by provincial and national, to those that are called oecumenical, whose head is the pope.

Yet two things must be further observed, to clear this communion of the Roman Catholic church; as, —

1. That there is no ascent of church order or power by a *vital act of communion* from the lower degrees, orders, or consociations, and by them to the pope, as though he should receive any thing of church-power from them; but all the plenitude of it being originally vested in him, by these several orders and degrees he communicates of it unto all churches, as the life of their conjunction and communion.
2. That no man is so jointed in this order, so compacted in this body, but that he is also personally and immediately subject to the pope, and depends on him as unto his whole profession of religion.

And this is that which constitutes him formally to be what he is, — that is, antichrist; and the church-state arising from its union unto him, holding him as its head, subsisting in a communion by virtue of power received through various orders and constitutions from him, to be antichristian: for he and it are set up in the room of, and in direct opposition unto, the Lord Christ, as the head of the catholic church and the church-state thereon depending. This we have described, ~~ROM~~ Ephesians 4:15, 16: “Speaking the truth in love, may grow up,” etc.; as also ~~ROM~~ Colossians 2:19, where there is a rejection of them who belong not unto the church catholic, taken from its relation unto Christ, and the nature of its dependence on him: “Not holding the Head,” etc.

When men shall cease to be wilfully blind, or when the powers of the “strong delusion,” that begin to abate, shall expire, they will easily see the direct opposition that is between these two heads and two churches, namely, Christ and the pope, the catholic church and that of Rome.

I know well enough all the evasions and distinctions that are invented to countenance this antichristianism: as, “That there is a double head, — one of *internal influence* of grace, which Christ is, and the pope is not; the other of *rule and authority*, which the pope is. But this also is twofold, supreme and remote, and immediate and subordinate; the first is Christ, the latter is the pope. And there is yet further a twofold head of the

church, — the one invisible, which is Christ; the other visible, which is the pope.”

Not to insist on these gross and horrible figments of a *twofold head of the catholic church*, in any sense, which are foreign to the Scripture, and foreign to antiquity, whereof never one word was heard in the church for six hundred years after Christ, deforming the beautiful spouse of Christ into a monster, we will allow, at present, that the pope is only the immediate, visible, subordinate head of all rule and authority to their church; which is what they plead for. Then I say, that the church whereof he is the head is his body, that it holds him as its head, that it is compacted together by the officers and orders that depend on him and receive all their influence of church power and order from him: which though he communicates not by an internal influence of grace and gifts, (alas, poor wretch!) yet he doth it by officers, offices, orders, and laws; so giving union and communion unto the whole body by the effectual working of every joint and part of the hierarchy under him, for its union, communion, and edification. This, I say, is the antichrist and the antichristian church-state, as I shall be at any time ready to maintain.

Let any man take a due prospect of this head and this body, as related and united by the bond of their own rules, constitutions, and laws, acting in worldly pomp, splendor, and power, with horrid, bloody cruelties against all that oppose them, and he will not fail of an open view of all the scriptural lineaments of the apostate, anti-christian state of the church.

I say again, this assigning of the original of all church order, union, and communion, unto the pope of Rome, investing him there-with as an article of faith, constituting him thereby the head of the church, and the church thereon his body, — as it must be if he be its head, so as that from him all power of order, and for all acts of communion, should be derived, returning all in obedience and subjection unto him, — doth set up a visible, conspicuous, antichristian church-state in opposition unto Christ and the catholic church. But with this sort of men we deal not at present.

There is a pretense unto a union of churches not derived from the papal headship; and this consists in the *canonical subjection of particular churches unto a diocesan bishop* and of such bishops to metropolitans, which though “*de facto*” it be at present terminated and stated within the

bounds of a nation, yet “de jure” it ought to be extended unto the whole catholic church.

According unto this principle, the union of the catholic church consists in that order whereby particular churches are distributed into deaneries, archdeaconries, exempt peculiars, under officials; dioceses, provinces, under metropolitans; and so by or without patriarchs, to avoid the rock of the Papacy, issuing in a general council, as I suppose. But, —

1. To confine the union and communion of the catholic church hereunto is at present absolutely destructive both of the church and its communion: for all particular churches, when they are by a coalescency extended unto those which are provincial or national, have, both politically and ecclesiastically, such bounds fixed unto them as they cannot pass to carry on communion unto and with the church as catholic, by any acts and duties belonging unto their order; and hereby the union and communion of the church is utterly lost, for the union of the catholic church, as such, doth always equally exist, and the communion of it is always equally in exercise, and can consist in nothing but what doth so exist and is so exercised. Wherever is the catholic church, there is the communion of saints; but nothing of this can be obtained by virtue of this order.

2. We inquire at present after such a union as gives particular churches *communion among themselves*, which this order doth not, but absolutely overthrows it, leaving nothing unto them but subjection to officers set over them, who are not of them, according to rules and laws of their appointment; which is foreign to the Scripture and antiquity.

3. This order itself, the only bond of the pretended union, having *no divine institution*, especially as to its extent unto the whole catholic church, nor any intimation in the Scripture, and being utterly impossible to be put in execution or actual exercise, no man can declare what is the original or center of it, whence it is deduced, and whereon it rests.

Having removed these pretences out of our way, we may easily discern wherein the union, and consequently the communion, of all particular churches doth consist; and in the due observation whereof all that church-order which the Lord Christ hath appointed and doth accept is preserved.

I say, then, that the true and only union of all particular churches consists in that which gives form, life, and being unto the church catholic, with the addition of what belongs unto them as they are particular; and this is, that they have all one and the same God and Father, one Lord Jesus Christ, one faith and one doctrine of faith, one hope of their calling, or the promised inheritance, one regeneration, one baptism, one bread and wine, and are united unto God and Christ in one Spirit, through the bond of faith and love.

This description, with what is suited thereunto and explanatory of it, is all the account which is given us in the Scripture of the constituting form of the catholic church, and of the union of particular churches among themselves. What church soever fails in the essential parts of this description, or any of them, it is separated from the catholic church, nor hath either union or communion with any true churches of Christ.

Two things concur unto the completing of this union of churches, —

1. Their *union or relation* unto Christ;
2. That which they have *among themselves*.

1. The Lord Christ himself is the *original and spring* of this union, and every particular church is united unto him as its head; besides which, with or under which, it hath none. This relation of the church unto Christ as its head the apostle expressly affirms to be the foundation and cause of its union, ^{<401>}Ephesians 4:15, 16, ^{<502>}Colossians 2:19, — the places before quoted. Hereby it is also in God the Father, ^{<500>}2 Thessalonians 1:1, or hath God as its Father. And unless this union be dissolved, unless a church be disunited from Christ, it cannot be so from the catholic church, nor any true church of Christ in particular, however it may be dealt withal by others in the world.

From Christ, as the head and spring of union, there proceedeth unto all particular churches a bond of union, which is his Holy Spirit, acting itself in them by faith and love, in and by the ways and means and for the ends of his appointment.

This is the kingly, royal, beautiful union of the church: Christ, as the only head of influence and rule, bringing it into a relation unto himself as his

body, communicating of his Spirit unto it, governing it by the law of his word, enabling it unto all the duties of faith, love, and holiness.

For unto the completing of this union on the part of the church, these things are required: —

- (1.) Faith in him, or holding him as the head, in the sincere belief of all things concerning his person, office, and doctrine in the gospel, with whatever belongs thereunto;
- (2.) Love unto him and all that is his;
- (3.) That especial holiness whose foundation is repentance and effectual vocation;
- (4.) The observance of his commands as unto all duties of divine worship. These things are essentially requisite, unto this union on the part of the church. The reality and power of them is the internal form of the church, and the profession of them is its external form.

2. There concurrerth hereunto an *union among themselves*, I mean all particular churches throughout the world, in whom the church catholic doth act its power and duty. And the relation that is between these churches is that which is termed “*relatio aequiparentiae*,” wherein neither of the “*relata*” is the first foundation of it, but they are equal. It doth not arise from the subordination of one unto another, they being all equal as unto what concerns their essence and power. And the bond hereof is that especial love which Christ requireth among all his disciples, acting itself unto all the ends of the edification of the whole body.

Take in the whole, and the union of churches consists in their relation unto God as their Father, and unto Christ as their only immediate head of influence and rule, with a participation of the same Spirit in the same faith and doctrine of truth, the same kind of holiness, the same duties of divine worship, especially the same mysteries of baptism and the supper, the observance of the same rules or commands of Christ in all church-order, with mutual lodge, effectual unto all the ends of their being and constitution, or the edification of the church catholic.

There may be failures in them or some of them, as unto sundry of these things; there may be differences among, them about them, arising from the

infirmities, ignorance, and prejudices of them of whom they do consist, the best knowing here but in part; but whilst the substance of them is preserved, the union of all churches, and so of the catholic church, is preserved.

This is that blessed oneness which the Lord Christ prayed for so earnestly for his disciples, that they might be one in the Father and the Son, one among themselves, and “made perfect in one,” ^{<B7ZD>}John 17:20-23, without any respect unto that horrid image of it which was set up in the latter days of the church, which all men were compelled to bow down unto and worship by the fire of Nebuchadnezzar’s furnace. Of any other union there is not the least mention in the Scripture.

This union of the catholic church in all particular churches is always the same, inviolable, unchangeable, comprehending all the churches in the world at all times, not confinable unto any state or party, not interruptible by any external form, nor to be prevailed against by the gates of hell; and all such disputes about a catholic church and its union as can be so much as questionable among them that profess to believe the gospel are in direct opposition unto the prayers and promises of Jesus Christ. Whilst evangelical faith, holiness, obedience unto the commands of Christ, and mutual love, abide in any on the earth, there is the catholic church; and whilst they are professed, that catholic church is visible. Other catholic church upon the earth I believe none, nor any that needs other things unto its constitution.

These things being premised, I proceed unto that which is our present inquiry, — namely, wherein the communion of particular churches among themselves doth consist.

The communion of churches is *their joint actings in the same gospel duties towards God in Christ, with their mutual actings towards each other with respect unto the end of their institution and being, which is the glory of Christ in the edification of the whole catholic church.*

As unto the actings of the FIRST sort, the ground of them is faith, and therein is the first act of the communion of churches. And this communion in faith among all the churches of Christ is fivefold: —

1. *General, in the belief of the same doctrine of truth*, which is according unto godliness, the same articles of faith, and the public profession thereof; so that every one of them is the pillar and ground of the same truth. This the primitive church provided for in creeds and symbols, or confessions of faith, as is known. But as never any one of them was expressly owned by all churches, so in process of time they came to be abused, as expressing the sense of the present church, whether true or false. Hence we have as many Arian creeds yet extant as those that are orthodox. But unto the communion of all particular churches in the world, there is nothing required but a belief of the Scripture to be the word of God, with a professed assent unto all divine revelations therein contained, provided that no error be avowed that is contrary to the principal or fundamental doctrines of it. For although any society of men should profess the Scripture to be the word of God, and avow an assent unto the revelations made therein, yet, by the conceptions of their minds, and misunderstanding of the sense of the Holy Spirit therein, they may embrace and adhere unto such errors as may cut them off from all communion with the catholic church in faith: such are the denial of the holy Trinity, the incarnation of the Son of God, his divine person or office, the redemption of the church by his blood, the necessity of regeneration by his Spirit, and the like. And they may also add that of their own unto their professed belief as shall exclude them from communion with the catholic church: such are the assertions of traditions as equal with the written word, of another head of the church besides the Lord Christ, of another sacrifice besides what he once offered for all, and the like. But where any are preserved from such heresies on the one hand and the other, there is no more required unto communion with the whole church, as unto faith in general, but only the belief before described.

2. This communion in faith respects the church itself as its *material object*; for it is required hereunto that we believe that the Lord Christ hath had in all ages, and especially hath in that wherein we live, a church on the earth, confined unto no places nor parties of men, no empires nor dominions, nor capable of any confinement; as also, that this church is redeemed, called, sanctified by him; that it is his kingdom, his interest, his concernment in the world; that thereunto, and [unto] all the members of it, all the promises of God do belong and are confined; that this church he will save, preserve,

and deliver, from all opposition, so as that “the gates of hell shall not prevail against it,” and after death will raise it up and glorify it at the last day. This is the faith of the catholic church concerning itself; which is an ancient, fundamental article of our religion. And if any one deny that there is such a church called out of the world, separated from it, unto which alone, and all the members of it, all the promises of God do appertain, in contradistinction unto all others, or confine it unto a party unto whom these things are not appropriate, he cuts himself off from the communion of the church of Christ.

In the faith hereof all the true churches of Christ throughout the world have a comforting, refreshing communion; which is the spring of many duties in them continually.

3. This communion of churches in faith consists much in the principal fruit of it, namely, *prayer*. So is it stated, ~~and~~ Ephesians 2:18, “For through Christ we have access by one Spirit unto the Father.” And that therein the communion of the catholic church doth consist the apostle declares in the following verses, 19-22, “Now therefore,” etc.; for prayers in all churches having one object, which is God even the Father, God as the Father; proceeding in all from one and the same Spirit, given unto them as a Spirit of grace and supplications to make intercession for them; and all of them continually offered unto God by the same High Priest, who adds unto it the incense of his own intercession, and by whom they have all an access unto the same throne of grace, — they have all a blessed communion herein continually. And this communion is the more express in that the prayers of all are for all, so as that there is no particular church of Christ in the world, — not any one member of any of them, but they have the prayers of all the churches in the world and of all the members of them every day. And however this communion be invisible unto the eyes of flesh, yet is it glorious and conspicuous unto the eye of faith, and is a part of the glory of Christ the mediator in heaven. This prayer, proceeding from or wrought by one and the same Spirit in them all, equally bestowed on them all by virtue of the promise of Christ, having the same object, even God as a Father, and offered unto him by the same High Priest, together with his own intercession, gives unto all churches a communion far more glorious than what consists in some outward rites and orders of men’s devising.

But now if there be any other persons or churches which have any other object of their prayers but God even the Father, and as our Father in Christ, or have any other mediators or intercessors by whom to convey or present their prayers unto God but Christ alone, the only high priest of the church, or do renounce the aid and assistance of the Holy Spirit as a Spirit of grace and supplications, they cut themselves off from all communion with the catholic church herein.

4. The unity of faith in all churches effecteth communion among them in *the administration of the same sacraments of baptism and the supper of the Lord*. These are the same in, unto, and amongst them all; neither do some variations in the outward manner of their administration interrupt that communion. But wherever the continuation of these ordinances is denied, or their nature or use is perverted, or idolatrous worship is annexed unto their administration, there communion with the catholic church is renounced.

5. They have also by faith communion herein, in that *all churches do profess a subjection unto the authority of Christ in all things*, and an obligation upon them to do and observe all whatsoever he hath commanded.

Other instances of the like nature might be given, but these are sufficient to manifest how unscriptural the notion is, that there is no proper communion with or among churches but what consists in a compliance with certain powers, orders, and rites, the pressing whereof under the name of “uniformity” hath cast all thoughts of real, evangelical church-communion into oblivion.

SECONDLY. Churches ordained and constituted in the way and manner, and for the ends, declared in our former discourse on this subject, and, by virtue of their union unto Christ and among themselves, living constantly, in all places of the world, in the actual exercise of that communion which consists in the performance of the same church-duties towards God in Christ, unto their own continuation, increase, and edification, have also an especial union among themselves, and a mutual communion thence arising.

The bond of this union is love; not the common regulated affection of human nature so called, not merely that power and duty which is engraven

on the hearts of men by the law of creation towards all of the same kind and blood with themselves, but an especial grace of the Holy Spirit, acting in the church as the principle and bend of its union unto itself; whence the command of it is called a “new commandment,” because in itself, as unto the only example of it, in the person of Christ, the causes and motives unto it, with its peculiar ends and proper exercise, it was absolutely new and evangelical. An explanation of the nature of it belongs not unto this place; although it be a grace and a duty of so much importance, — wherein so much of the life, power, and peculiar glory of Christian religion doth consist, — and is either so utterly lost or hath such vile images of it set up in the world, that it deserves a full consideration; which it may receive in another place.

I say, the Holy Spirit of grace and love being given from Christ, the fountain and center of all church-union, to dwell in and abide with his church, thereby uniting it unto himself, doth work in it and all the members of it that mutual love which may and doth animate them unto all those mutual acts which are proper unto the relation wherein they stand, by virtue of their union unto Christ their head, as members of the same body one with another.

Herein consists the union of every church in itself, of all churches among themselves, and so of the whole catholic church, their communion consisting in regular acts and duties proceeding from this love, and required by virtue of it.

This account of the union and communion of churches may seem strange unto some, who are enamoured of that image which is set up of them in the world, in canons, constitutions of rites, and outward order, in various subordinations and ceremonies, which are most remote from making any due representation of them.

The church, in its dependence on Christ its head, being by its institution disposed into its proper order for its own edification, or fitly joined together and compacted, this love working effectually in every office, officer, and member, according unto its disposal in the body for the receiving and communicating supplies for edification, gives the whole both its union and communion, all the actings of it being regulated by divine rule and prescription.

Instead hereof, to erect a machine, the spring and center of whose motions are unknown (any other, I mean, but external force), compacted by the iron joints and bands of human laws, edifying itself by the power of offices and officers foreign unto the Scripture, acting with weapons that are not spiritual but carnal, and mighty through him whose work it is to cast the members of the Church of Christ into prison, as unto an outward conformity, is to forsake the Scripture and follow our own imagination.

The *outward acts* of communion among churches, proceeding from this love, and the obligation that is on them to promote their mutual edification, may be referred unto the two heads of *advice* and *assistance*.

Churches have communion unto their mutual edification by advice in synods or councils; which must in this place be considered.

SYNODS are the meetings of divers churches by their messengers or delegates, to consult and determine of such things as are of common concernment unto them all by virtue of this communion which is exercised in them.

1. The necessity and warranty of such synods ariseth, —

(1.) From the *light of nature*; for all societies which have the same original, the same rule, the same interest, the same ends, and which are in themselves mutually concerned in the good or evil of each other, are obliged by the power and conduct of reason to advise in common for their own good on all emergencies that stand in need thereof.

Churches are such societies; they have all one and the same authoritative institution, one and the same rule of order and worship, the same ends, as we have declared, and their entire interest is one and the same. When, therefore, any thing occurs amongst them that is attended with such difficulties as cannot be removed or taken away by any one of them severally, or in whose determination all of them are equally concerned, not to make use herein of common advice and counsel is to forsake that natural light which they are bound to attend unto in all duties of obedience unto God.

(2.) The union of all churches as before described, — in one Head, by one Spirit, *through* one faith and worship, unto the same ends, — doth so

compact them into one *body mystical* as that none of them is or can be complete absolutely without a joint acting with other members of the same body unto the common good of the whole, as occasion doth require. And this joint acting with others in any church can be no otherwise but by common advice and counsel; which natural circumstances render impossible by any means but by their convention in synods by their messengers and delegates: for although there may be some use of letters missive, and was so eminently in the primitive churches, to ask the advice of one another in difficult cases (as the first instance we have of the communion of churches after the days of the apostles is, in the letter of the church of Corinth unto that of Rome, desiring their advice about the composing of a difference among them, and the answer of the church of Rome thereunto), yet many cases may fall out among them which cannot be reconciled or determined but by present conference; such as that was recorded, Acts 15. No church, therefore, is so independent as that it can always and in all cases observe the duties it owes unto the Lord Christ and the church catholic, by all those powers which it is able to act in itself distinctly, without conjunction with others. And the church that confines its duty unto the acts of its own assemblies cuts itself off from the external communion of the church catholic; nor will it be safe for any man to commit the conduct of his soul to such a church. Wherefore, —

(3.) This *acting in synods* is an institution of Jesus Christ, not in an express command, but in the nature of the thing itself, fortified with *apostolical* example; for having erected such a church-state, and disposed all his churches into such order and mutual relation unto one another as that none of them can be complete or discharge their whole duty without mutual advice and counsel, he hath thereby ordained this way of their communion in synods, no other being possible unto that end. And thereby such conventions are interested in the promise of his presence, — namely, that “where two or three are gathered together in his name, there he will be in the midst of them;” for these assemblies being the necessary effect of his own constitution, in the nature and use of his churches, are or may be in his name, and so enjoy his presence.

(4.) The end of all particular churches is the edification of the *church catholic*, unto the glory of God in Christ; and it is evident that in many instances this cannot be attained, yea, that it must be sinfully neglected,

unless this way for the preservation and carrying of it on be attended unto. Truth, peace, and love, may be lost among churches, and so the union of the catholic church in them be dissolved, unless this means for their preservation and reparation be made use of. And that particular church which extends not its duty beyond its own assemblies and members is fallen off from the principal end of its institution; and every principle, opinion, or persuasion, that inclines any church to confine its care and duty unto its own edification only, yea, or of those only which agree with it in some peculiar practice, making it neglective of all due means of the edification of the church catholic, is schismatical.

(5.) There is direction hereunto included in the *order* and *method* of church proceedings in case of offense, prescribed unto it by Christ himself. The beginning and rise of it is between two individual persons; thence is it carried unto the cognizance and judgment of two or three others before unconcerned; from them it is to be brought unto the church; and there is no doubt but the church hath power to determine concerning it, as unto its own communion, to continue the offender in it or reject him from it. This must abide, as unto outward order and the preservation of peace. But no church is infallible in their judgment absolutely in any case; and in many their determinations may be so doubtful as not to affect the conscience of him who is censured. But such a person is not only a member of that particular church, but, by virtue thereof, of the catholic church also. It is necessary, therefore, that he should be heard and judged as unto his interest therein, if he do desire it; and this can no way be done but by such synods as we shall immediately describe.

(6.) Synods are consecrated unto the use of the church in all ages by the example of the apostles in their guidance of the first churches of Jews and Gentiles; which hath the force of a *divine institution*, as being given by them under the infallible conduct of the Holy Ghost, Acts 15; which we shall speak further unto immediately.

2. Having seen the original of church synods, or their formal cause, we shall consider also their material cause, or the subject-matter to be treated of or determined in them; and this, in general, is every thing wherein churches are obliged to hold communion among themselves when any thing

falls out amongst them which otherwise would disturb that communion. And hereof some instances may be given: —

(1.) Churches have mutual communion in *the profession of the same faith*. If any doubts or differences do arise about it, any opinions be advanced contrary unto it, either in any particular church, which they cannot determine among themselves, or among sundry churches, the *last outward means* for the preservation of the rule of faith among them, and of their communion in the condemnation of errors and opinions contrary unto the form of wholesome words, is by these synods or councils. The care hereof is, indeed, in the first place, committed unto the churches themselves, as was at large before declared; but in case, through the subtlety, prevalency, and interest of those by whom damnable doctrines axe broached, the church itself whereunto they do belong is not able to rebuke and suppress them, nor to maintain its profession of the truth, or that by suffering such things in one church others are in danger to be infected or defiled, this is the last external refuge that is left for the preservation of the communion of churches in the same faith. We have multiplied examples hereof in the primitive churches, before the degeneracy of these synods into superstition and domination. Such was eminently that gathered at Antioch for the condemnation of the heresies of Paulus Samosatenus, the bishop of that church.

(2.) It is so with respect unto that *order, peace, and unity*, wherein every particular church ought to walk in itself and amongst its own members. There were schisms, divisions, strifes, and contentions, in some of the churches that were of apostolical planting and watering; so there were at Antioch, and afterward at Corinth, as also in some of the churches in Galatia. The duty of remedying and healing these divisions and differences, from what cause soever they arise, is first incumbent on each particular member in every such church. Unto them it is given in charge by the apostle in the first place; and if every one of them do perform their duty in love, an end will be put unto all strife. In case of failure therein, the whole church is charged, in the exercise of its power, authority, and wisdom, to rebuke and compose such differences; but in case it is not able so to do, as it fell out in the church at Antioch, then an assembly of other churches walking in actual communion with that church wherein the difference is

arisen, and thereon concerned in their prosperity and edification, by their messengers and delegates, is the last outward means for its composure.

(3.) Where there hath been any *maladministration of discipline*, whereby any members of a church have been injured, — as suppose they are unduly cast out of the church by the power and interest of some Diotrophes, or that any members of the church make a party and faction to depose their elders, as it was in the church at Corinth when the church at Rome gave them advice in the ease, — it is necessary, from the communion of churches and the interest the persons injured have in the catholic church, whose edification is the end of all church administrations, that the proceedings of such a church be reviewed by a synod, and a remedy provided in the case. Nor was it the mind of the apostles that they should be left without relief which were unduly cast out of the church by any Diotrophes, nor is there any other ordinary way hereof but only by synods; but this case, I suppose, I shall speak unto afterward.

(4.) The same is the case with respect unto *worship*, as also unto manners and conversation. If it be reported, or known by credible testimony, that any church hath admitted into the exercise of divine worship any thing superstitious or vain, or if the members of it walk like those described by the apostle, ~~3018~~ ^{Philippians} 3:18, 19, unto the dishonor of the gospel and of the ways of Christ, the church itself not endeavoring its own reformation and repentance, other churches walking in communion therewith, by virtue of their common interest in the glory of Christ and honor of the gospel, after more private ways for its reduction, as opportunity and duty may suggest unto their elders, ought to assemble in a synod for advice, either as to the use of further means for the recovery of such a church, or to withhold communion from it in case of obstinacy in its evil ways. The want of a due attendance unto this part of the communion of churches, with respect unto gospel worship in its purity, and gospel obedience in its power, was a great means of the decay and apostasy of them all. By reason of this negligence, instead of being helpful one to another for their mutual recovery, and the revival of the things that were ready to die, they gradually infected one another, according as they fell into their decays, and countenanced one another by their examples unto a continuance in such disorders.

The image which, in late ages, was set up hereof, diocesan and metropolitan visitations, and those of lesser districts, Under officers of antichristian names, hath been useful rather unto destruction than edification; but so it hath fallen out in most things concerning church order, worship, and discipline. The power and spirituality of divine institutions being lost, a machine hath been framed to make an appearance and representation of them, to divert the minds of men from inquiring after the primitive institutions of Christ, with an experience of their efficacy.

Considering what we have learned in these later ages, by woful experience, of what hath fallen out formerly amongst all the churches in the world, as unto their degeneracy from gospel worship and holiness, with the abounding of temptations in the days wherein we live, and the spiritual decays that all churches are prone unto, it were not amiss if those churches which do walk in express communion would *frequently meet in synods*, to inquire into the spiritual state of them all, and to give advice for the correction of what is amiss, the due preservation of the purity of worship, the exercise of discipline, but especially of the power, demonstration, and fruit of evangelical obedience.

Hence it is evident what are the *ends* of such synods among the churches of Christ. The general end of them all is to promote the edification of the whole body or church catholic; and that, —

- (1.) To prevent divisions from differences in judgment and practice, which are contrary thereunto. The first Christian Synod was an assembly of the first two churches in the world by their delegates. The first church of the Jews was at Jerusalem, and the first church of the Gentiles was at Antioch; to prevent divisions and to preserve communion between them was the first synod celebrated, Acts 15.
- (2.) To avoid or cure offenses against mutual love among them.
- (3.) To advance the light of the gospel by a joint confession and agreement in the faith.
- (4.) To give a concurrent testimony against pernicious heresies or errors, whereby the faith of any is overthrown, or in danger so to be.

(5.) To relieve such by advice as may be by any Diotrephes unduly cast out of the church.

What are the ends whereunto they have been used may be seen in the volumes written concerning them, and the numberless laws enacted in them; whereof very little belongs unto the discipline of the gospel or real communion of churches.

3. The *measure or extent* of them ariseth from concernment and convenience. All unprejudiced persons do now acknowledge that the pretense of oecumenical councils, wherein the whole church of Christ on the earth or all particular churches should be represented, and so obliged to acquiesce in their determinations, is a fond imagination; and it were easy to demonstrate in particular how every one of them which hath in vulgar esteem obtained that title were openly remote from so being. Such councils never were, and, as it is probable, never will nor can be, nor are any way needful unto the edification of the church.

Their due measure and bounds, as was said before, are given them by concernment and convenience; wherein respect also may be had unto the ability of some churches to promote edification above others. Such churches as are, in the same instances, concerned in the causes of them before declared, and may be helpful unto the ends mentioned, are to convene in such synods. And this concernment may be either from some of those causes in themselves, or from that duty which they owe unto other churches which are immediately concerned. So it was in the assistance given by the church at Jerusalem in that case which was peculiar to the Church of Antioch.

With this interest or concernment there must be a concurrence of natural, moral, and political conveniences. Some churches are planted at such distances from others that it is naturally impossible that they should ever meet together to advise by their messengers; and some are at such as that they cannot assemble but with such difficulties and hazards as exempt them from the duty of it. And whereas they are placed under different civil governments, and those oftentimes engaged in mutual enmities, and always jealous of the actings of their own subjects in conjunction with them that are not so, they cannot so convene and preserve the outward peace of the churches, Hence the largest of the councils of old that are called

“oecumenical” never extended farther than the single Roman empire, when there were innumerable churches planted under the civil jurisdiction of other sovereigns.

Wherefore, in the assembling of churches in synods, respect is to be had unto the convenience of their meeting, that it may be, so far as is possible, without trouble or danger. And this, with respect unto the causes or occasions of them, will determine what churches (which or how many) may be necessary on such occasions to constitute a synod. And it is useful hereunto that the churches which are planted within such a circumference as gives facility or convenience for such conventions should, by virtue of their mutual communion, be in express readiness to convene on all occasions of common concernment.

Again; in the assistance which, in the way of advice and counsel, any one church may stand in need of from others, respect is to be had, in their desire, unto such churches as are reputed and known to have the best ability to give advice in the case; on which account the church at Antioch addressed themselves in a peculiar manner unto the church at Jerusalem, which was far distant from them.

But in all these cases use is to be made of spiritual prudence, with respect unto all sorts of circumstances; which although some would deny, [such] as the privilege of even matters of fact, and the application of general Scripture rules unto practice, because we require divine institution unto all parts of religious worship, yet we must not decline from using the best we have in the service of Christ and, his church, rather than comply with any thing which, in the whole substance of it, is foreign to his institution.

It was the Roman empire under *one monarch*, in its civil distributions for rule and government, which gave the first rise and occasion unto a pretended *visibly ruling catholic church* under one spiritual monarch, distributed into those that were patriarchal, diocesan, metropolitical, and others of inferior kinds; for, retaining the people in their civil distributions, whereinto they were cast according to the polity and interest of the empire, there were ecclesiastical officers assigned unto each distribution, answerable unto the civil officers which were ordained in the polity of the empire. So, in answer unto deputies, exarchs, prefects, governors of provinces and cities, there were found out and erected patriarchs,

metropolitans, diocesans, in various allotments of territories and powers, requiring unto their complete state one visible monarchical head, as the empire had; — which was the pope. And whereas the emperors had not only a civil rule and power, but a military also, exercised under them by legates, generals, tribunes, centurions, and the like; so there was raised an ecclesiastical militia, in various orders of monks, friars, and votaries of all sorts, who, under their immediate generals and prefects, did depend absolutely on the sovereign power of the new ecclesiastical monarch. So was the visible professing church molded and fashioned into an image of the old Roman pagan empire, as it was foretold it should be, ¹¹¹³Revelation 13:13-15. And although this image was first framed in compliance with it and for a resemblance of it, yet in process of time it substituted itself entirely in the room of the empire, taking all its power unto itself, and doing all its works.

From this distribution of various sorts of new-framed churches in the Roman empire arose a constitution of synods or councils in subordination one unto another, until, by sundry degrees of ascent, they arrived unto those which they called “general,” under the conduct of the pope, whose senate they were.

But these things have no countenance given them by any divine institution, apostolical example, or practice of the first churches, but are a mere product of secular interest working itself in a mystery of iniquity.

Since the dissolution of the Roman empire, nations have been cast into distinct civil governments of their own, whose sovereignty is in themselves, by the event of war and counsels thereon emergent. Unto each of these it is supposed there is a church-state accommodated, as the church of England, the church of Scotland, the church of France, and the like; whose original and being depend on the first event of war in that [their?] dissolution. Unto these new church-states, whose being, bounds, and limits, are given unto them absolutely by those of the civil government which they belong unto, it is thought meet that ecclesiastical synods should be accommodated; but in what way this is to be done there is not yet an agreement: but it is not my present business to consider the differences that are about it, which are known unto this nation on a dear account. Yet this I shall say, that whereas it is eminently useful unto the

edification of the church catholic that all the churches professing the same doctrine of faith, within the limits of the same supreme civil government, should hold constant actual communion among themselves unto the ends of it before mentioned, I see not how it can be any abridgment of the liberty of particular churches, or interfere with any of their rights which they hold by divine institution, if, through more constant lesser synods for advice, there be a communication of their mutual concerns unto those that are greater, until, if occasion require and it be expedient, there be a general assembly of them all, to advise about any thing wherein they are all concerned. But this is granted only with these limitations: —

- (1.) That the rights of particular churches be preserved in the free election of such as are to be members of all these synods;
- (2.) That they assume no authority or jurisdiction over churches or persons, in things civil or ecclesiastical;
- (3.) That none are immediately concerned in this proper synodal power or authority (which what it is we shall inquire) who are not present in them by their own delegates.

As for that kind of synods which some call a *classis*, which is a convention of the elders or officers of sundry parochial churches, distinguished for presential communion ordinarily, in some acts of it, by virtue of their office, and for the exercise of office-power, it is the constitution of a new kind of particular churches by a combination of them into one, whose original distinction is only in the civil limits of their cohabitation; which probably may be done sometimes and in some places unto edification.

4. The persons of whom all sorts of ecclesiastical synods are to consist must be inquired into; and there is nothing of mere human prudential constitution that hath longer obtained in the church than that these should be officers of the churches only. And whereas, after the days of the apostles, we have no record of any synods of more churches than one, until after the distinction was made between bishops and presbyters, they were made up of both sorts of them; but afterward, those who were peculiarly called bishops enclosed this right unto themselves, — on what

grounds God knows, there being not one tittle in the Scripture or the light of reason to give them countenance therein.

It must therefore be affirmed, that no persons, by virtue of any office merely, have right to be members of ecclesiastical synods, as such; neither is there either example or reason to give color unto any such pretense. Further; no office-power is to be exerted in such synods as such, neither conjunctly by all the members of them, nor singly by any of them. Officers of the church, bishops, pastors, elders, may be present in them, ought to be present in them, are meetest for the most part so to be, but merely as such it belongs not unto them. The care, oversight, and rule of the churches whereunto they do belong, the flock among them distinctly, is committed unto them; and for that they are intrusted with power and authority by virtue of their office: but as unto their conjunction in synods, which is a mere act and effect of the communion of churches among themselves, it is not committed unto them in a way of peculiar right by virtue of their office. If it be so, without respect unto the power of the magistrate in calling them, or of the churches in choosing them, then it belongs unto them all; for that which belongs unto any of them, as such, by virtue of office, belongs equally unto all: and if it belong unto all, then it belongs unto all of one sort only, as, for instance, bishops; or unto all of all sorts, as, for instance, presbyters also. If it be stated in the latter way, then every presbyter, as such, by virtue of his office, hath right and power to be present in all ecclesiastical synods equal with that of the bishops; for although it be supposed that his office is not equal unto theirs, yet it is so also that this right doth equally belong unto his office. If the former be avowed, namely, that this right belongs unto bishops only (such as are pleaded for), by virtue of their office as such, then, —

(1.) I desire that any tolerable proof of the confinement of this right unto such an office be produced, either from the Scripture, or reason, or the example of the first churches; which as yet I have never seen.

(2.) I fear not to say, that a false presumption hereof was one principal cause and means of introducing tyranny into the churches, and the utter ruin of their liberty.

Concerning the composition that is made herein, that some should convene in ecclesiastical synods by their own personal right and in virtue of their

office, and others by a kind of delegation from some of their own order, it being a mere political constitution, which I shall immediately speak unto, it is not here to be taken notice of.

There is nothing, therefore, in Scripture example or the light of natural reason, with the principles of all societies in union or communion, that will lead us any farther than this, that such synods are to be composed and consist of such persons as are chosen and delegated by those churches respectively who do act and exert their communion in such assemblies. So was it in the first example of them, Acts 15. The church of Antioch chose and sent messengers of their own number to advise with the apostles and elders of the church at Jerusalem, at which consultation the members of that church also were present; and this is the whole of the nature and use of ecclesiastical synods. It is on ether accounts that they make up so great a part of the history of the church. For the first three hundred years there were nothing but *voluntary conventions* of the officers or elders, bishops and presbyters, with some others of neighboring churches, on the occasion of differences or heresies among them. In and from the council of Nice, there were assemblies of bishops and others, called together *by the authority of the Roman emperors*, to advise about matters of faith. In after ages, those which were called in the western parts of the world, in Italy, Germany, France, and England, were of a mixed nature, advising about things civil and political, as well as sacred and religious, especially with respect unto mutual contests between popes and princes. In them the whole nature of ecclesiastical synods was lost and buried, and all religion almost destroyed.

Thus this laudable practice of churches acting their mutual communion by meeting in synods or assemblies, by their delegates or messengers, to advise about things of their common concernment and joint edification, as occasion should require, founded in the light of nature, and countenanced by primitive, apostolical example, was turned, by the designing interests and ambition of men, into the instating of all church-power in such synods, and the usurpation of a power given unto no churches nor all of them together; as might be made evident by instances innumerable.

And whereas they have made such a noise in Christian religion, and have filled so many volumes with their acts and doings, yet some of them who,

under the pope, would place all religion in them, do grant and contend that they are a mere human invention; so Bellarmine affirms Pighius to have done in his book *De Coelest, Hierarch.* lib. 6, cap. 1. But for his part he judgeth that it is more probable that they have a divine original by virtue of that word, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there I will be in the midst of them,” ~~AKO~~ Matthew 18:20, *De Concil.* lib. 1, cap. 3, which will not bear the least part of the superstructure pretended to be built upon it.

Of these delegates and messengers of the churches, the elders or officers of them, or some of them at least, ought to be the principal; for there is a peculiar care of *public edification* incumbent on them, which they are to exercise on all just occasions. They are justly presumed to know best the state of their own churches, and to be best able to judge of matters under consideration; and they do better represent the churches from whom they are sent than any private brethren can do, and so receive that respect and reverence which is due to the churches themselves; as also, they are most meet to report and recommend the synodal determinations unto their churches; and a contrary practice would quickly introduce confusion.

But yet it is not necessary that they alone should be so sent or delegated by the churches, but [they] may have others joined with them, and had so until prelatical usurpation overturned their liberties. So there were others besides Paul and Barnabas sent from Antioch to Jerusalem; and the brethren of that church, whatever is impudently pretended to the contrary, concurred in the decree and determination there made.

5. That which is termed *the calling of these synods*, is nothing but *the voluntary consent of the churches concerned to meet together* by their delegates and messengers, for the ends before declared.

I no way deny but that a Christian magistrate may convene, by his authority, the bishops, pastors, or ministers, with such others as he shall think meet, within his own territories, yea, and to receive into his convention meet men out of the territories of others, by their consent; to advise among themselves and to give them advice about the concernments of religion and of the church under his dominion, and regulate himself accordingly. It hath been practiced with good success, and may be with bad also. And I do deny that churches have power, without the consent

and authority of the magistrate, to convene themselves in synods to exercise any exterior jurisdiction that should affect the persons of his subjects any otherwise than by the law of the land is allowed.

But whereas the synods whereof we treat, and which are all that belong unto the church, can take no cognizance of any civil affairs wherein the persons of men are outwardly concerned, have no jurisdiction in any kind, can make no determination but only doctrinal declarations of divine truth, of the same nature with the preaching of the word, there is no more required unto their calling, beyond their own consent, but only that they may meet in external peace by the permission of the magistrate; which when they cannot obtain, they must deport themselves as in case of other duties required of them by the law of Christ.

6. In the last place, I shall speak briefly of *the power and authority of these synods*, in what measures, extent, and numbers soever they are assembled; for although this may be easily collected from what hath been declared concerning their original, nature, causes, use, and ends, yet it may be necessary to be more particularly inquired into, because of the many differences that ate about it.

There is a threefold power ascribed unto synods. The first is *declarative*, consisting in an authoritative teaching and declaring the mind of God in the Scripture; the second is *constitutive*, appointing and ordaining things to be believed, or done and observed, by and upon its own authority; and, thirdly, *executive*, in acts of jurisdiction towards persons and churches.

The persons whom the authority pleaded may affect are of two sorts: —

- (1.)** Such as have their *proper representatives* present in such synods, who are directly concerned in its conciliary determinations;
- (2.)** Such as have no *such representatives* in them, who can be no otherwise concerned but in the doctrine, materially considered, declared in them.

Wherefore the ground of any church's receiving, complying with, or obeying the determinations and decrees of synods must be either, —

- (1.)** The *evidence of truth* given unto those determinations by the synod from the Scripture; or,

(2.) The *authority of the synod itself*, affecting the minds and consciences of those concerned.

In the first way, wherein the assent and obedience of churches is resolved ultimately into the evidence of truth from the Scripture, upon the judgment which they make thereof, not only the discovery of truth is to be owned, but there is an authoritative proposal of it by virtue of the promised presence of Christ in them, if duly sought and regarded; whence great respect and reverence is due unto them.

The power of a synod for the execution of its decrees respects either, —

(1.) The things or doctrines declared, and is recommendatory of them, on its authority from the presence of Christ; or,

(2.) Persons, to censure, excommunicate, or punish those who receive them not.

These things being premised, the just power of synods may be positively and negatively declared in the two following assertions: —

(1.) The authority of a synod declaring the mind of God from the Scripture in doctrine, or giving counsel as unix practice synodically, unto them whose proper representatives are present in it, whose decrees and determinations are to be received and submitted unto on the evidence of their truth and necessity, as recommended by the authority of the synod from the promised presence of Christ among them, is suitable unto the mind of Christ and the example given by the apostles, Acts 15.

Hence it is evident that, in and after suck synods, it is in the power of churches concerned humbly to consider and weigh, —

[1.] The evidences of the presence of Christ in them, from the manner, causes, and ends, of their assembling, and from their deportment therein.

[2.] What regard, in their constitutions and determinations, there hath been unto the word of God, and whether in all things it hath had its due pre-eminence.

[3.] How all their determinations have been educed from its truth and are confirmed by its authority.

Without a due exercise of judgment with respect unto these things, none can be obliged by any synodical determinations, seeing that, without them and on the want of them, many assemblies of bishops, who have had the outward appearance and title of synods or councils, have been dens of thieves, robbers, idolaters, managing their synodical affairs with fury, wrath, horrible craft, according to their interests, unto the ruin of the church. Such were the second Ephesine, the second at Nice, and that at Trent, and others not a few.

Hence nothing is more to be feared, especially in a state of the church wherein it is declining in faith, worship, and holiness, than synods, according to the usual way of their calling and convention, where these things are absent, for they have already been the principal means of leading on and justifying all the apostasy which churches have fallen into; for never was there yet synod of that nature which did not confirm all the errors and superstitions which had in common practice entered into the church, and opened a door to a progress in them, nor was ever the pretense of any of them for outward reformation of any use or signification.

(2.) The authority of a synod *determining articles of faith, constituting orders and decrees* for the conscientious observance of things of their own appointment, to be submitted unto and obeyed on the reason of that authority, under the penalty of excommunication, and the trouble by custom and tyranny thereto annexed, or acted in a way of jurisdiction over churches or persons, is a mere human invention, for which nothing can be pleaded but prescription from the fourth century of the church, when the progress of the fatal apostasy became visible.

The proof of both these assertions depends on what was before declared of the nature and use of these synods; for if they are such as we have evinced, no other power or authority can be ascribed unto them but that here allowed. Yet the whole may be further illustrated by some brief considerations of the assembly at Jerusalem in the nature of a synod, recorded Acts 15.

(1.) The *occasion* of it was a difference in the church of Antioch, which they could not compose among themselves, because those who caused the difference pretended authority from the apostles, as is evident, verses 1, 24.

- (2.) The *means of its convention* was the desire and voluntary reference of the matter in debate made by the church at Antioch, where the difference was, unto that at Jerusalem, where, as it was pretended, the cause of the difference arose, unto the hazard of their mutual communion, to be consulted of with their own messengers.
- (3.) The *persons constituting the synod* were the apostles, elders, and brethren of the church at Jerusalem, and the messengers of that of Antioch, with whom Paul and Barnabas were joined in the same delegation.
- (4.) The *matter* in difference was debated, as unto the mind of God concerning it in the *Scripture*, and out of the *Scripture*. On James' proposal the determination was made.
- (5.) There was nothing *imposed anew* on the practice of the churches; only direction is given in one particular instance as unto duty, necessary on many accounts unto the Gentile converts, namely, to abstain from fornication and from the use of their liberty in such instances of its practice as whereon scandal would ensue; which was the duty of all Christians even before this determination, and is so still in many other instances besides those mentioned in the decree, only it was now declared unto them.
- (6.) The *grounds* whereon the synod proposed the reception of and compliance with its decrees were four: —

[1.] That what they had determined was the mind of the Holy Ghost: "It pleased the Holy Ghost." This mind they knew either by inspiration, or immediate revelation made unto themselves, or by what was written or recorded in the *Scripture*, which on all other occasions they alleged as what was the word and spoken by the Holy Ghost; and it is evident that it was this latter way, namely, a discovery of the mind of the Holy Ghost in the *Scripture*, that is intended. However, it is concluded that nothing be proposed or confirmed in synods but what is well known to be the mind of the Holy Ghost in the *Scripture*, either by immediate inspiration or by *Scripture* revelation.

[2.] The authority of the assembly, as convened in the name of Christ and by virtue of his presence, whereof we have spoken before: "It pleased the Holy Ghost and us."

[3.] That the things which they had determined were “necessary;” that is, antecedently so unto that determination, — namely, the abstaining from the use of their liberty in things indifferent, in case of scandal.

[4.] From the duty with respect unto the peace and mutual communion of the Jewish and Gentile churches: “Doing thus,” say they, “ye shall do well;” which is all the sanction of their decree, manifesting that it was doctrinal, not authoritative in way of jurisdiction.

(7.) The doctrinal abridgment of the liberty of the Gentile Christians in case of scandal they call the “imposing of no other burden,” in opposition unto what they rejected, namely, the imposing a yoke of ceremonies upon them, verse 10: so that the meaning of these words is, that they would lay no burden on them at all, but only advise them unto things necessary for the avoidance of scandal; for it is impious to imagine that the apostles would impose any yoke or lay any burden on the disciples but only the yoke and burden of Christ, as being contrary to their commission, ~~and~~ Matthew 28:19, 20.

Hence it will follow that a synod convened in the name of Christ, by the voluntary consent of several churches concerned in mutual communion, may declare and determine of the mind of the Holy Ghost in the Scripture, and decree the observation of things true and necessary, because revealed and appointed in the Scripture; which are to be received, owned, and observed on the evidence of the mind of the Holy Ghost in them, and on the ministerial authority of the synod itself.

I.

A LETTER

CONCERNING

THE MATTER OF THE PRESENT
EXCOMMUNICATIONS.

II.

A DISCOURSE

CONCERNING

THE ADMINISTRATION OF
CHURCH CENSURES.

PREFATORY NOTES.

I.

No date can be assigned to this letter on the subject of the excommunications. The reader will find an explanation of these cruel processes in a prefatory note to our author's "Word of Advice to the Citizens of London:" see vol. 42, p. 576. The letter, which is written, especially towards the close, with some point and humor, exposes the prostitution of a gospel ordinance implied in these excommunications by the civil power, and vindicates the character of the Dissenters, against whom they were issued.

II.

The tract on the administration of church censures appeared in the folio volume of "Sermons and Tracts," which was published in 1721, but seems to have been previously given to the world. It is of use in explaining and defending Congregational usages in matters of ecclesiastical discipline. — ED.

A LETTER

CONCERNING THE MATTER OF THE PRESENT EXCOMMUNICATIONS.

SIR,

You judge aright, that at my last being in London I did consider the unusual hurry of excommunications against those called Dissenters; and, because of the novelty of the proceedings therein, I did, moreover, endeavor my own satisfaction as unto the design, causes, and ends of them; and I find it a thing easily attainable, without difficulty or curiosity of inquiry: for, whereas there is no covering of religion, nor any thing appertaining thereunto, save only a name or title cast upon them, they openly discover themselves of what sort they are, and what they belong unto; and among many other indecencies wherewith they are accompanied, one seemed to me to be very notable, and this is, the collection of whole droves together by summons and citations, then dealing with them in such a clamorous manner as makes a representation of a public market or fair for chaffering about souls. But that, I found, which did principally affect the minds of men was the event which these proceedings do tend unto and will produce; and they generally concluded that they would be highly prejudicial, if not ruinous, unto all trust and trade among the peaceable subjects of the kingdom. For they said that if the commissaries would do as in the old Roman proscriptions in the time of Sylla, and of the triumvirate afterward, and set up the names of all that were to be proceeded against in public tables, to be exposed to the view of all, those concerned might shift for themselves as well as they could, and the residue of mankind might be at liberty to follow their own occasions; but whilst they retain an unreasonable reserve in their own breasts, as unto persons to be ruined by them, so as that they know not whose names, their own or of those with whom they are concerned, they shall see the next day affixed on the church-doors in order unto excommunication, it deprives them of all repose in the law of the land or public justice, and breaks all their measures about the disposal of their affairs. How, far this is already come to pass,

you, that are in the place, know better than I; but sure I am that the very rumor of it gives a general discomposure unto the minds of men.

Hearing no other discourse of these things, I was somewhat surprised with your letter, wherein you required my thoughts what influence these excommunications may have on the consciences of them who are so excommunicated; for I did not think there would have been any question made about it: but since you are pleased to make the inquiry, I shall, for the satisfaction of my respects unto you (though as unto any other end I judge it needless), give you a brief account of my judgment concerning these proceedings; which is the same, for the substance of it, with that of all sober persons with whom I ever conversed.

Excommunication is the name of a divine institution of Christ, wherein, and in whose due and just administration, the consciences of Christians are, or ought to be, highly concerned; and this, as for other causes, so principally because it is the only sure representation of the future judgment of Christ himself: he did appoint it for this end, that so it might be. Providential dispensations are various, and no certain judgment can be made on them, as unto the final and eternal determination of things and causes: “No man knoweth love or hatred by the things” of that nature “that are before him.” But this is ordained by the law of Christ, to be a just representation of his future judgment, with a recognition of the cause which he will proceed upon. Therefore it is divinely instructive in what he himself will do in the great day: it is “*futuri iudicii praeiudicium*.” But he will scarcely be thought well advised who shall send men to Doctors’ Commons to learn the way and manner of Christ’s judgment of his church, with the causes which he will proceed upon. We himself giveth another account of it, ⁴²⁵Matthew 25:31 unto the end of the chapter. Of what he there declares, there is neither name nor thing found among men of those practices which we treat about. The mentioning of them would be looked or as a sedition against their authority, or else make them ashamed, as a thief when he is found. But for any sort of persons to undertake the administration and execution of the sentence of excommunication against others, not making it their design to represent the judgment of Christ towards impenitent sinners, is to bid defiance to him and his gospel. Wherefore no person whatever, wise or unwise, good or bad, can be concerned in the excommunication in conscience, or on a religious account.

I speak not only of them who are forced to suffer by them, but of them also by whom they are administered and denounced; for it is impossible that men should be so far forsaken of all understanding as to imagine that the proceedings therein do belong unto the gospel or Christian religion any otherwise ‘but as a debasement and corruption of it: neither is any man ever the less of the communion of the church of England by these excommunications, though he may, by force, be debarred from some advantages that belong thereunto. Neither is the communion of any church to be valued from which a man may be really and effectually expelled by such means; for this excommunication is not only null as to the efficacy of its sentence, on the account of its maladministration, but it is not in any sense that which it is called, and which it pretends to be. Idols are called “gods,” but we know they are “nothing in the world;” so is this proceeding *called* “excommunication,” but *is* no such thing at all. If a man should paint a rat or hedge-hog, and write over it that it is a lion, no man would believe it so to be because of its magnificent title. All that it can pretend unto is a political engine, used to apply the displeasure of some, upon an accidental advantage, unto them whose ruin they design; and therein a satisfaction unto revenge, for discountenancing their supposed interest. That there is any acting in it of the authority of Christ, any representation of his love, care, and tenderness towards his church, any thing that is instructive in his mind or will, any “*praeludium*” of the future judgment, no man, I suppose, does pretend; nor, I am sure, can do so, without reflecting the highest dishonor imaginable on Christ himself and the gospel.

To make these things yet more evident, and to show how remote the present excommunications are from all possibility of affecting the consciences of any, I shall briefly pass through the consideration of those things which principally belong unto them, and whereinto all their efficacy is resolved. And that which first offereth itself is the persons by whom they are administered. The truth is, there is such a variety of scenes in this tragedy, and such different actors in it, — from [the] apparitor with whom it begins, unto the jailer with whom it ends, — that it seems not easy whom to ascribe the animating power and authority that is in it unto; but yet, on a little consideration, the matter is plain enough. The ministers of the parishes wherein the excommunicated persons are supposed to dwell, by whom the sentence of excommunication is rehearsed out of a paper

from the court, have no concernment herein; for they know nothing of the causes or reasons of it, nor of the process therein, nor do pretend unto any. right for the cognizance of them, nor do, for the most part, know the persons at all on whose qualifications alone the validity or invalidity of the sentence doth depend, nor can give an account to God or man of what is done, as to right and equity: and therefore I no way doubt but that those who are learned and pious among them do hardly bear the yoke of being made such properties^{f11} in those acts and duties which appertain unto their ministerial function. But it is known who they are who begin the work, and carry on the process of it until its final execution; and I shall say no more concerning them but this alone, that how meet soever they may be for the transaction of civil affairs, or for the skillful managing of that work herein which they suppose committed unto them, yet as unto any thing wherein conscience may be affected with the authority of Jesus Christ, they can be of no consideration in it. If any man can but pretend to believe that our Lord Jesus, by an act, grant, law, or institution of his, by any signification of his mind or will, hath committed, or doth commit, the keys of the kingdom of heaven, the power of binding and loosing, of expelling out of and admitting into his church, unto these or such persons, he hath assuredly confidence enough to pretend unto a persuasion of whatever he pleases. They do not believe it themselves, nor among themselves pretend unto any such thing, hut only a power to execute their own laws or canons. They do not judge that any personal, moral, or spiritual qualifications are required unto ecclesiastical administrations, which yet to deny is to undermine all religion; without which they may be fit for all church-duties who are no better than that archdeacon of Oxford, who, being charged with immoralities in his conversation, justified himself by the soundness of his faith, affirming that he believed three Gods in one person, and, besides, he believed all that God himself did believe! Let a man out of interest, or fear, or ignorant superstition, strive never so much to affect his conscience with the excommunications of such men, he will never be able to effect it.

But be the personal qualifications of those intended what they please, the question is, how they came by that power and authority herein which they pretend unto? They are chancellors, archdeacons, commissaries, officials, with their court attendants, of whom we speak. I confess these

horrid names, with the reports concerning them and their power, are enough to terrify poor harmless men, and make them fear some evil from them. But excommunication is that which no man knows on what grounds to fear from these names, titles, and offices: for that is the name of a divine ordinance instituted by Christ in the gospel, to be administered according to the rule and law thereof; but these names, and those unto whom they do belong, are utterly foreign unto the Scriptures, and, as unto the work, to the practice of the church for a thousand years. What, therefore, is done by them of this kind must of necessity be utterly null, seeing that, as such, they have no place in the church themselves by the authority of Christ. But however it be undeniably evident that they have no relation unto the Scripture, nor can have any authority from Christ by virtue of any law or institution of his, nor countenance given unto them by any practice of the primitive church, yet what they do in this kind being pretended acts of power and authority, an authority for them must be pleaded by them. But then it may be justly demanded of them what it is, of what nature and kind, how it is communicated unto them, or derived by them from others. This is that which those who are excommunicated by them are principally concerned to inquire into; and which themselves in the first place are obliged to declare and evince. Unless men are satisfied in conscience that those who act against them have just authority so to do, or in what they do, it is utterly impossible they should be concerned in conscience in what is done against them, or be any ways obliged thereby. Here, therefore, they abide until they are satisfied in this just and necessary demand.

But here all things are in confusion; they can declare neither what authority is required unto what they do, nor how they came to possess that which they pretend unto. If it be from Christ, how comes it to operate on the outward concerns of men, their liberties and estates? If it be merely of man, whence do they give the name and pretense of a divine ordinance unto what they do? If any should follow the clue in this labyrinth, it is to be feared that it would lead them into the abyss of papal omnipotency.

As they exercise this power in courts of external jurisdiction and forms of law, they will not deny, I suppose, but that it is. from, the king. But why do they not, then, act that power in the king's name? for what is not done by his name is not done by his authority. Ministers do not preach nor

administer sacraments in the name of the king; for they do it not by his authority or by virtue of authority derived from him: nor do parents govern their children or families in his name, but their own; because authority for it is their own by the law of God and nature. But that exercise of power which externally affects the civil rights and liberties of men must be in the king's name, or the foundations of the government of the nation are shaken. — But I make it not my concernment what name or style they use in their courts. Let it be granted, for their own security, that they have all their power and authority from the king, it must be therewithal granted of what nature it is, — namely, civil, and not spiritual. But why, then, doth what they do not go under the name of a civil order, constitution, or penalty, but of an ordinance or institution of Jesus Christ? Are not these things in their own nature everlastingly distinct? and is not conscience hereby fully absolved from any respect unto it as such an ordinance; which, on this supposition, it neither is nor can be? It is easily discernible how these things tend unto the utter confusion of all things in religion.

If it be said that the power of it, as it is excommunication, is originally seated in the prelates, by virtue of their office, and is communicated unto these sorts of persons by commission, delegation, or deputation, under their seals, it will yield no relief; for this fiction of the delegation of office-power, or the power of office, unto any, without giving them the office itself whereunto that power belongs, is gross and intolerable. Let it be tried whether the bishops can delegate the power of ministerial preaching the word and administration of the sacraments unto any persons, without giving them the office of the ministry. If excommunication be an act of office-power, authority to administer it cannot be delegated unto any without the office itself whereunto it doth belong; for these things are inseparable. I certainly believe it is the duty and concernment of some men to state proceedings of this nature on better foundations; that the exercise of such solemn duties of Christian religion be not exposed to utter contempt, nor men led, by a discovery of false pretences of divine institutions, to despise the things themselves that are so abused.

It were easy, from many other considerations, to demonstrate the nullity of these men's pretended authority with respect unto excommunication as it is an ordinance of the gospel, in which respect alone the consciences of

men are concerned; and as unto their power over the civil rights and interests of men, those troubled by them must shift as well as they can.

But yet further: the manner of the administration of the present excommunications doth evidence their invalidity and nullity. That which they pretend unto, as hath been said, is a divine ordinance, an institution of Jesus Christ; and this declares in general how it ought to be administered by them who have authority for it and are called thereunto: for it hence followeth that it ought to be accompanied with an humble reverence of him and his authority; diligent attendance unto his law and the rule of his word in all things; with solemn, reiterated invocation of his holy name, for his presence, guidance, and assistance. Where these things are neglected in the administration of any divine ordinances, it is nothing but the taking the name of God in vain, and' the profanation of his worship. It may be some will despise these considerations; I cannot help it, — they do it at their utmost peril. It is conscience alone which I respect in this discourse; — they who have any such thing will think these things reasonable.

Again: the especial nature of this institution doth require an especial frame of mind in its administration, for it is the cutting off of a member of the same body with them, which cannot be without sense and sorrow (to cut off any one from a church who was never a member of it by his own consent, nor doth judge himself so to be, is ridiculous); hence St Paul calls the execution of this censure, “bemoaning,” ⁴¹²²2 Corinthians 12:21, denominating the whole action, from the frame of mind wherewith it ought to be performed. And he that shall dare to decree or denounce this sentence without sorrow and compassion for the sin and on the person of him that is excommunicated, plays a game with things sacred for his advantage, and shall answer for his presumption.

Besides, as was before observed, it is an instituted representation of the Lord Christ and his judgment in and of the church at the last day. If the consideration hereof be once out of the minds of them by whom it is administered, they must unavoidably err in all that they do, — much more if it be never once in them. But this they ought to take on their souls and consciences, that what they do, Christ himself, if present, would do, and will do the same at the last day; for so he will deal with all impenitent

sinners, — he will denounce them accursed, and deliver them to Satan. There is undoubtedly required from hence a reverential care and circumspection in all that is done here. To make a false representation of Christ in these things, — that is, his wisdom, authority, holiness, love, and care towards the church, — is the worst and most deformed image that can be set up. What higher indignity can be offered to his gracious holiness than to act and represent him as furious, proud, passionate, unmerciful, and delighting in the ruin of those that openly profess faith in him and love unto him? God forbid that we should think that he hath any concern in such ways and proceedings!

Whereas, also, the next end of this censure is not destruction, but edification, or the repentance and recovery of lapsed sinners, it ought to be accompanied with continual fervent prayers for this end. This the nature of the thing itself requireth, this the Scripture directs unto, and such was the practice of the primitive church.

If we are Christians, we are concerned in these things as much as we are in the glory of Christ and the salvation of our own souls. If we only make a pretense of religious duties, if we only erect an image of them for our own advantage, we may despise them, but at our peril. How well these things are observed in the present excommunications is notorious. Once to mention them is to deserve a second thunderbolt! An account of them, as to matter of fact, will be given shortly. At present I shall only say, that there is not any transaction of affairs in any kind, amongst men civilized, wherein there is a greater appearance and evidence of turbulent passions, acting themselves in all manner of irregularities, more profaneness of expression, more insolent insultations, more brawling, litigious proceedings, more open mixtures of money demanded in pretended administrations of right and equity, than there are in the public proceedings about them. Shall any Christian suppose that the Holy Spirit of God, on whom alone depends the efficacy of all divine ordinances unto their proper end, will immix his holy operations in or with this furious exertion of the lusts of men? If this be looked on as the complement of Christian discipline, or the last and utmost actings of the authority of Christ towards men in this world, it must needs be a temptation unto men of atheistical inclinations; certainly greater scandal cannot be given. And it is the interest of some, at least for the preservation of a veneration to their

office, to dispose of proceedings in this case in such a way and manner as may administer occasion of consideration unto them concerned, and not so as to be carried on, as at present, with laughter, indignation, and confusion; and if dissenters are to be destroyed, it is desirable that the work were left unto the penal statutes, — which, as now prosecuted and interpreted, are sufficient for it, — rather than that the name of religion and a divine ordinance should, merely for that end, be exposed to contempt.

The last thing that I shall trouble you with at present is, the consideration of the persons against whom the present excommunications are blustered, with the pretended causes of them. These are they whom they call Dissenters; concerning whom we may inquire what they are, and the cause of this pretended ecclesiastical severity towards them. And as unto the first part of the inquiry, they are such as believe and make open profession of all the articles of the Christian faith; they do so as they are declared in the Scripture; nor is the contrary charged on them. There is nothing determined by the ancient councils to belong unto Christian! faith which they disbelieve; nor do they own any doctrine condemned by them. They profess an equal interest of consent in the harmony of protestant confessions with any other Protestants whatever. They own the doctrine of the church of England as established by law, in nothing receding from it; nor have they any novel or uncatholic opinion of their own.

It is therefore utterly impossible to separate them from the communion of the catholic church in faith, or to cast them from that Rock whereon they are built thereby.

They do also attend unto divine worship in their own assemblies: and herein they do practice all that is agreed on by all Christians in the world, and nothing else; for they do not only make the Scripture the sole rule of their worship, so as to omit nothing prescribed therein to that purpose, nor to observe any thing prohibited thereby, but their worship is the very same with that of the catholic church in all ages; nothing do they omit that was ever used by it, nothing do they observe that was ever condemned by it. And this must be the principle and measure of catholic union in worship, if ever there be any such thing in the earth; to expect it in any other observances is vain and foolish Offering prayers and praises to God in the name of Jesus Christ, reading the holy Scripture and expounding of

it, singing of psalms to God, preaching of the word, with the administration of the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's supper, in a religious observation of the Lord's day unto these ends, all according as God doth enable them by his Spirit, is the sum and substance of the worship of the catholic church, wherein all Christians are agreed. These things the Scripture doth prescribe, and these things the church in all ages hath observed. All differences about this worship, which have filled the world with inhuman contentions, arose from men's arbitrary addition of forms, rites, modes, ceremonies, languages, cringings, adorations, which they would have observed in it; whereof the Scripture is silent and primitive antiquity utterly ignorant. And it may be it will be one day understood, that the due observance of this catholic worship, according as God enableth any thereunto (leaving others at liberty to use such helps unto their devotion as they shall think meet), is the only communion of worship in the church which the Scripture requires, or which is possible to be attained. About the imposition of other things, there ever were, since they were, and ever will be, endless contentions. Wherefore, these dissenters practising nothing in the worship of God but what is approved by all Christians, particularly by the church of England, omitting nothing that either the Scripture or catholic tradition directs unto, they are, notwithstanding this pretended excommunication, secure of communion with the catholic church in evangelical worship.

Moreover, they plead that their conversation is unblamable, — that they are peaceable in the civil government, and useful among their neighbors. If they do evil in these things, let them that prosecute them bear witness of the evil; but if they do well, why are they smitten? If they can be charged with any immoralities, with any disobedience unto the rule and precept of the gospel, those by whom they are thus prosecuted are highly concerned, if not in conscience, yet in honor and interest, to manage the charge against them, that some countenance may be given unto their proceedings: for "the law is not made," as penal, "for a righteous man, but for the lawless and disobedient, for the ungodly and for sinners, for unholy and profane;" and if it be otherwise with the laws about these excommunications, they neither belong to nor are derived from the law of God.

There are, indeed, great clamors against them that they are schismatics and separatists, and things of the like nature, — that is, that they are

dissenters; but in this case the whole force of any inference from hence is built on this supposition, that it is the will of Christ that those who profess faith in him and obedience unto him unblamably should be excluded from an interest in and participation of those ordinances of divine worship which are of his own institution, if they will not comply with and observe such rites and practices in that worship as are not so, but confessedly of human invention. But no color of proof can be given hereunto; for it is directly contrary unto express Scripture rule, to the example of the apostolical churches, and unheard of in the world before the branded usurpation of Victor, bishop of Rome. An assertion of it is to prostitute the wisdom, authority, and love of Christ towards his disciples unto the wills of men, oftentimes prepossessed with darkness, ignorance, superstition, and other lusts; as shall be more fully manifested if there be occasion. Let any color be given unto this supposition from Scripture or antiquity, and the whole cause shall be given up. Yet thus is it, and no otherwise, in the matter of the present excommunications: Persons of all sorts, every way sound in the faith, unreprouable in the catholic worship of the gospel, professing love and obedience unto Jesus Christ, without blame, are excluded, — what lies in them who manage these ordinances of divine worship which the Lord Christ hath appointed and enjoined, — without pretense of any other cause or reason but only their not observance, in that worship, of what he hath not appointed. He that can believe this to be the will of Christ neither knoweth him nor his will, as it is revealed in his word; and the consciences of men are sufficiently secure from being concerned in that wherein such an open defiance is bid unto evangelical precepts and rules, with apostolical examples.

And further to manifest the iniquity of these proceedings, whilst these dissenters are thus dealt withal, all sorts of persons, — ignorant, profane, haters of godliness, and openly wicked in their lives, — are allowed in the full communion of the church, without any disciplinary admonition or control! But as this serves to acquit them from any concernment in what is done against them, so nothing can be invented that tends more directly to harden men in their sins and impenitency; for whilst there is a pretense of church-censures, they will be apt to think that they are sufficiently approved of Christ and the church, seeing their displeasure is no way declared against them. So they are not dissenters, they have reason to

judge that they are safe here, and shall be so to eternity! Let them look to themselves who deserve to be excommunicated. Is this the rule of the gospel? Is this the discipline of Christ? Is this the representation of his future judgment? Is this the way and manner of the exercise of his authority in the church, a declaration of what he owns, and what alone he disavows? God forbid that such thoughts should have any countenance given unto them! Ecclesiastical laws have been always looked on as cobwebs that catch the smaller flies, whilst the greater break them at their pleasure; but amongst those lesser, to spare those that are noxious or poisonous, and to cast the net over the innocent and harmless, is that which the spider gives no pattern of, — nor can imitate.

I shall not mention the avowed end and design of these present excommunications; only I shall say, they are such as [that] many good men tremble to consider the horrible profanation of things sacred which they manifest to be in them.

There are also many other things which evidence the nullity of these proceedings, which may be pleaded if there be occasion. What hath already been spoken is abundantly sufficient to satisfy my engagement unto you, namely, that the consciences of men are not at all concerned in the present excommunications.

It may be it will be said that all this while we have been doing just nothing, or that which is to no purpose at all, as not concerning the present case; for those of whom we treat pretend no power in “*foro interiori*,” or the court of conscience, or unto any thing that should immediately affect it. Their authority is only in “*foro exteriori*,” in the court of the church, which it seems is at Doctors’ Commons. Wherefore, by their sentence of excommunication they oblige men only as unto their outward concernments; as unto what concerns conscience, they leave that unto the preachers of the word. It may be it will be so pleaded; but before they quit their hands well of this business, they will understand that excommunication itself is nothing but an especial way of the application of the word unto the consciences of sinners unto their edification, and that which is not so, pretend what it will, is nothing at all. Unto the dispensers of the word, therefore, it doth alone belong. And whereas the apostle tells us that the weapons of our Christian warfare are not carnal, but mighty,

through God, to bring into captivity every thought unto the obedience of Christ, they seem herein to say that the weapons of their warfare are carnal, and mighty, through the aid of somebody, to cast men into prison, or to bring their persons into captivity. And, indeed, this outward court of theirs is part of that court without the temple which is trodden down by the Gentiles, and shall not be measured in the restoration of the worship of God; yea, the distinction itself is silly, if any thing be intended by this outward court but only the outward declaration of what is, or is supposed to be, effected in the inward, or the mind and consciences of men. But let it be what it will, those who have neither name, nor place, nor office in the church, by divine institution, who attend not at all in what they do unto any rule of the Scripture, nor can nor do pretend any authority from Christ in and for what they do, are no way to be heeded in this matter, but only as the instruments of external compulsion; which, for the sake of the public peace, is to be submitted unto with quietness and patience.

I find, I confess, by the books with me, sent us weekly into the country, that in this state of things some of the reverend clergy do manifest great compassion towards the dissenters, in writing and publishing many discourses containing persuasives unto and arguments for conformity, whereby they may be freed from their troublesome circumstances; — but I must needs commend their prudence in the choice of the season for this work, as much as their charity in the work itself; for the conformity they press needs no other recommendation at this time, nor need they use any other arguments for it, but only that it is better than being hanged, or kept in perpetual durance, or stifled in prisons, or beggared, they and their families, or being starved in exile. And it hath been always observed, that arguments which march with halberts, bills, staves, sergeants, bailiffs, writs, warrants, and capias, are very forcible and prevalent.

But I have done, and shall leave it unto others to declare what mischiefs do ensue on these proceedings on civil accounts, and what an inroad is made by them on the government of the kingdom; for a new tenure is erected by them, whereon all men must hold their birthright privileges, especially that which is the root whereon they all do grow, — namely, their personal liberty. They hold them no longer by the law of the land, nor can pretend unto security whilst they forfeit them not by that law: they are all put into the power of chancellors, archdeacons, commissaries, and officials;

they may deprive them of them all at their pleasure, against the protection of that law under which they are born, and which hath been looked on as the only rule and measure of the subject's liberties, privileges, and possessions. These things tend not only to the disturbance, but the ruin of all peace and trust among men, and of all good government in the world.

And if they should excommunicate all that by the law of Christ are to be excommunicated on the one hand, and all that are to be so by their own law on the other, and then procure capiases for them all, it is to be feared the king might want subjects to defend his realms against his enemies, unless he should do as they did of old at Rome in great distresses, — open the jails, and arm the prisoners; or it may be the lesser part would at length find it troublesome to keep the greater in prison. But these things concern not you nor me. I beg your excuse, as not knowing whether you will judge this hasty writing too little for the cause or too much for a letter. As it is, accept it from, Sir, your, etc,

J. O.

A DISCOURSE

CONCERNING THE ADMINISTRATION OF CHURCH- CENSURES.

Ques. 1. *May a true church of Christ err or mistake in the administration of church-censures?*

ANS. A true church of Christ may err or mistake in the administration of the censures, or any act of discipline, whereby members of it, who are true members of Christ, may be injured, and sundry other inconveniences may ensue. And this is not unduly supposed: —

1. Because no particular church is absolutely infallible either in doctrine or administrations, especially in such points or things as overthrow not the foundation of faith or worship.
2. Because churches are more obnoxious and liable to error and mistake in their administrations and discipline than in doctrine; for all doctrines of truth are absolutely determined and revealed in the Scripture, so that there is no principle, means, nor cause of mistake about them, but what is only in the minds of men that inquire into them and after them. But the administration of the censures of the church hath respect unto many fallible mediums, requiring testimonies, evidences, and circumstances, which of themselves may lead a church acting in sincerity into many mistakes, especially considering how much in the dark unto us, for the most part, are the principles, causes, and ends of actions, [and] the frames of men's spirits in and after them; all which, in such cases, deserve much consideration.
3. Churches have erred in not administering the censures of the gospel according unto order and their duty, ~~<KRD>~~ 1 Corinthians 5:2.
4. The experience of all ages confirms the truth of this supposition. The first church-censure after the death of the apostles that is remaining on any record was that of the church of Corinth against some of their elders; wherein how they miscarried is evident from the epistle of the church of Rome unto them about that matter.

Corollary. In case any question arise about the administration of any church-censure in a church of Christ, it ought to be very jealous lest it have, in matter or manner, miscarried therein, seeing absolutely they may do so, and seeing there are so many ways and means whereby they may actually be induced into mistakes.

Q. 2. *Is it necessary that such maladministrations be rectified?*

A. It is necessary such maladministrations should be rectified by some way or means of Christ's appointment. And it is so, —

1. First on the part of the censures themselves; and that, —

(1.) Because of their nullity; for they are null, and bind not, —

[1.] “In foro coeli.” They bind not in heaven: for the Lord Christ ratifieth nothing in heaven but what is done in his name, by his commission, and according to his word; in some or all of which every maladministration faileth.

[2.] Nor “in foro conscientiae;” for conscience is not bound, nor will bind, on mere external ecclesiastical authority, where the person is indeed free, and judgeth himself to be so according unto rule.

Only such censures may be said to bind for a season, in some cases, in the church, but that “quod ordinem exteriorem et mere ecclesiasticum,” with respect unto outward order, that the peace of the church be not troubled, until mistakes may be rectified; but not “quoad ordinem internum et mere spiritualem,” with reference unto the dependence of the whole church on Christ the head.

(2.) Because of the consequents of them. Disadvantage to the gospel, prejudice to the ways of Christ, and the utter impairing the authority of all church-censures, must needs ensue, if there be no way to rectify such mistakes, or if they are left unrectified; as may easily be manifested.

2. This is also necessary on the part of the church supposed to have erred; for whereas all church-power is for edification, that which is unduly put forth and exercised is rather for destruction, the guilt whereof every church ought to rejoice in being delivered from, especially considering that there is

much more evil in *condemning the righteous* than in *acquitting the wicked*, though both of them be an abomination.

3. On the part of the persons unduly or unjustly separated from the church by such censures. This is so evident that it needs no confirmation.

4. On the account of all other churches holding communion with the church which hath (as it is supposed to have) miscarried. The reasons hereof will afterward be made to appear.

Corol. This relief, by what means soever it is to be obtained, is of great use to the churches of Christ, and of great concernment unto their peace and edification.

Q. 3. *How may such [mal]administrations be rectified?*

A. The rectifying such maladministrations may be (and is ordinarily no otherwise to be expected) by the advice and counsel of other churches, walking in the same fellowship and ordinances of the gospel with that church so failing, as is supposed; and this to be given upon the hearing and understanding of the whole proceedings of that church in the administration supposed irregular.

This, being the principal thing aimed at, must be further considered. And,

1. The way or means whereby other churches come to the knowledge of such supposed miscarriages in any church of their communion may be considered. Now, this is either, —

(1.) By public report. So the Israelites took notice of the fact of the Reubenites, and the Gadites, [and the half tribe of Manasseh,] in building an altar; which thereupon they sent to inquire about: they heard say they had done it, ⁽¹²²¹⁾Joshua 22:11. So the apostle took notice of the miscarriage of the church of Corinth in the case of the incestuous person, ⁽¹²²¹⁾1 Corinthians 5:1. And this is a sufficient ground of inquiry, or of desiring an account of any church in such cases.

(2.) By information of particular persons whom they judge holy and faithful. So the apostle took notice of the dissensions in the church of

Corinth: they were “declared unto him by them of the house of Chloe,”
~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 1:11.

(3.) By an account given unto them by any church requiring their advice in any case of difficulty, either before or after the administration of censures. So the church at Antioch gave an account of their troubles and differences to the church at Jerusalem, Acts 15.

(4.) By the addresses of the persons injured, or supposing themselves to be so: which to make, whilst they judge themselves innocent, is their indispensable duty, either directly by seeking advice or counsel from them, or by desiring admission into the fellowship of the gospel with them; which they cannot grant without an inquiry into the causes of their separation from any other church or society.

Corol. Where there is a concurrence of the most ways or means of information, there ought to be the more diligence in the inquiry.

Hence it follows, that it is the duty of churches walking in the same order and fellowship of the gospel, upon such information or complaint as before mentioned, of any undue administration of church-censures, especially of excommunication by any church amongst themselves, to inquire by their messengers into the cause and manner of it, to the end that they may give their joint advice and counsel in the matter. And it is the duty of the church complained of or informed against to give them an account of all their proceedings in that case, with their reasons for their procedure, and to hearken unto and consider the advice that shall be offered and given unto them.

2. This will appear sufficiently confirmed if we consider, in order unto a right judgment of the grounds whereon this way and practice is asserted,

(1.) That this advice of churches in communion to be given and taken is no ordinary or standing ordinance of the church as to its practice, though it be as unto its right, but is only to be made use of in extraordinary cases, and such as should not occur, — although they will; and for this cause it is more sparingly mentioned in the Scripture.

(2.) That it is, and may be fully proved to be, the duty of all churches, by previous advice with other churches in cases of difficulty, to prevent this consequent counsel; which, being after a sentence given, must needs be attended with many difficulties.

(3.) That the practice of the churches as to discipline is no longer recorded in the Scripture than they had the direction and help of the apostles, which supplied all extraordinary emergencies among them; so that many instances of this practice amongst them are not to be expected, — and it is of the care and wisdom of our Lord Jesus that we have any.

(4.) That we must here be content with such arguments and testimonies as we act upon in other ordinances and things belonging to the worship and order of the churches; such as the distribution of elders into teaching and ruling, the administration of the sacraments by officers only, gesture in the sacrament of the supper, observation of the first day of the week, and the like.

These things being premised, the order above expressed is confirmed, —

I. From the light and law of nature, with the unalterable reason of the thing itself. Hence are churches directed unto this order and practice.

There is somewhat that is moral in all ordinances. Some of them are wholly so as to their matter and substance, and founded in the light of nature, being only directed as to their principle, manner, and end, in the gospel. Such is excommunication itself, as might easily be made to appear. And from hence a direction unto duty and an indispensable obligation unto obedience do arise. That which is moral in any ordinance doth no less oblige us to an observation of it than that which is of mere institution; and it obligeth us because it is moral. And the Lord Christ being in all things the Lord of our consciences, what we do therein we do it in obedience unto him.

Now, that the order established is thus grounded and warranted appears by the ensuing rules, taken from the light of nature: —

1. “*Quod omnes tangit, ab omnibus tractari debet.*” All men are to consider that wherein the concernment of all doth lie, according to their respective interests. What is the ground and reason why all the members

of a church do consider, determine, give their counsel and consent, in the case of any person being cast out of their society? It is warranted by virtue of this rule. They all have communion with such a person, and must all withdraw communion from him, and therefore must consider the reason of his excision or cutting off. Now, a church in its censures doth not eject any one from the enjoyment of ordinances numerically only, that is, in that one society; but specifically, that is, from the ordinances of Christ in all churches. Hence it becomes the concernment of other churches, even as many as the person ejected may seek communion from; and therefore it is to be considered by them with respect unto their own duty of walking towards him.

2. “*Cujus est judicare, ejus est cognoscere.*” Whosoever is to judge is to take cognizance of the fact, and the reason of it. This is to be done according to the several interests that men may have in the matter under consideration; — which in some is of jurisdiction, which in this case we admit not of; in others, of counsel and advice. Now, other churches are not allowed in this case to be merely passive and indifferent, but must make a determination in it. This is evident on supposition of the injured person’s offering himself to their communion; for they must reject him or receive him. In both they judge, and therein must take cognizance, by hearing the matter from the church, and so on both sides. And unless this be allowed, no church can or ought to expect that any other church will reject from communion any whom they reject, merely because they are rejected, unless they suppose their judgment to be absolutely a rule unto any other churches to walk by in their observation of the commands and institutions of Christ.

3. On the part of the persons supposed to be injured, every man by the law of nature is obliged to undertake “*inculpatam sui tutelam,*” the just defense of his own innocency by all lawful ways and means. And as absolutely the way, means, and measure of this defence are left unto a man’s own prudence, so there is a rule given unto it, — Wherever the glory of God or the good of his neighbor is concerned. If either of these suffer by his wrong, he is obliged to vindicate his own innocency, nor is at liberty to suffer false imputations to lie upon him. It is in such cases a man’s sin not to do so. And in the case under consideration, this can be done only by an address unto other persons for their assistance, according

to their interest, An interest of jurisdiction, in civil courts or in churches, in this case there is none. The interest of private persons herein is of compassion, prayer, and private advice; the interest of churches is a cognizance of the cause, with advice and judgment thereon. And for persons or churches not to give assistance in this case, according to truth and equity, is their sin.

That these are principles of the light of nature and the natural reason of such things, appears from the general allowance of them so to be, and their constant practice amongst all men walking according to that light and law.


Corol. If churches, as they are assemblies and societies of men in communion for the same end, observe not the indispensable rules of societies, they cannot, as such, be ordinarily preserved in their being and communion.

II. The way and order laid down is directed unto, warranted, and confirmed, by general rules of the Scripture.


1. On the part of the church supposed to err in its administrations. There are sundry general rules which declare it to be their duty to give an account unto other churches of their proceedings therein, and to consider their advice. Some of these may be named, as, —

(1.) That they “give none offense to the church of God,” ~~400~~ 1 Corinthians 10:32. “Give no offense in any thing, that the ministry be not blamed,” ~~400~~ 2 Corinthians 6:3. Upon a supposition, or information, or complaint of maladministration of any ordinance, offense may be taken, and that, if accompanied (as it may be) with much appearing evidence, justly. And in this case the church hath no way to clear itself from having indeed given offense but by giving an account of their proceedings, and the reason thereof. And without this it cannot be avoided but that offenses will be multiplied amongst the churches of Christ, and that to the utter ruin of their mutual communion. Thus when Peter, by the special command and direction of God, went and preached the gospel to the Gentiles, many, not knowing the grounds of his so doing, nor his warrant for it, took offense at it, and charged him with irregular walking, ~~400~~ Acts 11:2, 8. In this case, he doth not defend himself by his apostolical authority and privilege, nor in a few words tell them he had a warrant for what he did; but, to remove all

doubts, questions, and causes of offense, he distinctly repeats the whole matter, and all the circumstances of it; — an example of so great importance, that the Holy Ghost thought meet at large to express his account and defense, though the matter of it was set down immediately before, Acts 10, 11.

(2.) That they “be ready always to give an answer” (that is, an account) “to every man that asketh them a reason of the hope that is in them” (and, consequently, of their practice suitable thereunto) “with meekness and fear,”  1 Peter 3:15. This proves it “a minore ad majus;” if they should be ready thus to answer every man, much more many churches of God, and that in and about things of their mutual edification.

(3.) That, in particular, they clear themselves when suffering under any imputation, or being in danger of so doing:

“What carefulness it wrought in you, what clearing of yourselves!
In all things ye have approved yourselves to be clear in this
matter,”  2 Corinthians 7:11.

And this on many accounts is the duty of a church in the case proposed. The glory of God, the honor of Christ, their own peace and edification, with the peace and credit of all other churches, require it of them. Nor can this duty be any otherwise performed but by this giving an account of their own proceeding, and receiving the advice of other churches therein. And if this be not done freely, with readiness and submission of mind, there is no way left to preserve the peace and communion of churches. Those who suppose they may in such cases act in a way of jurisdiction and church-power can attain the end by them aimed at, by virtue of the censures which they do administer. But in this way of counsel and advice, unless those who are concerned to give an account of themselves will do it with meekness, gentleness, mutual trust and confidence, suitable unto the conduct of the Spirit of Christ, in obedience unto his institutions, the whole end of it will be in danger to be frustrated.

2. On the part of other churches.

(1.) All churches walking in the same order and fellowship of the gospel are mutually debtors to each other for their good and edification: “Their

debtors they are,” ⁴⁸⁵⁷Romans 15:27. And this debt, in this case, can no otherwise be paid but by the way prescribed.

(2.) What the apostles did, might do, and ought to do, towards one another, who were all equal by virtue of their common interest in the same work, *that* one church may do, and ought to do, towards another, or many churches towards one; but one apostle might take cognizance of the ways and walking of another, and withstand, advise, or reprove him, if in any thing he failed, and walked not with a right foot, ⁴⁸⁵⁸Galatians 2:11, 14.

Corol. General rules, containing the grounds and reasons of particular institutions, are sure guidance and direction in and unto their observation.

III. The way and order expressed is warranted by necessity, as that without which the peace of communion and edification of the churches cannot be preserved and carried on; as, —

1. On the part of the church whose administrations are questioned. The persons censured (which is ordinary) may, in their own vindication, or by way of undue reflection, not to be discovered without a just examination, impair their reputation with other churches, or many members of them, whereby they may suffer and be exposed to sundry inconveniences. In this case, a church can have no relief but by reporting the matter unto other churches, so seeking their advice and counsel; whereby they may receive great encouragement, comfort, and boldness in the Lord, if found to have proceeded according unto rule.

2. On the part of other churches. A church may, either causelessly or with just cause, cast out or withdraw communion from such a number of their members as, bearing themselves on their own innocency and right, may continue in a society, and plead that the power, authority, and privilege of the church do abide with them. How, in this case, shall other churches know with which of these societies they may and ought to hold communion, unless they may and ought to examine and consider the causes of the dissension between them? And they may justly, and ought to withhold communion from that party of them, which shall refuse to tender their case unto such consideration.

3. On the part of the persons supposed to be injured, and that either for their restoration or their conviction and humiliation; for, —

(1.) If they are innocent, it is meet that they should be heard (as the Israelites heard the Reubenites), and necessary that they should be restored. Now, it being supposed that the church which hath rejected them will not rescind their own act without new light and evidence, — which, for many reasons, is not likely to spring from among themselves, — this is the only way left for that necessary relief which the Lord Christ requires to be given; for what is our duty towards a person repenting, in reference to his restoration, is certainly our duty towards a person who hath not sinned, when his innocency shall be discovered.

(2.) For their conviction and humiliation, if they be found offenders. Whilst they see not right the regularity of the church's proceedings with them, whilst they are able to justify themselves in their own consciences, and their hearts condemn them not, it is not to be expected that the sentence of excommunication, which works only by the means of men's light and conviction, will have its effect upon them. But when there shall be the concurrence of many churches in the approbation of the censure inflicted on them, which probably will be accompanied with a contribution of new light and conviction, it is a most useful means to bring them to humiliation and repentance. It was an aggravation of the censure inflicted on the incestuous Corinthian that it was given out against him by "many," ~~and~~ 2 Corinthians 2:6, — that is, by the common consent of the church; and it will add thereunto when the censure shall be confirmed and approved by the concurrent advice of many churches.

Corol. The Lord Christ having provided all things necessary for the peace and edification of his church in all things that are evidently of that importance, his mind and will is diligently to be inquired after.

IV. This whole order and practice are grounded on especial warrant and approbation, recorded Acts 15.; concerning which we may observe, —

1. That the occasion there mentioned fell out in the providence of God, and the practice upon it was guided by the Holy Ghost, that it might be an example and rule for the churches of Christ in cases of a like concernment unto them in all ages, and so have the force and warranty of an institution: as it was in the case that gave occasion unto deacons, Acts 6, — a matter of fact, wherein was some disorder, rectified by a practice answering the necessity of the church, became an institution for order in all future ages.

2. That in that synod things were not determined by immediate inspiration, but the truth was searched out, and the mind of the Holy Ghost searched into by reasonings, arguings, and the consideration of Scripture testimonies; whereby they were guided in their conclusion and determination.

3. That the institution and rule given is not in its exercise to be confined to that particular case and instance there mentioned (which to do would overthrow many other rules and observations which we admit), but it is to be extended, in proportion and parity of reason, unto all cases of a like nature: for the reason of any law is the rule of its interpretation; and so it is of any institution. That that which gives offense and trouble unto any church, — that wherein many churches are concerned, that which in any church hinders edification and disturbs the faith or peace of any of its members, whether it be in doctrine or practice, that which is not or cannot be composed in any one church, — should be considered, advised upon, and determined, by more churches holding communion together, and meeting for that purpose by their messengers, in the senses meaning, design, and importance of this institution.

Corol. To deny an institution of so great necessity to the peace and edification of the churches, will give great countenance unto men who, supposing such defects, are ready to supply them with their own inventions.

V. The order asserted is confirmed by the practice of the first churches, after the decease of the apostles; for when the church of Corinth had, by an undue exercise of discipline, deposed some of their elders, the church of Rome, taking cognizance of it, wrote unto them reproving their rashness, and advised their restoration. And when the church of Antioch was afterward troubled with the pride and false opinions of Paulus Samosatenus, the neighboring bishops or elders came unto the church, and joined their consent in his deposition.

Some things are, or may be, objected unto this course of proceeding amongst the churches of Christ; which shall therefore be briefly considered and answered.

Objection 1. This way of proceeding will abridge the liberty and destroy the privileges of particular churches, which ought to be carefully preserved, as the ground and foundation of the whole superstruction of church-order.

Ans. **1.** Particular churches have certainly no liberties or privileges that are inconsistent with and do contradict either the light of nature, moral equity, general rules of the Scripture, or the reasons and ends of all institutions, and the edification of the whole body of Christ. And on these, as hath been declared, is this way and course of proceeding grounded.

2. Other churches taking care about their own concernments and duty, according to the will and appointment of Christ, — namely, in considering whom they receive into, and whom they are to deny communion unto, with the causes thereof, — do not, nor can truly, abridge the liberties or privileges of any church whatever; for the duty of many churches will never interfere with the due liberty of any one. And this is all upon the matter that they do in this case; which must be granted them, unless we will say that the actings of one church, and those it may be irregular, shall not only abridge all other churches of their liberty, but hinder them also from performing their duty.

3. I do not see how counsel and advice can abridge the liberty of any church or person. Certainly to guide, direct, and assist any in the acting of their liberty, is not to abridge it, but rather to strengthen it; for liberty acted not according to rule is licentiousness. A man in the use of his liberty may be going to do himself some notable injury; he that shall stop him by counsel and persuasion, with the prevalency and authority of reason, doth not take away his liberty, but guide him aright in the use of it.

4. Wherein is the abridgment pretended? Is a church by this means hindered from the free use and acting of its own judgment, in taking in what members to it seems good, in watching over them according to the rule, in admonishing, reproving, or casting them out, if it find just and sufficient cause so to do? To hinder or obstruct a church in any of these acts or actings, by any authority, sentence, or determination, by any act or acts whatever, is utterly disclaimed: so that this is but a pretense.

5. When a case hath difficulty in it, — and such mostly, if not universally, have all cases wherein there will be found the least appearance of a grievance in the execution of censures, or pretense for seeking redress, — a church hath not liberty, hath no privilege, to secure it from previously seeking the advice of other churches; which is their duty by many rules of Scripture. We must not pretend unbounded liberty against known duty. And as a church doth not seek previous advice from other churches, that they may obtain power to execute their censures, which they have in themselves, no more doth this following advice any way cut them short in the use or execution of their power, but only direct them. And if a church have not this liberty by rule before censure in difficult cases, as it hath not, no more hath it after a censure, whereby the necessity of advice and counsel may be increased.

Obj. 2. This way of proceeding will erect a jurisdiction or judicature in some churches over others; which is not to be allowed.

So some have spoken, who have not, it may be, duly weighed either what jurisdiction, properly so called, is, or how great an evil it is to cast a reproach upon the right ways of the Lord. In answer I say, —

Ans. 1. Excommunication itself, whatever men may suppose, is no proper act of jurisdiction; for jurisdiction in any sense is an adjunct of office, and the acts of it are acts of office and power. But so is not excommunication; for it is not an authoritative act of the officers of the church, but a judicial sentence of the whole church. Now the whole church is not in office; the whole body is not an eye. What is done, then, by it is no act of office-power, but a declaration of a judgment according to especial institution. And if excommunication itself may be exercised without any jurisdiction, surely that exercise may be consulted and advised about without any pretense thereunto.

2. To constitute a jurisdiction, it is required that there be, first, an office-power stated in them that claim it, and a duty in others on the same account to submit unto them; secondly, an authoritative acting by virtue of that office-power, with an obligation from that authority, formally considered, unto obedience; with sundry other things, which in this matter are utterly disclaimed.

3. A right understanding of the true state of the question, of what is granted and what asserted in this matter, will, with them that love peace and truth, fully obviate such objections as these; for, —

(1.) It is granted that all church power and authority, for the administration of all the ordinances and institutions of the gospel, is intrusted with a particular congregation.

(2.) That there is no judicature, no church assembly, vested with church power and authority, without, above, or beyond a particular church, that should either contribute authority unto such a church for its actings, or authoritatively control it in its actings, to order or change its proceeding in any thing, as by virtue of any authority received unto that purpose.

