I. Whether it be Necessary or Profitable to the right Order or Peace of the Churches of England, that we Restore the extruded Episcopacy? Neg.

II. Assert. Those who Nullifie our present Ministry and Churches, which have not the Prelatical Ordination, and teach the People to do the like, do incr the guilt of grievous Sin.

III. An Episcopacy desirable for the Reformation, Preservation and Peace of the Churches.

IV. Whether a short Liturgie or Form of Worship be a desir-able means for the Peace of these Churches?

V. Whether Humane Ceremonies be Necessary or Profitable to the Church?

By Richard Baxter.
To his Highness
RICHARD
Lord Protector
OF THE
Common-wealth of England, Scotland and Ireland.

SIR,

These Papers are ambitious of accompanying those against Popery into your Highness's presence, for the tender of their service, and that upon the same account. The Controversies here decided, are those that have had a hand in most of the great transactions that of late years have here past; and that still have a hand in the differences that hinder our desired peace. I observe
observe that the Nation generally rejoiceth in your peaceable entrance upon the Government. And are affected with indignation, if they hear but any rumors that troublesome persons would disturb their hopes. And many are persuaded that you have been strangely kept, from participating in any of our late bloody contentions, that God might make you an Healer of our breaches, and imploy you in that Temple-work, which David himself might not be honoured with, though it was in his mind, because he had shed blood abundantly, and made great wars, 1 Chron. 22. 7, 8. I perceive also that some settlement of Church-affairs will be expected from you by the most. And therefore it concerneth all our welfare that you be well acquainted with the state of those differences, about which all will expect your judgement. For my own part I think not that matters are half so far out of order in the Churches, as most discontented men imagine: But yet I know there is much to be mended, wherein both God and most good men expect you should contribute a considerable part. Some think there is no settlement in the Church, till they are in the saddle, and all their Brethren are become their servants, and do them obedience. And alas, we have those that take it for no settlement, till they have the sword in their own hands, or have engaged you to use it at their discretion, and may again fill the Prisons or other Lands, with their Brethren that are far better than themselves: Those I mean that in their writings do glory that their predecessors hang'd the Puritans, and lament that of late they were but silenced, as being a less effectual means. Some would have no other settlement then we have, or else would have Licentiousness settled by a Law, and have unlimited Liberty in Religion. Doubtless these are conscious what it is that they have need
need of: If Heathens, Infidels and Papists be but excepted out of the Toleration, it displeath them: And we can easily conjecture why. If we grant them all the Liberty of their consciences (that is, of their mis-belief, because, alas, we cannot cure it) it satisfieth them not, unless they may have also Liberty of tongue and Practice. When I have heard and read the Reasonings of some of them against the Immortality of the soul, and the Christian Religion itself, I have wondered why they should take it for such a point of Liberty, to have leave to draw others to their opinion, when they seem to think that mens Happiness or Misery is no more concerned in it. These are the men that tell the world that Magistrates have nothing to do with Religion, but only with our Peace and Bodily welfare, contrary to the fullest Testimony of the Scriptures: Which is but to perswade men to esteem you as the dirt of the earth, and to value the Ministry above the Magistracy, as much as the Soul is better then the Body, and as Heaven is better then this dunghill-world. And for this odious doctrine, they have no stronger reason, then because that Heathen Princes are incapable of deciding matters about Religion. As if mens wilfull and wicked indisposition would change the office, and disoblige both them and those that are guilty of no such unfitness, from the obligations laid upon them by the Lord: They may as wisely say that a sober Physitian is obliged to no more then a drunken one can perform; or that a seeing man may do no more then the blind can do: Or that a Learned Prince may not meddle with Learning, because an unlearned Prince is unfit for it. But any man that hath read Bellarmine, Parsons, Greter, or such like Jesuites, may know the Fathers of this doctrine: Nothing more familiar with them, then that
Princes have nothing to do but for our Bodies, and the Common Peace: but forsooth it is the Pope that must Rule all about our Souls. The Libertines know whose cause they plead. But verily men that regard the Interest of Christ and their salvation, would set light by Princes, if they believed them to be such terrestrial animals as Papists and Libertines would make them.

Some also there be, that would have a settlement upon too rigorous terms, though they would not have it executed with cruelty. Most men would fain have their own opinions prevail, and too many place too much of their Religion in censuring as Heterodox all that differ from them, and think it an evidence of their Godliness that they are Uncharitable; and seeing many minds and wails, they think that punishment must heal them all: Not that they would be driven to their Brethren, but all their Brethren must be driven unto them.