(3.) That in case any person be not satisfied with the administration of the church whereof he is a member, but finds himself aggrieved thereby, he cannot appeal unto any Church, or churches, or assemblies of churches, as having power or authority to revoke or disannul the sentence or act of the church wherewith he is offended, either in pretense that the church without their concurrence and consent had not power to pass any such act, or that they have authority to control their acts, or can on any account authoritatively interpose in their administrations.

(4.) It is granted, then, that the power of excommunication, in the preceding acts unto it and full execution of it, is placed in a particular congregation, without respect unto any superior authority but that of Christ and his word. These things are acknowledged. But that it should hence follow, that, in case of supposed maladministration of ordinances, and the complaint of persons pretending to be injured thereby, other churches are not, by virtue of Scripture rules, institution of our Lord Jesus, warrant of the light of nature, on their communion and common interest, to inquire into the matter and take cognizance of it, that no offense be given or taken, that they may know how to discharge aright their duty towards both the church and the persons aggrieved, and give their advice in the common concernment of all the churches, there is no pretense to surmise. And for a church to say that because they have power to do what they do, they will therefore in such things neither desire advice, nor take advice, nor hearken unto counsel, nor give account of their

proceedings to them that are or may be offended or that require an account of them, is scarce agreeable to the Spirit of Christ or the rule of his word.

Obj. 3. This is the way to frustrate the sentence of excommunication, and to prevent the due efficacy of it upon the persons censured, yea, to harden them in their sin and offense.

Ans. 1. Concerning whom are these things feared? Were the advice mentioned, and the counsel to be had and given, to be among heathens, enemies of the church or of the ways of Christ, or of the especial way and order of church-fellowship which in this discourse is supposed, such events might be feared: but to pretend to fear that other churches of Christ, walking in the same order and communion with ourselves, and whom we ought to look on in all things as like-minded with ourselves, as to their aim at the glory of God and edification of the church, should, by their counsel and advice, frustrate the end of any ordinance of Christ, is a surmise that ought not to be indulged unto; yea, we have herein cause to admire the wisdom and bless the care of our Lord Jesus Christ, who hath provided this help for us, to strengthen and confirm us in the ways of truth and righteousness, or to direct us where we are or may be mistaken.

2. Where excommunication is not administered but in a due manner and for just causes, there will appear little trouble or difficulty in this matter. Let the cause or matter of it be as it ought to such a sin or sins as the mind or conscience of a believer, of an enlightened person, free from open prejudices, will at first view condemn in himself and others, and this or these sins persisted in after due admonition, — and there will indeed be left no pretense of grievance or complaint in those that are censured. But if it be administered in dubious cases, we shall find that this way of counsel is so far from being an obstruction of its efficacy as that it is the only means to render it effectual.

3. No man will complain, or address himself unto the relief declared, if he be convinced in his conscience that he is not injured, but that he is indeed guilty of the crimes charged on him, and that by Scripture rule they are such as deserve that censure. In this case no man will be so foolish or obstinate as to seek for relief; and if he should do so, he can possibly expect nothing but to have his bands made strong. But now suppose that a person be not so convinced, neither before nor after sentence denounced

against him, but looks on himself as innocent and injured, either in part or in whole, in matter or manner of proceeding, — what effect can be expected of his excommunication? We are deceived if we look that this ordinance should have any effect upon men but by the conviction of their minds and consciences. It worketh doctrinally only, though peculiarly by virtue of especial institution. And in this case it is evident how this way may further, and that it cannot possibly obstruct, the effects of this censure; as was in part before declared.

4. The address being but once to be made, this is the only way to bind the guilty person, and that without delay, and to give him a sense of his sin, which it is supposed that before he had not.

5. It is our duty not to cast even persons that are excommunicated under new temptations, Now, he that is aggrieved with the sentence denounced against him, and supposeth himself injured (which whilst he doth so he cannot be humbled for his sin), if he suppose he hath no way of relief left unto him, — that is, that his case can no more come under advice or counsel, — he will be exposed unto temptations to irregular ways, and so cast off the yoke which he supposeth grievous and injurious.

Obj. **4.** The pattern urged for this course of proceeding, Acts 15, concerneth only doctrines, and not the administration of censures, which was not then or there in question; and therefore in the like case only may the like course be taken.

Ans. **1.** The way of mutual counsel and advice amongst churches pleaded for is not built only upon that instance and, example, as hath before been evinced. There are many more grounds of it, reasons for it, and directions about it, than what are or can be comprised in any one particular instance.

2. There is frequently, if not always, some doctrinal mistake in the bottom of all maladministration; for whereas the nature of the sin proceeded against, and the rule proceeded by, ought in the first place to be doctrinally and dogmatically stated, here usually is the beginning of the mistake and error of any church. This, therefore, falls confessedly under that example of Acts 15.

3. Though that assembly made a doctrinal determination of the things in difference, yet the formal reason of the consideration of those things was

the offense that was given, and that the churches were troubled: so that the pattern is to be extended unto all things whereby the peace of the church is disturbed.

4. Maladministration may tend to the subversion of the church, and the ruin of the souls of men, no less than false doctrines; as suppose a church should admit known Arians or Socinians into their society, supposing they have liberty so to do, may not other churches both consider the fact, and, unless they alter their proceeding, withhold communion from them? Instances innumerable of the same kind may be given.

Obj. 5. Churches have the sole power of admitting members into their society; by virtue of which admission they are not only received into a participation of the privileges of the church in that particular society whereof they are members, but also into the communion of all other churches of Christ. Now, this is daily practiced by churches, without any further inspection into their actions by others. Those admitted are received upon their testimony unto their admission. And why shall not churches have the same trust reposed in them as to the exclusion of any members from them, and expect that their testimony alone to the fact should satisfy for their exclusion from all other churches and their communion?

Ans. 1. The cases, indeed, are parallel, and the power of every church is no less for the exclusion of any of their members than for their admission, nor ought their testimony to be of less weight in the one [case] than in the other.

2. Ordinarily, and where there is no ground of further consideration, the actings of a church of Christ in both these cases are, and ought to be, granted and taken to be according unto rule, so that other churches do acquiesce as to their concerns in the judgment of all the several churches of their communion.

3. There may be mistakes in [the] admission as well as in the exclusion of members; and some there are who do very much scruple complete communion with many churches principally upon this account, that they proceed not on right grounds in their admission of members; and such cannot but grant that, on occasion, the grounds of their own admission may and ought to be questioned and examined.

4. No church hath such an absolute power in the admission of members, but that in cases of difficulty, and such as may in their determination one way or other give offense, they are bound to seek and to take the advice of other churches with whom they hold communion.

5. Suppose it be reported or intimated, by any of the ways that were before mentioned, that a church in communion with others had admitted into their society an Arian or Socinian, a seducer or a person of a flagitious life, given to corrupt the manners of others; shall not the other churches of the same communion, to whom the matter is so reported or declared, and who are offended thereat, require an account of that church's proceeding therein, to know whether it be as it is reported or no? And is not that church so represented or reported of obliged to give a full and punctual account of their proceedings, and to receive advice thereupon? Let any consider the instances before given, the nature of the thing itself, the rule of the Scripture in such cases, and determine. The case is directly the same as to excommunication.

“But if any man seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, neither the churches of God,” ~~1~~¹ 1 Corinthians 11:16.

I.

AN ANSWER UNTO TWO QUESTIONS:

*with*TWELVE ARGUMENTS AGAINST ANY CONFORMITY TO
WORSHIP NOT OF DIVINE INSTITUTION.*Should ye not hear the words which the Lord hath cried by the former
prophets? — ~~<XIV>~~ Zechariah 7:7.**Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth. —
~~<XIV>~~ Romans 14:22*

II.

OF MARRYING AFTER DIVORCE IN CASE OF
ADULTERY.

III.

OF INFANT BAPTISM AND DIPPING.

PREFATORY NOTES.

I.

Mr. Orme thus explains the origin and history of the following treatise, which first appeared in the Sermons of Owen, published by Marshall, in 1720: — “About the time of the Doctor’s death, a small manuscript was handed about, containing twelve arguments against conformity to worship not of divine institution. The leading object of these arguments is to point out the unlawfulness of those who had separated from the Church of England uniting in its public services, as those services are of a very different nature from the worship which Christ hath appointed. This manuscript occasioned a very violent discussion. It was sent to Baxter, as that which had satisfied many of the impropriety of joining in the liturgy. ‘I hastily answered them,’ he says, ‘but found after that it had been most prudent to have omitted his name; for on that account a swarm of revilers in the city poured out their keenest censures, and three or four wrote against me, whom I answered.’ No wonder that Owen’s friends were displeased, as he was scarcely in his grave when this attempt was made by Baxter to convict him of no less than forty-two errors in the space of ten pages! It reminds us of the controversy between Erasmus and Natalis Bedda. The latter extracted from the writings of Erasmus two hundred erroneous propositions; who revenged himself in the same way, by calculating that Bedda had been guilty of a hundred and eighty-one lies, three hundred and ten calumnies, and forty-seven blasphemies! Owen’s Twelve Arguments are printed in the octavo edition of his Sermons, published in 1720. Baxter’s reply is in his ‘Defence of Carbollic Communion.’ The occasional conformity controversy gave a great deal of trouble to the Dissenters, both then and afterwards, to which Baxter’s conduct and writings very largely contributed. Owen’s tract is one of the best things on the other side.”

II. AND III.

THE tracts on “Marriage,” etc., and on “Infant Baptism,” etc., were published in the folio volume of “Sermons and Tracts” by Owen, which was printed in 1721. — ED.

AN ANSWER UNTO TWO QUESTIONS.

QUESTION 1.

WHETHER persons who have engaged unto reformation and another way of divine worship, according to the word of God, as they believe, may lawfully go unto and attend on the use of the prayer book in divine worship?

ANSWER.

1. We suppose herein all that hath been pleaded against that kind of service, as to its matter, form, imposition, use end, and consequents; which are all of them duly to be considered before the practice inquired after can be allowed. But, —
2. The present question is not about the lawfulness or unlawfulness of forms of prayer in general; nor about the lawfulness of that form or those forms which are prescribed in the Common-prayer book, as unto their matter and manner of composure, absolutely considered; nor yet about the expediency of the whole system of worship limited thereunto: but it respects all these things, and the like, with reference unto the persons described in the inquiry. And as unto the persons intended in the inquiry, we judge this practice unlawful unto them, as contrary unto sundry rules of the Scripture, and wherein it is condemned.
1. It is contrary unto that *general rule* in those easements given us by the apostle, ^{ROM} Galatians 2:18, “If I build again the things which I destroyed, I make myself a transgressor.” To “destroy” or dissolve any thing in the worship of God, is to lay it aside and remove it out of that worship, as that which we have no divine obligation unto: so the apostle destroyed the legal ceremonies whereof he there speaks, and no otherwise. To “build again,” is to admit into the worship of God as useful unto the edification of the church. And these are contrary, so that if the one be a duty, the other, in the same case, or with respect unto the same things, is a sin. If it were a duty to destroy, it is a sin to build; and if it be a duty to build, it was a sin to destroy. He that doth both makes himself unavoidably a transgressor.

But we have in this sense, as unto ourselves, destroyed this form of worship; that is, we have omitted it, and left it out in the service of the church, as that which we had no divine obligation unto, and as that which was not unto edification. If we now build it again, as it is done in the practice inquired after, we make ourselves transgressors, either by destroying or building.

And there is strength added unto this consideration, in case that we have suffered any thing on the account of the forbearance of it; as the same apostle speaks in the same case, “Have ye suffered so many things in vain? if it be yet in vain,” ^{<6142>}Galatians 3:4. It is a great folly to lose our own sufferings: “Are ye so foolish?” verse 3.

2. It is contrary unto that *great rule*, “Whatsoever is not of faith is sin,” ^{<6143>}Romans 14:23; for that any thing which a man doth in the worship of God may be of faith, it is necessary that he be convinced or persuaded that it is his duty so to do, ^{<1820>}Matthew 28:20; ^{<2012>}Isaiah 1:12; ^{<6042>}Deuteronomy 4:2.

It is no rule in the worship of God, that we should do what we can, or that we have a liberty to do this or that, which we yet suppose, all circumstances considered, that we are not divinely obliged to do. In all things in general, and in particular duties or instances, we must have an obligation on our consciences from the authority of God that so we ought to do, and that our not doing of it is a neglect of a duty, or it is not of faith. The performance of any thing in the worship of God hath in it the formal nature of a duty, given it by its respect unto divine authority; for a duty to God that is not an act of obedience with respect unto his authority is a contradiction.


Wherefore, no man can (that is, lawfully and without sin) go to and attend on this kind of religious worship but he who judgeth his so doing to be a duty that God requireth of him, and which it would be his sin to omit, every time he goes unto it. God will not accept of any service, from us on other terms. Whether this be the judgment of those who make the inquiry as unto what they do, they may do well to consider.

3. It is contrary to the rule delivered, ^{<3013>}Malachi 1:13, 14,

“Ye brought that which was torn, and the lame, and the sick; thus ye brought an offering: should I accept this of your hand? saith the LORD. But cursed be the deceiver, which hath in his flock a male, and voweth, and sacrificeth unto the LORD a corrupt thing: for I am a great King, saith the Lord of hosts.”

We are obliged, by all divine laws, natural, moral, and positive, to serve God always with our best. The obligations hereunto are inseparable from all just conceptions of the divine nature, and our relation thereunto. No man can think aright of God, and that it is his duty to serve him, but must think it to be so with the best that he hath. To offer him any thing when we have that which is better, or which we judge to be better, is an act of profaneness and not obedience. In all sacrifices the blood and the fat were to be offered unto God. Wherefore, he that attends unto this service doth avow to God that it is the best that he hath; and if it be not so, he is a deceiver.

If it be objected, hereon, that “by virtue of this rule, so understood as that we are always obliged to the use of that which we judge best in the worship of God, we are bound to leave this or that ministry or church, if we judge that the administrations are better amongst others,” it is answered, that the rule respects not *degrees*, where the whole administration is according to the mind of God, but different *kinds* of worship, as worshipping by a limited prescribed form and worshipping by the assistance of the Spirit of God are.

4. It is contrary unto that rule, “Let all things be done unto edifying,”  1 Corinthians 14:26. Whatsoever doth not promote edification is excluded out of the worship of the church by virtue of this rule, nor can it be a duty in us to give countenance thereunto or to make use of it. It is said that “prayer is the worship of God; these forms of it are only a determination of the manner of it, or an outward means of that worship.” Let it be supposed so; although it be certain that, as prescribed, they are parts of the service. They are therefore means that are a help and furtherance unto edification in prayer, or they are an hinderance of it, or they are of no use or signification one way or the other. If it be said that “they are a help unto edification, and are found so by experience, in the exclusion of any other way of worship,” then I ask why they are not constantly used? —

why do we at any time, in any place, refuse the aid and help of them unto this great end of all things that are done in the church? But this can be pleaded only by those who contend for the constant use of them in the worship of God, with whom at present we are not concerned. If it be acknowledged that “indeed they are an hinderance unto edification, which is more promoted without them, yet are they not in themselves unlawful,” I say, as before, that is not the present question; we inquire only whether the use of them by those who judge them hinderances unto edification be not contrary to the rule mentioned, “Let all things be done unto edifying.” For the things of the third sort, that are of no use nor signification at all, they can have no place nor be of any consideration in the worship of God.

5. It is inconsistent with that *sincerity in profession* that is required of us. Our public conjunction with others in acts and duties of religious worship is a part of that profession which we make; and our whole profession is nothing but the declaration of the subjection of our souls unto the authority of Christ, according unto the gospel.

Wherefore, in this conjunction in worship we do profess that it is divinely required of us, and that it is part of that obedience which we owe to Jesus Christ; and if we do not so judge it, we are hypocritical in what we do, or the profession that we make. And to deny that our practice is our profession in the sight of God and men, is to introduce all manner of licentiousness into religion.

6. Such a practice is, in very many instances, contrary unto *the great rule of not giving offense* [~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 10:32]; for it is unavoidable but that many will be given and taken, and some of them of pernicious consequence unto the souls of men. In particular, —

First, “Woe will be unto the world because of these offenses:” for hence our adversaries will take occasion to justify themselves in their most false and injurious charges against dissenters, unto the hardening of them in their ways; as, —

(1.) They accuse them as factious and seditious, in that they will not do what they can do, and what, by the present practice, they own to be the mind of God that they should do (or else expressly play the hypocrite), for the sake of peace, order, and obedience unto magistrates.

(2.) That they pretend conscience wherein indeed it is not concerned in their own judgment, seeing, on outward considerations which conscience can have no regard unto, they can do what is required. On these apprehensions they will justify themselves in their security, and harden themselves in their sins, it may be to their perdition. Woe be unto them by whom such offenses come!

Secondly, By this practice we cast in our suffrage on the part of *persecutors* against the present *sufferers* in the nation; for we justify what is done against them, and condemn them in their sufferings, as having no just cause or warranty for what they do, as we declare by our practice of what they refuse. There is no man who complies in this matter but it is a part of his profession that those who refuse so to do, and are exposed to sufferings thereon, do not suffer according to the will of God, nor do their sufferings redound unto his glory; and no offense or scandal can be of a higher nature.

Thirdly, *Differences and divisions* will on this practice unavoidably arise between churches themselves and members of the same church, which will be attended with innumerable evil consequences, unto the dishonor of the gospel, and, it may be, to the loss of all church-communion.

Fourthly, Many will be induced, on the *example of others*, especially if they be persons of any reputation in the church who shall so practice, to follow them against their own light, having the great weight of the preservation of their liberties and goods lying on the same side; and experience will quickly show what will be the event hereof, either in total apostasy, or that terror of conscience which they will find no easy relief under, as it hath fallen out with some already. And, —

Fifthly, It is a *justification of our adversaries* in the cause wherein we are engaged, —

(1.) In their *church-state*;

(2.) In a *reading ministry*;

(3.) In their *casting us out* of communion on the present terms;

(4.) In their judgment concerning us on the point of *schism*; as might easily be manifested.

Lastly, There is in this practice a visible compliance with the design of the prescription of this form of service unto the sole use of the church in the duties of divine worship. And this, in the nature of the thing itself, is an exclusion of the exercise of the gifts of the Holy Spirit in that worship, which is given and continued by Christ to this very end, that the church may be edified in divine worship and the due performance of it. And whether this answers our loyalty unto Christ in his kingly office ought to be well inquired into.

And we shall hereby, on a mere act of outward force, join with them in church-communion who have cast us out of their communion by the imposition of principles and practices in divine worship no way warranted by the Scripture or authority of Christ, who allow us no church-state among ourselves, nor will join in any one act of church-communion with us! who persecute us even unto death, and will not be satisfied with any compliance without a total renunciation of our principles and practice in the worship of God, and giving away our whole cause about the state of the church and other divine institutions! Besides, we shall seem to be influenced by a respect unto their excommunications; which, as they are managed and administered at present, are not only a high profanation of a sacred ordinance, but suited to expose Christian religion unto scorn and contempt.

QUESTION 2.

A second inquiry is, Whether the persons before mentioned and described may lawfully, and in a consistency with or without a renunciation of their former principles and practice, go to and receive the sacrament of the Lord's supper in the parish churches, under their present constitution and administration?

ANSWER.

It appears that they may not, or cannot so do; for, —

1. *Their so doing would be an ecclesiastical incorporation in the church wherein they do partake; for a voluntary conjunction in the highest, act of communion with any church, according to its order and institution, warranted by its own authority, is an express corporation with it,*

whereby a man is constituted a formal member of it unto all ends and purposes of privilege, right, and duty. The church-state is owned hereby, its authority submitted unto in its right and exercise; nor is it otherwise interpreted of them unto whom they so join themselves. But this is a virtual, yea, an express renunciation of their own present church-state in any other society, and necessitates a relinquishment of their former practice.

It will be said that “a member of one particular church may partake of the sacrament of the Lord’s supper in another, without incorporating or becoming a stated member of that church wherein he doth so partake.”

It is answered, that he may do so by virtue of that communion which is between the church whereof he is a member and that church wherein he doth so partake; for he is admitted unto that participation by virtue of that communion, and not on his own personal account. If it be otherwise, where any one is received unto the participation of this ordinance, there he is admitted unto entire membership, and is engaged unto all the duties thereunto belonging.

And thus is it in this case; for those unto whom they join themselves herein, if but *occasionally*, do, —

- (1.) Own no church-state in this nation but their own;
- (2.) Admit of none unto this sacrament by virtue of their communion with any other church, or any churches not of their own constitution; nor,
- (3.) Will administer it unto any but those whom they claim to be their own, as living in their Parishes, in opposition unto any other church-state whatever.

Wherefore, it is impossible that any man should be a member of one church and communicate in this ordinance with another which condemns that whereof he is [a member] as schismatical, and receiveth him as one belonging unto itself only, but he doth professedly renounce the communion of that church wherein he was, and is by them that receive him esteemed so to do. And no reserves of a contrary judgment or resolution in his own mind will relieve any man, in conscience or reputation, against the testimony of his practical profession.

2. They do hereby *profess a spiritual incorporation with those or that church wherein they do so communicate*, — namely, that they are “one bread and one body” with them, that they all “drink into one Spirit,” ¹ ~~600~~ Corinthians 10:17, 12:13. How they can do this in those places where they judge the generality of them to be profane and ignorant, without sinning against their own light, is not to be understood.

It is said that “no persons, in this or any other ordinance of divine worship, are polluted or made guilty by the sins of others with whom they do communicate.” It is answered, that this is not at present inquired into. That which such persons are charged with is their own sin only, in making a profession of spiritual incorporation, or becoming of one body, one bread with them, and of drinking into the same Spirit with them, when they do not esteem them so to be, in the exercise of love without dissimulation. The neglect also of other express duties, which we owe unto those who stand in that union with us, will necessarily follow hereon. Neither do such persons as so communicate intend to take on themselves an obligation unto all those duties which are required of them towards those with whom they profess themselves to be one spiritual body; which is an open prevarication against Scripture rule.

3. They would *hereby not only justify the whole service of the liturgy, but the ceremonies also enjoined to be used in the administration of the sacrament*; for the rule of the church wherewith they join is that whereby they are to be judged. Any abatement that may be made of them in practice is on both sides an unwarrantable self-deceiving, inconsistent with Christian ingenuity and sincerity. But hereby they do not only condemn all other present dissenters, but all those also of former days and ages, ministers and others, who suffered under deprivation, imprisonment, and banishment, in their testimony against them.

If they shall say they do not approve what is practiced by others, though they join in the same worship and duties of it with them, I say this is contrary to the language of their profession, unto Scripture rule, ¹ ~~610~~ Romans 14:22, and is indefensible in the sight of God and good men, and unworthy of that plain, open, bold sincerity which the gospel requireth in the professors of it.

4. *The posture of kneeling in the receiving of this sacrament is a peculiar act of religious adoration, which hath no divine institution or warranty; and is therefore at best an act of will-worship, not to be complied withal.*

It is said that “kneeling is required not as an act of worship or religious adoration, but only as a posture decent and comely, because the sacrament is delivered with a prayer unto every one.” But, —

- (1.)** That *delivery of it with a prayer unto every one is uninstituted*, without primitive example, contrary to the practice at the first institution of the ordinance, unsuited unto the nature of the communion required, and a disturbance of it.
- (2.)** He that prays stands, and he that doth not pray kneels, which must be on another consideration; for, —
- (3.)** Prayer is not the proper exercise of faith in the instant of receiving of this sacrament, as is evident from the nature and use of it.
- (4.)** The known original of this rite cloth render it not only justly to be suspected, but to be avoided.

On these considerations, which might be enlarged, and many others that might be added, it is evident that the practice inquired into, with respect unto the persons at first intended, is unlawful, and includes in it a renunciation of all the principles of that church-communion wherein they are engaged. And whereas some few have judged it not to be so, they ought to rectify their mistake in their future walking.

TWELVE ARGUMENTS

AGAINST ANY CONFORMITY OF MEMBERS OF SEPARATE CHURCHES TO THE NATIONAL CHURCH.

POSITION. — It is not lawful for us to go to and join in public worship by the Common-prayer, because that worship itself, according to the rule of the gospel, is not lawful.

Some things must be premised to the confirmation of this position: as, —

1. The whole system of *liturgical worship*, with all its inseparable dependencies, are intended; for as such it is established by law, and not in any part of it only, and as such it is required that we receive it and attend unto it. It is not in our power, it is not left to our judgment or liberty, to close with or make use of any part of it, as we shall think fit.

There are in the Mass-book many prayers and praises directed to God only by Jesus Christ; yet it is not lawful for us thereon to go to mass, under a pretense of joining only in such lawful prayers. As we must not affect their drink-offerings of blood, so we must not take up their names into our lips, ~~which~~ Psalm 16:4; we must have no communion with them.

2. It is to be considered as armed with laws; — first, such as declare and enjoin it as the only true worship of the church; secondly, such as prohibit, condemn, and punish, all other ways of the worship of God in church-assemblies. By our communion and conjunction in it, we justify those laws.

3. This conjunction by communion in the worship of the liturgy is a symbol, pledge, and token of an ecclesiastical incorporation with the church of England in its present constitution. It is so in the law of the land,^{f12} it is so in the common understanding of all men. And by these rules must our profession and practice be judged, and not by any reserves of our own, which neither God nor good men will allow of.

4. Wherefore, he that joineth in the worship of the Common-prayer doth, by his practice, make profession that it is the true worship of God, accepted by him, and approved of him, and wholly agreeable to his mind;

and to do it with other reserves is hypocrisy, and worse than the thing itself without them. “Happy is he that condemneth not himself in that thing which he alloweth,” ^{<410>}Romans 14:22.

5. There may be a false worship of the true God as well as a worship of a false god: such was the worship of Jehovah the Lord by the calf in the wilderness, ^{<436>}Exodus 32:5, 6; such was the feast unto the LORD ordained by Jeroboam “in the eighth month, on the fifteenth day of the month,” the which “he devised of his own heart,” ^{<412>}1 Kings 12:32, 33.

On these suppositions, the proposition laid down is proved by these, following arguments: —

First Argument. — Religious worship not divinely instituted and appointed is false worship, not accepted with God; but the liturgical worship intended is a religious worship not divinely instituted nor appointed: *ergo*, not accepted of God.

The proposition is confirmed by all the divine testimonies wherein all such worship is expressly condemned; that especially where the Lord Christ restraineth all worship to his alone command, ^{<404>}Deuteronomy 4:2, 12:32; ^{<410>}Proverbs 30:6; ^{<415>}Jeremiah 7:31; ^{<439>}Isaiah 29:13; ^{<481>}Matthew 28:20.

It is answered to the minor proposition, “That the liturgical worship is of Christ’s appointment as to the substantials of it, namely, prayers and praises, though not as to its accidentals, not as unto its outward rites and forms, which do not vitiate the whole.” But it is replied, —

1. There is nothing accidental in the worship of God; every thing that belongs to it is part of it, ^{<493>}Matthew 23:23. Some things are of more use, weight, and importance, than others, but all things that duly belong unto it are parts of it, or of its substance. Outward circumstances are natural and occasional, not accidental parts of worship.

2. Prayers and praises, absolutely considered, are not an institution of Christ; they are a part of natural worship, common to all mankind. His institution respecteth only the internal form of them, and the manner of their performance; but this is that which the liturgy taketh on itself, — namely, to supply and determine the matter, to prescribe the manner, and

to limit all the concerns of them to modes and forms of its own; which is to take the work of Christ out of his hands!

3. Outward rites and modes of worship divinely instituted and determined do become thereby *necessary* parts of divine worship, ~~CRUC~~ Leviticus 1:1-6; therefore such as are humanly instituted, appointed, and determined, are thereby made parts of worship, — namely, of that which is false, for want of a divine institution.

4. Prayer and praise are not things prescribed and enjoined in and by the liturgy; it is so far from it, that thereby all prayers and praises in church-assemblies, merely as such, are prohibited; — but it is its own forms, ways, and modes, with their determination and limitation alone, that are instituted, prescribed, and enjoined by it; but these things have no divine institution, and therefore are so far false worship.

Second Argument. — That which was in its first contrivance, and hath been in its continuance, an invention or engine to defeat or render useless the promise of Christ unto his church of sending the Holy Spirit in all ages, to enable it unto a due discharge and performance of all divine worship in its assemblies, is unlawful to be complied withal, nor can be admitted in religious worship; but such is the liturgical worship: *ergo*, etc.

That the Lord Jesus Christ did make such a promise, that he doth make it good, that the very being and continuance of the church (without which it is but a dead machine) doth depend thereon, I suppose will not be denied; it hath been sufficiently proved. Hereon the church lived and acted for sundry ages, performing all divine worship in its assemblies by virtue of the gifts and graces of the Holy Spirit, and no otherwise.

When these things were neglected, when the way of attaining them and the exercise of them appeared too difficult to men of carnal minds, this way of worship by a prescribed liturgy was insensibly brought in, to render the promise of Christ and the whole work of the Holy Spirit in the administration of gifts useless; and thereupon two things did follow: —

1. A total neglect of all the gifts of the Holy Spirit in the administration of church worship and ordinances.

2. When a plea for the work of the Holy Spirit began to be revived, it produced all that enmity, hatred, and contempt of and against the Spirit of God himself, and his whole work in the church, which the world is now filled withal. All the reproaches that are daily cast upon the Spirit of prayer, all that contempt and scorn which all duties of religious worship performed by his aid and assistance are entertained withal, arise from hence alone, — namely, from a justification of this devised way of worship as the only true way and means thereof. Take away this, and the wrath and anger of men against the Spirit of God and his work in the worship of the church will be abated, yea, the necessity of them will be evident.

This we cannot comply with, lest we approve of the original design of it, and partake in the sins which proceed from it.

Third Argument. — That in religious worship which derogates from the kingly office of Jesus Christ, so far as it doth so, is false worship.

Unto this office of Christ it inseparably belongs that he be the sole lawgiver of the church in all the worship of God. The rule of his government herein is, “Teach men to observe and do whatsoever I command.” But the worship treated about consisteth wholly in the institutions, commands, prescriptions, orders, and rules of men; and on the authority of men alone do all their impositions on the practice of the church depend. What is this but to renounce the kingly office of Christ in the church?

Fourth Argument. — That which giveth testimony against the faithfulness of Christ in his house as a Son, and Lord of it, above that of any servant, is not to be complied withal; let all his disciples judge.

Unto this faithfulness of Christ it doth belong to appoint and command all things whatever in the church that belong to the worship of God, as is evident from his comparison with Moses herein, and his preference above him. But the institution and prescription of all things in religious worship, of things never instituted or prescribed by Christ, in the forms and modes of them, ariseth from a supposition of a defect in the wisdom, care, and faithfulness of Christ; whence alone a necessity can arise of prescribing that in religious worship which he hath not prescribed.

Fifth Argument. — That which is a means humanly invented for the attaining of an end in divine worship which Christ hath ordained a means for, unto the exclusion of the means so appointed by Christ, is false worship, and not to be complied withal.

The end intended is the edification of the church in the administration of all its holy ordinances This the Service-book is ordained and appointed by men for, or it hath no end or use at all. But the Lord Christ hath appointed other means for the attaining the end, as is expressly declared, “He hath given gifts unto men, for the work of the ministry, for the edifying of the body,” ~~and~~ Ephesians 4:8, 12; that is, in all gospel administrations: but the means ordained by Christ, — namely, the exercise of spiritual gifts in gospel administrations, unto the edification of the church, — are excluded, yea, expressly prohibited, in the prescription of this liturgical worship. The pretense of men’s liberty to use their gifts in prayer before their sermons, and in preaching, is ridiculed; they are excluded in all the solemn worship of the church.

Sixth Argument. — That which hath been and is obstructive of the edification of the church, if it be in religious worship, it is false worship, for the end of all true worship is edification; but such hath been and is this liturgical worship: for, —

1. It putteth an utter *stop* to the progress of the reformation in this nation, fixing bounds to it that it could never pass
2. It hath kept multitudes in *ignorance*.
3. It hath countenanced and encouraged *many* in reviling and reproaching the Holy Spirit and his work.
4. It hath set up and warranted an ungifted *ministry*.
5. It hath made great *desolations* in the church: —
 - (1.) In the silencing of faithful and painful ministers;
 - (2.) In the ruin of families innumerable;
 - (3.) In the destruction of souls!

It is not lawful to be participant in these things, yea, the glory of our profession lies in our testimony against them.

Seventh Argument. — That practice whereby we condemn the suffering saints of the present age, rendering them false witnesses for God, and the only blamable cause of their own sufferings, is not to be approved; but such is this practice. And where this is done on a pretense of liberty, without any plea of necessary duty on our part, it is utterly unlawful.

Eighth Argument. — That practice which is accompanied with unavoidable scandal, engaged in only on pretense of liberty, is contrary to the gospel; but such is our joining in the present public worship.

It were endless to reckon up all the scandals which will ensue hereon. That which respecteth our enemies must not be omitted. Will they not think, will they not say, that we have only falsely and hypocritically pretended conscience for what we do, when we can, on outward considerations, comply with that which is required of us? Woe to the world because of such offenses! — but woe to them also by whom they are given!

Ninth Argument. — That worship which is unsuited to the spiritual relish of the new creature, which is inconsistent with the conduct of the Spirit of God in prayer, is unlawful; for the nature, use, and benefit of prayer are overthrown hereby in a great measure.

Now, let any one consider what are the promised aids of the Holy Spirit with respect unto the prayers of the church, whether as to the matter of them, or as to the ability for their performance, or as to the manner of it, and he shall find that they are all rejected and excluded by this form of worship, comprising (as is pretended) the whole matter, limiting the whole manner, and giving all the abilities for prayer that are needful or required; and this hath been proved at large.

Tenth Argument. — That which overthrows and dissolves our church-covenant, as unto the principal end of it, is, as unto us, unlawful

This end is, the professed joint subjection of our souls and consciences unto the authority of Christ, in the observation of all whatever he

commands, and nothing else, in the worship of God. But by this practice this end of the church-covenant is destroyed, and thereby the church-covenant itself is broken, for we do and observe that which Christ hath not commanded; and while some stand unto the terms of the covenant which others relinquish, it will fill the church with confusion and disorder.

Eleventh Argument. — That which contains a virtual renunciation of our church-state, and of the lawfulness of our ministry and ordinances therein, is not to be admitted or allowed.

But this also is done by the practice inquired into, for it is a professed conjunction with them in church communion and worship by whom our church state and ordinances are condemned as null. And this judgment they make of what we do, affirming that we are gross dissemblers if, after such a conjunction with them, we return any more into our own assemblies. In this condemnation we do outwardly and visibly join.

Twelfth Argument. — That which depriveth us of the principal plea for the justification of our separation from the church of England in its present state ought not justly to be received or admitted; but this is certainly done by a supposition of the lawfulness of this worship, and a practice suitable thereunto, as is known to all who are exercised in this case. Many other heads of arguments might be added to the same purpose, if there were occasion.

OF MARRYING AFTER DIVORCE IN CASE OF ADULTERY.

It is confessed by all that adultery is a just and sufficient cause of a divorce betwixt married persons

This divorce, say some, consists in a dissolution “vinculi matrimonialis,” and so removes the marriage relation as that the innocent person divorcing or procuring the divorce is at liberty to marry again.

Others say that it is only a separation “a mensa et thoro,” and that on this account it doth not nor ought to dissolve the marriage relation.

I am of the judgment of the former; for, —

First, This divorce “a mensa et thoro” only is no true divorce, but a mere fiction of a divorce, of no use in this case, nor lawful to be made use of, neither by the law of nature nor the law of God; for, —

1. It is, as stated, but a late invention, of no use in the world, nor known in more ancient times: for those of the Roman church who assert it do grant that divorces by the law of nature were “a vinculo,” and that so they were also under the old testament; and this fiction they would impose on the grace and state of the gospel, which yet makes indeed no alteration in moral relations and duties, but only directs their performance.

2. It is deduced from a fiction, — namely, that marriage among Christians is a sacrament of that signification as renders it indissoluble; and therefore they would have it to take place only amongst believers, the rest of mankind being left to their natural right and privilege. But this is a fiction, and as such in sundry cases they make use of it.

Secondly, A divorce perpetual “a mensa et thoro” only is no way useful to mankind, but hurtful and noxious; for, —

1. It would constitute a new condition or state of life, wherein it is not possible that a man should either have a wife, or not have a wife lawfully, in one of which estates yet really every man capable of the state of wedlock is and must be, whether he will or no; for a man may, as things

may be circumstantiated, be absolutely bound in conscience not to receive her again who was justly repudiated for adultery, nor can he take another on this divorce. But into this estate God calls no man.

2. It may, and probably will, cast a man under a necessity of sinning: for suppose he hath not the gift of continency, it is the express will of God that he should marry for his relief; yet on this supposition, he sins if he does so, and in that he sins if he doth not so.

Thirdly, It is unlawful; for if the bond of marriage abide, the relation still continues. This relation is the foundation of all mutual duties; and whilst all that continues, none can dispense with or prohibit from the performance of those duties. If a woman do continue in the relation of a wife to a man, she may claim the duties of marriage from him. Separation there may be by consent for a season, or upon other occasions, that may hinder the actual discharge of conjugal duties; but to make an obligation unto such duties void, whilst the relation doth continue, is against the law of nature and the law of God. This divorce, therefore, supposing the relation of man and wife between any, and no mutual duty thence to arise, is unlawful.

Fourthly, The light of nature never directed to this kind of divorce. Marriage is an ordinance of the law of nature; but in the light and reason thereof there is no intimation of any such practice. It still directed that they who might justly put away their wives might marry others. Hence some, as the ancient Grecians, and the Romans afterward, allowed the husband to kill the adulteress. This among the Romans was changed “lege Julia,” but the offense [was] still made capital. In the room hereof, afterward, divorce took place purposely to give the innocent person liberty of marriage. So that this kind of divorce is but a fiction.

The first opinion, therefore, is according to truth; for, —

First, That which dissolves the form of marriage and destroys all the forms of marriage doth dissolve the bond of marriage; for take away the form and end of any moral relation, and the relation itself ceaseth. But this is done by adultery, and a divorce ensuing thereon. For the form of marriage consisteth in this, that two become “one flesh,” ^{<1916>}Genesis 2:24; ^{<1916>}Matthew 19:6; — but this is dissolved by adultery; for the adulteress

becometh one flesh with the adulterer, ~~1~~ 1 Corinthians 6:16, and no longer one flesh in individual society with her husband, and so it absolutely breaks the bond or covenant of marriage. And how can men contend that is a bond which is absolutely broken, or fancy a “vinculum” that doth not bind? and that it absolutely destroys all the forms of marriage will be granted. It therefore dissolves the bond of marriage itself.

Secondly, If the innocent party upon a divorce be not set at liberty, then,

- 1.** He is deprived of his right by the sin of another; which is against the law of nature; — and so every wicked woman hath it in her power to deprive her husband of his natural right.
- 2.** The divorce in case of adultery, pointed by our Savior to the innocent person to make use of, is, as all confess, for his liberty, advantage, and relief. But on supposition that he may not marry, it would prove a snare and a yoke unto him; for if hereon he hath not the gift of continency, he is exposed to sin and judgment.

Thirdly, Our blessed Savior gives express direction in the case, ~~1~~ Matthew 19:9, “Whosoever shall put away his wife, except it be for fornication, and shall marry another, committeth adultery.” Hence it is evident, and is the plain sense of the words, that he who putteth away his wife for fornication and marrieth another doth not commit adultery. Therefore the bond of marriage in that case is dissolved, and the person that put away his wife is at liberty to marry. While he denies putting away and marrying again for every cause, the exception of fornication allows both putting away and marrying again in that case; for an exception always affirms the contrary unto what is denied in the rule whereunto it is an exception, or denies what is affirmed in it in the case comprised in the exception; for every exception is a particular proposition contradictory to the general rule, so that when the one is affirmative, the other is negative, and on the contrary. The rule here in general is affirmative: He that putteth away his wife and marries another committeth adultery. The exception is negative: But he that putteth away his wife for fornication and marrieth another doth not commit adultery. Or they may be otherwise conceived, so that the general rule shall be negative, and the exception affirmative: It is not lawful to put away a wife and marry another; it is adultery. Then the

exception is: It is lawful for a man to put away his wife for fornication, and marry another. And this is the nature of all such exceptions, as I could manifest in instances of all sorts.

It is to no purpose to except that the other evangelists (~~and~~ Mark 10:11,12, ~~and~~ Luke 16:18) do not express the exception insisted on; for, —

1. It is twice used by Matthew, chap. 5:32, and chap. 19:9, and therefore was assuredly used by our Savior.
2. It is a rule owned by all, that where the same thing is reported by several evangelists, the briefer, short, more imperfect expressions, are to be men, red and interpreted by the fuller and larger. And every general rule in any place is to be limited by an exception annexed unto it in any one place whatever; and there is scarce any general rule but admitteth of an exception.

It is more vain to answer that our Savior speaketh with respect unto the Jews only, and what was or was not allowed among them; for, —

1. In this answer he reduces things to the law of creation and their primitive institution. He declares what was the law of marriage and the nature of that relation antecedent to the law and institution of Moses; and so, reducing things to the law of nature, gives a rule directive to all mankind in this matter.
2. The Pharisees inquired of our Savior about such a divorce as was absolute, and gave liberty of marriage after it; for they never heard of any other. The pretended separation “a mensa et thoro ‘ only was never heard of in the old testament. Now, if our Savior doth not answer concerning the same divorce about which they inquired, but another which they knew nothing of, he doth not answer them, but delude them; — they ask after one thing, and he answers another in nothing to their purpose. But this is not to be admitted; it were blasphemy to imagine it. Wherefore, denying the causes of divorce which they allowed, and asserting fornication to be a just cause thereof, he allows, in that case, of that divorce which they inquired about, which was absolute and from the bond of marriage.

Again: the apostle Paul expressly sets the party at liberty to marry who is maliciously and obstinately deserted, alarming that the Christian religion

doth not prejudice the natural right and privilege of men in such cases: ¶1
 Corinthians 7:15,

“If the unbelieving depart, let him depart. A brother or a sister is
 not under bondage in such cases.”

If a person obstinately depart, on pretense of religion or otherwise, and will no more cohabit with a husband or wife, it is known that, by the law of nature and the usage of all nations, the deserted party, because, without his or her default, all the ends of marriage are frustrated, is at liberty to marry. But it may be it is not so among Christians. What shall a brother or a sister that is a Christian do in this case, who is so departed from? Saith the apostle, “They are not in bondage, they are free, — at liberty to marry again.”

This is the constant doctrine of all protestant churches in the world; and it hath had place in the government of these nations, for Queen Elizabeth was born during the life of Queen Katharine, from whom her father was divorced.

OF INFANT BAPTISM AND DIPPING.

OF INFANT BAPTISM.

I. THE question is not whether professing believers, Jews or Gentiles, not baptized in their infancy, ought to be baptized; for this is by all confessed.

II. Neither is it whether, in such persons, the profession of saving faith and repentance ought not to go before baptism. This we plead for beyond what is the common practice of those who oppose us.

Wherefore, testimonies produced out of authors, ancient or modern, to confirm these things, which consist with the doctrine of infant baptism, are mere tergiversations, that belong not to this cause at all; and so are all arguments produced unto that end out of the Scriptures.

III. The question is not whether all infants are to be baptized or not; for, according to the will of God, some are not to be baptized, even such whose parents are strangers from the covenant, But hence it will follow that some are to be baptized, seeing an exception confirms both rule and right.

IV. The question is only concerning the children or infant seed of professing believers who are themselves baptized. And, —

First, They by whom this is denied can produce no testimony of Scripture wherein their negation is formally or in terms included, nor any one asserting what is inconsistent with the affirmative; for it is weak beneath consideration to suppose that the requiring of the baptism of believers is inconsistent with that of their seed. But this is to be required of them who oppose infant baptism, that they produce such a testimony.

Secondly, No instance can be given from the Old or New Testament since the days of Abraham, none from the approved practice of the primitive church, of any person or persons born of professing, believing parents, who were themselves made partakers of the initial seal of the covenant, being then in infancy and designed to be brought up in the knowledge of

God, who were not made partakers with them of the same sign and seal of the covenant

Thirdly, A spiritual privilege once granted by God unto any cannot be changed, disannulled, or abrogated, without an especial divine revocation of it, or the substitution of a greater privilege and mercy in the room of it; for, —

1. Who shall disannul what God hath granted? What he hath put together who shall put asunder? To abolish or take away any grant of privilege made by him to the church, without his own express revocation of it, is to deny his sovereign authority.

2. To say a privilege so granted may be revoked, even by God himself, without the substitution of a greater privilege and mercy in the room of it, is contrary to the goodness of God, his love and care unto his church, [and] contrary to his constant course of proceeding with it from the foundation of the world, wherein he went on in the enlargement and increase of its privileges until the coming of Christ. And to suppose it under the gospel is contrary to all his promises, the honor of Christ, and a multitude of express testimonies of Scripture.

Thus was it with the privileges of the temple and the worship of it granted to the Jews; they were not, they could not be, taken away without an express revocation, and the substitution of a more glorious spiritual temple and worship in their room.

But now the spiritual privilege of a right unto and a participation of the initial seal of the covenant was granted by God unto the infant seed of Abraham, ⁴¹⁷Genesis 17:10, 12.

This grant, therefore, must stand firm for ever, unless men can prove or produce, —

1. An express revocation of it by God himself; which none can do either directly or indirectly, in terms or any pretense of consequence.

2. An instance of a greater privilege or mercy granted unto them in the room of it; which they do not once pretend unto, but leave the seed of believers, whilst in their infant state, in the same condition with those of pagans and infidels; expressly contrary to God's covenant.

All this contest, therefore, is to deprive the children of believers of a privilege once granted to them by God, never revoked, as to the substance of it, assigning nothing in its room; which is contrary to the goodness, love, and covenant of God, especially derogatory to the honor of Jesus Christ and the gospel.

Fourthly, They that have the thing signified have right unto the sign of it, or those who are partakers of the grace of baptism have a right to the administration of it: so ~~400~~ Acts 10:47.

But the children of believers are all of them capable of the grace signified in baptism, and some of them are certainly partakers of it, namely, such as die in their infancy (which is all that can be said of professors): therefore they may and ought to be baptized. For, —

- 1.** Infants are made for and are capable of eternal glory or misery, and must fall, dying infants, into one of these estates for ever.
- 2.** All infants are born in a state of sin, wherein they are spiritually dead and under the curse.
- 3.** Unless they are regenerated or born again, they must all perish inevitably, ~~400~~ John 3:3. Their regeneration is the grace whereof baptism is a sign or token. Wherever this is, there baptism ought to be administered.

Fifthly, God having appointed baptism as the sign and seal of regeneration, unto whom he denies it, he denies the grace signified by it. Why is it the will of God that unbelievers and impenitent sinners should not be baptized? It is because, not granting them the grace, he will not grant them the sign. If, therefore, God denies the sign unto the infant seed of believers, it must be because he denies them the grace of it; and then all the children of believing parents dying in their infancy must, without hope, be eternally damned. I do not say that all must be so who are not baptized, but all must be so whom God would have not baptized.

But this is contrary to the goodness and law [love?] of God, the nature and promises of the covenant, the testimony of Christ reckoning them to the kingdom of God, the faith of godly parents, and the belief of the church in all ages.

It follows hence unavoidably that infants who die in their infancy have the grace of regeneration, and consequently as good a right unto baptism as believers themselves.

Sixthly, All children in their infancy are reckoned unto the covenant of their parents, by virtue of the law of their creation.

For they are all made capable of eternal rewards and punishments, as hath been declared.

But in their own persons they are not capable of doing good or evil.

It is therefore contrary to the justice of God, and the law of the creation of human kind, wherein many die before they can discern between their right hand and their left, to deal with infants any otherwise but in and according to the covenant of their parents; and that he doth so, see ◀H74 Romans 5:14.

Hence I argue, —

Those who, by God's appointment, and by virtue of the law of their creation, are, and must of necessity be, included in the covenant of their parents, have the same right with them unto the privileges of that covenant, no express exception being put in against them. This right it is in the power of none to deprive them of, unless they can change the law of their creation.

Thus it is with the children of believers with respect unto the covenant of their parents, whence alone they are said to be holy, ◀H74 1 Corinthians 7:14.

Seventhly, Christ is “the messenger of the covenant,” ◀H74 Malachi 3:1, — that is, of the covenant of God made with Abraham; and he was the “minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers,” ◀H74 Romans 15:8. This covenant was, that he would be “a God unto Abraham and to his seed.”

Now if this be not so under the new testament, then was not Christ a faithful messenger, nor did confirm the truth of God in his promises.

This argument alone will bear the weight of the whole cause. against all objections; for, —

1. Children are still in the same covenant with their parents, or the truth of the promises of God to the fathers was not confirmed by Christ.

2. The right unto the covenant, and interest in its promises, wherever it be, gives right unto the administration of its initial seal, that is, to baptism, as Peter expressly declares, ^{<HPS>}Acts 2:38, 39. Wherefore, —

The right of the infant seed of believers unto baptism, as the initial seal of the covenant, stands on the foundation of the faithfulness of Christ as the messenger of the covenant, and minister of God for the confirmation of the truth of his promises.

In brief, a participation of the seal of the covenant is a spiritual blessing. This the seed of believers was once solemnly invested in by God himself. This privilege he hath nowhere revoked, though he hath changed the outward sign; nor hath he granted unto our children any privilege or mercy in lieu of it now under the gospel, when all grace and privileges are enlarged to the utmost. His covenant promises concerning them, which are multiplied, were confirmed by Christ as a true messenger and minister; he gives the grace of baptism unto many of them, especially those that die in their infancy, owns children to belong unto his kingdom, esteems them disciples, appoints households to be baptized without exception. And who shall now rise up, and withhold water from them?

This argument may be thus further cleared and improved: —

Christ is “the messenger of the covenant,” ^{<HPS>}Malachi 3:1, — that is, the covenant of God with Abraham, ^{<HPS>}Genesis 17:7; for, —

1. That covenant was with and unto Christ mystical, ^{<HPS>}Galatians 3:16; and he was the messenger of no covenant but that which was made with himself and his members.

2. He was sent, or was God’s messenger, to perform and accomplish the covenant and oath made with Abraham, ^{<HPS>}Luke 1:72, 73.

3. The end of his message and of his coming was, that those to whom he was sent might be “blessed with faithful Abraham,” or that “the blessing of Abraham,” promised in the covenant, “might come upon them,” ^{<HPS>}Galatians 3:9, 14.

To deny this, overthrows the whole relation between the old testament and the new, the veracity of God in his promises, and all the properties of the covenant of grace, mentioned ^{<136>}2 Samuel 23:5.

It was not the covenant of works, neither originally nor essentially, nor the covenant in its legal administration; for he confirmed and sealed that covenant whereof he was the messenger, but these he abolished.

Let it be named what covenant he was the messenger of, if not of this. Occasional additions of temporal promises do not in the least alter the nature of the covenant.

Herein he was the “minister of the circumcision for the truth of God, to confirm the promises made unto the fathers,” ^{<618>}Romans 15:8; that is, undeniably, the covenant made with Abraham, enlarged and explained by following promises. This covenant was, that God would be “a God unto Abraham and to his seed;” which God himself explains to be his infant seed, ^{<1172>}Genesis 17:12, — that is, the infant seed of every one of his posterity who should lay hold on and avouch that covenant as Abraham did, and not else. This the whole church did solemnly for themselves and their posterity; whereon the covenant was confirmed and sealed to them all, ^{<1241>}Exodus 24:7, 8. And every one was bound to do the same in his own person; which if he did not, he was to be cut off from the congregation, whereby he forfeited all privileges unto himself and his seed.

The covenant, therefore, was not granted in its administrations unto the carnal seed of Abraham as such, but unto his covenanted seed, those who entered into it and professedly stood to its terms.

And the promises made unto the fathers were, that their infant seed, their buds and offspring, should have an equal share in the covenant with them, ^{<2224>}Isaiah 22:24, 44:3, 61:9. “They are the seed of the blessed of the LORD, and their offspring with them,” chap. 65:23. Not only themselves, who are the believing, professing seed of those who were blessed of the Lord, by a participation of the covenant, Galatians 3:9, but their offspring also, their brads, their tender little ones, are in the same covenant with them.

To deny, therefore, that the children of believing, professing parents, who have avouched God’s covenant, as the church of Israel did, ^{<1241>}Exodus 24:7,

8, have the same right and interest With their parents in the covenant, is plainly to deny the fidelity of Christ in the discharge of his office.

It may be it will be said, that although children have a right to the covenant, or do belong unto it, yet they have no right to the initial seal of it. This will not suffice; for, —

1. If they have any interest in it, it is either in its grace or in its administration. If they have the former, they have the latter also, as shall be proved at any time. If they have neither, they have no interest in it; — then the truth of the promises of God made unto the fathers was not confirmed by Christ.
2. That unto whom the covenant or promise doth belong, to them belongs the administration of the initial seal of it, is expressly declared by the apostle, ⁴¹²⁸ Acts 2:38, 39, be they who they will.
3. The truth of God's promises is not confirmed if the sign and seal of them be denied; for that whereon they believed that God was a God unto their seed as well as unto themselves was this, that he granted the token of the covenant unto their seed as well as unto themselves. If this be taken away by Christ, their faith is overthrown, and the promise itself is not confirmed but weakened, as to the virtue it hath to beget faith and obedience.

Eighthly, Particular testimonies may be pleaded and vindicated, if need be, and the practice of the primitive church.^{f13}

A VINDICATION OF TWO PASSAGES IN IRENAEUS AGAINST THE EXCEPTIONS OF MR TOMBS.

The passages are these: —

Adversus Haereses, lib. 2, cap. 22, sect. 4: “Magister ergo existens, magistri quoque habebat aetatem, non reprobans nec supergrediens hominem, neque solvens suam legem in se humani generis, sed omnero aetatem sanctificans per illam quae ad ipsum erat similitudinem. Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare, omnes inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes, et parvulos, et pueros, et juvenes, et seniores. Ideo per omnem venit aetatem; et infantibus infans factus,

sanctificans infantes; in parvulis, parvulus, sanctificans hanc ipsam habentes aetatem, simul et exemplum illis pietatis effectus, et justitiae et subjectionis; in juvenibus juvenis, exemplum juvenibus fiens, et sanctificans Domino; sic et senior in senioribus, ut sit perfectus magister in omnibus, non solum secundum expositionem veritatis, sed et secundum aetatem sanctificans simul et semores, exemplum ipsis quoque fiens; deinde et usque ad mortem pervenit, ut sit primogenitus ex mortuis, ipse primatum tenens in omnibus, princeps vitae, prior omnium, et praecedens omnes.”

Lib. 1: cap. 18: “Οσοι γάρ εἰσι τούτης τῆς γνώμης μυσταγωγοὶ, τοσαῦται καὶ ἀπολυτρώσεις. “Οτι μὲν εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως, καὶ πάσης τῆς πίστεως ἀπόθεσιν ὑποζέχληται τὸ εἶδος τοῦ ὑπὸ τοῦ σατανᾶ, ἐλέγχοντες αὐτοὺς ἀπαγγελοῦμεν ἐν τῷ προσήκοντι τόπῳ.

Mr Tombs tells us, “This proves not infant baptism, because though it be granted that in Justin Martyr, and others of the ancients, to be regenerated is to be baptized, yet it doth not appear that Irenaeus meant it so in this place, unless it were proved it is so only meant by him and the ancients. Nor doth Irenaeus, lib. 1, cap. 18, term baptism ‘regeneration;’ but saith thus, ‘To the denying of baptism of that regeneration which is unto God.’ But that indeed the word ‘renascuntur,’ ‘are born again,’ is not meant of baptism is proved from the words and the scope of them; for, —

“1. The words are, ‘Per eum renascuntur,’ ‘By him,’ that is, Christ, ‘are born again.’ And it is clear, from the scope of the speech about the fullness of his age, as a perfect master, that ‘By him’ notes his person according to his human nature. Now, if then, ‘By him are born again,’ be as much as ‘By him are baptized,’ this should be Irenaeus’ assertion, that by Christ himself, in his human body, infants, and little ones, and boys, and young men, and elder men, are baptized unto God. But this speech is most manifestly false; for neither did Christ baptize any at all in his own person, (~~BOOK~~ John 4:1, 2, ‘Jesus himself baptized not, but his disciples,’) nor did the disciples baptize any infant at all, as may be gathered from the whole New Testament.

“2. The word which Irenaeus expresseth whereby persons are born again to God by Christ is applied to the example of his age, as the

words and scope show. But he was not in his age an example of every age by his baptism, as if he did by it sanctify every age, for then he should have been baptized in every age; but in respect of the holiness of his human nature, which did remain in each age, and so exemplarily sanctify each age to God, so as that there was no age but was capable of holiness by conformity to his example.

“3. Irenaeus’ words are, ‘Omnes enim venit per semetipsum salvare, omnes, inquam, qui per eum renascuntur in Deum, infantes, et parvulos,’ etc. Now, if the meaning were, that Christ came to save all that were baptized by him or by his appointment, then he came to save Simon Magus, or whoever are or have been baptized rightly. But in that sense the proposition is most palpably false; and therefore that sense is not to be attributed to his words.

“4. Christ is by Irenaeus said to sanctify as ‘a perfect master, — not only according to the exposition of truth, but also as an example to them of piety, justice, and subjection.’ But this is to be understood not in respect of his baptism only, but his whole life, in which he was an example; even as an infant, for then he did willingly empty himself, — ‘Took upon him the form of a servant,’ etc., Philippians 5 7, 8.

“By all which reasons,” saith Mr Tombs, “I presume the readers who are willing to see truth will perceive this passage of Irenaeus to be wrested by Pedobaptists against its meaning, to prove a use of pedobaptism in his time.”

Ans. **1.** The phrase of “Renascuntur in Deum” is so constantly used by the ancients for baptism that it may be referred to the conscience of Mr Tombs or any one who hath been conversant in their writings, whether they would not have judged and granted that it was here intended, if mention had not been made of infants and little ones. The ensuing exceptions, therefore, are an endeavor to stifle light in favor of an opinion; — which is not unusual with some.

2. “Per eum” is the same with “Per semetipsum,” in the words immediately foregoing; that is, “By himself,” in his mediation, grace, and ordinances. And to suppose that if baptism be intended, he must baptize

them in his own person, is a mere cavil; for all that are born to God by baptism to this day are so by him.

3. The words, **Εἰς ἐξάρνησιν τοῦ βαπτίσματος τῆς εἰς Θεὸν ἀναγεννήσεως**, “Unto the denial of the baptism of regeneration unto God,” do plainly declare that by “renascuntur” he intends the baptism of regeneration, as being the means and pledge of it, in allusion to that of the apostle, **Λούτρον παλιγγενεσίας**, ^{
}Titus 3:5.

4. It is remarkable in the words of Irenaeus, that in expressing the way and means of the renascency of infants, he mentions nothing of the example of Christ, which he adds unto that of all other ages.

5. The example of Christ is mentioned as one outward means of the regeneration of them who were capable of its Use and improvement. Of his being an example of baptism nothing is spoken. Nor was Christ in his own person an example of regeneration unto any; for as he was not baptized in all ages, so he was never regenerated in any, for he needed no regeneration.

6. It is well that it is so positively granted that Christ doth sanctify infants; which, seeing he doth not do so to all universally, must be those of believing parents; which is enough to end this controversy.

7. The meaning of Irenaeus is no more but that Christ, passing through all ages, evidenced his design to exclude no age, to communicate his grace unto all sorts and ages; and he mentioneth old men, because his judgment was that Christ was fifty years old when he died.

8. It was the constant opinion of the ancients that Christ came to save all that were baptized; not intending his purpose and intention with respect unto individuals, but his approbation of the state of baptism, and his grant of the means of grace.

OF DIPPING.

Βάπτω, used in these scriptures, ^{
}Luke 16:24, ^{
}John 13:26, ^{
}Revelation 19:13, we translate “to dip.” It is only “to touch one part of the body.” That of ^{
}Revelation 19:13 is better rendered, “stained by sprinkling.”

In other authors it is “tingo, immergo, lavo,” or “abluo;” but in no other author ever signifies “to dip,” but only in order to washing, or as the means of washing. It is nowhere used with respect unto the ordinance of baptism.

The Hebrew word, **טָבַל**, is rendered by the LXX., ^{<1379>}Genesis 37:31, by **μολύνω**, “to stain by sprinkling” or otherwise; mostly by **βάπτω**. ^{<1384>}2 Kings 5:14 they render it by **βαπτίζω**, and nowhere else. In verse 10, Elisha commands Naaman “to wash;” therefore that in verse 14 is that “he washed.” ^{<1372>}Exodus 12:22 is, to put the top of the hyssop into blood, to sprinkle it; ^{<1387>}1 Samuel 14:27, is to take a little honey with the top of a rod. In neither place can dipping or plunging be intended. ^{<1380>}Leviticus 4:6, 17, 9:9, and in other places, it is only to touch the blood, so as to sprinkle it.

βαπτίζω signifies “to wash,” and instances out of all authors may be given, — Suidas, Hesychius, Julius Pollux, Phavorinus, and Eustathius.

It is first used in the Scripture, ^{<1380>}Mark 1:8, ^{<1383>}John 1:33, and to the same purpose, ^{<1385>}Acts 1:5. In every place it either signifies “to pour,” or the expression is equivocal “I baptize you with water, but he shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost;” which is the accomplishment of that promise, that the Holy Ghost should be poured on them.

For the other places, ^{<1380>}Mark 7:3, 4, **νίπτω**, and **βαπτίζω** are plainly the same, both “to wash.” ^{<1383>}Luke 11:38 is the same with ^{<1380>}Mark 7:3. No one instance can be given in the Scripture wherein **βαπτίζω** doth necessarily signify either “to dip” or “plunge.”

βαπτίζω may be considered either as to its original, natural sense, or as to its mystical use in the ordinance.

This distinction must be observed concerning many other words in the New Testament, as **ἐκκλησία**, **χειροτονία**, and others, which have a peculiar sense in their mystical use.

In this sense, as it expresseth baptism, it denotes “to wash” only, and not “to dip” at all: for so it is expounded, ^{<1380>}Titus 3:5; ^{<1380>}Ephesians 5:26; ^{<1380>}Hebrews 10:22; ^{<1380>}1 Peter 3:21. And it signifies that communication of the Spirit which is expressed by “pouring out” and “sprinkling,” ^{<1380>}Ezekiel

36:25, and expresseth our being washed in the blood of Christ, ^{<5124>}Titus 2:14; ^{<5105>}Hebrews 9:15, 19, 23.

Wherefore, in this sense, as the word is applied unto the ordinance, the sense of dipping is utterly excluded. And though as a mere external mode it may be used, provided the person dipped be naked, yet to urge it as necessary overthrows the nature of the sacrament.

For the original and natural signification of it, it Signifies “to dip, to plunge, to dye, to wash, to cleanse.”

But I say, —

- 1.** It doth not signify properly “to dip” or “plunge,” for that in Greek is ἐμζάπτω and ἐμζαπίζω.
- 2.** it nowhere signifies “to dip,” but as a mode of and in order to washing.
- 3.** It signifies the “dipping” of a finger, or the least touch of the water, and not plunging the whole.
- 4.** It signifies “to wash,” also, in all good authors.

I have not all those quoted to the contrary. In the quotations of them whom I have, if it be intended that they say it signifies “to dip,” and not “to wash,” or “to dip” only, there is neither truth nor honesty in them by whom they are quoted.

Scapula is one, a common book, and he gives it the sense of “lavo, abluo,” “to wash” ad “wash away.”

Stephanus is another, and he expressly, in sundry places, assigns “lavo” and “abluo” to be also the sense of it.

Aquinas is for dipping of children, provided it be done three times, in honor of the Trinity; but he maintains pouring or sprinkling to be lawful also, affirming that Laurentius, who lived about the time 250, so practiced. But he meddles not with the sense of the word, as being too wise to speak of that which he understood not; for he knew no Greek.

In Suidas, the great treasury of the Greek tongue, it is rendered by “malefacio, lavo, abluo, purgo, mundo.”

The places in the other authors being not quoted, I cannot give an account of what they say. I have searched some of them in every place wherein they mention baptism, and find no one word to the purpose. I must say, and will make it good, that no honest man who understands the Greek tongue can deny the word to signify “to wash,” as well as “to dip.”

It must not be denied but that in the primitive times they did use to baptize both grown persons and children oftentimes by dipping, but they affirmed it necessary to dip them stark naked, and that three times; but not one ever denied pouring water to be lawful.

The apostle, ~~ROM~~ Romans 6:3-5, is dehorting from sin, exhorting to holiness and new obedience, and gives this argument from the necessity of it and our ability for it, — both taken from our initiation into the virtue of the death and life of Christ, expressed in our baptism, — that by virtue of the death and burial of Christ we should be dead unto sin, sin being slain thereby, and by virtue of the resurrection of Christ we should be quickened unto newness of life; as Peter declares, ~~1PET~~ 1 Peter 3:21. Our being “buried with him,” and our being “planted together in the likeness of his death” and “in the likeness of his resurrection,” ~~ROM~~ Romans 6:4, 5, is the same with “our old man being crucified with him,” and the “destroying of the body of sin,” verse 6, and our being raised from the dead with him; which is all that is intended in the place.

There is not one word nor one expression that mentions any resemblance between dipping under water and the death and burial of Christ, nor one word that mentions a resemblance between our rising out of the water and the resurrection of Christ. Our being “buried with him by baptism into death,” verse 4, is our being “planted together in the likeness of his death,” verse 5. Our being “planted together in the likeness of his death” is not our being dipped under water, but “the crucifying of the old man,” verse 6. Our being “raised up with Christ from the dead” is not our rising from under the water, but our “walking in newness of life,” verse 4, by virtue of the resurrection of Christ, ~~1PET~~ 1 Peter 3:21.

That baptism is not a sign of the death, burial, and resurrection of Christ, is clear from hence, because an instituted sign is a sign of gospel grace participated, or to be participated. If dipping be a sign of the burial of

Christ, it is not a sign of a gospel grace participated; for it may be where there is none, nor any exhibited.

For the major: If all gospel ordinances are signs and expressions of the communication of the grace of Christ, then baptism is so; but this is the end of all gospel ordinances, or else they have some other end, or are vain and empty shows.

The same individual sign cannot be instituted to signify things of several natures; but the outward burial of Christ, and a participation of the virtue of Christ's death and burial, are things of a diverse nature, and therefore are not signified by one sign.

That interpretation which would enervate the apostle's argument and design, our comfort and duty, is not to be admitted; but this interpretation, that baptism is mentioned here as the sign of Christ's burial, would enervate the apostle's argument and design, our comfort and duty: and therefore it is not to be admitted.

The minor is thus proved: The argument and design of the apostle, as was before declared, is to exhort and encourage unto mortification of sin and new obedience, by virtue of power received from the death and life of Christ, whereof a pledge is given us in our baptism. But this is taken away by this interpretation; for we may be so buried with Christ and planted into the death of Christ by dipping, and yet have no power derived from Christ for the crucifying of sin and for the quickening of us to obedience.

REFLECTIONS
ON
A SLANDEROUS LIBEL AGAINST DR OWEN;
IN
A LETTER TO SIR THOMAS OVERBURY.

PREFATORY NOTE.

In vol. 15, p. 446, a reference will be found to a pamphlet entitled “A Letter to a Friend concerning some of Dr Owen’s Principles and Practices.” It was written against Dr Owen’s “Short Catechism,” by the Reverend George Vernon, a rector in Gloucestershire, who had received his education at Oxford University while Owen presided over it. It was full of calumnious charges of blasphemy and perjury. Our author, under the form of a Letter to Sir Thomas Overbury, replies to it in vehement terms, — terms perhaps more vehement than the absurdity of the charges at all required. In those days of slow communication, however, railing accusations, especially coming from one in the position of a rector, were fitted to work considerable mischief; and there was such a lack of all the decencies of controversy in Vernon’s lucubrations that he deserved a sharp reprimand. In the hands of Owen, he was but a fly broken on the wheel.

While he was vice-chancellor of Oxford, a story was raised against Owen, that he had spoken contemptuously of the Lord’s Prayer, and that he had put on his hat when it was on some occasion repeated at the close of the services in Christ Church. The slander was widely propagated, and Owen published a denial of the story, in English and French, in 1655. Merle Casaubon, nevertheless, published in 1660 a work in defense of the Lord’s Prayer, and against their “ungrounded zeal who are so strict for the observation of the Lord’s Day and make so light of the Lord’s Prayer.” Vernon, too, revived the slander, and Owen again gives it an emphatic contradiction in the following Letter; and yet Anthony Wood persists in it! — ED.

REFLECTIONS ON A SLANDEROUS LIBEL,

SIR,

It is upon your desire, and not in any compliance with my own judgment or inclination, that I have taken a little consideration of a late slanderous libel published against me. I have learned, I bless God, to bear and pass by such reproaches without much trouble to myself or giving the least unto others. My mind and conscience are not at all concerned in them; and so far as my reputation seems to be so, I am very willing to let it go, for I cannot entertain a valuation of their good opinion whose minds are capable of an impression from such virulent calumnies. Besides, I know that there is nothing absolutely new in these things under the sun. Others also have met with the like entertainment in the world in all ages; whose names I shall not mention, to avoid the envy in comparing myself with them. I acknowledge that it is a dictate of the law of nature, that where others do us open wrong, we should do ourselves right so far as we lawfully may; but I know also that it is in the power of every one to forego the prosecution of his own right and the vindication of himself, if thereby there arise no detriment unto others. That which alone in this case may be feared is, lest offense should be taken against my person to the disadvantage of other endeavors wherein I desire to be useful in the world.

But against this also I have the highest security, from that indignation and contempt wherewith this libel is entertained by all persons of ingenuity and sobriety. Not out of any respect, therefore, to myself or my own name (things of little or no consideration in or to the world), nor out of a desire that this paper should ever pass farther than to your own hand and thence to the fire, but to give you some account of this pamphlet, whose author it seems is known unto you, I have both perused it and made some short reflections upon it, which I have herewith sent unto you.

The whole design of this discourse is, “per fas et nefas,” to endeavor the defamation of a person who, to his knowledge, never saw the author of it, and is fully assured never gave him the least provocation unto any such attempt; for when I am told who he is, I am as wise and knowing unto all his concernments as I was before. And yet it is not only my reputation,

but, considering my present state and condition, with the nature of his libellous aspersions, my further outward trouble in the world, that he aimeth at; from which he seemeth to be much displeased that I am secured by the righteousness of the government and laws under which I live. Now, however he pleased himself in this attempt, yet there is no man but may give as tolerable an account, by the law of God, the customs of civilized nations, and in the estimation of wise and honest men, of robbing persons on the highway and spoiling them of their goods, as he can do of this undertaking. It is true, some others have of late dealt not much otherwise with me; wherein how far they have satisfied themselves and others time will discover. But yet, according to the present custom and manner of men, they may give some tolerable pretense to what they have done; for they sufficiently declare that they were provoked by me, — though no such thing was intended, — and it is abundantly manifest that they had no other way left them to give countenance unto some fond imaginations, which they have unadvisedly published, but by petulant reviling of him by whom they thought they were detected. And such things have not been unfrequent in the world. But as for this author, one wholly unknown to me, without the compass of any pretense of the least provocation from me, to accommodate the lusts and revenges of others with that unruly evil, a mercenary tongue, full of deadly poison, without the management of any difference, real or pretended, merely to calumniate and load me with false aspersions (as in the issue they will prove), is an instance of such a depraved disposition of mind, such a worthless baseness of soul, such a neglect of all rules of morality and principles of human conversation, such a contempt of Scripture precepts innumerable, as, it may be, can scarcely be paralleled in an age amongst the vilest of men. Something, I confess, of this nature is directed unto in the casuistical divinity or modern policy of the Jesuits: for they have declared it lawful to reproach and calumniate any one who hath done them an injury, or otherwise reflected on the honor of their society; and notable instances of their management of this principle are given us by the ingenious discoverer of their mysteries. But they always require a previous injury or provocation to justify themselves in this filthy kind of revenge. And hereby is our author freed from the suspicion of having been influenced by their suggestions; for he hath gone in a way whereon they never attempted to set a foot before him, and, scorning a villany that hath a precedent, he seems to design himself an

example in the art of sycophantry. However, the same author hath directed men unto the best way of returning an answer unto false and calumnious accusations, whatever be their occasion; for he tells us that Valerianus Magnus, an honest Capuchin friar, being so dealt withal by a Jesuit, made not any defense of his own innocency any further than by adjoining unto all the instances of his charge, “*Mentiris impudentissime*”! And this you will immediately find to be the substance of that answer which this book deserves; for, setting aside things relating to the former public troubles and disorders in these nations from the venom of all reflections, from which I am secured by the government, law, and interest of the kingdom, all which in this revival of them are notoriously abused and trampled on, — and there is no one thing charged on me in the whole libel but that, either in the matter or manner of its relation, is notoriously false. The task, I acknowledge, of making this discovery would be grievous and irksome unto me, but that I must not account any thing so which may fall out amongst men in the world, and do remember him who, after he had done some public services, whereof others had the advantage, was forced to defend his own house against thieves and robbers.

The whole discourse is a railing accusation, such as the angel durst not bring against the devil, but such as hath many characters and lineaments upon it of him who was a false accuser and murderer from the beginning; neither is it capable of a distribution into any other parts but those of railing and false accusations. And for the first, seeing he hath manifested his propensity unto it and delight in it, he shall by me be left to the possession of that honor and reputation which he hath acquired thereby. Besides, his way of managery hath rendered it of no consideration: for had it been condited to the present gust of the age, by language, wit, or drollery, it might have found some entertainment in the world; but downright dirty railing is beneath the genius of the times, and by common consent condemned to the bear-garden and Billingsgate. His charges and accusations, — wherein, doubtless, he placed his principal hopes of success, though I much question whether he knew what he aimed at in particular or no, — may in so many instances be called over as to discover unto you with what little regard to Christianity, truth, or honesty, they have been forged and managed by him.

I shall begin with what he calls my *practices*, and then proceed to the *principles* he mentions; which is the best order his confused rhapsody of slanders can be reduced unto, though inverting that which he projected in his title.

I. One of the first charges I meet withal, upon the first head, is page 9, that I was one of them who promised Cromwell his life upon his last sickness, and assured him that his days should be prolonged.” This, I confess, he manageth somewhat faintly and dubiously; the reason whereof I cannot guess at, it being as true as those other tales in the report whereof he pretends to more confidence. And I have no answer to return but that of the friar before mentioned, — “Mentitur impudentissime;” for I saw him not in his sickness, nor in some long time before. Of the same nature is what he affirms, p. 28, of my being the instrument in “the ruin of his son” Richard; with whose setting up and pulling down I had no more to do than himself. And such are the reasons which he gives for that which never was; for the things he instanceth in were my own choice, against all importunities to the contrary! so that the same answer must be returned again, — “Mentitur impudentissime.” Page 10, he charges me that, in writing against the Papists, I reflected upon the authority of the king, as to his power in matters of religion; which he repeats again, p. 34, and calls it “A covert undermining of the just authority of the king.” Still the same answer is all that can be given. His majesty’s supremacy, as declared and established by law, is asserted and proved in the book he intends, p. 404-406 [vol. 14, p. 378-392]; nor is there any word in the places quoted by him in his margin that will give the least countenance to this false calumny. Besides, the book was approved by authority, and that by persons of another manner of judgment and learning than this pitiful scribbler, who are all here defamed by him. Page 12, he chargeth me with countenancing an accusation against the reverend Bishop of Chester, then warden of Wadham College; which is a known lie, — and such I believe the bishop, if he be asked, will attest it to be. And so, p. 14, he says, I received a commission from Oliver to carry “*gladium ferri*,” but “*mentitur impudentissime*,” for I never received commission from any man or company of men in this world, nor to my remembrance did I ever wear a sword in my life. His whole 34th page, had there been any thing of wit or ingenuity in fiction in it, I should have suspected to have been borrowed

from Lucian's "Vera Historia," concerning which he affirmed that he wrote that which he had never seen, nor heard, nor did any one declare unto him; for it is only a confused heap of malicious lies, which all that read and know laugh at with scorn. Such like-wise is the ridiculous story he tells, p. 66, of my ordering things so that members of parliament should have a book, which he calls mine, laid in their lodgings by unknown hands; whereof there is not any thing, in substance or circumstance, that can lay the least pretense to truth, but it is an entire part of his industrious attempt to carry the whetstone.^{f14} The same must be said concerning what he reports of passages between me and the then lord chancellor; which as I have good witness to prove the mistake that fell out between us not to have been occasioned by me, so I much question whether this author was informed of the untruths he reports by Doctor Barlow, or whether ever he gave him his consent to use his name publicly for a countenance unto such a defamatory libel. It were endless and useless to cull out the remaining instances of the same kind, whereof I think there is scarce a page free in his book, unless it be taken up with quotations; and I am sure that whosoever will give the least credit unto any of his stories and assertions will do it at the utmost peril of being deceived. And where any thing he aims at hath the least of truth in it, he doth but make it a foundation to build a falsehood upon. Such are his ingenious repetitions of some things I should say fourteen or fifteen years ago in private discourses; which yet, supposing them true, in the terms by him reported, as they are not, contain nothing of immorality, nothing of injury unto or reflection on others. Surely this man must be thought to study the adorning and freedom of conversation, who thus openly traduceth a person for words occasionally and it may be hastily spoken, without the least injury to any or evil in themselves, fourteen or fifteen years after! And these also are such as he hath taken upon mere reports; for I believe he will not say that ever he spake one word with me himself in his life. How any one can safely converse with a man of this spirit and humor I know not.

I shall wholly pass by his malicious wresting and false applications of the passages he hath quoted out of some things published by me: for as for the greatest part of those small perishing treatises, whence he and others have extracted their pretended advantages, it is many years since I saw them, — some of them twenty at the least; nor do I know how they have dealt in

repeating their “excerpta,” which with so much diligence they have collected; that they are several times wrested and perverted by this malicious scribbler unto things never intended by me, that I do know. One discourse, about Communion with God, I find there is much wrath stirred up against; and yet, upon the severe scrutiny which it hath in several hands undergone, nothing can be found to lay to its charge but one passage concerning some differences about external worship, which they needed not to have put themselves to so much trouble to have found out and declared. But as for this man, he makes such inferences from it and applications of it as are full of malice and poison, — being not inferior in these good qualifications unto any of his other prodigious tales: for from what I speak concerning the purity of instituted worship, he concludes that I judge that all who in the worship of God make use of the Common-prayer are not loyal to Christ, nor have communion with God, nor can promote the interest of the gospel; all which are notoriously false, never thought, never spoken, never written by me. And I do believe that many that have used that book in the public administrations have been as loyal to Christ, had as much communion with God, and been as zealous to promote the interest of the gospel, as any who have lived in the world these thousand years; for men are accepted with God according to what they have, and not according to what they have not.

The next charge I can meet withal in this confused heap, — which is like the grave, a place of darkness, without any order, — is no less than of perjury; and this principally he doth on such an account as is not at all peculiar to me, but the reproach he manageth is equally cast on the greatest part of the kingdom by this public defamer. And I suppose others do, though I do not, know the prudence of encouraging such a slanderous libeller to cast fire-brands among peaceable subjects, and to revive the remembrance of things which the wisdom, clemency, and righteousness of his majesty, with and by the law of the land, upon the best and most assured principles of piety and policy, have put into oblivion. And it also seems strange to me how bold he and some other scribblers make by their interesting the sacred name of his majesty and his concerns in their impertinent squabbings, as they do on all occasions. But such things are of another cognizance, and there I leave them. What is peculiar to myself in this charge is represented under a double instance: —

1. Of the oath of canonical obedience, which I took and violated; and,
2. Of the university oath.

For the first, although I could easily return an answer unto the thing itself, yet, as to what concerns me, I shall give no other but “*Mentitur impudentissime;*” I never took any such oath.

And for the other, I doubt not to speak with some confidence that the intention and design of the oath was observed by me with as much conscience and diligence as by any who have since acted in the same capacity wherein I was at that time reflected on. And upon the provocation of this man, whoever he be, I do not fear to say, that, considering the state and condition of affairs at that time in the nation and the university, I do not believe there is any person of learning, ingenuity, or common modesty, who had relation in those days unto that place, but will grant, at least, that notwithstanding some lesser differences from them about things of very small importance, I was not altogether useless to the interests of learning, morality, peace, and the preservation of the place itself; and further I am not concerned in the ingratitude and envy of a few illiterate and malicious persons, as knowing that “*Obtrectatio est stultorum thesaurus, quem in linguis gerunt.*”

But if all these attempts prove successless, there is that yet behind which shall justify the whole charge, or at least the author, in filling up his bill with so many prodigious falsities; and this is my “blaspheming the Lord’s prayer,” which is exaggerated with many tragical expressions and hideous exclamations; — as, indeed, who can lay too heavy a load on so horrid a crime? But how if this should not prove so? how if, by all his outcries, he should but adorn and set forth his own forgeries? This I know, that I do, and ever did, believe that that prayer is part of the canonical Scripture; which I would not willingly blaspheme. I do believe that it was composed by the Lord Jesus Christ himself, and have vindicated it from being thought a collection and composition of such petitions as were then in use among the Jews, as some learned men had, I think unadvisedly, asserted it to be. I do, and ever did, believe it the most perfect form of prayer that ever was composed, and the words of it so disposed by the divine wisdom of our blessed Savior that it comprehends the substance of all the matter of prayer to God. I do, and did always, believe that it ought to be continually

meditated on, that we may learn from thence both what we ought to pray for and in what manner; neither did I ever think a thought or speak a word unsuitable to these assertions. Wherein, then, doth this great blasphemy lie? Unto two heads it must be reduced: —

1. That I judge not that our Lord Jesus Christ, in the giving of this prayer unto his disciples, did prescribe unto them the precise use or repetition of those words, but only taught them what to pray for or how.

Now, although it may be this man doth not, yet all men of any tolerable learning or reading know that this assertion, relating only to the different interpretations of one expression, indeed of one word, in one of the evangelists, hath been owned and allowed by learned men of all parties and persuasions. He may, if he please, consult Grotius, Musculus, and Cornelius a Lapide (to name one of a side), for his information. But, —

2. I have delivered other things concerning the use of it in my book against the Socinians.

Whereunto I shall only say, that he who differs from others in the manner of the use of any thing may have as reverent an esteem of the thing itself as they; and herein I shall not give place unto any man that lives on the earth with respect unto the Lord's prayer. It is true, I have said that there were manifold abuses in the rehearsal of it amongst people ignorant and superstitious; and I did deliver my thoughts, it may be, too freely and severely, against some kind of repetition of it, But as for the ridiculous and impudent charge of blasphemy hence raised by this pitiful calumniator, I am no way concerned in it; no more am I with that lie which hath been now reported to the satiety of its first broachers and promoters, — namely, that I should “put on my hat upon the repetition of it.”

It was, as I remember, about fifteen years ago that such a rumor was raised; by I know not whom, nor on what occasion. It was somewhat long before I heard any whisper of it, — as is the manner in such cases. But so soon as I did attain a knowledge that such a slander had been reported and scattered abroad, I did cause to be published, in English and French, a declaration of its notorious falsity, in the year 1655. But so prone are many to give entertainment to false reproaches of them whom on any account they are displeased with, so unwilling to part with a supposed

advantage against them, though they know it to have been put into their hand by the mistakes, folly, or malice of others, that the same untruth hath been several times since repeated and republished, without the least taking notice that it was publicly denied, condemned, and the authors of it challenged to give any tolerable account of their report. Only of late one learned person meeting it afresh, where its admittance would have been to his advantage (namely, Mr Durel, in his answer unto the apology of some nonconformists), had the ingenuity to acknowledge the public disclaimure of any such practice so long since made and published, and thereon at least to suspend his assent to the report itself.

I am, sir, quite weary of repeating the instances of this man's notorious falsehoods and unjust accusations; I shall therefore overlook the remainder of them on this head, that I may give you one of his intolerable weakness and ignorance, and this lies in his attempt to find out contradictions between what I have written in several places about toleration and liberty of conscience, p. 67. For because I say that "pernicious errors are to be opposed and extirpated, by means appointed, proper and suitable thereunto," as also that "it is the duty of the magistrate to defend, protect, countenance, and promote, the truth," the man thinks that these things are inconsistent with liberty of conscience, and such a toleration or forbearance as at any time I have pleaded for. But if any man should persuade him to let those things alone which either he hath nothing to do withal or doth not understand, it may be he would accommodate him with a sufficient leisure, and more time than he knows well how to dispose of.

II. His last attempt is upon some sayings which he calls my "principles;" in the representation whereof whether he hath dealt with any greater regard to truth and honesty than are the things we have already passed through shall be briefly considered.

The first, as laid down in the contents prefixed to this sorry chapter, is in these words: "That success in business doth authoricate its cause; and that if God's providence permit a mischief, his will approves it."

There are two parts, you see, of this principle, whereof the first is, "That success will justify a cause in business," — that is, as I take it, any one; and secondly, "That which God permits, he doth approve." How, as both parts of this principle are diabolically false, so in their charge on me also;

so that I must betake myself again to the example of the friar, and say,” “*Mentitur impudentissime.*” A cause is good or bad before it hath success one way or other; and that which hath not its warranty in itself can never obtain any from its success. The rule of the goodness of any public cause is the eternal law of reason, with the just legal rights and interests of men. If these make not a cause good, success will never mend it. But when a cause on these grounds is so indeed, or is really judged such by them that are engaged in it, not to take notice of the providence of God in prospering men in the pursuit of it, is to exclude all thoughts of him and his providence from having any concern in the government of the world. And if I or any other have at any time applied this unto any cause not warranted by the only rule of its justification, it no way reflects on the truth of the principle which I assert, nor gives countenance to the false one which he ascribes unto me. For the latter clause of this pretended principle, “That if God’s providence permit a mischief, his will approves it,” I suspect there is some other ingredient in it besides lying and malice, — namely, stupid ignorance; for it is mischief in a moral sense that he intends, nothing being the object of God’s approbation or disapprobation on any other account. It would therefore seem very strange how any one who hath but so much understanding as to know that this principle would take away all differences between good and evil should provide himself with so much impudence as to charge it on me.

Another principle, in pursuit of the same design, he lays down as mine, p. 46, namely, “That saints may retain their holiness in the act of sinning; and that whatever law they violate, God will not impute it to them as a sin.”

There seem to be two parts of this principle also. The first is, “That saints may retain their holiness in the act of sinning.” I know not well what he means by this part of his principle; and yet do, for some reasons, suppose him to be more remote from the understanding of it than I am, although the words are his own. If he mean that the act of sinning is not against, or an impeachment of holiness, it is a ridiculous contradiction. If he mean that every actual sin doth not deprive the sinner of all holiness, he is ridiculous himself if he assert that it doth, seeing “there is no man that doeth good, and sinneth not.” The framing of the last clause of this principle smells of the same cask, and, as it is charged on me, is false. Whatever law of God

any man breaks, it is a sin, is so judged of God, and by him imputed so far unto the sinner as to judge him guilty thereof, whoever he be; but God doth not impute every sin unto believers unto judgment and condemnation. And if he can understand any thing in the books quoted by him, he will find that there is no more in them towards what he reflects upon, but that God will by his grace preserve true believers from falling into such sins as whereby they should totally and finally lose their Faith, fall from grace, and be cast out of God's covenant. This principle I own, and despise his impotent, ignorant, and ridiculous defamation of it.

His third principle is about praying by the Spirit, which he chargeth at the highest rate, as that which will destroy all government in the world!

I know well enough whence he hath learned this kind of arguing; but I have no reason to concern myself particularly in this matter. The charge, for aught I know, as here proposed, falls equally on all Christians in the world; for whether men pray by a book or without a book, if they pray not by the Spirit, — that is, by the assistance of the Spirit of God, — they pray not at all. Let, therefore, the Scripture and Christianity answer for themselves; at present in this charge I am not particularly concerned.

Thus, sir, I have complied with your desire unto a perusal of this confused heap of malicious calumnies; which otherwise I had absolutely in silence put off to the judgment of the great day. It may be this author hath scarce yet cast up his account, nor considered what it is to lend his fingers to others to thrust into the fire, which they would not touch themselves; for whilst they do, or may if they please, enjoy their satisfaction in his villany and folly, the guilt and shame of them will return in a cruciating sense upon his own understanding and conscience. When this shall befall him, as it will do assuredly, if he be not utterly profligate, he will find no great relief in wishing that he had been better advised, nor in considering that those who rejoice in the calumny do yet despise the sycophant. — I am, Sir, your, etc.,

J.O.

OF THE

DIVINE ORIGINAL, AUTHORITY,
SELF-EVIDENCING LIGHT,
AND POWER OF THE
SCRIPTURES;

WITH AN ANSWER TO THAT INQUIRY, HOW WE KNOW THE
SCRIPTURES TO BE THE WORD OF GOD.

ALSO,

A VINDICATION OF THE PURITY AND INTEGRITY
OF THE HEBREW AND GREEK TEXTS OF THE
OLD AND NEW TESTAMENT;

IN SOME CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PROLEGOMENA AND
APPENDIX TO THE LATE “BIBLIA POLYGLOTTA.”

WHEREUNTO ARE SUBJOINED

SOME EXERCITATIONS ABOUT THE NATURE AND
PERFECTION OF THE SCRIPTURE, THE RIGHT OF
INTERPRETATION, INTERNAL LIGHT, REVELATION, ETC.

Ἐρευνᾶτε τὰς γραφάς. —  John 5:39.

OXFORD: 1659.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The Epistle Dedicatory to the three^{f15} following treatises is full of curious information, and deserves to be read, in order to understand our author's true position in his controversy with Brian Walton, the learned editor of the London Polyglott. Surprise has been expressed that under one general title Owen should have included tracts on subjects so different in their nature as the divine origin of Scripture, the purity of the Hebrew and Greek text of Scripture, and the doctrinal errors of the Society of Friends. The last tract, too, was first written, and on the subordinate title prefixed to it bears date 1658, whereas the others belong to the succeeding year. The bond of connection among the treatises is, however, sufficiently plain. In refuting the doctrine of the inward light, as held by the Quakers, he was discriminating his own profound and original views of the self-evidencing power of the Word from a dogma with which they might be confounded; and as in the first treatise he had expressed himself in language rather unguarded and too unqualified, about the providential care of God over every letter and syllable of revelation, he was prompted to question some features in Walton's Polyglott, which had just been published, and in which thousands of various readings were exhibited. These various readings seemed to refute the position he had taken, that the Scriptures had been providentially kept in their original integrity. How far he erred on this point, and to what extent his views have been misapprehended, are discussed in the prefatory note to the "Considerations on the Prolegomena and Appendix to the Biblia Polyglotta"

As this Polyglott was the occasion of the following Epistle and of the tract to which we have just alluded, it may be necessary to glance at its history and character. It appears that Walton issued the description and prospectus of it in 1852, and before the close of that year nearly £4,000 had been raised by subscription for the work. The Council of State promised to advance £1,000, and the paper to be used for it was exempted from duty. In May 1653 the subscriptions had risen to £9,000, and in the autumn of that year the impression was begun. Next year the first volume was completed, containing Prolegomena which are still a treasure of sacred criticism, and have been thrice republished separately, and the Pentateuch

in the Hebrew, the Vulgate, the Septuagint, the Syriac, the Targum of Onkelos, the Samaritan, and the Arabic: in 1655 the second volume appeared, comprising the historical books in the same languages and versions, with the exception of the Samaritan: in 1858 the third, comprehending the poetic and prophetic books from Job to Malachi, with the addition of an Ethiopic version of the Book of Psalms: and in 1857 the fourth, containing all the apocryphal books; the fifth, including all the books of the New Testament, in the Greek, Syriac, Persic, Vulgate, Arabic, and Ethiopic; and the sixth, composed of various readings, critical remarks, etc. Walton's assistants in this magnificent work were Ussher, Castell, Hyde, Pococke, Lightfoot, Huish, Samuel Clarke, De Dieu, and others. The terms in which Cromwell is mentioned in the preface are as follow: "*Primo autem commemorandi, quorum favore chartam a vectigalibus immunem habuimus, quod quinque abhinc annis a Concilio secretiori primo concessum, postea a SERENISSIMO D. PROTECTORE ejusque Concilio, operis promovendi cause, benigne confirmatum et continuatum erat.*" About the time of the Restoration two leaves of the preface were cancelled, the name of Cromwell was expunged from the list of benefactors, and a dedication to Charles II. prefixed, stigmatizing Cromwell as "the great dragon," and insinuating that he wished to extort from Walton the honor of the dedication: "*Insidiabatur partui nostro draco the magnus, et per tyrannidis suae mancipia hoc agebat, ut in ipso partu opprimeretur, nisi ipsi ut patrone et protectori dicaretur.*" The change could surely have been effected in a way more honorable to Walton, and without needless reflections on the memory of the Protector, his obligations to whom could not be concealed and should not have been forgotten. He was rewarded in 1660 with the bishopric of Chester; which he enjoyed only for the short space of a year. There are few names on the bright roll of British scholarship and learning to which Biblical literature has been more indebted. — ED.

TO MY REVEREND AND WORTHY FRIENDS,

THE PREBENDS OF CHRIST CHURCH COLLEGE
IN OXFORD,

WITH ALL THE STUDENTS IN DIVINITY IN THAT SOCIETY.

THE reason of my inscribing the ensuing pleas for the authority, purity, and perfection of the Scripture, against the pretences of some to the contrary in these days, unto *you*, is, because some of you value and study the Scripture as much as any I know; and it is the earnest desire of my heart that all of you would so do. Now, whereas two things offer themselves unto me, to discourse with you by the way of preface, — namely, the commendation of the Scripture and an exhortation to the study of it, on the one hand; and a discovery of the reproach that is cast upon it, with the various ways and means that are used by some for the lessening and depressing of its authority and excellency, on the other, — the former being to good purpose by one or other almost every day performed, I shall insist at present on the latter only: which also is more suited to discover my aim and intention in the ensuing discourses. Now, herein, as I shall, it may be, seem to exceed that proportion which is due unto a preface to such short discourses as these following, yet I know I shall be more brief than the nature of so great a matter as that proposed to consideration doth require; and, therefore, *ἀνευ προοιμίων καὶ παθῶν*, I shall fall upon the subject that now lies before me.

Many there have been, and are, who, through the craft of Satan and the prejudice of their own hearts, lying under the power of corrupt and carnal interest, have engaged themselves to decry and disparage that excellency of the Scripture which is proper and peculiar unto it. The several sorts of them are too many particularly to be considered; I shall only pass through them in general, and fix upon such instances by the way as may give evidence to the things insisted on.

Those who in this business are first to be called to an account — whose filth and abominations, given out in gross, others have but parcelled among themselves — are they of the synagogue of Rome. These pretend

themselves to be the only keepers and preservers of the Word of God in the world, the only “pillar and ground of truth.” Let us, then, a little consider, in the first place, how it hath discharged this trust; for it is but equal that men should be called to an account upon their own principles; and those *who*, supposing themselves to have a trust reposed in them, do manifest a treacherous mind, would not be one whit better if they had so indeed.

What, then, have these men done in the discharge of their pretended trust? nay, what hath that synagogue left unattempted? yea, what hath it left unfinished that may be needful to convince it of perfidiousness? that says the Scripture was committed to it alone; and would if it were able, deprive all others of the possession of it, or of their lives. What Scripture, then, was this, or when was this deed of trust made unto them? The oracles of God, they tell us, committed to the Jews under the Old Testament, and all the writings of the New; and that this was done from the first foundation of the church by Peter, and so on to the finishing of the whole canon. What now have they not done, in adding, detracting, corrupting, forging, aspersing those Scriptures, to falsify their pretended trust? They add more books to them, never indited by the Holy Ghost, as remote from being **ζεόπνευστα, ὡς οὐρανὸς ἐστὶ ἀπὸ γαίης**; so denying the self-evidencing power of that Word, which is truly **ἐξ οὐρανοῦ**, by mixing it with things **ἐξ ἀνθρώπων** of a human rise and spring; manifesting themselves to have lost the Spirit of discerning, promised with the Word to abide with the true church of God for ever. (~~280~~ Isaiah 59:21.) They have taken from its fullness and perfection, its sufficiency and excellency, by their Masora, their oral law, or *verbum* **ἄγραφον**, their unknown, endless, bottomless, boundless treasure of traditions, — that **πάνασοφον φάρμακον** for all their abominations. The Scripture itself (as they say, committed to them) they plead, to their eternal shame, to be in the *original languages* corrupted, vitiated, interpolated; so that it is no stable rule to guide us throughout in the knowledge of the will of God. The Jews, they say, did it whilst they were busy in burning of Christians. Therefore, in the room of the originals, they have enthroned a translation that was never committed to them, — that came into the world they know neither how, nor when, nor by whom; so that one (Erasmus) says of its author, “Si quis percontetur Gallus fuerit an Sarmata, Judaeus an Christianus, vir an mulier,

nihil habituri sint ejus patroni quod expedite respondeant.” All this to place themselves in the throne of God, and to make the words of a translation authentic from *their* stamp upon them, and not from their relation unto and agreement with the words spoken by God himself. And yet further, as if all this were not enough to manifest what trustees they have been, they have cast off all subjection to the authority of God in his Word, unless it be resolved into their own, denying that any man in the world can know it to be the Word of God unless they tell him so: it is but ink and paper, skin of parchment, a dead letter, a nose of wax, a Lesbian rule, — of no authority unto us at all. O faithful trustees! holy mother church! infallible chair! can wickedness yet make any farther progress? Was it ever heard of, from the foundation of the world, that men should take so much pains as these men have done to prove themselves faithless and treacherous in a trust committed to them? Is not this the sum and substance of volumes that have even filled the world: “The Word of God was committed to us alone, and no others: under our keeping it is corrupted, depraved, vitiated: the copies delivered unto us we have rejected, and taken up one of our own choice: nor let any complain of us; — it was in our power to do worse. This sacred depositum had no **κριτήρια**, whereby it might be known to be the Word of God; but it is upon our credit alone that it passes in the world or is believed! We have added to it many books upon our own judgment; and yet think it not sufficient for the guidance of men in the worship of God, and the obedience they owe unto him?” Yet do they blush? are they ashamed as a thief when he is taken? nay, do they not boast themselves in their iniquity, and say they are sold to work all these abominations? The time is coming, yea, it is at hand, wherein it shall repent them for ever that they have lifted up themselves against this sacred grant of the wisdom, care, love, and goodness of God!

Sundry other branches there are of the abominations of these men besides those enumerated, all which may be reduced to these three corrupt and bloody fountains: —

1. That the Scripture at best, as given out from God, and as it is to us continued, was and is but a partial revelation of the will of God, the other part of it (which how vast and extensive it is no man knows; — for the Jews have given us their **δευτερώσεις** in their Mishna and Gemara; these kept

them locked up in the breast or chair of their *holy father*) being reserved in their magazine of traditions.

2. That the Scripture is not able to evince or manifest itself to be the Word of God, so as to enjoy and exercise any authority in his name over the souls and consciences of men, without an accession of testimony from that combination of politic, worldly-minded men that call themselves the Church of Rome.

3. That the original copies of the Old and New Testaments are so corrupted (“*ex ore tuo, serve nequam*”) that they are not a certain standard and measure of all doctrines, or the touch-stone of all translations.

Now, concerning these things, you will find somewhat offered unto your consideration in the ensuing discourses; wherein I hope, without any great altercation or disputes, to lay down such principles of truth as that their idol imaginations will be found cast to the ground before the sacred ark of the Word of God, and to lie naked without wisdom or power.

It is concerning the last of these only that at present I shall deliver my thoughts unto you; and that because we begin to have a new concernment therein, wherewith I shall afterward acquaint you. Of all the inventions of Satan to draw off the minds of men from the Word of God, this of *decrying the authority of the originals* seems to me the most pernicious. At the beginning of the Reformation, before the council of Trent, the Papists did but faintly, and not without some blushing, defend their Vulgar Latin translation. Some openly preferred the original before it, as Cajetan,^{f16} Erasmus, Vives,^{f17} and others; yea, and after the council also, the same was done by Andradius,^{f18} Ferrarius,^{f19} Arias Montanus,^{f20} Masius,^{f21} and others. For those who understood nothing but Latin amongst them, and scarcely that, whose ignorance was provided for in the council, I suppose it will not be thought meet that in this case we should make any account of them. But the state of things is now altered in the world, and the iniquity which first wrought in a mystery, being now discovered casts off its vizard and grows held: “*Nihil est audacius istis deprensus.*” At first the design was managed in private writings. Melchior Canus,^{f22} Gulielmus Lindanus,^{f23} Bellarminus,^{f24} Gregorius de Valentia,^{f25} Leo Castrius,^{f26} Huntlaeus,^{f27} Hanstelius,^{f28} with innumerable others, some on one account, some on another, have pleaded that the originals were corrupted,

— some of them with more impudence than others. Leo Castrius, as Pineda observes, raves almost wherever he falls on the mention of the Hebrew text. “Sed is est author,’ ^{f29} saith he, “dum in hujusmodi Ebraizationes incidit, vix sui compos; et bono licet zelo, tamen vel ignorance rerum quarundam, vel vehementiori aliqua affectione, extra fines veritatis et modestiae rapitur: et si ex hujusmodi tantum unguibus *Leonem* ilium estimaremus, non etiam ex aliis praeclaris conatibus, aut murem aut vulpem censeremus, aut canem aut quiddam aliud ignobilius.” Yea, Morinus, who seems to be ashamed of nothing, yet shrinks a little at this man’s impudence and folly. “Apologetici libros,’ ^{f30} saith he, “sex bene longos scripsit, quibus nihil quam Judaeorum voluntarias et malignas depravationes demonstrare nititur; zelo sane pio scripsit Castrius, sed libris Hebraicis ad tantum opus quod moliebatur parum erat instructus. In the steps of this Castrius walks Huntley, a subtle Jesuit, who, in the treatise above cited, ^{f31} ascribes the corruption of the Hebrew Bible to the good providence of God, for the honor of the Vulgar Latin! But these, with their companions, have had their mouths stopped by Reynolds, Whitaker, Junius, Lubbertus, Rivetus, Chamierus, Gerardus, Ameslus, Glassius, Alstedius, Amama, and others: so that a man would have thought this fire put to the house of God had been sufficiently quenched. But after all the endeavors hitherto used, in the days wherein we live it breaks out in a greater flame; they now print the original itself and defame it, gathering up translations of all sorts, and setting them up in competition with it. When Ximenes put forth the Complutensian Bible, Vatablus his, and Arias Montanus those of the king of Spain, this cockatrice was not hatched, whose fruit is now growing to a fiery flying serpent. It is now but saying, “The ancient Hebrew letters are changed from the Samaritan to the Chaldean; the points or vowels, and accents, are but lately invented, of no authority; without their guidance and direction nothing is certain in the knowledge of that tongue; all that we know of it comes from the translation of the LXX.; the Jews have corrupted the Old Testament; there are innumerable various lections both of the Old and New; there are other copies differing from those we now enjoy that are utterly lost.” So that upon the matter there is nothing left unto men but to choose whether they will be Papists or Atheists.

Here that most stupendous fabric that was ever raised by ink and paper, termed well by a learned man, “Magnificentissimum illud, quod post homines natos in lucern prodiit unquam, opus biblicum,”^{f32} — I mean the Parisian Bibles, — is prefaced by a discourse of its erector, Michael Le Jay, wherein he denies the Hebrew text, prefers the Vulgar Latin before it, and resolves that we are not left to the Word for our rule, but to the Spirit that rules in their church: “Pro certo igitur atque indubitato apud nos esse debet, vulgatam editionem, quae communi catholicae ecclesiae lingua, circumfertur verum esse et genuinum sacrae Scripturae fontem; hanc consulendam ubique, inde fidei dogmata repetenda; ex quo insuper consentaneum est, vera an certissima fidei Christianae autographa in Spiritu ecclesiae residere, neque ab ejus hostium manibus repetenda.

“Et certe quamcunque pietatis speciem praetexunt, non religione quapiam, ant sincera in Scripturam saeram veneratione aguntur, duns eam unicam, quasi ineluctabilem salutis regulam, usurpant, neque spiritus evangelici veritatem investire decreverunt; dum, ad autographa curiosius recurrentes, ex quibus, prater perplexa quaedam vestigia, vix aliquid superest, vel capitales fidei hostes, vel eos qui ecclesiae minus faverint, de contextuum interpretatione ac germano sacrorum codicum sensu consulunt. Scilicet non alia est opportunior via a regio illius itinere secedendi, neque in privatarum opinionum placitis blandius possunt acquiescere, quas velut unicas doctrinae suae regulas sectari plerumque censuerunt. Apage caecam animorum libidinem! Non jam in institutionem nostram subsistit litera, sed ecclesiae spiritus; neque e sacris codicibus hauriendum quidquam, nisi quod ilia communicatum esse nobiscum voluerit.”^{f33}

So he, or Morinus in his name. And if this be indeed the true state of things, I suppose he will very hardly convince men of the least usefulness of this great work and undertaking. To usher those Bibles into the world, Morinus puts Forth his Exercitations, entitled, “Of the Sincerity of the Hebrew and Greek Texts” — indeed to prove them corrupt and useless. He is now the man amongst them that undertakes to defend this cause; in whose writings whether there be more of Pyrgopolynices or Rabshakeh is uncertain. But dogs that bark loud seldom bite deep; nor do I think many ages have produced a man of more confidence and less judgment. A prudent reader cannot but nauseate at all his leaves, and the man is well

laid open by a learned person of his own party.^{f34} By the way, I cannot but observe, that in the height of his boasting he falls upon his mother church, and embraces her to death. Exercit. 1, cap. 1, p. 11, that he might vaunt himself to be the first and only discoverer of corruptions in the original of the Old Testament, with the causes of them, he falls into a profound contemplation of the guidance of his church, which being ignorant of any such cause of rejecting the originals as he hath now informed her of, yet continued to reject them, and prefer the Vulgar Latin before them. “Hic admirare lector,” saith he, “Dei Spiritum ecclesiae praesentissimum, illam per obscura, perplexa, et invia quaeque, inoffenso pede agentem: quanquam incognita esset Rabbiorum supina negligentia, pertentosa ignorantia, foedaque librorum Judaicorum corruptela, et Haeretici contraria his magna verborum pompa audacter jactarent; adduci tamen non potuit ecclesia, ut versio, qua sola per mille fere et centum annos usa fuerit, ad normam et amussim Hebraei textus iterum recuderetur.” But is it so indeed, that their church receives its guidance in a stupid, brutish manner, so as to be fixed obstinately on conclusions without the least acquaintance with the promises? It seems she loved not the originals, but she knew not why; only she was obstinate in this, that she loved them not! If this be the state with their church, that when she hath neither Scripture, nor tradition, nor reason, nor new revelation, she is guided she knows not how, as Socrates was by his demon, or by a secret and inexpressible species of pertinacity and stubbornness falling upon her imagination, I suppose it will be in vain to contend with her any longer. For my own part, I must confess that I shall as soon believe a poor, deluded, fanatical Quaker, pretending to be guided by an infallible Spirit, as their pope with his whole conclave of cardinals, upon the terms here laid down by Morinus.

But, to let these men pass for a season, had this leprosy kept itself within that house which is thoroughly infected, it had been of less importance; it is but a further preparation of it for the fire. But it is now broken forth among Protestants also; with what designs, to what end or purpose, I know not, — Θεὸς οἶδε, “God knows,” and “the day will manifest.” To declare at large how this is come about, “longa esset historia,” — too long for me to dwell upon; some heads of things I shall briefly touch at. It is known to all that the reformation of religion and restoration of good

learning were begun and carried on at the same time, and mostly by the same persons. There was, indeed, a triumvirate among the Papists of men excellently skilled in rabbinical learning before the Reformation. Raymundus Martinus, Porchetus de Sylvaticis, and Petrus Galatinus, are the men; of the which the last dedicated his book to Maximilian the emperor, after that Zuinglius and Luther had begun to preach. Upon the matter, these three are but one: great are the disputes whether Galatinus stole his book from Raymundus or Porchetius, saith Morinus, and calls his work “Plagium portentosum, cui vix simile unquam factum est.” (Exerc. 1, cap. 2.) From Raymundus, saith Scaliget (Epist. 2:41), mistaking Raymundus Martinus for Raymundus Sebon, but giving the first tidings to the world of that book. From Raymundus also saith Josephus de Voysin, in his prolegomena to the *Pugio Fidei*; and from him Hornbeck, in his proleg, ad Jud. I shall not interpose in this matter. The method of Galatinus and his style are peculiar to him, but the coincidences of his quotations too many to be ascribed to common accident. That Porchetus took his “Victoria adversus impios Judaeos” for the most part from Raymundus, he himself confesseth in his preface. However, certain it is Galatinus had no small opinion of his own skill, and, therefore, — according to the usual way of men who have attained, as they think, to some eminency in any one kind of learning, laying more weight upon it than it is able to bear, — he boldly affirms that the original of the Scripture is corrupted, and not to be restored but by the Talmud; in which one concession he more injures the cause he pleads for against the Jews than he advantageth it by all his books beside. Of his גל' יזיא of Rabbi Hakkadosh there is no more news as yet in the world than what he is pleased to acquaint us withal. At the same time, Erasmus, Reuchlin, Vives, Xantes Pagninus, and others, moved effectually for the restoration of the Hebrew, Greek, and Latin. But the work principally prospered in the hands of the first reformers, as they were all of them generally skilled in the Hebrew, — some of them, as Capito, Bibliander, Fagius, Munster, to that height and usefulness that they may well be reckoned as the fathers and patriarchs of that learning. At that time lived Elias Levita, the most learned of the Jews of that age, whose grammatical writings were of huge importance in the studying of that tongue. This man, as he was acquainted with many of the first reformers, so he lived particularly with Paulus Fagius, as I have elsewhere declared. Now, in one book which in those

days he published, called “Masoreth Hammasoreth,” he broached a new opinion, not much heard of, at least not at all received, among the Jews, nor, for aught that yet appears, once mentioned by Christians before, namely, that the points or vowels, and accents, used in the Hebrew Bible were invented by some critical Jew or Masorete, living at Tiberias about five or six hundred years after Christ. No doubt the man’s aim was to reduce the world of Christians to a dependence on the ancient Rabbins for the whole sense of the Scripture. “Hinc prima mali labes.” Here lies the first breach in this matter. The fraud being not discovered, and this opinion being broached and confirmed by the great and almost only master of the language of that age, some even of the first reformers embraced his fancy. Perhaps Zuinglius had spoken to it before; justly I know not. After a while, the poison of this error beginning to operate, the Papists, waiting on the mouths of the reformers, like the servants of Benhadad on Ahab, to catch at every word that might fall from them to their advantage, began to make use of it. Hence Cochlaeus (lib. de Auth. Scripturae, cap. 5.) applauds Luther for saying the Jews had corrupted the Bible with points and distinctions; as well he might, for nothing could be spoken more to the advantage of his cause against him. Wherefore other learned men began to give opposition to this error; so did Munster, Junius, and others, as will be shown in the ensuing discourse. Thus this matter rested for a season. The study of the Hebrew tongue and learning being carried on, it fell at length on him who undoubtedly hath done more real service for the promotion of it than any one man whatever, Jew or Christian; I mean Buxtorfius the elder. His Thesaurus Grammaticus, his Tiberias, or Commentarius Masoretheticus, his Lexicons and Concordances, and many other treatises, whereof some are not yet published, evince this to all the world. Even Morinus saith that he is the only man among Christians that ever thoroughly understood the Masora; and Simeon de Muis acknowledgeth his profiting by him and learning from him. Other Jews who undertake to be teachers know nothing but what they learn of him. To omit the testimony of all sorts of learned men, giving him the pre-eminence in this learning, it may suffice that his works praise him. Now, this man, in his Tiberias, or Commentarius Masoretheticus, printed with the great Rabbinical Bible of his own correct setting forth at Basil, anno 1620, considereth at large this whole matter of the points, and discovereth the vanity of Elias’ pretension about the Tiberian Masorettes. But we must

not, it seems, rest here; within a few years after, to make way for another design, which then he had conceived, Ludovicius Cappellus published a discourse in the defense of the opinion of Elias (at least so far as concerned the rise of the punctuation), under the title of “*Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum*.” The book was published by Erpenius, without the name of the author. But the person was sufficiently known; and Rivetus not long after took notice of him, and saith he was his friend, but concealed his name. (Isag. ad Scrip. 1, cap. 8.) This new attempt immediately pleaseth some. Among others, our learned professor, Dr Prideaux, reads a public lecture, on the vespers of our Comitia, on that subject; wherein, though he prefaceth his discourse with an observation of the advantage the Papists make of that opinion of the novelty of the points, and the danger of it, yet upon the matter he falls in wholly with Cappellus, though he names him not. Among the large encomiums of himself and his work, printed by Cappellus in the close of his “*Critica Sacra*,” there are two letters from one Mr Eyre here in England; in one whereof he tells him that without doubt the Doctor read on that subject by the help of his book, as indeed he useth his arguments and quotes his treatise, under the name of “*Sud Hanisebhoth Hanaegalah*.” But that, I say, which seems to me most admirable in the Doctor’s discourse is, that whereas he had prefaced it with the weight of the controversy he had in hand, by the advantage the Papists make of the opinion of the novelty of the points, citing their words to that purpose, himself in the body of his Exercitationes falls in with them, and speaks the very things which he seemed before to have blamed. And by this means this opinion, tending so greatly to the disparagement of the authority of the originals, is crept in amongst Protestants also. Of the stop put unto its progress by the full and learned answer of Buxtorfius the younger (who alone in this learning, in this age, seems to answer his fathers worth) unto Cappellus, in his discourse, “*De Punctorum Yocalium Antiquitate*,” I shall speak more afterward. However, it is not amiss fallen out that the masters of this new persuasion are not at all agreed among themselves. Cappellus would have it easy to understand the Hebrew text, and every word, though not absolutely by itself, yet as it lies in its contexture, though there were no points at all. Morinus would make the language altogether unintelligible on that account. The one saith that the points are a late invention of the Rabbins; and the other, that without them the understanding of the Hebrew is *ἐκ τῶν ἀδυνάτων*: though they look diverse ways, there is a

firebrand between them. But we have this brand brought yet nearer to the church's bread-corn in the Prolegomena to the Biblia Polyglotta, lately printed at London. The solemn espousal of this opinion of the Hebrew punctuation in that great work was one chief occasion of the second discourse, as you will find it at large declared in the entrance of it. I dare not mention the desperate consequences that attend this imagination, being affrighted, among other things, by a little treatise lately sent me (upon the occasion of a discourse on this subject) by my worthy and learned friend Dr Ward, entitled "Fides Divina;" wherein its author, whoever he be, from some principles of this nature, and unwary expressions of some learned men amongst us, labors to eject and east out as useless the whole Scripture or Word of God. I should have immediately returned an answer to that pestilent discourse, but that upon consideration I found all his objections obviated or answered in the ensuing treatises, which were then wholly finished. And this, as I said, was the first way whereby the poison of undervaluing the originals crept in among Protestants themselves.

Now, together with the knowledge of the tongues, the use of that knowledge in critical observations did also increase. The excellent use of this study and employment, with the fruits of it in the explanation of sundry difficulties, with many other advantages, cannot be easily expressed. But as the best things are apt to be most abused, so in particular it hath fallen out with this kind of learning and study. Protestants here also have chiefly managed the business. Beza, Camerarius, Sealiger, Casauben, Drusius, Gomarus, Ussher, Grotius, Heinsius, Fuller, Dieu, Mede, Cameron, Glassius, Cappellus, Amama, with innumerable others, have excelled in this kind. But the mind of man being exceedingly vain. glorious, curious, uncertain, after a door to reputation and renown by this kind of learning was opened in the world, it quickly spread itself over all bounds and limits of sobriety The manifold inconveniences, if not mischiefs, that have ensued on the boldness and curiosity of some in criticizing the Scripture, I shall not now insist upon; and of what it might yet grow unto I have often heard the great Ussher expressing his fear. Of the success of Grotius in this way we have a solid account weekly in the lectures of our learned professor; which I hope he will in due time benefit the public withal. But it is only one or two things that my present design calls upon me to remark.

Among other ways that sundry men have fixed on to exercise their *critical abilities*, one hath been the collecting of various lections both in the Old Testament and New. The first and most honest course fixed on to this purpose was that of consulting various copies, and comparing them among themselves; wherein yet there were sundry miscarriages, as I shall show in the second treatise. This was the work of Erasmus, Stephen, Beza, Arias Montanus, and some others. Some that came after them, finding this province possessed, and no other world of the like nature remaining for them to conquer, fixed upon another way, substituting to the service of their design as pernicious a principle as ever, I think, was fixed on by any learned man since the foundation of the church of Christ, excepting only those of Rome. Now this principle is, that, upon many grounds (which some of them are long in recounting), there are sundry corruptions crept into the originals, which, by their critical faculty, with the use of sundry engines, those especially of the old translations, are to be discovered and removed. And this also receives countenance from those Prolegomena to the Biblia Polyglotte, as will afterward be shown and discussed. Now, this principle being once fixed, and a liberty of criticizing on the Scripture, yea, a necessity of it, thence evinced, it is inconceivable what springs of corrections and amendments rise up under their hands. Let me not be thought tedious if I recount some of them to you: —

1. It is known that there is a double consonancy in the Hebrew consonants among themselves — of some in *figure* that are unlike in *sound*, of some in *sound* that are unlike in *figure*. Of the first sort are כ and ג, נ and י, ו and ז, ד and ר, ט and ס, ט and ש, ח and ת, ע and צ, of the latter are כ and ק, ש and ע, ס and ש, ו and ב, צ and ז, Now, this is one principle of our new critics, that the scribes of the Bible were sometimes mistaken by the likeness of the letters in respect of figure, sometimes by their likeness in respect of sound, and so, remembering the words they wrote, oftentimes put one for another; so that whether they used their eyes or their memories, they failed on one hand or another: though the Jews deny any copy amongst them to be written but exactly by pattern, or that it is lawful for a man to write one word in a copy but by pattern, though he could remember the words of the whole Bible. Now, whereas the signification of every word is regulated by its radix, it often falls out that, in the formation and inflection of words, by reason of letters

that are defective, there remains but one letter of the radix in them, at least that is pronounced. How frequent this is in this tongue, those who have very little skill in it may guess by only taking a view of Frobenius' Bible, wherein the radical letters are printed in a distinct character from all the prefixes and affixes in their variations. Now, if a man hath a mind to criticize and mend the Bible, it is but taking his word or words that he will fix upon, and try what they will make by the commutation of the letters that are alike in figure and sound. Let him try what כ will do in the place of ק, or the contrary, — which as they are radical or as they are prefixed will sufficiently alter the sense; and so of all the rest mentioned. If by this means any new sense that is tolerable and pleaseth the critic doth emerge, it is but saying the scribe was mistaken in the likeness of the letters or in the affinity of the sound, and then it is no matter though all the copies in the world agree to the contrary, without the least variation. It is evident that this course hath stood Cappellus and Grotius in very good stead; and Simeon de Muis tells us a pretty story of himself to this purpose (Aesertio Verit. Heb.) Yea, this is the most eminent spring of the criticisms on the Old Testament that these times afford. A thousand instances might be given to this purpose.

2. But in case this course fail, and no relief be afforded this way, then the *transposition* of letters offers its assistance. Those who know any thing of this language know what alteration in the sense of words may be made by such a way of procedure; frequently words of contrary senses, directly opposite, consist only of the same letters diversely placed. Every lexicon will supply men with instances that need not to be here repeated.

3. The points are taken into consideration; and here bold men may even satisfy their curiosity. That word or those three letters דבר are instanced by Jerome to this purpose. (Hom. 9:12.) As it may be pointed, it will afford eight several senses: דְּבַר is *verbum*, and דִּבֶּר is *pestis*; as far distant from one another as life and death. Those letters in that order may be read with; ך... and ךך... and ךךך... and...and... The Jews give instances how by this means men may destroy the world. But, —

4. Suppose that this ground proves barren also, it is but going to an old translation, the Septuagint, or Vulgar Latin, and where any word likes us, to consider what Hebrew word answers unto it, and if it discover an

agreement in any one letter, in figure or sound, with the word in that text, then to say that so they read in that copy; yea, rather than fail, be the word as far different from what is read in the Bible as can be imagined, aver to yield the more convenient sense, and a various lection is found out.

And these are the chief heads and springs of the criticisms on the Old Testament, which, with so great a reputation of learning, men have boldly obtruded on us of late days. It is not imaginable what prejudice the sacred truth of the Scripture, preserved by the infinite love and care of God, hath already suffered hereby; and what it may further suffer, for my part I cannot but tremble to think. Lay but these two principles together — namely, that the points are a late invention of some Judaical Rabbins (on which account there is no reason in the world that we should be bound unto them), and that it is lawful to gather various lections by the help of translations, where there are no diversities in our present copies (which are owned in the *Prolegomena* to the *Biblia Polyglotta*), — and for my part I must needs cry out *Δὸς ποῦ στῶ*, not seeing any means of being delivered from utter uncertainty in and about all sacred truth. Those who have more wisdom and learning, and are able to look through all the digladiations that are likely to ensue on these principles, I hope will rather take pains to instruct me, and such as I am, than be angry or offended with us that we are not so wise or learned as themselves. In the meantime, I desire those who are shaken in mind by any of the specious pretences of Cappellus and others, to consider the specimen given us of reconciling the difficulties that they lay as the ground of their conjectures, in the *Miscellany Notes* or *Exercitations* of the learned Mr Pococke, — as useful and learned a work as is extant in that kind, in so few sheets of paper. The dangerous and causeless attempts of men to rectify our present copies of the Bible, the reader may there also find discovered and confuted.

But we have not as yet done. There is a new invention of Cappellus greatly applauded amongst the men of these opinions. He tells us (*Crit. Sacr. lib. 6, cap. 10*): “*Planum est omnem quae hodie est in terrarum orbe linguae Hebraicae cognitionem servandam tandem esse et aseribendam Graecae τῶν, LXX. Sacrorum Bibliorum translationi.*” This is greedily taken up by Morinus (as nothing could be spoken more to his purpose), who also tells us that the learned prefacer to these *Biblia Polyglotta* is of the same judgment. (*Morin. Praefat. ad opusc. Haebr. Samarit.*) Hereupon

he informs us, that in the translation of the Pentateuch he went for the meaning of sundry words unto Jerome and the translation of the LXX. But it is not unknown to these learned persons that Jerome, whom one of them makes his rule, tells us over and over, that notwithstanding the translation of the LXX., he had his knowledge of the Hebrew tongue from the Hebrew itself, and the help of such Hebrews as he hired to his assistance. And [as] for Cappellus, is not that the Helena for which he contends, and in fact the only foundation of his sacred work of criticizing on the Scripture, that there was a succession of learned men of the Jews at Tiberias until a hundred years after Jerome, who invented the points of the Hebrew Bible, and that not in an arbitrary manner, but according to the tradition they had received from them who spoke that language in its purity? Shall these men be thought to have had the knowledge of the Hebrew tongue from the translation of the LXX.? Certainly they would not, then, have hated it so, as he informs us they did. But this thing is plainly ridiculous. The language gives us the knowledge of itself. Considering the helps that by Providence have been in all ages and at all times afforded thereunto, ever since the time wherein, Cappellus says, some knew it so well as to invent and affix the present punctuation, there hath been a succession of living or dead masters to further the knowledge of it. And this will not seem strange to them who have given us exact translations of the Persian and Ethiopic pieces of Scripture. In the *ἅπαξ λεγόμενα* we are a little assisted by the LXX. The chiefest seeming help unto this tongue is from the Arabic.

And thus have I given you a brief account how, by the subtlety of Satan, there are principles crept in even amongst Protestants, undermining the authority of the “Hebrew verity,” as it was called of old, wherein Jerusalem hath justified Samaria, and cleared the Papists in their reproaching of the Word of God. Of the New Testament I shall speak particularly in the second discourse ensuing. Morinus, indeed, tells us (De Heb. et Graec. Tex. Sincerit. Exercit., 1, cap. 1, p. 5),” It is a jocular thing that the heretics, in their disputations, do grant that there are corruptions and various lections in the Greek and Latin copies of the Scripture, but deny it as to the Hebrew.” But why, I pray, is this so *ridiculous*? It is founded on no less stable bottom than this experience, that whereas we evidently find various lections in the Greek copies which we enjoy, and so grant that which ocular inspection evinces to be true, yet although men

discover such virulent and bitter spirits against the Hebrew text as this Morinus doth, calling all men fools or knaves that contend for its purity, they are none of them able to show, out of any copies yet extant in the world, or that they can make appear ever to have been extant, that ever there were any such various lections in the originals of the Old Testament. And is there any reason that we should be esteemed *ridiculous*, because, believing our own eyes, we will not also believe the testimony of some few men of no credit with us, asserting that for truth which we have abundant cause to believe to be utterly false? But of these men so far.

I thought, at the entrance of my discourse, to have also insisted on some other ways whereby Satan in these days assaults the sacred truth of the Word of God, in its authority, purity, integrity, or perfection, especially in the poor, deluded, fanatical souls amongst us, commonly called Quakers, for the instruction of the younger sort against whose abominations I have subjoined the theses in the close of the other treatises; but I am sensible how far I have already exceeded the bounds of a preface unto so small treatises as these ensuing, and therefore, giving a brief account of my undertaking in this cause of God and his Word, for the vindication of the authority and integrity of it, I shall put a close to this discourse.

It may be some of you have heard me professing my unwillingness to appear any more in the world this way. I have not, in some things, met with such pleasing entertainment as to encourage me unto it. When I have been for peace, others have made themselves ready for war; some of them, especially one ^{f35} of late, neither understanding me nor the things that he writes about, — but his mind for opposition was to be satisfied. This is the manner of not a few in their writings: they measure other men by their own ignorance, and what they know not themselves they think is hid to others also. Hence, when any thing presents itself new to their minds, as though they were the first that knew what they then first know, and which they have only an obscure glimpse of, they rest not until they have published it to their praise. Such are the discourses of that person, partly trivial, partly obviated and rendered utterly useless to his purpose by that treatise which he ventured weakly to oppose. I wish I could prevail with those whose interest compels them to choose rather to be ignorant than to be taught by me to let my books alone. Another, ^{f36} after two or three

years' consideration, in answer to a book of near a hundred and forty sheets of paper, returns a scoffing reply to so much of it as was written in a quarter of an hour. I am, therefore, still minded to abstain from such engagements. And I think I may say, if there were less writing by some, there would be more reading by others, at least to more purpose. Many books full of profound learning lie neglected, whilst men spend their time on trifles; and many things of great worth are suppressed by their authors, whilst things of no value are poured out one on the neck of another. One of yourselves ^{f37} I have often solicited for the publishing of some divinity lectures read at solemn times in the university; which (if I know aught) are, to say no more, worthy of public view. I yet hope a short time will answer my desire and expectation. Of my present undertaking there are three parts. The first is a subject that, having preached on, I was by many urged to publish my thoughts upon it, judging it might be useful. I have answered their requests. What I have performed, through the grace of Christ, in the work undertaken, is left to the judgment of the godly, learned reader. The second concerns the Prolegomena and Appendix to the late Biblia Polyglotta. Of this I said often, "Ab alto quovis hec fieri mallet, quam a me, sed a me tamen potius quam a nemine." The reasons of my engaging in that work are declared at large in the entrance of it. The theses in the close were drawn in by their affinity in subject to the other discourses; and, to complete the doctrine of the Scripture concerning the Scripture, I endeavored to comprise in them the whole truth about the Word of God, as to name and thing, opposed by the poor fanatical Quakers, as also to discover the principles they proceed upon in their confused opposition to that truth.

I have no more to add, but only begging I may have the continuance of your prayers and assistance in your several stations for the carrying on the work of our Lord and Master in this place committed unto us, that I may give in my account with joy and not with grief to Him that stands at the door, I commend you to the powerful word of His grace, and remain, your fellow-laborer and brother, in our dear Lord Jesus,

J.O.

*From my Study,
September 22, 1658.*

OF

THE DIVINE ORIGINAL,

AUTHORITY. SELF-EVIDENCING LIGHT, AND POWER

OF

THE SCRIPTURES:

with

AN ANSWER TO THAT INQUIRY,

**HOW WE KNOW THE SCRIPTURES TO BE THE
WORD OF GOD.**

PREFATORY NOTE.

THIS interesting treatise originated in the request of several persons, who had heard Owen preaching on the subject, that he would publish the substance of what he had preached. It broaches the great argument of the experimental evidence in favor of the Christian revelation, which he afterwards developed more fully in his "Reason of Faith" (see vol. 4, p. 4), in connection with which the present treatise should be studied. A similar train of reasoning has been prosecuted by Professor Halyburton, in the appendix to his work on Natural and Revealed Religion; by President Edwards, in his treatise on Religious Affections; and by Dr Chalmers, in his Theological Institutes. The last-mentioned author, in a preface to the following work, has recorded his high opinion of its merits: — "Dr Owen's Treatise 'On the Divine Original,' etc., embraces a distinct but most important species of evidence; and this article will be held in high estimation by those who desiderate a satisfactory conviction of the claims of the Bible to divine inspiration, of which he adduces the most solid and indubitable proof." Comparing it with other treatises on the evidences, by Leslie, Lyttelton, Doddridge, Bates, and Baxter, and after awarding a due meed of praise to these writers, he proceeds: "Yet do we hold Dr Owen to have rendered a more essential service to the cause of divine revelation, when, by his clear and irresistible demonstrations, he has proved that the written Word itself possesses a self-evidencing light and power for manifesting its own divine original, superior to the testimony of eye-witnesses, or the evidence of miracles, or those supernatural gifts with which the first teachers of Christianity were endowed for accrediting their divine mission."

ANALYSIS.

Starting with the principle that the authority of revelation depends on its divine origin, he exhibits the claim of the Old Testament Scriptures to this high authority, and unfolds the special providence through which they have been transmitted to us without corruption or mutilation. The same claim is advanced for the New Testament, chap. 10. Having proved that the Scriptures are to be received in the exercise of faith, resting directly on

the authority of God as its foundation, or as the formal reason of our assent to them as his word, he defines their authority to be their right and power to command and require obedience in the name of God. He enumerates three ways by which their divine origin, and, consequently, their divine authority, are proved: —

I. By a *general induction*, which consists of analogical arguments, to the effect that as the stamp of a divine authorship is impressed on creation, so that, apart from any separate and independent testimony from God, it teems with evidence of a divine original, so in the Word the intrinsic evidence of a divine original may reasonably be expected, and is actually to be found, chap. 2,

II. By the *testimonies which tie Word itself contains* to its own character and claims; and,

III. By *innate arguments*, evidence springing intrinsically from the Word, in the influence with which it operates on the mind and conscience. This self-evidencing property of Scripture is unfolded under a reference to the light which it imparts, and its spiritual efficacy to renew and sanctify, chap. III., 4. He explains what is meant by “the testimony of the Spirit,” discriminating it from popish and fanatical errors: he proceeds to reject the authority of *tradition*, and to indicate the true place of *miracles* in the evidences of Christianity, chap. 5. Two supplementary arguments close the treatise, designed to prove still further the self-evidencing power of the Word, and derived, —

1. From the nature of the doctrines contained in the Word, such as their universal adaptation and peculiarly glorious character; and,

2. From the harmony and connection subsisting among all the parts of Scripture. — ED.

CHAPTER 1.

The divine original of the Scripture the sole foundation of its authority — The original of the Old Testament — The peculiar manner of the revelation of the word — The written word, as written, preserved by the providence of God — Cappellus' opinion about various lections considered — The Scripture not ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως — The true meaning of that expression — Entirely from God, to the least tittle — Of the Scriptures of the New Testament, and their peculiar prerogative.

THAT the whole authority of the Scripture in itself depends solely on its divine original, is confessed by all who acknowledge its authority. The evincing and declaration of that authority being the thing at present aimed at, the discovery of its divine spring and rise is, in the first place, necessarily to be premised thereunto. That foundation being once laid, we shall be able to educe our following reasons and arguments, wherein we aim more at weight than number, from their own proper principles.

As to the original of the Scripture of the Old Testament, it is said, God SPAKE, πάλαι ἐν τοῖς προφήταις, (<ROM> Hebrews 1:1,) “of old, or formerly, in the prophets.” From the days of Moses the lawgiver, and downwards, unto the consignation and bounding of the canon delivered to the Judaical Church, in the days of Ezra and his companions, הַלְלֵי הַכֹּהֲנִים, the “men of the great congregation” — so God spake. This being done only among the Jews, they, as his church, ἐπιστεύθησαν τὰ λόγια τοῦ Θεοῦ, (<ROM> Romans 3:2, 9:4) were “intrusted with the oracles of God.” God spake, ἐν τοῖς προφήταις; ἐν for διὰ, (Chrysostom, Theophylact,) *in* for *by*: διὰ τῶν προφητῶν, “by the prophets,” as <LUK> Luke 1:70, διὰ στόματος τῶν ἁγίων προφητῶν, further intended in this expression.

In the exposition, or giving out the eternal counsel of the mind and will of God unto men, there is considerable [*to be considered*]:

1. His speaking *unto* the prophets; and,

2. His speaking *by* them unto us. In this expression, it seems to be that **בֵּית קוֹל**, or *filia vocis* — that voice from heaven that came to the prophets which is understood. So God spake in the prophets; and in reference thereunto there is propriety in that expression, **ἐν τοῖς προφήταις** — “in the prophets.” Thus the Psalms are many of them said to be, *To this* or *that* man. **מִכְתָּם לְדָוִד**, “A golden psalm to David” — that is, from the Lord; and from thence their tongue was as the “pen of a writer.” (**Psalm 45:1.**) So God spake in them, before he spake *by* them.

The various ways of special revelation, by dreams, visions, audible voices, inspirations, with that peculiar one of the lawgiver under the Old Testament called **פָּנִים אֶל-פָּנִים**, “face to face,” (**Exodus 33:11**; **Deuteronomy 34:10**) and **פָּה אֶל-פֶּה**, (**Numbers 12:8**), with that which is compared with it and exalted above it (**Hebrews 1:1-3**) in the New, by the Son, viz., **ἐκ κόλπου τοῦ πατρός**, “from the bosom of the Father,” (**John 1:17, 18**), are not of my present consideration — all of them belonging to the *manner* of the thing inquired after, not the thing itself.

By the assertion, then, laid down, of God “speaking in the prophets of old,” from the beginning to the end of that long tract of time (consisting of one thousand years) wherein he gave out the writings of the Old Testament, two things are ascertained unto us, which are the foundation of our present discourse.

1. That the laws they made known, the doctrines they delivered, the instructions they gave, the stories they recorded, the promises of Christ, the prophecies of gospel times they gave out and revealed, were not their own, not conceived in their minds, not formed by their reasonings, not retained in their memories from what they heard, not by any means beforehand comprehended by them, (**1 Peter 1:10, 11**), but were all of them immediately from God — there being only a passive concurrence of their rational faculties in their reception, without any such active obedience as by any law they might be obliged unto. Hence,

2. God was so with them, and by the Holy Ghost so spake in them — as to their receiving of the Word from him, and their delivering of it unto others by speaking or writing — as that they were not themselves enabled,

by any habitual light, knowledge, or conviction of truth, to declare his mind and will, but only acted as they were immediately moved by him. Their tongue in what they said, or their hand in what they wrote, was עֵט סוֹפֵר, no more at their own disposal than the pen is in the hand of an expert writer.

Hence, as far as their own personal concerns, as saints and believers, did he in them, they are said ἐρευνᾶω, “to make a diligent inquiry into, and investigation of,” the things which ἐδήλουν τὸ ἐν αὐτοῖς Πνεῦμα Χριστοῦ, the “Spirit of Christ that spake in themselves did signify.” (1 Peter 1:10, 11.) Without this, though their visions were express, so that in them their eyes were said to be open, (Numbers 24:3, 4,) yet they understood them not. Therefore, also, they studied the writings and prophecies of one another. (Daniel 9:2.) Thus they attained a saving, useful, habitual knowledge of the truths delivered by themselves and others, by the illumination of the Holy Ghost, through the study of the Word, even as we. (Psalm 119:104.) But as to the receiving of the Word from God, as God spake in them, they obtained nothing by study or meditation, by inquiry or reading. (Amos 7:15.) Whether we consider the matter or manner of what they received and delivered, or their receiving and delivering of it, they were but as an instrument of music, giving a sound according to the hand, intention, and skill of him that strikes it.

This is variously expressed. Generally, it is said דְּבַר הָיָה. “the word was” to this or that prophet, which we have rendered “the word came” unto them. (Ezekiel 1:3: הָיָה דְּבַר הָיָה, it “came expressly;” “essendo fuit” — it had a subsistence given unto it, or an effectual in-being, by the Spirit’s entering into him. (Ver. 14.) Now, this coming of the word unto them had oftentimes such a greatness and expression of the majesty of God upon it, as filled them with dread and reverence of him, (Habakkuk 3:16,) and also greatly affected even their outward man. (Daniel 8:27.) But this dread and terror (which Satan strove to imitate in his filthy tripods, and ἐγγαστρίμυθοι) was peculiar to the Old Testament, and belonged to the pedagogy thereof. (Hebrews 12:18-21.) The Spirit, in the declaration of the New Testament, gave out his mind and will in a way of more liberty and glory. (2 Corinthians 3). The expressness and immediacy of revelation was the same; but the manner of it related more to

that glorious liberty in fellowship and communion with the Father, whereunto believers had then an access provided them by Jesus Christ. (~~3008~~ Hebrews 9:8, 10:19, 20, 12:22-24.) So our Savior tells his apostles, (~~400~~ Matthew 10:20,) *Οὐχ ὑμεῖς ἐστε οἱ λαλοῦντες*, “You are not the speakers” of what you deliver, as other men are, the figment and imagination of whose hearts are the fountain of all that they speak; and he adds this reason, *Τὸ γὰρ Πνεῦμα τοῦ πατρὸς τὸ λαλοῦν ἐν ὑμῖν*, “The Spirit of the Father *is* that which speaketh in you.” Thus, the word that came unto them was a book which they took in and gave out without any alteration of one tittle or syllable. (~~2008~~ Ezekiel 2:8-10, 3:3; ~~600~~ Revelation 10:9-11.)

Moreover, when the word was thus come to the prophets, and God had spoken in them, it was not in their power to conceal it, the hand of the Lord being strong upon them. They were not now only, on a general account, to utter the truth they were made acquainted withal, and to speak the things they had heard and seen, (which was their common preaching work,) according to the analogy of what they had received, (~~4000~~ Acts 4:20,) but, also, the very individual words that they had received were to be declared. When the word was come to them, it was as a fire within them, that must be delivered, or it would consume them. (~~4008~~ Psalm 39:3; ~~600~~ Jeremiah 20:9; ~~3008~~ Amos 3:8, 7:15, 16.) So Jonah found his attempt to hide the word that he had received to be altogether vain.

Now, because these things are of great importance, and the foundation of all that doth ensue — viz, the discovery that the Word is come forth unto us from God, without the least mixture or interveniency of any medium obnoxious to fallibility, (as is the wisdom, truth, integrity, knowledge, and memory, of the best of all men,) — I shall further consider it from one full and eminent declaration thereof, given unto us, ~~600~~ 2 Peter 1:20, 21. The words of the Holy Ghost are, *Τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες ὅτι πᾶσα προφητεία γραφῆς, ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται· οὐ γὰρ ζελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία, ἀλλ’ ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἔλλησαν οἱ ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι* — “Knowing this first, that no prophecy of Scripture is of any private interpretation; for the prophecy came not in old time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.”

That which he speaks of is **προφητεία γραφής**, the “prophecy of Scripture,” or written prophecy.

There were then traditions among the Jews to whom Peter wrote, exalting themselves into competition with the written Word, and which not long after got the title of an oral law, pretending to have its original from God. These the apostle tacitly condemns; and also shows under what formality he considered that which (verse 19) he termed **λόγος προφητικός**, the “word of prophecy;” viz., as *written*. The written Word, as such, is that whereof he speaks. Above fifty times is **ἡ γραφή**, or **αἱ γραφαί**, in the New Testament, put absolutely for the Word of God. And **מכתב** is so used in the Old for the word of prophecy. (^{421D}2 Chronicles 21:12.) It is the **ἡ γραφή** that is **ζέόπνευστος**, (^{421K}2 Timothy 3:16,) “the writing, or word written, is by inspiration from God.” Not only the doctrine in it, but the **γραφή** itself, or the “doctrine as written,” is so from him.

Hence, the providence of God hath manifested itself no less concerned in the preservation of the writings than of the doctrine contained in them; the writing itself being the product of his own eternal counsel for the preservation of the doctrine, after a sufficient discovery of the insufficiency of all other means for that end and purpose. And hence the malice of Satan hath raged no less against the book than against the truth contained in it. The dealings of Antiochus under the Old Testament, and of sundry persecuting emperors under the New, evince no less. And it was no less crime of old to be *traditor libri* than to be *abnegator fidei*. The reproach of *chartacea scripta*, and *membranae*, (Coster. Enchirid., cap. 1.), reflects on its author. ^{f38} It is true, we have not the **Ἀυτόγραφα** of Moses and the prophets, of the apostles and evangelists; but the **ἀπόγραφα** or “copies” which we have contain every *iota* that was in them.

There is no doubt but that in the copies we now enjoy of the Old Testament there are some diverse readings, or various lections. The **וכתיב** ^{f39} **קרי** the **תקון סופרים**, ^{f40} the **עטור סופרים**, ^{f41} (for the **סברין** are of another nature,) the various lections of Ben Asher, or Rabbi Aaron the son of Rabbi Moses of the tribe of Asher, and Ben Naphtali, or Rabbi Moses the son of David of the tribe of Naphtali — the lections also of the eastern and western Jews, which we have collected at the end of the great

Bible with the Masora — evince it. But yet we affirm, that the whole Word of God, in every letter and tittle, as given from him by inspiration, is preserved without corruption. Where there is any variety it is always in things of less, indeed of no, importance.^{f42} God by his providence preserving the whole entire, suffered this lesser variety to fall out, in or among the copies we have, for the quickening and exercising of our diligence in our search into his Word.

It was an unhappy attempt, (which must afterward be spoken unto,) that a learned man^{f43} hath of late put himself upon, viz., to prove variations in all the present ᾽ Ἀπόγραφα the Old Testament in the Hebrew tongue from the copies used of old, merely upon *uncertain conjectures* and the credit of *corrupt translations*. Whether that plea of his be more unreasonable in itself and devoid of any real ground of truth, or injurious to the love and care of God over his Word and church, I know not; sure I am, it is both in a high degree. The translation especially insisted on by him is that of the LXX. That this translation either from the mistakes of its first authors, (if it be theirs whose name and number it beam,) or the carelessness, or ignorance, or worse, of its transcribers — is corrupted and gone off from the original in a thousand places twice told, is acknowledged by all who know aught of these things. Strange that so corrupt a stream should be judged a fit means to cleanse the fountain; that such a Lesbian rule should be thought a fit measure to correct the original by; and yet on the account hereof, with some others not one whit better, (or scarce so good,) we have one thousand eight hundred and twenty-six various lections exhibited unto us, with frequent insinuations of an infinite number more yet to be collected. It were desirable that men would be content to show their learning, reading, and diligence, about things where there is less danger in adventures.

Nor is the relief Cappellus provides against the charge of bringing things to an uncertainty in the Scripture, (which he found himself obnoxious unto,) less pernicious than the opinion he seeks to palliate thereby; although it be since taken up and approved by others.^{f44} “The saving doctrine of the Scripture,” he tells us,^{f45} “as to the matter and substance of it, in all things of moment, is preserved in the copies of the original and translations that do remain”

It is indeed a great relief against the inconvenience of corrupt translations, to consider that although some of them be bad enough, yet, if all the errors and mistakes that are to be found in all the rest should be added to the worst of all, every necessary, saving, fundamental truth, would be found sufficiently testified unto therein. But to depress the sacred truth of the originals into such a condition as wherein it should stand in need of this apology, and that without any color or pretense from discrepancies in the copies themselves that are extant, or any tolerable evidence that there ever were any other in the least differing from these extant in the world, will at length be found a work unbecoming a Christian, Protestant divine. Besides the injury done hereby to the providence of God towards his church, and care of his Word, it will not be found so easy a matter, upon a supposition of such corruption in the originals as is pleaded for, to evince unquestionably that the whole saving doctrine itself, at first given out from God, continues entire and incorrupt. The nature of this doctrine is such, that there is no other principle or means of its discovery, no other rule or measure of judging and determining any thing about or concerning it, but only the writing from whence it is taken; it being wholly of divine revelation, and that revelation being expressed only in that writing. Upon any corruption, then, supposed therein, there is no means of rectifying it. It were an easy thing to correct a mistake or corruption in the transcription of any problem or demonstration of Euclid, or any other ancient mathematician, from the consideration of the things themselves about which they treat being always the same, and in their own nature equally exposed to the knowledge and understanding of men in all ages. In things of pure revelation — whose knowledge depends solely on their revelation — it is not so. Nor is it enough to satisfy us, that the doctrines mentioned are preserved entire; every tittle and ἰῶτα in the Word of God must come under our care and consideration, as being, as such, from God. But of these things we shall treat afterward at large. Return we now to the apostle.

This προφητεία, this written prophecy, this λόγος προφητικός saith he, ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται — “is not of any private interpretation.” Some think that ἐπιλύσεως is put for ἐπηλύσεως or ἐπελεύσεως, which, according to Hesychius, denotes afflation, inspiration, conception within: so Calvin. In this sense, the importance of the words is the same with what I have already mentioned, viz., that the prophets had not their

private conceptions, or self-fancied enthusiasms, of the things they spake. To this interpretation assents Grotius, And ἐπηλύσεως for ἐπιλύσεως is reckoned amongst the various lections that are gathered out of him, in the appendix to the Biblia Polyglotta. Thus ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως, is the other side of that usual expression, ἐπὶ ἡλθε ἐπ' ἐμὲ ὁ λόγος, or τὸ πνεῦμα. Camero contends for the retaining of ἐπιλύσεως; and justly. We begin a little too late to see whither men's bold conjectures, in correcting the original text of the Scriptures, are like to proceed. Here is no color for a various lection. One copy, it seems, by Stephen, read διαλύσεως, without ground, by an evident error; and such mistakes are not to be allowed the name or place of various readings. But yet, says Camero, ἐπίλυσις is such a “resolution” and interpretation as is made by revelation. He adds, that in that sense ἐπιλύειν is used by the LXX. in the business of Joseph's interpretation of Pharaoh's dream, (Genesis 40.) which was by revelation. But indeed the word is not used in that chapter. However, he falls in with this sense as do Calvin and Grotius — that ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως is not to be referred to our interpretation of the prophets, but to the way and manner of their receiving the counsel and will of God.

And, indeed, ἰδίας ἐπιλύσεως οὐ γίνεται — taking ἐπίλυσις for an interpretation of the word of prophecy given out by writing, as our translation bears it — is an expression that can scarcely have any tolerable sense affixed unto it. Γίνεται, or οὐ γίνεται, relates here to προφητεία, and denotes the first giving out of the Word, not our after-consideration of its sense and meaning. And without this sense it stands in no coherence with, nor opposition to, the following sentence, which, by its causal connection to this, manifests that it renders a reason of what is hereto affirmed in the first place; and in the latter — turning with the adversative ἀλλά — an opposition unto it: Οὐ γὰρ ζελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία, ἀλλ' ὑπὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι. — “For prophecy came not at any time by the will of man, but holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.” What reason is in the first part of this verse why the Scripture is not of our private indirection? or what opposition in the letter to that assertion? Nay, on that supposal, there is no tolerable correspondency of discourse in the whole περιοχή. But take the word to express the coming

of the prophecy to the prophets themselves, and the sense is full and clear.

This, then, is the intention of the apostle: The prophecy which we have written — the Scripture — was not an issue of men's fancied enthusiasms, not a product of their own minds and conceptions, not an interpretation of the will of God by the understanding of man — that is, of the prophets themselves. Neither their rational apprehensions, inquiries, conceptions of fancy, or imaginations of their hearts, had any place in this business; no self-afflation, no rational meditation, manned at liberty by the understanding and will of men, had place herein.

Of this saith the apostle, **Τοῦτο πρῶτον γινώσκοντες** — “Knowing, judging, and determining this in the first place: “this is a principle to be owned and acknowledged by every one that will believe any thing else.” **Γινώσκω** is not only to know, to perceive, to understand; but also to judge, own, and acknowledge. This, then, in our religion, is to be owned, acknowledged, submitted unto, as a principle, without further dispute. To discover the grounds of this submission and acknowledgment is the business of the ensuing discourse.

That this is so indeed, as before asserted, and to give a reason why this is to be received as a principle, he adds, (verse 21,) **Οὐ γὰρ ζελήματι ἀνθρώπου ἠνέχθη ποτὲ προφητεία**. That word of prophecy which we have written, is not **ιδίᾱς ἐπιλύσεως** — “of private conception” — “for it came not at any time by the will of man.” **ἠνέχθη**, which is the passive conjugation of **φέρω** from **ἐνέγκω**, denotes at least to be “brought in” — more than merely it “came” it — was brought unto them by the will of God. The affirmative, as to the will of God, is included in the negative, as to the will of man; or it came as the voice from heaven to our Saviour on the mount. (Verse 18, where the same word is used) So ^{<200>}Ezekiel 1:3, **הָיָה הָיָה דְּבַר**, “essendo fuit verbum,” it was brought into him, as was showed before. Thus God brought the word to them, and spake *in* them, in order of nature, before he spake *by* them. As **ἠνέχθη**, it was brought to them, it was **קוֹל יְהוָה**, “the voice of the Lord,” (^{<200>}Genesis 3:8,) or **קוֹל בְּרָא**, as the Jews call it: as spoken by them, or written, it was properly **דְּבַר יְהוָה**, “verbum Dei,” “the word of God” which by his immediate voice he signified to the prophets. Thus some of them, in visions, first ate

a written book and then prophesied, as was instanced before. And this is the first spring of the Scripture — the beginning of its emanation from the counsel and will of God. By the power of the Holy Ghost it was brought into the organs or instruments that he was pleased to use, for the revelation and declaration of it unto others.

That which remains for the completing of this dispensation of the Word of God unto us is added by the apostle: **Ψὸ Πνεύματος ἁγίου φερόμενοι ἐλάλησαν ἅγιοι Θεοῦ ἄνθρωποι**. When the word was thus brought to them, it was not left to their understandings, wisdoms, minds, memories, to order, dispose, and give it out; but they were borne, acted, [actuated,] carried out by the Holy Ghost, to speak, deliver, and write all that, and nothing but that — to every tittle that was so brought to them. They invented not words themselves, suited to the things they had learned, but only expressed the words that they received. Though their mind and understanding were used in the choice of words, (whence arise all the differences — that is, in their manner of expression — for they did use **דְּבַרִּי הַפֶּץ** “words of will,” or choice,) yet they were so guided, that their words were not their own, but immediately supplied unto them. And so they gave out **כְּתוּב יֵשֶׁר**, the “writing of uprightness,” and **דְּבַרִּי אֱמֶת** “words of truth” itself. (^{<101>}Ecclesiastes 12:10.) Not only the *doctrine* they taught was the word of truth — truth itself, (^{<817>}John 17:17,) — but the *words* whereby they taught it were words of truth from God himself. Thus, allowing the contribution of passive instruments for the reception and representation of words — which answer the mind and tongue of the prophets, in the coming of the voice of God to them — every apex of the written Word is equally divine, and as immediately from God as the voice wherewith, or whereby, he spake to or in the prophets; and is, therefore, accompanied with the same authority in itself, and unto us.

What hath been thus spoken of the scripture of the Old Testament, must be also affirmed of the New, with this addition of advantage and pre-eminence, viz., that **ἀρχὴν ἔλαβεν λαλεῖσθαι διὰ τοῦ**, (^{<805>}Hebrews 2:3,) “it received its beginning of being spoken by the Lord himself.” God spake in these last days, **ἐν τῷ Ψίῳ**, “in the Son.” (^{<800>}Hebrews 1:2.)

Thus God, who himself began the writing of the Word with his own finger, (^{<1018>}Exodus 31:18,) — after he had spoken it, (Exodus 20) appointing or

approving the writing of the rest that followed, (^{<6312>}Deuteronomy 31:12; ^{<6316>}Joshua 23:6; ^{<1118>}1 Kings 2:3; ^{<1246>}2 Kings 14:6, 17:13; ^{<1323>}1 Chronicles 22:13; ^{<1424>}2 Chronicles 25:4; ^{<3618>}Ezekiel 2:8-10; ^{<3819>}Habakkuk 2:2; ^{<1659>}Luke 16:29; ^{<4159>}John 5:39, 20:31; ^{<4471>}Acts 17:11,) — doth lastly command the close of the immediate revelation of his will to be written in a book; (^{<6011>}Revelation 1:11;) and so gives out the whole of his mind and counsel unto us in writing, as a merciful and steadfast relief against all that confusion, darkness, and uncertainty, which the vanity, folly, and looseness of the minds of men — drawn out and heightened by the unspeakable alterations that fall out amongst them — would otherwise have certainly run into.

Thus we have laid down the original of the Scriptures from the Scripture itself. And this original is the basis and foundation of all its authority. Thus is it from God entirely from him. As to the doctrine confined in it, and the words wherein that doctrine is delivered, it is wholly his; what *that* speaks, *he* speaks himself. He speaks in it and by it; and so it is vested with all the moral authority of God over his creatures.

CHAPTER 2.

The main question proposed to consideration — How we may know assuredly the Scripture to be the word of God — The Scripture to be received by divine faith — The authority of God the foundation — The way whereby that authority is evidenced or made known — The various ways of God's revealing himself and his mind —

1. By his works;
2. By the light of nature;
3. By his word

— All of these evince themselves to be from him, his word especially.

Having laid, in the foregoing chapter, the foundation that we are to build and proceed upon, I come now to lay down the inquiry, whose resolution must thence be educed. That, then, which we are seeking after, is, how we, and the rest of men in the world, who, through the merciful dispensation of God, have the book or books wherein the scripture given out from him (as above declared) is contained, or said to be contained — we, who live so many ages from the last person who received any part of it immediately from God, or who have not received it immediately ourselves — may come to be ascertained, [assured,] as to all ends and purposes wherein we may be concerned therein, that the whole and entire written word in that book, or those books, hath the original, and consequently the authority, that it pleads and avows — viz., that it is **ἐξ οὐρανοῦ**, and not **ἐξ ἀνθρώπων**, from God, in the way and manner laid down, and not the invention of men, attending to **σεσοφισμένοις**, (~~6006~~ 2 Peter 1:16,) or “cunningly devised fables.”

Now, seeing it is expected from us, and required of us, by God himself, and that on the penalty of his eternal displeasure if we fail in our duty, (~~5002~~ 2 Thessalonians 1:7-10,) that we receive the Scripture not as we do other books in relation to their authors — with a firm opinion, built on prevailing probable arguments, prevalent against any actual conclusions to

the contrary — but with divine and supernatural faith — omitting all such inductions as serve only to ingenerate a persuasion not to be cast out of the mind by contrary reasonings or objections — it is especially inquired, What is the foundation and formal reason of our doing so, if we so do? Whatever that be, it returns an answer to this important question, “Why, or on what account, do you believe the Scriptures, or books of the Old and New Testament, to be the word of God? Now the formal reason of things being but one whatever consideration may be had of other inducements or arguments to beget in us a persuasion that the Scripture is the word of God, yet they have no influence on that divine faith wherewith we are bound to believe them. They may, indeed, be of some use to repel the objections that are, or may be, raised against the truth we believe — and so indirectly cherish and further faith itself — but as to a concurrence unto the foundation, or formal reason, of our believing, it is not capable of it.

Having, then, laid down the divine original of the Scriptures, and opened the manner of the Word’s coming forth from God, an answer shall now, on that sole foundation, be returned to the inquiry laid down. And this I shall do in the ensuing position: —

The authority of God, the supreme Lord of all, the first and only absolute Truth, whose word is truth — speaking in and by the penmen of the Scriptures — evinced singly in and by the Scripture itself — is the sole bottom and foundation, or formal reason, of our assenting to those Scriptures as his word, and of our submitting our hearts and consciences unto them with that faith and obedience which morally respect him, and are due to him alone.

God speaking *in* the penmen of the Scripture, (³⁰⁰ Hebrews 1:1,) his voice to them was accompanied with its own evidence, which gave assurance unto them; and God speaking *by* them or their writings unto us, his word is accompanied with its own evidence, and gives assurance unto us. His authority and veracity did, and do, in the one and the other, sufficiently manifest themselves, that men may quietly repose their souls upon them, in believing and obedience. Thus are we built ἐπὶ ζεμελίῳ τῶν ἀποστόλων καὶ προφητῶν, (⁴⁰² Ephesians 2:20,) “on the foundation of the apostles and prophets,” in our believing.

That, then, which (to the establishment of the souls of believers) I shall labor to prove and evince, is plainly this, viz., that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament do abundantly and uncontrollably manifest themselves to be the word of the living God; so that, merely on the account of their own proposal of themselves unto us in the name and majesty of God, as such — without the contribution of help or assistance from tradition, church, or any thing else without themselves — we are obliged, upon the penalty of eternal damnation, (as are all to whom by any means they come, or are brought,) to receive them, with that subjection of soul which is due to the word of God. The authority of God shining in them, they afford unto us all the divine evidence of themselves which God is willing to grant unto us, or can be granted us, or is any way needful for us. So, then, the authority of the written Word — in itself and unto us — is from itself, as the Word of God; and the eviction of that authority unto us, is by itself.

When the authority of the Scripture is inquired after, strictly *its power to command and require obedience, in the name of God*, is intended. To ask, then, whence it hath its authority, is to ask whence it hath its power to command in the name of God. Surely men will not say, that the Scripture hath its power to command in the name of God from any thing but itself. And it is, indeed, a contradiction for men to say that they give authority to the Scriptures. Why do they do so? why do they give this authority to that book rather than another? They must say, Because it is the Word of God. So the reason why they give authority unto it is the formal reason of all its authority, which it hath antecedently to their charter and concession of power: *Ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι*, (~~John~~ John 17:17,) “Thy word is truth.”

Some say, indeed, that the Scripture hath its authority in itself, and from itself, or its own divine original, but not *quoad nos*, “in respect of us;” [that in order] that it may reach us, that we may know, and understand, and submit to its authority, it must be testified unto *aliunde*, “from some other person or thing,” appointed thereunto.

Ans. **1.** But may not this be said of God himself, as well as of his Word? If God reveal himself to us, it must be by means; and if those means may not be understood to reveal him unless they are testified unto from somewhat

else, God cannot reveal himself to us. “Si Deus hominibus non placuerit, utique Deus non erit.” If God and his Word will keep themselves within themselves, to themselves, they may be God and his Word still, and keep their authority; but if they will deal with us, and put forth their commands to us, let them look that they get the church’s testimonials — or, on this principle, they may be safely rejected! But,

2. Authority is a thing that no person or thing can have in him or itself, that hath it not in respect of *others*. In its very nature it relates to others that are subject unto it. All authority arises from relation, and answers to it throughout. The authority of God over his creatures, is from their relation to him as their Creator. A king’s authority is in respect of his subjects; and he who hath no subjects hath no kingly authority in himself, but is only a stoical king. The authority of a minister relates to his flock; and he who hath no flock hath no authority of a minister: if he have not a ministerial authority, in reference to a flock, a people, a church, he hath none, he can have none in himself. So is it in this cause; if the Scripture hath no authority from itself in respect of us, it hath none in itself, nor can have. If it hath it in itself, it hath it in respect of us such a respect — that is, a right to command and oblige to obedience — is as inseparable from authority, or a moral power, as heat is from fire. It is true, a man may have, *de jure*, a lawful authority over those whom, *de facto*, he cannot force or compel to obedience. But want of force doth not lessen authority. God loseth not his authority over men though he put not forth towards them ὑπερβάλλον μέγεθος τῆς δυνάμεως, or ἐνέργειαν τοῦ κράτους τῆς ἰσχύος, “the greatness of his power, or the efficacy of the might of his strength,” to cause them to obey. It is fond, [foolish,] then, to imagine that a man, or any thing, should have an authority in himself or itself, and yet not have that authority in respect of them who are to be subject thereunto. That is not a law properly at all, which is not a law to some. Besides, all the evil of disobedience relates to the authority of him that requires the obedience. (300James 2:10, 11.) No action is disobedience, but from the subjection of him who performs it unto him who requires obedience. And, therefore, if the Scripture hath not an authority in itself towards us, there is no evil in our disobedience unto its commands, or in our not doing what it commandeth; and our doing what it forbiddeth is not disobedience, because it hath not an authority over us. I speak of it as

considered in itself, before the accession of the testimony pretended [to be] necessary to give it an authority over us. Hitherto, then, have we carried this objection — To disobey the commands of the Scripture before the communication of a testimony unto it by men is no sin. *Credat Apella.*

The sense, then, of our position, is evident and clear; and so our answer to the inquiry made. The Scripture hath all its authority from its Author, both in itself and in respect of us. That it hath the Author and original pleaded for, it declares itself, without any other assistance — by the ways and means that shall afterward be insisted on. The truth whereof I shall now confirm — 1st, By one general induction; 2d, By testimonies; 3d, By arguments, expressing the ways and means of its revelation of itself.

There are three ways whereby God, in several degrees, revealeth himself, his properties, his mind, and will, to the sons of men.

1. He doth it by his *works*, both of creation and providence. “All thy works praise thee.” (~~HEX~~ Psalm 145:10, etc.)

“The heavens declare the glory of God; and the firmament sheweth his handy-work. Day unto day uttereth speech, and night unto night sheweth knowledge. There is no speech nor language where their voice is not heard. Their line is gone out through all the earth, and their words to the end of the world.” (~~HEX~~ Psalm 19:1-4, etc.)

So Job 37-39, throughout.

“God, who made heaven and earth, and the sea, and all things that are therein, in times past suffered all nations to walk in their own ways; yet he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness.” (~~HEX~~ Acts 14:15-17.)

And, “God, that made the world, and all things therein, seeing that he is Lord of heaven and earth, dwelleth not in temples made with hands; neither is worshipped with men’s hands, as though he needed any thing, seeing he giveth to all life, and breath, and all things; and hath made of one blood all nations of men for to dwell on all the face of the earth, and hath determined the times before appointed, and the bounds of their habitation,” ζῆτεῖν τὸν Κύριον ἐν ἄραγε ψηλαφήσειαν αὐτὸν καὶ

εὕροιν, “that they should seek the Lord, if haply they might feel after him, and find him.” (^{<4175>}Acts 17:25-27.)

“For that which may be known of God is manifest in them, for God hath showed it unto them; for the invisible things of him from the creation of the world are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, even his eternal power and Godheads” (^{<4118>}Romans 1:18-20.)

All which places (God assisting) shall be opened, before long, in another treatise. ^{f46} The sum of them amounts to what was before laid down, viz., that God reveals and declares himself unto us by the works of his hands.

2. God declares himself — his sovereign power and authority, his righteousness and holiness — by the innate (or ingrafted) *light of nature*, and principles of the consciences of men. That indispensable moral obedience which he requireth of us, as his creatures, and subject to his law, is in general thus made known unto us. For

“the Gentiles, which have not the law, do by nature the things contained in the law; these, having not the law, are a law unto themselves; which show the work of the law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the mean while accusing or else excusing one another.” (^{<4114>}Romans 2:14, 15.)

By the light that God hath indelibly implanted in the minds of men — accompanied with a moral instinct of good and evil, seconded by that self-judgment which he hath placed in us, in reference to his own judgment over us — doth he reveal himself unto the sons of men.

3. God reveals himself by his *Word*, as is confessed. It remains, then, that we inquire how we may know and be ascertained that these things are not deceivable pretences, but that God doth indeed so reveal himself by them.

The works of God (as to what is his will to teach and reveal of himself by them) have that expression of God upon them — that stamp and character of his eternal power and Godhead — that evidence with them that they are his — that, wherever they are seen and considered, they undeniably evince that they are so, and that what they teach concerning him, they do it in his

name and authority. There is no need of traditions, no need of miracles, no need of the authority of any churches, to convince a rational creature that the works of God are his, and his only; and that he is eternal and infinite in power that made them. They carry about with them their own authority. By being *what* they are, they declare *whose* they are. To reveal God by his works, there is need of nothing but that they be by themselves represented, or objected to the consideration of rational creatures.

The voice of God in nature is in like manner effectual. It declares itself to be from God by its own light and authority. There is no need to convince a man by substantial witnesses, that what his conscience speaks, it speaks from God. Whether it bear testimony to the being, righteousness, power, omniscience, or holiness of God himself — or whether it call for that moral obedience which is eternally and indispensably due to Him, and so shows forth the “work of the law in the heart” it so speaks and declares itself, that without further evidence or reasoning, without the advantage of any considerations but what are by itself supplied, it discovers its Author, from whom it is, and in whose name it speaks. Those **κοινὰ ἔννοιαι, καὶ προλήψεις**, “those common notions and general presumptions” of Him and His authority, that are inlaid in the natures of rational creatures by the hand of God, to this end, that they might make a revelation of Him as to the purposes mentioned, are able to plead their own divine original, without the least contribution of strength or assistance from without.

And thus is it with those things. Now, the Psalmist says unto God, (~~Psalm~~ Psalm 138:2,) “Thou hast magnified **עַל-כֹּל-שֵׁם-אֱמָרָתְךָ**” over all thy name, thy Word” [which] thou hast spoken. The name of God is all that whereby he makes himself known. Over all this God magnifies his Word. It all lies in a subserviency thereunto. The name of God is not here God himself, but every thing whereby God makes himself known. Now, it were very strange, that those low, dark, and obscure principles and means of the revelation of God and his will, which we have mentioned, should be able to evince themselves to be from him, without any external help, assistance, testimony, or authority; and [that] that which is by God himself magnified above them which is far more noble and excellent in itself, and, in respect of its end and order, hath far more divinely conspicuous and glorious impressions and characters of his goodness, holiness, power, grace, truth, than all the creation — should lie dead,

obscure, and have nothing in itself to reveal its Author, until this or that superadded testimony be called in to its assistance. We esteem them to have done no service unto the truth, who, amongst innumerable other bold denials, have insisted on this also — that there is no *natural knowledge* of God, arising from the innate principles of reason, and the Works of God proposing themselves to the consideration thereof. Let now the way to the protein of *supernatural revelation* be obstructed, by denying that it is able to evince itself to be from God, and we shall quickly see what banks are cut, to let in a flood of atheism upon the face of the earth.

Let us consider the issue of this general induction: As God, in the creation of the world, and all things therein contained, hath so made and framed them, hath left such characters of his eternal power and wisdom in them and upon them, filled them with such evidences of their Author, suited to the apprehensions of rational creatures, that without any other testimony from himself, or any else — under the naked consideration and contemplation of what they are they so far declare their Creator, that they are left wholly inexcusable who will not learn and know him from thence; so in the giving out of his Word to be the foundation of that world which he hath set up in this world, as **הָאוֹפֶן בְּתוֹךְ הָאוֹפֶן**, “a wheel within a wheel” his church — he hath, by his Spirit, implanted in it and impressed on it such characters of his goodness, power, wisdom, holiness, love to mankind, truth, faithfulness, with all the rest of his glorious excellencies and perfections, that at all times, and in all places, when **הִרְקִיעַ**, “the expansion” of it, is stretched over men by his providence without any other witness or testimony given unto it — it declares itself to be his, and makes good its authority from him; so that the refusal of it upon its own evidence brings unavoidable condemnation on the souls of men. This comparison is insisted on by the Psalmist, Psalm 19; where, as he ascribeth **קוֹל** and **קוֹ**, a “voice” and “line,” to the creatures, so **אוֹר**, etc., light, power, stability, and permanency, like that of the heavens and sun, (in commutation of properties,) to the Word, and in an inexpressible exaltation of it above them; the light of one day of this sun being unspeakably more than that of seven others, as to the manifestation of the glory of God.

This, then, is fixed as a principle of truth:! *Whatever* God hath appointed to reveal himself by, as to any special or general end — that those whom he intends to discover himself unto may either be effectually instructed in his mind and will, according to the measure, degree, and means of the revelation afforded, or be left inexcusable for not receiving the testimony that he gives of himself, by any plea or pretense of want of clear, evident, manifest revelation — that, whatever it be, hath such an impression of his authority, upon it, as undeniably to evince that it is from him. And this, now, concerning his Word, comes further to be confirmed by testimonies and arguments.

CHAPTER 3.

Arguments of two sorts — Inartificial arguments, by way of testimony to the truth — To whom these arguments are valid — Of ζεοπνευστία — The rejection of a plea of ζεοπνευστία, wherein it consists — Of miracles, their efficacy to beget faith compared with the word.

Having declared the divine original and authority of the Scripture, and explained the position laid down as the foundation of our ensuing discourse, way is now made for us to the consideration of those *self-evidences* of its divine rise, and consequently authority, that it is attended withal, [and] upon the account whereof we receive it, as (believing it to be) the Word of God.

The arguments whereby any thing is confirmed are of two sorts; inartificial, by the way of testimony; and artificial, by the way of deductions and inferences. Whatever is capable of contributing evidence unto truth falls under one of these two heads. Both these kinds of proofs we make use of in the business in hand. Some profess they own the authority of the Scriptures, and also urge others so to do; but they will dispute on what grounds and accounts they do so. With those we may deal, in the first way, by testimony from the Scriptures themselves; which upon their own principles they cannot refuse. When they shall be pleased to inform us that they have relinquished those principles, and do no longer own the Scripture to be the word of God, we will withdraw the witnesses, upon their exceptions, whom for the present we make use of. Testimonies that are innate and ingrafted in the Word itself, used only as mediums of artificial arguments to be deduced from them, (which are of the second sort,) may be used towards them who at present own not the authority of the Scripture on any account whatever, or who are desirous to put on themselves the persons of such men, to try their skill and ability for the management of a controversy against the Word of God.

In both these cases the testimony of the Scripture is pleaded, and is to be received, or cannot with any pretense of reason be refused. In the former, upon the account of the acknowledged authority and veracity of the

witness, though speaking in its own case; in the latter, upon the account of that self-evidence which the testimony insisted on is accompanied withal, made out by such reasonings and arguments as, for the kind of them, persons who own not its authority cannot but admit. In human things, if a man of known integrity and unspotted reputation bear witness in any cause, and give uncontrollable evidence to his testimony, from the very nature and order of the things whereof he speaks, as it is expected that those who know and admit of his integrity and reputation do acquiesce in his assertion, so those to whom he is a stranger, who are not moved by his authority, will yet be overcome to assent to what is witnessed by him, from the nature of the things he asserts, especially if there be a coincidence of all such circumstances as are any way needful to give evidence to the matter in hand.

Thus it is in the case under consideration. For those who profess themselves to believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, and so own the credit and fidelity of the witness, it may reasonably be expected from them, yea, in strict justice demanded of them, that they stand to the testimony that they give to themselves and their own divine original. By saying that the Scripture is the word of God, and then commanding us to prove it so to be, they render themselves obnoxious unto every testimony that we produce from it that so it is, and that it is to be received on its own testimony. This witness they cannot waive without disavowing their own professed principles; without which principles they have not the least color of imposing this risk on us.

As for them with whom we have not the present advantage of their own acknowledgment, it is not reasonable to impose upon them with the bare testimony of that witness concerning whom the question is, Whether he be worthy the acceptation pleaded for but yet arguments taken from the Scripture from what it is and doth, its nature and operation, by which the causes and springs of all things are discovered — are not to be refused.

But it is neither of these that principally I intend to deal withal; my present discourse is rather about the satisfaction of our own consciences, than the answering of others' objections. Only we must satisfy our consciences upon such principles as will stand against all men's objections. This, then, is chiefly inquired after, viz., what it is that gives

such an assurance of the Scriptures being the word of God, as that, relying thereon, we have a sure bottom and foundation for our receiving them as such; and from whence it is that those who receive them not in that manner are left inexcusable in their damnable unbelief. This, we say, is in and from the Scripture itself; so that there is no other need of any further witness or testimony, nor is any, in the same kind, to be admitted.

It is not at all in my purpose to insist largely at present on this subject, and, therefore, I shall content myself with instancing some few testimonies and arguments, beginning with one or two of the first sort. ~~281~~ Isaiah 8:20: “To the law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, there is no light in them.” Whatever any one says — be it what or who it will, church or person — if it be in or about the things of God, concerning his will or worship, with our obedience to him, it is to be tried by the law and testimony. Hither we are sent; this is asserted to be the rule and standard, the touchstone of all speakings whatever. Now, that must speak alone for itself which must try the speaking of all but itself, yea, its own

But what doth this law and testimony — that is, this written Word — plead, on the account whereof it should be thus attended unto What doth it urge for its acceptation? Tradition, authority of the church, miracles, consent of men? or doth it speak and stand only upon its own sovereignty? The apostle gives us his answer to this inquiry, (~~282~~ Timothy 3:16,) Πᾶσα γραφὴ ζεόπνευστος. Its *plea* for reception — in comparison with and opposition unto all other ways of coming to the knowledge of God, his mind and will founded whereon it calls for attendance and submission with supreme, uncontrollable authority, is its ζεοπνευστία, or “divine inspiration.” It remains, then, only to be inquired, whether, when ζεοπνευστία is pleaded, there be any middle way, but either that it be received with divine faith or rejected as false.

Suppose a man were ζεόπνευστος, “divinely inspired,” and should so profess himself in the name of the Lord, as did the prophets of old; (Amos 7;) supposing, I say, he were so indeed, it will not be denied but that his message were to be received and submitted unto on that account The denial of it would justify them who “rejected and slew those that spake unto them in the name of the Lord.” And that is to say, in plain terms, we

may reject them whom God sends. Though miracles were given only with respect to *persons*, not *things*, yet most of the prophets who wrought no miracles insisted on this, that being **ζεόπνευστοι**, “divinely inspired,” their doctrine was to be received as from God. On their so doing, it was sin, even unbelief and rebellion against God, not to submit to what they spake in his name. And it always so fell out — to fix our faith on the right bottom — that scarce any prophet that spake in the name of God had any approbation from the church in whose days he spake. (^{415D} Matthew 5:12, 23:29; ^{415E} Luke 11:47, 48; ^{415C} Acts 7:52; ^{415B} Matthew 21:33-39.) It is true, **ἐγένοντο ψευδοπροφῆται ἐν τῷ λαῷ**, (^{411D} 2 Peter 2:1,) “there were false prophets among the people,” that spake in the name of the Lord, when he sent them not. (^{420D} Jeremiah 23:21.) Yet were those whom he did send to be received on pain of damnation: on the same penalty were the others to be refused. (^{420B} Jeremiah 23:28, 29.) The foundation of this duty lies in the **τὸ ζεῖον**, that accompanied the word that was **ἐκ ζεοπνευστίας**: of which afterward. And, without a supposal hereof, it could not consist with the goodness and righteousness of God to require of men — under the penalty of his eternal displeasure to make such a discrimination, where he had not given them **τεκμήρια**, “infallible tokens,” to enable them so to do.

But that he had and hath done so, he declares, (^{420B} Jeremiah 23:26-29,) “How long shall this be in the heart of the prophets that prophesy lies? that are prophets of the deceit of their own heart, which think to cause my people to forget my name by their dreams, which they tell every man to his neighbor, as their fathers have forgotten my name for Baal. The prophet that hath a dream, let him tell a dream; and he that hath my word, let him speak my word faithfully. What is the chaff to the wheat? saith the Lord. Is not my word like a fire? saith the Lord, and like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces?” In the latter days of that church, when the people were most eminently perplexed with false prophets both as to their number and subtlety — yet God lays their eternal and temporal safety or ruin on their discerning aright between his word and that which was only pretended so to be. And that they might not complain of this imposition, he tenders them security of its easiness of performance. Speaking of his *own word comparatively*, as to every thing that is not so, he says it is as wheat to chaff, which may infallibly — by being what it is — be discerned from it; and then *absolutely*, that it hath such properties as

that it will discover itself — even light, and heat, and power. A person, then, who was truly **ζέόπνευστος**, was to be attended unto because he was so.

As, then, it was said before, the *Scriptures* being **ζέόπνευστοι**, is not the case the same as with a *man* that was so? Is there any thing in the writing of it by God's command that should impair its authority? Nay, is it not freed from innumerable prejudices that attended it in its first giving out by men, arising from the personal infirmities and supposed interests of them that delivered it? (**348B** Jeremiah 43:3; **410B** John 9:29; **405B** Acts 24:5.)

This being pleaded by it, and insisted on, its testimony is received, or it is not. If it be received on this account, there is in it, we say, the proper basis and foundation of faith, whereon it hath its **ὑπόστασις**, or “subsistence.” If it be rejected, it must be not only with a refusal of its witness, but also with a high detestation of its pretense to be from God. What ground or plea for such a refusal and detestation any one hath, or can have, shall be afterward considered. If it be a sin to refuse it, it had been a duty to receive it; if a duty to receive it as the word of God, then was it sufficiently manifested so to be. Of the objection arising from them who pretend to this inspiration falsely, we have spoken before; and we axe as yet dealing with them that own the book whereof we spake to be the word of God, and only call in question the grounds on which they do so, or on which others ought so to do. As to these, it may suffice, that — in the strength of all the authority and truth they profess to own and acknowledge in it — it declares the foundation of its acceptance to be no other but its own divine inspiration. Hence it is **λόγος πάσης ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος**.

Again, in that dispute that was between Abraham and the rich man, (**405B** Luke 16:31,) about the best and most effectual means of bringing men to repentance: the rich man in hell, speaking his own conception, fixes upon miracles — if one rise from the dead and preach, the work will be done. Abraham is otherwise minded — that is, Christ was so, the author of that parable; he bids them attend to Moses and the prophets, the written Word, as that which all faith and repentance was immediately to be grounded on. The inquiry being, how men might be best assured that any message is from God, did not the Word manifest itself to be from him, this direction had not been equal.

The ground of the request for the rising of one from the dead, is laid in the common apprehension of men not knowing the power of God in the Scriptures; who think that if an evident miracle were wrought, all pretences and pleas of unbelief would be excluded. Who doth not think so? Our Savior discovers that mistake, and lets men know that those who will not own or submit to the authority of God in the Word, would not be moved by the most signal miracles imaginable. If a holy man, whom we had known assuredly to have been dead for some years, should rise out of his grave and come unto us with a message from God, could any man doubt whether he were sent unto us of God or no? I suppose not. The rising of men from the dead was the greatest miracle that attended the resurrection of our Savior; (~~4125~~ Matthew 27:52, 53;) yea, greater than his own, if the Socinians may be believed, viz., in that he raised not himself by his own power: yet the evidence of the mission of such a one, and the authority of God speaking in him — our Savior being judge — is not of an efficacy to enforce belief, beyond that which is in the written Word, nor a surer foundation for faith to repose itself upon.

Could we hear a voice from heaven, accompanied with such a divine power as to evidence itself to be from God, Should we not rest in it as such? I suppose men think they would. Can we think that any man should withdraw his assent, and say, Yea, but I must have some testimony that this is from God? All such evasions are precluded, in the supposition wherein a self-evidencing power is granted. What greater miracle did the apostles of Christ ever behold, or hear, than that voice that came ὑπὸ τῆς μεγαλοπρεποῦς δόξης, “from the excellent glory” — This is my beloved Son ?” Yet Peter, who heard that voice, tells us that, comparatively, we have greater security from and by the written Word than they had *in* and *by* that miraculous voice. We have βεβαίωτερον τὸν προφητικὸν λόγον. We heard, saith he, that voice indeed; but we have “a more sure word of prophecy” to attend unto — more sure, not in itself, but in its giving out its evidence unto us And how doth it appear so to be? The reason he alleges for it was before insisted on. (~~4018~~ 2 Peter 1:18-21.)

Yea, suppose that God should speak to us from heaven as he spake to Moses, or as he spake to Christ; or from some certain place, as ~~4019~~ Numbers 7:89; how should we be able to know it to be the voice of God? Cannot Satan cause a voice to be heard in the air, and so deceive us?

or, may not there be some way (in this kind) found out, whereby men might impose upon us with their delusions? Pope Celestine thought he heard a voice from heaven, when it was but the cheat of his successor. Must we not rest at last in that τὸ ζῆλον which accompanies the true voice of God evidencing itself, and ascertaining the soul beyond all possibility of mistake? Now, did not this τεκμήριον accompany the written Word at its first giving forth? If it did not, as was said, how could any man be obliged to discern 'it from all delusions? If it did, how came it to lose it? Did God appoint his Word to be written, that so he might destroy its authority? If the question be, whether the doctrines proposed to be believed are truths of God, or "cunningly devised fables," we are sent to the Scripture itself, and that alone, to give the determination.

CHAPTER 4.

Innate arguments in the Scripture of its divine original and authority — Its self-evidencing efficacy — All light manifests itself — The Scripture light — Spiritual light evidential — Consecratories from the premises laid down — What the self-evidencing light of the Scripture peculiarly is — Power self-evidencing — The Scripture the power of God, and powerful — How this power exerts itself — The whole question resolved.

Having given some few instances of those many testimonies which the Scripture, in express terms, bears to itself, and the spring, rise, and fountain of all that authority which it claims among and over the sons of men — which all those who pretend, on any account whatever, to own and acknowledge its divinity, are bound to stand to, and are obliged by — the second thing proposed, or the innate arguments that the Word of God is furnished withal for its own manifestation, and whereby the authority of God is revealed, for faith to repose itself upon, comes in the next place into consideration. Now, these arguments contain the full and formal grounds of our answer to that inquiry before laid down, viz., why and wherefore we do receive and believe the Scripture to be the word of God. It being the formal reason of our faith, that whereon it is built and whereinto it is resolved, that is inquired after, we answer as we said before, We do so receive, embrace, believe, and submit unto it, because of the authority of God who speaks it, or gave it forth as his mind and will, evidencing itself by the Spirit in and with that Word, unto our minds and consciences: or, because that the Scripture, being brought unto us by the good providence of God, in ways of his appointment and preservation, it doth evidence itself infallibly unto our consciences to be the word of the living God.

The self-evidencing efficacy of the Scripture, and the grounds of it — which consist in common mediums, that have an extent and latitude answerable to the reasons of men, whether as yet they acknowledge it to be the word of God or no — are those, then, which, in the remainder of this discourse, I shall endeavor to clear and vindicate. This only I shall desire to premise, that whereas some grounds of this efficacy seem to be

placed in the things themselves contained in the Scripture, I shall not consider them abstractedly as such, but under the formality of their being the Scripture or written Word of God; without which consideration and resolution the things mentioned would be left naked, and utterly divested of their authority and efficacy pleaded for, and be of no other nature and importance than the same things found in other books. It is the writing itself that now supplies the place and room of the persons in and by whom God originally spake to men. As were the persons speaking of old, so are the writings now. It was the *word spoken* that was to be believed, yet as *spoken* by them from God; and it is now the *word written* that is to be believed, yet as *written* by the command and appointment of God.

There are, then, two things that are accompanied with a self-evidencing excellency; and every other thing doth so, so far as it is partaker of their nature, and no otherwise. Now, these are —

1st, Light;

2d, Power, for or in operation.

1. Light manifests itself. Whatever is light doth so; that is, it doth whatever is necessary on its own part for its manifestation and discovery. Of the defects that are or may be in them to whom this discovery is made we do not as yet speak; and “whatever manifests itself is light” — πᾶν γὰρ τὸ φανερούμενον φῶς ἐστί. (^{MSB} Ephesians 5:13.) Light requires neither proof nor testimony for its evidence. Let the sun arise in the firmament, and there is no need of witnesses to prove and confirm, unto a seeing man, that it is day. A small candle will so do. Let the least child bring a cradle into a room that before was dark, and it would be a madness to go about to prove by substantial witnesses — men of gravity and authority — that light is brought in. Doth it not evince itself with an assurance above all that can be obtained by any testimony whatever? Whatever is light, either naturally or morally so, is revealed by its being so. That which evidenceth not itself is not light.

That the Scripture is a light we shall see immediately. That it is so, or can be called so, unless it hath this nature and property of light, to evidence itself as well as to give light unto others, cannot in any tolerable correspondency of speech be allowed. Whether light spiritual and

intellectual regarding the mind, or natural with respect to bodily sight, be firstly and properly light, from whence the other is by allusion denominated, I need not now inquire. Both have the same properties in their several kinds, Φῶς ἀληθινὸν φαίνει· — “True light shineth.” Ὁ Θεὸς φῶς ἐστὶ, (^{<6165>}1 John 1:5,) “God is light;” and he inhabiteth φῶς ἀπρόσιτον, (^{<5165>}1 Timothy 6:16,) not a shining, glistening brightness, as some^{f47} grossly imagine, but the glorious, unsearchable majesty of his own being, which is inaccessible to our understandings. So Isaiah, (^{<2575>}57:15,) “God inhabiteth eternity.” So אֱלֹהִים עַד עַד saith the Psalmist, (^{<3405>}civ. 2,) “Thou clothest thyself with light;” and Daniel, (^{<2122>}2:22,) עֲמָה שָׁרָא וְנִהְיָרָא, the “light remaineth with him.” God is light essentially, and is, therefore, known by the beaming of his eternal properties in all that outwardly is of him. And light abides with him as the fountain of it, he communicating light to all others. This being the fountain of all light, the more it participates of the nature of the fountain, the more it is light; and the more properly, as the properties and qualities of it are considered. It is, then, spiritual, moral, intellectual light, with all its mediums, that hath the preeminence, as to a participation of the nature and properties of light.

Now, the Scripture, the Word of God, is light. Those that reject it are called (^{<4213>}Job 24:13) מַרְדֵּי-אוֹר, “light’s rebels” — men resisting the authority which they cannot but be convinced of. (^{<9908>}Psalm 19:8, ^{<9433>}43:3, 119. 105, 130; ^{<4163>}Proverbs 6:23; ^{<2302>}Isaiah 9:2; ^{<3065>}Hosea 6:5; ^{<4101>}Matthew 4:16, 5:15; ^{<4120>}John 3:20, 21.) It is a light so shining with the majesty of its Author, as that it manifests itself to be his, (^{<6019>}2 Peter 1:19,) “a light shining in a dark place,” with an eminent advantage for its own discovery, as well as unto the benefit of others. Let a light be ever so mean and contemptible, yet if it shines, casts out beams and rays in a dark place, it will evidence itself. If other things be wanting in the faculty, the light, as to its innate glory and beauty, is not to suffer prejudice. But the Word is a glorious, shining light, as hath been showed; an illuminating light, compared to and preferred above the light of the sun. (^{<9915>}Psalm 19:5-8; ^{<5103>}Romans 10:18.) Let not, then, a reproach be cast upon the most glorious light in the world, the most eminent reflection of uncreated light and excellencies, that will not be fastened on any thing that, on any account, is so called. (^{<4156>}Matthew 5:16.)

Now, as the Scripture is thus a light, we grant it to be the duty of the church, of any church, of every church, to hold it up, whereby it may become the more conspicuous. It is a pillar and ground to set this light upon. (~~SOB~~1 Timothy 3:15.) *Στόλος καὶ ἐδραίωμα τῆς ἀληθείας*, may refer to the mystery of godliness in the next words following, in good coherence of speech, as well as to the church; but granting the usual reading, no more is affirmed but that the light and truth of the Scripture are held up and held out by the church. It is the duty of every church so to do — almost the whole of its duty. And this duty it performs *ministerially*, not *authoritatively*. A church may *bear up the light* — *it is not the light*. It bears witness to it, but kindles not one divine beam to further its discovery. All the preaching that is in any church, its administration of ordinances, all its walking in the truth, hold up this light.