In the midst of all these cross expectations, if you will consult with, and obey the Lord, I dare boldly tell you, it is past all doubt, that you must avoid extremes, and keep as tenderly the golden mean, in this point, as in any that concerns you. If you give Liberty to All that is called Religion, you will soon be judged of no Religion, and loved accordingly. If you so far close with any Party of them that walk in the faith of Christ, and the fear of God, as to deal rigorously with the rest, you will be hated by them as a Persecutor. And if men be oppressed in that which they value above their lives, it will tempt them to neglect their lives for their relief. If you joyn with no Church in the Lords Supper and other holy Communion, left you seem to espouse the party that you joyn with, you will by most be judged to be
be carnally wife, self-seeking and irreligious, or one that is yet to seek for your Religion. If you restrain all that are against the great undoubted Truths of Christ, from infecting others, and own all that hold the Necessary Truths in Godliness and Charity, you will please both God, and most good men. And if you hold your personall Communion with those that are of your own judgement in lesser differences, this will not lose you the affections of the godly (though of a few factious persons it may) as long as you are a tender Father to them all, though you Communicate but with some.

The Godly Emperours that suppreft the Arrians and many Heresies, maintained the Novatians in the Liberty of their Churches, and were beloved both by the Novatians and the Orophodox. But if you could be the happy instrument of taking away the Divisions of the Godly, that there might be no such thing as Parties or Separations known among them (though diversity of opinions there will be) (and if you could give all the Ministers of the Nation a pattern of such union of the tolerable dissenting parties in your own Pastors, with whom you shall Communicate) this would be the way to lift you highest in the Esteem and Love of all your people, and make them see that you were appointed of God to be a Healer and Restorer; and to glory in you, and bless God for you as the instrument of our chiefest peace. And O what a precedent and preparative it would be, for the Healing of all the Protestant Churches through the world! And certainly your Highness hath a fair opportunity for this happy work: You enter in a season when we are tired with contention, and sensible of our loss and danger, and tenderer then formerly of one another, and the most angry parties are much asswaged, and there is not so much reproach and bitter-
ness among the Godly, as lately there hath been. A Spirit of Peace and Healing is lately risen in the hearts of many thousands in the Land, and Ministers that differed, do lovingly associate, and most do feel the smart of our Divisions, and are so prepared for a perfecter closure, that they wait but for some Leading hand. I am certain that there are Healing Principles before us, and a temperament is obvious to judicious charitable men, upon which we might accord. And, though some are too rough to lie in any building, yet moderate men are to be found of every party, that deserveth your encouragement, whom you may use as a precedent to the rest, and instruments to promote this work. It is you that have those great advantages that can facilitate that which to others were impossible: and from you it is expected. In this Book, and one of Confirmation, which I lately published, I confidently affirm, is contained much of that Reforming, Reconciling Truth which must heal us if ever we be healed. And though the study of such matters require much time, yet seeing God commandeth Princes that the Book of his Law depart not out of their mouthes, but that they meditate in it day and night, that they may do according to it, Josh. 1. 8. I may suppose that they will be willing also to meditate on such Books as help them to understand it. I should have been as ready as another to censure such an address as this, as guilty of presumptuous boldness, but that I consider what is the work of my Calling, and what it is to be faithfull to the Eternall God, and am conscious of fidelity to your Highness in my boldness, and know that these are necessary Truths, and that to the Counsellors of Peace is joy, Prov. 12. 20. and have no interest in this world that I regard, in comparison of the Churches happiness. My earnest Prayers for your Highness
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Highness shall be, that your own soul being first subjected and devoted wholly unto God, you may Rule us as one that is Ruled by him, and never know any Interest but his, and that which is subservient to him, and may escape that stumbling-stone, on which the Princes of the earth do commonly dash themselves in pieces, even by espousing an Interest contrary to Christ's, and so growing jealous of his holy ways, and falling out with them: and that God would endue your Highness with that heavenly Wisdom, that is first Pure, and then Peaceable, Jam. 3. 17. and you may escape the flattering suggestions of the Wisdom of the flesh, and serious Piety may be the first part of your Policy, that so the Eternall-God may be engaged in the Protection of your Dominions and You: That you may always remember, that you are Christ's and your Peoples, and not your Own: and that the diligent promoting of GODLINESS and CONCORD may be the study and resolved work of your Life. This is the way, and only this, (let flesh and blood say what it will) to make you truly Great and Happy. God is the Center and Common Interest of all his servants. Keep close to him, and they will all keep close to you. There is no other Common Interest, nor any thing that the Godly do so highly value. If they see that it is indeed for God, they can bear any thing, or do any thing; for they are wholly devoted to him alone. The more of God appeareth on you, and the more you promote his Interest in the world, the highlyer will you be advanced, and the dearer will you be to all that Love him. And even with the ungodly multitude, that Piety is honoured in Princes, that is despised in their neighbours; and the hand of God is plainly demonstrated in their surviving Honour; the names of Pious Princes being Great, when
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The greatest leave a name that is vile, even in the mouths of common worldly men, who are ready to keep a Holy-day for a Saint when he is dead, though they hate or will not imitate the living. Your Zeal for God will kindle in your subjects a Zeal for you. The more your Life and Government is Divine, the more Divine will you appear, and therefore the more Amiable and Honourable to the Good, and Reverend to the evil. Parliaments will Love and Honour you, and abhor the motions that tend to a division, or your just displeasure. Ministers will heartily Pray for you, and Praise the Lord for his mercies by you, and teach all the people to Love, and Honour, and Obey you. The people will rejoice in you; and you will be Loved or Feared of all: Such happiness attendeth serious Piety, when impiety, selfishness, and neglect of Christ is the shame and ruine of Prince and People. I crave your Highness pardon of this boldness, and your favourable acceptance of the tendered service of

A faithfull subject to your Highness, as you are an Officer of the Universal King.