Nor doth it in the least impair this self-evidencing efficacy of the Scripture, that it is a moral and spiritual, not a natural light. The proposition is universal to all kinds of light; yea, more fully applicable to the former than the latter. Light, I confess, of itself, will not remove the defect of the visive faculty. It is not given for that end. Light is not eyes. It suffices that there is nothing wanting on its own part for its discovery and revelation. To argue that the sun cannot be known to be the sun, or the great means of communicating external light unto the world, because blind men cannot see it, nor do know any more of it than they are told, will scarce be admitted; nor doth it in the least impeach the efficacy of the light pleaded for, that men stupidly blind cannot comprehend it. (~~SOB~~John 1:5.)

I do not assert from hence, that wherever the Scripture is brought, by what means soever, (which, indeed, is all one,) all that read it, or to whom it is read, must instantly of necessity assent unto its divine original. Many men who are not stark blind may have yet so abused their eyes, that when a light is brought into a dark place they may not be able to discern it. Men may be so prepossessed with innumerable prejudices — principles received by strong traditions — corrupt affections making them hat the light — that they may not behold the glory of the Word when it is brought to them. But it is nothing to our present discourse, whether any man living be able by and of himself to discern this light, whilst the defect may be justly cast on his own blindness. (~~SOB~~2 Corinthians 4:2-4:

“By manifestation of the truth, commending ourselves to every man’s conscience in the sight of God. But if our gospel be hid, it is hid to them that are lost: in whom the god of this world hath blinded the minds of them which believe not, lest the light of the glorious gospel of Christ, who is the image of God, should shine unto them.”

There is, in the dispensation of the Word, an evidence of truth commending itself to the consciences of mere Some receive not this evidence. Is it for want of light in the truth itself? No; that is a glorious light that shines into the hearts of men. Is it for want of testimony to assert this light? No; but merely because the god of this world hath blinded the eyes of men, that they should not behold it.

From what, then, hath been laid down, these two things may be inferred: — That as the authority of God — the first and only absolute truth in the Scripture — is that alone which divine faith rests upon, and is the formal object of it — so wherever the Word comes, by what means soever, it hath in itself a sufficiency of light to evidence to all (and will do it eventually to all that are not blinded by the god of this world) that authority of God its author; and the only reason why it is not received, by many in the world to whom it is come, is the advantage that Satan hath to keep them in ignorance and blindness, by the lusts, corruptions, prejudices, and hardness of their own hearts.

The Word, then, makes a sufficient proposition of itself, wherever it is; and he to whom it shall come, who refuses it because it comes not so or so testified, will give an account of his atheism and infidelity. He that hath the witness of God need not stay for the witness of men, for the witness of God is greater.

Wherever the Word is received indeed, as it requireth itself to be received, and is really assented unto as the Word of God, it is so received upon the evidence of that light which it hath in itself, manifestly declaring itself so to be. It is all one by what means, by what hand — whether of a child or a church, by accident or tradition, by common consent of men or peculiar providence the Scripture comes unto us: come how it will, it hath its authority in itself and towards us by being the word of God — and hath its power of manifesting itself so to be from its own innate light.

Now, this light in the Scripture, for which we contend, is nothing but the beaming of the majesty, truth, holiness, and authority of God, given unto it and left upon it by its author, the Holy Ghost — an impress it hath of God's excellency upon it, distinguishing it by infallible **τεκμήρια** from the product of any creature. By this it dives into the consciences of men, into all the secret recesses of their hearts; guides, teaches, directs, determines, and judges *in* them, *upon* them, in the name, majesty, and authority of God. If men who are blinded by the god of this world, will yet deny this light because they perceive it not, it shall not prejudice them who do. By this self-evidencing light, I say, doth the Scripture make such a proposition of itself as the word of God, that whoever rejects it, doth it at the peril of his eternal ruin; and thereby a bottom or foundation is tendered for that faith which it requireth to repose itself upon.

For the proof, then, of the divine authority of the Scriptures unto him or them who, as yet, on no account whatever do acknowledge it — I shall only suppose that, by the providence of God, the book itself be so brought unto him or them, as that he or they be engaged to the consideration of it, or do attend to the reading of it. This is the work of God's providence in the government of the world. Upon a supposal hereof I leave the Word with them, and if it evidence not itself unto their consciences, it is because they are blinded by the god of this world, which will be no plea for the refusal of it at the last day; and they who receive it not on this ground, will never receive it on any, as they ought.

2. The second sort, of things that evidence themselves, are things of an effectual *powerful operation* in any kind. So doth fire by heat, the wind by its noise and force, salt by its taste and savor, the sun by its light and heat; so do also moral principles that are effectually operative. (⁴¹²⁴ Romans 2:14, 15.) Men in whom they are, **ἐνδείκνυνται τὸ ἔργον**, “do manifest the work of them, or manifest them by their work and efficacy. Whatever it be that hath an innate power in itself, that will effectually operate on a fit and proper subject — it is able to evidence itself, and its own nature and condition.

To manifest the interest of the Scripture to be enrolled among things of this nature — yea, (under God himself, who is known by his great power, and the effects of it,) to have the pre-eminence I shall observe only one or

two things concerning it, the various improvement whereof would take up more time and greater space than I have allotted to this discourse.

It is absolutely called the “power of God, and that unto its proper end; which way lies the tendency of its efficacy in operation. (^{<4010>}Romans 1:16.) It is **δύναμις Θεοῦ**, “vis, virtus Dei” — the “power of God.” ^{<4010>}**Ὁ λόγος ὁ τοῦ σταυροῦ**, the “word concerning the cross” — that is, the gospel is **δύναμις Θεοῦ**, (^{<4018>}1 Corinthians 1:18,) the “power of God.” And faith, which is built on that Word, without other helps or advantages, is said to stand in the “power of God (^{<4015>}1 Corinthians 2:5;) that is, effectually working in and by the Word, it worketh **ἐν ἀποδείξει Πνεύματος καὶ δυνάμεως**, “in the demonstration of the Spirit and of power;” **ἐν διὰ δυνάμει** — its spiritual power gives a demonstration of it. Thus it comes not as a naked word, (^{<5005>}1 Thessalonians 1:5,) but in “power, and in the Holy Ghost;” and **ἐν πληροφορίᾳ πολλῇ** giving all manner of assurance and full persuasion of itself, even by its power and efficacy.

Hence it is termed **ἡ ῥάβδος**, “the rod of power” or Strength, (^{<4010>}Psalms 110:2,) denoting both authority and efficacy. Surely that which is thus the power and authority of God, is able to make itself known so to be.

It is not only said to be **δύναμις**, “power,” the power of God in itself, but also **δυνάμενος**, “able and powerful” in respect of us. “Thou hast learned,” saith Paul to Timothy, **τὰ ἱερὰ γράμματα**, “the sacred letters,” (the written Word,) **τὰ δυνάμενά σε σοφίσαι εἰς σωτηρίαν**, “which are able to make thee wise unto salvation.” They are powerful and effectual to that purpose. It is **λόγος δυνάμενος σῶσαι τὰρ ψυχάς**, (^{<5002>}James 1:21,) “The word that hath power in it to save souls.” So ^{<4012>}Acts 20:32: “I commend you” **λόγῳ τῷ δυνάμει**, “to the able, powerful word.” And that we may now what kind of power it hath, the apostle tells us that it is **ζῶν καὶ ἐνεργής** — it is “living and effectual,” (^{<5002>}Hebrews 4:12,) and “sharper than any two-edged sword, piercing even to the dividing asunder of soul and spirit, and of the joints and marrow, and is a discernor of the thoughts and intents of the heart.” It is desired of God to declare **τὴν ἐνέργειαν τῆς δυνάμεως**, “the effectual working of his power.” (See ^{<4016>}John 6:68, 69; ^{<4014>}1 Corinthians 6:14, 15:57; ^{<4018>}Galatians 2:8.) By virtue of this power, it brought forth fruit in all the world. (^{<5000>}Colossians 1:6.) Without sword, without (for the most part)

miracles, without human wisdom or oratory, without any inducements or motives but what; were merely and solely taken from itself, consisting in things that “eye had not seen, nor ear heard, nor could enter into the heart of man to conceive,” hath it exerted this its power and effigy to the conquest of the world — causing men of all sorts, in all times and places, so to fall down before its divine authority, as immediately to renounce all that was dear to them in the world, and to undergo whatever was dreadful, terrible, and destructive to nature all its dearest concernments.

It hath been the work of many to insist on the particulars wherein this power exerts itself; so that I shall not enlarge upon them. In general, they have this advantage, that as they are all spiritual, so they are such as have their seat, dwelling, and abode, in the hearts and consciences of men, whereby they are not liable to any exception, as though they were pretended, Men cannot harden themselves in the rejection of the testimony they give, by sending for magicians to do the like; or by any pretense that it is a common thing that is befallen them on whom the Word puts forth its power. The seat or residence of these effects is safe-guarded against all power and authority but that of God. Its diving into the hearts, consciences, and secret recesses of the minds of men; its judging and sentencing of them in themselves; its convictions, tenors, conquer, and killing of men; its converting, building up, making wise, holy, obedient; its administering consolations in every condition, and the like effects of its power, are usually spoken unto.

These are briefly the foundations of the answer retched to the inquiry formerly laid down, which might abundantly be enlarged — How know we that the Scripture is the word of God; how may others come to be assured thereof? The Scripture, say we, bears testimony to itself that it is the word of God; that testimony is the witness of God himself, which whoso doth not accept and believe, he doth what in him lies to make God a liar. To give us an infallible assurance that, in receiving this testimony, we are not imposed upon by cunningly devised fables, the αἱ γραφαί, the ἱερά γράμματα, “the Scriptures,” have that glory of light and power accompanying them, as wholly distinguisheth them by infallible signs and evidences from all words and writings not divine; conveying their truth and power into the souls and consciences of men with an infallible certainty. On this account are they received as from God by all that receive them,

who have any real, distinguishing foundation of their faith, which would not be — separated from these grounds — as effectual an expedient for the reception of the Koran.

CHAPTER 5.

Of the testimony of the Spirit — Traditions — Miracles.

Before I proceed to the consideration of those other testimonies, which are as arguments drawn from those innate excellencies and properties of the Word which I have insisted on, some other things, whose right understanding is of great importance in the cause under debate, must be laid down and stated. Some of these refer to that testimony of the Spirit that is usually and truly pleaded as the great ascertaining principle, or that on the account whereof we receive the Scriptures to be the word of God. That it may be seen in what sense that is usually delivered by our divines, and how far there is a coincidence between that assertion and what we have delivered — I shall lay down what that testimony is, wherein it consists, and what is the weight or stress that we lay upon it.

That the Scripture be received as the word of God, there is required a twofold efficacy of the Spirit. The first respects the subject, or the mind of man that assents unto the authority of the Scripture. Now, concerning this act or work of the Spirit, whereby we are enabled to believe the Scripture, on the account whereof we may say that we receive the Scripture to be the word of God — or upon the testimony of the Spirit — I shall a little inquire, what it is, and wherein it doth consist.

First, then, It is not an outward or inward *vocal* testimony concerning the Word, as the Papist would impose upon us to believe and assent. We do not affirm that the Spirit immediately, by himself, saith unto every individual believer This book is, or contains, the word of God. We say not that the Spirit ever speaks to us *of* the Word, but *by* the Word. Such an enthusiasm as they fancy is rarely pretended; and where it is so, it is for the most part quickly discovered to be a delusion. We plead not for the usefulness, much less the necessity, of any such testimony. Yea, the principles we have laid down — resolving all faith into the public testimony of the Scriptures themselves — do render all such private testimonies altogether needless.

Secondly, This testimony of the Spirit consists not in a *persuasion* that a man takes up, he knows not well how or why; only this he knows, he will

not depose it [lay it aside] though it cost him his life. This would be like that which by Morinus^{f48} is ascribed to the Church of Rome, which, though it knew no reason why it should prefer the vulgar Latin translation before the original, yet, by the guidance of the Spirit, would do so — that is, unreasonably. But if a man should say, that he is persuaded that the Scripture is the word of God, and that he will die a thousand times to give testimony thereunto; and, not knowing any real ground of this persuasion that should bear him out in such a testimony, shall ascribe it to the Spirit of God — our concernment lies not in that persuasion. This may befall men by the advantage of traditions, whereof men are usually zealous, and obstinate in their defence. Education in some constitutions will give pertinacity in most vain and false persuasions. It is not, then, a resolution and persuasion induced into our minds we know not how, built we know not upon what foundation, that we intend in the assignation of our receiving the Scripture to be the word of God to the effectual work and witness of the Holy Ghost.

Two things, then, we intend by this work of the Spirit upon the mind of man.

1. His communication of spiritual light; by an act of His power, enabling the mind to discern the saving truth, majesty, and authority of the Word — **πνευματικὰ πνευματικῶς**. There is a blindness, a darkness, upon the minds of men **πνεῦμα μὴ ἔχόντων**, that not only disenables them from discerning the things of God in their certainty, evidence, necessity, and beauty, (for **ψυχικὸς ἄνθρωπος οὐ δέχεται τὰ τοῦ ζεοῦ**), but also causes them to judge amiss of them, as things weak and foolish, dark, unintelligible, not answering to any principle of wisdom whereby they are guided. (1 Corinthians 2.) Whilst this **γλαύκωμα** abides on the minds of men it is impossible that they should, on any right abiding foundation, assent to the Word of God. They may have a prejudicate opinion — they have no faith concerning it. This darkness, then, must be removed by the communication of light by the Holy Ghost; which work of his illumination is commonly by others spoken unto, and by me also in another place.^{f49} **2.** The Holy Ghost, together with and by his work of illumination, taking off the perverse disposition of mind that is in us by nature, with our enmity to and aversion from the things of God, effectually also persuades the mind to a receiving and admitting of the truth, wisdom, and authority of

the Word. Now, because this perverse disposition of mind, possessing the **τὸ ἡγεμονικόν** of the soul, influences the will also into an aversion and dislike of that goodness which is in the truth proposed to it, it is removed by a double act of the Holy Ghost.

(1.) He gives us wisdom — understanding — a spiritual judgment — whereby we may be able to compare spiritual things with spiritual, in a spiritual manner, and to come thereby to a clear and full light of the heavenly excellency and majesty of the Word; and so enables us to know of the doctrine whether it be of God. Under the benefit of this assistance all the parts of the Scripture in their harmony and correspondency, all the truths of it in their power and necessity, come in together to give evidence one to another, and all of them to the whole; I mean as the mind is enabled to make a spiritual judgment of them.

(2.) He gives **αἴσθησιν πνευματικὴν**, a spiritual sense, a taste of the things themselves upon the mind, heart, and conscience; when we have **αἰσθητήρια γεγυμνασμένα**, “senses exercised” to discern such things. These things deserve a more full handling, and to be particularly exemplified from Scripture, if the nature of our present design would admit thereof.

As in our natural estate, in respect of these things of God, the mind is full of vanity, darkness, blindness, yea, is darkness itself, so that there is no correspondency between the faculty and the object — and the will lies in an utter unacquaintedness, yea, impossibility of any acquaintance, with the life, power, savor, sweetness, relish, and goodness, that are in the things proposed to be known and discerned, under the dark shades of a blind mind; so, for a removal of both these, the Holy Ghost communicates light to the understanding, whence it is able to see and judge of the truth as it is in Jesus — and the will being thereby delivered from the dungeon wherein it was, mad quickened anew, performs its office, in embracing what is proper and suited unto it in the object proposed. The Spirit, indeed, discovereth to every one **καθὼς βούλεται**, according to the counsel of his will; but yet in that way, in the general, whereby the sun gives out his light and heat, the former making way for the latter. But these things must not now be insisted on.

Now, by these works of the Spirit he doth, I say, persuade the mind concerning the truth and authority of the Scripture, and therein leave an impression of an effectual testimony within us; and this testimony of his, as it is authoritative and infallible in itself, so [is it] of inconceivably more efficacy, power, and certainty, unto them that do receive it, than any voice or internal word, boasted of by some, can be. But yet this is not the work of the Spirit at present inquired after.

3. There is a testimony of the Spirit that respects the object, or the Word itself; and this is a public testimony, which, as it satisfies our souls in particular, so it is, and may be, pleaded in reference unto the satisfaction of all others to whom the Word of God shall come. The Holy Ghost speaking in and by the Word — imparting to it virtue, power, efficacy, majesty, and authority — affords us the witness that our faith is resolved into. And thus, whereas there are but two heads whereunto all grounds of assent do belong — viz., authority of testimony and the self-evidence of truth — they do here both concur in one. In the same Word, we have both the authority of the testimony of the Spirit and the self-evidence of the truth spoken by him; yea, so that both these are materially one and the same, though distinguished in their formal conceptions. I have been much affected with those verses of Dante, the Italian poet, which somebody hath thus, word for word, turned into Latin: —

— *“Larga pluvia
Spiritus sancti quae, est diffusa
Super veteres, et super novas membranas,
Est syllogismus qui eam mihi conclusit
Acute adeo ut prae illa
Omnis demonstratio mihi videatur obtusa.”*

The Spirit’s communication of his own light and authority to the Scripture, as evidence of its original, is the testimony pleaded for.

When, then, we resolve our faith into the testimony of the Holy Ghost, it is not any private whisper, word, or voice, given to individual persons; it is not the secret and effectual persuasion of the truth of the Scriptures that falls upon the minds of some men, from various involved considerations of education, tradition, and the like, whereof they can give no particular account; it is not the effectual work of the Holy Ghost upon the minds and wills of men, enabling them savingly to believe, that is intended; (the


Papists, for the most part, pleading about these things, do but show their ignorance and malice;) but it is the public testimony of the Holy Ghost given unto all, of the Word, by and in the Word, and its own divine light, efficacy, and power.

Thus far, then, have we proceeded: The Scripture, the written Word, hath its infallible truth in itself: *ὁ λόγος ὁ σὸς ἀλήθειά ἐστι.* (~~4577~~ John 17:17.) From whence it hath its verity, thence it hath its authority; for its whole authority founded in its truth. Its authority in itself, is its authority in respect of us; nor hath it any whir more in itself than, *de jure*, it hath towards and over all them to whom it comes. That, *de facto* some do not submit themselves unto it, is their sin and rebellion. This truth, and consequently this authority, is evidenced and made known to us by the public testimony which is given unto it by the Holy Ghost speaking in it, with divine light and power, to the minds, souls, and consciences of men; being therein by itself proposed unto us, we being enlightened by the Holy Ghost, (which, in the condition wherein we are, is necessary for the apprehension of any spiritual thing or truth in a spiritual manner,) we receive it, and religiously subject our souls unto it, as the word and will of the ever-living, sovereign God and Judge of all. And if this be not a bottom and foundation of faith, I here publicly profess that, for aught I know, I have no faith at all

Having laid this stable foundation, I shall, with all possible brevity, consider some pretences and allegations for the confirmation of the authority of the Scripture, invented and made use of by some to divert us from that foundation, the closing wherewith will, in this matter alone, bring peace unto our souls. And so this chapter shall, as it were, lay in the balance and compare together, the testimony of the Spirit before mentioned and explained, and the other pretences and pleas that shall now be examined.

1. Some say — when, on other accounts they are concerned so to say — that we “have received the Scripture from the Church of Rome; which received it by *tradition*; and this gives a credibility unto it.” Of tradition in general — without this limitation (which destroys it) of the Church of Rome — I shall speak afterward. Credibility either keeps within the bounds of probability, as that may be heightened to a manifest

uncontrollableness, whilst yet its principles exceed not that sphere — in which sense it belongs not at all to our present discourse; or it includes a firm, suitable foundation for faith, supernatural and divine. Have we, in this sense, received the Scripture from that church, as it is called? Is that church able to give such a credibility to any thing? or doth the Scripture stand in need of such a credibility to be given to it flora that church? Is not the first most false, and is not the last blasphemous? To receive a thing from a church as a church, is to receive it upon the authority of that church. If we receive any thing from the authority of a church, we do it not because the thing itself is ἀποδοχῆς ἄξιος, “worthy of acceptation,” but because of the authority alleged. If, then, we thus receive the Scriptures from the Church of Rome, why (in particular) do we not receive the apocryphal books also which she receives? How did the Church of Rome receive the Scriptures? Shall we say that she is authorized to give out what seems good to her as the Word of God? No; but she hath received them by tradition. So she pleads that she hath received the apocryphal books also. We, then, receive the Scriptures from Rome by tradition; we make ourselves judges of that tradition; and yet Rome saith this is one thing that she hath by the same tradition, viz., that she alone is judge of what she hath by tradition. But the common fate of liars is befallen that harlot. She hath so long, so constantly, so desperately lied, in many, the most, things that she professeth pretending tradition for, that indeed she deserves not to be believed when she telleth the truth. Besides, she pleads that she received the Scriptures from the beginning, when it is granted that the copies of the Hebrew of the Old and the Greek of the New Testament were only authentic; these she pleads, now under her keeping, to be woefully corrupted, and yet is angry that we believe not her tradition.

2. Some add, that we receive the Scripture to be the word of God upon the account of the miracles that were wrought at the giving of the Law and of the New Testament; which miracles we have received by universal tradition. But, first, I desire to know whence it comes to pass, that, seeing our Savior Jesus Christ wrought many other miracles besides those that are written, ( John 20:30, 21:25,) and the apostles likewise, they cannot, by all their traditions, help us to so much as an obscure report of any one that is not written; (I speak not of legends;) which yet at their performance were no less known than those that are, nor were less useful

for the end of miracles than they. Of tradition in general afterward: but is it not evident that the miracles whereof they speak are preserved in the Scripture, and no otherwise? And if so, can these miracles operate upon the understanding or judgment of any man, unless he first grant the Scripture to be the Word of God — I mean to the begetting of a divine faith of them, even that there were ever any such miracles? Suppose these miracles, alleged as the ground of our believing of the Word, had not been written, but, like the sibyl's leaves, had been driven up and down by the worst and fiercest wind that blows in this world — the breath of man; — those who should keep them by tradition (that is, men) are by nature so vain, foolish, malicious — such liars, adders, detractors — have spirits and minds so unsuited to spiritual things, so liable to alteration in themselves, and to contradiction one to another — are so given to impostures, and are so apt to be imposed upon — have been so shuffled and driven up and down the world in every generation — have, for the most part, so utterly lost the remembrance of what themselves are, whence they came, or whither they are to go — that I can give very little credit to what I have nothing but their authority to rely upon for, without any evidence from the nature of the thing itself.

Abstracting, then, from the testimony given in the Scriptures to the miracles wrought by the prime revealers of the mind and will of God in the Word, no tolerable assurance as to the business in hand, where a foundation for faith is inquired after, can be given, that ever any such miracles were wrought. If numbers of men may be allowed to speak, we may have a traditional testimony given to the blasphemous figments of the Koran, under the name of true miracles. But the constant tradition of more than a thousand years, carried on by innumerable multitudes of men, great, wise, and sober, from one generation to another, doth but set open the gates of hell for the Mohammedans. Yet, setting aside the authority of God in his Word, and what is resolved thereinto, I know not why they may not vie traditions with the rest of the world. The world, indeed, is full of traditions flowing from the Word — that is, a knowledge of the doctrines of the Word in the minds of men; but a tradition of the Word not resolved into the Word — a tradition referred to a fountain of sense in seeing and hearing, preserved as an oral law in a distinct channel and stream by itself — when it is evidenced, either by instance in some

particular preserved therein, or in a probability of securing it through the generations past, by a comparison of some such effect in things of the like kind, I shall be ready to receive it.

Give me, then, as I said before, but the least obscure report of any one of those many miracles that were wrought by our Savior and the apostles, which are not recorded in the Scriptures, and I shall put more valuation on the pretended traditions than I can as yet persuade myself unto. Besides, many writers of the Scripture wrought no miracles, and by this rule their writings are left to shift for themselves. Miracles, indeed, were necessary to take off all prejudices from the persons that brought any new doctrine from God; but the doctrine still evidenced itself. The apostles converted many, where they wrought no miracles; (Acts 16-18.) and where they did so work, yet they were received for their doctrine, and not the doctrine on their account. And the Scripture now hath no less evidence and demonstration in itself of its divinity, than it had when by them it was preached.

But because this tradition is pretended with great, confidence as a sure bottom and foundation for receiving of the Scriptures, I shall a little further inquire into it. That which in this case is intended by this Masora, or “tradition,” is a report of men, which those who are present have received from them that are gone before them.^{f50} Now, this may be either of all the men of the world, or only of some of them; if of all, either their suffrages must betaken in some convention, or gathered up from the individuals as we are able and have opportunity. If the first way of receiving them were possible, which is the utmost improvement that imagination can give the authority inquired after, yet every individual of men being a liar, the whole convention must be of the same complexion, and so not be able to yield a sufficient basis to build a faith upon, *cui non potest subesse falsum* — that is, infallible, and that “cannot possibly be deceived:” much less is there any foundation for it in such a report as is the emergency of the assertion of individuals.

But now if this tradition be alleged as preserved only by some in the world — not the half of rational creatures — I desire to know what reason I have to believe those who have that tradition, or plead that they have it, before and against them who profess they have no such report delivered to them

from their forefathers. Is the reason hereof, because I live among those who have this tradition, and they are my neighbors whom I know? By the same rule those who live among the other parts of men are bound to receive what they deliver them upon tradition; and so men may be obliged to believe the Koran to be the word of God.

It is more probable, it will be answered, that their testimony is to be received because they are the church of God. But it doth not yet appear that I can any other way have any knowledge of them so to be, or of any authority that any number of men (more or less) can have in this case, under that name or notion, unless by the Scripture itself. And if so, it will quickly appear what place is to be allotted to their testimony, who cannot be admitted as witnesses unless the Scripture itself be owned and received; because they have neither plea nor claim to be so admitted but only from the Scripture. If they shall aver, that they take this honor to themselves, and that, without relation to the Scripture, they claim a right of authoritative witness-bearing in this case — I say again, upon the general grounds of natural reason and equity, I have no more inducements to give credit to their assertions than to an alike number of men holding out a tradition utterly to the contrary of what they assert.

But yet suppose that this also were granted, and that men might be allowed to speak in their own name and authority, giving testimony to themselves which, upon the hypothesis under consideration, God himself is not allowed to do — I shall desire to know whether, when the church declares the Scriptures to be the word of God unto us, it doth apprehend any thing in the Scripture as the ground of that judgment and declaration, or no? If it says, No, but that it is proposed upon its sole authority — then surely, if we think good to acquiesce in this decision of this doubt and inquiry, it is full time for us to lay aside all our studies and inquiries after the mind of God, and seek only what that man [says,] or those men say, who are intrusted with this authority — as they say, and as they would have us believe them, though we know not at all how or by what means they came by it, seeing they dare not pretend any thing from the Scripture, lest thereby they direct us to that in the first place.

If it be said that they do upon other accounts judge and believe the Scripture to be true, and to be the word of God — I suppose it will not be

thought unreasonable if we inquire after those grounds and accounts, seeing they are of so great concernment unto us; All truths in relations consisting in their consonancy and agreement to the nature of the things they deliver, I desire to know how they came to judge of the consonancy between the nature of the things delivered in the Scripture and the delivery of them therein. The things whereof we speak being heavenly, spiritual, mysterious, and supernatural, there cannot be any knowledge obtained of them but by the Word itself. How, then, can they make any judgment of the truth of that Scripture in the relation of these things which are no where to be known (I speak of many of them) in the least, but by that Scripture itself?

If they shall say that they found their judgment and declaration upon some discovery that the Scripture makes of itself unto them, they affirm the same that we plead for; only they would very desirously appropriate to themselves the privilege of being able to discern that discovery so made in the Scripture. To make good this claim, they must either plead somewhat from themselves or from the Scripture. If from themselves, it can be nothing but that they see, (like the men of China,) and all others are blind, or have but one eye at the best — being wiser than any others, and more able to discern than they. Now, though I shall easily grant them to be very subtle and cunning, yet that they are so much wiser than all the world besides — that they are meet to impose upon their belief things that they neither do nor can discern or know I would not be thought to admit, until I can believe myself and all others, not of their society or combination, to be beasts of the field, and they as the serpent amongst us. If it be from the Scripture that they seek to make good this claim, then as we cause them there to take a stand — which is all we aim at — so their plea must be from the promise of some special assistance granted to them for that purpose. If their assistance be that of the Spirit, it is either of the Spirit that is promised to believers to work in them, as before described and related, or it is some private testimony that they pretend is afforded to them. If the former be affirmed, we are in a condition wherein the necessity of devolving all on the Scripture itself, to de aide and judge who are believers, lies in every one's view; if the latter, who shall give me assurance that when they pretend that witness and testimony, they do not

he and deceive? We must here certainly go either to the Scripture or to some cunning man to be resolved. (~~2089~~ Isaiah 8:19, 20.)

I confess the argument is of great force and efficacy which hath, not long since, been singled out, and dexterously managed, by an able and learned pen,^{f51} viz., of proving the truth of the doctrine of the Scripture from the truth of the story, and the truth of the story from the certainty there is that the writers of the books of the Bible were those persons whose names and inscriptions they bear; so pursuing the evidence, that what they wrote was true and known to them so to be, from all *requisita* that may possibly be sought after for the strengthening of such evidence. It is, I say, of great force and efficacy as to the end for which it is insisted on — that is, to satisfy men's rational inquiries; but as to a ground of faith; it hath the same insufficiency with all other arguments of the like kind. Though I should grant that the apostles and penmen of the Scripture were persons of the greatest industry, honesty, integrity, faithfulness, holiness, that ever lived in the world, as they were; and that they wrote nothing but what themselves had as good assurance of as what men by their senses of seeing and hearing are able to attain: yet such a knowledge or assurance is not a sufficient foundation for the faith of the church of God. If they received not every word by inspiration, and that evidencing itself unto us otherwise than by the authority of their integrity, it can be no foundation for us to build our faith upon.

Before the committing of the Scriptures to writing, God had given the world an experiment what keepers men were of this revelation by tradition. Within some hundreds of years after the flood, all knowledge of him, through the craft of Satan and the vanity of the minds of men, which is unspeakable, was so lost, that nothing but as it were the creation of a new world, or the erection of a new church-state by new revelations, could relieve it. After that great trial, what can be further pretended on the behalf of tradition, I know not.

The sum of all is: The merciful, good providence of God having, by divers and various means — using therein, amongst other things, the ministry of men and churches — preserved the writings of the Old and New Testament in the world, and by the same gracious disposal afforded them

unto us, they are received and submitted unto by us, upon the grounds and evidences of their divine original before resisted on.

Upon the whole matter, then, I would know, if the Scripture should be brought to any man when or where he could not possibly have it attested to be the word of God — by any public or private authority of man or church, tradition or otherwise — whether he were bound to believe it or no? whether he should obey God in believing, or sin in the rejecting of it? Suppose he do but take it into consideration, do but give it the reading or hearing, seeing in every place it avers itself to be the word of God, he must of necessity either give credit unto it or disbelieve it; to hang in suspense which ariseth from the imperfect actings of the faculties of the soul — is in itself a weakness, and, in this case, being reckoned on the worst side, is interpretatively a rejection. If you say it were the duty of such a one to believe it, you acknowledge in the Scripture itself a sufficient evidence of its own original authority — without which it can be no man's duty to believe it. If you say it would not be his sin to reject and refuse it, to disbelieve all that it speaks in the name of God, then this is what you say — God may truly and really speak unto a man, (as he doth by the Scripture,) and yet that man not be bound to believe him. We deal not thus with one another.

To wind up, then, the plea insisted on in the foregoing chapter, concerning the self-evidencing light and power of the Scripture, from which we have diverted, and to make way for some other considerations that tend to the confirmation of their divine original, I shall close this discourse with the two general considerations following: —

1. Then, laying aside these failing pleas, there seems to be a *moral impossibility* that the Word of God should not manifest its own original, and its authority from thence. “Quaelibet herba Deum,” There is no work of God, as was showed, but reveals its author. A curious artificer imparts that of form, shape, proportion, and comeliness, to the fruit of his invention and work of his hands, that every one that looks upon it must conclude that it comes from skill and ability. A man in the delivery of his mind in the writing of a book, will give it such an impression of reason, that though you cannot conclude that this or that man wrote it, yet you must that it was the product of a man or rational creature; yea, some

individual men of excellency in some skill are instantly known by them that are able to judge in that art or skill by the effects of their skill. This is the piece, this is the hand, the work of such a one. How easy is it for those who are conversant about ancient authors to discover an author by the spirit and style of his writings! Now, certainly, this is strange beyond all belief, that almost every agent should give an impress to his work whereby it may be appropriated unto him; and only the Word wherein it was the design of the great and holy God to give us a portraiture, as it were, of his wisdom, holiness, and goodness, so far as we are capable of an acquaintance with him in this life — is not able to declare and evince its original That God, who is *prima Veritas*, “the first and sovereign Truth,” infinitely separated and distinguished from all creatures, on all accounts whatever, should write a book, or at least immediately indite it, commanding us to receive it as his under the penalty of his eternal displeasure, and yet that book not make a sufficient discovery of itself to be his, to be from him, is past all belief. Let men that live on things received by tradition from their fathers — who perhaps never had sense of any real transaction between God and their souls, who scarce ever perused the Word seriously in their lives, nor brought their consciences to it — please themselves in their own imaginations; the sure anchor of a soul that would draw nigh to God, in and by his Word, lies in the things laid down.

I suppose it will not be denied but that it was the mind and will of God that those to whom his Word should come should own it and receive it as his; if not, it were no sin in them to reject it unto whom it doth so come. If it were, then either he hath given those characters unto it, and left upon it that impression of his majesty, whereby it might be known to be his, or he hath not done so; and that either because he would not or because he could not. To say the latter, is to make him more infirm than a man or other worm of the earth — than any naturally effectual cause. He that saith the former, must know that it is incumbent on him to yield a satisfactory account why God would not do so, or else he will be thought blasphemously to impute a want of that goodness and love of mankind unto Him which he hath in infinite grace manifested to be in himself. That no man is able to assign any such reason, I shall firmly believe, until I find some attempting so to do — which, as yet, none have arrived at that height of impudence and wickedness as to own.

2. How horrible is it to the thoughts of any saint of God, that the Scripture should not have its authority from itself! Tertullian objects this to the Gentiles: (Apol., cap. 5:) “Facit et hoc ad causam nostram, quod apud vos de humano arbitrato divinitas pensatur; nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deusi non erit; homo jam Deo propitius esse debebit.” Would it be otherwise in this case, if the Scripture must stand to the mercy of man for the reputation of its divinity, nay, of its verity? for whence it hath its authority, thence it hath its verity also, as was observed before; and many more words of this nature might be added.

CHAPTER 6.

Consequential considerations, for the confirmation of the divine authority of the Scripture.

I said, in the former chapter, that I would not employ myself willingly to enervate or weaken any of the reasons or arguments that are usually insisted on to prove the divine authority of the Scripture. Though I confess I like not to multiply arguments that conclude to a probability only, and are suited to beget a firm opinion at best, where the principle intended to be evinced is *de fide*, and must be believed with faith divine and supernatural; yet because some may haply be kept to some kind of adherence to the Scriptures by mean grounds, that will not in their own strength abide, until they get footing in those that are more firm, I shall not make it my business to drive them from their present station, having persuaded them by that which is better.

Yea, because, on supposition of the evidence formerly tended, there may be great use, at several seasons of some consequential considerations and arguments to the purpose in hand, I shall insist on two of that kind; which, to me who have the advantage of receiving the Word on the fore-mentioned account seem not only to persuade, and in a great measure to convince to undeniable probability, but also to prevail irresistibly on the understanding of unprejudiced men to close with the divine truth of it,

The first of these is taken from the nature of the doctrine itself contained in the Scripture; the second, from the management of the whole design therein: the first is innate, the other of a more external and rational consideration.

For the first of them, there are two things considerable in the doctrine of the Scripture, that are powerful, and, if I may so say uncontrollably prevalent as to this purpose.

First, Its universal suitableness, upon its first clear discovery and revelation, to all the entanglements and perplexities of the souls of men, in reference to their relation to and dependence upon God. It all mankind have certain entanglements upon their hearts and spirits in reference unto

God — which none of them that are not utterly brutish do not wrestle withal, and which all of them are not able in the least to assoil [acquit] themselves in and about — certainly that doctrine which is suited universally to satisfy all their perplexities, to calm and quiet their spirits in all their tumultuatings, and doth break in upon them with a glorious efficacy to that purpose, in its discovery and revelation, must needs be from that God with whom we have to do, and none else. From whom else, I pray, should it be? He that can give out the Word *ille mihi semper erit Deus*.

Now, there are three general heads of things, that all and every one of mankind, not naturally brutish, are perplexed withal, in reference to their dependence on God and relation to him.

1. *How they may worship him as they ought.*
2. *How they may be reconciled and at peace with him, or have an atonement for that guilt which naturally they are sensible of.*
3. *What is the nature of true blessedness, and how they may attain it, or how they may come to the enjoyment of God.*

That all mankind are perplexed and entangled with and about these considerations — that all men ever were so, without exception, more or less, and continue so to be to this day — that of themselves they miserably grope up and down in the dark, and are never able to come to any satisfaction, neither as to what is present nor as to what is to come — I could manifest, from the state, office, and condition of conscience, the indelible *προλήψεις*, “presumptions, about them, that are in the hearts of all by nature. The whole history of all religion which hath been in the world, with the design of all ancient and present philosophy, with innumerable other uncontrollable convictions, (which also God assisting, I shall in another treatise declare,) do manifest this truth.

That, surely, then, which shall administer to all and every one of them, equally and universally, satisfaction as to all these things — to quiet and calm their spirits, to cut off all necessity of any further inquiries — give them that wherein they must acquiesce and wherewith they will be satiated, unless they will cast off that relation and dependence on God which they seek to confirm and settle; surely, I say, this must be from the

all-seeing, all-satisfying Truth and Being, and from none else. Now, this is done by the doctrine of the Scripture, with such a glorious, uncontrollable conviction, that every one to whom it is revealed, the eyes of whose understanding are not blinded by the god of this world, must needs cry out **Ἐὕρηκα** — “I have found” that which in vain I sought elsewhere, waxing foolish in my imaginations.

It would be too long to insist on the severals — take one instance in the business of atonement, reconciliation, and acceptance with God. What strange, horrible fruits and effects have men’s contrivances on this account produced! What have they not invented? what have they not done? what have they not suffered? and yet continued in dread and bondage all their days. Now, with what a glorious, soul-appeasing light doth the doctrine of satisfaction and atonement by the blood of Christ, the Son of God, come in upon such men! This first astonisheth, then conquereth, then ravisheth and satiateth the soul. This is that they looked for, this they were sick for, and knew it not. This is the design of the apostle’s discourse in the three first chapters of the Epistle to the Romans. Let any man read that discourse from chap ^{ROM} 1:18, and onward, and he will see with what glory and beauty, with what full and ample satisfaction, this doctrine breaks out. (Chap. 3:21-26.)

It is no otherwise as to the particulars of present worship or future blessedness. This meets with men in all their wanderings, stops them in their disquisitions, convinces them of the darkness, folly, uncertainty, falseness, of all their reasonings about these things; and that with such an evidence and light as at once subdues them, captivates their understanding, and quiets their souls. So was that old Roman world conquered by it; so shall the Mohammedan be, in God’s good and appointed time.

Of what hath been spoken this is the sum: All mankind, that acknowledge their dependence upon God and relation to him, are naturally (and cannot be otherwise) grievously involved and perplexed in their hearts, thoughts, and reasonings, about the worship of God, acceptation with him, (having sinned,) and the future enjoyment of him. Some with more clear and distinct apprehensions of these things, some under more dark and general notions of them, are thus exercised. To extricate themselves, and to come to some issue in and about these inquiries, hath been the great design of

their lives — the aim they had in all things they did, as they thought, well and laudably in this world. Notwithstanding all which, they were never able to deliver themselves, no, not one of them, or attain satisfaction of their souls, but waxed vain in their imaginations, and their foolish hearts were more and more darkened. In this estate of things, the doctrine of the Scripture coming in with full, unquestionable satisfaction to all these sued to the inquirings of every individual soul, with a largeness of wisdom and depth of goodness not to be fathomed it must needs be from that God with whom we have to do. And those who are not persuaded hereby, that will not cast anchor in this harbor, let them put to sea once more, if they dare; turn themselves loose to other considerations, and try if all the fore-mentioned perplexities do not inevitably return.

Another consideration of the doctrine of the Scripture to this purpose regards some particulars of it. There are some doctrines of the Scripture, some revelations in it so *sublimely glorious, of so profound and mysterious an excellency*, that at the first proposal of them, nature startles, shrinks, and is taken with horror, meeting with that which is above it, too great and too excellent for it, which it could desirously avoid and decline but yet, gathering itself up to them, it yields, and finds that unless they are accepted and submitted unto, though unsearchable, not only all that hath been received must be rejected, but also the whole dependence of the creature on God be dissolved, or rendered only dreadful, terrible, and destructive to nature itself. Such are the doctrines of the Trinity, of the incarnation of the Son of God, of the resurrection of the dead, of the new birth, and the like. At the first revelation of these things nature is amazed, cries, “How can these things be?” or gathers up itself to opposition: “This is babbling” — like the Athenians; “Folly” — as all the wise Greeks. But when the eyes of reason are a little confirmed, though it can never clearly behold the glory of this sun, yet it confesseth a glory to be in it above all that it is able to apprehend. I could manifest, in particular, that the doctrines before mentioned, and several others, are of this importance; namely, though great above and beyond the reach of reason, yet, upon search, found to be such, as, without submission to them, the whole comfortable relation between God and man must needs be dissolved.

Let us take a view in our way of one of the instances. What is there, in the whole book of God, that nature at first sight doth more recoil at, than the

doctrine of the Trinity? How many do yet stumble and fall at it! I confess; the doctrine itself is but sparingly — yet it is clearly and distinctly — delivered unto us in the Scripture. The sum of it is: That God is one — his nature or his being one: that all the properties or infinite essential excellencies of God, as God, do belong to that one nature and being: that this God is infinitely good, holy, just, powerful; he is eternal, omnipotent, omnipresent; and these things belong to none but him — that is, that one God: that this God is the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; which are not diverse names of the same person, nor distinct attributes or properties of the same nature or being, but one, another, and a third, all equally that one God, yet really distinguished between themselves by such incommunicable properties as constitute the one to be that one, and the other to be that other, and the third to be that third. Thus, the Trinity is not the union nor unity of three, but it is a trinity in unity, or the ternary number of persons in the same essence; nor doth the Trinity, in its formal conception, denote the essence, as if the essence were comprehended in the Trinity, which is in each person; but it denotes only the distinction of the persons comprised in that number.

This, I say, is the sum of this doctrine, as it is delivered unto us in the Scripture. Here reason is entangled; yet, after a while, finds evidently, that unless this be embraced, all other things wherein it hath to do with God will not be of value to the soul. This will quickly be made to appear. Of all that communion which is here between God and man, founded the revelation of his mind and will unto him, which makes way for his enjoyment in glory, there are these two parts: —

1st, God's gracious communication of his love, goodness, etc., with the fruits of them, unto man;

2d, The obedience of man unto God, in a way of gratitude for that love, according to the mind and will of God revealed to him. These two comprise the whole of the intercourse between God and man. Now, when the mind of man is exercised about these things, he finds at last that they are so wrapped up in the doctrine of the Trinity, that without the belief, receiving, and acceptance: of it, it is utterly impossible that any interest in them should be obtained or preserved.

For the first, or the communication of God unto us in a way of love and goodness, it is wholly founded upon and inwrapped in this truth, both as to the eternal spring and actual execution of it, A few instances will evince this assertion. The eternal fountain of all grace, flowing from love and goodness, lies in God's election, or predestination. This being an act of God's will, cannot be apprehended but as an eternal act of his Wisdom or Word also. All the eternal thoughts of its pursuit lie in the covenant that was between the Father and the Son, as to the Son's undertaking to execute that purpose of his. This I have at large elsewhere declared.

Take away, then, the doctrine of the Trinity, and both these are gone; there can be no purpose of grace by the Father in the Son — no covenant for the putting of that purpose in execution: and so the foundation of all fruits of love and goodness is lost to the soul.

As to the execution of this purpose, with the actual dispensation of the fruits of grace and goodness unto us, it lies wholly in the unspeakable condescension of the Son unto incarnation, with what ensued thereon. The incarnation of the eternal Word by the power of the Holy Ghost, is the bottom of our participation of grace. Without it, it was absolutely impossible that man should be made partaker of the favor of God. Now, this inwraps the whole doctrine of the Trinity in its bosom, nor can once be apprehended without its acknowledgment, Deny the Trinity, and all the means of the communication of grace, with the whole of the satisfaction and righteousness of Christ, fall to the ground. Every tittle of it speaks this truth; and they who deny the one reject the other.

Our actual participation of the fruits of this grace is by the Holy Ghost. We cannot ourselves seize on them, nor bring them home to our own souls. The impossibility hereof I cannot now stay to manifest. Now, whence is this Holy Ghost? Is he not sent from the Father by the Son? Can we entertain any thought of his effectual working in us and upon us, but it includes this whole doctrine? They, therefore, who deny the Trinity, deny the efficacy of its operation also.

So is it as to our obedience unto God, whereby the communion between God and man is completed. Although the formal object of divine worship be the nature of God, and the persons are not worshipped as persons distinct, but as they are each of them God; yet, as God, they are every one

of them distinctly to be worshipped. So is it as to our faith, our love, our thanksgiving, all our obedience, as I have abundantly demonstrated in my treatise of distinct communion with the Father in love, the Son in grace, and the Holy Ghost in the privileges of the gospel. Thus, without the acknowledgment of this truth, none of that obedience which God requireth at our hands can in a due manner be performed.

Hence, the Scripture speaks not of any thing *between God and us* but what is founded on this account. The Father worketh, the Son worketh, and the Holy Ghost worketh. The Father worketh not but by the Son and his Spirit; the Son and Spirit work not but from the Father. The Father glorifieth the Son, the Son glorifieth the Father, and the Holy Ghost glorifieth them both. Before the foundation of the world the Son was with the Father, and rejoiced in his peculiar work for the redemption of mankind. At the creation, the Father made all things, but by the Son and the power of the Spirit. In redemption, the Father sends the Son; the Son, by his own condescension, undertakes the work, and is incarnate by the Holy Ghost. The Father, as was said, communicates his love and all the fruits of it unto us by the Son, as the Holy Ghost doth the merits and fruits of the mediation of the Son. The Father is not known nor worshipped, but by and in the Son; nor Father nor Son, but by the Holy Ghost, etc.

Upon this discovery, the soul that was before startled at the doctrine in the notion of it, is fully convinced that all the satisfaction it hath sought after, in its seeking unto God, is utterly lost if this be not admitted. There is neither any foundation left of the communication of love to him, nor means of returning obedience unto God. Besides, all the things that he hath been inquiring after appear, on this account, in their glory, beauty, and reality, unto him; so that that which most staggered him at first in the receiving of the truth, because of its deep, mysterious glory, doth now most confirm him in the embracing of it, because of its necessity, power, and heavenly excellency.

And this is one argument of the many belonging to the things of the Scripture, that, upon the grounds before mentioned, hath in it, as to my sense and apprehension, an evidence of conviction not to be withstood.

Another consideration of the like efficacy may be taken from a brief view of the whole Scripture, with the design of it. The consent of parts, or harmony of the Scripture in itself, and every part of it with each other and with the whole, is commonly pleaded as an evidence of its divine original. This much, certainly, it doth evince, beyond all possible contradiction, that the whole proceedeth from one and the same principle, hath the same author, and he wise, discerning, able to comprehend the whole compass of what he intended to deliver and reveal. Otherwise, or by any other, that oneness of spirit, design, and aim, in unspeakable variety and diversity of means of its delivery — that absolute correspondency of it to itself, and distance from any thing else — could not have been attained. Now, it is certain that this principle must be *summum* in its kind either *bonum* or *malum*. If the Scripture be what it reveals and declares itself to be, it is then unquestionably the “word of the living God,” truth itself; for that it professeth of itself from the beginning to the ending — to which profession, all that it reveals answers absolutely and unquestionably in a tendency to his glory alone. If it be not so, it must be acknowledged that the author of it had a blasphemous design to hold forth himself to be God, who is not so — a malicious design to deceive the sons of men, and to make them believe that they worship and honor God, and obey him, when they do not, and so to draw them into everlasting destruction; and that to compass these ends of blasphemy, atheism, and malice, he hath laid out, in a long course of time, all the industry and wisdom that a creature could be made partaker of. Now, he that should do thus must be the devil, and none else: no other creature can possibly arrive at that height of obstinacy in evil. Now, certainly, whilst God is pleased to continue unto us any thing whereby we are distinguished from the beasts that perish, whilst there is a sense of a distance between good and evil abiding amongst men, it cannot fall upon the understanding of any man that that doctrine which is so holy and pure — so absolutely leading to the utmost improvement of whatever is good, just, commendable, and praiseworthy — so suitable to all the light of God, of good and evil, that remains in us — could proceed from any one everlastingly hardened in evil, and that in the pursuit of the most wicked design that that wicked one could possibly be engaged in, namely, to enthrone himself, and maliciously to cheat, cozen, and ruin the souls of men; so that upon necessity the Scripture can own no author but him whose it is — even the living God.

As these considerations are far from being the bottom and foundation of our faith, in our assenting to the authority of God in the Word, so, on the supposition of what is so, they have a usefulness, as to support in trials and temptations, and the like seasons of difficulty: but of these things so far.

OF THE INTEGRITY AND PURITY

OF THE

HEBREW AND GREEK TEXT OF THE SCRIPTURE;

WITH

*CONSIDERATIONS ON THE PROLEGOMENA AND APPENDIX TO THE
LATE "BIBLIA POLYGLOTTA."*

PREFATORY NOTE.

THERE is a tendency to acquiesce in the general verdict against our author for the part he took in the controversy with Walton on the subject of the London Polyglott, without any very careful inquiry into the grounds on which it rests. Dr Owen, we are convinced, has been the victim of unintentional misrepresentation on this point, partly through the dexterous management of Walton, partly through his own want of caution in properly defining his position, and partly because on some points he was completely in error. Dr Twells, in his biography of Pococke, accuses Owen of writing against the Polyglott; and Mr Todd, in his biography of Walton, bitterly re-echoes the charge. Even his friendly biographer, Mr Orme, intimates that he viewed the Polyglott "With jealousy or disapprobation." No statement could be more unfounded. Transparent honesty and perfect truthfulness were leading features of his character; and we cannot think of him as speaking in any other terms but those of warm and unfeigned admiration, when he eulogizes the Polyglott as "a noble collection," "a great and useful work," "which he much esteemed," and when he declares that he "would never fail, on all just occasions, to commend the usefulness of the work, and the learning, diligence, and pains, of the worthy persons that have brought it forth." Dr Chalmers, also, in

reference to this controversy, censures Owen as “illiterate” for the views he expressed in it, and contrasts “the lordly insolence of the prelate” with “the outrageous violence of the puritan.” There is more of alliteration than truth in the contrast. Walton’s short-lived prelacy did not begin till after his controversy with Owen; and the charge of “outrageous violence” against the latter appears to have been suggested by the misrepresentation of his antagonist. Owen professed a desire to conduct the dispute “with Christian candor and moderation of spirit;” and, on the whole, he redeemed his pledge.

On the minute and multifarious details of biblical literature, our author assuredly must yield the palm to Walton. It was not his province. But the real merits of the controversy between them involve two questions, and by his opinions on these it must be judged whether the condemnation so unsparingly heaped on him is altogether well founded. These questions relate to the various readings in the original text of Scripture, and to the antiquity of Hebrew punctuation.

1. On the subject of various readings, Owen had submitted, in the epistle dedicatory, at the beginning of the former treatise, ample evidence that Papists had resorted on a great scale to the artifice of magnifying the corruption of the text, in order to exalt the Vulgate and support the claim of their church to infallibility. As critical research multiplied the various readings by the inspection of the ancient codices, Protestant divines took alarm, and, trembling for the ark of truth, discountenanced such inquiries. That Owen was altogether free from the panic cannot be affirmed. We must sympathize, however, with any pious jealousy for the honor of the holy oracles, in an age when sound principles of criticism had not been clearly established. It will be new, moreover, to many readers, who have hitherto assumed as true the charge against Owen of ignorant antipathy to the duties and advantages of sacred criticism, when they are told that he not only admitted the existence of various readings, but held that if any others could be discovered from a collation of manuscripts, they “deserved to be considered;” differing in this respect from Dr Whitby, who, at a later period, in 1710, published his “*Examen Variantium Lectionum*,” in opposition to Mill’s edition of the New Testament, taking up ground from which Owen would have recoiled, and insisting that every word in the common text stood as originally written, — “in its omnibus lectionem

textus defendi posse.” Owen acknowledged and proclaimed the fact, that in spite of all the variety in the readings, not a single doctrine was vitally affected by them. In regard to them, he objected to the unnecessary multiplication of very trivial differences, — an objection of no moment, stated in a single sentence, and never afterwards pressed. He objected further to the practice of Cappell, in making innovations on the received text by the authority of translations only, on the ground that these translations were made from copies *essentially different* from any now extant. He exonerates Walton from this error, but deems him not sufficiently careful to refrain from admitting into his Polyglott readings gathered from such a source. It was against Cappell’s theory that he chiefly wrote; and some strong expressions used in regard to it are quoted by Walton, in his reply to the following treatise, as directed sweepingly against the Polyglott. Few now would ratify the innovations of Cappell. Dr Davidson, in his standard work on biblical criticism, “sighs over the groundless conjectures introduced into parts of the Old Testament text by Cappell.” Owen’s main objection, however, reproduced frequently in the course of his tract, was against the attempt to amend the text by mere conjecture. There is still a diversity of opinion as to the legitimacy of this source of criticism. Griesbach repudiated the use of it in his edition of the New Testament. Marsh would avail himself of it in regard to the Old Testament, but not in regard to the New. Davidson reckons the cautious use of it lawful in regard to both. At all events, Walton himself professed to discard it as an instrument of criticism; and yet, as Owen shows, he admitted into the Polyglott the conjectural emendations of Grotius. Even Simon, an admirer of Grotius, while commending his notes, complains that he “sometimes multiplies the various readings without necessity.” So far, therefore, as it was a question of principle between them, Walton was not in advance of Owen. So far as it was a question of fact, Owen had rather the best of the dispute.

2. As to Hebrew punctuation, Owen held the points to be part of Scripture, and as sacred and ancient as the other elements of the text. Here he may have erred, but it was in honorable company, — with the Buxtorfs, Gerard, Glass, Voet, Flacius Illyricus, Lightfoot, Leusden, and others. Cappell, in 1624, though wrong on the question of criticism, adopted the opinions of a learned Jew, Elias Levita, who wrote in 1520,

and of some Jewish and Christian writers even before the days of Levita, and first took strong ground in denying the antiquity of the Hebrew points, and tracing them to the school of the Masoretes. Still, the question was not determined. Schultens, in 1737, followed by Michaelis, adopted an intermediate course, contending that some points had been in use from the earliest ages of the language, Eichhorn and Gesenius were inclined to believe in the existence of some points before the Talmud and the days of Jerome. It was only in 1830 that Hupfeld is considered to have set the question at rest, by proving the Masoretic punctuation to have been unknown both to the authors of the Talmud and to Jerome. It is a question which it has taken the discussion of centuries to settle, and some may even yet be disposed to think that all the difficulties connected with Hupfeld's view are not eliminated from it, and that some apparatus corresponding to the points must have been needed to secure uniformity in Hebrew pronunciation during successive ages, and in all parts of the world, wherever in ancient times there were Jews to speak their own tongue or read their own Scriptures.

Owen erred in various matters of detail; but the same allegation, though not to the same extent, might be made respecting Walton, who advanced opinions in the controversy which no modern scholar would endorse with his sanction. Owen erred also in betraying a nervous sensitiveness, lest an imposing array of various readings should invalidate the authority of the sacred text. The spirit in Which Walton replied, however, cannot be justified, — transmuting the hypothetical reasonings of his adversary into positive averments, and applying to the Polyglott what he wrote against Bellarmine, Leo Castrius, Morin, and Cappell, whose principles of criticism were notoriously unsound and dangerous. Owen begins the following treatise by stating, that after he had finished but before he had sent off the manuscript of the preceding treatise “On the Original of Scripture,” the London Polyglott had reached him. “Palpable untruth!” exclaimed Walton; “for in that treatise there are two references to the Polyglott;” — as if they could not have been inserted after he had seen it, the more especially as on seeing it Owen declares that he took time for consideration. It is to be wished that he had taken more time, and been more guarded, and less rash on this occasion. He would have been less open in minor details to the rebukes of his learned and haughty antagonist;

with whom, after all, we cannot help feeling some degree of sympathy, in his fears lest the rude breath of jealous criticism should scorch the laurel due to his brow for devising and completing that stupendous monument of enterprise, learning, and industry, — the *Biblia Sacra Polyglotta Londini*. — ED.

CHAPTER 1.

The occasion of this discourse — The danger of supposing corruptions in the originals of the Scripture — The great usefulness of the Biblia Polyglotta — The grounds of the ensuing animadversions — The assertions proposed to be vindicated laid down — Their weight and importance — Sundry principles in the Prolegomena prejudicial to the truth contended for laid down — Those principles formerly asserted by others — Reasons of the opposition made to them.

WHEN this whole little precedent treatise ^{f52} was finished and ready to be given out unto the stationer, there came to my hands the Prolegomena and Appendix to the Biblia Polyglotta lately published. Upon the first sight of that volume, I was somewhat startled with that bulky collection of various reading which the appendix tenders to the view of every one that doth but cast an eye upon it. Within a while after, I found that others also, men of learning and judgment, had apprehensions of that work not unlike those which my own thoughts had suggested unto me. Afterward, considering what I had written about the providence of God in the preservation of the original copies of the Scripture in the foregoing discourse, fearing lest, from that great appearance of variations in the original copies, and those of all the translations, published with so great care and diligence, there might some unconquerable objections against the truth of what I had asserted be educed, I judged it necessary to stop the progress of those thoughts until I could get time to look through the Appendix and the various lections in that great volume exhibited unto us, with the grounds and reasons of them in the Prolegomena. Having now discharged that *task* and (as things were stated) *duty*, I shall crave leave to deliver my thoughts to some things contained in them, which possibly men of perverse minds may wrest to the prejudice of my former assertions, — to the prejudice of the certainty of divine truth, as continued unto us, through the providence of God, in the originals of the Scripture.

What use hath been made, and is as yet made, in the world, of this supposition, that corruptions have befallen the originals of the Scripture, which those various lections at first view seem to intimate, I need not

declare. It is, in brief, the foundation of Mohammedanism (Alcor. Azoar. 5), the chiefest and principal prop of Popery, the only pretense of fanatical anti-scripturists, and the root of much hidden atheism in the world.^{f53} At present there is sent unto me by a very learned person, upon our discourse on this subject, a treatise in English, with the Latin title of “Fides Divina,” wherein its nameless author, on this very foundation, labors to evert and utterly render useless the whole Scripture. How far such as he may be strengthened in their infidelity by the consideration of these things time will manifest.

Had there not been, then, a necessity incumbent on me either utterly to desist from pursuing any thoughts of publishing the foregoing treatise, or else of giving an account of some things contained in the Prolegomena and Appendix, I should, for many reasons, have abstained from this employment. But the truth is, not only what I had written in the first chapter about the providence of God in the preservation of the Scripture, but also the main of the arguments afterward insisted on by me concerning the self-evidencing power and light of the Scripture, receiving, in my apprehension, a great weakening by the things I shall now speak unto, if owned and received as they are proposed unto us, I could not excuse myself from tinning the hazard of giving my thoughts upon them.

The wise man tells us that he considered “all travail, and every right work, and that for this a man is envied of his neighbor;” which, saith he, is “vanity and vexation of spirit,” ^{<2000>}Ecclesiastes 4:4. It cannot be denied but that this often falls out, through the corruption of the hearts of men, that when works, right works, are with most sore travail brought forth in the world, their authors are repaid with envy for their labor; which mixes all the issues of the best endeavors of men with vanity and vexation of spirit. Jerome of old and Erasmus of late are the usual instances in this kind. That I have any of that guilt in a peculiar manner upon me in reference to this work of publishing the Biblia Polyglotta, which I much esteem, or the authors and contrivers of it, whom I know not,^{f54} I can with due consideration, and do, utterly deny. The Searcher of all hearts knows I lie not. And what should possibly infect me with that leaven? I neither profess any deep skill in the learning used in that work, nor am ever like to be engaged in any thing that should be set up in competition with it, nor did I ever know that there was such a person in the world as the chief

author of this edition of the Bible but by it. I shall, then, never fail, on all just occasions, to commend the usefulness of this work, and the learning, diligence, and pains, of the worthy persons that have brought it forth; nor would be wanting to their full praise in this place, but that an entrance into this discourse with their due commendations might be liable to misrepresentations. But whereas we have not only the Bible published, but also private opinions of men, and collections of various readings (really or pretendedly so we shall see afterward), tending some of them, as I apprehend, to the disadvantage of the great and important truth that I have been pleading for, tendered unto us, I hope it will not be grievous to any, nor matter of offense, if, using the same liberty that they or any of them whose hands have been most eminent in this work have done, I do, with, I hope, Christian candor and moderation of spirit, briefly discover my thoughts upon some things proposed by them.

The renownedly learned prefacer to the Arabic translation in this edition of it tells us that the work of translating the Pentateuch into that language was performed by a Jew, who took care to give countenance to his own private opinions, and so render them authentic by bringing them into the text of his translation.

It is not of any such attempt that I have any cause to complain, or shall so do in reference to these Prolegomena and Appendix; only I could have wished (with submission to better judgments be it spoken) that, in the publishing of the Bible, the sacred text, with the translations, and such naked historical accounts of their originals and preservation as were necessary to have laid them fair and open to the judgment of the reader, had not been clogged with disputes and pleas for particular private opinions, imposed thereby with too much advantage on the minds of men by their constant neighborhood unto canonical truth.

But my present considerations being not to be extended beyond the concernment of the truth which in the foregoing discourse I have pleaded for, I shall first propose a brief abstract thereof, as to that part of it which seems to be especially concerned, and then lay down what to me appears in its prejudice in the volumes now under debate, not doubting but a fuller account of the whole will by some or other be speedily tendered unto the learned and impartial readers of them. The sum of what I am pleading for,

as to the particular head to be vindicated, is, *That as the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament were immediately and entirely given out by God himself, his mind being in them represented unto us without the least interveniency of such mediums and ways as were capable of giving change or alteration to the least iota or syllable; so, by his good and merciful providential dispensation, in his love to his word and church, his whole word, as first given out by him, is preserved unto us entire in the original languages; where, shining in its own beauty and lustre (as also in all translations, so far as they faithfully represent the originals), it manifests and evidences unto the consciences of men, without other foreign help or assistance, its divine original and authority.*

Now, the several assertions or propositions contained in this position are to me such important truths, that I shall not be blamed in the least by my own spirit, nor I hope by any others, in contending for them, judging them fundamental parts of the faith once delivered to the saints; and though some of them may seem to be less weighty than others, yet they are so concatenated in themselves, that by the removal or destruction of any one of them, our interest in the others is utterly taken away. It will assuredly be granted that the persuasion of the coming forth of the word immediately from God, in the way pleaded for, is the foundation of all faith, hope, and obedience. But what, I pray, will it advantage us that God did so once deliver his word, if we are not assured also that that word so delivered hath been, by his special care and providence, preserved entire and uncorrupt unto us, or that it doth not evidence and manifest itself to be his word, being so preserved? Blessed, may we say, were the ages past, who received the word of God in its unquestionable power and purity, when it shone brightly in its own glorious native light, and was free from those defects and corruptions which, through the default of men in a long tract of time, it hath contracted; but for us, as we know not well where to lay a sure foundation of believing that this book rather than any other doth contain what is left unto us of that word of his, so it is impossible we should ever come to any certainty almost of any individual word or expression whether it be from God or no. Far be it from the thoughts of any good man, that God, whose covenant with his church is that his word and Spirit shall never depart from it, ^{<2502>}Isaiah 59:21, ^{<0188>}Matthew 5:18, ^{<0125>}Peter 1:25, ^{<0123>}1 Corinthians 11:23, ^{<0803>}Matthew 28:20, hath left it in

uncertainties about the things that are the foundation of all that faith and obedience which he requires at our hands.

As, then, I have in the foregoing treatise evinced, as I hope, the self-evidencing light and power of the Scripture, so let us now candidly, for the sake and in the pursuit of truth, — dealing with a mind freed from prejudices and disquieting affections, save only the trouble that arises from the necessity of dissenting from the authors of so useful a work, — address ourselves to the consideration of what seems in these Prolegomena and Appendix to impair the truth of the other assertions about the entire preservation of the word as given out from God in the copies which yet remain with us. And this I shall do, not doubting but that the persons themselves concerned will fairly accept and weigh what is conscientiously tendered.

As, then, I do with all thankfulness acknowledge that many things are spoken very honorably of the originals in these Prolegomena, and that they are in them absolutely preferred above any translation whatever,^{f55} and asserted in general as the authentic rule of all versions, contrary to the thoughts of the publisher of the great Parisian Bibles, and his infamous *hyperaspistes*, Morinus; so, as they stand in their aspect unto the Appendix of various lections, there are both opinions and principles, confirmed by suitable practices, that are of the nature and importance before mentioned.

1. After a long dispute to that purpose, it is determined that the Hebrew points or vowels, and accents, are a *novel invention* of some Judaical Rabbins, about five or six hundred years *after the giving out of the gospel*.

^{f56} Hence, —

(1.) An antiquity is ascribed to some *translations*, two or three at the least, above and before the invention of these points; whose agreement with the original cannot, therefore, by just consequence, be tried by the present text, as now pointed and accented.

(2.) The whole credit of our reading and interpretation of the Scripture, as far as regulated by the present *punctuation*, depends solely on the faithfulness and skill of those Jews whose invention this work is asserted to be.

2. The קרי וּפְתִיב, of which sort are above eight hundred in the Hebrew Bibles, are various lections, partly gathered by some Judaical Rabbins out of ancient copies, partly their critical amendments.^{f57} And, therefore, —

After these various lections, as they are esteemed, are presented unto us in their own proper order, wherein they stand in the great Bibles (not surely to increase the bulk of diverse readings, or to present a face of new variety to a less attentive observer, but) to evidence that they are such various lections as above described, they are given us over a second time, in the method whereinto they are cast by Cappellus, the great patriarch of these mysteries.^{f58}

3. That there are such alterations befallen the *original* as, in many places, may be rectified by the translations that have been made of old.^{f59}

And therefore, —

Various lections may be observed and gathered out of those translations, by considering how they read in their copies, and wherein they differed from those which we now enjoy.^{f60}

4. It is also declared, that where any *gross faults* or corruptions are befallen the originals, men may by their faculty of critical conjecturing, amend them, and restore the native lections that were lost; though in general, without the authority of copies, this may not be allowed.^{f61}

And therefore, —

A collection of various readings out of Grotius, consisting for the most part in such conjectures, is in the Appendix presented unto us.

5. The *voluminous bulk of various lections*, as nakedly exhibited, seems sufficient to beget scruples and doubts in the minds of men about the truth of what hath been hitherto by many pretended concerning the preservation of the Scripture through the care and providence of God.

It is known to all men acquainted with things of this nature that in all these there is no *new opinion* coined or maintained by the learned prefacer to these Bibles; the severals mentioned have been asserted and maintained by sundry learned men. Had the opinion about them been kept in the ordinary sphere of men's private conceptions, in their own private writings,

running the hazard of men's judgments on their own strength and reputation, I should not from my former discourse have esteemed myself concerned in them. Every one of us must give an account of himself unto God. It will be well for us if we are found holding the foundation. If we build hay and stubble upon it, though our work perish, we shall be saved. Let every man in these things be fully persuaded in his own mind; it shall be to me no offense. It is their being laid as the foundation of the usefulness of these Biblia Polyglotta, with an endeavor to render them catholic, not in their own strength, but in their appendage to the authority that on good grounds is expected to this work, that calls for a due consideration of them. All men who will find them stated in these Prolegomena may not perhaps have had leisure, may not perhaps have the ability, to know what issue the most of these things have been already driven unto in the writings of private men.

As I willingly grant, then, that some of these things may, without any great prejudice to the truth, be candidly debated amongst learned men, so taking them altogether, placed in the advantages they now enjoy, I cannot but look upon them as an engine suited to the destruction of the important truth before pleaded for, and as a fit weapon put into the hands of men of atheistical minds and principles, such as this age abounds withal, to oppose the whole evidence of truth revealed in the Scripture. I fear, with some, either the pretended *infallible judge* or the *depth of atheism* will be found to lie at the door of these considerations. "Hoc Ithacus vellet." But the debate of the advantage of either Romanists or Atheists from hence belongs to another place and season. Nor is the guilt of any consequences of this nature charged on the workmen, which yet may be feared from the work itself.

CHAPTER 2.


Of the purity of the originals — The ἀυτόγραφα of the Scripture lost — That of Moses, how and how long preserved — Of the book found by Hillkiah — Of the ἀυτόγραφα of the New Testament — Of the first copies of the originals — The scribes of those copies not ζεόπνευστοι — What is ascribed to them — The great and incomparable care of the scribes of it — The whole word of God, in every tittle of it, preserved entire in the copies of the original extant — Heads of arguments to that purpose — What various lections are granted in the original of the Old and New Testaments — Sundry considerations concerning them, manifesting them to be of no importance — That the Jews have not corrupted the text — The most probable instances considered.

HAVING given an account of the *occasion* of this discourse, and mentioned the particulars that are, all or some of them, to be taken into further consideration, before I proceed to their discussion, I shall, by way of addition and explanation to what hath been delivered in the former treatise, give a brief account of my apprehensions concerning the purity of the present original copies of the Scripture, or rather copies in the original languages, which the church of God doth now and hath for many ages enjoyed as her chiefest treasure; whereby it may more fully appear what it is we plead for and defend against the insinuations and pretences above mentioned.

First, then, it is granted that the individual ἀυτόγραφα of Moses, the prophets, and the apostles, are in all probability, and as to all that we know, utterly perished and lost out of the world; as also the copies of Ezra The reports mentioned by some to the contrary are open fictions.^{f62} The individual ink and parchment, the rolls or books that they wrote, could not without a miracle have been preserved from moldering into dust before this time. Nor doth it seem improbable that God was willing by their loss to reduce us to a nearer consideration of his care and providence in the preservation of every tittle contained in them. Had those individual writings been preserved, men would have been ready to adore them, as the Jews do their own ἀπόγραφα in their synagogues.

Moses, indeed, delivered his original copy of the Pentateuch in a public assembly unto the Levites (that is, the sons of Korah), to be put into the sides of the ark, and there kept for a perpetual monument, ^{<1612>}Deuteronomy 31:25, 26. That individual book was, I doubt not, preserved until the destruction of the temple. There is, indeed, no mention made of the book of the law in particular, when the ark was solemnly carried into the holy place after the building of Solomon's temple, ^{<1609>}2 Chronicles 5:4, 5; but the tabernacle of the congregation continued until then. That, and all that was in it, are said to be "brought up," verse 5. Now, the placing of the book by the sides of the ark being so solemn an ordinance, it was no doubt preserved; nor is there any pretense to the contrary. Some think the book found by Hilkiah in the days of Josiah was this **καλὴ παραθήκη**, or **αὐτόγραφον** of Moses, which was placed by the sides of the ark. It rather seems to have been some ancient sacred copy, used in the service of the temple, and laid up there, as there was in the second temple, ^{f63} which was carried in triumph to Rome: for besides that he speaks of his finding it in general in the house of the Lord, upon the occasion of the work which was then done, ^{<1615>}2 Chronicles 34:15, which was not in or about the holy place, where he, who was high priest, knew full well this book was kept, it doth not appear that it was lawful for him to take that sacred depositum from its peculiar archives to send it abroad, as he dealt with that book which he found; nay, doubtless, it was altogether unlawful for him so to have done, it being placed there by a peculiar ordinance, for a peculiar or special end. After the destruction of the temple, all inquiry after that book is in vain. The author of the Second Book of Maccabees mentions not its hiding in Nebo by Jeremiah, with the ark and altar, or by Josiah, as say some of the Talmudists; nor were it of any importance if they had. Of the Scripture preserved in the temple at its last destruction, Josephus gives us a full account, De Bell. Jud. lib. 7, cap. 24.

Secondly, For the Scriptures of the New Testament, it doth not appear that the **αὐτόγραφα** of the several writers of it were ever gathered into one volume, there being now no one church to keep them for the rest. The epistles, though immediately transcribed for the use of other churches, ^{<1610>}Colossians 4:16, were doubtless kept in the several churches whereunto they were directed. From those **πρωτότυπα** there were quickly

ἐκτυπούμενα, “transcribed copies,” given out to “faithful men,”  Timothy 2:1, whilst the infallible Spirit yet continued his guidance in an extraordinary manner.

For the first transcribers of the original copies, and those who in succeeding ages have done the like work from them, whereby they have been propagated and continued down to us, in a subserviency to the providence and promise of God, we say not, as is vainly charged by Morinus and Cappollus, that they were all or any of them ἀναμάρτητοι, and ζέόπνευστοι, “infallible and divinely inspired,” so that it was impossible for them in any thing to mistake. It is known, it is granted, that failings have been amongst them, and that various lections are from thence risen; of which afterward. Religious care and diligence in their work, with a due reverence of Him with whom they had to do, is all we ascribe unto them. Not to acknowledge these freely in them, without clear and unquestionable evidence to the contrary, is high uncharitableness, impiety, and ingratitude. This care and diligence, we say, in a subserviency to the promise and providence of God, hath produced the effect contended for; nor is any thing further necessary thereunto. On this account to argue, as some do, from the miscarriages and mistakes of men, their oscitancy and negligence in transcribing the old heathen authors, Homer, Aristotle, Tully, we think it not tolerable in a Christian, or any one that hath the least sense of the nature and importance of the word, or the care of God towards his church. Shall we think that men who wrote out books wherein themselves and others were no more concerned than it is possible for men to be in the writings of the persons mentioned, and others like them, had as much reason to be careful and diligent in that they did as those who knew and considered that every letter and tittle that they were transcribing was part of the word of the great God, wherein the eternal concernment of their own souls and the souls of others did lie? Certainly, whatever may be looked for from the religious care and diligence of men lying under a loving and careful aspect from the promise and providence of God, may be justly expected from them who undertook that work. However, we are ready to own all their failings that can be proved. To assert in this case without proof is injurious.

The Jews have a common saying among them, — that to *alter one letter of the law is no less sin than to set the whole world on fire*; and shall we think

that in writing it they took no more care than a man would do in writing out Aristotle or Plato, who for a very little portion of the world would willingly have done his endeavor to get both their works out of it? Considering that the word to be transcribed was, every **יֶדְוָא** and tittle of it, the word of the great God; that that which was written, and as written, was proposed as his, as from him; that if any failings were made, innumerable eyes of men, owning their eternal concernment to lie in that word, were open upon it to discover it, and thousands of copies were extant to try it by; and all this known unto and confessed by every one that undertook this work, — it is no hard matter to prove their care and diligence to have outdone that of other common scribes of heathen authors. The truth is, they are prodigious things that are related of the exact diligence and reverential care of the ancient Jews in this work, especially when they intrusted a copy to be a rule for the trial and standard of other private copies. Maimonides in **הלכות ספר תורה** chap. 8:3, 4, tells us that Ben Asher spent many years in the careful, exact writing out of the Bible. Let any man consider the twenty things which they affirm to profane a book or copy, and this will further appear. They are repeated by Rabbi Moses, Tractat. de Libro Legis. cap. 10. One of them is, **אות אחת** **שחסר אפילו**, “If but one letter be wanting;” and another, “If but one letter be redundant.” Of which more shall be spoken if occasion be offered.

Even among the heathen, we will scarce think that the Roman pontifices, going solemnly to transcribe the Sibyls’ verses, would do it either negligently or treacherously, or alter one tittle from what they found written; and shall we entertain such thoughts of them who knew they had to do with the living God, and that in and about that which is dearer to Him than all the world besides? Let men, then, clamor as they please, and cry out of all men as ignorant and stupid which will not grant the corruptions of the Old Testament which they plead for, which is the way of Morinus; or let them propose their own conjectures of the ways of the entrance of the mistakes that they pretend are crept into the original copies, with their remedies, which is the way of Cappellus; we shall acknowledge nothing of this nature but what they can prove by undeniable and irrefragable instances, — which, as to any thing as yet done by them or those that follow in their footsteps, appears upon the matter to be

nothing at all. To this purpose take our sense in the words of a very learned man:

“Ut in iis libris qui sine vocalibus conscripti sunt, certum constantemque exemplarium omnium, tum excusarnm scriptionem similemque omnino comperimus, sic in omnibus etiam iis quibus puncta sunt addita, non aliam cuipiam nec discrepantem aliis punctationem observavimus; nec quisquam est qui ullo in loco diversa lectionis Hebraicae exemplaria ab iis quae circumferuntur, vidisse se asserat, modo grammaticam rationem observatam dicat. Et quidem Dei consilio ac voluntate factum putamus, ut cum magna Graecorum Latinorumque fere omnium ejusdem auctoris exemplarium, ac praesertim manuscriptorum pluribus in locis varietas deprehendatur, magna tamen in omnibus Hebraicis, quaecunque nostro saeculo inveniuntur, Bibliis, scriptionis aequalitas, similitudo atque constantia servetur quocunque modo scripta ilia sint, sive solis consonantibus constant, sive punctis etiam instructa visantur,” Arias Montan. praefat, ad Biblia Interlin. de Varia Hebraicorum Librorum Scriptione et Lectione.

It can, then, with no color of probability be asserted^{f64} (which yet I find some learned men too free in granting), namely, that there hath the same fate attended the Scripture in its transcription as hath done other books. Let me say without offense, this imagination, asserted on deliberation, seems to me to border on atheism. Surely the promise of God for the preservation of his word, with his love and care of his church, of whose faith and obedience that word of his is the only rule, requires other thoughts at our hands.

Thirdly, We add, that *the whole Scripture*, entire as given out from God, without any loss, is preserved in the *copies of the originals* yet remaining; what varieties there are among the copies themselves shall be afterward declared. In them all, we say, is every letter and tittle of the word. These copies, we say, are the rule, standard, and touchstone of all translations, ancient or modern, by which they are in all things to be examined, tried, corrected, amended; and themselves only by themselves. Translations contain the word of God, and are the word of God, perfectly or imperfectly, according as they express the words, sense, and meaning of

those originals. To advance any, all translations concurring, into an equality with the originals, — so to set them by it as to set them up with it on even terms, — much more to propose and use them as means of castigating, amending, altering any thing in them, gathering various lections by them, is to set up an altar of our own by the altar of God, and to make equal the wisdom, care, skill, and diligence of men, with the wisdom, care, and providence of God himself. It is a foolish conjecture of Morinus, from some words of Epiphanius, that Origen in his Octapla placed the translation of the LXX. in the midst, to be the rule of all the rest, even of the Hebrew itself, that was to be regulated and amended by it: “Media igitur omnium catholica editio collocata erat, ut ad eam Hebraea caeteraeque editiones exigenter et emendarentur,” Exercit. lib. 1, cap. 3, p. 15. The truth is, he placed the Hebrew, in Hebrew characters, in the first place, as the rule and standard of all the rest; the same in Greek characters in the next place; then that of Aquila; then that of Symmachus; after which, in the fifth place, followed that of the LXX., mixed with that of Theodotion.

The various arguments giving evidence to this truth that might be produced are too many for me now to insist upon, and would take up more room than is allotted to the whole discourse, should I handle them at large, and according to the merit of this cause.

1. The *providence of God* in taking care of his word, which he hath magnified above all his name, as the most glorious product of his wisdom and goodness, his great concernment in this word answering his promise to this purpose;
2. The *religious care* of the church (I speak not of the Romish synagogue) to whom these oracles of God were committed;
3. The care of the first writers in giving out *authentic copies* of what they had received from God unto many, which might be rules to the first transcribers;
4. The *multiplying copies* to such a number that it was impossible any should corrupt them all, wilfully or by negligence;
5. The preservation of the *authentic copies*, first in the Jewish synagogues, then in the Christian assemblies, with reverence and diligence;

6. The *daily reading* and studying of the word by all sorts of persons, ever since its first writing, rendering every alteration liable to immediate observation and discovery, and that all over the world; with,
7. The consideration of the many *millions* that looked on every letter and tittle in this book as their inheritance, which for the whole world they would not be deprived of: and in particular, for the Old Testament (now most questioned),
8. The care of Ezra and his companions, *the men of the great synagogue*, in restoring the Scripture to its purity when it had met with the greatest trial that it ever underwent in this world, considering the paucity of the copies then extant,^{f65}
9. The *care of the Masoretes* from his days and downward, to keep perfect and give an account of every syllable in the Scripture, — of which see Buxtorfius, Com. Mas.;
10. The *constant consent* of all copies in the world, so that, as sundry learned men have observed, there is not in the whole Mishna, Gemara, or either Talmud, any one place of Scripture found otherwise read than as it is now in our copies;
11. The security we have that no mistakes were voluntarily or negligently brought into the text before the coming of our Savior, who was to *declare* all things, in that he not once reproves the Jews on that account, when yet for their false glosses on the word he spares them not;^{f66}
12. Afterward the watchfulness which the two nations of Jews and Christians had always one upon another, — with sundry things of the like importance, might to this purpose be insisted on. But of these things I shall speak again, if occasion be offered.

Notwithstanding what hath been spoken, we grant that there are and have been various lections in the Old Testament. and the New. For the Old Testament, the Keri and Ketib, the various readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, of the eastern and western Jews, evince it. Of the קרי וכתוב I shall speak particularly afterward. They present themselves to the view of every one that but looks into the Hebrew Bible. At the end of the great Rabbinical Bibles (as they are called) printed by Bombergus at Venice, as

also in the edition of Buxtorfius at Basil, there is a collection of the various readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, of the eastern and western Jews — we have them also in this Appendix. For the two first mentioned, they are called among the Jews, one of them, R. Aaron, the son of Moses, of the tribe of Asher; the other, R. Moses, the son of David, of the tribe of Naphtali. They flourished, as is probable, among the Jews, about the year of Christ 1030, or thereabouts, and were teachers of great renown, the former in the west or Palestina, the latter in the east or Babylon. In their exact consideration of every letter, point, and accent of the Bible, wherein they spent their lives, it seems they found out some varieties. Let any one run them through as they are presented in this Appendix, he will find them to be so small, consisting for the most part in unnecessary accents, of no importance to the sense of any word, that they deserve not to be taken notice of. For the various readings of the oriental or Babylonian, and occidental or Palestine Jews, all that I know of them (and I wish that those that know more of them would inform me better) is, that they first appeared in the edition of the Bible by Bombergus, under the care of Felix Pratensis, gathered by R. Jacob Ben Chajim, who corrected that impression. But they give us no account of their original, nor (to profess my ignorance) do I know any that do: it may be some do, but in my present haste I cannot inquire after them. But the thing itself proclaims their non-importance; and Cappellus, the most skillful and diligent improver of all advantages for impairing the authority of the Hebrew text, so to give countenance to his “*Critica Sacra*,” confesses that they are all trivial, and not in matters of any moment. Besides these, there are no other various lections of the Old Testament. The conjectures of men conceited of their own abilities to correct the word of God are not to be admitted to that title. If any others can be gathered, or shall be hereafter, out of ancient copies of credit and esteem, where no mistake can be discovered as their cause, they deserve to be considered. Men must here deal by instances, not conjectures. All that yet appears impairs not in the least the truth of our assertion, that every letter and tittle of the word of God remains in the copies preserved by his merciful providence for the use of his church.

As to Jews, besides the mad and senseless clamor in general for corrupting the Scriptures, three things are with most pretense of reason objected against them: — The **תקון סופרים**, *tikkun sopherim*, or “correctio

scribarum,” by which means it is confessed by Elias that eighteen places are corrected. But all things are here uncertain: uncertain that ever any such things were done; uncertain who are intended by their sopherim, — Ezra and his companions most probably; nor do the particular places enumerated discover any such correction. They are all in particular considered by Glassius, lib. 1, tract. 1; but the whole matter is satisfactorily determined by Buxtorfius in his letters to Glassius, printed by him, and repeated again by Amama, Anti. Barb. Bib. lib. 1 p. 30, 31. Because this thing is much insisted on by Galatinus to prove the Jews’ corrupting of the text, it may not be amiss to set down the words of that great master of all Jewish learning: —

“Ad tertium quaesitum tuum, de tikkun sopherim, 18 voces hanc eensuram subiisse Massora passim notat. Receusio locorum in vestibulo libri Numerorum, et Psalm cvi. Utrobique non nisi 16 recensentur, sed in ^{דברים} Numbers 12:12 duo exempla occurrunt, ut notat R. Solomon. Deest ergo unus locus mihi, quem ex hullo Judaeo hactenus, expiscari potui, nec magnus ille Mercerus eum invenit. Galatinus hoc thema non intellexit, et aliena exempla admiscet. Sic et alii qui corruptlones ista ease putant. Nec ullum hactenus ex nostris sire evangelicis sire catholicis vidi, qui explicarit, quae fuerint scribae isti, et quales **תיקונים** ipserum. Quam antiquae hae nostre de tikkun sint, liquido mihi nondum constat. Autiquior ipsarum memoria est in libro **ספרו**, qui ante Talmud Babylonicum fertur conscriptua Dissentiunt tamen Hebraei de ejus autore et tempore. In Talmud neutro ulla plane istlus tikkun mentio fit, cum alias **עומר סופרים** longe minoris negotii in Talmud commemoretur. Si aliter ista loca fuissent aliquando scripta, Onkelos et Jonathan id vel semel expressissent. Nec Josephus reticuisset, qui contrarium Hebraeis adscribit, nullam scilicet unquam literam mutatam fuisse in lege ab Hebraeis popularibus suis, lib. 1 contra Apionem. Talmudistae in Leviticus 27 vers. ult. diversis locis notant, nec prophetae ulli licitum fuisse vel minimum in lege mutare vel innovare. Quomodo ergo scribae quidam vulgares hanc audaciam sibi arrogassent, textum sacrum in literis et sensu corrigere? In silentio itaque omnium, in aurem tibi dico, Sopherim hosee fuisse ipsos autores sacros, Mosen et

Prophetas, qui nunquam aliter scripserunt quam hodie scripture legitur. At sapientes Hebraeorum nasutiores, animadvertentes inconvenientiam quandam in istis locis, scripserunt, aliter istes autores loqui debuisse, et secundum cohaerentiam propositi textus, sic vel sic scribere, sed pro eo maluisse sic scribere, et id sic efferre, ut illud hodie in textu est. Veluti ^{<182>}Genesis 18:22, lecture scriptum, ‘Et Abraham adhuc stabat coram Domino.’ Itane? ubi legitur, inquiunt sapientes, quod Abraham venerit ad Dominum, et steterit coram eo; contrarium dicitur in praecedentibus, Deus scilicet venit ad Abraham, et dixit ad eum, ‘Num ego celo ab Abrahamo,’ etc. ‘Clamor Sodomae et Gomorrhae magnus est,’ etc. Ideoque Moses scribere debuit, ‘Et Dominus adhuc stabat coram Abrahamo.’ At ita serviliter de Deo loqui non decuit Mosen, unde תיקון ^{<183>}correxit et mutavit stylum sermonis, honoris majoris causa, et dixit, ‘Et Abraham adhuc stabat,’ etc. Hinc R. Salamo adjicit היה לו לכתוב scribendum ipsi (Mosi) erat, (Seu) scribere debebat, Et Dommus stabat; non quod ahter sic scripserit antea, et postea id ab aliis scribis correctum sit, aut corruptum. Hinc R. Aben Ezra, ad aliquot loca irridet nasutos, inquiens, nullo tikkun opus fuisse, id est, nihil esse, quod nasuti isti sapientes putarint, autorem debuisse aliter ibi loqui vel scribere. Vide et eum Job. 32:3. Habes mysterium proluxe explieatum, in quo et multi Hebraeorum impegerunt.” Thus far Buxtorfius.

The עיטור סופרים are insisted on by the same Galatinus; but these are only about the use of the letter ך four or five times, which seem to be of the same rise with them foregoing.

But that which makes the greatest cry at present is the corruption of ^{<184>}Psalms 22:17, where, instead of כַּאֲרִי, which the LXX. translated "ὡς λέων, “They digged” or “pierced,” — that is, “my hands and feet,” — the present Judaical copies, as the Antwerp Bibles also, read כַּאֲרִי, “as a lion,” so depraving the prophecy of our Savior’s suffering, “They digged (or pierced) my hands and my feet,” leaving it no sense at all; “As a lion my hands and my feet.” Simeon de Muis upon the place pleads the substitution of ך for ך to be a late corruption of the Jews; at least, כַּאֲרִי was the Keri, and was left out by them. Johannes Isaac, lib. 2 ad Lindan.,

professes that when he was a Jew, he saw כְּאֵרִי in a book of his grandfather's. Buxtorf affirms one to have been the Ketib, the other the Keri, and proves it from the Masera; and blames the Antwerp Bibles for printing כְּאֵרִי in the line. With him agree Genebrard, Pagninus, Vatablus, Mercer, Rivet, etc. Others contend that Ca-ari, "as a lion," ought to be retained, repeating ὑπὸ κοινοῦ, the verb הִקִּיפוּנִי, "They compassed me about," affirming also that word to signify, "to tear, rend, and strike;" so that the sense should be, "They tear my hands and feet as a lion." So Voetius, De Iusolubil. Scripturae. But that כְּאֵרִי cannot be here rendered "sicut leo" most evince, partly from the anomalous position of the prefix כ with Kamets, but chiefly from the Masora, affirming that that word is taken in another sense than it is used ^{<288C>}Isaiah 38:13, where it expressly signifies, "as a lion." The shorter determination is, that from the radix כָּרַה by the epenthesis תוֹוֹ נ, and the change which is used often of ל into ' (as in the same manner it is ^{<1504>}Ezra 10:44), in the third person plural, the preterperfect tense of kal is כָּאֵרִי, "perfoderunt, "they digged," or "pierced through my hands and my feet." But to what purpose is this gleaning after the vintage of Mr Pococke to this purpose in his excellent Miscellanies?

The place of old instanced in by Justin Martyr, ^{<990>}Psalm 96:10, where he charges the Jews to have taken out these words, ἀπὸ ξύλου, "from the wood," making the sense, "The LORD reigneth from the wood," or the tree, so pointing out the death of Christ on the cross, is exploded by all; for besides that he speaks of the Septuagint, not of the Hebrew text, it is evident that those words were foisted into some few copies of that translation, never being generally received, as is manifested by Fuller, Miscellan. lib. 3 cap. 13. And it is a pretty story that Arias Montanus tells us of a learned man (I suppose he means Lindanus) pretending that those words were found in a Hebrew copy of the Psalms, of venerable antiquity, beyond all exception, here in England; which copy coming afterward to his hand, he found to be a spurious, corrupt, novel transcript, wherein yet the pretended words are not to be found! Arias Mont. Appar. de Variis Lec. Heb. et Mass. And I no way doubt, but that we want opportunity to search and sift some of the copies that men set up against the common reading in sundry places of the New Testament, we

should find them not one whit better or of more worth than he found that copy of the Psalms.

CHAPTER 3.

Of various lections in the Greek copies of the New Testament.

FOR various lections in the Greek copies of the New Testament, we know with what diligence and industry they have been collected by some, and what improvement hath been made of those collections by others. Protestants, for the most part, have been the chiefest collectors of them. Stephanus, Camerarius, Beza, Cameron, Grotius, Drusius, Heinsius, De Dieu, Cappellus, all following Erasmus, have had the prime hand in that work. Papists have ploughed with their heifer to disparage the original, and to cry up the Vulgar Latin. A specimen of their endeavors we have in the late virulent exertions of Morinus. At first very few were observed. What a heap or bulk they are now swelled unto we see in this Appendix. The collection of them makes up a book bigger than the New Testament itself! Of those that went before, most gave us only what they found in some particular copies that themselves were possessors of; some, those only which they judged of importance, or that might make some pretense to be considered whether they were proper or no. Here we have all that by any means could be brought to hand, and that whether they are tolerably attested for various lections or no; for as to any contribution unto the better understanding of the Scripture from them, it cannot be pretended. And whither this work may yet grow I know not.

That there are in some copies of the New Testament, and those some of them of some good antiquity, *diverse readings*, in things or words of less importance, is acknowledged. The proof of it lies within the reach of most, in the copies that we have; and I shall not solicit the reputation of those who have afforded us others out of their own private furniture. That they have been all needlessly heaped up together, if not to an eminent scandal, is no less evident. Let us, then, take a little view of their rise and importance.

That the Grecian was once as it were the vulgar language of the whole world of Christians is known. The writing of the New Testament in that language in part found it so, and in part made it so. What thousands, yea, what millions of copies of the New Testament were then in the world, all

men promiscuously reading and studying of the Scripture, cannot be reckoned. That so many transcriptions, most of them by private persons, for private use, having a standard of correction in their *public assemblies* ready to relieve their mistakes, should be made without some variation, is **ἐκ τῶν ἀδυνάτων**. From the copies of the first ages, others in the succeeding have been transcribed, according as men had opportunity. From those which are come down to the hands of learned men in this latter age, whereof very few or none at all are of any considerable antiquity, have men made it their business to collect the various readings we speak of; with what usefulness and serviceableness to the churches of God others that look on must be allowed their liberty to judge. We know the vanity, curiosity, pride, and naughtiness of the heart of man; how ready we are to please ourselves with things that seem singular and remote from the observation of the many, and how ready to publish them as evidences of our learning and diligence, let the fruit and issue be what it will. Hence it is come to pass, — not to question the credit of any man speaking of his manuscripts, which is wholly swallowed in this Appendix, — that whatever varying word, syllable, or tittle, could be by any observed, wherein any book, though of yesterday, varieth from the common received copy, though manifestly a mistake, superfluous or deficient, inconsistent with the sense of the place, yea, barbarous, is presently imposed on us as a various lection.

As, then, I shall not speak any thing to derogate from the worth of their labor who have gathered all these various readings into one body or volume, so I presume I may take liberty without offense to say, I should more esteem of theirs who would endeavor to search and trace out these pretenders to their several originals, and, rejecting the spurious brood that hath now spavined itself over the face of so much paper, that ought by no means to be brought into competition with the common reading, would reduce them to such a necessary number, whose consideration might be of some other use than merely *to create a temptation* to the reader that nothing is left sound and entire in the word of God.

However, now Satan seems to have exerted the utmost of his malice, men of former ages the utmost of their negligence, of these latter ages of their diligence, — the result of all which we have in the present collection in this Appendix, — with them that rightly ponder things there ariseth nothing at

all to the prejudice of our assertion; as may possibly, God assisting, be further manifested hereafter, in the particular consideration of some or all of these diverse readings therein exhibited unto us. Those which are of importance have been already considered by others, especially Glassius, tract. 1, lib. i.

It is evident that the design of this Appendix was to gather together every thing of this sort that might by any means be afforded. At the present, that the reader may not be too much startled at the fruit of their diligence whose work and labor it was, I shall only remark concerning it some few things that, on a general view of it, occur unto me: —

First, then, here is professedly no choice made nor judgment used in *discerning* which may indeed be called various lections, but all differences whatever that could be found in any copies, printed or written, are equally given out. Hence many differences that had been formerly rejected by learned men for open corruptions are here tendered us again. The very first observation in the treatise next printed unto this collection, in the Appendix itself, rejects one of the varieties as a corruption. So have some others of them been by Arias Montanus, Cameron, and many more. It is not every variety or difference in a copy that should presently be cried up for a various reading. A man might with as good color and pretense take all the printed copies he could get of various editions, and gathering out the *errata typographica*, print them for various lections, as give us many, I shall say the most, of those in this Appendix under that name. It may be said, indeed, that the composers of this Appendix found it not incumbent on them to make any judgment of the readings which *de facto* they found in the copies they perused, but merely to represent what they so found, leaving the judgment of them unto others. I say also it may be so; and therefore, as I do not reflect on them nor their diligence, so I hope they or others will not be offended that I give this notice of what judgment remains yet to be made concerning them.

Secondly, Whereas Beza, who is commonly blamed by men of all sides and parties for making too bold upon various lections, hath professedly *stigmatized his own manuscript*, that he sent unto Cambridge, as so corrupt in the Gospel of Luke that he durst not publish the various lections of it, for fear of offense and scandal (however, he thought it had

not fallen into the hands of heretics, that had designedly depraved it), we have here, if I mistake not, all the corruptions of that copy given us as various readings; for though I have not seen the copy itself, yet the swelling of the various lections in that Gospel into a bulk as big or bigger than the collection of all the New Testament, — besides the [other] Gospels and Acts, wherein that copy is cited one thousand four hundred and forty times, — puts it out of all question that so we are dealt withal. Now, if this could be taken, and every stigmatized copy may be searched for differences, and these presently printed as various readings, there is no doubt but we may have enough of them to frighten poor unstable souls into the arms of the pretended infallible guide; — I mean as to the use that will be made of this work by such persons as Morinus.

Thirdly, I am not without apprehensions that “opere in longo obrepit somnus,” and that whilst the learned collectors had their hands and minds busied about other things, some *mistakes* did fall into this work of gathering these various lections. Some things I meet withal in it that I profess I cannot bring to any good consistency among themselves. To let pass particular instances, and insist on one only of a more general and eminent importance: — in the entrance unto this collection an account is given us of the *ancient copies* out of which these observations are made; among the rest one of them is said to be an ancient copy in the library of Emmanuel College in Cambridge: this is noted by the letters Em. throughout the whole collection. Now, whereas it is told us, in these preliminary cautions and observations, that it contains only Paul’s Epistles, I wonder how it is come to pass that so many various lections in the Gospels and Acts as in the farrago itself are fixed on the credit of that book could come to be gathered out of a copy of Paul’s Epistles. Certainly here must be some mistake, either in the learned authors of the previous directions, or by those employed to gather the varieties following. And it may be supposed that that mistake goes not alone; so that, upon a further consideration of particulars, it may be we shall not find them so clearly attested as at first view they seem to be. It would indeed be a miracle, if, in a work of that variety, many things should not escape the eye of the most diligent observer.

I am not, then, upon the whole matter, out of hopes but that, upon a diligent review of all these various lections, they may be reduced to a less

offensive and less formidable number. Let it be remembered that the vulgar copy we use was the public possession of many generations, — that upon the invention of printing it was in actual authority throughout the world with them that used and understood that language, as far as any thing appears to the contrary; let that, then, pass for the standard, which is confessedly its right and due, and we shall, God assisting, quickly see how little reason there is to pretend such varieties of readings as we are now surprised withal: for, —

1. Let those places be *separated* which are not sufficiently attested unto, so as to pretend to be various lections; it being against all pretense of reason that every mistake of every obscure, private copy, perhaps not above two or three hundred years old (or if older), should be admitted as a various lection, against the current consensus of, it may be, all others that are extant in the world, and that without any congruity of reason as to the sense of the text where it is fallen out. Men may, if they please, take pains to inform the world wherein such and such copies are corrupted or mistaken, but to impose their known failings on us as various lections is a course no, to be approved.

2. Let the same judgment, and that deservedly, pass on all those *different places* which are altogether inconsiderable, consisting in *accents* or the change of a *letter*, not in the least intrenching on the sense of the place, or giving the least intimation of any other sense to be possibly gathered out of them but what is in the approved reading. To what end should the minds of men be troubled with them or about them, being evident mistakes of the scribes, and of no importance at all?

3. Let them also be removed from the pretense, which carry their own convictions along with them that they are *spurious*, either, —

(1.) By their *superfluity*, or *redundancy* of unnecessary words; or,

(2.) Their *deficiency* in words evidently necessary to the sense of their places; or,

(3.) Their *incoherence* with the text in their several stations; or,

- (4.) [By giving] *evidence* of being intended as expository of difficulties, having been moved and assoiled by some of the ancients upon the places, and their resolutions being intimated; or,
- (5.) Are foisted out of the Septuagint, as many places out of the New have been inserted into that copy of the *Old*; or,
- (6.) Are taken out of one *place* in the same penman and are used in *another*; or,
- (7.) Are apparently taken out of *one Gospel* and supplied in another, to make out the sense of the place; or,
- (8.) Have been corrected *by the Vulgar Latin*, — which hath often fallen out in some copies, as Lucas Brugensis shows us on ◀Matthew 17:2, ◀Mark 1:38, 7:4, and sundry other places; or,
- (9.) Arise out of *copies apparently corrupted*, like that of Beza in Luke, and that in the Vatican boasted of by Huntley the Jesuit, which Lucas Brugensis affirms to have been changed by the Vulgar Latin, and which was written and corrected, as Erasmus says, about the [time of the] council of Florence, when an agreement was patched up between the Greeks and Latins; or, (10.) Are notoriously corrupted by the old *heretics*, as ◀1 John 5:7. Unto which heads many, yea, the most of the various lections collected in this Appendix may be referred. I say, if this work might be done with care and diligence (whereunto I earnestly exhort some in this university, who have both ability and leisure for it), it would quickly appear how small the number is of those varieties in the Greek copies of the New Testament which may pretend unto any consideration under the state and title of various lections, and of how very little importance they are to weaken in any measure my former assertion concerning the care and providence of God in the preservation of his word. But this is a work of more time and leisure than at present I am possessor of; what is to come, ξεοῦ ἐν γούνασι κείται. In the meantime I doubt not but to hear tidings from Rome concerning this variety, no such collection having as yet been made in the world.

CHAPTER 4.

General premises — Opinions prejudicial to the authority of the originals in the Prolegomena enumerated — The just consequences of these premises — Others engaged in these opinions — Of Cappellus — Of Origen, Ximenes, Arias Montanus' editions of the Bible.

Having now declared in what sense, and with what allowance as to various lections, I maintain the assertion laid down in the foregoing treatise concerning the providential preservation of the whole book of God, so that we may have full assurance that we enjoy the whole revelation of his will in the copies abiding amongst us, I shall now proceed to weigh what may be objected further (beyond what hath already been insisted on) against the truth of it from the Prolegomena and Appendix to the Biblia Polyglotta, at the entrance of our discourse proposed to consideration: —

To speak somewhat of them in general, I must crave leave to say, — and it being but the representation of men's avowed judgments, I hope I may say without offense, — that together with many high and honorable expressions concerning the originals, setting aside the incredible figment of the Jews corrupting the Bible out of hatred to the Christians, which, being first supposed by Justin Martyr (though he speaks of the LXX. only), hath scarce found one or two since to own it, but is rejected by the universality of learned men, ancient and modern, unless some few Papists mad upon their idols, and the *thesis* preferring in general this or that translation above the original, there is no opinion that I know of that was ever ventilated among Christians, tending to the depression of the worth or impairing the esteem of the Hebrew copies, which is not, directly or by just consequence, owned in these Prolegomena. Thence it is contended that the present *Hebrew character* is not that used by God himself and in the old church before the captivity of Babylon, but it is the Chal-dean, the other being left to the Samaritans; that the *points* or *vowels*, and *accents*, are a late invention of the Tiberian Masoretes, long after sundry translations were extant in the world; that the Keri and Ketib are *critical notes*, consisting partly of various lections gathered by the late Masoretes and Rabbis; that considering how oftentimes, in likelihood, translators read

the text before the invention of the points and accents, the present reading may be corrected and amended by them, and that because the old translators had other copies, or different copies from them which we now enjoy; that where *gross faults* are crept into the Hebrew text, men may by their own conjectures find out various lections whereby they may be amended, — and to this purpose an instance of such various lections, or rather corrections of the original, is in the Appendix exhibited unto us out of Grotius; that the books of the Scriptures having had the fate of other books, — by passing through the hands of many transcribers, they have upon them the marks of their negligence, ignorance, and sloth.

Now, truly, I cannot but wish that some other way had been found out to give esteem and reputation to this *noble collection* of translations than by espousing these opinions, so prejudicial to the truth and authority of the originals. And it may be justly feared, that where *one* will relieve himself against the uncertainty of the originals by the consideration of the various translations here exhibited unto us, being such as upon trial they will be found to be, *many* will be ready to question the foundation of all.

It is true, the learned prefacer owns not those wretched consequences that some have labored to draw from these premises; yet it must be acknowledged, also, that sufficient security against the lawful deriving those consequences from these premises is not tendered unto us. He says not that because this is the state of the Hebrew language and Bible, therefore all things in it are dubious and uncertain, easy to be turned unto various senses, not fit to be a rule for the trial of other translations, though he knows full well who think this a just consequence from the opinion of the *novelty of the vowels*; and himself grants that all our knowledge of the Hebrew is taken from the translation of the LXX., as he is quoted to that purpose by Morinus, Praefat. ad Opusc. Hebrae. Samarit. He concludes not that on these accounts we must rely upon an *infallible living judge*, and the translation that he shall commend unto us, though he knows full well who do so; and himself gives it for a rule, that at the correction of the original we have the consent of the guides of the church. I could desire then, I say, that sufficient security may be tendered us against these inferences before the premises be embraced, seeing great and wise men, as we shall further see anon, do suppose them naturally and necessarily to flow from them.

It is confessed that some learned men, even among the Protestants, have heretofore vented these or some of these paradoxes; especially Cappellus, in his “Arcanum Punctuationis Revelatum,” “Critica Sacra,” and other treatises; in the defense whereof, as I hear, he still laboureth, being unwilling to suffer loss in the fruit of so great pains. What will become of his reply unto Buxterfius in the defence of his *Critica* I know not. Reports are that it is finished; and it is thought he must once more flee to the Papists by the help of his son, a great zealot amongst them; as he did with his *Critica*, to get it published. The generality of learned men among Protestants are not yet infected with this leaven; nor, indeed, do I find his boldness in conjecturing approved in these Prolegomena. But let it be free for men to make known their judgments in the severals mentioned. It hath been so, and may it abide so still. Had not this great and useful work been prefaced with the stating of them, it had not been of public concernment (as now it seems to be) to have taken notice of them.

Besides, it is not known whither this inconvenience will grow. Origen, in his *Octapla*, as was declared, fixed the Hebrew original as the rule and measure of all translations. In the reviving of that kind of work by Ximenes in the Complutensian Bibles, its station is left unto it. Arias Montanus, who followed in their steps (concerning whose performances under his master the king of Spain, I may say, for sundry excellencies, “*Nil oriturum alias, nil ortum tale*”), was religiously careful to maintain the purity of the originals, publishing *the Hebrew verity* (as it is called by Jerome, Austin, and others of the ancients) as the rule of examining by it all translations whatever; for which he is since accused of ignorance by a petulant Jesuit,^{f67} that never deserved to carry his books after him. Michael Le Jay hath given a turn to this progress, and in plain terms exalts a corrupt translation above the originals, and that upon the principle under consideration, as is abundantly manifest from Morinus. And if this change of judgment, which hath been long insinuating itself, by the curiosity and boldness of critics, should break in also upon the protestant world, and be avowed in public works, it is easy to conjecture what the end will be. We went from Rome under the conduct of *the purity* of the originals; I wish none have a mind to return thither again under the pretense of their *corruption*.

CHAPTER 5.

The original of the points proposed to consideration in particular — The importance of the points to the right understanding of the Scripture — The testimony of Morinus, Junius, Johannes Isaac, Cevallerius, and others — The use made by the Papists of the opinion of the novelty of the points — The importance of the points further manifested — The extreme danger of making the Hebrew punctuation arbitrary — That danger evinced by instance — No relief against that danger on the grounds of the opinion considered — The authors of the Hebrew punctuation according to the Prolegomena; who and what — Morinus' folly — The improbability of this pretense — The state of the Jews, the supposed inventors of the points, after the destruction of the temple — Two attempts made by them to restore their religion: the first under Barchochab, with its issue; the second under R. Judah, with its issue — The rise and foundation of the Talmuds — The state of the Jews upon and after the writing of the Talmuds — Their rancor against Christ — Who the Tiberian Masoretes were that are the supposed authors of the Hebrew punctuation; their description — That figment rejected — The late testimony of Dr Lightfoot to this purpose — The rise of the opinion of the novelty of the points — Of Elias Levita — The value of his testimony in this case — Of the validity of the testimony of the Jewish Rabbins — Some considerations about the antiquity of the points: the first, from the nature of the punctuation itself, in reference unto grammatical rules; [the second,] from the Chaldee paraphrase, and integrity of the Scripture as now pointed.

THIS being, in my apprehension, the state of things amongst us, I hope I may without offense proceed to the consideration of the particulars before mentioned, from whence it is feared that objections may arise against the purity and self-evidencing power of the Scriptures, pleaded for in the foregoing treatise. That which in the first place was mentioned, is the assertion of the *points or vowels, and accents, to be a novel invention of some Rabbins of Tiberias in Palestina*. This the learned author of the

Prolegomena defends with Cappellus' arguments, and such other additions as he was pleased to make use of. To clear up the concernments of our truth in this particular, it will be necessary to consider, —

1. What *influence* in the fight understanding of the text these points have, and necessarily must have;
2. What is their *original*, or whom their invention is ascribed unto in these Prolegomena. As to the assertive part of this controversy, or the vindication of their true sacred original, some other occasion may call for additions to what is now (by the way) insisted on. And as I shall not oppose them who maintain that they are coevous with the letters, — which are not a few of the most learned Jews and Christians, — so I nowise doubt but that, as we now enjoy them, we shall yet manifest that they were completed by **בְּנֵי הַגְּדוֹלָה אֲנָשִׁי**, the men of the great synagogue, Ezra and his companions, guided therein by the infallible direction of the Spirit of God.

That we may not seem **ἀεροζατεῖν**, or to contend de lana caprina, the importance of these points as to the right understanding of the word of God is first to be considered, and that from testimony and the nature of the thing itself. Morinus, in his preface to his Hebrew Lexicon, tells us that without the points no certain truth can be learned from the Scriptures in that language, seeing all things may be read divers ways, so that there will be more confusion in that one tongue than was amongst all those at Babylon: “Nulla igitur certa doctrina poterit tradi de hac lingua, cum omnia possint diversimodo legi, ut futura sit major confusio unice hujus linguae quam illa Babylonia” Morinus plainly affirms that it is so indeed, instancing in the word **דָּבָר**, which, as it may be variously pointed, hath at least eight several significations, and some of them as distant from one another as heaven and earth. And to make evident the uncertainty of the language on this account, he gives the like instance in *c, r, s*, in Latin. Junius, in the close of his animadversions on Bell. De Verbo Dei, lib. 2, cap. 2, commends that saying of Johannes Isaac against Lindanus, “He that reads the Scriptures without points is like a man that rides a horse **ἀγάλλινος**, without a bridle; he may be carried he knows not whither.” Radulphus Cevalerlus goes further: Rudiment. Ling. Heb. cap. 4, “Quod superest de vocalium et centuum antiquitate, eorum sententiae subscribo,

qui linguam Hebraeam, tanquam omnium aliarum ἀρχέτυπον absolutissimum, plane ab initio scriptam confirmant; quandoquidem qui contra sentiunt non modo auctoritatem sacrae Scripturae dubiam efficiunt, seal radicitus (meo quidem iudicio) convellunt, quod absque vocalibus et distinctionum notis, nihil certi firmique habeat;” — “As for the antiquity of the vowels and accents,” saith he, “I am of their opinion who maintain the Hebrew language, as the exact pattern of all others, to have been plainly written with them from the beginning; seeing that they who are otherwise minded do not only make doubtful the authority of the Scriptures, but, in my judgment, wholly pluck it up by the roots, for without the vowels and notes of distinction it hath nothing firm and certain.”

In this man’s judgment (which also is my own), it is evident to all how obnoxious to the opinion now opposed the truth is that I am contending for.

To these also may be added the great Buxtorfs, father ^{f68} and son, ^{f69} Gerard, ^{f70} Glassius, ^{f71} Voetius, ^{f72} Flacius Illyricus, ^{f73} Polanus, Whitaker, Hassret, ^{f74} Wolthius. ^{f75}

It is well known what use the Papists make of this conceit. Bellarmine maintains that there are errors crept into the original by this addition of the points: De Verb. Dei, lib. 2, cap. 2, “Hisce duabus sententiis refutatis, restat tertia, quam ego verissimam puto, quae est, Scripturas Hebraicas non esse in universum depravatas opera et malitia Judaeorum, nec tamen omnino esse integras et puras, sed habere suos errores quosdam, qui partita irrepererint negligentia et ignorantia librariornm, etc., partim ignorantia Rabbiorum qui puncta addiderunt; itaque possumus, si volumus, puncta detrahare et aliter legere;” — “These two opinions being confuted, the third remaineth, which I suppose to be most true; which is, that the Hebrew Scriptures are not universally corrupted by the malicious work of the Jews, nor yet are wholly pare and entire, but that they have errors, which have crept in partly by the negligence and ignorance of the transcribers, partly by the ignorance of the Rabbins who added the points; whence we may, if we please, reject the points and read otherwise.”

In the voluminous opposition to the truth made by that learned man, I know nothing more perniciously spoken, nor do yet know how his

inference can be avoided on the hypothesis in question. To what purpose this insinuation is made by him is well known, and his companions in design exactly declare it. That their Hebrew text be corrected by the Vulgar Latin is the express desire of Gregory de Valentia, tom. 1 disput. 5, q. 3; and that because the church hath approved that translation, it being corrected (says Huntley) by Jerome before the invention of points. But this is put out of doubt by Morinus, who from hence argues the Hebrew tongue to be a very nose of wax, to be turned by men which way they please, and to be so given of God on purpose that men might subject their consciences to their infallible church, Exercit. lib. 1 exer. 1 cap. 2. Great hath been the endeavor of this sort of men, wherein they have left no stone unturned, to decry the originals. Some of them cry out that the Old Testament is corrupted by the Jews, as Leo Castrins, ^{f76} Gordonius Huntlaeus, ^{f77} Melchior Canus, ^{f78} Petrus Galatinus, ^{f79} Morinus, ^{f80} Salmeron, Pintus, Mersennus, Animad. in Problem. Georgii Venet, etc., p. 233; ^{f81} — that many corruptions have crept into it by negligence and the carelessness of scribes, so Beltarmine, ^{f82} Genebrard, ^{f83} Sixtus Senensis, ^{f84} with most of the rest of them. In these things, indeed, they have been opposed by the most learned of their own side, as Arias Montanus, ^{f85} Johannes Isaac, ^{f86} Pineda, ^{f87} Masius, ^{f88} Ferrarius, ^{f89} Andradius, and sundry others, who speak honorably of the originals. But in nothing do they so pride themselves as in this conceit of the novelty of the Hebrew punctuation, whereby they hope, with Abimelech's servants, utterly to stop the wells and fountains from whence we should draw our souls' refreshment.

This may serve for a short view of the opinions of the parties at variance, and their several interests in these opinions. The importance of the points is on all hands acknowledged, Whether aiming at the honor or dishonor of the originals. Vowels are the life of words; consonants without them are dead and immovable; by them are they carried to any sense, and may be to divers. It is true that men who have come to acquaintance with the Scriptures by the help of the vowels and accents, being in possession of an habitual notion and apprehension of that sense and meaning which ariseth from them, may possibly think that it were a facile thing to find out and fix upon the same sense by the help of the *matres lectionis* ׀׀׀׀, and the consideration of antecedents and consequents, with such like assistances.

But let them be all taken out of the way (as I shall manifest it is fit they should be, if they have the original assigned to them by the Prolegomena), and let men lay aside that advantage they have received from them, and it will quickly appear into what devious ways all sorts of such persons will run. Scarce a chapter, it may be a verse, or a word, in a short time, would be left free from perplexing, contradicting conjectures. The words are altogether innumerable whose significations may be varied by an arbitrary supplying of the points. And when the regulation of the punctuation shall be left to every single person's conjectures upon antecedents and consequents (for who shall give a rule to the rest), what end shall we have of fruitless contests? What various, what pernicious senses shall we have to contend about! Suppose that men sober, modest, humble, pious, might be preserved from such miscarriages, and be brought to some agreement about these things (which yet in these days, upon many accounts, is not to be looked for, yea, from the nature of the thing itself seems impossible), yet this gives us but a human, fallible persuasion, that the readings fixed on by them are according to the mind of God; but to expect such an agreement is fond and foolish. Besides, who shall secure us against the luxuriant, atheistical wits and spirits of these days, who are bold upon all advantages ἀκίνητα κινεῖν, and to break in upon every thing that is holy and sacred, that they will not, by their huckstering, utterly corrupt the word of God? How easy is it to foresee the dangerous consequents of contending for various readings, though not false nor pernicious, by men pertinaciously adhering to their own conjectures! The word of God, as to its literal sense, or reading of the words of it, hath hitherto been ἐξαγώνιον, and the acknowledged touchstone of all expositions; render this now μῆλον ἔριδος, and what have we remaining firm and unshaken?

Let men, with all their confidence as to the knowledge of the sense and meaning of the Scriptures which they have already received, by such helps and means as are all of them resolved into the present punctuation of the Bible (for all grammars, all lexicons, the whole Masora, all helps to this language, new and old in the world, are built on this foundation), reduce themselves to such an indifferency as some of late have fancied as a meet rise for knowledge, and fall seriously to the reading of some of the prophets, whose matter is sublime and mystical, and their style elliptical and abstruse, without the help of points and accents, — let them fix them,

or any figures to answer their sounds, *arbitrarily*, merely on their judgment in the language and conjectures at the sense of the place, without any advantage from what they have been instructed in, — and let us see whether they will agree, as they fabulously report of the seventy translators! Whatever may be the issue of their industry, we need not fear quickly to find as learned as they that would lay their work level with the ground. I confess, considering the days we live in, wherein the bold and curious wits of men, under pretense of critical observations, alluring and enticing with a show of learning, have ventured to question almost every word in the Scripture, I cannot but tremble to think what would be the issue of this supposition, that the points or vowels, and accents, are no better guides unto us than may be expected from those who are pretended to be their authors. The Lord, I hope, will safeguard his own from the poison of such attempts. The least of its evil is not yet thoroughly considered. So that whereas, saving to myself the liberty of my judgment as to sundry particulars, both in the impression itself and in sundry translations, I acknowledge the great usefulness of this work, and am thankful for it, which I here publicly testify, yet I must needs say, I had rather that it, and all works of the like kind, were out of the world, than that this one opinion should be received, with the consequences that unavoidably attend it.

“But this trial needs not be feared. Grant the points to have the original pretended, yet they deserve all regard, and are of singular use for the right understanding of the Scripture; so that it is not lawful to depart from them without urgent necessity, and evidences of a better lection to be substituted in the room of that refused.” But as this relieves us not, but still leaves us within the sphere of rational conjectures, so whether it can honestly be pretended and pleaded in this case comes nextly to be discovered by the consideration of the supposed authors of this invention.

The founders of this story of the invention of the Hebrew points tell us that it was the work of some Rabbins living at Tiberias, a city in Galilee, about the year of Christ 500, or in the next century after the death of Jerome and the finishing of the Babylonian Talmud. The improbability of this story or legend I am not now to insist upon. Morinus makes the lie lower. He tells us that the Babylonian Talmud was finished but a little before the year 700, Exer. 2 cap. 3, par. poster.; and that the Masoretes

(to whom he ascribes the invention of the points) wrote a long time after the finishing of the Talmud and the year 700, p. p. 5, cap. 3. This long time cannot denote less than some hundreds of years. And yet the same man in his preface to his “Samaritica Opuscula,” boasting of his finding R. Jehuda Chiug, manifests that he was acquainted with the present punctuation, and wrote about it. Now, this rabbi was a grammarian, — which kind of learning among the Jews succeeded that of the Masoretes, — and he lived about the year 1030 so that no room at all seems to be left for this work. That there was formerly a famous school of the Jews and learned men at Tiberias is granted. Jerome tells us that he hired a learned Jew from thence for his assistance, Epist. ad Chromat. Among others, Dr Lightfoot¹⁹⁰ hath well traced the shadow of their sanhedrim, with their presidents in it, in some kind of succession, to that place. That they continued there in any esteem, number, or reputation, unto the time assigned by our authors for this work, is not made to appear from any history or record of Jews or Christians; yea, it is certain that about the time mentioned, the chiefest flourishing of the Jewish doctors was at Babylon, with some other cities in the east, where they had newly completed their Talmud, the great pandect of Jewish laws and constitutions, as themselves everywhere witness and declare. That any persons considerably learned were then in Tiberias is a mere conjecture; and it is most improbable, considering what destruction had been made of them at Diocaesarea and Tiberias, about the year of Christ 352, by Gallus, at the command of Constantius. That there should be such a collection of them so learned, so authorized, as to invent this work and impose it on the world, no man once taking notice that any such persons ever were, is beyond all belief. Notwithstanding any entanglements that men by their conjectures may put upon the persuasion of the antiquity of the points, I can as soon believe the most incredible figment in the whole Talmud as this fable. But this is not my business. Let it be granted that such persons there were. On the supposition under consideration, I am only inquiring what is the state and condition of the present Hebrew pointing, and what weight is to be laid thereon. That the reader, then, may a little consider what sort of men they were who are assigned in these Prolegomena as the inventors of this artifice of punctuation, I shall take a brief view of the state of the Jews after the destruction of the temple down to the days inquired after.

That the Judaical church-state continued not only *de facto*, but, in the merciful forbearance of God, so far that the many thousands of believers that constantly adhered to the Mosaical worship were accepted with God until the destruction of the temple; that that destruction was the ending of the world that then was by fire, and the beginning of setting up solemnly the new heaven and new earth wherein dwelleth righteousness, — I have at large elsewhere declared, and may, God assisting, yet further manifest in my thoughts on the Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews. From the time between the beginning of Christ's preaching to the utter desolation of the city and temple, an open, visible rejection of that church, as such, was made. Thereon an utter separation of the true Israel from it ensued; and the hardened residue became **לֹא רַחֲמָה** and **לֹא-עֵמִי**, — a people not in covenant or delight, but of curse and indignation. What their state was for a season onwards, both civil and religious, many have declared. I shall only insist on the heads of things. In general, then, they were most remote from accepting of the punishment of their sin, or considering that God was revenging upon them the quarrel of his covenant to the utmost, having broken both his staves, "Beauty and Bands," So far were they from owning their sin in selling of their Messiah, that, seeing an end put to all their former worship thereupon, there is nothing recorded of them but these two things, which they wholly, in direct opposition unto God, gave themselves up unto: —

1. They increased in rage and madness against all the followers of Christ, stirring up persecution against them all the world over. Hereunto they were provoked by a great number of apostates, who, when they could no longer retain their Mosaical rites with the profession of Christ, being rejected. by the churches, fell back again to Judaism or semi-Judaism. **2.** A filthy lusting and desire after their former worship, now become abominable and a badge of infidelity, that so their table might become a snare unto them, and what had been for their safety might now become the means of their utter ruin and hardening. Of the former, or their stirring up of persecution, all stories are full of examples and instances. The latter, or their desires and attempts for the restoration of their worship, as conducing to our present business, must be further considered.

For the accomplishment of a design to restore their old religion, or to furnish themselves with a new, they made two desperate attempts. The

first of these was by arms, under their pseudo-Messiah, Barchochab, in the days of Hadrian. Under the conduct and influencings of this man, to whom one of the chief Rabbins (Akiba) was armor-bearer, in the pursuit of a design to restore their temple and worship, they fell into rebellion against the Romans all the world over. In this work, after they had committed unheard-of outrages, massacres unparalleled, murders, spoils, and cruelties, and had shaken the whole empire, they were themselves in all parts of the world, especially in the city Berber, where was the head of their rebellion, ruined with a destruction seeming equal to that which befell them at Jerusalem in the days of Vespasian and Titus.

That the rise of this war was upon the twofold cause mentioned, namely, their desire to retain their former worship and to destroy the Christian, is evident. For the first, it is expressed by Die Cassius: Hist. Romans lib. 69 in Vita Had., Ἐς δὲ τὰ ἱεροσόλυμα πόλιν αὐτοῦ ἀντὶ τῆς κατασκαφείσης οἰκίσαντος, ἦν καὶ Αἰλίαν Καπιτωλίναν ὠνόμασε καὶ ἐς τὸν τοῦ ζεοῦ τόπον, ναὸν τῷ Διὶ ἕτερον ἀναντεγείροντος, πόλεμος οὔτε μικρὸς οὔτ' ὀλιγοχρόνιος ἐκινήθη. Ἰουδαῖοι γὰρ, δεινὸν τι ποιούμενοι τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους τινὰς ἐς τὴν πόλιν σφῶν οἰκισθῆναι, καὶ τὰ ἱερὰ ἀλλότρια ἐν αὐτῇ ἰδρυθῆναι. κ. τ. λ. It was the defiling of the soil whereon the temple stood (which God suffered on set purpose to manifest their utter rejection, and that the time was come wherein he would be no more worshipped in that place in the old manner) that put them in arms, as that author declares at large. And for the latter, Justin Martyr, who lived at that time, informs us of it: Apol. 2 ad Anton. Pium., Καὶ γὰρ ἐν τῷ νῦν γεγεννημένῳ Ἰουδαϊκῷ πολέμῳ βαρχοχέζας ὁ τῆς Ἰουδαίων ἀποστάσεως ἀρχηγέτης Χριστιανούς μόνους εἰς τιμωρίας δεινὰς, εἰ μὴ ἄρνοῖντο Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν καὶ βλασφημοῖεν, ἐκέλευεν ἀπάγεσθαι. His fury was in an especial manner against the Christians, whom he commanded to be tortured and slain, unless they would deny and blaspheme Jesus Christ. See Euseb. Chron. ad an. Christi 136. And this war they managed with such fury, and, for a while, success, that after Hadrian had called together against them the most experienced soldiers in the world, particularly Julius Severus out of England, and had slain of them five millions and eighty thousand in battle, with [while?] an infinite number besides, as the historian speaks, by famine, sickness, and fire, were consumed, he found himself to have sustained so much loss by them that he began not his letter to the senate in

the wonted manner, Εἰ αὐτοὶ καὶ οἱ παῖδες ὑμῶν ὑγιαίνετε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα ὑγιαίνομεν· he could not assure them that it was well with him and his army.

By this second desolation they were [brought] very low, made weak and contemptible, and driven into obscurity all the world over. In this state they wandered up and down for some season in all manner of uncertainty. They had not only lost the place of their solemn worship, seeing it was wholly defiled, the name of Jerusalem changed into Aelia, and themselves forbid to took towards it upon pain of death,^{f91} but also, being now unspeakably diminished in their number, all hope of conniving themselves into any condition of observing their old rites and worship was utterly lost.^{f92}

Here they sat down atoned for a season, being at their wits' end, as was threatened to them in the curse. But they will not rest so. Considering, therefore, that their old religion could not be continued without a Jerusalem and a temple, they began a nefarious attempt against God, equal to that of the old world in building Babel, even to set up a new religion, that might abide with them wherever they were, and give them countenance in their infidelity and opposition to the gospel unto the utmost. The head of this new apostasy was one R. Judah, whom we may not unfitly call the Mohammed of the Jews. They term him Hannasi, the "price;" and Hakkadosh, the "holy." The whole story of him and his companions, as reported by the Jews, is well collected by Joseph de Voysin, *Observat. in Proem. ad Pugi. Fidei.* p. 26, 27. The sum of the whole concerning this work is laid down by Maimonides in his *praefatio in Seder Zeraim*, p. 36, 37 of the edition of Mr Pococke; wherein also a sufficient account is given of the whole Mishna, with the names of the Rabbins either implied in it or occasionally mentioned. This man, about the year of Christ 190 or 200, when the temple had now lain waste almost three times as long as it did in the Babylonish captivity, being countenanced, as some of themselves report,^{f93} by Antoninus Pius, compiled the Jewish Koran, or the Mishna, as a rule of their worship and ways for the future. Only, whereas Mohammed afterward pretended to have received his figments by revelation (though, indeed, he had many of his abominations from the Talmud), this man pleaded the receiving of his by tradition, — the two main engines that have been set up against the

word of God. Out of such pharisaical traditions as were indeed preserved amongst them, and such observances as they had learned and taken up from apostate Christians, as Aquila and others, with such figments as were invented by himself and his predecessors since the time of their being publicly rejected and cursed by God, this man compiled the **ספר משניות** — which is the text of their Talmud, and the foundation of their present religion, — under the name of the old oral law. That sundry Christian ceremonies and institutions, vilely corrupted, were taken up by the Jews of those days, many of them being apostates, as were also some of Mohammed's assistants in compiling of the Koran, I shall, God assisting, elsewhere endeavor to evince and manifest. That any gospel observances were taken from the Jews, as being in practice amongst them before their institution by Christ, will appear in the issue to be a bold and groundless fancy.

The foundation mentioned being laid in a collection of traditions and new invention of abominations, under the name of old traditions, by this Rabbi, the following Talmuds are an improvement of the same attempt of setting up a religion under the curse and against the mind and will of God, that, being rejected by him, and left “without king, without prince, without sacrifice, without image, without an ephod, and without teraphim,” any kind of worship, true or false, they might have something to give them countenance in their unbelief. The Talmud of Jerusalem, so called (for it is the product of many comments on the Mishna in the city of Tiberias, where R. Judah lived) because it was compiled in the land of Canaan, whoso metropolis was Jerusalem, was published about the year of Christ 230: so it is commonly received, though I find Dr Lightfoot of late, on supposition of finding in it the name of Diocletian the emperor, to give it a later date; but I confess I see no just ground for the alteration of his judgment from what he delivered in another treatise before. The Doclet mentioned by the Rabbins was beaten by the children of R. Judah Princes, as himself observes, who lived in the days of one of the Anteninuses, a hundred years before Diocletian. Neither was ever Diocletian in a low condition in the east, being a Sarmatian born, and living in the western parts; only he went with Numerianus in that expedition into Persia, wherein he was made emperor at his return. But this is nothing to my purpose. See Lightfoot, Chorograph. cap. 81, p. 144. The

Babylonian Talmud, so called because compiled in the land of Babylon, in the cities of Nahardea, Sora, and Pumbeditha, where the Jews had their synagogues and schools, was finished about the year 506 or 510. In this greater work was the mystery of their iniquity finished, and the engine of their own invention for their further obduration perfectly completed. These are now the rule of their faith, the measure of their exposition of Scripture, the directory of their worship, the ground of their hope and expectation.

All this while the Jews enjoyed the letter of the Scriptures, as they do to this day; yea, they receive it sometimes with the honor and veneration due to God alone. God preserved it amongst them for our present use, their further condemnation, and means of their future conversion. But after the destruction of the temple, and rejection of their whole church-state, the word was no longer committed to them of God, nor were they intrusted with it, nor are to this day. They have it not by promise or covenant, as they had of old, ^{צבוי} Isaiah 59:21. Their possession of it is not accompanied with the administration of the Spirit; without which, as we see in the instance of themselves, the word is a dead letter, of no efficacy for the good of souls. They have the letter amongst them, as at one time they had the ark in the battle against the Philistines, for their greater ruin.

In this state and condition they everywhere discover their rancor and malice against Christ, calling him, in contempt and reproach, תָּלוּי, who is קדוש קדוש קדוש יהוה צבאות, relating monstrous figments concerning him and their dealing with him, under the name of “Jesus the son of Pandira.” Some deny that by Jesus, the son of Pandira and Stada, in the Talmud, the blessed Messiah is intended. So did Galatinus, Arcan. Relig. Cathol. lib. 1 cap. 7; and Reuchlinus Cabal lib. 1 p. 636; Guliel. Schickard., in Prooem. Tarich. p. 83. The contrary is asserted by Reynoldus, Praelec. in lib. Apoc., praelec. 103, p. 405, 406; Buxtorfius Lexic. Rab. voce סטד, and also in פנדרא; Vorstius Not. ad Tzem. Dav. p. 264. And, in truth, the reason pleaded by Galatinus and others to prove that they did not intend our Savior doth, upon due consideration, evince the contrary. The Jesus, say they, who is mentioned in the Talmud, lived in the days of the Maccabees, being slain in the time of Hyrcanus, or of Aristobulus, one hundred years before the death of the true Messiah; so

that it cannot be he who is by them intended. But this is invented by the cursed wretches, that it should not appear that their temple was so soon destroyed after their wicked defection from God in killing of his Son. This is most manifest from what is cited by Genebrard from Abraham Levita, in his “Cabala Historiae,” where he says that Christians invented this story, that Jesus was crucified in the life of Herod (that is, the tetrarch), that it might appear that their temple was destroyed immediately thereupon; “when,” saith he, “it is evident from the Mishna and Talmud that he lived in the time of Alexander, and was crucified in the days of Aristobulus:” so discovering the true ground why they perverted the whole story of his time, — namely, lest all the world should see their sin and punishment standing so near together. But it is well that the time of our Savior’s suffering and death was affirmed even by the heathens, before either their Mishna or Talmud were born or thought of: “Abolendo rumori” (he speaks of Nero, and of his firing Rome) “subdidit reos, et quaesitissimis poenis affecit, quos, per flagitia invisos, vulgus Christianos appellabat. Auctor nominis ejus Christus, Tiberio imperitante, per Procuratorem Pontium Pilatum supplicio affectus erat,” Tacit. Annal. lib. 15 cap. 44. To return to our Jews: universally in all their old writings they have carried on a design of impugning him in his Gospel; for as we need not their testimony, nor any thing but the Scripture, for their conviction and αὐτοκατακρίσία, so, to acknowledge the truth, the places cited out of their Talmuds and Gemara, from the Cabalists and other Rabbins, by Martinus Raymundus, Porehetus, Galatinus, Reuchlinus, and others (setting aside Galatinus his Gale Rezeia, which must be set aside), seem[ing] to be wrested the most of them beside their intentions, as things obscurely, metaphorically, and mystically written, are easily dealt withal. Their disputes about the Messiah, when they speak of him of set purpose, as in Lib. Sanhedrim, are foolish, contradictory triflings, wherein they leave all things as uncertain as if they were wrangling in their wonted manner, “de lana caprina” So that, for my part, I am not much removed from the opinion of Hulsius (lib. 1 p. 2, dic. sup. de Temp. Messiae), that AEsop’s Fables are of as much use in Christian religion as the Judaical Talmud. Whilst they keep the Scripture, we shall never want weapons out of their own armory for their destruction. Like the Philistine, they carry the weapon that will serve to cut off their own heads. Now, the Tiberian Masorettes, the supposed inventors of the points or vowels, and accents,

which we now use, were men living after the finishing of the last Talmud, whose whole religion was built thereon.

Let us, then, a little, without prejudice or passion, consider who or what these men were, who are the supposed authors of this work: —

1. Men they were (if any such were) *who had not the word of God committed* to them in a peculiar manner, as their forefathers had of old, being no part of his church or people, but were only outwardly possessors of the letter, without just right or title to it, utterly uninterested in the promise of the communication of the Spirit, which is the great charter of the church's preservation of truth, ²⁸⁰Isaiah 59:21.
2. Men *so remote from a right understanding of the word*, or the mind and will of God therein, that they were desperately engaged to oppose his truth in the books which themselves enjoyed, in all matters of importance unto the glory of God or the good of their own souls, from the beginning to the ending; the foundation of whose religion was infidelity, and one of their chief fundamentals an opposition to the gospel. ^{f94}
3. Men *under the special curse of God* and his vengeance, upon the account of the blood of his dear Son.
4. Men *all their days feeding themselves with vain fables*, and mischievous devices against the gospel, laboring to set up a new religion under the name of the old, in despite of God; so striving to wrestle it out with his curse to the utmost.
5. Men *of a profound ignorance in all manner of learning and knowledge* but only what concerned their own dunghill traditions; ^{f95} as appears in their stories, wherein they make Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, help Nebuchadnezzar against Jerusalem, with innumerable the like. fopperies.
6. Men *so addicted to such monstrous figments*, as appears in their Talmuds, as their successors of after ages are ashamed of, and seek to palliate what they are able; yea, for the most part *idolaters and magicians*, as I shall evince. Now, I dare leave it to the judgment of any godly, prudent person, not addicted to parties and names of men, who is at all acquainted with the importance of the Hebrew vowels and accents unto the right understanding of the Scripture, with what influence their present

fixation hath upon the literal sense we embrace, whether we need not very clear evidence and testimony, yea, undeniable and unquestionable, to cast the rise and spring of them upon the invention of this sort of men.

Of all the fables that are in the Talmud I know none more incredible than this story, that men who cannot, by any story or other record, be made to appear that they ever were in *rerum natura*, — such men as we have described, obscure, unobserved, not taken notice of by any learned man, Jew or Christian, — should in a time of deep ignorance, in the place where they lived, amongst a people wholly addicted to monstrous fables, themselves blinded under the curse of God, find out so great, so excellent a work, of such unspeakable usefulness, not once advising with the men of their own profession and religion, who then flourished in great abundance at Babylon and the, places adjacent, and impose it on all the world. (that receive the Scriptures), and have every tittle of their work received, without any opposition or question from any person or persons, of any principle whatever; yea, so as to have their invention made the constant rule of all following expositions, comments, and interpretations. *Credat Apella*.

To draw, then, to the close of this discourse, I must crave liberty to profess that if I could be thoroughly convinced that the present Hebrew punctuation were the figment and invention of these men, I should labor to the utmost to have it utterly taken away out of the Bible, nor should I (in its present station) make use of it any more. What use such an invention might be of under catholic rules, in a way of grammar, I shall not dispute; but to have it placed in the Bible as so great a part of the word of God is not tolerable. But blessed be God, things are not as yet come to that pass! I shall only add, that whereas some of the most eminently learned and exercised persons in all the learning and antiquity of the Jews that these latter ages have produced, have appeared in the confutation of this fancy of the invention of the points by some post-Talmudical Masoretes, I am sorry their respect to the Rabbins hath kept them from the management of this consideration, which is to me of so great importance

To what I have spoken! shall add the words of learned Dr Lightfoot, in his late *Centuria Chorograph.*, which came to my hands since the finishing of this discourse, cap. 81 p. 146: “Sunt qui punctata Biblia credunt a

sapientibus Tiberiensibus” (he means Elias only, for other Jews of this opinion there are none). “Ego impudentiam Judaeorum, qui fabulam invenerunt, non miror; Christianorum credulitatem miror, qui applaudunt, Recognosce (quaeso) nomina Tiberiensium a site illic primum academia ad eam expirantem, et quidnam tandem invenies nisi genus hominum prae Pharisaismo insaniens, traditionibus faseinans et fascinatam, caecum, vafrum, delirum; ignoscant, si dicam magicum et monstrum? Ad opus tam divinum homines quam ineptos, quam stolidos! Perlege Talmud Hierosolymitanum, et nota qualiter illic se habeant R. Judy, R. Chamnath, Z. Judah, R. Hoshai, R. Chaija Rubba, R. Chaija Bar Be, R. Jochanan, reliquique inter Tiberienses grandissimi doctores; quam serio nihil agunt; quam pueriliter seria; quanta in ipserum disputationibus vafrities, spume, venenum, fumus, nihil; et si punctata fuisse Biblia in istiusmodi schola potes credere, crede et omnia Talmudica, Opus Spiritus Sancti sapientia Bibliorum, non opus hominum perditorum, excaecatorum, amentium.” In the words of this learned person there is the sum of what I am pleading for. Saith he, “I do not admire the Jews’ impudence, who found out that fable; I admire Christians’ credulity, who applaud it. Recount, I pray, the names of the Tiberians from the first foundation of a university there to the expiring thereof, what do you find but a sort of men being mad with (or above) the Pharisees, bewitching and bewitched with traditions, blind, crafty, raging; pardon me if I say magical and monstrous? What fools, what sots, as to such a divine work! Read over the Talmud of Jerusalem; consider how R. Juda, R. Chamnath, Z. Judan, R. Hoshai, R. Chaija Rubba, R. Chaija Bar Ba, R. Jochanan, and the rest of the great doctors among the Tiberians, do behave themselves; how seriously they do nothing; how childish they are in serious things; how much deceitfulness, froth, venom, smoke, nothing, in their disputations: and if you can believe the points of the Bible to proceed from such a school, believe also their Talmuds. The pointing of the Bible savors of the work of the Holy Spirit, not of wicked, blind, and mad men.”

The Jews generally believe these points to have been from mount Sinai, and so downward by Moses and the prophets, at least from Ezra and his companions, the men of the great synagogue; not denying that the knowledge and use of them received a great reviving by the Gemarists and

Masorettes, when they had been much disused. So R. Azarias at large, Imre Binah. cap. 59.

Had it been otherwise, surely men stupendously superstitious in inquiring after the traditions of their fathers would have found some footsteps of their rise and progress. It is true, there is not only the opinion, but there are the arguments, of one of them to the contrary, — namely, Elias Levita. This Elias lived in Germany about the beginning of the Reformation, and was the most learned grammarian of the Jews in that age. Sundry of the first reformers had acquaintance with him. The task not only of *reforming religion*, but also of *restoring good literature*, being incumbent on them, they made use of such assistances as were to be obtained then to that purpose. This man (whom Thuanus takes notice of ^{f96}) lived with Paulus Fagius, and assisted him in his noble promotion of the Hebrew tongue. Hence haply it is that some of those worthies unwarily embraced his novel opinion, being either overborne with his authority, or not having leisure to search further after the truth. That the testimony of this one Elias should be able to outweigh the constant attestation of all other learned Jews to the contrary, as Cappellus affirms and pleads, and as is insinuated in our Prolegomena, ^{f97} is fond to imagine; and the premises of that learned man fight against his own conclusion. “It is known,” saith he, “that the Jews are prone to insist on every thing that makes for the honor of their people and language; and therefore their testimony to the divine original of the present punctuation, being in their own case, is not to be admitted. Only Elias, who in this speaks against the common interest of his people, is presumed to speak upon conviction of truth.” But the whole *evidence* in this cause is on the other side. Let us grant that all the Jews are zealous of the honor and reputation of their nation and language, as they are; let us grant that they greedily close with every thing that may seem to have a tendency thereunto: what will be the issue or natural inference from these premises? Why, as nothing could be spoken more honorably of the Jews whilst they were the church and people of God than that of Paul, that “to them were committed the oracles of God,” so nothing can be imagined or fixed on more to their honor since their divorce from God than that their doctors and masters should make such an addition to the Scripture, so generally acknowledged to be unspeakably useful. And to this purpose Elias, who was the father of this opinion, was far from making such

deductions thence as some do now-a-days, namely, that it is lawful for us to change the vowels and accents at our pleasure, but ties all men as strictly to them as if they had been the work of Ezra It is Elias, then, that speaks in his own case; whose testimony is, therefore, not to be admitted. What was done of old and in the days of Ezra is ours, who succeed unto the privileges of that church; what hath been done since the destruction of the temple is properly and peculiarly theirs.

It may, perhaps, be thought that by the account given of the Rabbins, their state and condition of old and of late, I might have weakened one great argument which learned men make use of to confirm the *sacred antiquity* of the present Hebrew punctuation, taken from the universal consent and testimony of the Jewish doctors, ancient and modern, this one Elias excepted. Who can think such persons are in any thing to be believed? But indeed, the case is quite otherwise. Though we account them wholly unmeet for the work that is ascribed unto them, and, on supposition that it is theirs, affirm that it had need undergo another manner of trial than as yet, out of reverence to its generally received antiquity, it hath met withal; yet they were men still who were full well able to declare what *de facto* they found to be so, and what they found otherwise. It cannot, I think, be reasonably supposed that so many men, living in so many several ages, at such vast distances from one another, who, some of them, it may be, never heard of the names of other some of them, should conspire to cozen themselves and all the world besides in a matter of fact not at all to their advantage. However, for my part, whatever can be proved against them I shall willingly admit, But to be driven out of such a rich possession as is the present Hebrew punctuation, upon mere surmises and conjectures, I cannot willingly give way or consent.

It is not my design to give in arguments for the divine original of the present Hebrew punctuation; neither do I judge it necessary for any one so to do whilst the learned Buxtorfius' discourse," *De Origine et Antiquitate Punctorum*," lies unanswered. I shall, therefore, only add one or two considerations which to me are of weight, and not, as I remember, mentioned by him or his father in his "Tiberias," or any other that I know of in their disputes to this purpose.

1. If the points or vowels, and accents, be coevious with the rest of the letters, or have an original before all grammar of that language (as, indeed, languages are not made by grammar, but grammars are made by languages), *then the grammar of it and them must be collected from the observation of their use*, as they were found in all their variety, before any such art was invented or used; and rules must be suited thereunto. The drawing into rules all the instances that, being uniform, would fall under such rules, and the distinct observation of anomalous words, either singly, or in exceptions comprehending many under one head that would not be so reduced, was the work of grammar. But, on the other side, if the vowels and accents were invented by themselves, and added to the letters, *then the rule and art of disposing, transposing, and changing of them, must be constituted and fixed before the disposition of them*; for they were placed after the rules made, and according to them. A middle way, that I know of, cannot be fixed on. Either they are of the original writing of the language, and have had rules made by their station therein, or they have been supplied unto it according to rules of art. Things are not thus come to pass by chance; nor was this world created by a casual concurrence of these atoms. Now, if the grammar or art was the ground and foundation, not the product of their use, as I am confident I shall never see a tolerable answer given to that inquiry of Buxtorfius the elder in his “Tiberias,” why the inventors of them left so many words anomalous and pointed otherwise than according to rule or the constant course of the language, precisely reckoning them up when they had so done, and how often they are so used, as.. and.. for.., and.. for.., and the like, when they might, if they had so pleased, have made them all regular, to their own great ease, advantage of their language, and facilitating the learning of it to all posterity, the thing they seem to have aimed at: so I cannot be satisfied why, in that long, operose, and curious work of the Masoretes, wherein they have reckoned up every word in the Scripture, and have observed the irregularity of every letter and tittle, they never once attempt to give us out those catholic rules whereby they or their masters proceeded in affixing the points; or whence it came to pass that no learned Jew for hundreds of years after should be able to acquaint us with that way, but in all their grammatical instructions should merely collect observations, and inculcate them a hundred times over, according as they present themselves to them by particular instances; Assuredly, had this wonderful art of pointing, which for the

most part may be reduced to catholic rules, and might have wholly been so if it were an arbitrary invention, limited to no pre-existing writing, been found out first and established as the *norma* and canon of affixing the vowels, some footsteps of it would have remained in the Masora, or among some of the Jews, who spent all their time and days in the consideration of it.

2. In the days of the Chaldee paraphrast, when the prophecies of the humiliation and death of their Messiah were only not understood by them, yet *we see into how many several ways and senses they are wrested by that paraphrast*, to affix some tolerable meaning to them. Take an instance on Isaiah 53. Jonathan there acknowledges the whole prophecy to be intended of Christ, as knowing it to be the common faith of the church; but not understanding the state of humiliation which the Messiah was to undergo, he wrests the words into all forms, to make that which is spoken passively of Christ, as to his suffering *from* others, to signify actively, as to his doing and exercising judgment *upon* others! But now, more than five hundred years after, when these points are supposed to be invented, when the Rabbins were awake and knew full well what use was made of those places against them, as also that the prophets (especially Isaiah) are the most obscure part of the whole Scripture, as to the grammatical sense of their words in their coherence, without points and accents, and how facile it were to invert the whole sense of many periods by small alterations in these rules of reading, yet as they are pointed they make out incomparably more clearly the Christian faith than any ancient translations of those places whatever. Johannes Isaac, a converted Jew, lib. 1 ad Lindan., tells us that above two hundred testimonies about Christ may be brought out of the original Hebrew that appear not in the Vulgar Latin or any other translation. And Raymundus Martinus, “Noverint quæ ejusmodi sunt (that is, who blamed him for translating things immediately out of the Hebrew, not following the Vulgar Latin) “in plurimis valde sacrae Scripturae locis veritatem multo planius atque perfectius pro fide Christiana haberi in litera Hebraica quam in translatione nostra,” Procem. ad Pug. Fid. sec. 14. Let any man consider those two racks of the Rabbins and swords of Judaical unbelief, Isaiah 53 and Daniel 9, as they are now pointed and accented in our Bibles, and compare them with the translation of the LXX, and this will quickly appear unto him. Especially hath this

been evidenced, since the Socinians^{f98} as well as the Jews have driven the dispute about the satisfaction of Christ to the utmost scrutiny and examination of every word in that 53d of Isaiah. But yet, as the text stands now pointed and accented, neither Jews nor Socinians (notwithstanding the relief contributed to them by Grotius wresting that whole blessed prophecy to make application of it unto Jeremiah, thinking therein to outdo the late or modern jews; Abrabanel and others applying it to Josiah, the whole people of the Jews, Messiah Ben Joseph, and I know not whom) have been able, or ever shall be able, to relieve themselves from the sword of the truth therein. Were such exercitations on the word of God allowable, I could easily manifest how, by changing the distinctive accents and vowels, much darkness and perplexity might be cast on the contexture of that glorious prophecy. It is known, also, that the Jews commonly plead that one reason why they keep the copy of the law in their synagogues without points is, that the text may not be restrained to one certain sense, but that they may have liberty to draw out various, and, as they speak, more eminent senses.

CHAPTER 6.

Arguments for the novelty of the Hebrew points proposed to consideration — The argument from the Samaritan letters considered and answered — Of the copy of the law preserved in the synagogues without points — The testimony of Elias Levita and Aben Ezra considered — Of the silence of the Mishna, Talmud, and Gemara, about the points — Of the Keri and Ketib — Of the number of the points — Of the ancient translations, Greek, Chaldee, Syriac — Of Jerome — The new argument of Morinus in this cause — The conclusion about the necessity of the points.

BUT because this seems to be a matter of great importance, wherein the truth formerly pleaded for appears to be nearly concerned, I shall, ὥς ἐν παρόδῳ, very briefly consider the arguments that are usually insisted on (as in these Prolegomena) to prove the points to be a *novel invention*; I mean of the men and at the time before mentioned. Particular instances I shall not insist upon, nor is it necessary I should so do; it hath been done already. The heads of arguments, which yet contain their strength, are capable of a brief despatch, which shall be given them in the order wherein they are represented by the Prolegomena, Proleg. 3, sect. 38-40.

1. It is said, then, “That whereas the *old Hebrew* letters were the present Samaritan,^{f99} the Samaritan letters having been always without points, as they yet continue, it is manifest that the invention of the points must be of a later date than the change of the letters, which was in the days of Ezra; and so, consequently, be the work of the post-Talmudical Masoretea.” “Pergula Pictoris!” This whole objection is made up of most uncertain conjectures. This is not a place to speak at large of the Samaritans, their Pentateuch, and its translation. The original of that nation is known from the Scripture, as also their worship of God, 2 Kings 17. Their solemn excommunication and casting out from any interest among the people of God is also recorded, Ezra. 9:10, Nehemiah 13. Their continuance in their abominations after the closing of the canon of the Scripture is reported by Josephus, Antiq. lib. 11 cap. 8. In the days of the Maccabees they were conquered by Hyrcanus, and brought into subjection by the Jews, Joseph Antiq. lib. 13 cap. 10. Yet their will-worship, upon

the credit of the tradition of their fathers, continued to the days of our Savior, and their hatred to the people of God, ~~and~~ John 4:9, 22. When, by whom, in what character, they first received the Pentateuch, is most uncertain; — not likely by the priest sent to them; for notwithstanding his instructions, they continued in open idolatry, which evidences that they had not so much as seen the book of the law. Probably this was done when they were conquered by Hyrcanus, and their temple razed, after it had stood two hundred years. So also did the Edomites. What diligence they used in the preservation of it, being never committed to them by God, we shall see afterward. That there are any of them remaining at this day, or have been these thousand years past, is unknown. That the letters of their Pentateuch were the ancient Hebrew letters, as Eusebius, Jerome, and some of the Rabbins, report, seems to me (on the best inquiry I have been able to make) a groundless tradition and mere fable. The evidences tendered to prove it are much too weak to bear the weight of such an assertion. Eusebius speaks only on report; affirmatur, — it was so affirmed, on what ground he tells us not. Jerome, indeed, is more positive; but give me leave to say, that supposing this to be false, sufficient instances of the like mistakes may be given in him. For the testimony of the Talmud, I have often declared that with me it is of no weight, unless seconded by very good evidence. And indeed the foundation of the whole story is very vain. The Jews are thought and said to have forgot their own characters in the captivity, and to have learned the Chaldean, upon the account whereof they adhered unto it after their return, when the same men were alive at the burning of the one and the building of the other temple. That the men of one and the same generation should forget the use of their own letters, which they had been exercised in, is incredible. Besides, they had their Bibles with them always, and that in their own character only; whether they had any one other book or no, we know not. And whence, then, this forgetting of one character and learning of another should arise doth not appear; nor shall I, in such an improbable fiction, lay much weight on testimonies the most ancient whereof is six hundred years later than the pretended matter of fact.

The most weighty proof in this case is taken from the ancient *Judaical coins*, taken up with Samaritan characters upon them. We are now in the high road of forgeries and fables; in nothing hath the world been more

cheated. But be it granted that the pretended coins are truly ancient, must it needs follow that because the letters were then known and in use, that they only were so, that the Bible was written with them, and these now in use unknown? To salve the credit of the coins, I shall crave leave to answer this conjecture with another. The Samaritan letters are plainly preternatural (if I may so say), a studied invention, — in their frame and figure fit to adorn, when extended or greatened, by way of engraving or embossing, any thing they shall be put upon or cut in. Why may we not think they were invented for that purpose, namely, to engrave on vessels and to stamp on coins, and so came to be of some use in writing also? Their shape and frame promise some such thing. And this is rendered the more probable from the practice of the Egyptians, who, as Clemens Alexandrinus^{f100} tells us, had three sorts of letters; one which he calls ἐπιστολογραφική, with which they wrote things of common use; another termed by him ἱερογραφική, used by the priests in the sacred writings; and the other ἱερογραφική, which also was of two sorts, simple and symbolical. Seeing, then, it was no unusual thing to have sundry sorts of letters for sundry purposes, it is not improbable that it was so also among the Jews: not that they wrote the sacred writings in a peculiar character as it were to hide them, which is declaimed against, but only that the other character might be in use for some purposes; which is not unusual. I cannot think the Greeks of old used only the *uncial* letters, which yet we know some did; though he did not who wrote Homer's Iliad in no greater a volume than would go into a nutshell.

But if that should be granted that cannot be proved, — namely, that such a change was made, — yet this prejudices not them in the least who affirm Ezra and the men of the great congregation to have been the authors of the points, seeing the authors of this rumor affixed that as the time wherein the old Hebrew letters were excommunicated out of the church, together with the Samaritans. Nay, it casts a probability on the other hand, namely, that Ezra, laying aside the old letters because of their difficulty, together with the new introduced the points, to facilitate their use. Nor can it be made to appear that the Samaritan letters had never any vowels affixed to them. Postellus affirms that the Samaritans had points in the days of Jerome, and that their loss of them is the cause of their present corrupt reading: “Punctis hodie quae habebant Hieronymi temporibus carent:

leguntque, sine punctis admedium depravate,” Postell. Alphab. 12 lingua. There were always some copies written without vowels, which might be preserved, and the others lost. That people (if we have any thing from them) being wicked, ignorant, sottish, superstitious, idolatrous, rejecters of the greatest part of the Scripture, corrupters of what they had received, might neglect the task of transcribing copies with points, because a matter of so great care and diligence, to be performed aright. Nor is it improbable, whatever is pretended to the contrary, that, continuing in their separation from the people of God, they might get the law written in a character of their own choosing, out of hatred to the Jews.

Now, let any man judge whether, from this heap of uncertainties, any thing can arise with the face of a witness, to be admitted to give testimony in the cause in hand. He that will part with his possession on such easy terms never found much benefit in it.

2. The *constant practice* of the Jews in preserving in their synagogues one book, which they almost adore, written without points, is alleged to the same purpose; “for what do they else hereby but tacitly acknowledge the points to have a human original?” *Ans.* But it is certain they do not so acknowledge them, neither by that practice nor by any other way, it being the constant opinion and persuasion of them all (Elias only excepted) that they are of a divine extract; and if their authority be to be urged, it is to be submitted unto in one thing as well as in another. The Jews give a threefold account of this practice: —

(1.) The difficulty of transcribing copies without any failing, the least rendering the whole book, as to its use in their synagogues, profane.

(2.) The liberty they have thereby to draw out *various senses*, more eminent, as they say (indeed more vain and curious), than they have any advantage to do when the reading is restrained to one certain sense by the vowels and accents.

(3.) To keep all *learners* in dependence on their teachers, seeing they cannot learn the mind of God but by their exposition, R. Azarias, lib. Imre Binah. cap. 59. If these reasons satisfy not any as to the ground of that practice, they may be pleased to inquire of them for others who intend to be bound by their authority; — that the points were invented by some late

Masoretes they wilt not inform them. For Jesuitical stories out of China, they are with me, for the most part, of the like credit with those of the Jews in their Talmud; he that can believe all the miracles that they work, where men are not warned of their juggling, may credit them in other things. However, as I said, I do not understand this argument: “The Jews keep a book in their synagogues without points, therefore the points and accents were invented by the Tiberian Masoretes;” when they never read it, or rather sing it, but according to every point and accent in ordinary use. Indeed, the whole profound mystery of this business seems to be this, that none be admitted to read or sing the law in their synagogues until he be so perfect in it as to be able to observe exactly all points and accents in a book wherein there are none of them.

3. The testimony of *Elias Levita*, not only as to his own judgment, but also as to what he mentions from Aben Ezra and others, is insisted on. “They affirm,” saith he, “that we have received the whole punctuation from the Tiberian Masoretes.” *Ans.* It is very true that Elias was of that judgment; and it may well be supposed, that if that opinion had not fallen into his mind, the world had been little acquainted with it at this day. That by “receiving of the punctuation from the Tiberians,” the *continuation* of it in their school, not the *invention* of it, is intended by Aben Ezra, is beyond all exception evinced by Buxtorfius, *De Punct. Antiq. par. 1 cap. 3*. Nor can any thing be spoken more directly to the contrary of what is intended, than that which is urged in the Prolegomena from Aben Ezra, *Comment. in* ^{Exodus} ~~Exodus~~ 25:31, where he affirms that he saw some books examined in all the letters, and the whole punctuation by the wise men of Tiberias, namely, to try whether it were done exactly according to the patterns they had. Besides, all Elias’ arguments are notably answered by R. Azarias, whose answers are repeated by Joseph de Voysin in his most learned *Observations on the Procemium of the Pugio Fidei*, p. 91, 92. And the same Azarias shows the consistency of the various opinions that were among the Jews about the vowels; ascribing them as to their virtue and force to Moses, or God on Mount Sinai; as to their figure and character to Ezra; and as to the restoration of their use unto the Masoretes.

4. The silence of the Mishna Gemara, or *whole Talmud*, concerning the points is further urged. This argument is also at large discussed by Buxtorfias, and the instances in it answered to the full; nor is it needful for

any man to add any thing further until what he hath discoursed to this purpose be removed. See par. 1 cap. 6. See also Glassius, lib. 1 tract. 1. De Textus Hebraei Puritate, who gives instances to the contrary; yea, and the Talmud itself, in Nedarim, or “of vows,” chap. 4, on ~~xxx~~ Nehemiah 8:8, doth plainly mention them; and treatises more ancient than the Talmud, cited by R. Azarias in Imre Binah, expressly speak of them. It is to me a sufficient evidence, able to overbear the conjectures to the contrary, that the Talmudists both knew, and in their readings were regulated by, the points now in use, in that, as many learned men have observed, there is not one text of Scripture to be found cited in the Talmud in any other sense, as to the literal reading and meaning of the words, than only that which it is restrained unto by the present punctuation; when it is known that the patrons of the opinion under consideration yield this constantly as one reason of the seventy translators reading words and sentences otherwise than we read them now in our Bibles, — namely, because the books they used were not pointed, whereby they were at liberty to conjecture at this or that sense of the word before them. This is one of the main pillars of Cappellus’ whole fabric in his *Critica Sacra*. And how it can be fancied there should be no variety between our present reading and the Talmudists’, upon supposition they knew not the use of points, know not. Is it possible, on this supposition, there should be such a coincidence between their and our present punctuation, when, on the same principle, it seems there are so many variations by the and the Chaldee paraphrast?

5. Of the **קָרִי וְכֵתִיב**, which are pleaded in the next place to this propose, I shall speak afterward. The difference in them is in the consonants, not in the vowels; which yet argues not that there were no vowels when they were collected or disposed as now we find them. Yea, that there were no vowels in the copies from whence they were collected (if they were so collected) may be true, but that that collection was made any later, for the main of it, than the days of Ezra doth not appear. Now, whatever was done about the Scripture in the Judaical church before the times of our Savior is manifest to have been done by divine authority, in that it is nowhere by him reprov’d, but rather the integrity of every word is by him confirmed. But of these things distinctly by themselves afterward we are to speak.

6. A sixth argument for the novelty of the points is taken from their *number*; for whereas it is said all kinds of sounds may be expressed by five vowels, we are in the present Hebrew punctuation supplied with fourteen or fifteen, which, as it is affirmed, manifests abundantly that they are not coevous or connatural to the language itself, but the arbitrary, artificial invention of men, who have not assigned a sufficient difference in their force and sound to distinguish them in pronunciation. But this objection seems of small importance. The ground of it is an apprehension that we still retain exactly the true pronunciation of the Hebrew tongue; which is evidently false.


(1.) It is now near two thousand years since that tongue was vulgarly spoken in its purity by any people or nation. To imagine that the true, exact, distinct pronunciation of every tittle and syllable in it, as it was used by them to whom it was vulgar and natural, is communicated unto us, or is attainable by us, is to dream pleasantly whilst we are awake. Aben Ezra makes it no small matter that men of old knew aright how to pronounce Kamets Gadol. Saith he, **יודעים לקרוא הקמץ גדול**, **אנשי טבריא גם חכמי מצרים ואפריקה** “The men of Tiberias, also the wise men of Egypt and Africa, knew how to read Kamets Gadol.”

(2.) Even the distinct force of one consonant, and that always radical, *v*, is utterly lost, so that the present Jews know nothing of its pronunciation.

(3.) Nor can we distinguish now between **תב** and **טב**, between **ב** and **ו**, though the Jews tell us that the wise men of Tiberias could do so twelve hundred years ago; as also between **ַ** and **ֶ**, **ִ** and **ֵ**; nor is the distinct sound of **עחהא** so obvious unto us.

(4.) The variety of consonants among many nations, and their ability to distinguish them in pronunciation, makes this of little consideration. The whole nation of the Germans distinguish not between the force and sound of *t* and *d*; whereas the Arabic *dal* and *dhsal*, *dad*, *ta*, and *da*, manifest how they can distinguish those sounds.

(5.) Nor are the Jewish **ש ז ס ש ין** answered distinctly in any other language; to distinguish some of which good old Jerome had his teeth filed, by the direction of his Nicodemus.^{f101}

(6.) The truth is, the Hebrews have but ten vowels, five long and five short, or five great and five less; Sheva is but a servant to all the rest, and its addition to Segol and Pathakh makes no new vowels. To distinguish between Kamets Khatuph and Khatuph Kamets there is no color. Seven only of them, as Morinus hath manifested out of R. Jehuda Chiug, one of the first grammarians among the Jews, namely , they called, of old, kings, or the chief rulers of all the motions of the letters. So that indeed they have not so many figures to distinguish sounds by, with all their vowels, as have the Greeks. Besides the seven vowels, they have twelve diphthongs, and three of them, as to any peculiar sound, as mute as Sheva. It is true, Pliny tells us that Simonides Melicus found out two of the vowels, η and ω , as he did also two consonants, ζ and ψ ; but surely he did so because he found them needful to answer the distinct sounds used in that language, or he had deserved little thanks for his invention.^{f102} Speaking lately with a worthy learned friend^{f103} about a universal character, which hath been mentioned by many, attempted by divers, and by him brought to that perfection as will doubtless yield much if not universal satisfaction unto learned and prudent men, when he shall be pleased to communicate his thoughts upon it to the world, we fell occasionally on the difference of apert sounds or vowels: which when I heard him with good reason affirm to be eight or nine, remembering this argument about the Hebrew points, I desired him to give his thoughts in a few words the next day; which he did accordingly. Now, because his discourse seems evidently to discover the vanity of this pretense, that the Hebrew vowels are an arbitrary invention from their number, I have here inserted it: —

Apert sounds are either

Simple. Vowels.

Double. Diphthongs.

1. Apert simple sounds are distinguishable

Formally..... Accidentally.

(1.) The *formal* difference is that which doth constitute several letters, and must depend upon the various apertion required to the making of them, together with the gravity or acuteness of the tone which is made by them;

according to which there are at least eight simple vowels, that are by us easily distinguishable, namely, —

E magis acutum as in he, me, she, ye, etc.

3. I or Y, which are both to be accounted of one power and sound.

Shi,

di; thy, my.

4. A magis aperture. All, tall, gall, wall.

5. minus aperture. Ale, tale, gale, wale.

6. O rotundum, minus grave: as the English, go, so, no; the Latin, do.

7. magis grave et pingue: as the English, do, to, who.

8. U as in tu, use, us, etc.

So many apert simple sounds there are evidently distinguishable: I would be loath to say that there neither are nor can be any more; for who knows how many other minute differences of apertion and gravity may be now used, or hereafter found out by others, which practice and custom may make as easy to them as these are to us?

(2.) But besides this formal difference, they are some of them *accidentally* distinguishable from one another, with reference to the quantity of time required to their prolation, whereby the same vowel becomes sometimes long [and sometimes] short: —

Long. Mete, sterne.

So E min. acut

Short. Met, stem.

Alive, give, drive, tittle, thine.

I

Live, give, driven.

I: e., tittle, thin.

A min. apert. A Bate, hate, cate, same, dame — ae.

Bat, hat, cat, sam, dam.

L. One, none, note, etc. — oe *velca*.

O rotund.....

S. One (non Lat.), not.

U

Use, tune, pule, acute, ue.

Us, tun, pull, cut.

The other remaining vowels, namely, E magis acut., A magis apert., and O magis grave, do not change their quantities, but are always long.

2. Diphthongs are made of the complexion of two vowels in one syllable, where the sounds of both are heard. These are: —

1. Ei, ey....Hei, Lat. They.

2. Ea....Eat, meat, seat, teat, yea, plea

3. Eu, ew...Heu, Lat. Few, dew.

4. Ai, ay....Aid, said, pay, day.

5. Au, aw...Audience, author, law, draw.

6. Oi, oy Point, soil, boy, toy.

7. Ou, ow Rout, stout, how, now.

8. Ui, uy Bui, juice.

9. Eo .Yeoman, people.

How other diphthongs (which have been used) may be significant for the expression of long vowels, see noted above.

There is, then, very little weight to be ventured upon the strength of this objection.

7. It is further pleaded, Proleg. 8, sect. 46, that the ancient *translations*, — the Greek, the Chaldee, and the Syriac, — do manifest that at the time of their composing the points were not invented, and that because in sundry places it is evident that they read otherwise, or the words with other points (I mean as to the force and sound, not figure of them) than those now affixed. For this purpose, very many instances are given us out of the Septuagint, especially by Cappellus; Grotius also takes the same course. But neither is this objection of any force to turn the scale in the matter under consideration. Somewhat will, in the close of this discourse, be spoken of those translations. The differences that may be observed in them, especially in the former, would as well prove that they had other consonants, — that is, that the copies they used had other letters and words, — than ours, as other vowels; yea, if we must suppose that where they differ from our present reading they had other and better copies, it is most certain that we must grant ours to be very corrupt. “Hoc Ithacus vellet.” Nor can this inference be avoided, as shall, God willing, be further manifested, if occasion be administered. The truth is, the present copies that we have of the Septuagint do in many places so vary from the original that it is beyond all conjecture what should occasion it. I wish some would, try their skill upon some part of Job, the Psalms, and the Prophets, to see if, by all their inquiries of extracting various lections, they can find out how they read in their books, if they rendered as they read, and we enjoy what they rendered. Simeon de Muis tells us a very pretty story of himself to this purpose, Asset Verit. Heb. sect. 1; as also how ridiculous he was in his attempt. But I shall recall that desire. The Scripture, indeed, is not so to be dealt withal; we have had too much of that work already. The rabbinical **אל תקרא** is not to be compared with some of our critics’ Temura and Notarjecon,^{f104} Of the Chaldee paraphrase I shall speak afterward. It seems not to be of the antiquity pretended. It is not mentioned by Josephus, nor Origen, nor Jerome; — but this will not impeach its antiquity. But whereas it is most certain that it was in high esteem and reverence among all the Jews before the time assigned for the punctuation of the points, it seems strange that they should, in disposing of them, differ from it voluntarily in so many places. Besides, though these translators, or any of them, might use copies without vowels, as it is confessed that always some such there were, as still there are, yet it doth not follow at all that therefore the points were

not found out nor in use. But more of this hen we come to speak distinctly of these translations.

8. Of the same importance is that which is, in the last place, insisted on from *the silence of Jerome* and others of the ancients as to the use of the points among the Hebrews. But [as] Jerome saw not all things (he saw not the Chaldee paraphrase, which our authors suppose to have been extant at least four hundred years before him), so it cannot be made evident that he mentioned all that he saw. To speak expressly of the vowels he had no occasion; there was then no controversy about them, nor were they then distinctly known by the names whereby they are now called. The whole current of his translation argues that he had the Bible as now pointed; yea, learned men have manifested by instances that seem of irrefragable evidence that he had the use of them; or, it may be, he could not obtain a pointed copy, but was instructed by his Jew in the right pronunciation of words. Copies were then scarce, and the Jews full of envy. All these things are uncertain. See Munster. Praefat. ad Bib. The truth is, either I cannot understand his words, or he doth positively affirm that the Hebrew had the use of vowels, in his Epistle to Evagrius, Epist. 126: “Nec refert utrum Salem an Salim nominetur, cum vocalibus^{f105} in medio litteris perraro utantur Hebraei.” If they did it *perraro*, they did it, and then they had them, though in those days, to keep up their credit in teaching, they did not much use them. Nor can this be spoken of the sound of the vowels, but of their figures; for surely they did not seldom use the sounds of vowels, if they spake often. And many other testimonies from him may be produced to the same purpose.

Morinus, in his late “Opuscula Hebraea Samaritica,” in his digression against the Hebrew points and accents, the first part, p. 209, brings in a new argument to prove that the *puncta vocalia* were invented by the Jewish grammarians, however the distinction of sections might be before. This he attempts out of a discourse of Aben Ezra concerning the successive means of the preservation of the Scripture; first, by the men of the great synagogue, then by the Masoretes, then by the grammarians. As he assigns all these their several works, so to the grammarians the skill of knowing the progresses of the holy tongue, the generation of the kingly points and of Sheva, as he is by him there cited at large. After, he labors to prove by sundry instances that the *puncta vocalia* are by him called *reges*,

and not the accents, as is now the use; and in the *addenda* to his book, prefixed to it, he triumphs upon a discovery that the vowels are so called by Rabbi Jehuda Chiug, the most ancient of the Jewish grammarians. The business is now, it seems, quite finished, and he cries out, “Oculis aliorum non egemus amplius, **αὐτόπται** nunc sumus”! A sacrifice is doubtless due to this drag of Morinus. But *quid dignum tanto*?

The place insisted on by him out of Aben Ezra was some years before produced, weighed, and explained, by Buxtorf, out of his **לשון הקדש מאני**, or the Standard of the Holy Tongue, De Punct. Orig. par. 1 p. 13, 14, cap. 3; and it is not unlikely, from Morinus his preface to his consideration of that place, that he fixed on it some years ago, that he learned it from Buxterfius, by the provision that he lays in against such thoughts; for what is it to the reader when Morinus made his observations? The manner of the men of that society in other things gives sufficient grounds for this suspicion. And Simeon de Muis intimates that he had dealt before with the father as he now deals with the son, Censur. in Exercitat. 4 cap. 7 p. 17; himself, with great and rare ingenuity, acknowledging what he received of him: Assert. Verit. Heb. cap. 5, “Dicesve me haec omnia mutuatum a Buxtorfio? quidni vero mutuor, si necesse erit.” But what is the great discovery here made?

1. That the *puncta vocalia* are some of them called *reges*; the accents have now got that appellation; some of them are *reges*, and some *ministri*: so that the present state of things in reference to vowels and accents is but novel.
2. That the grammarians invented these *regia puncta*, as Aben Ezra says.

But, I pray, what cause of triumph or boasting is in all this goodly discovery? Was it ever denied by any that the casting of the names of the vowels and accents, with the titles, was the work of the grammarians? was it not long since observed by many that the five long vowels, with **א** and **י**, were called of old *reges*? and that the distinction of the vowels into long and short was an invention of the Christians rather than Jewish grammarians, the Jews calling them some absolutely *reges*, some great and small, some *matres et filias*? “But then,” saith he, “the grammarians were

the inventors of these points.” Why so? “Aben Ezra refers this unto the work of the grammarians, to know the progresses of the holy tongue, the generation of those kings,” etc. But can any thing be more evident against his design than his own testimony? It was the work of the grammarians to know these things, therefore not to *invent* them. Did they invent the radical and servile letters? Surely they also then invented the tongue; for it consists of letters radical and servile, of points and accents: and yet this is also ascribed to them by Aben Ezra But it is well that Morinus hath at length lighted upon R. Jehuda Chiug. His opinion before was collected out of Kimchi, Ephodius, Muscatus, and others. But what says he now himself? For aught that appears, by what we have quoted by Morinus, he is like to prove a notable witness of the antiquity of the points. It may be well supposed that Morinus, writing on set purpose against their antiquity, would produce that testimony which in his Whole author was most to his purpose; and yet he fixes on one wherein this ancient grammarian, who lived about the year of Christ 1150 or 1200, gives us an account of the points, with their names, without the least intimation of any thing to the impeachment of their divine original. So also the same Aben Ezra on ^{<9999>}Psalm 9:7 tells us of one Adonim Ben-lafrad, who, long before this R. Jehuda, found _ for _ in an ancient copy. And therefore, when Morinus comes to make the conclusion of his argument, discovering, it seems, himself the folly of the pretense that the points were invented by the grammarians, the last sort of men mentioned by Aben Ezra, he says, “Procul omni dubio est, et luce meridiana clarius Aben Ezram sensisse omnium vocalium punctuationem a Masorethis Tiberiensibus, et grammaticis, qui hos sequuti sunt, originem ducere.” But of these Masoretes there is not one word in the premises, nor is any such thing assigned unto them by Aben Ezra, but quite another employment, — of making a hedge about the law, by their observations on all the words of it — and had he dreamed of their inventing the points, he would sure enough have assigned that work to them; and as for the grammarians, his own testimony lies full to the contrary.

And these are the heads of the arguments insisted on by Cappellus and others, and by these Prolegomena, to prove the Hebrew punctuation to be an invention of the Jews of Tiberias five hundred years or more after the incarnation of Christ. “Brevis Cantilena, sed longum Epiphonema.” As I

have not here designed to answer them at large, with the various instances produced to give countenance unto them (nor is it needful for any so to do until the answer already given to them be removed), so by the specimen given of their nature and kind, the sober and pious reader may easily judge whether there be any force in them to subvert the persuasion opposed by them, grounded on the *catholic tradition* and consent of the Jews; the *uncontradicted reception* of them absolutely, without the least opposition, all the world over, by Jews and Christians; the very *nature of the punctuation* itself, following the genius of the language, not arising or flowing from any artificial rules; the impossibility of assigning any author to it since the days of Ezra, but only by such loose conjectures and imaginations as ought not to be admitted to any plea and place in this weighty cause; all attended with that great uncertainty which, without their owning of these points to be of divine original, we shall be left unto in all translations and expositions of the Scripture. It is true, whilst the Hebrew language was the vulgar tongue of the nation, and was spoken by every one uniformly everywhere, it had been possible that, upon a supposition that there were no points, men, without infallible guidance and direction, might possibly affix notes and figures which might with some exactness answer the common pronunciation of the language, and so, consequently, exhibit the true and proper sense and meaning of the words themselves: but when there had been an interruption of a thousand years in the vulgar use of the language, it being preserved pure only in one book, to suppose that the true and exact pronunciation of every tittle, letter, and syllable, was preserved alive by oral tradition, not written anywhere, not commonly spoken by any, is to build towns and castles of imaginations, which may be as easily cast down as they are erected. Yet unless this be Supposed (which with no color of reason can be supposed, which is yet so by Cappellus and the learned author of the Prolegomena), it must be granted that the great rule of all present translations, expositions, and comments, that have been made in the church of God for some hundreds of years, is the arbitrary invention of some few Jews, living in an obscure corner of the world, under the curse of God, in their unbelief and blindness! The only relief in the Prolegomena against this amazing inference is, as was said, that the Masoretes affixed not the present punctuation arbitrarily (so also Cappellus), but according to the tradition they had received. What weight is to be laid upon such a tradition for near

a thousand years (above, according to Morinus) is easily to be imagined. Nor let men please themselves with the pretended facility of learning the Hebrew language without points and accents; and not only the language, but the true and proper reading and distinction of it in the Bible. Let the points and accents be wholly removed, and all apprehensions of the sense arising by the restraint and distinction of the words as now pointed, and then turn in the drove of the learned critics of this age upon the naked consonants, and we shall quickly see what woful work, yea, havoc of sacred truth, will be made amongst them. Were they shut. up in several cells, I should scarcely expect the harmony and agreement amongst them which is fabulously reported to have been in the like case among the LXX. The Jews say, and that truly, **על הקראה בלנקוד לא ירים איש את לשונו**, — “No man can lift up his tongue to read without punctuation.” And, “Si rationi in his et similibus dominium concedamus, toti mutabuntur libri, in literis, vocibus, et sentiis, et sic res ipsa quoque mutabitur,” Lib. Cosri. 1, par. 3, p. 28.

And thus have I, with all possible brevity, vindicated the position formerly insisted on from this grand exception, which might be justly feared from the principles laid down in the Prolegomena,

CHAPTER 7.

Of the קָרִי וּכְתִיב, their nature and original — The difference is in the consonants — Morinus' vain charge on Arias Montanus — The senses of both consistent — Of the great congregation — The spring and rise of these various readings — The judgment of the Prolegomena about them — Their order given twice over in the Appendix — The rise assigned to them considered — Of Cappellus, his opinion, and the danger of it.

WE are not as yet come to a close. There is another thing agitated in these Prolegomena, and represented in the Appendix, that may seem to derogate from the universality of my assertion concerning the entire preservation of the original copies of the Scripture. The קָרִי וּכְתִיב, or the *scriptio and lectio*, or *scriptum and lectum*, is that which I intend. The general nature of these things is known to all them that have looked into the Bible. One word is placed in the line and another in the margin, the word in the line having not the points or vowels affixed to it that are its own, but those that belong to the word in the margin. Of this sort there are in the Bible eight hundred and forty, or thereabout; for some of the late editions, by mistake or oversight, do differ in the precise number. All men that have wrote any considerations on the Hebrew text have spoken of their nature in general; so hath the author of these Prolegomena. As to our present concernment, — namely, to manifest that from them no argument can arise as to the corruption of the original, — the ensuing observations concerning them may suffice: —

1. All the difference in these words is in the consonants, not at all in the vowels. The word in the margin owns the vowels in the line as proper to it, and the vowels in the line seen to be placed to the word whereunto they do not belong, because there is no other meet place for them in the line where they are to be continued, as belonging to the integrity of the Scripture.

Morinus, to manifest his rage against the Hebrew text, takes from hence occasion to quarrel with Arias Montanus, and to accuse him of ignorance and false dealing, *De Heb. Text. Sincer., Exer. 1 cap. 4 p. 40.*

The pretense of his quarrel he makes to be, that Arias affirms the greatest part of these various lections to consist in some differences of the points; for which purpose he cites his words out of his preface to his collection of various lections: “Maxima in his lectionibus varietatis pars in hujusmodi punctorum discrepantia consistit, ut toto hujus Mazzoreth sire variarum lectionum volumine demonstratur.” Whereunto he subjoins, “Mira assertio! ne usa quidem in punctis sits est. Catalogum plurimorum ipse ad finem praefationis adtexuit. Et vaxietates omnes sunt in literis, nulls in punctis. Cenfidentius scribe omnium variarum lectionum quas Judaei appellant קְרִי וְכֵתִיב Keri et Ketib, de quibus agit Arias nulls prorsus ad puncta pertinet. Iterum confidentius,” etc. Would not any man think but that the man had made here some *great discovery*, both as to the nature of the קְרִי וְכֵתִיב, as also to the ignorance of Arias, whom he goes on to reproach as a person unacquainted with the Masora, and with the various lections of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, of the eastern and western Jews, at the end of the Venetian Bibles; which Bibles he chiefly used in the printing of his own? And yet, on the other hand, men acquainted with the ability and great discerning of Arias will be hardly persuaded that he was so blind and ignorant as to affirm the greatest part of the variety he spoke of consisted in the changing of vowels, and immediately to give instances wherein all he mentions consists in the change of consonants only. But what if all this should prove the ignorance and prejudice of Morinus? First, To his redoubled assertion about the difference of the Keri and Ketib in the consonants only, — wherein he speaks as though he were blessing the world with a new and strange discovery, — it is a thing known “lippis et tonsoribus,” and hath been so since the days of Elias Levita. What then? Intended Arias Montanus to affirm the contrary?

*“Hic nigri succus loliginis: haec est
AERugo mera,”*

He speaks not at all of the קְרִי וְכֵתִיב, but merely of the anomalous pointing of words, in a various way from the genius of the tongue, as they are observed and reckoned up in the Masora: of other varieties he speaks afterward, giving a particular account of the Keri and Ketib; which whether he esteemed various lections or no I know not “Non site superis aequus.” But all are ignorant who are not of the mind of an aspiring Jesuit!

2. That the difference in the sense, taking in the whole context, upon the matter very little, or none at all; at least each word, both that in the line and that in the margin, yields a sense agreeable to the analogy of faith.

Of all the varieties that are found of this kind, that of two words the same in sound, but of most distinct significations, seems of the greatest importance, — namely, לו and לא, fourteen or fifteen times; where לא “not,” is in the text, the margin notes לו, “to him,” or “his,” to be read.

But yet, though these seem contrary one to the other, wherever this falls out, a sense agreeable to the analogy of faith ariseth fairly from either word: as, to give one or two stances, ¹⁴⁰⁰Psalm 100:3, עָשָׂנוּ וְלֹא אֲנַחְנוּ, הוּא, — “He hath made us, and not we ourselves.” The Keri in the margin is וְלוֹ, “his;” giving this sense, “He hath made us, and his we are,” the verb substantive being included in the pronoun. So ²⁵⁰⁹Isaiah 63:9, לֹא צָר, בְּכָל-צָרָתָם, בְּתִיב. The קְרִי [is] לוֹ, “Straitness (or affliction) was to him,” or “he was straitened” or “afflicted.” In the first way, God signifieth that when they were in their outward straits, yet he was not straitened from their relief; in the other, that he had compassion for them, was afflicted with them, which upon the matter is the same. And the like may be showed of the rest.

I confess I am not able fully to satisfy myself in the original and spring of all this variety, being not willing merely to depend on the testimony of the Jews, much less on the conjectures of late innovators. To the uttermost length of my view, to give a full account of this thing is a matter of no small difficulty. Their venerable antiquity and unquestionable reception by all translators gives them sanctuary from being cast down from the place they hold by any man’s bare conjecture. That which to me is of the greatest importance is, that they appear most of them to have been in the Bibles then when the oracles of God were committed to the Jews; during which time we find them not blamed for adding or altering one word or tittle. Hence the Chaldee paraphrast often follows the Keri, which never was in the line, whatever some boastingly conjecture to the contrary; and sometimes the Ketib. That which seems to me most probable is, that they were collected, for the most part of them, by the אנשי כנסת הגדולה, “The men of the great congregation.” Some, indeed, I find of late (I hope

not out of a design to bring all things to a further confusion about the original) to question whether ever there were any such thing as the great congregation. Morinus calls it a Judaical figment. Our Prolegomena question it, Proleg. 8, sect. 22. But this is only to question whether Ezra, Nehemiah, Joshua, Zechariah, Haggai, and the rest of the leaders of the people, on their return from the captivity, did set a sanhedrim, according to the institution of God, and labor to reform the church and all the corruptions that were crept either into the word or worship of God. I see not how this can reasonably be called into question, if we had not, to confirm it, the catholic tradition of Jews and Christians. Neither is it called “The great congregation” from its number, but from the eminency of persons. Now, on this supposition it may be granted that the Keri on the books of these men themselves, Ezra and the rest, were collected by the succeeding church; unless we shall suppose, with Ainsworth, that the word was so received from God as to make both necessary. And if we know not the true cause of its being so given, we have nothing to blame but our own ignorance, this not being the only case wherein we have reason so to do. Our last translation generally rendereth the word in the margin, noting also the word in the line, where there is any considerable difference. Those who have leisure for such a work may observe what choice is used in this case by old and modern translators; and if they had not believed them to have had an authoritative original, beyond the impeachment of any man in these days, they could not fairly and honestly have used both line and margin as they have done.






What say now our Prolegomena, with the Appendix, unto these things?

We have them in the Appendix represented unto us in their own order, according as they are found in the books of the Scriptures; and then over again in the order and under the heads that they are drawn and driven unto by Cappellus; — a task that learned man took upon himself, that he might in the performance of it give some countenance to his opinion, that they are, for the most part, critical emendations of the text made by some late Masoretes, that came no man knows whence, that lived no man knows where nor when. Thus, whereas these Keri and Ketib have the only face and appearance upon the matter of various lections upon the Old Testament (for the Jews’ collections of the various readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, of the oriental and occidental Jews, are of no value, nor

ever had place in their Bible, and may be rejected), the unwary viewer of the Appendix is presented with a great bulk of them, their whole army being mustered twice over in this service!

But this inconvenience may be easily amended, nor am I concerned in it.

3. Wherefore, thirdly, for the rise of them, it is said that some of them are the amendments of the Masoretes or Rabbins; others, various lections out of divers copies. That they are all, or the most part of them, critical amendments of the Rabbins is not allowed; for which latter part of his determination we think the learned author, and take leave to say that in the former we are not satisfied. Prol. 8, sect. 23-25, the arguments that are produced to prove them not to have been from Ezra, but the most part from post-Talmudical Rabbins, are capable of a very easy solution, which also another occasion may discover; at present I am gone already too far beyond my intention, so that I cannot allow myself any farther digression.

To answer briefly. Ezra and his companions might be the collectors of all those in the Bible but their own books, and those in their own books might be added by the succeeding church. The oriental and occidental Jews differ about other things as well as the Keri and Ketib. The rule of the Jews, that the Keri is always to be followed, is novel, and therefore the old translators might read either or both as they saw cause. There was no occasion at all why these things should be mentioned by Josephus, Philo, Origen. Jerome says, indeed, on ²⁰⁰Isaiah 49:5, that Aquila rendered that word “to him,” which is written with  and , not  and . But he makes it not appear that Aquila read not as he translated, that is, by the . And for what is urged of the Chaldee and LXX. making use of the Keri and Ketib, it is not intended that they knew the difference under these names, but that these differences were in their days. That the word now in the margin was in the line until the days of the pretended Masoretes is not nakedly to be said, but proved, if such a novel fancy expect any credit in the world. That the Judaical Rabbins have made some alterations in the text of their own accord, at least placed words in the margin, as to their consonants, supplying their vowels in the line where they ought not to have place; that there were various lections in the copies after the Talmud, which have been gathered by some obscure Jews, no mention being made of those collections in the Masora or any of their grammarians, — is the

sum of the discourse under consideration. When all this, or any part of it, is proved by testimony or evident reason, we shall further attend unto it.

In the meantime, I cannot but rejoice that Cappellus' fancy about these things, — than which I know nothing more pernicious to the truth of God, — is rejected. If these hundreds of words were the critical conjectures and amendments of the Jews, what security have we of the mind of God as truly represented unto us, seeing that it is supposed also that some of the words in the margin were sometimes in the line? And if it be supposed, as it is, that there are innumerable other places of the like nature standing in need of such amendments, what a door would be opened to curious, pragmatical wits to overturn all the certainty of the truth of the Scripture every one may see. Give once this liberty to the audacious curiosity of men priding themselves in their critical abilities, and we shall quickly find out what woful state and condition the truth of the Scripture will be brought unto. If the Jews have made such amendments and corrections of the text, and that to so good purpose, and if so much work of the like kind yet remain, can any man possibly better employ himself than with his utmost diligence to put his hand to this plough? But he that pulleth down a hedge, a serpent shall bite him.

CHAPTER 8.

Of gathering various lections by the help of translations — The proper use and benefit of translations — Their new pretended use — The state of the originals on this new pretense — Of the remedy tendered to the relief of that state — No copies of old differing in the least from those we now enjoy, inferred from the testimony of our Savior — No testimony, new or old, to that purpose — Requisites unto good translations — Of the translations in the Biblia Polyglotta — Of the Arabic — Of the Syriac — Of the Samaritan Pentateuch — Of the Chaldee Paraphrase — Of the Vulgar Latin — Of the Septuagint — The translations of the New Testament — Of the Persian — Of the Ethiopian — The value of these translations as to the work in hand — Of the supposition of gross corruption in the originals — Of various lections out of Grotius — Of the Appendix in general.

BECAUSE it is the judgment of some, that yet other objection-s may be raised against the thesis pleaded for, from what is affirmed in the Prolegomena about gathering various lections by the help of translations, and the instances of that good work given us in the Appendix, I shall close this discourse with the consideration of that pretense.

The great and signal use of *various translations*, which hitherto we have esteemed them for, was the help afforded by them in expositions of the Scripture. To have represented unto us in one view the several apprehensions and judgments of so many worthy and learned men as were the authors of these translations, upon the original words of the Scripture, is a signal help and advantage unto men inquiring into the mind and will of God in his word. That translations were of any other use formerly was not apprehended. They are of late presented unto us under another notion, — namely, as means and helps of correcting the original, and finding out the corruptions that are in our present copies, showing that the copies which their authors used did really differ from those which we now enjoy and use! For this rare invention we are, as for the former, chiefly beholden to the learned and most diligent Cappellus; who is followed, as in sundry instances himself declares, by the no less learned Grotius. To this purpose

the scene is thus laid: It is supposed [that] of old *there were sundry copies of the Old Testament differing in many things, words, sentences, from those we now enjoy*. Out of these copies some of the ancient translations have been made. In their translations they express the sense and meaning of the copies they made use of. Hence, by considering what they deliver, where they differ from our present copies, we may find out (that is, learned men, who are expert at conjectures, may do so) how they read in theirs. Thus may we come to a further discovery of the various corruptions that are crept into the Hebrew text, and by the help of those translations amend them. Thus Cappellus. The learned author of our Prolegomena handles this business, Proleg. 6. I do not remember that he anywhere expressly affirms that they had *other copies* than those we now enjoy; but whereas (besides the Keri and Ketib, the various readings of Ben Asher and Ben Naphtali, of the eastern and western Jews) there are, through the neglect, oscitancy, and frailty of the transcribers, many things befallen the text, — not such failings as, happening in one copy, may be easily rectified by others, which are not to be regarded as various lections, nor such as may be collected out of any ancient copies, but faults or mistakes in all the copies we enjoy, or that have ever been known, — by the help and use of translations, conjecturing how they read in their books, either with other words or letters, consonants or points, we may collect various lections as out of the original. What this opinion upon the matter differeth from that of Cappellus I see not, for the difference between our copies and those of old are by him assigned to no other original; nor doth Cappellus say that the Jews have voluntarily corrupted the text, but only that alterations are befallen it by the means and ways recounted in the Prolegomena. To make this evident by instances, we have a great number of such various lections, gathered by Grotius, in the Appendix. The truth is, how that volume should come under that name, at first view I much wondered. The greatest part of it gives us no various lections of the Hebrew text, as is pretended, but various interpretations of others from the Hebrew. But the Prolegomena solve that seeming difficulty. The particulars assigned as various lections are not different readings, collected out of any *copies extant*, or ever known to have been extant, but *critical conjectures* of his own for the amendment of the text, or at most conjectures upon the reading of the words by translators, especially the LXX. and Vulgar Latin.

Let us now consider our disease intimated, and the remedy prescribed, together with the improbability of the one and the unsuitableness of the other as to the removal of it, being once supposed. The distemper pretended is dreadful, and such as may well prove mortal to the sacred truth of the Scripture. The sum of it, as was declared before, is, “That of old there were *sundry copies extant*, differing in many things from those we now enjoy, according to which the ancient translations were made, whence it is come to pass that in so many places they differ from our present Bibles, even all that are extant in the world;” so Cappellus; — or, “That there are corruptions befallen the text (varieties from the *αὐτόγραφα*) that may be found by the help of translations;” as our Prolegomena.

Now, whereas the *first translation* that ever was, as is pretended, is that of the LXX., and that, of all others, excepting only those which have been translated out of it, doth most vary and differ from our Bible, as may be made good by some thousands of instances, we cannot but be exceedingly uncertain in finding out wherein those copies which, as it is said, were used by them, did differ from ours, or wherein ours are corrupted, but are left unto endless uncertain conjectures. What sense others may have of this distemper I know not; for my own part, I am solicitous for the ark, or the sacred truth of the original, and that because I am fully persuaded that the remedy and relief of this evil provided in the translations is unfitted to the cure, yea, fitted to increase the disease. Some other course, then, must be taken; and seeing the remedy is notoriously insufficient to effect the cure, let us try whether the whole distemper be not a mere fancy, and so do what in us lieth to prevent that horrible and outrageous violence which will undoubtedly be offered to the sacred Hebrew verity, if every learned mountebank may be allowed to practice upon it with his conjectures from translations.

1. It is well known that the translation of the LXX., if it have the original pretended, and which alone makes it considerable, was made and finished three hundred years, or near thereabout, before the incarnation of our Savior. It was in that time and season wherein the oracles of God were committed to the Jews, whilst that church and people were the only people of God, accepted with him, designed by him keepers of his word for the use of the whole church of Christ to come, as the great and blessed

foundation of truth, — a time when there was an authentic copy of the whole Scripture, as the rule of all others, kept in the temple. Now, can it be once imagined that there should be at that time such notorious varieties in the copies of the Scripture, through the negligence of that church, and yet afterward neither our Savior nor his apostles take the least notice of it? Yea, doth not our Savior himself affirm of the word that then was among the Jews, that not *ἰῶτα ἓν* or *μία κεράια* of it should pass away or perish? where, let not the points, but the consonants themselves with their apices, be intended or alluded unto in that expression: yet of that word, which was translated by the LXX., according to this hypothesis, and which assuredly they then had, if ever, not only tittles and letters, but words, and that many, are concluded to be lost. But that no Jew believes the figment we are in the consideration of, I could say, “Credat Apella.”

2. Waiving the consideration of our refuge in these cases, namely, the good providence and care of God in the preservation of his word, let the authors of this insinuation prove the assertion, namely, that there was ever in the world any other copy of the Bible, differing in any one word from those that we now enjoy; let them produce one testimony, one author of credit, Jew or Christian, that can, or doth, or ever did, speak one word to this purpose; let them direct us to any relic, any monument, any kind of remembrancer of them, — and not put us off with weak conjectures upon the signification of one or two words, and it shall be of weight with us. Is it meet that a matter of so huge importance, called into question by none but themselves, should be cast and determined by their conjectures? Do they think that men will part with the possession of truth upon so easy terms? that they will be cast from their inheritance by divination? But they will say, “Is it not evident that the old translators did make use of other copies, in that we see how they have translated many words and places, so as it was not possible they should have done had they rendered our copy according to what we now read?” But will this indeed be pleaded? May it not be extended to all places as well as to any? and may not men plead so for every variation made by the LXX. from the original, that they had other copies than any that now are extant? Better all old translations should be consumed out of the earth than that such a figment should be admitted. That there are innumerable other reasons to be assigned of the variations from the original, — as the translators’ own

inadvertency, negligence, ignorance (for the wisest see not all), desire to expound and clear the sense, and, as it was likely, of altering and varying many things from the original, with the innumerable corruptions and interpolations that have befallen that translation, indifferently well witnessed unto by the various lections exhibited in the Appendix, — it were easy to manifest. Seeing, then, that neither the care of God over his truth, nor the fidelity of the Judaical church whilst the oracles of God were committed thereunto, will permit us to entertain the least suspicion that there was ever in the world any copy of the Bible differing in the least from that which we enjoy, or that those we have are corrupted, as is pretended; and seeing that the authors of that insinuation cannot produce the least testimony to make it good, *μένωμεν ὥσπερ ἔσμεν*, through the mercy and goodness of God, in the entire, *questionable possession* of his oracles once committed to the Jews, and the faith therein once committed to the saints.

But now, to suppose that such indeed hath been the condition of the holy Bible in its originals as is pretended, let us consider whether any relief in this case be to be expected from the translations exhibited unto us, with much pains, care, and diligence, in these Biblia Polyglotta, and so at once determine that question, whether this be any part of the use of translations, be they ever so ancient, namely, to correct the originals by, leaving further discussion of sundry things in and about them to other Exercitations.

That all or any translation may be esteemed *useful* for this purpose, I suppose without any contention it will be granted, —

1. That we be certain concerning them that they are *translated out of the originals themselves*, and not out of the interpretations of them that went before them; for if that appear, all their authority as to the business inquired after falls to the ground, or is at best resolved into that former whence they are taken, if they are at agreement therewith; otherwise they are a thing of naught. And this one consideration will be found to lay hold of one moiety of these translations.

2. That they be of venerable *antiquity*, so as to be made when there were other copies of the original in the world besides that which we now enjoy.

3. That they be known to be made by men of *ability and integrity*, sound in the faith, and conscientiously careful not to add or detract from the originals they made the translation out of. If all these things at least concur not in a translation, it is most undeniably evident that it can be of no use to assist in the finding out what corruptions have befallen our copies, and what is the true lection of any place about which any differences do arise. Let us, then, as without any prejudice in ourselves, so without, I hope, any offense to others, very briefly consider the state and condition of the translations given us in the Biblia Polyglotta as to the qualifications here laid down.

Let us, then, take a view of some of the chiefest of them, without observing any order, seeing there is no more reason for that which is laid down in this Appendix than for any other that may be fixed on. I shall begin with the ARABIC, for the honor I bear to the renownedly learned publisher ^{f106} of it and the various lections of the several copies thereof; and the rather because he hath dealt herein with his wonted candor, giving in a clear and learned account of the original and nature of that translation; which I had, for the substance of it, received from him in a discourse before, wherein also he gave me a satisfactory account concerning some other translations, which I shall not need now to mention, though I shall only say his judgment in such things is to be esteemed at least equal with [that of] any now alive.

First, then, he tells us upon the matter that this translation is *a cento*, made up of many ill-suited pieces, ^{f107} there being no translation in that language extant. I speak of the Old Testament.

2. For the antiquity of the most ancient part of it, [it] was made about the year 4700 of the Jews' account, that is, of Christ 950. ^{f108}

3. It was, as to the Pentateuch, translated by R. Saadiah Haggaon.

4. That it is interpreted [interpolated?] and changed in sundry things by some other person.

5. That he who made these changes seemed to have so done that he might the better thereby δουλεύειν ὑποθέσει, as to some particular opinion of his own; whereof sundry instances are given.

6. That he seems to have been a Mohammedan, or at least much to have favored them, as appears from other evidences, so from the inscription of his work with that solemn motto, taken out of the Koran, “In nomine Dei miseratoris, misericordia.”
7. It may be thought, also, that some other, a Jew or a Samaritan, had his hand in corrupting the last translation,
8. who thought to stamp a divine authority upon his particular opinions.
9. That the foundation of this translation, now printed, being that of Saadiah, it is observable that he professeth that he did both *add* and *detract* according as he thought meet, that so he might set out the hidden, cabalistical understanding of the Scripture.
10. That the other Arabic translations that are extant are out of the Septuagint, either immediately or by the Syriac, which was translated out of it, On these and the like heads doth that oracle of the eastern learning — who hath not only, as some, learned the words of some of those languages, but searched with great diligence and judgment into the nature of the learning extant in them, and the importance of the books we have — discourse in that preface. It is the way of sciolists, when they have obtained a little skill in any language or science, to persuade the world that all worth and wisdom lie therein: men thoroughly learned, and whose learning is regulated by a sound judgment, know that the true use of their abilities consists in the true suiting of men to a dear acquaintance with truth. In that kind, not only in this particular are we beholden to this worthy, learned person.

I suppose there will not need much arguing to prove that this translation, though exceeding useful in its own place and kind, yet is not in the least a fit remedy to relieve us against any pretended corruption in the original, or to gather various lections different from our present copy by. Well may it exercise the ability of learned men to consider wherein and how often it goes off from the rule of faith; but rule in itself and upon its own account, coming short of all the necessary qualifications laid down before, it is none.

Should I now go to gather instances of the failings of this translation, open and gross, and so proceed with the rest, I think I might make a volume near

as big as that of the various lections now afforded us; but I have another manner of account to give of my hours than so to spend them.

Whether the SYRIAC translation be any fitter for this use, any one who shall be pleased to consider and weigh it will easily discover. It seems, indeed, to have been made out of the original, at least for some part of it, or that the translation of the LXX. hath been in many things changed since this was made (which I rather suppose); but when, ^{f109} where, or by whom, doth not appear; nor doth it in many things seem to have any respect at all unto the Hebrew. The note at the close of the Prophets I suppose to proceed rather from the scribe of that individual copy than the translator; but that the reader may see what hands it hath passed through, he may take it as it is rendered by the learned author of the annotations on that translation: “Explicit Malachias sive libri 12 prophetarum, quorum oratio perpetuo nobis adsit, Amen; precibusque ipsorum, precibusque omnium sanctorum, sodalium ipsorum praesertim virginis, quae Deum peperit, omnium sanctorum matris quae pro genere Adami intercedit, propitius sit Deus lectori et scriptori peccatori, et omnibus sire verbo sive opere, ipsis participantibus? But this good conclusion is, as I suppose, from the scribe; the usual negligence of whom in his work is frequently taxed in the collection of various readings, as page 8, *et alibi*.

Now, though I confess this translation to be very useful in many things, and to follow the original for the most part, yet being made as yet I know neither when nor by whom, in sundry places evidently following another corrupt translation, and having passed through the hands of men ignorant and suspicious, against whose frauds and folly, by reason of the paucity of copies, we have no relief, I question whether it may be esteemed of any great use or importance as to the end inquired after. ^{f110}

Of the SAMARITAN PENTATEUCH, both original and translation, we shall not need to add much. What the people from whom it hath its denomination were is known; nor have the inquiries of Scaliger and Morinus added any thing to what is vulgarly known of them from the Scripture and Josephus. In a word, an idolatrous, superstitious, wicked people they were, before they were subdued by Hyrcanus; afterward they continued in the separation from the true church of God; and, upon the testimony of Our Savior, had not salvation among them. When they received their

Pentateuch is uncertain; it is uncertain also how long they kept it. That they corrupted it whilst, they had it is not uncertain; they are charged to have done so by the Jews in the Talmud, and the instance they give abides to this day, ^{<B13>}Deuteronomy 11:30. They have added “Sichem” to the text, to give countenance to their abominations. And openly, in ^{<B74>}Deuteronomy 27:4, where God gives a command that an altar should be set up on mount Ebal, they have wickedly and nefariously corrupted the text, and put in Gerizim. Now, one such voluntary corruption, made on set purpose to countenance a sin and false worship, is enough to lay low the authority of any copy whatever. The copy here printed was brought out of the east, from Damascus, not long since. “It appears to have been two hundred and thirty years old,” saith Morinus in the account of it, *Opusc. Samar. Praefat. ad Translat. Samarit.* As I said before, that any Samaritans do as yet remain is uncertain; some few Jews there are that walk in that way, here and there a few families. Now, that this Pentateuch, which was never as such committed to the church of God, that had its rise no man knows by whom, and that hath been preserved no man knows how, known by few, used by none of the ancient Christians, that hath been voluntarily corrupted by men of corrupt minds, to countenance them in their folly, should be of any authority, upon its own single account, to any end or purpose, especially to vie with the Hebrew text, men that have not some design that they publicly own not will scarce contend. The places instanced in by Morinus ^{f11} to prove its integrity above the Hebrew copy, as to the solution of difficulties by it, in ^{<B12>}Genesis 11:29, 31, ^{<B20>}Exodus 12:40, do evidently prove it corrupt. Any man that will consider them will find the alterations purposely made to avoid the difficulties in those places; which is one common evidence of corruption. In ^{<B13>}Genesis 11:31, sixty years are cut off from the life of Terah, to make the chronology agree; and that of ^{<B24>}Exodus 12:46, “The dwelling of the children of Israel and their fathers, when they dwelt in the land of Canaan and in the land of Egypt, was four hundred and thirty years,” is a plain comment or exposition on the text. Nor would Jerome, who had this copy, make any use of it in these difficulties. Might I go over the rest of Morinus’ instances, whereby he seeks to credit his Samaritan copy, which we have in these Biblia Polyglotta, I could manifest that there is scarce one of them but yields a clear argument of corruption in it, upon some of the best grounds that we have to judge of the sincerity or corruption of any

copy. And if this Pentateuch had been of any credit of old, it would not have been omitted, yea, as it seems, utterly rejected as a thing of nought, by Origen, in his diligent collection of the original and versions. ^{f112}

But we are in a way and business wherein all things are carried to and fro by conjectures; and it were no hard task to manifest the utter uncertainty of what is fixed on as the original of this Pentateuch by the author of the Prolegomena, or to re-enforce those conjectures which he opposeth; but that is not my present work, nor do I know that ever it will be so. But I must for the present say, that I could have been glad that he had refrained the close of his discourse, sect. 2, wherein, from the occasional mention of the Samaritan Liturgy, and the pretended antiquity of it, he falls, not without some bitterness of spirit, on those who have laid aside the English Service-book. It were not (in the judgment of some) imprudently done, to reserve a triumph over the sectaries to some more considerable victory than any [that] is to be hoped [for] from the example of the Samaritans. Were they all barbers, and porters, and alehouse-keepers, yet they might easily discern that the example and precedent of a wicked people, forsaken of God, and forsaking of him, to whom the promise of the Spirit of supplications was never made, nor he bestowed upon them, is not cogent unto the people of Christ under the new testament, who have the promise made good unto them. And much more unto the same purpose will some of them be found to say, when men of wisdom and learning, who are able to instruct them, shall condescend personally so to do. But I shall forbear what might further be spoken.

The CHALDEE PARAPHRASE is *a cento* also. The Targum of Jonathan is ancient, so also is that of Onkelos; they are supposed to have been made before or about the time of our Savior. Some of the Jews would have Jonathan to have lived not long after Ezra; others [say] that he was the chief disciple of Hillel, about a hundred years before Christ's incarnation; some are otherwise minded, and will not own it to be much older than the Talmud: but as yet I see no grounds sufficient to overthrow the received opinion. The other parts of the Scripture were paraphrased at several times, some above five hundred years after our Savior, and are full of Talmudical fancies, if not fables; as that on the Canticles, That all these Targums are of excellent use is confessed; and we are beholden to the Biblia Polyglotta for representing them in so handsome an order and place,

that with great facility they may be compared with the original. But as to the end under consideration, how little advantage is from hence to be obtained, these few ensuing observations will evince: —

1. It was never the aim of these paraphrasts to render the original text exactly *verbum de verbo*, but to represent the sense of the text according as it appeared to their judgment. Hence it is impossible to give any true account how they read in any place wherein they dissent from our present copies, since their endeavor was to give us the sense as they thought, rather than the bare and naked importance of the words themselves. Hence Elias saith of them, **לֹא שָׁמְרוּ לַפְעָמִים דֶּרֶךְ הַדְּקוּק וְהֵנָּה** **הַמְתַּרְגְּמִים**, — “Behold, the Targumists observed not sometimes the way of grammar:”

2. It is evident that all the Targums agreed to give us often mystical senses, especially the latter, and so were necessitated to go off from the letter of the text.

3. It is evident that they have often made additions of whole sentences to the Scripture, even the best of them, from their own apprehensions or corrupt traditions, whereof there is not one tittle or syllable in the Scripture, nor ever was.

4. What careful hands it hath passed through, the bulky collection of various lections given in this Appendix doth abundantly manifest. And seeing it hath not lain under any peculiar care and merciful providence of God, whether innumerable other faults and errors, not to be discovered by any variety of copies (as it is happened with the Septuagint), may not be got into it, who can tell? Of these and the like things we shall have a fuller account when the “Babylonia” of Buxtorf the father (promised some while since by the son to be published, Vindic. Veritat. Heb. p. 2, c. 10:p. 337, and, as we are informed by the learned annotator on this Paraphrase, in his preface in the Appendix, lately sent to the publishers of this Bible) shall be put out. So that we have not as yet arrived at the remedy provided for the supposed distemper.

Of the VULGAR LATIN, its uncertain original, its corruptions and barbarisms, its abuse, so much hath been spoken, and by so many already, that it were to no purpose to repeat it over again. For my part, I esteem it

much the best in the whole collection exhibited unto us, excepting the interlineary of Arias; but not to be compared to sundry modern translations, and very unfit to yield the relief sought after.

The SEPTUAGINT is that which must bear the weight of the whole. And good reason there is, indeed, that it should answer for the most of the rest, they being evidently taken out of it, and so they are oftentimes worse; yet they are now better than that is. But here again all things are exceedingly uncertain; nothing almost is manifest concerning it but that it is wofully corrupt. Its rise is uncertain. Some call the whole story of that translation into question as though there had never been any such persons in *rerum natura*. The circumstances that are reported about them and their works are certainly fabulous. That they should be sent for upon the advice of Demetrius Phalereus, who was dead before, that they should be put into seventy-two cells or private chambers, that there should be twelve of each tribe fit for that work, are all of them incredible. ^{f113} See Scal. ad Euseb. fol. 123; Wouwer Syntag. cap. 11. —

Some of the Jews say that they made the translation out of a corrupt Chaldee paraphrase; and to me this seems not unlikely. Josephus, Austin, Philo, Jerome, Zonaras, affirm that they translated the Law or Pentateuch only. Josephus affirms this expressly: Οὐδὲ γὰρ, saith he, πᾶσαν ἐκεῖνος ἔφθη λαβεῖν τὴν ἀναγραφὴν, ἀλλ' αὐτὰ μόνα τὰ τοῦ νόμου παρέδοσαν οἱ πεμφθέντες ἐπὶ τὴν ἐξήγησιν, Prooem. ad Antiquit. And this is a received opinion; whence we have the rest is unknown. Take to this purpose the ensuing chapter out of Drusius, Observat. lib. 6 cap. 9.: —

“Vulgatam translationem Graecam non esse LXX. interpretum, contra, quam olim existimatum fuit.

“Translatio ea quae vulgo apud Graecos habetur, quin LXX. interpretum non sit, nemini hodie dubium esse arbitror ham si nihil aliud, innumeri in ea loci sunt, qui argnunt magnam imperitiam sermonis Ebraici; sed et negligentiam singularem in legendo, et oscitantiam tantis viris indignam qui in ea editione non videt, nihil videt; etsi Eusebius, Hieronymus passim in monumentis suis earn Septuaginta interpretibus attribuire videtur, Nos quoque cure aliquid inde proferimus usitato magis quam veto nomine utimur,

exemplo videlicet Hieronymi, quem suspicamus, licet crederet interpretationem earn a viris illis elaboratam minime fuisse, ne offenderet Graecos voluisse tamen recepto nomine semper appellare. Certe quin dubitaverit super iisdem authoribus, nihil dubitamus, nam vel hoc nos in ea opinione confirmat, quod scribit Josephum, omnemque adeo scholam Judaeorum quinque tantum libros Mosis a Septuaginta interpretibus translato esse asserere, scribit autem hoc non semel, sed saepius, ut Ezechiel 5 page 343, et page 301 et 372 et Mich. 2 page 150. Libris Antwerpiae vulgatis.”

Let it be granted that such a translation was made, and that of the whole Bible, by some Alexandrian Jews, as is most probable, yet it is certain that the *αὐτόγραφον* of it, if left in the library of Alexandria, was consumed to ashes in Caesar’s wars; though Chrysostom tells us that the Prophets were placed in the temple of Serapis: *Μέχρι νῦν ἐκεί τῶν προφητῶν αἱ ἑρμηνευθεῖσαι βίβλοι μένουσιν*, Ad Judeeos; “and they abide there,” saith he, “unto this day.” How unlikely this is any man may guess, by what Jerome, who made another manner of inquiry after those things than Chrysostom, affirms concerning the incurable various copies of that translation wanting an umpire of their differences. We know also what little exactness men in those days, before the use of grammar, attained in the knowledge of languages in their relation to one another; and some learned men do much question even the skill of those interpreters. So Munster. Praefat. ad Biblia, “Videbat Hieronymus vir pius et doctus, Latinos vera et genuina legis atque prophetarum destitutos lectione, nam LXX. interpretum editio, quae tunc ubique locorum receptissima erat apud Graecos et Latinos nedum perperam plerisque in locis versa fuit, verum per scriptores atque scribas plurimum corrupta, id quod et hodie facile patet conferenti editionem illam juxta Hebraicam veritatem, ut interim fatear illos non admodum peritos fuisse linguae Hebraicae id vel quod inviti cogimur fateri, alioquin in plurimis locis non tam fcede lapsi fuissent.”

If, moreover, the ability be granted, what security have we of their *principles* and *honesty*? Cardinal Ximenes, in his preface to the edition of the Complutensian Bibles, tells us (that which is most true, if the translation we have be theirs) that on sundry accounts they took liberty in translating according to their own mind; and thence concludes, “Unde translatio Septuaginta duum, quandoque est superflua quandoque

diminuta;” — “it is sometimes superfluous, sometimes wanting.” But suppose all these uncertainties might be overlooked, yet the intolerable corruptions that (as is on all hands confessed) have crept into the translation make it altogether useless as to the end we are inquiring after. This Jerome in his Epistle to Chromatius at large declares, and shows from thence the necessity of a new translation. Yea, Bellarmine himself says, that though he believes the translation of the LXX. to be still extant, yet it is so corrupt and vitiated that it plainly appears to be another, lib. 2 De Verbo Dei, cap. 6.

He that shall read and consider what Jerome hath written of this translation, even then when he was excusing himself, and condescending to the utmost to waive the envy that was coming on him upon his new translation, in the second book of his Apology against Rufinus, cap. 8:9, repeating and mollifying what he had spoken of it in another place, will be enabled in some measure to guess of what account it ought to be with us. In brief, he tells us it is corrupted, interpolated, mingled by Origen with that of Theodotion, marked with asterisks and obelisks; that there were so many copies of it, and they so varying, that no man knew what to follow (he tells us of a learned man who on that account interpreted all the errors he could light on for Scripture); that in the book of Job, take away what was added to it by Origen, or is marked by him, and little will be left. His discourse is too long to transcribe. See also his Epistle to Chromatius at large to this purpose. Let the reader also consult the learned Masius, in his preface to his most learned Comment on Joshua.

For the translations of the New Testament that are here afforded us, little need be spoken. Of the antiquity, usefulness, and means of bringing the Syriac into Europe, an account hath been given by many, and we willingly acquiesce in it. The ETHIOPIAN and PERSIAN are novel things, of little use or value; yea, I suppose it may safely be said they are the worst and most corrupt that are extant in the world. The Persian was not translated out of the Greek, as is confessed by the learned annotator upon it, “*Praesens locus satis arguit, Persam Graecum codicem baud consuluisset,*” in Luc. 10 et 41. Yea, in how many things he goes off from the Greek, Syriac, Arabic, yea, goes directly contrary to the truth, is both acknowledged by its publisher and is manifest from the thing itself. I know no use of it but only to show that such a useless thing is in the world.^{f114} Nor is the Ethiopian

one whir better, — a novel endeavor of an illiterate person. He tells us that John, when he wrote the Revelation, was archbishop of Constantia, or Constantinople, etc. It is to no purpose to go over the like observations that might be made on these translations; if any man hath a mind to be led out of the way, he may do well to attend unto them. Whether some of them be in use now in the world I know not; I am sure it is well if they be not. Had I not seen them, I could not have imagined any had been so bad. Would I make it my business to give instances of the mistakes, ignorance, falsifications, errors, and corruptions of these translators, whoever they were (Jews or Christians, for I am not without some ground of thinking that Jews have had their hands in them for money), my discourse, as I said before, would swell into a volume; and, unless necessitated, I shall avoid it.

From what hath been spoken, it may abundantly appear that if there are indeed such corruptions, mistakes, and errors, crept into the original, as some have pretended, there is no relief in the least provided for the security of truth by any of the translations exhibited unto us in these late editions of the Bible, themselves being of an uncertain original, corrupt, and indeed of no authority from themselves, but merely from their relation to that whose credit is called in question. For my own part, as I said before, I allow them their proper use and place, and am thankful to them by whose care and pains we are made partakers of them; but to endeavor by them to correct the Scripture, — to gather various lections out of the original, as say others, — for my part I abhor the thought of it; let others do as seems good unto them. And if ever I be necessitated to speak in particular of these translations, there are yet in readiness further discoveries to be made of them. ^{f115}

There remains only, as to my purpose in hand, that some brief account be taken of what is yet further insinuated of the liberty to observe various lections in the Bible, upon supposition of *gross corruptions* that may be crept into it; as also of the specimen of various lections gathered out of Grotius' Annotations; and somewhat of the whole bulk of them as presented unto us in the Appendix.

For the corruptions supposed, I could heartily wish that learned men would abstain from such insinuations, unless they are able to give them some pretense by instances. It is not spoken of this or that copy, which,

by the error of the scribes or printers, may have important mistakes found in it. There is no need of men's critical abilities to rectify such mistakes; other copies are at hand for their relief. It is of the text, without such suppositions, that this insinuation is made. Now, to cast scruples into the minds of men about the integrity and sincerity of that, without sufficient ground or warrant, is surely not allowable. It is not good to deal so with *men* or their writings, much less with *the word of God*. Should any man write that in case of such a man's theft or murder, who is a man of unspotted reputation, it were good to take such or such a course with him, and publish it to the world, would their stirring of such rumors be looked on as an honest, Christian, and candid course of proceeding? And is it safe to deal so with the Scripture? I speak of Protestants. For Papists, who are grown bold in the opposition to the originals of the Scripture, I must needs say that I look upon them as effectually managing a design of Satan to draw men into atheism; nor, in particular, do I account Morinus' Exercitations one whit better. It is readily acknowledged that there are many difficult places in the Scripture, especially in the historical books of the Old Testament. Some of them have by some been looked at as *ἄλυτα*. The industry of learned men of old, and of late Jews and Christians, has been well exercised in the interpretation and reconciliation of them: by one or other a fair and probable account is given of them all. Where we cannot reach the utmost depth of truth, it hath been thought meet that poor worms should captivate their understandings to the truth and authority of God in his word. If there be this liberty once given, that they may be looked on as corruptions, and amended at the pleasure of men, how we shall be able to stay before we come to the bottom of questioning the whole Scripture I know not. That, then, which yet we insist upon is, that according to all rules of equal procedure, men are to prove such corruptions before they entertain us with their provision of means for remedy.

For the specimen of various lections gathered out of Grotius' Annotations, I shall not much concern myself therein; they are nothing less than various lections of that learned man's own observations. Set aside,

1. The various lections of the Septuagint, [of the] Vulgar Latin, [and] of Symmachus, Aquila, and Theodotion, wherein we are not concerned;

2. The Keri and Ketib, which we have oftentimes over and over in this volume;
3. The various readings of the oriental and occidental Jews, which we have also elsewhere;
4. Conjectures how the Septuagint and Vulgar Latin read, by altering letters only;
5. Conjectures of his own how the text may be mended, — and a very little room will take up what remains. By that cursory view I have taken of them, I see not one word that can pretend to be a various lection, unless it belong to the Keri and Ketib, or the difference between the oriental and the occidental Jews: so that, as I said before, as to my present design, I am not at all concerned in that collection; those that are may further consider it.

As short an account will serve for the general consideration of the whole bulky collection of various lections that we have here presented unto us. For those of the several translations, we are not at all concerned in them; where any or all of them fail or are corrupted, we have a rule, blessed be God, preserved to rectify them by. For those of the originals, I have spoken to them in particular. I shall only add, that we have some of them, both from the Old and New Testament, given us thrice over at least; many of the Keri and Ketib, after a double service done by them, are given us again the third time by Grotius; so also are those of the New Testament by the same Grotius and Lucas Brugensis.

POSTHUMOUS SERMONS:

SERIES PUBLISHED FOR THE FIRST TIME

IN 1854

ALSO

THREE DISCOURSES,

PUBLISHED IN 1798.

PREFATORY NOTE.

The following Sermons have never hitherto been published. It was observed that the other posthumous discourses of our author had been drawn mostly from manuscripts in the possession of Mrs Cooke of Stoke Newington, the grand, daughter of Sir John Hartopp, the friend of Owen, and member of the small church in which, during the closing years of his life, he officiated as pastor. On application to the present representative of Sir John Hartopp's family. Sir W. E. C. Hartopp, Four Oaks, Sutton Coldfield, Warwickshire, it was ascertained that an additional volume of the same unpublished manuscripts was in his possession; and with a generosity which merits the warm gratitude of all the admirers of Owen, he placed it immediately at the disposal of the publishers of the present edition of Owen's works. On the fly-leaf of the volume, which is beautifully written and carefully preserved, there appear the following name and statement: "Eliz. Cooke; These manuscript sermons were taken in shorthand by her grandfather, Sir John Hartopp, from Dr Owen's own mouth, and transcribed by him into longhand; — bound up by her, in order to preserve such valuable discourses. Newington, 1755." In farther confirmation of their genuineness, it may be added, that the first sermon in the series is evidently identical with Owen's posthumous treatise "On the Mortification of Sin." A proof of scrupulous adherence to Owen's statements, and of a desire on the part of the writer to give as exactly as possible what came from his lips, is found in the beginning of one of the sermons, where he mentions, that having come late into the meeting-house, after the service had begun, he had not been able to give the introductory part of the discourse. With all the disadvantages under which they are now given to the world, they have still sufficient merit to justify the character ascribed to them by Mrs Cooke, to whose care we are indebted for their preservation, when she pronounces them "valuable discourses."

SERMON 1.

THE FURNACE OF DIVINE WRATH.

“And the word of the Lord came unto me, saying, Son of man, the house of Israel is to me become dross: all they are brass, and tin, and iron, and lead, in the midst of the furnace; they are even the dross of silver. Therefore thus saith the Lord God; Because ye are all become dross, behold, therefore I will gather you into the midst of Jerusalem. As they gather silver, and brass, and iron, and lead, and tin, into the midst of the furnace, to blow the fire upon it, to melt it; so will I gather you in mine anger and in my fury, and I will leave you there, and melt you. Yea, I will gather you, and blow upon you in the fire of my wrath, and ye shall be melted in the midst thereof. As silver is melted in the midst of the furnace, so shall ye be melted in the midst thereof; and ye shall know that I the Lord have poured out my fury upon you.” — ²⁰²⁷Ezekiel 22:17-22.

I SHALL not insist upon the particular opening of these words, but only take some observations from them: —

First, This is a very instructive similitude this of silver and dross; therefore it is often made use of by the Holy Ghost: ²⁰¹²Isaiah 1:21,22, “How is the faithful city become an harlot! it was full of judgment; righteousness lodged in it; but now murderers. Thy silver is become dross.” “Thy silver is become dross;” — this is God’s expression of the condition of an apostate people. “Thy silver is become dross.” He uses it again, ²⁰¹⁹Jeremiah 6:29, 30, “The bellows are burned, the lead is consumed of the fire; the founder melteth in vain: for the wicked are not plucked away. Reprobate silver,” refuse silver, drossy silver, “shall men call them.” And so here, in this place of the prophet, “Thy silver is become dross”

Secondly, There are two sorts of things that are called the dross of silver. The first is the scoria, that which remains after the furnace, and which manifests, the whole not being departed, the whole to be dross; that is, to be refuse and reprobate silver, — that is, the dross after a trial. There is,

secondly, a dross that is called so, which is nothing but the ore the silver is mixed withal before a trial. That is the dross here mentioned, — brass, tin, iron, lead; such things as are mixed with the silver before the trial. When God promises a purification, “I will take away all thy tin,” saith he. Now, whenever a nation is thus dross, there is yet some good silver in it. When there is nothing but refuse silver *after* a trial, then is all thrown away; but when there is a multitude of dross *before* a trial, there is always some good silver, or else no trial would be made. God is not an unskilful founder, to make a trial when there is no silver in the material. So here, in the text, “As silver is melted in the furnace;” — “as *silver*.”

Thirdly, When the dross is greatly increased, and the silver will not be otherwise separated from it, both dross and silver must into the same furnace. That is the case here; and you will excuse me if I judge it to be the case with ourselves. Both dross and silver must go into the same furnace; for we must observe, —

1. That the furnace belongs to God’s covenant. There is nothing in the furnace but that the best silver may be brought into it; and it needs to be brought into it, if it be but a furnace. In the day that God made a covenant with Abraham, ^{<0157>}Genesis 15:17, “it came to pass, that, when the sun went down, and it was dark, behold a smoking furnace, and a burning lamp that passed between the pieces of his sacrifice.” There the furnace is dedicated, God’s furnace, in those words, for the use of the church. If it be but a furnace, it is in the covenant for the use of the church: for, —

2. God hath an oven as well as a furnace; but the oven belongs not to the church at all: ^{<300>}Malachi 4:1, “Behold, the day cometh, that shall burn as an oven; and all the proud, yea, and all that do wickedly, shall be stubble: and the day that cometh shall burn them up, saith the LORD of hosts, that it shall leave them neither root nor branch.” When was this? Why, first, Christ came as “a refiner and purifier of silver,” chap. 3:3; and they are not purified by Christ. And “the day cometh that shall burn as an oven;” that was the day when Jerusalem was burned, and all that wicked, apostate church was consumed. God left them neither root nor branch, when eleven hundred thousand of them were destroyed in that city. That was God’s oven, which burned up that wicked, apostate church. Truly, brethren, if we had complied with Christ as a refiner, in the day of his refining, we

might have prevented the day of the coming of his oven. However, that is not the thing here threatened; but it is a furnace in common for the silver and for the dross, — the same furnace.

Why then, observe, that when God brings both silver and dross, both good and bad, into the same furnace, it is the highest token of God's displeasure. So it is here in the text, 'Ye shall know that I do it in my fury, and in mine anger, and in my displeasure.' There is nothing more to be trembled at than when all must go into the same furnace. 'I will gather the silver, and the brass, and the iron, and the lead, and the tin together, and they shall go into the same furnace.' God sometimes makes a distinction; as ²³¹⁹Isaiah 31:9, "Saith the LORD, whose fire is in Zion, and his furnace in Jerusalem." The "fire" there is the fire of a fining-pot; the "furnace" is a burning furnace. There is such a time, there may be, there hath been such a time, when God wilt bring his own Zion only to the fining-pot, and they shall not be in the furnace with wicked ones. I am afraid the cleansing of the churches is beyond the fining-pot; however, here in my text they are put into the same furnace.

When is a people so overgrown with dross as that it is necessary the good and the bad should go into the same furnace?

I shall name but two plain things: —

1. When the generality of a people are openly wicked and profane. You will see in the following verses of this chapter the reason given why God will put them all into the furnace. And why is it? Because the prophets were wicked, and the priests were wicked, and the princes were wicked, and the people were Wicked. He distributes them all into several parts, — prophets, priests, princes, people; and they are all wicked, and therefore they must into the furnace, saith he. Isaiah also speaks of setting up a furnace, chap. 1. Why will God set up such a dreadful furnace? Why, saith he, verses 5, 6, it is because "the whole head is sick, and the whole heart faint. From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment." When there is an universal corruption of the ways and walkings of all sorts of men, and of the whole body of the people, then God sets up his furnace.

2. You may add hereunto, that the dross doth so cleave unto the silver that there is no other way of separating them, a, but they must all into the same furnace. When all endeavors fail, warnings fail, chastisements fail, preaching of the word fails, an the silver is not separated from the dross; when men can scarce, professors can scarce, bear to be warned; when they can think of others' sins, but will not think of their own; when they will do nothing towards reformation, but say they shall have peace, — let what will come, one way or other they shall have peace; — there is no way but we must all into the same furnace; nothing else will do.

This is all that I shall observe from the words; only I would make a little use of them in one or two words. And I will say concerning them, as the apostle Paul doth in another case, "This speak I, not the Lord;" that is, not that he spake any thing against the mind of the Lord, but it was that which he had not an immediate revelation about. 'Though,' saith he, 'I judge I have the Spirit of God to guide me according to rule in this matter, yet I have not an especial revelation about it; "This speak I, not the Lord." But when he comes in with that for which he hath a special revelation, then, "This the Lord commandeth, not I." So, truly, I will say two things, whereof one is, 'I say, and not the Lord;' and it is only this, that it is my judgment we are all going into the same furnace. Let men please and flatter themselves as they will, crying, 'The church, the church; The temple of the Lord; Peace, peace;' my judgment is, we are all going into the same furnace with all the brass, and tin, and lead, and iron, in the nation, — going into the same furnace. And do I say so *now*? do I think so *now*? Nay, I have been speaking of it to this congregation for some years, that we are all going into the same furnace. But this I can say, 'I speak from the Lord, the Lord speaketh, and not I,' that things are so stated in the rule, so stated in providence, that it is your duty and mine to prepare for the furnace, a fiery furnace, a smoking furnace, that I am afraid God will cast this whole nation into; for, —

First, Neither you nor I can tell what to say as to the sins of the nation, of all sorts of persons, — our priests, prophets, princes, people. Nor you nor I can tell what to say unto the deadness and slowness of all sorts of professors, — of me, and you, and of all sorts of professors, — to come to such a reformation as may be preventive of a furnace; nay, to come to such a reformation as may give us faith to plead for an interest in the

fining-pot and not in the furnace. I know what the general hopes of men plead and speak. Well, bring forth your reasons, plead them before God this day, if you can, if you have any thing to plead but sovereign grace and mercy.

And [as for] the utter impossibility that appears by any other way to separate the silver from the dross, to separate us from the world, the plague, the fire, have not done it; signs in the heavens above and in the earth beneath have not done it; the sincere preaching of the gospel, though in weakness, hath not done it; entreaties, beggings, exhortations, have not done it; our prayers have not done it: we cleave unto the world still.

I will not insist upon particulars now; I have showed you enough formerly. So that I know nothing that can be a plea why we should not all into the same furnace. And, —

Secondly, God hath called out his workmen to set up a furnace. The workmen that God calls out in the world are not to make the fining-pot, but men that work in mortar and brick, fit to build a great furnace. And there are all sorts of them; — the Lord help us! God employs his workmen to build the furnace; — some by violence, some by treachery, some by folly; but all prepare a furnace. We may see them at work and hear them working every day, to prepare for this nation a furnace of God's wrath and displeasure.

Now, brethren, this I say, this saith the Lord, when God's workmen are setting up a furnace it is certainly our duty to be building an ark. The persons that were employed about Noah's ark (it is but another kind of allusion) were God's workmen to bring on a destruction that destroyed the old world, the world that repented not at the preaching of Noah. God called out his workmen; but Noah, moved with fear, built an ark. I have observed that the spirits of men do work towards and hearken after every thing that may keep them from fear: generally they do so; and oftentimes most weak and trivial things will put off our fear. But, saith He, "Noah, moved with fear," upon the warning of God that there would come a deluge that would destroy like this furnace, "built an ark." He was moved with fear, and he built an ark. I have often wondered at that word,

~~and~~ Ezekiel 21:9-13. God threatens "a sword, a sword sharpened, and also furbished: it is sharpened to make a sore slaughter; it is furbished that it

may glitter: should we then make mirth? He hath given it to be furbished, that it may be handled: this sword is sharpened, and it is furbished, to give it into the hand of the slayer. Smite therefore upon thy thigh.” Why? “Because it is a trial,” saith he, “and what if the sword condemn even the rod?” — all other meaner afflictions? After having spoken such a great and dreadful word of the sword being furbished and given into the hand of the slayer, “It is a trial,” saith he. The meaning is this: Here the people themselves had thoughts of a thousand ways of escaping the sword; and that it should not be a trouble, a trial, unto them, they would bear it this way and that way. Truly, I am ashamed of myself and most of the people of God with whom I converse, to see that we have such thoughts; — that when God’s sword is furbished, there is not a trial in it, — that we shall be dealt well enough withal. But prepare yourselves; a trial it will be, a trial that will try all your carnal confidences, and consume them. It will try your profession of what sort it is; and if it be found false, will consume it also. It is to try all your graces to the utmost, — all your faith, all your trust, all your self-resignation, all your readiness to leave the things of the world and to part with them. It will be a trial, friends. Think what you will, it will be a trial. “Because it is a trial,” saith He. It is strange there should be such stupidity upon us, that when the sword is furbished and made bright for the slaughter, and given into the hands of the slayer, we should not so much as think that it will be a trial, but make mirth. The reason is this, plainly, Because we have escaped former trials in the plague, and fire, and in the wrath of man. But saith the prophet, “This shall condemn every rod,” — go beyond all those rods we have undergone, and despise them. You think it is a rod; but do not mistake; it shall condemn every rod, despise them, and will be a trial. You have had no trial; neither your confidence nor your grace has been tried: but this will be a trial. I do not believe these things are a vain divination.

Then what is our duty, if this be the posture of things with us? Why, that which we are come together for this day; which is to cry to God for mercy, in this day of darkness, of gloominess, this day of anguish, —

1. For the whole nation. Let us pray to God that, if it be his holy will, however he shall deal with the nation, he would call in the workmen that seem to be employed about building the furnace; for their faces are filled with dread and terror, and it argues dreadful work when God employs

such workmen: beg of God to divert them, otherwise to employ them; beg of God to take them off, — that fierce, cruel men may not have the execution of God's judgments upon this poor land, — that God would take us yet into his own hands, — that men whose hearts are like the nethermost millstone, that grind with blood and revenge, may not have the trial of the land.

2. We may hope yet that the decree is not gone forth, and we may beg that God would not use these workmen. Now, if we should beg of God that he would yet cause the furnace to pass away, if we find it coming, and if we find our hearts enlarged to pray, and God bowing down his ear to hear, let us continue to ask further, not only that such and such may not be employed to fire the poor nation, but that God would even cause the furnace to pass away. Abraham began to pray to God: 'O Lord,' saith he, 'if there be fifty righteous in Sodom, wilt thou spare?' 'I will,' saith God, 'if there be fifty.' 'Lord,' saith he, 'if there be forty-five, wilt thou spare?' 'I will for forty-five,' saith God. 'Yet let me add, suppose there be forty?' 'I will spare for forty's sake.' Abraham found the infinite condescension of God to his prayer, and he asks no more by fives, but by tens: 'Wilt thou if there be thirty, twenty, ten, there?' Faith grew upon the Lord. If we find God answers our supplications for the removal of the workmen that are employed, that God would employ them elsewhere, and we have asked salvation in that, and a disappointment of others in their counsels, and find the Lord coming down, let faith come to ask by tens and tens, to bring it to the lowest degree. The utmost condescension of grace and mercy that will bear a consistency with the essential holiness and righteousness of God may be drawn out by faith and prayer. Then cry mightily unto the Lord, that, if it be his will, the furnace may depart from the nation.

3. If it be so determined that the furnace must be set up, and that we must all into the furnace, beg of God that we may have the lamp that belongs unto the covenant as well as the furnace. The furnace was all horror and smoke; but the lamp had a light in it. I take it from that of Abraham. When the furnace was a dark and smoking furnace, yet there was a lamp, a burning, shining light, that passed between the pieces of the sacrifice. That the dark, smoking furnace may not deprive us of the light of God's countenance in Christ, to support us in it and under it, beg of God that

though we go into the furnace, yet we may have the lamp to direct us, to give us light in that horror of darkness, and in the smoking furnace.

Lastly, Who knows but that God may yet, by prayer, by the preaching of the word, by continual warnings, before the day comes, before the decree brings forth, before it be too late, make such a separation (for this is as far as ever I can go), that his people shall be put into the fining-pot, and not into the same furnace? Cry for that! It is your mercy to be in Zion's fining-pot rather than in the consuming furnace.

And, then, tremble to think that there seems to me no dispensation remaining but the oven, but that which shall consume, and leave neither root nor branch.

The substance of all is, brethren, that there is a woful and a wicked corruption and profaneness of life grown upon the generality of the nation, — that there is such an adherence to the world and the ways of the world among professors, that former means have not separated them from the world (for this separation from the world in outward worship, if it be all, signifies nothing), — that we seem all to be ready, unless God relieve in infinite mercy, to be brought into the same furnace; which is under a testimony of God's displeasure: 'Ye shall know that I have done it in anger, when I have brought you into the same furnace.' It is a great pledge of God's displeasure with us. Yet there is left room for faith and prayer to plead with God in all the particulars mentioned; — to deliver us from the hands of blood-thirsty men; to divert the judgment ('I repented me of the evil,' saith God); yea, to remove the furnace; yea, to make us meet for the fining-pot, or, however, to enjoy the lamp when we are in the furnace, — to enjoy light, direction, guidance, when we are in all confusion of darkness and in the smoking of the furnace.

SERMON 2.

THE WISDOM OF MAKING THE LORD OUR REFUGE.

PREACHED FEBRUARY 27, 1669.

“Ye have shamed the counsel of the poor, because the LORD is his refuge.” —
~~Psalm~~ *Psalm 14:6.*

THERE is a peculiar mark put upon this psalm, in that it is twice in the Book of Psalms. The 14th psalm and the 53d psalm are the same, with the alteration of one or two expressions at most. And there is another mark put upon it, in that the apostle transcribes a great part of it, ~~Heb~~ Romans 3:10-12.

It contains a description of a most deplorable state of things in the world, — ay, in Israel; a most deplorable state, by reason of the general corruption that was befallen all sorts of men, in their principles, and in their practices, and in their opinions.

First, It was a time when there was a mighty prevalent *principle* of atheism got into the world, got among the great men of the world. Saith he, ‘That is their principle, they say in their hearts, “There is no God.”’ It is true, they did not absolutely profess it; but it was the principle whereby all their acting were regulated, and which they were conformed unto. “The fool,” saith he, “hath said in his heart, There is no God.” Not this or that particular man, but the fool, — that is, those foolish men; for in the next words he tells you, “*They* are corrupt.” Saith he, “The fool.....they are corrupt;” and verse 3, “They are all gone aside.” “The fool” is taken indefinitely for the great company and society of foolish men, to intimate that whatsoever they were divided about else, they were all agreed in this. ‘They are all a company of atheists,’ saith he, ‘practical atheists.’ “The fool hath said in his heart;” — that was their principle.

Secondly, Their *affections* were suitable to this principle, as all men's affections and actions are suitable to their principles. What are you to expect from men whose principle is, that there is no God? Why, saith he, for their affections, "they are corrupt;" which he expresseth again verse 3, "They are all gone aside, they are all together become filthy." "All gone aside." The word in the original is, "They are all grown sour; " as drink, that hath been formerly of some use, but when grown vapid, — lost all its spirits and life, — it is an insipid thing, good for nothing. And, saith he, "They are all together become filthy," — "become stinking," as the margin hath it. They have corrupt affections, that have left them no life, no savor; but stinking, corrupt lusts prevail in them universally. They say "There is no God; " and they are filled with stinking, corrupt lusts.

Thirdly, If this be their principle and these their affections, us look after their *actions*, in the third place, to see if they be any better there, if they are any better in their actions. But consider their actions. They be of two sorts, —

1. How they act in the world;
2. How they act towards the people of God.

1. How do they act in the world? Why, consider that, as to their duties which they omit, and as to the wickednesses which they perform. What good do they do? Nay, saith he, "None of them doeth good." Yea, some of them. "No, not one." Saith he, verses 1, 3, "There is none that doeth good, no, not one." If there was any one among them that did attend to what was really good and useful in the world, there was some hope. 'No,' saith he; 'their principle is atheism, their affections are corrupt; and for good, there is not one of them doeth any good, — they omit all duties.'

What do they do for evil? Why, saith he, "They have done abominable works; — 'works, saith he, 'not to be named, not to be spoken of, — works which God abhors, which all good men abhor.' "Abominable works," saith he, ' such as the very light of nature would abhor;' and give me leave to use the expression of the psalmist, — "Stinking, filthy works." So he doth describe the state and condition of things under the reign of Saul, when he wrote this psalm.

2. ‘If thus it be with them, and if thus it be with their own ways, yet they let the people of God alone; they will not add that to the rest of their sins.’ Nay, it is quite otherwise; saith he, “They eat up my people as they eat bread.” “Those workers of iniquity have no knowledge, who eat up my people as they eat bread, and call not upon the LORD.” What is the reason why he brings it in that manner? Why could he not say, ‘They have no knowledge that do such abominable things;’ but brings it in thus, “They have no knowledge, who eat up my people as they eat bread”? — ‘It is strange, that after all my dealings with them and declaration of my will, they should be so brutish as not to know this would be their ruin. Don’t they know this will devour them, destroy them, and be called over again in a particular manner.’ In the midst of all the sins, and greatest and highest provocations that are in the world, God lays a special weight upon the eating of his people. They may feed upon their own lusts what they will; but, ‘Have they no knowledge, that they eat up my people as they eat bread?’

There are very many things that might be observed from all this; but I aim to give but a few hints from the psalm.

Well, what is the state of things now? You see what it was with them. How was it with the providence of God in reference unto them? Which is strange, and a man would scarce believe it in such a course as this is, he tells you, verse 5, notwithstanding all this, they were in great fear. “There were they in great fear,” saith he. May be so, for they saw some evil coming upon them. No, there was nothing but the hand of God in it; for in ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 53:5, where these words are repeated, it is, “There were they in great fear, where no fear was;” — no visible cause of fear; yet they were in great fear.

God by his providence seldom gives an absolute, universal security unto men in their height of sin, and oppression, and sensuality, and lusts; but he will secretly put them in fear where no fear is: and though there be nothing seen that should cause them to have any fear, they shall act like men at their wits’ end with fear.

But whence should this fear arise? Saith he it ariseth from hence, “For God is in the generation of the righteous.” Plainly they see their work doth not go on; their meat doth not digest with them; their bread doth not go well

down. 'They were eating and devouring my people, and when they came to devour them, they found God was among them (they could not digest their bread); and this put them in fear, quite surprised them.' They came, and thought to have found them a sweet morsel: when engaged, God was there filling their mouth and teeth with gravel; and he began to break out the jaw-bone of the terrible ones when they came to feed upon them. Saith he, 'God was there,' verse 5.

The Holy Ghost gives an account of the state of things that was between those two sorts of people he had described, — between the fool and the people of God, them that were devouring, and them that had been utterly devoured had not God been among them. Both were in fear, — they that were to be devoured, and those that did devour. And they took several ways for their relief; and he sheweth what those ways were, and what judgment they made upon the ways of one another. Saith he, "Ye have shamed the counsel of the poor, because the Lord is his refuge."

There are the persons spoken of, — they are "the poor;" and that is those who are described in the verses foregoing, the people that were ready to be eaten up and devoured.

And there is the hope and refuge that these poor had in such a time as this, when all things were in fear; and that was "the LORD." The poor maketh the Lord his refuge.

And you may observe here, that as he did describe all the wicked as one man, "the fool," so he describes all his own people as one man, "the poor," — that is, the poor man: "Because the LORD is his refuge." He keeps it in the singular number. Whatsoever the people of God may differ in, they are all as one man in this business

And there is the way whereby these poor make God their refuge. They do it by "counsel," saith he. It is not a thing they do by chance, but they look upon it as their wisdom. They do it upon consideration, upon advice. It is a thing of great wisdom.

Well, what thoughts have the others concerning this acting of theirs? The poor, they make God their refuge; and they do it by counsel. What judgment, now, doth the world make of this counsel of theirs? Why, they "shame it;" that is, they cast shame upon it, condemn it as a very foolish

thing, to make the Lord their refuge. ‘Truly, if they could make this or that great man their refuge, it were something; but to make the Lord their refuge, this is the foolishest thing in the world,’ say they. To shame men’s counsel, to despise their counsel as foolish, is as great contempt as they can lay upon them.

Here you see the state of things as they are represented in this psalm, and spread before the Lord; which being laid down, the psalmist sheweth what our duty is upon such a state of things, — what is the duty of the people of God, things being thus stated. Saith he, ‘Their way is to go to prayer:’ Verse 7, “Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion! when the Lord bringeth back the captivity of his people, Jacob shall rejoice, and Israel shall be glad.” If things are thus stated, then cry, then pray, “Oh that the salvation of Israel were come out of Zion,” etc. There shall a revenue of praise come to God out of Zion, to the rejoicing of his people.

That which I would principally think of use for myself and you in this psalm is this, —

That it is a wise thing, a thing of great counsel and advice, to make God our refuge in the time of greatest distress, terror, disorder, and wickedness, that can be in the world. This was the counsel of the poor of old in such a time as is here described (and there is not a sadder time in the whole book of God), that at such a time, and at all times, it is a wise thing, a thing of counsel and advice, to make God our refuge. I do remember, in

^{<152>}Deuteronomy 32:21, God reproaches his people that they provoked him with that which was not God; and in ^{<808>}Galatians 4:8 it is a reproach unto them, “Ye did service unto them which by nature are no gods.” The meaning of it is this, that it is the foolishest thing in the world to put our trust and confidence in any thing that hath not the nature of God. There is nothing but the immense nature of God that is able to yield a refuge unto a poor soul in all the distresses whereinto it may fall; and therefore it is certainly our wisdom to make him our refuge. It is true, men do not take their immediate refreshment out of the ocean; but it is from the ocean that all our streams are derived that give refreshment unto all creatures. We do not immediately take our spiritual relief in trouble from the immensity of God’s nature, from his being God; but it is from thence that all our streams whereby we are relieved do proceed. And let us, any of us, set ourselves to

the most glorious stream that appears for our refreshment, if we do not by faith trace it unto the immensity of God's nature, we shall deal with it as behemoth thinks to do with Jordan, drink all up, swallow up the glorious stream of refreshment that lies before it, if we do not see it by faith stream from the immensity of God's nature. "Trust in the LORD for ever," saith he, ^{<2004>}Isaiah 26:4. Why? what is the reason? "For in the LORD JEHOVAH is everlasting strength. The eternity of God and the omnipotency of God, the everlasting strength and name of God, that he is Jehovah, are reasons for us to place our trust and confidence in him. "Trust in the LORD for ever: for in the LORD JEHOVAH is everlasting strength." Ye know that God doth often invite us to trust in his name; and they that know his name will put their trust in him: ^{<4900>}Psalms 9:9, 10,

"The LORD also will be a refuge for the oppressed, a refuge in times of trouble. And they that know thy name will put their trust in thee."

"The name of the LORD is a strong tower: the righteous runneth into it and is safe," ^{<1830>}Proverbs 18:10.

Is there any one that

"walketh in darkness, and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the LORD," ^{<2010>}Isaiah 1:10.

Ay, but you will say, 'Is it wisdom so to do? is it matter of counsel? the best course?' We have briefly seen it is great folly to trust in any thing that is not God by nature. Now we come to the positive part, that we are to make him our refuge. Is it good counsel so to do? Yea, 'Trust in my name,' saith God.

1. I would observe two things concerning this *name* of God, that he doth propose to us for the object of our trust; to make our refuge of: —

(1.) In general, what is there in this name of God? Why, the whole Scripture is but a declaration of the name of God. All the preaching of Jesus Christ is nothing but to declare the name of God. He saith so himself, ^{<8716>}John 17:6, where he gives an account of his ministry: "I have manifested thy name," saith he, "unto the men which thou gavest me out of the world." And ye have a summary description of it, ^{<0305>}Exodus 34:5-7,

“I will proclaim my name.” What name? Why, saith he, “The LORD, strong and mighty;” or, as we read it, “The LORD GOD,^{f116} merciful and gracious, long-suffering, and abundant in goodness and truth, forgiving iniquity and transgression and sin, and that will by no means clear the guilty.” Certainly, if this be the name of God, it is better to trust in the Lord than to put confidence in princes. It is wiser, it is better, of better counsel; for this *is* his name. The name of a prince may be Nabal; but God proposeth his name to us, so as to suit every state and condition we may possibly be in, under any distress: “The LORD God, merciful and gracious.”

(2.) It is wisdom, because God hath, in the revelation of his name, from the foundation of the world, accommodated himself unto the state and condition of his people, that they might thereby be wrought; upon to trust in him. When he revealed himself to Abraham, who was to wander up and down the earth in the midst of strange and wicked nations, without a dwelling-place, and was, I am persuaded, in that state oftentimes which he expresses once, “The fear of God is not in this place, and they will slay me” (he had occasion oftentimes to think thus, “They will slay me for my goods and possessions;” he was a very great eye-sore to all the wicked inhabitants of the land, as Isaac was afterwards, “Thou art much mightier than we”), why saith God, “Fear not, I am God Almighty.” He accommodates his name to his condition. And you know when the children of Israel quite despaired, and thought they should die under their bondage, and be worn away, God comes to them, and reveals himself unto them by his name Jehovah; — ‘I will fulfill all my promises now.’ When the children of Judah came out of captivity from Babylon, and the world was full of noise, confusion, and tumult., and armies were round about them, as you may see in the prophecies of Haggai and Zechariah, what was the name God revealed himself by? “Thus saith the LORD of hosts.” He revealed that he had the power of all the armies in the world. What name hath God revealed himself now by, that may be relief unto us, and make it advice and counsel now? Why, he is revealed now as “The God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ.” That is his name, and that is his memorial throughout all generations, which takes in all our spiritual and temporal concerns, — one who is afflicted with us in all our afflictions, tempted in all our temptations, suffers with us under all our sufferings. He

is the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, who is the captain of our salvation, and able to say unto the uttermost. He hath called us to trust in this name, and hath given us this reason for it.

2. God, to show it to be our duty and wisdom, doth immediately propose *the very properties of his nature* for our relief: ~~2307~~ Isaiah 40:27,

“Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, My way is hid from the LORD, and my judgment is passed over from my God?”

— words whose sense are often ready to possess our hearts: I am sure they often lie at the door of mine; I know not how it is with you. What doth God propose to relieve them in that condition? Why, he doth tell them, verse 28, “Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the Lord, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding.” Why, he proposeth three or four of the essential properties of his nature to our consideration to make our refuge: — His eternity; he is “the everlasting God;” — his power; he is “the Creator of the ends of the earth;” — his unchangeableness; he “fainteth not, neither is weary;” — and his infinite wisdom; “there is no searching of his understanding.” He proposeth immediately unto our consideration these glorious properties of his nature for our relief and refuge in such a time, when we are so far beyond all relief and all hope in the world. We are so quite sunk under the weight, so laid out of the way, so thrown away, that we are ready to think that we can see no relief from God himself. “My way is hid from the LORD;” — I have had my last trial and hearing; my judgment is cast out in the court of God, passed over; God will not determine in my cause.’ It is the complaint of the church under the great oppression of the Babylonians, ‘God hath passed it over, put off the day of hearing.’ What doth God give in this great distress to their relief? Why, he minds them of his glorious properties, of his unchangeableness, eternity, infinite wisdom, and infinite power. God carries it on in that place, but I will go no farther, though in the next words God manifests that he will exert all these holy properties of his nature in a way of covenant mercy to those that believe in him and put their trust in him.

3. It is our wisdom; because no distress is unspeakably and uncontrollably great that is capable of any relief or appearance of relief from any thing but the infinite nature of God. We are exposed, or may be, unto such distresses as nothing can give us the least relief in but the consideration of God's nature. Suppose a man were by the hands of violence cast into prison or a dungeon, where none was able to relieve him. Ay, but he will say, 'I have relief here; many good people know I am in a dungeon, and they will pray for me, pity me, have compassion upon me.' But a man may be cast into that condition where no man sees him, no man knows of him, where there is none to pity him, — a storm at sea, a dungeon out of knowledge. What shall relieve this man but the sole consideration of his interest in the infinite properties of God? I have known many in distresses of conscience that have been able to blow off every thing, until God comes to swallow them up with the infiniteness of God. Doubts and fears of their hearts have despised every answer, every word of comfort, that could be given unto them; but if you could once come to swallow them up in the infiniteness of God, that hath given them some quiet. And the reason of all this is, because our fears are able to pursue our apprehensions [of relief]. Whatever you can apprehend, your fears will go as far as your apprehensions, and weaken it unto you. Swallow up your apprehensions in what is infinite, and fear is swallowed up thereby. Every particular that your apprehension or reason can go through, your fears will go through, and will imbitter it to you. But if you can swallow all up into infinite wisdom, unchangeableness, mercy, fears and every thing else are swallowed up; and then the soul is at rest. Bring it to a particular promise. While fear and unbelief are at work, they will go as far as you, and give trouble; but if you come to make the Lord himself, in his infinite nature, to be your refuge, there is rest and peace in the soul.

It is matter of counsel and wisdom to make God our refuge, because it is a foolish thing to trust in that which is not God; and because God hath so proposed his nature and properties to us, as is suited to give us relief in every strait and distress whatsoever that may befall us.

"Ye have shamed," saith he, "the counsel of the poor." There is nothing that wicked men do so despise as the making God a refuge, — nothing which they scorn in their hearts like it. "They shame it," saith he. 'It is a thing to be cast out of all consideration. The wise man trusts in his

wisdom, the strong man in his strength, the rich man in his riches; but this trusting in God is the foolishhest thing in the world.’

The reasons of it are, —

- 1.** They know not God; and it is a foolish thing to trust one knows not whom.
- 2.** They are enemies to God, and God is their enemy; and they account it a foolish thing to trust their enemy.
- 3.** They know not the way of God’s assistance and help. And, —
- 4.** They seek for such help, such assistance, such supplies, as God will not give; — to be delivered, to serve their lusts; to be preserved, to execute their rage, filthiness, and folly. They have no other design or end of these things; and God will give none of them. And it is a foolish thing in any man to trust God to be preserved in sin. It is true, their folly is their wisdom, considering their state and condition. It is a folly to trust in God to live in sin, and despise the counsel of the poor.

Here we see what our duty is; and I thought I should have been able to have added a word or two of direction how to put this counsel into execution, to make the Lord our refuge, but my strength is gone.

SERMON 3.

FAITH'S ANSWER TO DIVINE REPROOFS.

PREACHED JANUARY 5, 1672.

“I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower, and will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved. And the LORD answered me, and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it. For the vision is yet for an appointed time, but at the end it shall speak, and not lie: though it tarry, wait for it; because it will surely come, it will not tarry. Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith.” —

 Habakkuk 2:1-4.

I MUST look a little back into the first chapter. The title is, “The burden which Habakkuk the prophet did see.” The burden is a burdensome prophecy, that should lade and burden them that were concerned in it. It is the burden which Habakkuk did see. Habakkuk, I do judge, is a proper name, though there is some question, because of the composition; and it signifies the “wrestler” or “striver.” It is apparent he was a very great wrestler with God, a great pleader with God; as any man may discern, if he will but read the first and third chapters, where there is as great a spiritual conflict and wrestling in them both as is in the whole book of God. He may be so called because he was an eminent wrestler with God in those days, as Jacob was. And it is such to whom God gives visions. God gives visions of judgment and of peace (for they are both here in a principal manner) to those that are great wrestlers with him. I will not insist upon this, though I could prove it, because I am not so absolutely certain that the word here is not merely a proper name.

The burden and vision he had was a grievous burden, a grievous vision, concerning the wasting of Jerusalem and of all the nations about by the Chaldeans. God doth frequently involve his church in common calamities;

but he hath always a special design towards them in those common calamities. Alas! Nebuchadnezzar commanded the Chaldeans and the nations about; they saw no more in the wasting and destroying of Jerusalem than in the wasting of Egypt and the countries about. God involves his church in general calamities with particular designs: for we know what particular design God had upon his people at that time; which, indeed, was the wheel within the wheel that caused the destruction of all the nations round about. Jerusalem was not destroyed because the nations were to be destroyed; but they were to be destroyed because Jerusalem was to be destroyed. And this was a great and dreadful period of time. God had set up his church, and had continued it now for four or five hundred years; but it had so many breaches, flaws, decays, that he saw there was no dealing with it, but to take the fabric down to the ground. It had been often repaired; in Josiah's and Hezekiah's times many reparations had been made of the fabric of the church. God saw it was grown so ruinous that it must be taken down to the ground; therefore he brought that universal devastation upon them by the Chaldeans, when their whole nation and church-state was ruined, and the people carried into captivity, and the temple burned with fire. I often compare it to God's dealing with the Christian church. When it had stood four or five hundred years after its erection, God saw it necessary to take it quite down; and turned in the Goths and Vandals, those barbarous nations, that ruined the church all the world over, the apostate church. And God let the church of Judah lie but seventy years before he repaired it; but he let the Christian church lie in rubbish seven times seventy years, before there was any vigorous attempt for its reformation. I only observe, it was a great period of time when this prophet had his vision; which gives great weight unto it. And he describes the matter of his vision in verses 6-11:

“For, lo, I raise up the Chaldeans, that bitter and hasty nation, which shall march through the breadth of the land, to possess the dwelling-places that are not theirs. They are terrible and dreadful: their judgment and their dignity shall proceed of themselves. Their horses also are swifter than the leopards, and are more fierce than the evening wolves: and their horsemen shall spread themselves, and their horsemen shall come from far; they shall fly as the eagle that hasteth to eat. They shall come all for violence: their faces

shall sup up as the east wind, and they shall gather the captivity as the sand. And they shall scoff at the kings, and the princes shall be a scorn unto them: they shall deride every stronghold; for they shall heap dust, and take it. Then shall his mind change, and he shall pass over, and offend, imputing this his power unto his god.”

Truly, a man would take it to be a description of another nation at this very day. And if I would insist thereon, I could show you how applicable the particulars are, in the hastiness, fury, pride, of that nation; in the multitude of their horsemen, and spoils, and captivities, and taking of forts; in their superstition and idolatry, imputing it to their gods, and standing upon their strength: but I will not do it.

Upon the consideration hereof, that so great and mighty a nation should come and swallow up the people, and there would be no standing before them, upon the strangeness of it, the prophet falls under a double, deep temptation: and, let us do what we will or can, we shall find something of those temptations exercise our minds in a like dispensation. The first was, That notwithstanding all their profession, yet God has no regard unto his church and those that make profession of his name and truth; that he respects other men in the world more than them. “Wherefore,” saith he, verse 13, “lookest thou upon them that deal treacherously, and holdest thy tongue when the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he?” — ‘It is true, this poor people is a sinful people; but they are more righteous than the Chaldeans. Whence is this? I cannot understand it.’ And so in verse 4, “The wicked doth compass about the righteous; therefore wrong judgment proceedeth.” This was his first temptation. Secondly, He hath another temptation upon it that goes farther. Saith he, ‘It may be God regards none of these things; that even throughout the world the strongest carries it.’ Verse 14, “Thou makest men as the fishes of the sea;” the rule whereof is, that the greater devour the less. ‘Thou makest all the inhabitants of the earth as the fishes of the sea, I can see nothing else [than] that those that have strength, power, and greatness, they devour the less.’ And this twofold temptation is exceeding apt to insinuate itself into the minds of men in the time of such terrible dispensations. And thence there ariseth a twofold conclusion which the prophet maketh in verse 4, under his paroxysm; a dreadful conclusion: —

1. That “the law is slacked.” The word, the law, is ceased; there is an end of the law; it seems as though the law were come to an end; that is, the whole covenant of God, and the ordinances and presence of God with them, are come to an end, for the wicked devoureth the man that is more righteous than he, and, when it is done, imputes it to his god. There is an end of the law, the covenant, and institutions.

2. Saith he, ‘There is no providence, then, in governing of the world, and judgment doth never go forth.’ Dreadful conclusions the prophet was tempted unto, or tempted with, upon the consideration of this wonderful vision of the Chaldeans, that hasty and fierce nation, destroying the church of God, with the nations round about them, because terrible, strong, and many.

To stay himself, in this first chapter he fixes upon two general conclusions, with which, in the midst of these great concussions and impressions that were upon him, he should stay himself: —

1. That notwithstanding all this, God is holy and faithful, and always the same: Verse 12, “Art thou not from everlasting, O LORD my God, mine Holy One?” — ‘He is the LORD our God, and our Holy One, notwithstanding all these dispensations.’

2. The second conclusion he fixes upon is this, That correction is needful for the church of God, but it shall not be to their destruction: “We shall not die. O LORD, thou hast ordained them for judgment; and, O mighty God, thou hast established them for correction.”

These two general conclusions he lays down; and I would only observe, that it is good for us to retain some general principles, that we may be unshaken in whatever private, particular concussions our faith may have under God’s dispensations; such as these: That God is from everlasting the same, the Holy One, and changeth not; secondly, That though the church of God need judgment and rection, yet they shall not die, God will not utterly destroy them.

Having fixed these principles, the prophet knew it was not enough; but he goes to bring things to a particular issue, in the beginning of this second chapter, in the words I have read unto you.

And there are four things in the words: —

1. What he would do now, after all these shakings: “I will stand upon my watch, and set me upon the tower.”
2. To what end he would do so. It is to “see what God will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved.”
3. There is the event of it; God shows him a new vision: “The LORD answered and said, Write the vision, and make it plain upon tables.” And,
4. There is the conclusion which he works all unto, and his own will unto, the issue of these things, in verse.

3. This, then, must all come to, to put an end to all disputes, fears, temptations, “Behold, his soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by his faith.”

For the opening of these words (which is the most I aim at, and some short observations from them), take notice that the prophet may be looked on under a double consideration, —

1. As a public minister of the church, as a prophet; 2. As a particular believer, that had to deal with God about these things.

First, He may be looked upon as a *public minister of the church*, and so having received a vision from God, it was his duty to observe what would be the issue of it, what would become of it.

It is the duty of all public ministers of God, whether ordinary or extraordinary, to look after the event, and success, and issue of the visions which they receive from God, which they give out from him. So doth the prophet here: ‘Well, I see not through to the end of this business; I will set me upon the tower, where God places the watchmen;’ that is, he doth enjoin himself to have continual consideration of God’s dealings and of God’s works.

In this posture he hath a vision; and you may consider, —

1. The vision itself, and,

2. The nature of it.

The vision itself is explained, ²²⁰⁰Isaiah 21:6-10. That and this put together explain well what this vision was “Thus hath the Lord said unto me, Go, set a watchman,” set this Habakkuk, “and let him declare what he seeth. And he saw a chariot with a couple of horsemen, a chariot of asses, and a chariot of camels; and he hearkened diligently with much heed: and he cried, A lion: My lord, I stand continually upon the watch-tower in the daytime, and I am set in my ward whole nights: and, behold, here cometh a chariot of men, with a couple of horsemen.” This the watchman tells God. “And God answered and said, Babylon is fallen, is fallen; and all the graven images of her gods he hath broken unto the ground. O my threshing, and the corn of my floor.” God sets him upon the watch-tower in a vision, and he seeth all sorts of creatures come with tidings that Babylon is fallen, that God hath executed judgment upon these Chaldeans. All bring tidings that Babylon is fallen, the Chaldeans are destroyed. So here in this, when he comes to declare this vision. It is expressed in verses 5-8, “Because he transgresseth by wine, he is a proud man, neither keepeth at home, who enlargeth his desire as hell, and is as death, and cannot be satisfied, but gathereth unto him all nations, and heapeth unto him all people: shall not all these take up a parable against him, and a taunting proverb against him, and say, Woe to him that increaseth that which is not his! how long? and to him that ladeth himself with thick clay! Shall they not rise up suddenly that shall bite thee, and awake that shall vex thee, and thou shalt be for booties unto them? Because thou hast spoiled many nations, all the remnant of the people shall spoil thee; because of men’s blood, and for the violence of the land, of the city, and of all that dwell therein.” This is the vision God gave him concerning the Chaldeans. Let them spoil the people for a season, the watchman upon the tower sees, and tidings come unto him that Babylon is fallen, is fallen, the Chaldeans are destroyed by the nations whom they had destroyed and pillaged; because they enlarged their desire like hell and the grave, and nothing could satisfy them until they should gather all nations unto them. This is the vision. In the midst of the greatest distresses, there is a vision of the destruction of all Christ’s enemies and the enemies of the church sufficiently recorded; and after a while he will declare the accomplishment of this vision, when we shall see

chariots coming, one providence after another, declaring God is executing vengeance against Babylon, [and] the Chaldeans.

Then we have the adjuncts of this vision, which I will but name: —

1. It is *certain*: “Write it.” It is a certain vision.
2. It is *evident*: “Make it plain upon tables, that he may run that readeth it.”
3. It is *determined*: “The vision is yet for an appointed time; “ you must not cause it to make haste.
4. That there will be a *great many interposition*, that will cause men to fear this vision will never be accomplished: “Though it tarry, wait for it; at the end it shall speak, and not lie.” Men will think it is but a false vision, that it will lie; but wait, for it will not tarry beyond its appointed time.

I could take observations from these adjuncts concerning the destruction of the adversaries of the church, but I shall say nothing to them, because there is something else I would speak unto.

Secondly, Habakkuk may be considered not only as a public minister of the church, but as *a private believer*; and thence we may learn three or four things from his deportment in this case, as he was a private believer.

1. In all that we have to do with God, we may justly fear and justly expect that we shall be reprov'd by him. Habakkuk had had dealings with God, and saith he, “Now I will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reprov'd.” Pray remember it, I say, in all wherein we have to do with God we may justly fear that we shall be reprov'd, that he will reprove us.

Consider ourselves as men, poor creatures, consider ourselves as sinful men, we have reason to expect reproof from God.

Consider ourselves as men: ^{<R&H7>} Job 4:17-19,

“Shall mortal man be more just than God? shall a man be more pure than his maker? Behold, he put no trust in his servants; and his angels he charged with folly: how much less in them that dwell in

houses of clay, whose foundation is in the dust, which are crushed before the moth?"

If God chargeth his very angels with folly, that is, an unanswerableness unto his infinite holiness and wisdom, — what can poor mortal men expect, that dwell in houses of clay, that are crushed before the moth? Therefore, upon that very consideration, when Abraham spake unto God, ^{<1187>}Genesis 18:27, "Behold," saith he, "I have taken upon me to speak unto the Lord, who am but dust and ashes;" — 'Let not God be angry that I, who am but dust and ashes, speak unto thee.' We may upon this consideration, but much more upon the consideration that we are sinful men, expect God will reprove us.

We may refer the grounds whence we should be in a continual expectation of reproof from God unto these three heads: —

- (1.) The consideration of God's own holiness. This ground the prophet lays down, ^{<301>}Habakkuk 1:13, "'Thou art of purer eyes than to behold evil, and canst not look on iniquity;" and therefore I must consider what I shall say when I am reproved.' Such is the infinite purity and holiness of God, that we cannot expect but that we shall fall under reproof when he comes to deal with us. The reason why men think they shall not be reproved by God is, because they think God is such an one as themselves, having no regard to the holiness of God. But saith God, 'I will reprove thee, and manifest myself to be a holy God.'
- (2.) We may justly expect to be reproved, because of the defilement that is in the best of our duties, Poor Habakkuk here was a great wrestler with God, yet he had such defilements cleaving to the best of his duties that he might justly expect to be reproved by God upon that account. ^{<260>}Isaiah 64:6, "All our righteousnesses are as filthy rags;" and if, in any thing we have to do with God, the best righteousness we have is but as filthy rags, may we not expect to be reproved?
- (3.) We have reason to fear upon the account of sin: ^{<301>}Psalms 130:3, "If thou, Lord, shouldest mark iniquities," what is done amiss, we have done so many things amiss, "who shall stand?" So ^{<491>}Psalms 143:2, "Enter not into judgment with thy servant;" he deprecates God's reproving of him: "for in thy sight shall no man living be justified."

I say, it is good to apprehend upon all these accounts, of God's holiness, the imperfection of our best duties, the multiplication of our sins, that God will reprove us. Fear always. Blessed is the man that doth so.

2. Observe from hence, also, that it is good to be well prepared with an answer to give unto God when we are reproved. Saith he, "I will watch to see what he will say unto me, and what I shall answer when I am reproved." It is good to be prepared with an answer to give unto God. Job thought so: Chap. ~~23~~23:3, 4,

"Oh that I knew where I might find him! that I might come even to his seat! I would order my cause before him, and fill my mouth with arguments."

You know who was reproved, and had nothing to answer; — the poor creature that came in to the wedding, as we all do. Our profession is our coming in to the wedding. Christ comes and reproves him: "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having a wedding garment?" The poor creature had nothing to answer, — he was speechless. What then? "Bind him hand and foot, and cast him into outer darkness." If we have nothing to answer when God reproves us, that will be the issue with every one of us.

And there is a fourfold evil answer that men betake themselves unto under God's reproof: —

(1.) There is Adam's answer. "Hast thou eaten of the tree whereof I commanded thee that thou shouldest not eat?" "The woman whom thou gavest to be with me, she gave me of the tree, and I did eat." Men think to answer God by palliating excuses. God will reprove them, and they will make palliating excuses in their own hearts. 'It is not so and so; there was this and that occasion of it.' This answer will not stand.

(2.) There is Jonah's answer when he was reproved. "Doest thou well to be angry?" saith God to Jonah. He tenderly reproves him. "Yea, I do well to be angry, even unto death." Men [there are] that, under God's reproofs, will justify themselves in all their sins; like the man in ~~19~~Deuteronomy 29:19, who when he heareth the words of the curse yet saith, "I shall have peace, though I add drunkenness to thirst;" — 'Notwithstanding all these reproofs of God, I do well to go on in the way wherein I am.' This answer also will not stand.

(3.) There is Israel's answer: ^{<1983>}Psalm 78:34-36,

“When he slew them, then they sought him: and they returned and inquired early after God. And they remembered that God was their rock, and the high God their redeemer.”

But what then? “Nevertheless they did flatter him with their mouth, and they lied unto him with their tongues.” False professors, upon God's reproofs, they humble themselves temporarily, and engage in false promises of reformation. This is the common answer mankind give to God's reproofs; but this answer will not pass when comes to reprove.

(4.) There is men's answer at the last day: ^{<1172>}Matthew 7:22,

“Lord, Lord, have we not prophesied in thy name? and in thy name have cast out devils? and in thy name done many wonderful works?”

God comes and reproves them, and they plead their duties, their works. It will not do. “I never knew you: depart from me, ye that work iniquity,” verse 23.

These are the common answers men, in their souls, and consciences, and spirits, give to God, when he reproves them. Either they excuse themselves, with Adam; or justify themselves, with Jonah; or promise better things, with false, flattering Israel; or plead what good things they have done. All these things will fail us; which leads me to the last observation.

3. There is but one answer that will hold, but one good answer that is to be made unto God when we are reprov'd by him; and that is this, — free justification in the blood of Jesus Christ. What shall I answer when I am reprov'd? Truly this, “His soul which is lifted up is not upright in him: but the just shall live by fairly.” And the apostle, in three or four several places, doth prove that this resolution of the prophet intends faith, that is the means of our free justification, in the blood of Jesus Christ. This is the great and only answer poor sinful souls can make unto God when reprov'd.

I will a little open it unto you, by showing you how God reproves us, and whence it is that this is our only answer.

God reprove us four ways: —

(1.) In general, by *the curse of law*: “Cursed is every one that continueth not in all things which are written in the book of the law to do them.” This is God’s great reproof of all sinners. Under this reproof we all lie. Truly, he that cannot answer this reproof of God will be cast out as a speechless, self-condemned person.

(2.) God reprove us *by particular applications of the word of the law*, finding out our special sins; as when the prophet came to David, and told him, “Thou art the man.” When in the preaching of the word there is application made unto the souls of men, that they are the persons that are guilty, that is a peculiar reproof of God. The general reproof is by the curse of the law, the sanction of the law; the particular reproof is by the application of the word to the conscience.

(3.) God reprove us *in general judgments*: “O LORD, when thy judgments are in the earth, the inhabitants of the world will learn righteousness.” All the dispensations of God that are dreadful and terrible in the world, we ought every one to take them as reproofs for sin, and not put the evil day far from us, nor think there are not any calls of God in them towards us.

(4.) God reprove us *by particular afflictions and trials*, — chastisements in our persons, in our relations, in things that befall us in this world. The end of them is to reprove us. The first language wherewith affliction upon a person or in a family opens its mouth in conscience is, ‘Thou art a sinner;’ as the woman, when her child died, said unto the prophet,

“O thou man of God, art thou come unto me to call my sin to remembrance, and to slay my son?” ^{<1178>}1 Kings 17:18.

The brethren of Joseph, as soon as they’ fell into trouble, said, ‘ God hath called our sin to remembrance.’ One great end of fliction is to reprove for sin.

Now, I say there is no other answer, when God thus reprove in conscience, to be given, but only the plea of pardon of sin and free justification of our souls by the blood of Jesus Christ. The apostle tells us so, ^{<688>}Romans 3:19,


“Now we know that what things soever the law saith, it saith to them who are under the law: that every mouth may be stopped, and all the world may become guilty before God.”

God gives reproofs by the law; what is the issue? Every mouth is stopped; all the world becomes guilty before God. Must they lie always so? is there no answer to be given to God? no relief? ‘No,’ saith he; ‘but we are “justified freely by his grace, through the redemption that is in Christ Jesus,”’ verse 24. Here the mouth of the sinner is opened again, here is something for him to plead. But take him by himself under God’s reproofs by the law, and every mouth is stopped, and that to eternity, and that with a sense of guilt; all the world becomes guilty before God.

The reasons hereof are these: There is no other answer,

1. Because in every other answer we should attempt the soul is lifted up. The prophet doth distribute all things that can be said to God when we are reprov’d under these two heads; — one of them, “whose soul is lifted up, and that is not upright in him;” and the other pleads that “the just shall live by faith.” There is an elation of mind, a lifting up of soul, which God abhors, in any other answer we can give him when we are reprov’d, whatever it be. This is the only answer,
2. Because, in truth, the Lord Jesus Christ hath really made this answer for us. The whole charge from God consists in the curse of the law, and in the application of it unto our souls in particular. If Jesus Christ hath answered to both these, where shall we have another answer? He hath answered the curse of the law, taken away the curse by “being made a curse for us,” ~~and~~ Galatians 3:13; hath answered whatever the law required. “What the law could not do, in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us.” God reproveth not but by the law. He speaks in the command and curse of the law, and reproveth in both. Christ hath answered in both. He was made a curse, and answered that reproof. He fulfilled the righteousness of it, and answered that reproof, paying that which he took not. God reproveth us in the particular application of the law to our souls for our sins. Why, God hath made all our sins to meet upon him, ~~and~~ Isaiah 53:6: which is the second

reason why this is the only answer, — because, indeed, Christ hath made this answer for us.

3. Because in all cases wherein we are reprov'd by God, Christ hath undertaken to be our advocate:  1 John 2:1, “If any man sin, we have an advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous.” It is upon the account of sin that we are reprov'd. God comes to reprove us, and we have set ourselves upon the watch-tower to see what we can answer him; for God must be answered when he reprov's. Why, we have an Advocate. An advocate appears for a man, and pleads his cause. Shall we take the plea of Christ out of his mouth, and say, ‘We can answer better for ourselves?’ I think it is our wisdom to trust to our advocate. And he pleads his own righteousness; for he is a propitiation for us. He pleads the atonement unto all God’s reproofs. When a man pleads nothing but pardon of sin through free justification by the blood of Christ, he saith nothing to God but what Jesus Christ pleads for him. The last reason is,

4. Because indeed we have nothing else to plead, no other answer to give. Our mouths are stopped, we are become guilty, and have not [any thing wherewith] to answer any reproof of God. We are apt to betake ourselves for relief unto excuses and promises, of what we are, and have done, or will do; but these answers will not do. I might easily go over the consideration of all we are apt to consider, our works before justification and after justification, to see if any of them will answer God when he comes to require a perfect righteousness of us, and to reprove us for every sin. What else will answer, what can we return else, but this righteousness of Christ? “The just shall live by faith.”

[As] for the use of it, it should keep our souls in an abhorrency of all those doctrines which pretend other pleas before God for our justification, that would make our own faith, our own obedience, our own works, to be the condition of our justification; that is, to make them to be our plea when we come to answer God when we are reprov'd of him. Do we think we can do such things when God charges upon us the curse of the law? Will our faith, our obedience, our works, be an answer to God? ‘Nay, Lord, we have done thus and thus; we have obeyed in sincerity; we have performed these and those duties.’ Shall we trust to it? Will the men of these doctrines trust to it themselves, when God comes indeed to deal with them? Can their hands

be strong or their hearts endure upon these principles, when indeed God shall deal with them? when God speaks in the application of the law to their souls? Besides the great contempt cast therein upon Christ, we will not allow him to be our advocate. They will soon find their hearts cannot endure when they come to die, or when conscience is brought under a sense of his displeasure for sin.

A second use of it is for instruction unto ourselves, that we should always have this answer in readiness. We know not how soon God may come with special reproofs unto us. Truly, besides those general ways, in the law and in the preaching of it, God hath particular applicatory ways, and works in the world in judgments and afflictions; and how soon he may enter into our consciences we know not. It is good to have an answer ready. And truly we see what the answer is, ‘Lord, we are poor, lost, undone creatures. If thou wilt deal with us, we cannot answer thee for one of a thousand; if thou markest what is done amiss, none can stand.’ ‘What, then, have you to plead, or are you speechless?’ ‘No, Lord; yet there is a plea left, this great plea, “The just shall live by faith.” Thou hast appointed a new way of interesting us in justification, by the way of believing in Christ; and that plea our souls advance.’ Have this plea in readiness when sin is charged upon your souls and consciences, in all your troubles and fears. Nothing else will answer God when he reproves.

I thought to have showed you what is required of us that we may be able to manage this plea aright, that it be not presumption in us; as, a stable self-condemnation without reservation, a prospect and view of the atonement made by Christ, and casting ourselves upon him to undertake for us.

SERMON 4.

SPIRITUAL STRENGTH; — ITS REALITY, DECAY, AND RENOVATION.

PREACHED JANUARY 9, 1672.

“But they that wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength; they shall mount up with wings as eagles; they shall run, and not be weary; and they shall walk, and not faint.” — ~~2MR~~ Isaiah 40:31.

THE occasion of the words arises from the complaint of Jacob and Israel, verse 27, “Why sayest thou, O Jacob, and speakest, O Israel, My way is hid from the Lord, and my judgment is passed over from my God.” It was with respect unto the dark dispensations of God’s providence towards the whole church, the church in general that this complaint was made.

I shall not stay to open the particulars; but as it is the complaint of the church in general, upon the account of God’s dispensation in general, so it is the condition of particular believers, of many believers. internal and external, spiritual and temporal, that they may be brought to that state wherein, through their weakness and unbelief, they may make this complaint.

God gives an answer hereunto, verse 28, “Hast thou not known? hast thou not heard, that the everlasting God, the LORD, the Creator of the ends of the earth, fainteth not, neither is weary? there is no searching of his understanding.” He proposeth his own infinite and glorious properties and excellencies for the relief of his people. When all other considerations fail them (as there is a time and season when nothing will relieve us but that which is every way infinite), it overbears and overwhelms them.

But in the following verses, and in that which I have read, he gives them to understand where the great mistake lay. They thought it was trouble that arose for want of kindness and evidence of kindness from God, when indeed their trouble arose all for want of spiritual strength in themselves;

and therefore God speaks not unto them of further manifestations of his love and grace to deliver them out of those straits, but he speaks to them of giving them more strength, more grace, whereby they may be able to manage themselves better under it. All our troubles and all our despondencies, they are not from want of sufficiency in God to relieve us, they are not from the greatness of our troubles and temptations; but they are all of them from the weakness of our faith and our grace. We think otherwise, but it is well if we could learn that that is the true state of things with us. When Peter was coming upon the water to Christ, the winds began to rise, and the waves to run high; and Peter cried out, “Lord, save me.” And now, if you should have asked Peter why he doubted, he would have answered, ‘Because of the greatness of the danger,’ — because the winds and waves of the sea were against him. Christ lets him know it was otherwise: “O thou of little faith, wherefore didst thou doubt?” It was not because of the greatness of his danger, but because of the littleness and weakness of his faith, that he was put into that condition of doubting. “My way is hid from the LORD, and my judgment is passed over from my God.” ‘Why,’ saith the Lord, ‘you must have more strength. Therefore that is it which God promises in these words, “They that wait upon the LORD shall renew their strength.” And I think these things lie plain in it, which I shall but little more than name: — First, That all believers have a spiritual strength. Secondly, That this spiritual strength of believers is subject to decays, to weaknesses. And, Thirdly, That the way to renew this spiritual strength and to increase it is by waiting upon God. And then we may, in a word or two, show you what it is to wait upon God, and how we do renew and increase our spiritual strength thereby.

First, It is plain in the text that all believers have a spiritual strength: “They shall renew their strength.” I acknowledge the word “their” is not in the original, but the very phrase carries it, “They shall renew strength;” that is, their own spiritual strength. Who hath a spiritual strength by nature? We have no strength, we have no power, no ability to live the life of God, nor to do any thing that tends thereunto: ~~ROM~~ Romans 5:6, “When we were yet without strength, in due time Christ died for the ungodly;” and till we are made partakers of the benefits and effects of the death of Christ, we are ungodly and without strength; we have no strength at all No unbeliever hath any strength.

But now all that do believe, they have spiritual strength: ^{<600>}2 Peter 1:3,

“According as his divine power hath given unto us all things that pertain unto life and godliness, through the knowledge of him that hath called us to glory and virtue;”

that is, whatsoever is required to lead a godly life is given unto believers by the divine power of God, a power that hath given us all things that pertain to life and godliness, — strength to enable us to live, and godliness for a holy and godly life and conversation. There are expressions to that purpose in other places: ^{<481>}Ephesians 3:16, “That he would grant you, according to the riches of his glory, to be strengthened with might by his Spirit in the inner man.” Through the Spirit, the Spirit of God, that is, the author of all grace, he strengtheneth us with might, gives might and power. And the apostle affirms the same again, ^{<501>}Colossians 1:11,

“Strengthened with all might, according to his glorious power, unto all patience and long-suffering.”

And though there is a principle, a seed of grace, a habit of holiness, inlaid in the heart and mind of all believers, enabling them to live unto God, a sufficiency of grace for that end and purpose, yet so as [that] what they do by virtue thereof is not done by themselves but by the grace of God. As our apostle said, “I labored more abundantly than they all; yet not I, but the grace of God which was with me;” giving him strength, power, and ability to go through with all those dangerous and laborious duties wherein he was engaged in the work of the gospel. We have no strength by nature, we are dead in trespasses and sins; but when quickened by the Spirit of God, he gives us this spiritual strength and power whereby we are enabled to live to God.

Secondly, This strength of believers, which is the actings of the principle of grace and holiness in them, is subject unto decays. “Be watchful,” saith Christ in the counsel he gives unto the church of Sardis, ^{<492>}Revelation 3:2,

“and strengthen the things which remain, that are ready to die: for I have not found thy works perfect before God.”

There was a decay in grace, a decay in spiritual strength, wherein their faith and love, in all the fruits of them, and works, were ready to die.

It would be worth the while, had I time, to consider the many ways whereby our spiritual strength and principle of grace, wherewith our natures are inlaid in our conversion unto God, are weakened. It is principally by our own negligence, by powerful corruptions and temptations, by cares of the world and the business of it, by want of attending unto the frame of our hearts, and not keeping our own vineyard. There is spiritual strength. This spiritual strength is subject to decay.

Thirdly, How shall we renew this spiritual strength? how shall we increase it? It is greatly incumbent upon us to be daily increasing our spiritual strength, to be renewing it, to be strengthening the things that are ready to die. All the losses we are at and troubles we meet with, they are all for want of well discharging this duty, because we do not take care to renew our spiritual strength. The way whereby it is to be done is by waiting upon God. Would you be strong, lively, vigorous, active Christians? would you have power to perform holy duties, to resist temptations, be fruitful in the world, be cheerful in yourselves? would you have corruptions die, and wither, and be prevailed against? You will say, ‘We would have all these things.’ Why, the way is plain; — it is to wait upon God. What is it to wait upon God? How is it that we may increase our spiritual strength by waiting upon God?

There are three or four things in waiting upon God that make up waiting; for it is a peculiar kind and work of faith that is called *waiting*: and if you will read the Scriptures, you will find that there is not a duty or exercise of faith which hath greater or more precious promises annexed to it than this of waiting.

1. The first thing in waiting is *looking unto God*, eyeing of God. So David expresses it in the Psalms: “As the eyes, of servants look unto the hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto the hand of her mistress; so our eyes wait upon the LORD our God.” God expresses it by “looking:” Look unto me, all ye ends of the earth.” “In the morning will I direct my prayer unto thee,” saith David, “and will look up.”

Now, this looking unto God, which is the foundation of waiting, is the fixing of the soul towards God; as when we look upon a thing, we make it the object of our consideration, and bend our thoughts towards it. If we would wait upon God, we must be, in the actings of our faith, looking

towards him; that is, we must consider his goodness, the excellency of Christ, his promises, and his truth and faithfulness in them, and his power. We must be in the contemplation of these things if we intend to wait upon God.

2. The second thing is *patience in looking*. Sometimes it is called “patient waiting,” waiting patiently for the Lord, not to faint, not to be weary. Many a one will cast a look towards God, but as quickly weary; this is not waiting. But he that will wait on God is to do it in patience, against all discouragements and oppositions that may arise from our own hearts and temptations. When God comes not in as we desire, nor such a progress is made as we would have, yet if we look unto God, that is patient waiting.


3. There is *expectation* too, and this is the life and soul of waiting. Waiting is often expressed in the Scriptures by “silence.” “My soul is silent to God; “ which silence is a quiet waiting to hear what God will answer. It is a wondrous sorry waiting on God when we do not expect something from him. To come together in the performance of this or the like duties without expectation of receiving something from God, it is the way to go as we came, without strength renewed or increased. We come to a duty and go from it at the same rate, when we have no expectation of receiving from God. Where there is no expectation, there is no waiting. Look to God with expectation to receive things suitable to what we expect, and then we shall see his infinite bounty and goodness. This is waiting on God.

The way wherein we exercise this grace is by *prayer*. I do not put it wholly upon it; for acting of faith, quiet submission of soul, constant looking up and expectation in a course of walking before God, make up a great part of this duty; but the solemn discharge of this duty is by prayer, wherein we act all these things. We ought to pray always, and to continue in prayer; and we are the strangest kind of creatures upon the earth if we abide in this duty without expectation from God. A man that looks for nothing from God had best never pray more. In prayer we are to exercise this grace of waiting upon God. They that thus wait upon the Lord shall renew their strength.

Whence is it that the renewing and increase of spiritual strength depend upon our waiting on God? There is not any thing in this world wherein we are more concerned, next to the securing our interest in Jesus Christ, than

this one thing of renewing our strength, our spiritual strength. Especially it is of great concern unto us now when it is a time, as hath been confessed unto God, wherein there are great decays, visible decays, in most professors, and inward decays I fear in all. Therefore it is our duty to consider how we may improve this great duty, for this end, to renew strength, to strengthen the things that are ready to die, that you and I that are weak may be strong, that are dead may be quickened and live, that our graces may be lively and flourishing. Saith the Lord, ‘They that wait upon me shall renew their strength.’ They shall do so upon a double assurance:

First, Upon a moral assurance, by reason of the faithfulness of God in his covenant. God hath promised it, and we may really believe it because of God’s promise: ‘They that wait upon me shall renew their strength.’ If we wait upon God in that way he accepts and approves, he is faithful to do it. And upon this account we may truly say, and do believe it, that no person under heaven waits on God as he ought, but God doth renew spiritual strength unto him, doth revive his graces, strengthen his faith and love, and enable him to obedience, as he hath promised.

Secondly, It is the way that God hath appointed for us to draw supplies of spiritual grace and strength from him. Our judgment and our dignity are not like those of the Chaldeans, that proceeded of themselves,  Habakkuk 1:7; but our judgment and dignity are of another, — God in Christ. All is from Christ; — our strength and honor are all from another. There must be a way, therefore, whereby we may derive strength from another, since it is not from ourselves. Now, this is the way that God hath appointed for us to derive supplies of spiritual strength from Jesus Christ, in whom are all the springs and stores of it; it is by waiting upon God in the ways before mentioned, — in the way of looking, of patience, of expectation on God in Christ, that he will perform his promise. God hath made this the way of communicating strength unto us, and deriving strength from Jesus Christ. ‘Abide in me,’ saith Christ: ‘if ye abide not in me, ye can do nothing; but if ye abide in me, ye shall be branches that shall be purged and bring forth fruit.’ Our abiding in Christ is by this exercising of faith upon God in Christ, whereby spiritual strength is renewed unto us.

I might speak of those things that are subordinate hereunto, because by this way of waiting upon God we mix his promises with faith, which God hath appointed; but I should then transgress my purpose and take up your time.

I have spoken these words to direct you and myself to the true use of this duty, that we have so frequent opportunities for, that none of us may rest in the work done, or satisfy ourselves that we have been at such a duty so often, so long, but improve it to its proper end, which is waiting on God in times of backsliding, that we may renew our strength; the consequence whereof is in the next words, 'We shall then mount up with wings as eagles; we shall run, and not be weary; and we shall walk, and not faint.'

SERMON 5.

HOLINESS URGED FROM THE LIABILITY OF ALL THINGS TO DISSOLUTION.

PREACHED JULY 11, 1673.

“Seeing then that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?”

— ~~GEN~~ 2 Peter 3:11.

MY design is only to go over a few texts of Scripture that may give us light into that instruction which is wrapped up in these words, and a little, if it may be, whet it upon us.

It is not certain what is meant by “All these things,” whether all the things of the world, the heavens and the earth, and all that is in them; or whether it be the “all things,” the heavens and the earth, of an apostatized church, such as was the church of the Jews, at that time drawing nigh to a fiery destruction. I shall not detain you in discussing the difficulties of it. But that which I would leave with you from the words, and which without all doubt is in them, is this, that all things in and of the world are liable and obnoxious to a destructive dissolution. Our things, and other men’s things, the things of the nation, and the things of families, so far as they are in and of this world, are liable to a destructive dissolution.

And then there is this again, I am sure, in the words, that upon the near approach of great, destructive dissolutions, it is highly incumbent upon all professors of the gospel to be signal in holiness and godliness, or assuredly they will not escape the pressure and evil of that destructive dissolution.

I pray let us believe that there is nothing in this world, but only the gospel of Christ, and the interest of Christ, and the grace and mercy of God in the covenant, but it is liable to a destructive dissolution. It is the law that hath passed upon all things since the entrance of sin. All alterations tend to dissolution, and all things in this world are put into a course of change.

Things alter every day, and the end of all that alteration is dissolution. Our relations, they must all be dissolved. There is a dissolution lies at the door between you and your estates, between you and your wives, between you and your children. And it is not a perfective dissolution, it is a destructive dissolution; for this dissolution ends it: and it lies at the door of us all, and every day leads us towards it. But there is a gathering up of the spirit of all things into a consistency in Christ Jesus, ~~AND~~ Ephesians 1:10. God hath reconciled all, and gathered all as the first-fruit and spirit of the whole into one head; that is, into Christ. What is gathered up into him never changes, it is obnoxious to no dissolution. Whatever is gathered up into Christ, be it never so little, if all the world should set themselves to dissolve it, they can never do it, — no, nor the gates of hell to boot; and whatever is not gathered up into Christ, if all the world should combine to preserve it, it shall never do it, — it will come to its dissolution. ~~AND~~ Psalm 75:3 are the words of Christ: “The earth and all the inhabitants thereof are dissolved: I bear up the pillars of it. Selah.” ‘Let there be a mark,’ saith he, ‘set upon that, their being dissolved.’ “Are,” that is only, being obnoxious to dissolution. They have nothing in themselves to give them a consistency or a stability. Christ is pleased for a season to put some pillars in it.

The conclusion made from thence is, that there is a great deal of madness and folly in all men, to pride themselves in any thing hero below; as in the next words, “I said unto the fools, Deal not foolishly: and to the wicked, Lift not up the horn: lift not up your horn on high; speak not with a stiff neck.” All pride and elation of mind from the things here below is mere folly and madness, and from want of considering that in their principle they are all dissolvable, and nothing stands but what Christ gives a pillar to. You may see the law of this, ~~AND~~ Romans 8:20,

“The creature was made subject to vanity, not willingly, but by reason of him who hath subjected the same in hope.”

Verse 22, “For we know that the whole creation groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now.” The “creature” in one place is the “whole creation” in the other; and by the entrance of sin it is brought into this state and condition, is “subject unto vanity.” “Vanity,” that is, to changes and alterations, which will issue in a destructive dissolution. It groans for deliverance. Every thing you see in the world of order, of power, they are

all but endeavors in the creation to free itself from this state of vanity, to preserve itself as long as it can from dissolution; and they are but vain endeavors, for there is a dissolution waiteth for it. ‘Some things will be excepted, surely, from this dissolution. It may reach our small concernments, but the heavens and the earth, they will stand firm; there is no danger of those more noble and glorious parts of the creation-’ Why, truly, if there were not, yet as long as our interest in them is subject to it, we are not much concerned; but there is [an end] to them also: ¹⁸⁴²⁵Psalm 102:25, 26, “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands.” What will he conclude from thence? ‘Therefore they shall endure? It is quite otherwise; “They shall perish, but thou shalt endure,” are the next words: “yea, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed.”’ A man would have thought from that great preface, “Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands,” the conclusion would certainly have been, ‘Then they should endure.’ No, saith the psalmist; “They shall perish.” God only shall endure, and an especial interest in God only shall endure; as I shall show you afterward from those words.

Go from the heavens and the earth to the inhabitants of them; the inhabitants of the earth, see what is their state and condition: Isaiah, 40:6-8, “The voice said, Cry. And he said, What shall I cry?” Something God would have taken notice of. ‘Cry out. What shall I cry?’ “All flesh is grass, and all the goodness thereof is as the flower of the field: the grass withereth, the flower fadeth; because the spirit of the LORD bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth.” All is grass, and all is but grass. It is twice affirmed that all is grass, and it is twice affirmed that all withereth. It may be green and flourishing for a little season; but the wind shall come over it, and shall cause it all to wither. “All flesh,” all men living; all their powers, all their honors, all their riches, all their beauty, all their glory, all their wisdom, all their gifts and parts, it is all “flesh” and all “grass,” and all liable to a destructive dissolution, that lies at the door.

‘Ay, but things in the world may come into such a combination as that they may be preserved from any danger of such a dissolution.’ No; ¹⁸⁴²⁶Ezekiel 21:26, 27,

“Thus saith the Lord God; Remove the diadem, and take off the crown: this shall not be the same: exalt him that is low, and abase him that is high. I will overturn, overturn, overturn, it: and it shall be no more, until he come whose right it is.”

One dissolution shall come upon the neck of another, until it all issue in Jesus Christ. ‘I will overturn it,’ saith God. ‘But men will set it up again.’ ‘I will overturn it again,’ saith God, ‘perfectly overturn it. All men’s endeavors shall but turn things from one destructive issue to another, till all issue in one whose right it is.’ The Jews have a way of remembering things, by a word that one way or other shall direct unto them. Truly, God hath strangely, wrapped up all this mystery in one word: ⁸¹²⁷Hebrews 12:27, “This word, saith he, “Yet once more, signifieth the removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things which cannot be shaken may remain. It is wrapped up in this one word. Carry this about with you as a note of remembrance, that God in dealing about those things hath put a “once more upon them; which is a sign they must come to a dissolution. It signifies that they are shaking, movable things, and must be gone. Remember God hath said concerning every thing, except only the unshaken things of the kingdom of Christ, God hath said of them”“ Once more,” and they shall have an end.’ That mark is set upon every thing but the things of Christ.

‘If we would look about us we might consider what would preserve any thing in this world from a destructive dissolution. A great consent and agreement would do it. Nations come to be broken and dissolved by differences one with another, and among themselves. If there were but a good consent and agreement, things would stand long enough, at least to the day of judgment.’ — I know not but that men were wonderfully well agreed before the flood, they all went the same way; yet that did not preserve the world; God marred the world he had made. They agreed so well, they would not destroy the world with their own hands; but God had a way to bring the world to a destructive dissolution.

‘But where an empire is mighty and strong, where there is force and power, we need fear no dissolution there.’ — Pray what is become of that part of Nebuchadnezzar’s image that was like iron, and broke every thing in pieces? what is become of the Roman empire, that dashed the world in

pieces at its pleasure? It is brought to a destructive dissolution; it is brought to the dust, and that dust scattered away before the wind.

‘A long-continued title, a long prescription of time in the same state of things, certainly *that* will secure us from the fear of a dissolution.’ — There is not an empire at this day in the world that hath had a life so long as man had before the flood; and if a prescription of eight or nine hundred years could not preserve men from the grave, will it preserve empires, kingdoms, and nations, when the time of their dissolution is come? God’s own institutions, that were not immediately managed in the hands of Christ, were all liable to a dissolution, and had it, that we may be sure to know that there was nothing but should be dissolved, except only what is managed immediately in the hands of Christ. The Lord dissolved all his own institutions, all that glorious worship that he had instituted and appointed under the law.

Let us see *our* concernment herein, and what use we may make of it. Truly this, that if all our own things, and all things wherein we are concerned in this world, — our lives, our relations, our enjoyments, our interest in public things, — if they are all obnoxious to such a destructive dissolution, that waits for them every moment, certainly it is our wisdom to look after an interest in Him that is unchangeable, and in immutable, unchangeable things. Two of the places I mentioned before give us this direction. Psalm 102, the psalmist speaks first of his own condition: Verses 23, 24,

“He weakened my strength in the way; he shortened my days. I said, O my God, take me not away in the midst of my days.”

He had apprehensions of his own frailty and mortality, and that in the appearing midst of his days. He was ready to sink and to fail away. He looked to the creation: Verse 26,

“They shall perish,” saith he, “all of them shall wax old like a garment.”

Whereunto doth he betake himself then? Verses 27, 28

“Thou art the same,” saith he, “and thy years shall have no end. The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee.”

In an apprehension of the mutable condition of himself and all things wherein he was concerned, he betakes himself unto an interest in the immutability of God. There is nothing firm, stable, unchangeable, but God himself: “But thou art the same.” There is nothing else the same; we are not the same the following moment as the moment before; nothing is the same, but only God: “Thou art the same.” What advantage will ensue hereon? ‘In the midst of all these changes, “The children of thy servants shall continue, and their seed shall be established before thee.”’ Where there is an interest in the immutable God, in the midst of all changes whereunto we are obnoxious there is stability and eternal continuance for us and for our seed.

The other place also gives the same direction: ^{<2407}Isaiah 40:7, 8,

“The grass withereth, the flower fadeth: because the spirit of the LORD bloweth upon it: surely the people is grass. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth.”

What shall we do, then? “But the word of our God shall stand for ever,” saith he; that is, as the apostle Peter explains it, ^{<4025}1 Peter 1:25,

“The word of the gospel which is preached unto you.”

In this fading condition of all things, if you would come to any thing of stability, it must be in the stability of the word of God, that abides for ever. That contains the whole of what I have been speaking unto you, that there is a destructive dissolution waits for every thing, but only the kingdom and gospel of Jesus Christ.

The Lord keep us from needing that reproof which the psalmist uses to some hereon: “I said unto the fools, Deal not foolishly.” But can there be any thing more foolish for us than to fix and set our hearts and minds upon that which God hath told us is grass? Your estates, your parts, your wisdom, your wives and children, are grass; they all wither away, decay, and die. Yourselves are grass: “Surely,” saith he, “the people is grass.” Let us not be so foolish as to set our hearts upon those things that are withering and decaying; let us not please ourselves. We have security in nothing, when we return to our habitations, but this one thing, “The word of our God shall stand for ever.” Wives, children, husbands, may be dead, our houses may be fired and all consumed. There is only this, the word of

God, that abides for ever; the promises of God fail not; everything else is obnoxious to dissolution, please yourselves with them as much as you will. Men are apt to have strange contrivances to satisfy themselves in other things, Psalm 49. The men the psalmist there speaks of, he gives this account of them: "They see wise men die, likewise the fool and the brutish person perish, and leave their wealth to others." They have convictions upon them, that as to their own persons, all their interest in present things is but perishing: for they see wise men and fools all die; there is no man but dies, be he of what condition he will. But they have contrivances to secure themselves another way; and this overpowers them, that they dare not speak one word that there is a happiness to be had in those outward, earthly things. But "their inward thought is" (they have a reserve yet), "their inward thought is, that their houses shall continue for ever, and their dwelling-places to all generations; they call their lands after their own names," verse 11. Though they cannot continue those things to themselves, yet they will continue them in their posterity: 'Posterity from generation to generation, they shall enjoy all my wealth, and all I have labored for, hoarded up, and preserved. What if I do die, seeing all must die, the wise man and the fool alike, yet posterity of generations to come shall enjoy it.' That is their "inward thought;" that is it wherewith they relieve themselves against the open convictions they have that all things here, are uncertain and not worth the setting the mind upon. What judgment doth the Holy Ghost make of it, verse 17? Alas, poor man! he is little concerned in all that comes after him, for "When he dieth he shall carry nothing away; his glory shall not descend after him." The meaning is this, he hath no manner of concernment in all that is above ground. If he could carry his riches and his glory with him, it were something; but as for all that he leaves behind, he is no more concerned in it than any common man that lives upon the face of the earth: "He shall go to the generation of his fathers; they shall never see light."

This should teach us, — and it were a good lesson if we could learn it this day, — to secure an interest in unchangeable things; about which you need not be careful or solicitous, as you are about all things you enjoy. I know you are so; — don't deny it. There are none of you so negligent: careless, and stupid, but you may take a prospect of such near-approaching dissolutions as must make you solicitous about all your enjoyments. It

were better, then, we should lay out the whole of our concernment in those things that cannot be shaken or moved, — that never are obnoxious to a destructive dissolution. “The word of our God shall stand for ever;” the things of the kingdom of Christ are unshaken things. Mercy coming from an everlasting covenant to his children and their seed shall be blessed salvation. Though “all these things shall be dissolved,” God is “the same.” That is for the first observation.

The next observation is this, That upon the approach of a destructive dissolution, it is required of all professors to be signal in holiness: “Seeing that all these things shall be dissolved, what manner of persons ought ye to be in all holy conversation and godliness?”

I take here an approaching, destructive dissolution not to be that which attends all our designs upon the common account, but upon the account of the judgments of God that are in the world, the judgments of God that come upon people and nations. And I would speak to two things: —

1. What are the evidences of the approach of a destructive dissolution;
2. What are the reasons from thence unto signal holiness and godliness,

FIRST, What are the signs and tokens of an approaching dissolution? First, There is one in general that never misses; I mean this, that we have no instance in Scripture that ever God brought a destruction upon any place or people where that did not go before it, — and if we can free ourselves from that, we may free ourselves from the fear of an approaching dissolution, — and that is, *security*. The rule of all great, destructive judgments is laid down in ~~1~~ 1 Thessalonians 5:3,

“When they shall say, Peace and safety; then sudden destruction cometh upon them, as travail upon a woman with child; and they shall not escape.”

You never read of any people or place destroyed with overturning judgments, but it is remarked before their approach that they were secure; though we do not rightly understand this security. There is no security but such as a woman may have that is with child, that yet may be surprised with the hour of travail. It is not every thought and apprehension of danger, every conjecture, every talk of it, that will free men from being in

such a security as opens the door to great judgments and destructions. Things are so evident sometimes that men cannot but think, that unless a miracle interpose judgments must come; but yet they come “as travail upon a woman with child.” Therefore there are three or four things wherein this security doth consist: —

1. It consists in a general, earnest intension upon the occasions of life and the temptations of life. When a nation is divided into these two sorts, that some are extraordinarily intent upon the occasions of life, and some are extraordinarily compliant with the temptations of life, that nation is under universal security. It was so before the flood. Our Savior tells us of some of them, ¹⁰⁸⁸Matthew 24:38, that “they were eating and drinking, marrying and giving in marriage;” they were earnestly intent upon the occasions of life. And some of them were given up to a compliance with the temptations of life. Surfeiting, drunkenness, violence, the earth was filled withal. Let us now think what we will, talk what we will, if a nation may be distributed into these two parts, — one part over-intent upon the occasions of this life, and the other over-compliant with the temptations of life, sin and wickedness, — that nation, that people, is secure.

2. When, upon a prospect of the danger of approaching destructive dissolutions, men betake themselves to any other preparations or provisions than unto the proper remedy and help, there is security. In Isaiah 22 there is a great and terrible vision concerning a destructive dissolution coming upon Jerusalem: Verse 2, “Thou that art full of stirs, a tumultuous city, a joyous city: thy slain men are not slain with the sword, nor dead in battle;” — that is, not yet. The day cometh: Verse 5, “It is a day of trouble, and of treading down, and of perplexity by the LORD GOD of hosts in the valley of vision, breaking down the walls, and of crying to the mountains.” And in verses 8-11, he tells you what provision was made to avoid this destruction and desolation that was coming upon them: “He discovered the covering of Judah, and thou didst look in that day to the armor of the house of the forest. Ye have seen also the breaches of the city of David, that they are many: and ye gathered together the waters of the lower pool. And ye have numbered the houses of Jerusalem, and the houses have ye broken down to fortify the wall Ye made also a ditch between the two walls for the water of the old pool.” Those were not a secure people, surely, who took all this pains, were at all this charge, made

all this provision, to prevent destruction from coming upon them. There are a people in the world who can see destruction lie at the door, and make no manner of preparation to keep it off from them. But these people were secure; and the reason is given: Verse 11,

“But ye have not looked unto the Maker thereof, neither had respect unto him that fashioned it long ago.”

They had respect to other things to give relief, and not unto God, who alone ought to have been looked unto. We are not rulers or governors of nations, but poor and private persons. Let us examine our hearts what provision we are most apt to make against a destructive dissolution. Have we not hopes and reserves that we may escape? — this way and that way we may do it; it may come here, and not there? This is a sign of security.

3. A people are then secure when God’s warnings among them are despised. I am persuaded that, such is the goodness and tenderness of God to mankind, so little is he delighted in bringing sore judgments upon them, to their ruin and destruction, he scarce ever destroyed the most wicked and idolatrous nation, — those that knew nothing of him now of Christ, — but he gave them some providential warnings of it, that might make them look about them and consider where they were. It is apparent in story. He dealt so with all the heathen of old. There came no great destruction upon any nation but there were providential warnings went before. When these warnings are despised, that people are secure; as ~~2011~~ Isaiah 26:11, “Lord, when thy hand is lifted up, they will not see.” The lifting up of the hand is a giving notice that there is a stroke ready to come. And many lesser judgments are but God’s lifting up of his hand. Though they are strokes in themselves, yet, comparatively with what follows, they are but the lifting up of his hand, — they are but warnings. “LORD,” saith he, “when thy hand is lifted up, they will not see: but they shall see.” “They will not see: but they shall see;” — how is that? ‘They will not see while thy hand is only lifted up; but they shall see when thy hand is come down.’ While under warnings, they will not see; but when warnings are executed, they shall see. May be we will not see in the plague, fire, sword; but when something else comes, many shall see then. When shall they see? ‘They shall see when “the fire of thine enemies shall devour them.” ‘Fire of thine enemies;’ that is, it may be, the fire wherewith God will destroy his

enemies. May be it is, when the fiery rage of a people that are enemies to God, shall, by the just judgment of God, be let out upon them. Oftentimes, if God have a nation in the world that is more an enemy to him than any other nation of the world, he will make use of that nation for the execution of corrective or destructive judgments upon others. No nation under heaven were at such enmity unto God as the Babylonians were. How they first began an open apostasy from God, and maintained an idolatrous opposition to him all their days, is known. Yet God would use the Babylonians. And sometimes a nation, by atheism, idolatry, and cursed persecution, may make themselves meet to be God's instrument for the punishing of others before themselves be utterly destroyed. God's hand hath been lifted up in these nations. I need not make application. It is well if the best of us all have been shaken from our security by God's warnings. In truth, brethren, it doth not appear so to be, but that there is security enough yet left to let in a destroying dissolution upon us.

4. The highest thing wherein this security acts itself is by scoffing at warnings given from the word of God: ~~ORR~~ 2 Peter 3:3,

“Knowing this first, that there shall come in the last days scoffers, walking after their own lusts.”

The last days of churches, when they are drawing towards their period, are always filled with this sort of persons. And it must be so. In the last days of any church-state that has had, it may be, some good reputation of life, and has been of use, there shall abound among them a sort of men that shall be scoffers, ‘Ye may know them,’ saith the apostle, ‘by this, they walk after their hearts’ lusts.’ They have no rule but their lusts; they give up themselves wholly to their lusts. ‘Well, but what do they scoff at?’ He tells you in verse 4, “Where is the promise of his coming?” say they. ‘What promise of his coming?’ Why, truly, the poor persecuted Christians had been letting them know that Christ would come and take vengeance on them for all their bloody cruelty and persecution; and the time is delayed, and they prosper, walking after their lusts, and at length they fall a scoffing, “Where is the promise of his coming?” — for it was such a coming as God came in when he destroyed the old world with a flood. ‘But scoff you while you will,’ say they, ‘a fiery destruction will come upon you.’ When leading persons shall be scoffers at the promised coming

of Christ to visit his people, and take vengeance on his adversaries, that is the height of security.

Where some are intent upon the occasions of life, and some are given up to the temptations of life; where, in an apprehension of approaching judgments, our relief is not from God, and in God alone; where God's warnings in his providence are not improved, and where God's warnings from his word are despised; — there a people are secure, if God hath instructed us aright out of his word.


Why are a people to be thus secure? for, as I told you before, God doth not bring destruction ordinarily upon any but upon a secure people. One reason is taken from God, and another reason is taken from the devil.

1. God gives men up to security in a way of judiciary hardening of them. God hath now determined their destruction; but he will take his own time, way, and season.

But may not this work be diverted? and will it be accomplished? Saith God, 'I will take care for that:' ~~2000~~ Isaiah 6:9-11,


“Go, make the heart of this people fat, and make their ears heavy, and shut their eyes; lest they see with their eyes, and hear with their ears, and understand with their heart, and convert, and be healed. Then said I, Lord, how long?”

how long shall they! be in this state and condition? “And he answered, Until the cities be wasted without inhabitant, and the houses without man, and the land be utterly desolate.” God brings them now under security judicially. It is not preaching, — it is not men's thundering from heaven; it is not sudden judgments, poverty, misery, distresses, fears; — nothing shall now awaken such a people. ‘Make their heart fat, and their ears heavy.’ ‘How long?’ ‘Until the land be utterly desolate. But the time is not yet come, I must stay a little longer, to try and exercise my people's faith, patience, and obedience; and many other things I have to do: but this people shall not escape,’ saith he. ‘But if this judgment and the other judgment pass over, they will escape.’ ‘No,’ saith God; ‘I will make their heart fat, and their ears heavy, that they shall not hear, nor understand, until the land become desolate.’

A man that is not utterly stupid cannot sometimes but wonder and stand amazed whence it is that mankind should be so secure when judgments are compassing them round about. If the word of God be true, and any tokens of God's anger and displeasure are to be taken notice of, whence is it that men are so unconcerned that they will not lend an ear to them? The reason is given,  Isaiah 6:10-12.

2. Satan hath a great hand in it. He is a very crafty prognosticator, — hath great apprehensions that judgments are drawing near to a people; and he was a murderer from the beginning, and delights in nothing but blood and mischief. He is afraid of nothing so much as that judgments should be diverted from a people. When he sees deserved judgments approaching, he knows he hath but this one way to take off all interventions that may hinder them. What is that? He makes them secure. He will now labor more with his temptations with all sorts of people than at any other time or season in the world. This is his day, the hour and power of darkness, now to try his skill, and see what he can do. If he can but keep people secure, judgments will follow. He delights in blood, as being a murderer from the beginning; and he that sees him not at work in the world in a most eminent manner in these days to this very end and purpose, working in men, by their lusts, by occasions and temptations of life, every day, to continue them in their security, I think takes little observation.

This is the first sign of an approaching dissolution, which I have spoken to at large because it is that which the Scripture speaks so much of, and guides us most to consider, — namely, a general security.

Secondly, Another sign is, *a universal corruption of life* in all sorts of persona The Holy Ghost tells us, that before the coming of the flood, “all flesh had corrupted his way upon the earth,”  Genesis 6:12. The way of the flesh is not very good at any time; I mean the way of men: but when they come as it were by general consent, all of them, to corrupt their way, it is to make way for the bringing in of a flood. Such a state and condition as that is described by the prophet Isaiah, chap. 3:1-5, “The Lord of hosts doth take away the mighty man, and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet, and the prudent, and the ancient, the captain of fifty, and the honorable man, and the counsellor, and the cunning artificer, and the eloquent orator. And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall

rule over them. And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbor: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honorable.” There is a general confusion and corruption of life and manners. The prophet describes what their state and condition was before God, and which would bring those destructive judgments upon the whole nation; as afterwards He did.

Thirdly, When unto universal corruption of life there is added *persecution of the church*, that is another sign of an approaching destructive dissolution. Our Savior tells us, ⁴¹⁰Matthew 24:7-9, that “nation shall rise against nation, and kingdom against kingdom: and there shall be famines, and pestilences, and earthquakes, in divers places, All these are the beginning of sorrows. Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you.” A man would think they had something else to do at such a day, when nation rises against nation, and kingdom against kingdom, and there are pestilences, and famines, and earthquakes. A man would think they should have other employment. No; “Then shall they deliver you up to be afflicted, and shall kill you.” What is the reason of it? That there may be another symptom of approaching desolation, ⁴¹³Matthew 23:34-36.

I could name many other signs; — as, visible apostasy, the love of many waxing cold; God in an eminent manner calling off to rest with himself many of his servants, taking them away from the evil to come: but I have said enough upon this head.

I shall now speak a few words, in the SECOND place, unto the reasons why in such approaching dissolutions all professors ought to be signally holy, signally godly. I shall but name one or two things: —

First, Because in every such dissolution, especially where the gospel hath been professed, there is a peculiar coming of Jesus Christ. Christ is in it, whether we see him or see him not. “Be patient, brethren,” saith James, chap. 5:7, “unto the coming of the Lord.” How could that generation, to whom he wrote sixteen hundred years ago, “be patient unto the coming of the Lord,” who is not yet come? That is not the coming of the Lord James intended; but his coming for the destruction of the impenitent, persecuting, obdurate Jews, “Be patient, brethren, unto the coming of the Lord.” When will that be? Why, saith he, verse 8, “The coming of the Lord draweth nigh.” It will be within a very few years: Verse 9, “Behold, the Judge

standeth before the door.” This was the coming of Christ in the great and terrible judgment wherein he executed vengeance upon his stubborn adversaries, according as he had said before, “Those mine enemies, which would not have me to reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me.” In every signal dissolution and judgment, there is a coming of Christ; and every coming of Christ will be a day of great trial, ^{<3011}Malachi 3:1-3. Their state was then with them, as to the person of Christ, much as it is now with many as unto other appearances of Christ. “The Lord, whom ye seek, shall suddenly come, the messenger of the covenant whom ye delight in.” He shall come, yea, he shall come suddenly. ‘What could be more welcome? what more desirable? We desire nothing in this world but that he may come!’ “But who may abide the day of his coming?” saith he. That people did nothing but cry out, the Messiah would come; and when he came, it proved their utter ruin and destruction. It is a great thing to have Christ come. We know not what will come to pass when Christ comes. It is a great thing to stand before Christ when he comes. And pray, brethren, what do you think Christ expects of us when he doth come? It is a foolish thing, as the psalmist shows, when men are in expectation of a dissolution, to be engaged in business about earthly matters (I mean beyond what duty requires), so as not to be prepared for it; but it is a wicked thing, when in that dissolution Christ comes, and men are not prepared for his coming. There is Christ in it. There is no dissolution that attends us, in our persons, relations, in the world, but Christ is in it. Christ cometh in it; and how are we prepared to entertain this great guest that cometh? Truly, I am afraid that in regard to many who bear themselves wonderfully high upon the coming of the Lord, when he comes, it will be darkness to them, and not light. Christ comes not to gratify men’s lusts; he comes not to exalt them in the world, nor to satisfy them in their desires upon their adversaries Christ comes to make us more holy, more humble, more mortified and weaned from the world; and if we are not so prepared for it, we are no way prepared for the coming of Christ. Oh, what ought to be the frames of our hearts if we lived under this apprehension, that Christ, the glorious, holy one, were coming to us every day!

Secondly, What doth he come for? Why, every such time of dissolution is a lesser day of judgment. I thought to have showed you how Christ in such a season will execute judgment. There are two parts of the judgment

that Christ will execute. One is in vengeance upon his adversaries; the other is in trial upon his people. The apostle puts both together, ^{<800>}Hebrews 10:30, “Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense, saith the Lord. And again, The Lord shall judge his people.” The first place is taken out of ^{<625>}Deuteronomy 32:35, and the latter place is taken out of ^{<800>}Psalms 1:4. In the first place, God doth eminently speak of his stubborn adversaries, of his enemies: “Vengeance belongeth unto me,” saith he, “I will recompense.” And in the latter place, he directly speaks of his saints, of his own people, “The Lord will judge his people;” as we may see ^{<800>}Psalms 1:4. Why doth our apostle put both these together, things of so wonderfully different natures, “Vengeance belongeth unto me,” and, “The Lord shall judge his people”? The reason is, because though these works are wonderfully distant and discrepant one from another, yet Christ doth them always at the same time. When he taketh vengeance upon his adversaries, he judgeth his people. He judgeth the profession of many, and will put an end to it, determine it. He judgeth the miscarriages of others, and reproveth them. He comes as a spirit of judgment in all such trials. Let none mistake themselves. Whenever Christ comes to take vengeance on his people’s enemies, he cometh also to judge his people. We are wonderfully apt to have pleasant thoughts, that when the Lord comes forth in judgment on the world professors shall be hid, and shall escape. No; saith he, “Vengeance belongeth unto me, I will recompense;” and again, “The Lord shall judge his people.”

What manner of persons, then, ought we to be? If Christ be coming to judge us, to make a judgment upon our profession, he will come into a church, and discard one for a false professor, and another for a false professor. Have none of us seen such a day of judgment already, — how God, by his providence, hath discarded many already? And he will do so more and more. He will discover hypocritical professors, and bring forth their hidden works of darkness; he will reprove others for their worldliness and unprofitableness under the gospel. How? It may be by consuming them, all they have in this world, bringing them to great poverty and distress. He will judge them in these things. ‘You have loved the world, and you shall have nothing left you in the world.’ Don’t expect the day of the Lord will be all light; there is sharpness even to his own in the coming of Christ, when he shall come with a destructive dissolution. It is good,

therefore, to be preparing beforehand for his entertainment, and considering what manner of persons we ought to be in all holy conversation and godliness, seeing Christ will thus come and call upon us.

SERMON 6.

THE OBLIGATION TO INCREASE IN GODLINESS,


PREACHED MAY 29, 1674.

“Furthermore then we beseech you, brethren, and exhort you by the Lord Jesus, that as ye have received of us how ye ought to walk and to please God, so ye would abound more and more.”

—  1 Thessalonians 4:1.

OUR business that we design this day is, to consider how we may carry on our practice. This text of Scripture speaks out the whole of what I aim at; and I wish that I could speak it in the same spirit and with the same frame of heart wherewith it is done by the apostle.

It is a very unusual earnestness the apostle uses in this matter. “We beseech you, brethren, and exhort you,” saith he. And it is evident from thence that this matter, whatever it be, is of very great importance in itself; that it sat with very great weight upon the heart and mind of the apostle; and that it is a matter that brethren, members of churches, will oftentimes stand in need of being very earnestly pressed unto. I conceive all these three things to be evidently included in this earnestness of the apostle, and the reduplication of it. “Now we beseech you, brethren, and we exhort you,” saith he.

The first word, in my apprehension, doth express his love and condescension, “We beseech you;” and the latter doth express his ministerial authority, “We exhort you,” speaking of the application of the word in the ministry of the gospel, called “exhortation,”  Romans 12:8. So here is a mixture of personal love and ministerial authority, which is the wisdom of a minister. The apostle lays his whole interest upon this matter.

And there is another word that signifies also what weight he lays on it, We have rendered it here, “Furthermore then.” It is *τὸ λοιπὸν οὖν*, — “for

what remains” ‘You have been instructed in the mystery of the gospel; you have been made partakers of the privileges of the gospel: all that remains now, brethren, is that you so walk as to please God, and abound therein more and more.’ Having prepared the way thus, he gives another encouragement and enforcement unto what he hath to press upon them; and that is, that he had taught them their duty already, there was nothing now behind but their practice. “As ye have,” saith he, “received of us how ye ought to walk.” He had already taught them this great matter; which would be a facilitating of the duty, and a great aggravation of their guilt if they lived in the neglect of it.

What is this thing the apostle makes this entrance into? It is, “How ye ought to walk and to please God,” saith he.

And further to insinuate it upon their minds, and take off any objection, ‘What makes this earnestness? why do you press this? why are you so importunate with us? what can you blame in us?’ ‘No,’ saith the apostle, ‘as we have taught you “how to walk and to please God;” so,’ saith he, ‘I charge you with nothing, but desire you that ye would “abound more and more.”’ ‘Rest not in what ye have attained; there is yet a progress for us all,’ saith he, — ‘for you and for me.’ If we think we are risen as high as we need, we have attained as much as is necessary, ‘it is quite otherwise,’ saith the apostle, ‘your work is to “abound more and more.”’

And, truly, the great thing that is upon my heart to exhort you unto, — and this text of Scripture doth but confirm it, — is, to abound more and more in such work wherein we may please God. I cannot speak with that love the apostle did, nor with that authority the apostle did; no, truly. We cannot say we have taught you in all things, yet, how to walk and to please God; though we hope you have been taught: but I can truly say the same thing is upon my heart, according to my measure, to beseech you and exhort you, to declare unto you how to walk in this church relation wherein you stand, so as that you may please God, and so as that you may abound in so walking more and more; and the Lord convince us all, every one, that it is our duty to be abounding in this matter! Some may think there is no more needful but so to walk as that they may be members in the church, and give no offense to the church; some, who have already attained a good reputation in their profession, may not think it incumbent

on them to do any more but to keep up their place and station, not to decay. Our duty is quite otherwise; we are to “abound more and more.”

Now, because I do intend, if I live, and God will and permit, to go over all the especial duties of our relation, to show in them all how we may so walk as to please God, I shall lay a little general foundation at present out of these words, and that in this rule or proposition, — That there is a peculiar walking with God in fruitful holiness required of all who are admitted into the fellowship of the gospel, the communion of the saints, — and the order of the churches.

This is the first general rifle, and I would build all that ensues upon it. There is a peculiar walking with God, so as to please God, and a progress therein, abounding more and more in it, required of all who are admitted to the privileges of the gospel in church-order and society, and the communion of the saints.

A walking with God; — in the Scripture our obedience to God is not so frequently expressed, in general, by any one word as by this of walking: to walk with God; to walk in his law; to walk in his statutes; to walk in the fear of the Lord.

Now, this walk we speak of is the whole course of our conversation, and our exercise therein with respect unto God. That is a man’s walk. As is the course of a man’s conversation, and his exercise therein with respect unto God, so is his walk: which may be either straight or crooked; it may be either close or loose; it may be either with God or contrary to him. ‘If ye walk contrary to me,’ saith God, ‘I will walk contrary to you.’ And it is variously expressed in Scripture. Sometimes it is called walking with God: ^{<0034>}Genesis 5:24, “Enoch walked with God;” — sometimes it is called walking before God: ^{<0034>}Genesis 17:1, “Walk before me, and be thou perfect;” — sometimes it is called a walking after God: ^{<0034>}2 Kings 23:3, “The king made a covenant to walk after the LORD;” — sometimes it is called a “walking worthy of the Lord,” ^{<0034>}Colossians 1:10; — and sometimes it is termed a “humbling ourselves to walk with God,” ^{<0034>}Micah 6:8. We render it to “walk humbly with God;” but it is so in the original. And all this is to show that God ought to be all and in all in our walk; that we ought so to walk as those who have all from him, as those who do all for him, as those who design conformity to him, and as those that wait for

the enjoyment of him. It is every way expressed, that we may know that God ought to be all in our whole walk, — that is, in all we do in this world.

Answerable hereunto, God's gracious actings towards us are called his walking with us. ^{OR} Leviticus 26:11, 12, "And I will walk among you," saith God. Two cannot walk together unless they are agreed. When God and we walk together in peace, upon the agreement made between us by Christ, by the blood of the cross, then are we in our places, and then is God exalted.

Now, this walking with God, without which, as I shall manifest afterwards to you, all our privileges and all our enjoyments are useless, are dangerous, are present means and will be future aggravations of our eternal ruin (without it, I say, that which we lay such weight upon, that which we suffer for, that which we rejoice in, if there be not this walking with God, so as to please him, it is useless and dangerous, — it is a present means of destruction, and will be a future aggravation of it), I say this walking with God may be considered two ways:

1. With respect unto the covenant of grace in general; and,
2. With respect unto the particular church covenant, or holy agreement that is among us in the fellowship of the gospel, which the apostle hath here a particular respect unto: "How ye ought to walk;" — 'Ye church of Thessalonica, which is in God the Father and in our Lord Jesus Christ; how ye ought to walk.'

First, It is our obedience in general according to the tenor of the covenant of grace; for so it is expressed. All covenant-obedience is expressed in that word, "Walk before me," ^{OR} Genesis 17:1. "I am the Almighty God," saith he: "walk before me, and be thou upright." And so, when God promises his Spirit to fulfill in all believers, in all the elect, the grace of the covenant, he saith, "I will write my law in their hearts, and cause them to walk in my statutes"

Now, brethren, I would desire you to consider this, in the second place, that church-society is the peculiar way that God hath chosen and ordained whereby we may express covenant-obedience, unto the glory of God and the furtherance of our own salvation. I say, that church-society is a

peculiar way God hath appointed whereby we may express our covenant-obedience, unto the glory of God and unto the furtherance of our own salvation. And if any man ask us a reason of this way, and a reason of the ordinances of this way; we can give him neither better nor other answer than this, It is the way God hath appointed whereby we may express our covenant-obedience unto his glory.

Hence these two things follow: — First, That no man can walk as he ought, and please God in church-society, that doth not walk as he ought in the covenant of grace. The reason is plain, for this our church-society is nothing but the way God hath appointed to express that obedience; as all institutions from the beginning of the world were nothing but ways God had appointed to express covenant-obedience in.

There is no man, therefore, let him by any way or means come into a church, and be made partaker of the privileges of the church, can walk so as to please God (as the text saith) in that church, unless he walk antecedently and fundamentally in the covenant-obedience that God requireth of him.

Secondly, It follows from hence that no man can walk as he ought to the glory of God in covenant-obedience, that doth not join himself to some church-society wherein to walk; and the reason is, because it is the way God hath chosen and appointed whereby that obedience may be expressed, in one church-society or other that is sound in the faith, walking in the truth. A man cannot walk orderly else in covenant-obedience, because he knows not how to express it to the glory of God.

Now, the first of these, how we should walk in general with respect unto the covenant of grace, I shall not speak unto. It is a long work, a great work; it is not that which I design. In brief, the *principle* of it is the Spirit of God, whence we are said to “walk in the Spirit;” — the *rule* of it is the word of God, whence we are said to walk according to the rule, “As many as walk by this rule, peace be on them,” etc.; — the *life*, way, power of it, is Jesus Christ, in the third place, “I am the way, the truth, and the life;” — the *object and end* of it is God himself; we walk before God, and so come to the enjoyment of him; — the *bounds* of it are the covenant; nothing beyond what God requires in his covenant belongs to this walk, nothing that falls beneath the grace of the covenant doth belong unto it,

nothing that is contrary to the precepts of the covenant. It is the covenant that gives bounds unto our walking. And the design of this walk is the resignation of ourselves to God, conformity to him, and enjoyment of him. But these are not the things I intend.

That which I intend to speak unto (not now, but hereafter), is our walk with God in that especial church-relation wherein we stand. And I shall endeavor, if God will, to show you how we ought to walk so as to please God, by plain, evident, familiar instructions from the Scripture, accommodated to our state and condition in all things: and, secondly, press it upon your consciences and my own, as the necessity, and condition, and temptations befalling churches, in the days wherein we live, do require; and especially with respect unto that woful conformity to the world which seems to have overtaken the generality of professors in these days.

What I spoke unto you the last day hath occasioned me to go thus back, to lay this foundation; for that will give but one particular of what will be found necessary to press upon you, that you may so walk as to please God, and abound in it more and more.

Yet that is such a weighty particular, — namely, how we may every one of us, in our places and conditions, and under our opportunities, promote holiness in one another, and be awakened to a diligent watchfulness unto that duty, that I would beg of you that that might not fall off from our consideration with the experience of other things. And that you might know how to put it in practice more among us was referred to your consideration as well as mine.

SERMON 7.

PERILOUS TIMES.

PREACHED MAY 21, 1575.

“This know also, that in the last days perilous times shall come. For men shall be lovers of their own selves, covetous, boasters, proud, blasphemers, disobedient to parents, unthankful, unholy, without natural affection, truce-breakers, false accusers, incontinent, fierce, despisers of those that are good, traitors, heady, high-minded, lovers of pleasures more than lovers of God; having a form of godliness, but denying the power thereof: from such turn away.” — ~~2~~ Timothy 3:1-5.

THE apostle, in the first chapter of the Epistle to the Romans, gives an account of the great and abominable sins that Rome pagan, heathen Rome, was given up unto, the catalogue of sins in that place no way exceeding that given us in this. It may be asked what pagans and heathens these were? The apostle here tells us what pagans and heathens they were. The truth is, they were Christians whom the apostle intends, as is plain from verse 5, where he saith these persons had “a form of godliness”

There is a time when persons who claim the holy name and title of Christians are as bad, if not worse, in their lives, than the worst of pagans, Saith the apostle, “This know also;” — ‘Many things I have told you of, acquainted you with; in particular, that there would be many miscarriages among church-members, among the real disciples of Christ, by envy and strife (which are spoken of in the last chapter): but know this also, — there is more than these.’ It was a great mercy unto them to be forewarned of what would ensue on the wickedness of men.

“In the last days,” saith he, “perilous times shall come.” I have upon other occasions showed you that those expressions of “latter days” and “last days” are nowhere taken in the New Testament for the last days absolutely, but for the last days of the church, the latter days of the

church, when they come unto their declination, when they have continued long in a profession, and have grown worse and worse, and are coming towards the last days. “God hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son;” that is, in the very last days of the Judaical church. Christ came last, he sent him last, in answer unto what Jacob prophesied, “I will tell you what shall come in the last days;” — that is, the days when the church was coming unto an issue; then Christ came. And so in all other places. The latter days of churches are always perilous days, days full of danger.

When I speak of churches, I intend not only those that are properly so called, but those that call themselves churches, national churches, that which would have itself called the Catholic Church. The longer they continue, the nearer they come unto their end; the farther they advance in their last days, the more perilous the times will be. And it is to no purpose to expect but that as apostatizing churches grow by continuance, they will grow in wickedness; they will grow more and more wicked every day, and the times shall be more and more perilous every day. We shall be mistaken if we look for any thing else. Till God shall new-form this world, the perils of the days shall increase upon us continually. They will do so till God’s time comes to bring in a reformation, or a powerful work upon the world, that may be some relief; but in the meantime, while they are in their last days, “perilous times shall come.”

What is it that makes them “perilous?” Men wallowing in a litter of unclean lusts under a profession of Christianity make the times perilous. I am afraid we are apt to look upon the peril of the times merely from the outward dangers that in these times we ourselves are obnoxious to.

But where lies the peril of the times? Truly, I don’t think that all the world together can give so great a character of the world, of that which they call the “Christian world,” at this day, as is given here by the apostle; — that is, they live in the open practice of all horrible lusts, and yet continue a form of godliness; that is, continue a profession of the Christian religion. Such times are perilous, not only because divers of those lusts that are here mentioned will be exercised towards them that are good (for in the midst of all those sins they are despisers of them, they hate them, and they despise them), but those times are perilous, —

First, Because they provoke unto judgment against the nations and people that are overtaken with these sins A great part of the book of the Revelation is taken up with declaring the judgments of God against apostatizing churches, destroying such churches as are overgrown with lusts in their latter days; that is, all that combination of men who, under the Romish conduct, falling into the apostasy, make up several churches in the world. I say, the book of the Revelation is spent in declaring God's fearful and dreadful judgments upon the world for these sins; this makes the times very perilous. Though, when the church of the Jews was going into its latter days before the captivity, there were some among them who were very good, very good figs, yet the days were so perilous that they must also into captivity. The judgments of God were to come upon the land, and the very good figs must also into captivity. God may bring destruction upon whole nations, because of those abounding lusts in the last days of the church.

Secondly, It is greatly perilous in point of temptations. There are two or three things wherein the open wickedness of the world proves a great temptation to professors: —

1. All professors are apt to countenance themselves in their lesser miscarriages by the open sins of the world. That makes a day of great sinning very perilous. They see and know that they are very far from being such as they see the generality of Christians are, and countenance themselves in a low, dead, carnal, worldly profession in many other things. There is more peril in this, as it will secretly insinuate itself into the best of us, more than in all the persecutions the men of the world can contrive, — lest we should secretly please ourselves in an unthrifty and unholy profession that is seen in the world, seeing all this litter of lusts that others clothe themselves with every day, and we see we are not as they are.

2. There is danger and peril lest they should lead us, by some other more pleasant lust, into a compliance with them; for when a church is fallen into its latter days, all sorts of lusts that may suit the corruption and vanity of men's minds do abound among them, and some of these may insinuate themselves into professors, and make the times very dangerous unto them. I am afraid of a thing I have often mentioned, and that is pride and vanity of apparel; it is one of the lusts and sins of the latter days. And, indeed,

upon the account of these very lusts, the days are very perilous, very dangerous, lest our minds be infected with them, and lest we conform unto them more or less, — lest we do many things that else we would not do, because they are done by the world; which is a perfect compliance with the lusts of the latter days,

3. There is peril in that ordinary converse which men are necessitated to by their conversation in the world and in their occasions, and other business which they must have with men, especially those who are traders and dealers in the world. They can scarce touch upon a business with those in whom there are those predominant lusts of a decaying church, but they must be, compelled to hear swearing, cursing, filthy discourses, that are not convenient, and all manner of profaneness. There is peril in this. And there are some kinds of professors who are so regardless and careless, that they will put themselves into such company on choice, when they have no business or necessity for it.


Thirdly, The times are most perilous, in the last place, upon this account, lest God utterly remove his candlestick from such a people, and suffer his gospel to be no more despised and dishonored among them.

Now, truly, if it be so, the use I aim at in calling over these words is this: It is plain we are fallen into those times and seasons; — I am persuaded none of you will deny it. And if the Holy Ghost tells us expressly that these days and times are perilous, full of dangers; we are in a path wherein be robbers on every hand; and we ourselves can see somewhat of peril in them, — we know there is something in them of peril: and if you will but search, you will find out more. Now, if this be our present state and condition, it is our duty to be earnest with God to be preserved in such a perilous state as this. Shall we think we have an amulet to carry us through all perils, spiritual and temporal, that no danger shall befall us? It is not so with us. Unless we are upon our watch and guard, and cry mightily unto God for help and assistance, we shall be all overtaken with perils and dangers in the days wherein we live.

SERMON 8.

THE MUTUAL CARE OF BELIEVERS OVER ONE ANOTHER.

PREACHED SEPTEMBER 6, 1678.

“But speaking the truth in love, may grow up into him in all things, which is the head, even Christ: from whom the whole body fitly joined together and compacted by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part, maketh increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.” —
 Ephesians 4:15, 16.

A GATHERED church comes from Christ, and all of the church are from Christ. From him they flow, and they grow up again in him from whom they flow. It is compacted together by officers and ordinances. On both of them the apostle had discoursed before: “Compacted by that which every joint supplieth.” Officers and ordinances are by virtue derived from Christ, and they tend unto Christ. They are compacted and fitly joined by officers and ordinances. How shall they proceed and go on? “According to the effectual working in the measure of every part, making increase of the body unto the edifying of itself in love.” The great business of the church is not our number by addition, but by grace, by growing up in Christ And the way whereby it doth it, is the working of every part, according to every one’s measure, for the edification of itself in love. What is, then, the church watch? It is the work of every member, according to its measure, to the increase of grace in itself and others, according to the principle of love. This we all know; but we are slow in the improvement of it. This is the work of every member, according to the measure of the grace of Christ received, to the increase of grace in ourselves and others, through a principle of love. Every one is not required to be a preacher, but every one hath a measure; and where there is any measure, there is some work. If this be not found in us, our church-order, as the apostle calls it, will not avail us. And, truly, methinks churches in these days do not abide this test.

They are not “fitly joined together by that which every joint supplieth, according to the effectual working in the measure of every part,” which should grow and increase in love. That is lost. I desire to know of all the brethren and sisters what they have done to answer this rule and duty, — what they have done to increase the body in every part. Some I can tell what they have done to destroy and pull down, contrary to this principle of watch. None of us but have our measure. Wherever there are gifts and graces, they will work.

To come nearer, I will show you where the rule of this church watch is. It is the mutual work and care of all the members of the church for the temporal, and spiritual, and eternal good of the whole and every member, proceeding from union and love, — the mutual operative care of all the members of the church. This is that watch I would speak unto.

It proceeds originally from union; they are united in love. Of this the apostle discourses at large, 1 Corinthians 12, by comparing the members of the church with the members of a man, whose mutual care and assistance are for the unity of the same body. There is none of us but knows the concern of all the members in every member, and the care of every member of all the members of the body. You believe yourselves to be the church of God? Yes. Then, saith the Scripture, we are members, and are to have the same spiritual care of every other member as the members of the natural body have. But is it so? How unacquainted is one hand with another, one member with another! I lay this principle, that ye are all members one of another throughout the congregation. None so great or so wise but is a member; none so poor and abject but is a member. And if we have not care of the whole body, according as we have opportunity and seasons, we are wonderfully to seek. Indeed, there is no watch without love. The apostle tells us that it is “the bond of perfection,” ^{Colossians} Colossians 3:14. This is perfect church-order. Take a company of sticks, some long and some short, some great and some little, some straight and some crooked. As long as there is a good firm band about them, you may carry them where you please, and dispose of them as you will: break this band, and every thing will appear crooked that is so. If this band, — that is, our perfection, — be loosed, every one’s crookedness will appear, one to be too long, one to be too short; one too big, one too little; one crooked, and

one straight; there is no keeping them together. All the order in the world will never keep a church together if the band of love be loosed.

There be two things I shall speak unto, — what I have found in my ministry by experience. I have found when church-order was the greatest ease, the greatest relief, that a man could certainly desire or attain. I have known it. And I have lived to see church-order burdensome, that many have complained of it as the most insupportable burden. Nothing else is the reason but the decay of love. So that any person that will discharge his duty hath an insupportable burden on him. I tell you freely, my fears are, that if we were to gather churches again, as we did thirty years ago, we should have but a small harvest. That which should bring us together and keep us up in love is all lost. Read 1 Corinthians 13. I beg of you believe that scripture to be the word of God. We can love them who, as far as we know, are lovely; but that love that “beareth all things and believeth all things,” I am afraid not six of us believe that it is a duty. If we hear any thing of a brother or a sister, it is forty to one but we aggravate it unto the next body we meet. Is this love?

This watch, what is it for? It is for the temporal, and spiritual, and eternal good of all believers.

Their temporal good is first to advise about the poor; which I think is well attended to, being put into the way of God.

Their spiritual good, whereby we may keep up this watch, is to be sought two ways; — by the prevention of evil, on the one hand; and by recovery from evil, promotion of grace, and confirming in it, on the other hand.

We are to prevent evil in others. There are two ways whereby we may do it, — by example, and by exhortation.

If a considerable number of the church would engage to endeavor after an exemplary holiness and usefulness in all things, it would prevent much evil in others. Some things are troublesome in the church; but still, exemplary holiness and usefulness in believers are great means to prevent evil in others.

Exhortation will be so too. Exhort one another to edification. We are pitiful creatures as to this duty.

We want three things: we want love; we want ability; we want holy consciousness to ourselves of unbelief. Nothing can conquer these things but the grace of God; and unless we have these things, we cannot do it. Our recovery from any of these evils is a great part of this watch.

I will tell you of two defects: —

1. If we do come unto it, to admonish others, we do not do it with that meekness, that evidence of love, that tenderness, that are required in us. I would have no man come to admonish another but that he should carry it as the offender, and the other as the offended person, — with that profession of love.
2. We want wisdom; for this is very certain, ill management hath spoiled many things in this congregation, — talking, reflecting, complaining, even among carnal people. It is the constant exercise of the mind renewed by the Holy Ghost, and furnished with the principles of spiritual light and life, in thoughts and meditations upon spiritual things, proceeding from the cleaving of the affections unto them, with a sense of a spiritual gust, relish, and savor in them, that must enable us to this duty.

SERMON 9.

NATIONAL SINS AND NATIONAL JUDGMENTS.

PREACHED APRIL 11, 1679.

“For Jerusalem is ruined, and Judah is fallen: because their tongue and their doings are against the LORD, to provoke the eyes of his glory. The show of their countenance doth witness against them; and they declare their sin as Sodom, they hide it not. Woe unto their soul! for they have rewarded evil unto themselves.” —

~~2888~~ Isaiah 3:8, 9. ^{f117}

First, HERE is a confluence of sins delighted in.

Secondly, Here is a concurrence of various judgments unregarded. In the ninth chapter of this prophecy, the prophet enumerates, from the 13th verse to the end of the chapter, all sorts of judgments and indications of the continuance of God’s displeasure, concluding every one of them with this: “For all this his anger is not turned away, but his hand is stretched out still;” and it will end in their utter destruction.

Thirdly, Here are the preparative causes of ruin, that which would dispose Jerusalem and Judah to ruin and destruction. There are five of them reckoned up in this chapter: —

1. When God takes away the good, the sober, the understanding part of a nation, and leaves a nation very thin of such kind of persons: Verses 1-3, “Behold, the Lord, the LORD of hosts, doth take away from Jerusalem and from Judah the stay and the staff, the whole stay of bread, and the whole stay of water, the mighty man, and the man of war, the judge, and the prophet, and the prudent, and the ancient, the captain of fifty, and the honorable man, and the counsellor, and the cunning artificer, and the eloquent orator.” When God makes a nation thin of such persons, it is a preparation and disposition to their ruin.

2. Weakness in their government is another preparation and disposition: “And I will give children to be their princes, and babes shall rule over them,” verse 4.
3. Horrible disorder in the minds of men, and contempt of God’s order, that should be among them: “And the people shall be oppressed, every one by another, and every one by his neighbor: the child shall behave himself proudly against the ancient, and the base against the honorable,” verse 5.
4. When there is great oppression and persecution: “As for my people, children are their oppressors, and women rule over them,” verse 12. And what did they do? “Ye have eaten up the vineyard; the spoil of the poor is in your houses. What mean ye that ye beat my people to pieces, and grind the faces of the poor? saith the Lord God of hosts,” verses 14, 15.
5. And, lastly, there is horrible pride, and especially the pride of vain and foolish women; which the prophet insists upon from verse 16 to the very last words of the chapter, and concludes,” Thy men shall fall by the sword, and thy mighty in the war. And her gates shall lament and mourn; and she being desolate shall sit upon the ground.”

This is the end of it all. So that you have an account of what are those causes whereon God in his word doth pronounce cities and nations to be ruined and destroyed, even then when they stand in their fullest security, in their own opinion.

Now, the inquiry is, how those things are with us. I told you I would do no more than speak a word or two for the present occasion: and I shall speak that which I do believe; and if you do so too, it may be it may be your mercy. But it is a hard thing to believe London is ruined and England fallen, when we have peace and enjoy all things; but if we speak it in pride, it will be harder how to avoid it.

First, Is there not a confluence of all sorts of sins among us whereof mankind can contract guilt, especially of those sins upon the commission of which God pronounces a nation ruined, — atheism and profaneness, blood and murder, adultery and uncleanness, and pride? When these sins are predominant in a nation that makes profession of the knowledge of

God, God himself saith, and we may say, that nation is ruined. Those things have prevailed among us.

Then let us mourn over those sins as we ought to do. Have we done so in this congregation? Hath it been done in any congregation in England as it ought? Hath it been done in private, in our retirement, to mourn over that confluence of sins that hath prevailed and spread itself over the nation till it hath reached to the very neck? We have not done it to this very day. There is not the least attempt for any reformation. Do we think in such a day as this is a little prayer is enough to save a dying nation? There is nothing seriously done to work that reformation without which London will be undone and England will fall, and there will be no deliverance. It is all one whether you will believe it or no, but the word of God abides for ever.

Secondly, A concurrence of judgments was the second thing we showed you from the words, — a concurrence of judgments unregarded; — a confluence of sins delighted in, and a concurrence of various judgments unregarded.

Judgments are of two sorts, — temporal and spiritual.

1. Temporal judgments are of two sorts. They are either monitory tokens of God's displeasure, or they are actual punishments. All these various judgments have been upon us.

(1.) We have had monitory tokens of God's displeasure:

[1.] Signs in the heavens above and in the earth beneath; — things that ought not to be despised. Our Savior hath warned us to expect and look for them before the general dissolution. They have been monitory judgments.

[2.] God is making the nation thin of persons ancient, honorable, counsellors, the wise. He threatens to do this. They are persons rarely to be found, who are the stay and staff of a nation. It is a monitory judgment, and so laid down by the prophet.

[3.] The strange and unaccountable differences and divisions that are in the minds and affections of men. Multitudes in these nations stand at this day with their swords in their hands, ready to sheathe them in the bowels of

their neighbors; Ephraim against Manasseh, and Manasseh against Ephraim, — one part of the nation against another, and another against them, ready to destroy one another.

[4.] And, lastly, the warnings God hath given us of making us base and dishonorable, which I will not insist upon. We have had these monitory judgments.

(2.) We have had judgments which consist in punishments, — the plague, the fire, the sword, great distresses and poverty, that are come upon the nation; enough to make the hearts of men to tremble, but that we are grown hard like the nethermost millstone, and are sensible of nothing at all. I say these judgments and warnings of God are generally disregarded.

I would but ask two things, to see if by them we can evidence the contrary, notwithstanding all the judgments that we talk of: —

[1.] Who is the man, where is the person, that hath made any abatement in any thing of the world, — in love to the world, in conformity to the world, in the pursuit of any lust? Show me the man who, upon the account of these judgments in the world, hath made any abatement.

[2.] Show me the person who can by experience show that he hath by fear been moved to provide an ark for himself and family, any other ark besides present circumstances, — so much wealth, enjoyment, peace and quiet? Who is the person that hath provided an ark for himself and his family? Let us talk what we will, unless we make a visible abatement in conformity to the world, and labor to provide an ark, we disregard the judgments of God.

2. There are spiritual judgments also; and they are found among us, —

(1.) In God's taking from us so many faithful laborers in the dispensation of the gospel, in the midst of their days and strength, as he hath done of late years in this nation.

(2.) And in driving the remnant of his faithful ministers, many of them, into comers. where they are not able to serve the interest of Christ and the nation by promoting and furthering its return unto God: and thereby that which would have been the greatest mercy that the nation can be partaker of, the greatest means of the preservation of it and deliverance from ruin, is

made the greatest means of the restraining and shutting up their ministerial abilities and graces; which I shall not now enlarge upon.

(3.) There is another part of these spiritual judgments, and that is the general security that is come upon all sorts of men, according to the variety of their degrees, in being overtaken with the present temptations of the day. These judgments are upon us unregarded.

Thirdly, Another thing in the text is the preparation and disposition that are in a nation to ruin. But I shall not speak unto them; they are visible and known unto all.

But you will say, ‘When God doth thus in his word declare that a nation is fallen and ruined by such causes, is there no hope but that it must be ruined, that destruction must overtake it?’

I answer, —

1. There is no hope at all while that place, that nation, continues in those ways and sins whereby God declares that they are ruined. A nation cannot be saved abiding in those ways which are the causes of its ruin, which God declares to be the causes of it. And let men have what expectations they will, please themselves as they will, I neither can desire nor will look for deliverance for a nation while it continues in those sins against which God pronounces judgments.

2. I do acknowledge it is frequent with God to declare a nation ruined with respect of merit, and yet to prevent their ruin with respect to the event. They may be delivered from that state and condition, and so be saved. The case is stated, ~~218~~ Jeremiah 18:7, 8,

“At what instant I shall speak concerning a nation, and concerning a kingdom to pluck up and pull down, and to destroy it: if that, nation, against whom I have pronounced, turn from their evil. I will repent of the evil that I thought to do unto them”

God declares what they do deserve, but yet they may never feel it as to the event. Wherefore it is not in vain that we have designed to seek the Lord this day. There is room yet left to deal with God about London, about the nation, though plainly in the word they are declared to be under ruin.

But it will have no success without these three things: —

- 1.** That there be a visible reformation, — I will not say a conversion, but a visible reformation, — vigorously attempted in and upon the body of the people.
- 2.** Unless those who truly fear the Lord do mourn over the sins of the people continually. And, —
- 3.** Unless they are fervent in their prayers for their deliverance. It doth not stand with the honor of God, the glory of his righteousness, holiness, word, and truth, to save this nation without these things; — without an attempt at visible reformation of the body of the people; without his own people mourn over the sins of the nation, and abide in fervent prayer for that end. Without these, as Jeremiah the prophet told the Jews, chap. 37:10, “Though ye had smitten the whole army of the Chaldeans that fight against you, and there remained but wounded men among them, yet should they rise up every man in his tent, and burn this city with fire;” So I say of our Chaldeans at this day: If half of them were executed, and the other half wounded, they should rise up and smite this city, unless we turn thus unto God.

We are called to consider the sins of the nation, and to deplore its state and condition upon the account of those sins. That is our present work; and these plain things God hath directed me unto from the reading of these words.

I will add a little more, for the further opening of the words. There is in them a summary declaration of the causes of this state and condition: “Because,” saith he, “their tongue and, their doings are against the Lord, to provoke the eyes of his glory. You may range all sins under these two heads — men’s tongues and their doings; for their tongues and their doings have been against the Lord. —

There is a particularly ruining provocation, when men set their tongues against the Lord. It a great sign, of the approaching, ruin of a people and nation when men set their tongues against the Lord. He puts a special mark upon that. I shall only name the things whereby men set their tongues against the Lord, keeping themselves to that one thing, by such ways as will certainly prove ruining.

There are these ways whereby men set their tongues against the Lord: —

1. By blasphemy. And thereof there are two branches: —

(1.) Cursed oaths;

(2.) Atheistical discourses. Whether they are found among us or no let every one judge as he hath experience. Men set their tongues against the Lord especially by blaspheming the Spirit of Christ and the gospel. I do acknowledge that this is a sin which our Lord Jesus Christ as it were separates from all other sins, reserving it unto spiritual and eternal judgment; but it hath influence also on temporal judgments.

2. By mocking at all those judgments: “Where is the promise of his coming?” where is this talk that hath been among the prophets, among professors, for so many years, of judgment coming? “for since the fathers fell asleep, all things continue as they were.” They scoff at the word of God with reproachful terms.

When these are the things whereby men’s tongues are set against God (I do not speak of the sins of the tongue in general, but of those sins whereby the tongue is peculiarly set against God), we shall do well to inquire whether any such things are found among us or no.

This comprises the whole remainder of outward sins against the Lord. I shall not need to speak unto them; I shall only touch upon the aggravations: —

1. The first aggravation of these sins, that makes them ruinous, is when they rise to such a degree as that they are a “provocation unto the eyes of God’s glory.”

The “eyes of God’s glory” intend two things, — First and principally, His holiness: “He is of purer eyes than to behold evil,” ³⁰¹³ Habakkuk 1:13. The eyes of God’s glory are the purity of his holiness. Secondly, God’s omniscieny and omnipreseney. His eyes are not eyes of flesh. He sees and knows all things by the infinite immensity of his own presence. Sins committed in an especial manner against the eyes of God’s glorious holiness and his omniscieny will always have special influence into the ruin of Jerusalem and of Judah.

What are the sins that have a special opposition unto the eyes of God's glory as it denotes his holiness? I answer, —

All sorts of uncleanness, — adultery, fornication. Uncleanness is in a peculiar manner opposed unto the holiness of God. We are to inquire whether there have been any overspreading of such abominations in the nation wherein we live. If there have, there have been provocations unto the eyes of God's glory. Every impure lust in the heart is provoking to the eyes of God's glory; every uncleanness wherewith the land is defiled, upon this account, because of its contradiction unto the pure and holy nature of God, is provoking unto the eyes of God's glory.

2. When men are bold in sin, — which brings along with it contempt of God's omniscency and omnipresency, — it is a provocation unto the eyes of God's glory.

There are two ways whereby men do manifest themselves bold in their sins; and they are both mentioned in the text: —

(1.) By appearing under all demonstrations of outward pride, while they are filled with inward filth and laden with guilt; a thing that God doth greatly abhor. "The show of their countenance doth witness against them." We live in days wherein the nation is overwhelmed with the guilt of sin, and full of all manner of iniquities and defilements. They do compose all their garbs and ways unto pride. And,

(2.) They reject the ways of God. They condemn God and man when they have all that guilt upon them.

3. The last aggravation whereby men provoke the eyes of God's glory is when they declare their sin as Sodom."

How is it to "declare their sin as Sodom?"

(1.) When men will confer and talk together about the vilest sins and wickednesses. So did they in Sodom; they got together to act wickedness. Time was when profaneness and atheism were not grown to that boldness as now they are. They covered their sin. But now men and women will consult together, talk and advise together, about their sins, how and what way they shall commit them.

(2.) When they will come unto that impudence, not only to confer about their sins, but so as to make them a scoffing and a laughing matter.

Let us consider whether there be not those abominations among us against which the wrath of God is revealed from heaven. These are the aggravations the prophet gives of the sins of Jerusalem and of Judah, upon the account whereof he pronounces the one to be “ruined,” and the other to be “fallen” from her strength and beauty. The judgment he passes upon all is, “Woe unto their soul! for they have rewarded evil unto themselves.”

I shall close all with a word or two of use: —

First, If this be the deplorable state and condition of the nation wherein we live, let us endeavor, by all ways and means that lie in us, to retrieve the nation out of this state and condition, every one acting unto the utmost of his power to turn men from their evil ways, that God may repent him of the evil that he hath purposed against this nation.

Secondly, If they will not be healed, let our souls mourn in secret for them, and let us do something to help the poor dying nation. There is not one of you but may do much towards the saving, of this nation, by mourning in secret because of the abominations that are committed in it. whereby we have provoked the eyes of God’s glory.

Thirdly, Take heed that we do not partake in any of their sins, that we make no approach unto them, lest we partake of their plagues. There is no greater duty incumbent at this day on persons that fear God than this one, to be cautious of making approaches towards any persons or people against whom God hath declared that he hath a controversy with them.

Fourthly, Prepare to meet the Lord in the way of his judgments. God is righteous in all his ways, when he shall bring the scourge upon the nation, and it “shall be spoiled as Shalman spoiled Betharbel in the day of battle,” ²⁹¹⁴ Hosea 10:14

Lastly, Give glory unto him for all the appearances of sovereign grace and mercy in preserving this nation from that late horrid design and plot,

which might have swallowed us up unless God himself had immediately interposed.

There are three or four things I would mention, that I have upon my thoughts: —

- 1.** The open discovery of the profaneness and villany of their hearts, in striving to hide from God and man the wickedness they had contrived, by adding a new wickedness unto it, which they had not thought of, — the murdering of that innocent person.^{f118} God left them to discover the wickedness and profaneness of their hearts, that they would cover one sin with another, and God should not look through it.
- 2.** The wisdom and justice of God, in making that which they concluded the means of hiding their plot from the eyes of men prove upon the matter the means of discovering it unto all men. They behaved themselves subtly, but the hand of God was upon them; there was “*digitus Dei*” plainly in the case. Their great design was, by the murder of that gentleman to conceal all. Saith God, ‘I will discover all by the murder of that person.’
- 3.** See the hand and glory of God in this also. You are directed unto it this day, that though their wickedness and malice continue, God hath taken away their hearts. If wisdom and courage had not been taken from them, they might have ruined this nation; but God hath taken away their hearts, and so long we shall be safe enough.
- 4.** In this glorious act of God there is a spirit poured out upon the commonalty of this nation above their light and above their principles; which is the immediate hand of God: for every man’s spirit follows his light and principles, but here it is beyond their light and principles. Therefore glorify God in this, and let it encourage us to be instant in prayer day and night for this poor nation, the laud of our nativity.

SERMON 10.

THE DEATH OF THE RIGHTEOUS.

PREACHED JULY 1, 1681.

“The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart: and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come. He shall enter into peace: they shall rest in their beds, each one walking in his uprightness.” —

 Isaiah 57:1, 2.

THIS is a text that the providence of God hath severely preached on to this congregation. I cannot look before me, I cannot look behind me, but I see the footsteps of death. It hath been here, it hath been there, upon the right hand and upon the left. Sometimes God expounds the works of his providence by his word; and sometimes he expounds his word by the works of his providence. To suit the word of God and the works of God, as the one interprets the other, is the sum and substance of all our wisdom here in this world.

God doth at this day expound his works by his word. The world is full of confusion, full of tokens of God's displeasure, full of judgments, full of dread; yet the world understands nothing of all these. Bring these works of God to the word of God, and we shall understand them. We shall understand the world is full of sin and provocation, that God is displeased, that he is talking away rest from men, — shaking every thing within and without. Those who know not the word of God understand nothing of these works, but are filled with a multitude of vain thoughts. He expounds his works by his word.

And sometimes God expounds his word by his works, as he doth this day. He expounds this text; so that in the works of God we may see the mind and sense of the Holy Ghost plainly, as in a glass. “The righteous perisheth, and no man layeth it to heart; and merciful men are taken away, none considering that the righteous is taken away from the evil to come.”

The general truth in these words is this: — That when God is bringing evils, distressing evils, upon a church, upon a people, in the ordinary way of his providence, he doth take away beforehand many of those who are most eminent and most useful. When in a particular manner “the righteous perisheth, and merciful men are taken away,” it is a time when God is bringing evils certainly. So, when God was bringing evils upon Jerusalem and the land of Judah, Jeremiah 24, he gathered all the good figs, and laid them aside. Many of them died, some went into captivity; but all that were good and were to be restored, God gathered them out from among them; and then came the universal desolation. “The righteous perisheth.” Josiah is an instance of this, whom some think the prophet (though long before) had a particular respect unto in this text: ‘Josiah shall perish; he shall be taken away.’ To what end? ‘That I may bring evil,’ saith God. ‘Go thou thy way. Thou shalt perish, and be slain; yet thou shalt go unto thy grave in peace, that I may bring evil.’ I have often spoken it myself, and beard others say, the taking away, the gathering in, as the word is, (“They shall be gathered”), of so many ministers, — many of them in the fullness of their strength, and fullness of their labors, and best of their designs for God, — has been a token that there was evil to come. And it is not only so as to ministers; but as to others in this congregation, in a most eminent manner, such as I have never had experience of in the whole course of my life; — so many persons of holiness, worth, and usefulness, to be taken away, and gathered in out of one poor society in so short a time! That is the general scope of the place.

I shall a little open the words in particular.

It is a double description of the persons spoken of: —

1. With reference to their state and condition before God; they are “righteous men:”
2. With respect unto their state and condition towards men; they are useful men, “merciful men,” who are spoken of.

First, With reference to their state before God: “The righteous perisheth.” I know the word is frequently used for a man who is morally righteous, a just man among men. But from what follows in verse 2, as we shall see by-and-by, I rather take the righteous man here to be a justified man, — a man

who is righteous and accepted with God; a just man, that is, a man justified by the blood of Christ. That is his first description, as to his estate in reference unto God, of whom he speaks: he is a justified person.

Secondly, With respect unto their state and condition towards men. He speaks of “merciful men,” — men of benignity, men of kindness, men of goodness, good men, useful men, men that exercise kindness in the earth, who are peculiarly the lovely and desirable men in the world. The apostle makes a distinction between a just man and a good man, ~~and~~ Romans 5:7, ‘Scarcely for a righteous man will one die’ (for a justified man); “yet peradventure for a good man” (one who is benign, kind, useful, merciful), — “some would even, dare to die” for such a man. Such are the persons who are here mentioned, — a justified man, and a man of benignity and kindness.

Truly, I cannot avoid the application of it; for God by his providence at present speaking unto us, it is our duty to apply it unto our case, to the person whom God hath lately taken from this congregation, — a justified man; as I might do to many others who have gone before. I was with him the day before he died, and found him in the exercise of faith upon as noble a principle as ever I would desire to live and die in, — that view which God had given him of the glory of his wisdom, of his righteousness, of his grace, and love, and mercy, all manifested in Jesus Christ for the saving of his soul. I know no more glorious act of faith. And they are the substance of the words wherein he expressed himself; as, indeed, he had done oftentimes before, when I had conference with him about his spiritual estate: for he was a person neither afraid of his pastor, nor unfree to communicate his thoughts unto him. And I cannot but give him the other character, — a “merciful man.” I see the faces of sundry in this congregation who have spoken of him to me as one full of kindness, love, benignity, ready to serve every one in all their occasions, inquiring how he might serve the meanest, and any other, with great condescension, meekness, and humility. I account this little that I have said due unto him; and I shall add no more but that it is an instance of God taking away a righteous man, and of God’s gathering in a merciful man. And it is known unto us that the same character, both for faithfulness and usefulness, may be applied in a most eminent manner unto several persons of this congregation who have been taken from us. I pray God we may be

“followers of them who through faith and patience are inheriting the promises;” that all of us, who profess that we are justified before God, may take care that we be merciful, — that is, kind, benign, and useful, not selfish, not living to ourselves, but ready to serve one another, ready to serve all the members of the congregation, and all others, as we have opportunity. If we are justified persons, let us take care to be good, to be merciful, kind and benign.

But to go on with the words. What is said of this righteous man? He “perisheth.” Absolutely? No; no righteous man perishes eternally. The prophet in the next verse obviates any such objection; for there he gives a distribution of him into his two essential parts. What saith he of him? “He shall enter into peace.” There is his soul. What shall become of his body? That shall go into the grave. If the righteous man perishes, it shall be only a dissolution; — as to their souls, they shall go to rest; as to their bodies, they shall go into the grave. I say he doth not perish absolutely, neither as to soul nor body; but the prophet uses these expressions that he may be said to leave out no justified man, by what way soever or by what means soever they may come to their death, though they may seem to perish, to be cut off. Some die in their youth, in the beginning of their usefulness; some die in their usefulness; — some die under strong pains; some may die by the sword: all which have an appearance of perishing. This expression comprises whatever way or time God is pleased to take a just man out of the world.

Again; a just man is said to perish and be gathered in, because of the help and assistance he should have been unto the church, and city, and place where he lived. He is perished and gone. The just man perishes, and the merciful man is taken away. They are gathered. There is an emphasis upon the season. There is a time when the just man so perishes and the merciful man is so taken away; and we can all give instances of it in near relations, in friends and acquaintances, that it hath been so.

To go a little further; What is the end hereof? what is the issue of this dispensation of God in the perishing of righteous and merciful men?

Why, saith he, —

1. “No man layeth it to heart.” And,

2. “None considering that they are taken away from the evil to come.” The meaning of it is this, that in those strange and wonderful dispensations of God, there are very few that either consider the cause or end of it: none lays it to heart in considering the cause; none considers it in respect of the end, — their being “taken away from the evil to come.” And that is the doleful truth which these words teach us, namely, that when God takes away, gathers in, righteous and merciful men, to make way for the bringing in of great evils, distresses, and destruction, few or none shall either lay it to heart or consider it. It is part of God’s displeasure, part of his judgment, that we are not more awakened by it. God be merciful to this poor church, or we are lost! If we don’t see the cause and end of God’s dispensation towards us, — unless the Lord be pleased to give us a further sense than yet we have attained, — I shall be afraid of “the evil to come, that is approaching unto a more sad event than we are ready to think of. “No man layeth it to heart;” very few shall do so. Yea, surely, how many sad words have we heard from all sorts of persons concerning those who have been lately taken from us: “Ah, my brother! Ah, my sister! Ah, their usefulness while they were among us!” and we can hang down our heads for a day, for a night; — but this is not laying it to heart. I speak unto the remnant of this congregation what God doth certainly require of us, that this complaint may not be found true concerning us, that none considers the cause and end, what they are; which is the saddest prognostic of most distressing evils.

Evil is a comprehensive word for every thing that is so. It is required of us that we do really take notice of the displeasure of God in it, — that God is displeased, not with them whom he hath taken away. Was God displeased with some of the best sprouts among bur brethren? was God displeased with them? No. But we are to take notice of God’s displeasure towards us. When God’s hand is lifted up, if men will not see, he saith, “they *shall* see.” Truly, I am almost ashamed, and ready to blush to look men in the face, to consider what rebukes God hath given us. Our Father hath spit in our face; he hath showed his displeasure, not in this instance only, but in nine or ten I could name, eminent in grace, whom he hath taken from us; so that I know not how we should not be ashamed that our Father is displeased with us, The Lord help us to lay it to heart! If we laid it to heart, we should blush.

What are the *causes* of God's displeasure with us? If God be displeased with us, what are the causes of it? I do not know that he hath given me a greater rebuke, in the whole course of my ministry, than that I have been laboring in the fire to discover the causes of God's withdrawing from us without any success. I will say nothing of them now, though it is good for us to think of them. Our duty is to let go all our vain pretences and security, and consider what is the cause that God is displeased with us as a congregation, and take shame unto ourselves.

And then, let us be jointly humbled for those causes, and be turning with all our heart from every thing that hath been a provocation unto the eyes of his glory. Without this, my own love unto this congregation will make me to apply that word unto it: 'You have I known of all the congregations in London in a peculiar manner, and therefore will I punish you for all your sins.' We have been lifted up unto heaven by privileges, and how God will bring us down I know not. But it is time for us to consider the causes of this displeasure of God, testified so openly against us, to be humbled for them, and return unto the Lord. It is high time so to do. Oh, blessed is he that contributes any thing hereunto in this particular! The Lord raise up some, and pour his spirit upon them, to be useful unto this end; that we may help to save ourselves, the pity, and the nation wherein we live, and the residue of the churches in this land! The Lord can pour out such a spirit on some, that may raise such a spirit of repentance for sin and humiliation before God as may be useful to this end and purpose. The first charge is, that "No man layeth it to heart." And I do believe, and therefore I speak, that if these things be not laid to heart in the way that I have declared, or to that purpose, it is an evidence that evil will come and overtake us in the latter end; for so it is said, "The righteous perisheth, and merciful men are taken away from the evil to come."

Why are they taken from the "evil to come"?

First, That God may bring the evil: 'I will leave some when the evil comes to be exercised; may be an old man, may be a young man. It waits but till I have gathered some to myself. I cannot bring evil till those lights be gone out and the good figs be carried away. I cannot,' saith God, 'bring evil upon Jerusalem till then.' And they are taken away that evil may come. And, —

Secondly, Which is the most general acceptance, they are taken away that they should not see the evil; as Josiah was taken away by the sword that he might not see the evil. Death by the sword hath no evil in it, in comparison of the evil God will bring upon a people or nation when he comes in a way of judgment. 'Josiah shall not see the burning of the city and temple, shall not see women eating their own children,' etc. What is perishing by the sword in comparison of all those temptations wherewith these evils are accompanied? The Lord will take them away, that they shall not see that which hath evil, wrath, distress, in it. They are "taken away from the evil to come."

SERMON 11.

THE HUMILIATION AND CONDESCENSION OF CHRIST.

PREACHED NOVEMBER 9, 1681.

“Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus: who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God: but made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men: and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.” — ^{<144>}Philippians 2:5-8.

THE apostle tells us, ^{<145>}1 Timothy 2:5, that “there is one God, and one mediator between God and men.” The difference, by reason of sin, between God and men was such as could not be made up without a mediator. God himself could not be this mediator; so the same apostle tells us, ^{<146>}Galatians 3:20, “A mediator is not of one, but God is one.” A mediator must be a middle person, and God in his divine nature is one: “A mediator is not of one.” Suppose this mediator be taken from among men, for one man sinning against another, “the judge shall judge him: but if a man sin against the LORD who shall entreat for him?” ^{<147>}1 Samuel 2:25. “There is no umpire betwixt us, ‘ saith Job, chap. ^{<148>}9:33, “that might lay his hand upon us both.” Who, then, is this mediator? Why, “There is one God, and one mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus.” How comes he so to be? This office was not imposed upon him against his mind and will; it did not befall him by chance; we did not choose him; it was not a matter of any advantage unto him; neither did it befall him by necessity of nature or condition. How, then, did he come unto this office? how came it that this mediator was “the man Christ Jesus”? Why, it was his mind; it was from his own mind. Not to insist upon the designation of the Father, the apostle places it there: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.” What was the mind that was in Christ Jesus? This

was the mind, that when he was “in the form of God,” and “thought it not robbery to be equal with God,” he “made himself of no reputation:” which was the original of Christ’s mediation. There are three things in the words:

First, The substance of them, — a description of the self-humiliation and condescension of Jesus Christ, in becoming the mediator between God and men by the taking up of this office. And there are two parts of it: —

1. Ἐκκένωσις, — his emptying of himself; 2. Ταπείνωσις, — the humbling of himself. He “being in the form of God, took upon him the form of a servant.” Ἐκκένωσε, saith the apostle. We say, “He made himself of no reputation;” he emptied himself. Having taken this form of a servant, what did he do? Why, “he humbled himself.” He emptied himself to take the form of a servant; and he humbled himself in that form, to engage in obedience, to undergo death. There is an infinite distance between the Ἐκκένωσις, the self-emptying of Christ, when, “being in the form of God, he took upon himself the form of a servant,” and the ταπείνωσις, the taking on him the form of a servant to obey and die. The one infinitely excels the other.

Secondly, There is in the words the principle from whence these distinct acts arise, — self-emptying, by taking our nature; self-humiliation, engaging in our nature to do and suffer. Whence doth it proceed? It proceeds solely from his own mind: “Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not: then said I, Lo, I come to do thy will, O God.”

Thirdly, There is the application and improvement of these things unto our practice: “Let this mind be in you which was also in Christ Jesus;” which is the thing I principally aim at, though I cannot reach unto it at this time.

The words, so far as we are concerned, will be opened in our passage. I shall take these two propositions from them: —

First, That it was an infinite, mysterious self-humiliation and condescension in Jesus Christ, the Son of God, to take our nature upon him, with reference unto the office of a mediator. That is the truth which the apostle designs here to demonstrate.

Secondly, That there is a spiritual greatness of mind, like unto the mind that was in Christ, required of all believers, unto that self-denial and unto those sufferings which they may be called unto for the gospel, and are like to be: “Let this mind be in you, which was also in Christ Jesus.”

I shall now treat of the first, that it was an infinite, mysterious self-humiliation of the Son of God, in taking upon him our nature, for the discharge of the office of a mediator. I shall, —

1. Prove it in general;
2. Show wherein it consists; and,
3. Make some use of it, if I am able.

1. For the proof of it, I would lay down but that one consideration which you have, ^{<113>}Psalm 113:5, 6, “Who is like unto the LORD our God, who dwelleth on high, who humbleth himself to behold the thing that are in heaven, and in the earth!” Such is the infinite perfection of the divine nature, that it is an act of self-humiliation, it is a condescension from the prerogative of his excellency and glory, to take notice of the most glorious things in heaven, and of the greatest things upon the earth.

And it is so upon these two accounts: —

(1.) Upon the account of that infinite distance which is between his nature, being, and essence, and the nature, being, and essence of any creature of any kind. Hence, ^{<30>}Isaiah 40:15, 17, it is said, “The nations are before him as a drop of a bucket, and are counted as the small dust of the balance: all nations are as nothing; and they are counted to him less than nothing, and vanity.” He is the infinite Being; and in comparison of him all creatures are “nothing,” even “less than nothing.” Now, there is no measure, no proportion, between an infinite Being and nothing and that which is as nothing: so that there can be no reason why an infinite Being should have any regard unto that which is as nothing, but its own infinite condescension. They are vain thoughts and imaginations of men that would find out foreseen causes in ourselves of God’s eternal election, in the first choice he makes of us. There is no proportion between an infinite Being and nothing. ^{<25>}Isaiah 57:15, He is “the high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity;” and, “To this man will I look, even to him that is of


an humble heart and of a contrite spirit, and trembleth at my word.” He is “the high and holy One that inhabiteth eternity,” who exists in his own eternal being; and what is beyond that is a bowing down to look on “him who is of an humble heart and of a contrite spirit.” The most glorious exaltation that a creature can have brings him not one step nearer the essence of God than a worm; for between that which is infinite and that which is not infinite there is no proportion. That is the first reason: God “humbleth himself to behold the things that are in heaven and in the earth,” because of the infinite distance that is between his nature and the nature of all things.

(2.) Because of his infinite self-sufficiency to all the ends of his own blessedness and eternal satisfaction. Whatever we desire, it that it may add unto our satisfaction. There is no creature in heaven or earth that is self-sufficient. The top of the creation, the flower, the glory of it, is the human nature of Christ; yet is it not self-sufficient. It eternally lives in dependence on God and by communications from the divine nature. No creature can be self-sufficient. No angel in heaven or man on earth who can have any desire, or act any thing, but it is to add to his satisfaction; and therefore he takes the reason of what he doth from without. But, saith the apostle, ‘God stands in need of nothing, inasmuch as he gives life and breath to all things.’ There is nothing can add unto God, unto his satisfaction. There is nothing wanting in himself unto his own eternal blessedness: ~~KJB~~ Job 35:6, “If thou sinnest, what doest thou against him? or if thy transgressions be multiplied, what doest thou unto him?” God loses nothing of his own eternal sufficiency: Verse 7, “If thou be righteous, what givest thou him? or what receiveth he of thine hand?” There can be no addition made unto God. Therefore it must be an infinite condescension in him and a humbling of himself, to behold the things done in heaven and on earth.

I make my inference from hence: If such be the eternal, blessed nature of God, and his infinite distance from all creatures, if such be his infinite self-sufficiency and blessedness, that it is a humbling of himself so much as to behold the most glorious things in heaven or the greatest things on earth, what great humiliation is it in the Son of God, who did not only look upon and behold us, and act kindly towards us, but took our nature upon him to

be his own This is the self-humiliation which the apostle proposes unto us, and which for ever we are to be found in.

2. I shall show you wherein this humiliation of the Son of God did consist; which will tend to the opening of the words. And because it is the center, life, and soul, of religion, the main rock on which the church is built, and against which there hath been opposition in all ages, but never so fierce and subtle as in the days wherein we live, I shall show you first wherein it doth not consist, as far as may be apprehended, and then wherein it doth.

(1.) When Christ humbled himself, he did not leave, he did not relinquish, he did not forego, his divine nature. He did not cease to be God when he became man. The foundation of it lay here: He was “in the form of God, and thought it not robbery to be equal with God,”  Philippians 2:6. He was “in the form of God.” God hath no innate form hut his nature, his being, his essence; and therefore to be “in the form of God” is to be participant of the nature, essence, and being of God. What follows thereon? He “thought it not robbery to be equal with God” the Father, in dignity, power, and authority. Because he was “in the form of God,” partaking of the divine essence, therefore he was “equal with God,” in dignity, power, and authority: which nothing could give him but only his being in the form of God; for though there is an order in the persons of the Trinity, there is no distinction or inequality in the nature of God. Every one who is partaker of that nature is equal in that nature, in dignity, power, and authority. This was the state of Christ. He had the same nature with God the Father, he was “in the form of God;” and had the same dignity, authority, and power, — “equal with God.” Here is the “terminus a quo.” This the apostle states. He “took upon him the form of a servant.” **Εκένωσε**, he did “empty himself, he did humble himself, and took upon him the form of a servant.” When? While he was God; when he abode “in the form of God;” and was “equal with God;” then he “took upon him the form of a servants” This is that glorious condescension of Christ, which is the greatest of all gospel mysteries, which is the life and soul of the church. He that is God can no more cease to be God, by any act of his own, or act upon him, than he that is not God can become God by any act of his own, or any act upon him. Christ could not cease to be God, — no more than a worm can make itself God. We say, Christ, being God, was made man for our sakes. The Socinians say,

that, being a man, he was made a god for his own sake; he was made equal unto God, in the same authority, but never “in the form of God.” In brief, we say, “The Word was made flesh,” — that is, had glorious authority and power given him in this nature. But Jesus Christ did not forego his divine nature; that he could not do. The apostle speaks that with as much confidence as that God cannot cease to be God.

(2.) This condescension did not consist in any substantial conversion of the divine nature into the human, though some of the Arians thought so of old; and some (too many), following their dotage to this day. say, “‘The Word was made flesh.’” But how? As the water was made wine by a miracle, by a substantial conversion; the substance of the water was turned into the substance of wine.’ As there the accident of water ceased, and the accident proper to wine did accompany it, they would have it so here, — that the divine nature of Christ was created by the will of God before the world was made, and after, by a substantial conversion, was turned into human nature. They assert that that which is called the divine nature was destroyed, as water was no more water when made wine. And so a human nature is produced that is of no affinity and cognation unto us; not derived of Adam as we, but made of the substance of the divine Word. This is far from being a due representation of this condescension of Jesus Christ.

(3.) It was not hereby, that the divine and human natures were mixed and compounded into one nature, so that it was neither that divine nature that was originally and eternally, nor human nature, but another, a third nature, made in time. This frenzy troubled the church for above one hundred years. Though Christ was made to be what he was not, yet he never ceased to be distinctly what he was. The divine nature had neither change nor shadow of turning. Consider this condescension of Christ, and observe all its essential properties It acts suitably unto itself; it acts nothing but what becomes it and is proper unto the divine nature. Jesus Christ did many things in the human nature wherein his divine nature had no concurrence but in the sustentation of the human nature in his one person. The divine nature did not act in hungering, and thirsting, and weariness, and bleeding, and dying; it cannot do so. All the acts of the divine nature on the human were acts of sustentation, whereby he acted these things

But you will say, ‘What did Christ do with reference to his divine nature, when he took our nature upon him?’ That the apostle expresses in this mysterious word, **ἐκκένωσε**. He veiled himself, he shadowed himself, he hid his divine nature, he eclipsed the glory of it. Not absolutely; all things under heaven cannot veil, eclipse, or hide, the glory of the divine nature. But the eclipsed, shadowed, hid, and laid it aside, as to himself and his interest in it: for upon his taking our nature upon him, men were so far from looking on him as God, that they did not look on him as a good man; and the reason was, because they saw and knew him to be a man, and he professed himself to be a man, and was no less a man than any of themselves were. And yet he professes himself to be God. They were so far from believing him so to be, that they took him not to be so much as a good man. Therefore, upon the mentioning of his pre-existence to his incarnation, — “Before Abraham was, I am,” **John** 8:58, — they fell into a great rage and madness, and took up stones to cast at him, as we read in the next verse; and they give this reason, **John** 10:33, “We stone thee because that thou, being a man, makest thyself God.” This they could not understand. ‘This we will not believe,’ say they. And this overthrew the persuasion of many, that if Christ will be man, he shall be only a man.

All this is part of the condescension of Christ, if we will believe what the apostle here saith, He was “in the form of God,” and “equal with God,” — partaking of his essence, and equal in dignity, authority, and power. What then? “He took upon him the form of a servant;” that is, our nature, that therein he might be “obedient unto death.” How did he take it upon him so to be his own that he should be a man, and in that nature be “obedient unto death” ?

Having showed you that it was not by the relinquishment of his divine nature, that, being God from eternity, he then ceased to be God when he was made man; that it was not by a conversion of the divine nature into the human, — the Word was not made flesh as the water was made wine; that it was not by a composition of two natures into one, for still they remained distinct in their essence; I shall now show you wherein it did consist: —

(1.) The condescension of Christ consisted in veiling the glory of the Deity, — not in taking a man to himself, but in taking the nature of man upon himself. Flesh and blood can reveal that unto no man.

I shall show you how it was; and then give you a word of use: —

What, then, did Christ do in his condescension? Pray remember it, for it is the principal object of your faith, and the life of your souls. This was that which he did: The person of the Son of God, or the divine nature in the second person, continuing God in his essence and God in his state and dignity, did take “upon” him (I use that word rather than take “unto” him) the nature of man, into an individual subsistence in his own person, whereby he became that man; and what was done and acted in it by that man was done and acted by the person of the Son of God. This is that Condescension of Christ that is here spoken of. Every man hath his own individual subsistence, whereby the human nature is divided in particular. We have all of us the same nature in general; — that is, the same specific human nature belongs unto us equally and unto all men in the world; yet every man and woman hath this nature entire and absolutely unto himself, as if there were no other man or woman in the world. And Adam was not more a single person when there was none in the world but himself, than every one of us is a single person now the world is full of men, as if there were but one man. And every one comes into the world in his own individual subsistence unto himself, whereby he becomes a man as much as any of us. Here is the great act of self-denial in Christ.

I should have insisted upon the consequences of it, — for neither of his natures is changed, — and how the divine nature was concealed and veiled hereby; but these must be waived at present. 3. I shall speak to the use of it, and so conclude: — The use should be, to raise up our hearts into the admiration of the great condescension of Christ in thus humbling and emptying himself for our sakes. But I cannot enlarge upon this. The prophet tells us, ²¹⁸⁴Isaiah 8:14 (which is a prophecy of Christ), “And he shall be for a sanctuary; but for a stone of stumbling and for a rock of offense to both the houses of Israel; for a gin and for a snare to the inhabitants of Jerusalem.” Peter expounds this place, ²¹⁸⁵1 Epist. 2:6-8. He shall be “a sanctuary” unto them who believe, to them who are oppressed; but “a stone of stumbling and a rock of offense, even to them which

stumble at the word.” Both these is our Lord Jesus Christ in a peculiar manner, by this self-emptying, by this self-humiliation; he is “a sanctuary,” and he is “a stone of stumbling.” Herein Christ is principally a sanctuary unto them who do believe. What do men look for in a sanctuary? Freedom from danger, deliverance out of trouble, and a supply of all their wants. All these are proposed in this self-humiliation of Jesus Christ, if we could by faith make him our sanctuary, — if we could by faith, as we ought, go unto him for relief. If we go unto any one for relief, we question but two things, — his will and his power. If he be willing and if he be able, you have no ground to question but you shall have relief. I know how it is with us all. We have all wants, we have all temptations, we have all fears, we have all inward conflicts and perplexities, more or less; and we all secretly groan to be delivered from all these things. Groaning is the best of our spiritual life, — to live in continual groaning. Oh, that we may do so every morning and every evening! that there may be nothing but God and Christ in our souls, all clear and serene, and all our minds spiritual and heavenly! Where shall we betake ourselves, then, for relief in all cases? If any one have will and power to relieve us, oh, that he would come in to our relief and help; thither would we go! But here is the loss of our souls and peace, here is that which keeps us at such a poor, low rate, and makes us scramble for the world, — because we neglect going unto Christ for relief in all our wants. How few of us live in the exercise of faith for this purpose! ‘But will he relieve me?’ Why, he hath humbled, emptied himself, and laid aside his glory, for this very end, that he might relieve us. For my own part, I do verily believe that all coming short of all gospel joy, strength, and power, is for want of due application unto Jesus Christ for relief. The not believing of his willingness shall be the condemnation of the world for their ingratitude. “Ye will not come unto me that ye may have life.” ‘Oh, who would have thought that he would have received us?’ Why, can I give you greater encouragement than I do? He still retains his omnipotent power; he is still “in the form of God.” The holy God help us to live more in the exercise of faith on him, that we may have more comfort in our lives!

But herein Christ is also “a stumbling-block and a rock of offense” unto the rest of the world. This they stumbled at of old, and this is that which the world continues yet to do. Some asserted Jesus Christ only to be a

prophet come out from God. This the Mohammedans will all comply with; and the Jews were well enough content that John the Baptist should be a prophet, but Christ should be none, because he made himself equal unto God. There they stumbled and fell. And at this day great offense is taken in the world at this divine person of Christ and his self-humiliation. The truth is, "All flesh hath corrupted his way." All the world begins to grow weary of the religion which they profess, and to question whether there be any thing of supernatural revelation. God gave us a natural religion at first; we lost it; and God raised it by supernatural revelation, which continued till the coming of Christ. Then he put an end unto all supernatural revelation. Then the devil was at a loss, and he raised a scandal upon supernatural revelation. The world is grown weary of it, and would return unto a natural religion, having lost the power of all supernatural revelation. It makes way for atheism. They believe nothing the Scripture expresses of gospel mysteries; and this makes way for the disbelief of the Trinity and incarnation of the Son of God. They follow the conduct of men influencing them unto their own secular advantage. But let us hold this fast, because the world grows weary of it. Let this corner-stone be laid hold of by us for a foundation, and it will prove our life and safety.

SERMON 12.

ENOCH'S WALK WITH GOD.

[THE DATE OF THIS SERMON APPEARS
TO BE OCTOBER 8, 1675.]

*“And Enoch walked with God: and he was not; for God took him.” —
Genesis. 5:24.*

THIS Enoch here spoken of hath the most considerable circumstances of any one of the patriarchs before the flood, nor was there any more but one afterwards, under the law, equal unto him; for he was a prophet, and foretold, as, no doubt, of other things needful unto the then present state of the church, so in particular of the future judgments of God, and the manner of them, on ungodly sinners, with the causes and reasons of those judgments. This part of his prophecy was revived by the Holy Ghost, and reported unto us by Jude, verses 14, 15. And although therein he seems principally intend the general judgment of the last day, yet he doth it so as include other lesser days of public judgment, when the patience of God being as it were wearied with the preventions of men, he hath testified his wrath from heaven against them in calamitous desolations. Such were the flood, the conflagration of Sodom, the destruction of Jerusalem; which, with other things of an alike nature, he foretold.

And herein he was also, as his great-grandchild Noah, a “preacher of righteousness” unto that generation; for the application of his prophecies was to deter men from profaneness, and to call them to repentance.

The state of things at this time in the world was very evil and corrupt, as being far engaged into that condition which, not long after, came unto a universal apostasy, ^{<0005}Genesis 6:5, 11-13. In the days of Enos there had been some reformation attempted, as the children of God by profession had separated themselves from the profane and wicked posterity of Cain, ^{<0005}Genesis 4:26: but at this time the degenerate offspring of Seth, the generality of visible professors, began to mix themselves in society, have

communication and practice wickedness with the profane, scoffing, apostate world; an account whereof is given, ~~and~~ Genesis 6:1-4. And as those days were full of sin, so were they full of danger, persecution, and oppression, unto all that feared God. This Enoch in his prophecy expresseth a sense of the “hard speeches,” — that is, revilings and reproaches, — that were cast upon God; that is, on his servants and his ways: and we do know that such things in a multitude of ungodly men, accompanied with power, do not use to go alone. And, besides, the whole earth was then filled with violence and oppression; wherein those who feared God had no doubt the greatest share in suffering.

In this state and condition of things, both in the world and the church, we yet see in this instance of Enoch, —

- 1.** That, under the most universal and deplorable apostasy of professors, God will maintain some to bear witness unto his truth, ways, and worship, against the profane wickedness of the children of men, until he comes unto the bounds and limits appointed in his wisdom unto his patience, whereon the universal destruction of apostates shall ensue; and,
- 2.** That no difficulties, discouragements, dangers, reproaches, persecutions, violences, oppositions, shall, can, or ought, to hinder any in, or terrify them from, the duty of bearing witness unto God and his cause in their generation, which they are called unto.

Again; we may observe of this Enoch, that his continuance in this world was but short in comparison of the rest of mankind, — scarce half the days of any one whose years are numbered before the flood, his father and his son being the longest livers that ever were in the world; for it is not long life, but public service for God, that we are to esteem a blessing in this world. A little time filled up with service and duty is inexpressibly to be preferred before a multitude of days spent in unprofitableness and vanity.

But yet while he was such an eminent prophet, a faithful preacher and witness for God, the Holy Ghost, intending to declare that rare privilege whereof he was made partaker above the residue of mankind, makes mention of none of those things whereunto it should have respect but only of his walking with God. And this is twice mentioned, as that which God

had a peculiar regard unto, in the signal testimony of divine favor which he was made partaker of.

That, therefore, which is ascribed unto him here is, that “he walked with God;” the consequent whereof is, that “he was not;” and the reason of that consequent is, “because God took him.”

I shall not discourse any thing about the manner of this taking of Enoch, which our apostle calls “translation;” only we may observe that it is here doubly expressed: —

1. By his ceasing to be in the world: “He was not”

2. By God’s receiving of him into another state out of this world: “For God took him.” And the first is expressed with respect unto his state in the world. His life, no doubt, was like unto that of Elijah, his only associate in this favor from the foundation of the world, — full of labor, sorrow, persecution, danger, and trouble. His deliverance from this state and condition is that which is expressed in that word, “And he was not” He was no more exposed to the reproaches, and hard speeches, and violences of ungodly men. And although this was a peculiar way of deliverance, yet in general a deliverance it was, and that in and from as woful and calamitous a time as ever was since the foundation of the world. And that which I shall observe from hence is, — That walking with God is the only way to preserve and deliver any from the calamities of general apostasies, in wickedness, violence, and destruction. Many other ways men may contrive for this end, but this alone will be effectual. Some, scoff, ^{<OR>} 2 Peter 3:3, 4; some at such a season live in security, as did then the generality of the world until the flood came, ^{<OR>} Matthew 24:38, 39; some have hopes that either all things will grow better, or that they will not be so bad as some fear and imagine, ^{<OR>} 1 Thessalonians 5:8; some expect sudden changes of all things into a better condition, — whereunto, as unto desire, I could say with the prophet Jeremiah, Amen, but profess withal that I believe it not [possible] on such easy terms as are imagined, ^{<OR>} Malachi 2:2, ^{<OR>} Amos 5:18; some have many contrivances for their own personal safety, let what will fall out: but it will appear at last that it is this walking with God alone that will give us assured deliverance, so as that, when we are not, God will take us.

Enoch was a great prophet, and a great preacher, and a great patriarch; yet in his deliverance and translation there is no respect had unto these things, but only unto his walking with God. And this is that wherein you, who are neither prophets, nor preachers, nor of any great signification in the world, may be like unto him; and without which no other privileges whatever will avail us. Wherefore here is a common rule and duty expressed unto all, as the means and condition of a safe deliverance one way or other, which the meanest, the poorest, may have as good an interest in as the greatest and wisest in the world.

Two things, therefore, I design to do: —

- 1.** To show you what it is to walk with God, or wherein this walking with God doth consist, or what is required thereunto.
- 2.** How this walking with God will be the means of our deliverance from the calamities of a general apostasy drawing towards destruction.

It is the first of these which I shall principally insist upon; wherein I shall endeavor to declare the true nature of a Christian's daily walk with God, and what is required thereunto.

The great, comprehensive duty of walking with God, which expresseth the whole obedience of the new covenant, hath been treated of and spoken unto by many, whoso labors have been of great use in and profit unto the church of God; yet am I not discouraged from casting my mite also into the same treasury; and that partly because I have apparently observed some useful gleanings yet to be made after their vintage, and partly because I more particularly understand the state and condition of them unto whom I speak than any other can do, whence many directions may be taken for the directions which I shall give; for it is not so much walking with God absolutely and in general, as your walking with God in particular, which I design to guide and promote.

Two things herein I shall carefully avoid: —

- 1.** Such a prolixity in handling of particulars, or the introduction of less necessary considerations or of such as may more properly be handled on other heads and occasions, as should weary or divert you, or turn you aside from being always in the consideration of what is offered, intent on

this one thing of walking with God. Diversions and digressions may be useful and profitable on their proper occasions, where they be to the confirmation of doctrinal points, or the “confirmation of truth in controversy, or the full declaration of the nature of particular duties; but when a man’s only business is to attend unto his way and walk therein, it is not expedient to attend unto them. It is no part of his duty who undertakes to show and guide another in his way, for to speed his course, to lead him out of it, that he may See this or that pleasant town or place, though desirable, and though he brings him into his way again; but it is so to attend continually unto the way wherein he is. I shall therefore only insist on such things as belong directly, immediately, and necessarily, unto our duty, as it is formally walking with God, and not on anything that may be reduced thereunto.

2. Such brevity must be avoided as would occasion an omission of any important duty necessarily belonging hereunto, and that either absolutely or in the especial relation or circumstances wherein we may stand; yet I shall reduce all into as narrow a compass as I am able.

Now, unto the directions which I have to give unto this purpose some few things must be premised; as, —

1. They are professed believers alone whom we consider in this matter, — those, I mean, who pass for and are esteemed as true believers in the church of God, upon the profession they make of faith and obedience. It may be some, it may be many, such there are who are not truly and savingly interested in that condition. But these directions, though not intended for them, yet may be of use unto them; for when they shall see what is the indispensable duty of all believers herein, finding themselves to come every way short thereof, it may be a means of discovering unto them their own self-deceiving, and so of a delivery from their ruinous condition. But hence it is that I shall give no directions about our first general repentance, conversion to God, regeneration, and the like; all which are supposed here, as also I have handled them at large elsewhere.^{f119}

2. Whereas this walking with God respects the acting of our faith and obedience, we do suppose the nature of faith, obedience, and holiness in general, with their necessity and arguments for it, to be already received or admitted; and this part also of their great duty, wherein the foundations of

it do lie, hath been elsewhere discoursed and declared. The principles whereby and the duties wherein we do or ought actually so to walk do alone now fall under consideration; and those we shall handle, both as unto the constant frame of our spirits and the daily acts of obedience that are required of us.

3. I shall not need to insist upon the explication of the metaphor of “walking with God,” or walking before him, which is commonly spoken unto and generally understood by all who concern themselves in these things. The Scripture doth variously express it unto us. It is “the life of God,” which wicked men are “alienated from,” ^{<4018>}Ephesians 4:18; that life which is from God, and Whereby we live unto God: “Not living unto ourselves, but unto him that died for us,” ^{<4015>}2 Corinthians 5:15. To “walk with God,” is to live to him in an especial manner, in and through Jesus Christ, who died for us, that we might have grace, power, and wisdom, so to do. It is instantly to serve God day and night,” ^{<4017>}Acts 26:7; that is, to serve and obey him in the continual, intent performance of all the duties which he requireth of us. It is the “ordering of our conversation “ aright, so as that we may “see the salvation of God,” ^{<4010>}Psalm 1:23; wherein we have “our conversation in heaven,” ^{<4010>}Philippians 3:20; or it is so to walk as “to please God” in all things, ^{<4001>}1 Thessalonians 4:1.

Concerning this walking with God, I shall give these rules, which may both declare wherein it doth consist and also, give directions how we may be always found in the path thereof; as, —

FIRST, Be sure that the general, prevailing design of our whole souls be to live unto God. It is not enough that we perform the duties which are required of us, but our whole course is to be managed with design and purpose of heart. Every agent that doth any thing according to reason hath some scope and design in what he doth, which both influences and guides him therein. To live unto the satisfaction of present desires, appetites, lusts, pleasures, and to subordinate various contrivances unto them, is the life of brutes, and brutish, unreasonable men only. And if no man can lead this natural, or a civil life as becometh a rational creature, but he must guide it by design, much less can any one otherwise live unto God in a due manner.

So Barnabas exhorted the first Christians, that “with purpose of heart they would cleave unto the Lord,” ^{<4112>}Acts 11:23. To “cleave unto the Lord” is to “walk with him” or “before him” in faith and obedience. So Moses expresseth it, ^{<1804>}Deuteronomy 4:4, “Ye that did cleave unto the LORD your God are alive;” that is, who by faith in his promises yielded obedience unto his commands, and so “walked with God.” Now, this is to be done “with purpose of heart;” that is, with the full design and resolution of our souls. David carries it up unto the highest solemnity of expression, ^{<1806>}Psalms 119:106, “I have sworn.” He respecteth his solemn covenant-engagement that he had made to God for universal obedience, with his resolution for its performance. This is that which I intend by this design, an express engagement of heart and soul constantly to pursue such an end. And this is that which God looketh on as such an eminent duty, ^{<3811>}Jeremiah 30:21, “Who is this that hath engaged his heart to approach unto me?” It is not merely approaching unto God, but the engagement of the heart to do so in all instances of duty, that is so acceptable unto God.

The Lord severely threatens those persons that “walk contrary unto him,” and that with a multiplication of plagues upon them, ^{<1821>}Leviticus 26:21. The word is, and so is the meaning of the place, that “walk at all adventures with him.” They will walk with him in the performance of duties, it may be of all known duties, public and private; but they will do it “at all adventures,” — without design, or scope, or end, — without that reverent consideration that becometh those who walk with God; so that every occasion will either turn them out of the way or put a stop and end unto their walk. As two men may be walking together in the field, and they may both go the same way and at the same pace: but one of them hath a journey to go, a designed place that he would be at and must come to, or he utterly fails in his purpose; the other only walks for his health, or recreation, or diversion, or good company, without any certain design of an especial end, — that is, “at all adventures.” If a storm arise, if the rain fall, if weariness come on, the latter person either immediately turns out of the way for shelter, or returns quite back unto his own habitation; but the former, knowing that he hath a journey to go, an end proposed, which he must pursue, or it may be he shall be undone, the difficulties and oppositions which he meets with do but occasion him to fortify his resolution, and to stir up all his strength for its accomplishment. So it is

with him that “walketh with God at all adventures,” — difficulties, temptations, occasions of life, do easily turn him out of the way, or put a stop unto his progress; but he that hath a fixed design, that “cleaveth unto the Lord with purpose of heart,” is prepared to conflict with all difficulties, not to faint on any discouragements, but still to press forward towards his course and end, the mark of the high calling set before him.

SECONDLY, It ought to be inquired what it is to live unto God, which we are thus to design,

I answer briefly, three things are required thereunto: —

1. That we make him our end;
2. That we make his will our only rule;
3. That we expect our strength and reward from him alone.

1. If we live to God, we make him our *universal end*. This can be but one in any one man at the same time, or in the same state and condition. A man may have various general ends in various conditions; as the same person, whilst he is unconverted to God hath one general end, and when he is converted another: but in the same state he can have but one end. Every man may have, every man hath, many particular ends, and these are every way consistent with each other. Every particular action hath its particular end, and every especial course of life hath its especial end, if it be ordered aright; — in civil things, men pursue their trades, to increase their wealth thereby, like those in ⁵⁰⁰³James 4:13, and to provide for their families, or the like; and every thing they do in that course hath its especial end also. And these may be multiplied, according unto men’s occasions. So also in duties of religion, men may have particular ends. As he that giveth an alms to the poor, his next, particular end is to relieve their necessity. And although these particular ends are good, and the things done with respect unto them are honest and good in their own nature, yet do they not absolutely render them good unto them by whom they are performed, seeing there is an universal end over all these particular ends, whereon depends the formal nature of all that we do with respect unto God. These particular ends, therefore, may be many and various, coordinate or subordinate one to another, yea, sometimes contrary and stirring up a fierce conflict in the minds of men, — as it is with persons under the

power of strong convictions, as also with them that serve divers lusts and pleasures. But as for universal ends, they are but two, and those so absolutely inconstant that no man can make them both to be his ends at the same time; and these are God and self. No man can make both these to be his general and principal end. He whose end is God may do too many things for self, and he whose end is self may do many things for God, — and our duty it is to inquire whether is predominant in us, — but both of these cannot be our chief and universal end at the same time. This our Savior fully instructs us in, in one great instance wherein self prevails,

~~and~~ Matthew 6:24. Our general end is our absolute master; we give up ourselves unto it without limitation or condition. And although in such a sense we may sometimes do this or that work for another on particular occasions, yet we cannot entertain ourselves for an hour in the service of another. He that maketh self his end and master may do many things for God, but he can in nothing make God his chief end, but comparatively he will love self, and hold to self, and God shall be despised; and so also on the contrary. How we may know what is our principal end, or what end the prevailing design of our souls is for, shall immediately be inquired into.

How, then, is God thus the chief end of them who design to live unto him, or wherein do they make him so to be?

In answer, Our living unto God as our chief end consists in two things: —

- (1.) Our doing of all things unto his glory; and,
- (2.) Our aiming in and above all things at the enjoyment of him.

(1.) He is so when we do all things unto his glory; which the Scripture expressly requireth of us. In actions natural and civil, and in things sacred or religious, “whatsoever ye do, do all to the glory of God,” ~~and~~ 1 Corinthians 10:31. This is in all things our principal end, if we live to God and not to self. That we may rightly understand it, we may observe, —

[1.] That, as we granted before, there are sundry particular ends that we may have in and unto all that we do. It is not so required of us to do all to the glory of God as not to have any lawful end of our own that may be subordinate thereunto. A sinful end, as the satisfaction of our lusts or self in any thing, we may not have; it is inconsistent with the general end proposed. So far as we attend unto it, we cross our principal end, if God

be so. But such ends as are good in themselves are also allowed unto us. A man may eat and drink for the refreshment and sustentation of his nature, and may make that his end; so he may industriously labor in his particular calling, thereby to provide for himself and his family, and may make that his immediate end; yea, a man may use diversions and recreations for the relief and refreshment of his wearied nature, and make that his end. And so it may be in all instances, natural, civil, and religious; for all these ends may be as well subordinated unto the general end of living unto God as any of those actions may whose ends they are.

[2.] It is not, therefore, necessary that, in every particular action of our lives, of what sort soever it be, natural, civil, or religious, we should actually make the glory of God, or the glorifying of God, to be the immediate especial end of it. it may suffice, in many instances, that their particular ends be not inconsistent therewithal, but such as may be subordinated thereunto. Nevertheless, in greater duties, and such as the glory of God may have an immediate concernment in, such as are all acts of religious worship, there is an actual, especial intention of glorifying him, or of giving glory unto him; for that is the immediate end of all divine worship, which if it fail, the whole is lost. He, therefore, that lives to God, designs the immediate glorifying of him in all acts of his worship, and that by faith and the obedience thereof. And the like may be said of sundry actions, ways, and courses, which are of importance in our conversation in this world. Wherefore, —

[3.] There are these five things required in all who design so to live to God as to make his glory, or the glorifying of him, their principal end: —

1st. They are bound to prefer, esteem, and value, the glory of God above all other things whatever. This Moses testifieth himself to have done on that great occasion wherein the lives of so many thousands and the being of a whole nation were concerned, ^{<04411>}Numbers 14:11-19. And so did Joshua on the like occasion, chap. 7:8, 9. The glory of God carries it, in the minds of those that walk with him, against all competition. Sometimes the contest may be seen; as when the glory of God is apparently engaged one way, and all our temporal interests another. And much work there will be to bring the soul into an acquiescency, by the preference of the glory of God unto all lawful self-interest and natural affection. David failed here in

the case of Absalom; and a due discharge of this duty was that which the tribe of Levi was so renowned for, ^{<133>}Deuteronomy 33:9. It hath respect unto their action in slaying their idolatrous relations, ^{<132>}Exodus 32:25-29. They were scattered for their progenitor preferring self-revenge by the sword before the glory of God, ^{<141>}Genesis 49:7; and they are now consecrated to God by the sword, in preferring the glory of God above all natural affection and self-interest whatever. This is always to be done.

2dly. To order the general course of our lives in such a way as, considering our circumstances, may most conduce and tend unto the glory of God. I fear there is nothing among the most more neglected. Most men, indeed, are engaged into a course of life before they know how to choose for themselves with respect unto this great end; but supposing the way wherein they are so engaged. to be in general according to the mind of God, as to that industrious use and improvement of our time which he requires of us, no small part of our wisdom and duty consists in ordering things so as that God may be glorified by us in the course of our conversation in our callings. This we ought to aim at, how we ought in them to walk so as to please God, and how to set forth his praise in all that we do. How this may be done will fall under many directions that shall be spoken unto afterwards.

3dly. To admit of nothing, to comply with nothing, that is contrary unto, or would in the least impeach, his glory. There is no man who makes God his end but he hath, in general, a careful circumspection in this matter. Possible it is that he may be surprised into particular actions that are derogatory unto the glory of God; but they are thereon his burden and his sorrow, as they were to David and to Peter, and will he so unto all true believers in instances of a much inferior nature, yea, in all that are any way contrary unto that regard which they owe to God's glory. And it must be said, that he who hath not a watchful care influencing him continually herein, that nothing he admitted or complied withal, in his person or any of his relations or circumstances, so far as in him lies, which doth any way in the least interfere with God's glory, doth not so live to God as to make him his chief good. And into how many considerations this doth branch itself will afterwards appear.

4thly. Constant prayer for the exaltation of God's glory in the world, the church, and ourselves, answering a valuation of it in our hearts, is also required to this purpose. The Scripture is full of examples herein; and in that summary of prayer which is given us by our Savior, the first and principal petition of it concerns singly this exaltation of the glory of God. Most men, indeed, do bring it into their prayers, — they are taught so to do; but if those prayers are not principled and animated by an inward, real, abiding esteem and love for the glory of God, they are of no value, nor any way accepted with God. But when we find our hearts so really affected with the concernments of God's glory in the world as that we cannot hut he pouring them out unto God about them, it is an evidence that we make him our principal end.

5thly. Readiness to do many things on the sole account of God's glory is also required hereunto. I have showed that there are particular and general ends of our moral actions, and how they differ. Now, our particular end cannot be made a general end, but our general end may be made a particular; that is, the immediate end of what we do, without the interposition of any other. So ought we to make the glory of God the particular end of much of what we do in the world, especially of what we suffer. Discarding all other considerations and motives, the concern of the glory of God is that which alone should influence us, and is itself the thing alone that we should aim at.

(2.) We live unto God as our Lord, when our principal aim is to enjoy him as our chief good. This is our utmost end and blessedness, the excellency and pre-eminence of our nature Consisting in its capacity for such a happiness. And there is a double enjoyment of God whereof we are capable; — the one present, in his love and favor; the other future, in the presence of his glory: and they are both intended in this rule.

[1.] Whoever lives to God as his chief end, prefers the present enjoyment of God, in his love and favor in Christ, before all other things in the world. So doth the psalmist, ^{<900>}Psalm 4:6, 7, ^{<950>}Psalm 63:3. Indeed, he walks not with God, nor glorifies him as God whose principal aim and endeavor in this world is not to enjoy his favor in Christ, and to be made partaker of the pledges of his love and grace. And we may observe concerning it, —

1st. That he who doth So will not have his endeavors after it, nor his care about it, nor his love to it, abated, in the greatest confluence of earthly mercies. Nor,

2dly. will he despond of finding rest and satisfaction in God under the greatest pressures imaginable.

3dly. It may be observed, also, that our aim and design at the present enjoyment of God in the tokens of his love is the true measure of what our real desires are to enjoy God in glory when we shall be here no more. For take that alone by itself, and it is a matter wherein men are very apt to deceive themselves. Every one would “die the death of the righteous,” and would, out of a natural desire of happiness, with traditional notions, wherein that must consist, come to the enjoyment of God. But all these things may be false and deceiving. We have, indeed, no more desire to come to the future immediate enjoyment of God than we have desire to enjoy him here in his love and favor by Christ at present. [But,]

[2.] The future enjoyment of God in glory is the great design of all that walk with God, and belongs in an especial manner unto our living unto him as our chief and utmost end. This is spoken out plainly in the nature of the thing itself; for if God be our chief good, ultimate end, and eternal reward, it cannot be but that our principal design must be to attain the enjoyment of him. And that this may be regular, two things are required: —

1st. That we look for it by the way that he hath appointed. Now, this is only by faith in Christ Jesus; for none can come to God but by him. God despiseth all attempts for the enjoyment of him by any other way or by any other means, as knowing that those who use them seek not him, but themselves. And therefore those natural desires which all men have, to go to God when they die, are no evidence that they either live to God or walk with him. They only are accepted in this duty who make Jesus Christ, with faith and obedience in him, the way of attaining their end.

2dly. That we aim at the enjoyment of God spa spiritual good, and at a holy, spiritual satisfaction in him. God is herein to be eyed as infinite holiness, infinite goodness, infinite power, all in an infinite, eternal being. Wherefore our blessedness in the enjoyment of God consists in our eternal

contemplation of these things, and assimilation unto them, according unto our capacity and measure. This is that which is to be the object of our desires. For men to have carnal notions of God and glory, or those which will give satisfaction unto their natural appetites and affections, is but to dream away their souls into disappointment and misery.

And this is the first thing in them who design to live unto God, — namely, that in all things they make him their chief end.

2. Where the prevailing design of our souls is to live unto God, his revealed will is *the rule and measure* of all we do, either in religion or in our course in this world. God doth as much require that his will be our rule as that his glory be our end; and it is equally necessary that it should be so, from his nature and ours. If we make our own reason or our own desires to be our rule, we cast off our dependence on the rule of God, and make ourselves to be in the stead of God unto ourselves. But it is a principal part of the design insisted on to do what God would have us to do, and to be what God would have us to be; without which we can never either please God or have peace in our own souls. Now, that we may thus make the will of God in all things to be our rule and measure, to give bounds unto our affections and desires, and order unto our actions, it is necessary, —

(1.) To know it, and that we make it no small part of our endeavors so to do. All light, wisdom, knowledge, and direction, are laid up in the word of God. See ~~ROM~~ Psalm 19:7, 8, 119:98-100; ~~STIM~~ 2 Timothy 3:16, 17. But yet we must consider two things: —

[1.] That many great and principal parts of this wisdom and these directions are laid deep and hidden, as in a treasury or a mine: hence there must be great diligence used to search after them, and, as it Were, to dig them out, ~~ROM~~ Proverbs 2:3-5. God may teach men and instruct them, in his sovereign grace, as he pleaseth, but assuredly the common, way of cursorily reading the Scriptures, which most men satisfy themselves withal, is not ordinarily sufficient unto the investigation of the truth according unto what our own duty requires

[2.] Where general rules are laid plain in the word, yet unless a man abound in the Scripture, he will be at a loss about their particular application. Were it not so, we should not so often miss it as we do in plain duties.

Wherefore, unto the end that we may know the mind of God, as the universal rule of our obedience, all those instructions that are usually given about prayer, meditation, diligent use of all means, public and private, to the end we may come to a right understanding of the mind of God in the Scriptures, are necessarily to be attended unto. They are commonly spoken of. I will add one only, — which is indeed the principal in this case, and ought to influence all the rest, — and this is, That we should always read, and hear, and teach the word, and meditate upon it, with this end and design, that in our whole souls and lives, in all that we are and do, within and without, we may be conformable thereunto. Want of this design constantly kept up in our minds renders all other means fruitless. We take God's name in vain, and aggravate our own guilt, when we converse with the Scripture without this design. I need not produce particular instances; the whole word of God proclaims that, with respect unto ourselves, it is to be learned and studied with no other design.

(2.) That we use diligence to keep ourselves universally close to the rule, so far as we have attained an acquaintance with it. Our walk in this world, if we intend to please God and discharge our duty, is to be according unto rule, and that attended unto with circumspection. Loose, way-side walkers are like way-side hearers; both will fail of what they seem to aim at. Every thing within us that is of ourselves, and every thing about us that is of the world and occasions of life, do either incline or solicit us unto a negligence of the rule; and if we walk not diligently, we shall frequently be turned aside. Hence is that loose, crooked, uneven walking that is among professors. He only is upon his guard in a due manner who always considers what his rule is, and what God in all things requireth of him. Let it not be said that this attendance unto the rule in all things is the way to make men scrupulous, fearful, and at length useless: for the word of God giveth light and liberty, and bringeth none into bondage who attends regularly unto it. Yet to prevent that careless boldness in walking and conversation which hath overrun the generality of professors, we must remember that “blessed is the man who feareth always;” and that it is our wisdom to “spend the time of our sojourning here in fear;” — which is the counsel given us by him who had learned this before from his own sad experience.

(3.) That we take heed of false rules and measures in our walking, both in things religious, moral, and of civil conversation. There are five false rules in religion, to some or all of which the generality of mankind do give up the conduct of themselves: —

- [1.]** Tradition;
- [2.]** Multitude;
- [3.]** Outward order and splendor;
- [4.]** Human authority;
- [5.]** Self-imagination

It were easy to show how one or other, or all of these, are the rule and measure unto the generality of men in all their religious concerns. The whole church of Rome builds itself on the traditions received from the fathers; and what a long-derived tradition doth with them, the custom of a few ages doth among us. Men will do as those that went before them, and no otherwise; yea, some think there is no other fault in religion but the not doing of what others have done before, without more ado. And multitude prevails with many. It is thought safe doing what is done by the most; and, however, [at least,] few think it is particularly incumbent on them to examine whether almost all the world, especially the rulers, with the scribes and Pharisees, are out of the way or no. The other things mentioned are made rules to some, inasmuch as of late it is avowed, owned, pleaded for, that the civil laws of magistrates, or human authority, is the proper rule of all external religious worship. And many there are who leave the word and follow their own imaginations, Which they call their “light,” and take for their guide. But whoever attends unto any of these rules, he neither doth nor can walk with God, ²¹⁸⁹ Isaiah 8:19, 20.

There are also five false rules whereby men may deceive themselves in their moral and civil conversation: —

[1.] The example of the best of men, taking in their infirmities. The examples of good men, being considered as they exemplify Scripture rules, are forcible encouragements unto duty. The example of Christ is an original rule; the example of others is to be looked on as such a transcript as wherein there may be mistakes. They are all, therefore, to be reduced unto

the rule; and when they appear conformable unto it, they adorn it, illustrate it, and render it beautiful. Hence may we take encouragement unto imitation. But, for the most part, we are ready to consider good men, so as to countenance ourselves by their infirmities, ‘So and so do they; so do they talk, discourse, converse; unto such places and companies do they resort: and why may not we do so too?’ But I do believe that he who will be content with the worst of a good man hath no part of his best.

[2.] The fashions of the world in things not directly sinful.

[3.] Custom in trading, received by tradition. Men may, if they are not aware, learn in their apprenticeship to be dishonest all their lives; they have yet the trade of it.

[4.] Satisfaction as to reputation in the world and the church.

[5.] Quiet and satisfaction in our own minds.^{f120}

SERMON 13.

A FAST SERMON: — CHRISTIAN DUTY UNDER THE HIDINGS OF GOD’S FACE.

PREACHED JANUARY 1, 1676

THE end of our meeting here this day is to bemoan, if God would help us, the withdrawing of God from among us, and to beg his returning unto us. It is not about any particular or any small occasion; but it is about the greatest concern of the glory of God and our own souls that we can ever be engaged or concerned in this world. Whether our spirits are suited and prepared to meet the Lord in such a work or no, we may do well to consider. Something I shall offer, if God bring it to mind, that may be of use unto us on the present occasion, from ~~2487~~ Isaiah 8:17, —

“And I will wait upon the LORD, that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him.”

You may remember that my way is, upon these occasions, to speak some plain words unto you, that are not only of your special but of your present concern. I shall not, therefore, open the context here, but only tell you (which you will see by reading the chapter at any time) it was a time of great sin, of great darkness, of great danger; and yet there was a promise of Christ, that kept life in the church in the midst of all.

For the opening of the words, I would inquire into these four or five things: —

1. Whom it is that God hideth his face from;
2. What it is for God to hide his face;
3. How we may know when God hideth his face;
4. What are the reasons why God hideth his face;

5. How we may distinguish between God's hiding his face and God's departing; and, lastly, What is our duty in such a state and case, when God doth hide his face: "I will wait upon the Lord, who hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him."

I shall speak very plainly, and I fear somewhat briefer than I intended, by reason of my infirmities, unto these things.

First, Whom is it that the Lord hideth his face from? It is from "the house of Jacob." God never hideth his face from the world, because his face never shines upon them. The face of God's providence alters towards the world. It is sometimes filled with more frowns and anger than at other times, and he works great alterations accordingly; but the face of God's grace, that neither shines upon nor can be said to be hid from the world.

God hides his face from "the house of Jacob." And two things are considerable herein: —

- 1.** That it is the true church of God that is intended;
- 2.** That it is the church of God in some special state and condition that is intended, that is "Jacob."

1. It is the true church of God that is intended. Jacob is he that received the promises, with whom God made a covenant, to whom God engaged his truth: ^{<317>}Micah 7:20, "Thou wilt perform the truth to Jacob, and the mercy to Abraham, which thou hast sworn unto our fathers from the days of old." Jacob being he that God had entered into covenant withal, took into covenant with himself, "the house of Jacob" are those, that are in covenant with God.

2. There is a twofold circumstance of the church comprised in this term, "Jacob:" —

(1.) That it is in a low, poor, afflicted condition. So was Jacob all his days. He was a man of sorrow, a man of affliction, a man of temptation. "Few and evil were the days of his pilgrimage." And the church is nowhere called "Jacob" but with reference unto its low estate: ^{<318>}Isaiah 41:14, "Fear not, thou worm Jacob, and ye men of Israel," saith he. When the church is as a contemptible worm, when there are but few that belong unto it, then it is

called “Jacob.” The church in a low, tempted, oppressed, sorrowful and mean condition, is “the house of Jacob.”

(2.) It is in a wrestling condition. This was the character of Jacob above all the patriarchs, — he was the great wrestler with God; and he got nothing but by wrestling through great difficulties. You all know so that know the story of Jacob from first to last. So that the church is called “the house of Jacob when it is in a wrestling condition, contending with God and man for the blessing. And many repulses he had, and came off lame at last, with the unjointing of his bones.

Brethren, you see who it is that in here intended, — the true church of God, in a low, weak, distressed condition; and there are some at least among them eminently wrestling with God and eminently wrestling with men for the great blessing of Jesus Christ and the gospel. Pray take notice that God can, and sometimes doth, hide himself from the church in this state and condition. Now, a man would think, now if ever is the time for God to shine upon the house of Jacob. But there may be such things found in the church, when it is in a low, wrestling condition, that God is compelled to hide his face from them.

Thus we have stated the subject. I desire to know whether it falls upon us or no? whether we are this “house of Jacob,” whose condition is low, that, through infinite, free grace, God hath taken into covenant with himself? I do not speak absolutely in reference to ourselves, but to our brethren in the world, whose condition is low, distressed, tempted, oppressed. And yet there are remaining those that wrestle with God. If this be so, then the subject is rightly stated, and we are concerned in the text.

Secondly, Our second inquiry is, What it is for God to “hide his face”? To know that, we must inquire what it is for the face of God to shine upon any. You may observe that the shining of God’s face upon any is, in Scripture, comprehensive of all mercies and of all blessings whatsoever. I will mention but one place, ^{Gen} Numbers 6:24-26, the blessing of God when he put his name upon the people: “The LORD bless thee, and keep thee: the LORD make his face shine upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the LORD lift up his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace.” Grace, preservation, and peace, they are the sum of all we receive from God in this world. And how cloth this come? “The LORD cause his face to shine

upon thee, and be gracious unto thee: the LORD lift up the light of his countenance upon thee, and give thee peace: the LORD cause his face to shine and bless thee.” In a word, there the shining of God’s face is, where the grace and favor of God in Christ Jesus evidences and communicates itself to the church and the souls of men. The grace and favor of God evidencing and communicating itself unto the souls of men is the shining of God’s face and the lifting up of God’s countenance.

And there are four things that do always accompany the shining of God’s face upon any people or upon any person. The peculiar way of the communication and evidence of the grace and favor; which is the shining of his face, hath these four effects: —

1. It gives them light and guidance. “In thy light,” saith the psalmist, ~~Psalm~~ Psalm 36:9, “we shall see light,” — in the light of God’s countenance. When the face of God shines upon men, they are not at a loss to find their way. It is as the sun unto our natural occasions. Let a man be in his way, let him know it never so well, while the sun shines upon him, how pleasantly doth he travel! Though he be in the same way, if the sun go down and darkness come, what a loss is the man at! I know not what you have done, but I know what some others have done; — they have found sometimes pleasantness, plainness, satisfaction, in the same ways that afterwards they have been ready to stumble in, and could scarce find how to take one step before another. The sun was gone down! While God’s face shines upon us, we shall not be at a loss nor in the dark about any of our ways.

2. Where God’s face shines there is the communication of spiritual strength; for, as I told you, this face of God is his grace and favor, which is the fountain of all our spiritual life, of all spiritual strength, of all spiritual vigor. I need not stay to prove these things, which you know are acknowledged. All our spiritual life is from the fountain of God’s grace and favor; and the shining of the face of God is the actual communication, of spiritual strength from that grace and favor. Whenever God’s face shines, — and let us please ourselves with any other apprehension, — We shall have spiritual life, strength, vigor, quickening, as to all duties, as to all occasions, as to all trials and sufferings, whatsoever, we are called unto.

3. The shining of God's face is, in a peculiar manner, the cause of spiritual joy and refreshment; for by the shining of God's countenance he doth give in pledges unto our hearts that he is our reconciled God and Father. Spiritual joy is a most peculiar effect and an infallible evidence of the shining of God's face. Wherever it is, there God's face shines; and where it is not, there God hides his face.

4. And lastly, Deliverance from trouble is an effect of the shining of God's face: "Cause thy face to shine, and we shall be saved." Such is the prayer of the psalmist.

These four effects do constantly accompany the lifting up of God's countenance, and the shining of his face upon us Wherefore the hiding of God's face must respect these effects, — light and guidance, spiritual strength, joy, and deliverance.

1. The hiding of God's face respects light and guidance: ~~2386~~ Hosea 5:6, "They shall go with their flocks and with their herds to seek the LORD; but they shall not find him." Why? "He hath withdrawn himself from them." God hath hid himself. For God to hide himself, and for God to hide his face, are the same: ~~2385~~ Isaiah 45:15, "Verily thou art a God that hidest thyself." And when God withdraws and hides himself, men cannot find their way. They went with their flocks and with their herds to find the way to God, — with their church-assemblies, with all their concerns, — and could not find the way to God. When God hides his face, we shall be left under darkness as unto our churches, ways, and walking,

Pray, brethren, let us now inquire whether it is so with us or no. Consider these few things in the fear of the Lord: —

(1.) Do you see the beauty and the glory of the ways of God? Do you see the glorious goings of God in the sanctuary, as may be you have seen them? Do you see a desirableness and a beauty in the ways of God's worship in the church? Or, are these things grown unto you a very common thing? You are in a good way; hut is not the sun gone down? You are in the same path as formerly; but are your hearts so delighted, so refreshed? Do we really see a beauty and a glory in the ways and worship of the house of God? I am afraid we can scarce say so. And if it be so, it is through the want of the light of God's countenance. We are in the same

way still, but darkness is round about us; we see not the beauty and glory of the ways and worship of God. Our very walking, our very actings, the very course we most of us take in the ways of the church, do manifest the hiding of God's face, — that God hath so far withdrawn the light of his countenance from us that we do not see a glory in the same way that once we saw before.

(2.) Are we not at a great loss as unto the ways themselves, and in the least difficulty we cannot find our way, but we are bewildered? Every trivial exception, that hath been answered a hundred times, will turn us out of the way, and keep us from the discharge of our duty, and from what God calls us unto. God hideth his face and leaves us much in the dark. When we would go about our duty, we do not find our way. All things have not been plain and clear.

(3.) Are we not in the dark as to the way of love, — the life, the soul, the cement of church-communion, — without which the best of us, as unto any church-order, are but as “sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal”? Whatever sweet or pleasant noise we make by our way or walk, without the exercise of love, we are as “sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal.” Is there not darkness come upon all professors herein? Is there that love among professors in general that either hath been or ought to be? Is there that love among churches, one church to another? They are scarce concerned in one another. I did little think ever to have lived to see the day wherein the churches of Christ should have so little concern in one another as they have. There is not that love among ourselves which there ought to be. Do not the paths of love mourn because none walk in them? Doth joy arise in our hearts and pleasantness in our countenances when we behold the faces one of another? Why, then, do some complain that none visit, none confirm, none help, none relieve, none seek after their spiritual or outward condition? Who among us seeks to make himself an example of love? Is there a duty wherein men may exercise and show their gifts and parts? — there is a pretty readiness for it. Is there any thing wherein men may act severity of spirit? — they will be prepared for that. Who among us endeavors, in meekness, in condescension, in self-denial, in being little in his own eyes, to make himself an example of love? And all our church order and relation is a thing of no value without it. One person who is filled with love, which is a charitable grace, it will make him have low

thoughts of himself, condescend greatly to others, forego temptation to provocations, and let go all these things. And who among us endeavors to make himself an example hereof? One such person would bring more honor and glory to Christ, and make a more glorious representation of him in the world, than a thousand of us do at this kind of rate of walking. The ways of God are the same, the worship of God the same, the saints of God the same also, — a company of poor tempted sinners: but we have not the same light, we have not the same guidance, we have not the same love; we live upon gifts, and not upon grace. God doth hide his face from us in this thing.

2. When God hides his face, there will be a decay as to spiritual strength, as to the flourishing and vigor of grace. I have spoken so much and so often to you upon this head, in this place, in our inquiry wherefore the Lord doth harden the hearts of his people from his fear, and in conference among ourselves, that I shall say no more to it, to manifest that we have this evidence of God's hiding his face, that there is a decay of spiritual strength as to the flourishing of grace among us. And truly, brethren, I am verily persuaded that if God do not give us an understanding of it by his *word*, he will give us an understanding of it by his *sword*, by his judgments, that will follow us till we are consumed.

3. When God hides his face, there will be a decay of spiritual joys. Spiritual joys are the immediate effect of the shining of God's countenance, the most proper pledge of it unto our hearts. And how is it with us, brethren? Pray remember my design, which is to speak familiarly unto you, and so bear with my manner of speaking at this time. How is it with us, brethren, as to this matter of spiritual joy? It is a thing that was purchased by the blood of Christ. It is more worth than all this world, and it is that without which we shall never greatly honor God, in this world or when we get out of it.

I cannot toll how to judge any of your hearts, nor what stock you have of this spiritual joy, but I will give you two or three outward signs, and one or two inward trials, whereby we may know whether there be not a decay among us in spiritual joy; and (which is the worst part of the story) we are content that so it should be.

(1.) This is certain, that carnal joys and spiritual joys are inconsistent; that where carnal joy is predominant, let men pretend what they will, and speak with the tongue of men and angels, there is no spiritual joy. By carnal joy I understand the prevalent satisfaction of the minds of men in present enjoyments, whether in relations, or in outward state and condition, or in the succeeding of their affairs. Where there is a predominant satisfaction in these things, there is no spiritual joy. “Many say, Who will show us any good? Lord, lift thou up the light of thy countenance upon us. Thou hast put gladness in my heart, more than in the time that their corn and their wine increased.” These things are absolutely opposed. The gladness of heart arising from the shining of God’s countenance is absolutely opposed unto that good which men find in the increase of their corn, and wine, and oil. A predominancy of carnal joy in present satisfaction as to things here below is inconsistent with spiritual joy.

(2.) Earthly cares prevailing are inconsistent with heavenly joys. God hath brought many of us into that state and condition that it may be we will say we are free upon that accouter: ‘We have nothing here to rejoice in; we are poor; we are low, disconsolate, afflicted.’ Well, then, but have we not, on the other side, earthly cares and desires prevalent in us? We are not rich, but we would be rich; we are not healthy, but we would be healthy and strong; we have not provision for our lusts, but we would have it. Where there is this frame of spirit there is no spiritual joy.

I will give you these two inward trims whether you have spiritual joy or no: —

[1.] The first is, a frequency in surprisals with spiritual exultation. The spouse saith that her soul was surprised: “Ere I was aware, my heart made me as the chariots of Ammi-nadib,” Cant. 6:12. Have not we found oftentimes that we have had surprisals, upon the approaches of God, upon the visits of Christ, with spiritual exultation, rejoicing in spirit, wherein the heart hath been lifted above itself, out of itself, hath been nigh unto God, and found that sweetness which no reasoning could ever bring it unto? A frequency in these spiritual exultations is that bubbling from the fountain of joy which will fix our hearts, in the night season, by the wayside, and upon other occasions. Oftentimes the heart is drawn up with

these spiritual exultations. How is it with you, brethren? Are these things frequent with you? or can you scarcely recall the time when God hath given you such rejoicing of spirit? When the mother of Jesus came to visit the mother of John the Baptist, the babe sprang in her womb. When Christ comes to give the soul a visit, the heart will spring and rise up with joy. If these things are not frequent with us, if our hearts are not often surprised with these exultations, there is not a spring of spiritual joy in them.

[2.] What doth first present itself to you upon spiritual self-examination and inquiry as to your state and condition? I do not doubt that there is none of you but do often retreat to serious examination of your own state and condition. What doth first present itself to you? If you are compassed with darkness, that you are fain to work through by acts of faith, and to labor to Come to light as to your own state and condition, you are strangers to spiritual joy. Your condition may be good as to believing, but I speak as to spiritual joy. Where the heart is stored with that, the first reflection it makes from self-examination will be full of light, and will present a beauty and a glory. Though there be faith, if there be not spiritual joy, the first consideration will be dark and confused, and our souls will be put hard to it to work out any evidence of their state and condition.

Have we not from hence another evidence that God doth hide his face from us, in the decay of spiritual joys. Either carnal joys and satisfaction do possess the room of them, or the cares of this world do stifle them, or we have not such surprisals with exultation of spirit as spiritual joy will give us upon all occasions. Sometimes when a man is taken with the greatest affliction, sorrow, distress, where there is the root of spiritual joy it will surprise him into exultation of spirit. "In that hour Jesus exulted in spirit,"

 Luke 10:21.

(3.) Lastly, If we are in the dark, and are fain to grope as in darkness after evidences of our state and condition, we are decayed in spiritual joy; God hideth his face as to these things.

4. God hideth his face when he doth not give deliverance. I shall not speak to this hiding, but leave it to the judgment of all whether there be not the hiding of the face of God in that particular, as to the deliverance of the church out of trouble.

Such is our second great inquiry, What it is for God to “hide his face”? When God hides his face there is a withdrawal as to light and guidance in the ways of his own worship, in the goings in and goings out of his house; as to spiritual strength in our own hearts, and the vigor of grace in our walking before him; as to spiritual joy (which, I am afraid, we are many of us strangers unto, and are pretty well content to be so); and as to deliverance; — all which things are effects of the hiding of God’s face; and when God causes his face to shine upon our souls, all will return unto us.

Thirdly, The third inquiry is, How we may know when God hideth his face from us? for it may be all these things may happen and fall out, and yet there may not be a special hiding of God’s face. These things may be in some measure and degree among us, and yet there may be no great nor special hiding of God’s face. How shall we know, if it be thus with us, that it proceeds from this cause, that God doth hide his face?

I will name but one or two things: —

1. The first is this: When in such a state and condition God seems to shut out our prayers, and we have not returns of them, we may be sure it is a time wherein God hideth his face. The church complains of it, ~~CHR~~Lamentations 3:8, “Also,” saith she, “when I cry and shout, God shutteth out my prayer.” How is it with us, brethren? We have had some days of prayer as to this matter; we have had frequent opportunities and seasons for prayer, and this thing hath been spread before the Lord; and it is the hope of my soul that you have in particular, every one of you, sought God in this matter. Where is the effect of our prayer? What ground have we got, what pledge have we of God’s return? or what revival in ourselves as to any of these things? Is it not evident that in such matters, as yet, God shutteth out our prayers? Do not think it is an ordinary thing that is befallen us. It is from the hiding of God’s face, or he would not thus shut out our prayers, that so little ground should be got upon so many endeavors.

2. God hideth his face when our endeavors for relief are fruitless; — as in that place of Hosea, chap. ~~CHR~~5:6, “They shall go with their flocks and with their herds to seek me, but they shall not find me; I have withdrawn myself from them,” saith the Lord. It is time of hiding when endeavors are fruitless for recovery.

And they are fruitless upon these two grounds: —

(1.) When we are in the dark, and cannot find the right way. There is something lies before us that we would fain be at, but we cannot find the way to it. The prophet tells you the reason why it is so, ^{<2890>}Isaiah 59:10, “We grope for the wall like the blind, and we grope as if we had no eyes: we stumble at noon-day as in the night.” Our way is plain, our rule is plain, and yet we cannot find the way. I am persuaded many that hear me this day would tell me, with all their souls, what it is they would be at. They would be at a spirit of faith and love; they would be at self-denial and resignation to the will of God in their own persons; they would be at special fruitfulness, at recovering a face of beauty and glory upon the church: but they cannot find the way; they grope as in the dark when they go about it; they miss the way, they cannot attain it. It is because God hath hid his face.

(2.) When we grow weak and languid under our endeavors; for notwithstanding this, brethren, that God seems to shut out our prayers, that we cannot find our way, unless we abide continually in prayer and wrestling for the way, we shall never recover the face of God.

Now, it is a sign God hides his face, when we grow languid and cold in our endeavors, “Then shall we know, if we follow on to know the Lord.” We grow languid in our endeavors; warm one day and cold another, enlarged in prayer one day, and give over the next; we do not warm one another: and yet our lives, and souls, and the glory of God, lie all at stake in this matter. Our hearts are feeble; it is an evidence God hideth his face. We do not wait upon him as we ought; for they that wait shall not faint, whatever they do. It is wonderfully difficult, and we do not help one another as we ought. We do not go to one another; and advise with one another, to set one another in the way. And, lastly, we grow languid after we have been put into the way. The world cools our hearts, and we think enough is done upon such occasions. We shall not know the Lord in this matter, unless we follow on to know him.

Fourthly, Why doth the Lord thus hide his face from poor Jacob, from oppressed Jacob, from wrestling Jacob, — from his own people? why cloth God thus hide his face from them as to all those things we have

mentioned, — as to guidance, strength, joy, and deliverance? The reasons are very plain why God doth it. It is, —

1. For their love of the world: ^{<2577>}Isaiah 57:17, “For the iniquity of his covetousness I was wroth, and I hid my face from him.” It is our love of the world and conformity to the world that hath caused God thus to hide his face from us. I bless God that hath put it into the hearts of some among us to desire we may get together to consider what remedies we may have to cure us of that great conformity to the world that is grown amongst us; and I shall desire of the congregation that we may have a time to consider of it, because it is that which will greatly, with apparent offense, take us off from hearing our testimony against the world, which Christ hath committed to us. But it is for our love of the world, all and every one of us. None of us but have greatly refused God’s teachings in that particular of love of the world that is among us. “For the iniquity of his covetousness was I wroth, and smote him: I hid me, and was wroth.” I would not judge any, nor reflect upon any; but I am afraid it is one great sin for which God is contending with our brethren at the ends of the earth, hiding his face from them, as at this day. Their hearts have too much gone out after the world, too much cleaved to it; and the word of God Cannot fail. If Jacob will love the world, if the iniquity of covetousness be found in him, God will assuredly hide his face; the word of God cannot be of none effect, It is in vain to imagine, that under a worldly, carnal frame of spirit, we should have the shining of God’s face upon us.

2. A frowardness in our walking is another reason why God hides his face from his people. God complains of Israel, they are “froward children,” and a “froward generation;” and so saith they shall not find him: ^{<3304>}Micah 3:4, “He will even hide his face from them, as they have behaved themselves ill in their doings,” — “frowardly in their doings” When we behave ourselves frowardly in our ways, God hides his face from us. What is it to behave ourselves frowardly in the ways of God? It consists in two things, —

(1.) Unreadiness to comply with God’s providence; and, —

(2.) Unevenness, crookedness, in our conversations in the world. The great thing God complains of under the name of frowardness is unreadiness to comply with his providence. We do not come to that which God calls us unto; we will not be at what God calls us unto. See a particular instance,

~~2002~~ Isaiah 22:12-14, “In that day did the Lord God of hosts call to weeping, and to mourning, and to baldness, and to girding with sackcloth: and behold joy and gladness, slaying oxen and killing sheep, eating flesh, and drinking wine: let us eat and drink; for tomorrow we shall die. And it was revealed in mine ears by the LORD of hosts, Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die.” Here is great frowardness. God calls to mourning, to humiliation; instead thereof there is slaying of oxen and killing of sheep, every one rejoicing in what he hath according to his power, every one eating and drinking as they can, adorning themselves as they please, — and that at a time when God called to mourning. ‘But it is not such a time now.’ Then it was never such a time in this world. All the tokens of God’s displeasure are upon us; what we hear in the world is near approaching, particularly to ourselves. All the contests God hath had with this nation, by poverty, by that dreadful judgment of fire, and the like, threaten us every day. If these be not calls to mourning, we can have none from the word of God nor from conjunctions of providence. Yet at this time, who doth not eat and drink and clothe himself as he can, refresh himself with what he is intrusted withal, from the highest to the lowest, especially those that are great and rich, even among professors? This is to walk frowardly with God, to walk uncomplyingly with providence. Neither our garb, nor countenance, nor food, nor raiment, nor any thing else, testifies we comply with the calls of God. And it is a dreadful word that follows: “It was revealed by the LORD of hosts, Surely this iniquity shall not be purged from you till ye die.” For, “If ye walk contrary unto me, I will walk contrary unto you, and will punish you seven times more.” Instead of looking for the return of God and for the shining of his countenance, God speaks quite another language: “Ye walk contrary unto me, and I will punish you seven times more.” It may be this comes home to our own state and condition, to God’s dealing with his church and with particular persons. May be there is not that readiness in us to comply with the will of God in all things which he expecteth from us; and if we walk frowardly, God will never be prevailed upon by our frowardness.

3. Lukewarmness and formality in religious duties and worship are another reason why God hides his face from us. A multitude of duties men do perform. I never knew any professors in my life that were under the power of light and conviction, that did intend to countenance themselves

in their lusts, but did multiply duties. But lukewarmness and formality in duty, and indulging to any lust, are as inconsistent with spirituality in duty (which is the acting of every grace in duty that is required thereunto) as light is inconsistent with darkness. And when it is so with us, God will hide his face from us.

4. And lastly, Another great reason why God hides himself from us is, because we do not fill up that testimony against the world which he hath committed to us. God hath committed to us a great testimony against the world for Christ, and for the glory and honor of his ways. And he looks on to see how we behave ourselves. And we have so shamefully betrayed the cause of God in the purity of his worship, wherein we are engaged, that saith he, “Let them alone; I will hide my face from them.”

These are some of the causes of God’s hiding his face from us: —

Love of the world, frowardness, or a non-compliance with the calls of providence, formality in spiritual duties, and a not filling up our testimony against the world. And we have scarce time enough left in the world to sigh to the breaking of our hearts, that we do not more glorify God in this world. Therefore God hides his face from us.

I will but just name what I thought to have spoken on the two other heads:

—

Fifthly, How shall we know that this is but a hiding, and not a departure? for saith God, “Woe to them when I depart from them!” If this should prove a departing, and the glory of God remove more and more from us, then woe unto us! How shall we know when it is a hiding, and not a departure?

1. If we mourn after the Lord, who hath hid himself from us; if we do indeed really, in our houses, closets, mourn and sigh, ‘When will the Lord return again to his people?’ — it is but a hiding.

2. It is but a hiding, when nothing will satisfy us unless God return. If God should give us peace and prosperity, give now England victory and success; if we can be satisfied with these things, God is departed. But if we can say, ‘Nothing will satisfy us unless we have a sense of the return of God again unto us, of his shining upon us in the light of his

countenance, quickening and reviving a spirit of grace in our hearts, filling our souls with joy; then we can be satisfied, but never without it; — it is but a hiding.

3. When we can never rest in any of those things or ways which cause God to hide himself from us; when we can search our hearts and say, ‘This is that I have put into the ephah, that hath contributed to the hiding of God’s face from this congregation, from the church of God;’ when we will give ourselves no rest in any thing that contributes to the hiding of God’s face; — then it is but a hiding, and there is an appointed time wherein God will return.

Sixthly, and lastly, What is our duty in such a case as this? “I will wait upon the LORD,” saith the text, “that hideth his face from the house of Jacob, and I will look for him.” Here is our duty.

What is “waiting?” Waiting is a permanent continuance in the performance of duties, against all difficulties and discouragements. It is a permanent abiding, a continuance in duty, whereby we seek for the return of God unto us, against all discouragements, difficulties, temptations whatsoever. They will arise from our own hearts on many various occasions; so that if we will wait upon God we must be permanent and abiding, — we must not make an end of what we have to do this day, but we must follow it on; and then the Lord will return unto the house of Jacob, from whom he hath hid his face.

THREE DISCOURSES SUITABLE TO THE LORD'S SUPPER.

PREFATORY NOTE.

IN 1798 a volume was published in Edinburgh under the title, “The Lord’s Supper fully Considered, in a Review of the History of its Institution; with Meditations and Ejaculations suited to the several parts of the Ordinance: to which are prefixed Three Discourses delivered at the Lord’s Table; by the Late Rev. John Owen, D.D.” It needs but a glance at the three discourses in order to feel assured, from internal evidence, that they belong to Owen. The rest of the volume is assuredly not Owen’s, as it consists of “Remarks on the ‘Plain Account,’“ etc., — a work published long after our author’s death. These remarks are directed against a treatise of the celebrated Hoadly, bishop of Bangor, and latterly of Winchester. His treatise bears the title, “A Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Lord’s Supper,” and was published in 1735. An answer to it was published by Thomas Brett, LL.D., an English divine and controversialist; but whether his answer is identical with the “Remarks,” we have failed to ascertain. The three discourses subjoined are not of much importance, but as they have already appeared in print, we include them in this edition. — ED.

DISCOURSE 1.

JUNE 8, 1673.

FAITH is bounded, in every ordinance, by its objects and acts. The general object of saving faith respecting God, is the truth of his word and promises, ^{<618>}Romans 15:8. The special object of our faith in this ordinance is the sufferings and death of Christ. Herein he is “evidently set forth crucified before our eyes.” And we must act faith upon three things with respect to his death: —

First, The personal love of Christ to our persons, from whence it was that he died for us. So saith the apostle, “Who loved me, and gave himself for me,” ^{<812>}Galatians 2:20. Were we helped to raise up our hearts by faith to apprehend Christ’s love to our persons, it would greatly help us in this ordinance. The Lord lift us up above our fears, and give us a view by faith, not only of the love of Christ in general, but that he personally loved us, even this whole church!

Secondly, The sufferings of Christ. In this ordinance we are to act faith upon his death, as therein undergoing the punishment due to our sins. It is [intended] to mind us that “he made his soul an offering for sin,” that “he suffered for sin, the just for the unjust,” “bearing our sins in his own body on the tree,” that we should not come into judgment.

Thirdly, The effects of Christ’s death; which were, the making an atonement for all our sins, — the making peace between God and our souls, bringing in everlasting righteousness. Under the law we find that “the blood of bulls and of goats, and the ashes of a heifer sprinkling the unclean, sanctified to the purifying of the flesh,” and that the people were thereby legally cleansed; “how much more shall the blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, purge our conscience from dead works to serve the living God?” ^{<806>}Hebrews 9:13, 14.

The acts of faith in this ordinance are, first, *recognition*. That faith which is exercised on the death of Christ, that is past, is to call it over, and make it present to the soul. It is to realize it and bring it before us. It is not a bare

remembrance of it, but such a one as makes it present. And where there is faith, there is the same advantage to a believing soul in the participation of this ordinance as there would have been if we had stood by the cross.

Secondly, Faith works by reflecting *to humiliation*. “They shall look on him whom they have pierced, and mourn” for all their unkindness and unthankfulness to their Savior. And when we come to this work in this ordinance, self-abasement, self-abhorrence, and brokenness of heart, will be acted, and flow forth in abundance of love to Jesus Christ.

Thirdly, Another act of faith in this ordinance is, *thankfulness to God* for his wisdom and grace in contriving this way of our salvation; and *thankfulness to Christ*, in whom was this mind, that, “being in the form of God, and thinking it not robbery to be equal with God, he took upon him the form of a servant, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross,” that he might save us from our sins. If the Lord be pleased to lead us to act faith in any of these things, in some signal and eminent manner, we shall find an advantage in this ordinance.

DISCOURSE 2.

JULY 6, 1673.

To help you in the exercise of faith in the administration of this ordinance, I would briefly show what it is to have a sacramental participation of Jesus Christ.

When the world had lost the understanding of this mystery, for want of spiritual light, they contrived a means to make it up, very easy on the part of them that partake of it, and very prodigious on the part of the priest; for he, by a few words, turns the bread into the body of Christ, and the people have no more to do but to receive it as such into their mouths! It was the loss of the understanding of this mystery that put them upon that invention.

There is, indeed, a figure or representation in this ordinance; but that is not all. When the bread is broken, it is a figure, a representation, that the body of Christ was broken for us; but there is also a real exhibition of Christ unto every believing soul. This is distinct from the tender of Christ in the promises of the gospel. In the promises, the person of the Father is particularly looked upon as proposing and tendering Christ to us. In this ordinance, as God exhibits him, so Christ makes an immediate tender of himself, and calls our faith to have respect to his grace, to his love, and to his readiness to unite and spiritually incorporate with us. He tenders himself to us not in general, but under a special consideration, — namely, as having “made an end of sin,” and done all that was to be done between God and sinners, that they might be at peace.

Christ made a double presentation of himself, as the great mediator; — first, when he offered himself a sacrifice on the cross, for the accomplishing the work of man’s redemption; secondly, when he presented himself to God in heaven, there to do whatever remained to be done with God on our behalf by his intercession. The intercession of Christ is the presentation of himself to God upon his oblation and sacrifice. He presents himself to God, to do with him what remains to be done on our part, — to procure mercy and peace for us; and he presents

himself to us in this ordinance (which answers to that intercession of Christ above, and is a counterpart of it) to do what remains to be done on the part of God, — to give in peace, and mercy, and the sealed covenant to us.

There is this special exhibition or tender of Jesus Christ; and this directs to a special exercise of faith, that he may know how to receive him in this ordinance. And, first, let us receive him as one that hath actually accomplished the great work of making peace with God for us, blotting out our sins, and bringing in everlasting righteousness; secondly, as one that hath done this work by his death. It is a relief when we have an apprehension that Christ can do all this for us: but he does not tender himself to us as one that can or will do it, upon such and such conditions as shall be presented, but as one that hath done it; and so we must receive him if we intend to glorify God in this ordinance, — namely, as having blotted out all our sins, and purchased for us eternal redemption.

Let us act faith on Jesus Christ, as one who brings along with him mercy and pardon, procured by his death, — all the mercy and grace that are in the heart of God and in the covenant, To have such a view of him, and so to receive him by faith, is the way to give glory to God, and to have peace and rest in our own bosoms.

DISCOURSE 3.

AUGUST 10, 1673.

To a due attendance on this ordinance it is requisite not only that we be in a spiritual frame, but that we endeavor to bring and fix our hearts to some special thoughts with respect to this special ordinance; wherein the principal act on the part of God, and the principal act on our part with respect to Christ, are gloriously represented. The great act of God with reference to Christ is the exhibiting of him. God did two ways exhibit Christ: —

First, There was, as I may call it, on the part of God, a legal exhibition of Christ, mentioned by the apostle, ~~ROM~~ Romans 3:25, 26,

“Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation through faith in his blood, to declare his righteousness for the remission of sins; that he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus”

This I call God’s legal exhibition of Christ, when he set him forth to undergo the curse of the law that we might be blessed. This setting forth of Christ is here represented in this ordinance when the bread is broken. And this is that which you may exercise your faith on in this ordinance, that as the bread is here set forth to be broken, so God, to declare his own righteousness, hath set forth Christ to be bruised and broken, to undergo the sentence of the law. Thus we have a gracious sight of God’s holiness in this ordinance.

Secondly, He doth exhibit Jesus Christ in the promises of the gospel. And it might be with some respect to this ordinance that the gospel invitations, which have the nature of promises, were in the Old Testament set forth by eating and drinking: ~~2COR~~ Isaiah 4:1,” every one that thirsteth, come ye to the waters, and he that hath no money: come ye, buy, and eat; yea, come, buy wine and milk without money and without price.” God having provided Jesus Christ to be the food of our souls, he doth propose and exhibit him in the gospel as such. And what a blessed representation is there hereof in this ordinance! Here God makes a visible tender of Christ, as exhibited in

the promises of the gospel, for the life, food, and strength of our souls. To answer the promises, he here makes this tender unto us.

Thus you see the principal act of God in this ordinance is the exhibiting of Jesus Christ unto us. The great act on our part, with respect to Christ, which is also represented in this ordinance, is the reception of him by faith. It is not enough that God hath set forth Christ to declare his righteousness, and in the promises of the gospel: unless we receive Christ, we shall come short of all the design of grace and mercy therein. “As many as *received* him, to them gave he power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name,” ^{<B12>}John 1:12. If there be any thing that is tendered to you, unless you receive it, there is nothing done; things are but in the same state wherein they were. Notwithstanding all the tenders that God makes of Jesus Christ, in both the ways mentioned, if there be not an act of faith in receiving him, we shall have no benefit by it. Now, can any thing be more lively represented to us than our receiving of the bread in this sacrament? but if we act not faith therein, it will be but a bare representation. Therefore, if we believe that God is in good earnest with us in the tender that he makes of Christ, let us not be backward on our part, that the sacrament rites may not be empty signs to us.

FOOTNOTES

- ^{ft1} The initials probably of Isaac Chauncey. See vol. 5 p. 404 and vol. 7 p. 503.
- ^{ft2} An allusion to a saying of Cicero respecting soothsayers: “Mirabile videtur quod non rideat aruspex cum aruspice viderit.” — De Nat. Deor. lib. 1, cap. 26; and De Divina lib. 2, cap. 24:— ED.
- ^{ft3} This passage is not in the first Philippic, though in that speech χειροτονέω occurs frequently in the sense referred to. Owen seems to have found this sentence in Stephens, who does not specify where it actually occurs in Demosthenes. The following expressions, however, are to be found in it, and are sufficient authority for the statement of our author: Οὐκ ἐχειροτονεῖτε δὲ ἐξ ὑμῶν αὐτῶν δέκα ταξιάρχους... Εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν χειροτονεῖτε τοὺς ταξιάρχους. — ED.
- ^{ft4} Not attainable? — ED.
- ^{ft5} So given in the textus receptus. Critical editions of the new Testament now give ῥαζζουνί — ED.
- ^{ft6} See Vol. iv. of the author’s works.
- ^{ft7} It is difficult to explain this estimate by our author of the value of three hundred denarii. According to the received valuation of Roman money, the sum could not have exceeded 9 pounds, 7s. 6d. of our money. — ED.
- ^{ft8} A term of English law, signifying the deliverance of a prisoner on security for his appearance on a future day. — ED.
- ^{ft9} Strangely enough, our author mentions only one sort, and omits to specify the other. Perhaps he intended by the second sort members, whose conduct, though not grossly and obstinately scandalous, was so contumacious in resisting the authority of the church, that their continued enjoyment of church-membership would have been subversive of all peace and order. See a preceding paragraph, which appears to imply as much, p. 165. — ED.

- ^{ft10} *Significabit, Capias*. The first words of certain legal writs issued to prosecute the sentences of the church, and maintain its authority. — ED.
- ^{ft11} Articles and machinery necessary for the stage; used here in a sense equivalent to “puppets.” — ED.
- ^{ft12} In the canon of the church.
- ^{ft13} See also Dr Owen on the Hebrews, vol. 1, Exercitation the sixth, and vol. 2, p. 256; in which place he gives further light into this truth of infant baptism. [This note is appended by the editors of the folio edition of Owen’s Sermons and Tracts, published in 1721. The second passage referred to occurs in the extortion of chap. 4, ver. 9 — ED.]
- ^{ft14} “Whetstone,” an ancient reward for the person who told the greatest lie. — ED.
- ^{ft15} The third treatise, a Latin work, listed on the previous page, has been omitted from this 1968 reprint. See note on page v.
- ^{ft16} Praef. in 5 Lib. Mos.
- ^{ft17} In August. de Civit. Dei, lib. 15, cap. 13.
- ^{ft18} Defens. Conc. Trid., lib. iv.
- ^{ft19} Proleg. Biblica.
- ^{ft20} Praef in Bib. in Lat., et passim.
- ^{ft21} Praef. in Comment. in Joshua.
- ^{ft22} Loc. Com., lib. 1, cap. 13.
- ^{ft23} De Opt. Genesis Interp., lib. i.
- ^{ft24} Lib. ii. De Verb. Dei.
- ^{ft25} Tom. 1, d. 5, q. 3.
- ^{ft26} De Translat. Srae. cum Comment in Esau.
- ^{ft27} Epito. Controv Contrar., 1, c. 8.
- ^{ft28} Dispunctio Calum. Casaub.
- ^{ft29} Pined., lib. v. De Reb. Solom., c. 4, s. 1.
- ^{ft30} Morin. Exerci de Sincerit. Exerc. 1, c. 3.
- ^{ft31} Cap. x. lib. I.

- ^{ft32} Edm. Castel. Praef. ad. Animad. Samar. in Bib. Poly.
- ^{ft33} Mich. Le Jay, Praefat, ad opus Bibl.
- ^{ft34} Simeon de Muis, Assertio Verit. Heb.
- ^{ft35} Giles Firmin, who replied to a work of Dr Owen's upon Schism. — ED.
- ^{ft36} This refers to the elaborate treatise on the "Perseverance of the Saints," which Dr Owen had written in opposition to John Goodwin, and to which that celebrated Arminian replied. — ED.
- ^{ft37} Dr Henry Wilkinson, public reader of divinity in the university.
- ^{ft38} Hebraea volumina nec in una dictione corrupta invenies. Sant. Pag. ἰῶτα ἔν ἡ μία χεραία οὐ μὴ παρέλθῃ. (~~4188~~ Matthew 5:18.)
- ^{ft39} Reading, in the margin, and writing, in the line.
- ^{ft40} Correctio scribarum, or the amendment of some small *apiculi* in eighteen places.
- ^{ft41} Ablatio scribarum, or a note of the redundancy of in five places. (Vid. Raymund., Pugio Fid. Petrus Galatians, lib. 1, cap. 8.)
- ^{ft42} Hebraei V. T. Codices per universum terrarum orbem, per Europam, Asiam, et Africam, ubique sibi sunt similes, eodemque modo ab omnibus scribuntur et leguntur; si forte exiguas quasdam apiculorum quorundam differentias excipias, quae ipsae tamen nullam varietatem efficiunt, (Bux. Vin. Ver. Heb. 2, cap. 14.)
- ^{ft43} Ludovicus Cappellus, in his "Critica Sacra."
- ^{ft44} Proleg. ad Bibl. Polyglot.
- ^{ft45} Satis ergo est quod eadem salutaris doctrina quae fuit a Mose, prophetis, apostolis et evangelistis in suis **αὐτογράφοις** primum literis consignata, eadem omnino pariter in textibus Graeco et Hebraeo, et in translationibus cure veteribus, tum recentibus, clare certo et sufficienter inveniatur. Pariter illae omnes una cum textibus Graeco et Hebraeo sunt et dici possunt authenticae, sacra, divinae, **ζεόπνευστοι** — respectu materiae, etc. Sunt in Scripturis multa alia non usque adeo scitu necessaria, etc. (Cappel. Critic. Sac., lib. 6, cap. 5, § 10, 11.)
- ^{ft46} **Θεολογούμενα**, sive De Naturae, Ortu, et Studio Theologiae.

- ^{ft47} John Biddle, the father of English Socinians, in a catechism which he published in 1654. — ED.
- ^{ft48} Morin. Exercit. de Heb. Text. Sincer., Exercit. 1, cap. 1.
- ^{ft49} Dr Owen treats of this subject in his Pneumatologia, or discourse concerning the Holy Spirit. — ED.
- ^{ft50} Hinc Masora sive Massoreth *Traditio*, vel rei de manu in manum, aut doctrinae ex animo in animum, mediante docentis voce, qua seu manu doctrina alteri traditur. (Buxtor. Comment. Mas.)
- ^{ft51} D. Ward, Essay, etc.
- ^{ft52} The treatise “Of the Divine Original, etc., of the Scriptures.”
- ^{ft53} Whitak. Cham. Rivet. de S. S. Molin. nov. Pap. Mestrezat. Cont. Jesuit. Regourd. Vid. Card. Perron. Respon. ad Reg. mag. Bullen. 1. 5, c. 6.
- ^{ft54} Since my writing of this, some of the chief overseers of the work, persons of singular worth, are known to me.
- ^{ft55} Proleg. 7, sect. 17.
- ^{ft56} Ibid. 3, sect. 8, et seq.
- ^{ft57} Ibid. 8, sect. 28, etc.
- ^{ft58} Append. p. 5.
- ^{ft59} Proleg. 7, sect. 12.
- ^{ft60} Proleg. 6, sect. 8-10.
- ^{ft61} Ibid. 6, sect. 12.
- ^{ft62} Adrianus Ferrariensis Flagellum Judaeor. lib. 9, cap. 2. Rab. Azarias Meor Henaim. p. 13, cap. 9.
- ^{ft63} Joseph De Bell. Jud. lib. 7, cap. 24.
- ^{ft64} Proleg. 7, sect. 12.
- ^{ft65} “Hierosolymis Babylonica expugnatione deletis, omne instrumentum Judaicae literaturae per Esdram constat restauratum.” — Tertull, lib. de Hab. Mul. cap. 3.
- ^{ft66} “Quod si aliquis dixerit Hebraeos libros a Judaeis esse falsatos, audiat Origenem, quid in octavo volumine explanationum Esaiæ respondeat quaestiunculae; quod nunquam dominus et apostoli qui caetera crimina

arguunt in Scribis et Phariseis, de hoc crimine quod erat maximum reticuisent. Sin autem dixerint post adventum Domini et praedicationem apostolorum libros Hebraeos fuisse falsatos cachinnum tenere non potero.”—Hierom. in cap. ni. Esaiae.

^{ft67} Morin. Exercit. de Heb. Text. Sinc. lib. 1 exer. 1 cap. 4.

^{ft68} Buxtorf. Tiberias.

^{ft69} De Antiquitate Punct.

^{ft70} Exeg. loc. com. tom. 1 de Sa Sc.

^{ft71} De Text. Heb. Puri.

^{ft72} Loc. com. quousque se extendat. Author S. Sa.

^{ft73} Clav. Scrip. Sel. p. 2, trac. 6.

^{ft74} De Templ. Ezech.

^{ft75} Disputat. Jenae.

^{ft76} De Translat. Scripturae.

^{ft77} Controversarium Epitome

^{ft78} Loc, Theol. lib. 2 cap. 13.

^{ft79} Arcan. Cathol. lib. 1.

^{ft80} Exercit. de Heb. Text. Sincer.

^{ft81} Proleg.

^{ft82} De Verbo Dei, lib. 2.

^{ft83} In Psalm 21.

^{ft84} Biblioth. lib. 8 Haeres. 13.

^{ft85} Praefat ad Bib. Interlin.

^{ft86} Respons. ad Lindan.

^{ft87} De rebus Solom. cap. 4 sect. 1.

^{ft88} Praefat. ad Josu.

^{ft89} Proleg. Biblica.

^{ft90} Lightfoot, Fall of Hierus sect. 8-5, etc.

^{ft91} Euseb. Hist. lib. 4 cap. 6.; Orosius lib. 7 cap. 13; Hieron. Com. in Zach. cap. 11. Vid Tzemach. David. et Hotting. Hist. Ecclesi Nov. Testam.

- ^{ft92} “Dispersi, palabundi et coeli et soli sui extorres, vagantur per orbem sine homine, sine Deo, rege, quibus neo advenarum jure terram patriam saltem vestigio salutare conceditur.” — Tertull. Apol.
- ^{ft93} “Post haec processu temporis ventum est ad Rabbinu Hakkadosh, cui pax, qui fuit seculi sui phoenix etc. Ille legem in Israele confirmavit sententiis, dictis, et differentiis ore traditis a Mose, usque ad tempora sua collectis cum et ipse esset ex iis qui ore tradita referebant. Collectis igitur sententiis et dietis istis, manum admovit componendae Mishnae, quae in lege scripta sunt praeceptorum explicationem continerent, partim traditionibus a Mose (cui pax), ore acceptis, partim consequentiis argumentatione elicitis,” etc. — Vid. R. Maimon praefat. in Seder Zeraim, edit. Poc. p. 36-38.
- ^{ft94} Fundament. nonum. apud Maimon, praefat, ad Perek. Chelek. p. 175, edit. Poc.
- ^{ft95} Shobet Jehuda, p. 40.
- ^{ft96} “Eodem fete tempore Palatinus abolita pontificia autoritate doctrinam Lutheri recepit, eaque de causa Pauini Fagini tabernis Rhenanis in Palatinatu naturae Heidelbergae evocavit. Is sub Volfgango Capitone perfectissimam linguae sanctae cognitionem adeptus, cum egestate premeretur, Petri Buseri veri locupletis Isnae in qua ille docebat senatoris liberalitate sublevatus Heliam illum Judaeorum doctissimum accersendum curavit, et instituta typographica officina maximum ad solidam reuerentiam Hebraicarum cognitionem momentum attulit.” — Thuanus Hist. lib. 2 ad an. 1564, 1). 546.
- ^{ft97} Proleg. 3, sect. 42.
- ^{ft98} Faustus Socin. de Jesu Christo Salvatore; Crellius Cont. Grot. p. 62.
- ^{ft99} Pietro Della Valle had discovered, in his travels through the east, a copy of the Samaritan Pentateuch, which was presented in 1620 to the library of the Oratory at Paris, by Harlaeus de Sancy. It excited considerable sensation among the learned, was reputed of great antiquity, and held to be derived from some copy antecedent to the Babylonian captivity. It contained no vowel points, and hence the analogical argument to which our author refers against the antiquity of the Hebrew points. — ED.

- ft100 Αὐτίκα δὲ οἱ παρ' Αἰγυπτίοις παιδευόμενοι, πρῶτον μὲν πάντων τὴν Αἰγυπτίων γραμμάτων μέθοδον ἐκμανθάνουσι, τὴν ἐπιστολογραφικὴν καλουμένην· δευτέραν δὲ, ἱερατικὴν ἣ χρῶνται οἱ ἱερογραμματεῖς· ὑστάτην δὲ καὶ τελευταίαν, τὴν ἱερογλυφικὴν ἥς ἡ μὲν ἐστὶ διὰ τῶν πρωτῶν στοιχείων κυρισλογικὴ, ἡ δὲ συμζολικὴ· τῆς δὲ συμζολικῆς ἡ μὲν κυριολογεῖται κατὰ μίμησιν· ἡ δὲ ὥσπερ τροπικῶς γράφεται, ἡ δὲ ἄντικρυς ἀλληγορεῖται κατὰ τινὰς αἰνιγμούς· ἥλιον γὰρ οὖν γράψαι βουλόμενοι, κύκλον ποιοῦσι· σελήνην δὲ, σχῆμα μηνοειδὲς, κατὰ τὸ κυριολογούμενον εἶδος.—Clemens. Alex., Stromat. lib. 5.
- ft101 “Veni rursum Hierosolymam, et Bethlehem ubi labore pretii Bartemium Judaeum nocturnum habui praeceptorem; timebat enim Judaeos, et exhibebat so mihi alium Nicodemum.” — Hieron. Ep. ad Oceanum.
- ft102 “Literas semper arbitror Assyrias fuisse, sed alii apud Egypties a Meawario, ut Gellius; alii apud Tyros repertas volunt: utiqus in Graeciam intulisse e Phoenice Cadmum sexdechn numero, quibus Trejano bello adjecisse quatuor hac figura ζ ξ φ χ. Palimedes totidem, post eum Simonidem Melioum ζ η ψ ω, quarum onmium vie in nostris cognoscitur.” — Plinius Nat. Hist. lib. 7 cap. 56. quae quiz in vita invenerit.
- ft103 Dr Wilkins, ward. of Wad. Col.: [afterwards bishop of Chester, and author of a celebrated “Essay towards a Real Character and Philosophical Language.” On account of his literary pursuits in this direction, Owen seems to have appealed to him as an authority in the present instance. A complete and more accurate classification of sounds will be found in certain recent works. See a list of authors on the subject in the appendix to the “Essentials of Phonetics,” by Ellis. — ED.
- ft104 Cabalistic signs, — תְּמִוּרָה and נִסְתָּרֵי־קַיִן, the former denoting a change either by transposition of letters, or by altering the alphabetical order of the letters; the latter being applied to instances in which one letter written is held to be the sign for a whole word or object. — ED.
- ft105 Words seemingly conclusive in favor of Owen’s view, if Jerome understood by “*vocales*” what we understand by “vowels.” The

former, however, in the language of Jerome denotes “gutturals.” See Havernick’s “Introduction to the Old Testament,” sect. 53, and Hupfeld, s. 580. ED.

^{ft106} Dr Edward Pococke, born 1604; rector of Childrey, Berkshire, in 1643; professor of Hebrew in Oxford; one of Walton’s assistants in the preparation of the Polyglott, and one of the most accomplished scholars of his time. — ED.

^{ft107} Pococke’s statement was, that this translation was not all made by one author, or directly from the Hebrew, but partly out of the Hebrew, partly out of the Syriac, and partly out of the Septuagint. — ED.

^{ft108} It was of the translation of the Pentateuch by Saadiah that Pococke had affirmed that it had been executed about A.D. 950. Owen seems to refer to the most ancient part of the *Old Testament*; Walton writes as if Owen had spoken Of the most ancient part of the *translation*. — ED.

^{ft109} The reference is to the old Syriac or Peshito; a name derived from the Chaldee ܫܠܬܐ *simple* or *single*. Though Walton complained bitterly of the statement of Owen, yet the date of the version has been long matter of controversy among the learned, Michaelis ascribing to it high antiquity, Marsh questioning the conclusiveness of his arguments, and Laurence unsuccessfully attempting to refute the bishop. It is thought to belong to the end of the second or beginning of the third century. — ED.

^{ft110} A statement that must be qualified, Michaelis pronouncing it “the very best translation of the Greek Testament he ever read;” and Dr Davidson affirming, “It is far from being as accurate or as uniformly good as it might have been,” but always to be “consulted as an important document in the criticism and interpretation of the New Testament.” The testimony of the latter author as to the value of the Old Testament according to this version is equally decided: “In point of fidelity, it is the best of all the ancient versions.” — ED.

^{ft111} Morin. cap. 1 ex. 4.

^{ft112} It is now beyond all question that Owen’s estimate of the value of the Samaritan Pentateuch, for the purposes of critical emendation, was correct. Since the dissertation of Gesenius, “De Pentateuchi Samaritani

Origine,” etc., “its credit in the critical world,” says Dr Davidson, “has been greatly lowered, its position as an authority depreciated far below the rank which several eminent scholars once gave it.” — ED.

ft113 On this point the good sense of Owen had fairly the better of the learning of Walton, who believed and defended the whole fable of Aristeeas in regard to the origin of the Septuagint: see Proleg. 9:18. — ED.

ft114 “The criticism of the New Testament should discard all Persian versions as worthless,” Dr Davidson, Bib. Crit. 2:222. In regard to the Ethiopic, no great value is attached to it by modern critics, as there is great uncertainty about its origin, and its text has never been very correctly printed. — ED.

ft115 On the important question of the value of ancient translations in criticism, it is right the modern reader should not be misled. That they are of value, not for the criticism, but the interpretation of the Scriptures, is the position of our author. It cannot be defended; and the language in which he objects to these versions is too unqualified, although on some points his objections were not destitute of weight, and have been confirmed by subsequent inquiries. On this subject, — the use of versions in criticism, — we may cite the opinion of the most recent authority, Dr Davidson, in his valuable work on Biblical Criticism. Speaking of the principal versions of the Old Testament, — the Septuagint, the fragments of the other Greek translators, the Peshito or old Syriac, the Latin of Jerome, the Targums of Jonathan and Onkelos, and the Arabic of Saadiah Haggaon, — he remarks, in regard to the supposition that they exhibit the text prior to all existing manuscripts, “They do without doubt render this important service *partially*. Their use in the criticism of the Old Testament is great. We have no other aids of equal value, provided they be rightly applied. Yet they do not give an *exact* and *complete* view of the original text, as it was at the time of their origin. They do not yield that important service to sacred literature which they might have done.”

On the subject of New Testament versions he observes, “No benefit has accrued from extending the range of investigation in this quarter. Rather has there been disadvantage..... The Arabic versions of the New Testament ought to be neglected. They are useless. The same may be

said of the Persian.” The versions which he regards as sources of criticism are the Syriac, Latin, Egyptian, Ethiopic, and Gothic. — ED.

^{ft116} In the Hebrew EL, which signifies “Mighty.”

^{ft117} This sermon was began before the writer came in. What he wrote is as follows. [This note is by Sir John Hartopp. On the top of the first page the word “fast” is written; seemingly to intimate that the sermon had been preached on the occasion of a fast. — ED.]

^{ft118} The author alludes to the affair of Titus Oates and the death of Sir E. Godfrey. See note, vol. 9, p.13 — ED.

^{ft119} In the author’s treatise on the Holy Spirit, vol. 3 of this works. — ED.

^{ft120} The third division of this discourse has not been preserved. See p. 575. — ED.