Richard Baxter.
A Preface to those of the Nobility, Gentry, and Commons of this Land, that adhere to Prelacy.

Honourable, Worshipful, and Beloved Country-men.

I being much for your sakes that I have published the following Disputations, it behoveth me here to address my self to you, in a few preparatory words. What distance there hath long been, and still continueth between you and your Brethren (for so they are) is too much known to friends and foes, at home and abroad, and too much daily manifested by each side. Shall it still continue, or would you have it healed? If it must continue, tell us how long, and tell us why? Would you have it go with us to Eternity? and will you not be reconciled, nor dwell with us in Heaven? It is not in your Power to shut us out; And will you not be there, if we be there? Or do you think there will be any Discord where Love is Perfected, and we are One in God? If you can be content to be saved with us, and believe that all of both Opinions, that truly love and fear the Lord, shall live there in dearest (a) Love.
Love for ever, how can you choose, when you forethink of this, but Love them now, that you must for ever Love? and long to be reconciled to them, with whom you must there so harmoniously accord? You know that Earth is our preparation for Heaven: and such as men would be there, they must begin to be here: As they must be Holy here, that ever will there see the Lord in Holiness; so must they here be Loving and Peaceable, that ever will live in that perfect heavenly Love and Peace. And why is it that the distance must be so great? Are we not all the Children of one Father? Have we not all the same God, the same Redeemer, the same Spirit in us? (if we are Christians indeed, Rom. 8. 9.) Are we not in the same Baptismal Covenant with God? Have we not the same holy Scripture for our Rule? and are we not in the same universal Church, and of the same Religion? Some of you say, No; to the grief of your friends, and the shame of your own understandings, and uncharitableness. I beseech you bear it, if I touch the sore: For my work is Healing; and therefore though it must be touch'd, it shall be as gently as the case will bear. If I may judge by such as I have had any opportunity to know, I must say, that the distance on your part is continued in some by confused apprehensions of the case, and not distinguishing things that differ; In some by discontent of mind, and too deep a sense of worldly losses, and the things that you take as injuries from others: In some by the advantage of a co-interest and consociation with those Divines that are of your way, and so by a Willingness to think them in the right, and those in the wrong that you take for adversaries: In some by a stiffness and stoutness of disposition, that calls it Constancy to hold your own, and Manliness not to stoop to others, and takes it as dishonourable to seek for Peace, even in Religion with your supposed adversaries; or to yield to it, at least without much impor-
importunity: With too many (miserable souls!) it is meer ungodliness, and enmity to that way of Piety, that in many that you differ from, appears: And in the best of you it is a Remissness of Charity, and want of Zeal for the Churches Peace, and the Love and Unity of Brethren. To confute the reasonings of all these sorts, would draw out this Preface to too great a length. The first sort my experience hath caused me to observe. Oft have I fallen into company with men that pour forth bitter odious words against Presbytery: and I ask them what that Presbyterie is that they speak of with so much abomination? Is it the Name or the Thing, which they so abhor? If the Name, is it not a term of Scripture used by the Holy Ghost? 1 Tim. 4. 14. Are not the Pastors of the Church most frequently called the Presbyters, or Elders? Tit. 1. 5. Act. 14. 23. & 15. 2, 4, 6, 22, 23. 1 Tim. 5. 17. Act. 20. 17. James 5. 14. 1 Pet. 5. 1, &c. It must needs then be the Thing, and not the Name which they abominate. And what is that Thing? most of them cannot tell me. Some presently talk of the disuse of the Common Prayer; as if, that were a part of Presbytery, and Government, and the form of worship were all one. Some presently run to Scotland, and talk of forcing men to Confession of sin, and of their secular enforcement of their Excommunications. But 1. If this be odious, why was it used by the Bishops? Is it good in them, and bad in others? 2. And why plead you for Discipline, and against Toleration, if you so loath the things you plead for? 3. But will you not, when its known so openly, distinguish the Ministerial Power from the secular? Its known by their Laws and constant Practice, that all the Power that was exercised by Violence, on Body or Estate, by the Assemblies, was derived from the Magistrate, whose Commissioners also sate among them. And the Bishops in England were seconded by the Sword, as much
much as they. It's known that the Presbyterians commonly maintain in their Writings, that Pastors have no Coercive or Secular Power, but only the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, to exercise on the Conscience, committed to them by Christ. 4. And the writings and practice of those in England, openly manifest it: and its them with whom you have most to do. Some tell me that Presbyterie is the Government of the Church without Bishops: And is it only the Negation of your Prelacy that is the odious thing? Is there nothing Positive odious in Presbyterie? Thus our Belief is condemned by the Papists, even because we Believe not so much as they; when in the Positives of our Faith there is nothing that they can blame. Some make it the odious thing that they have Lay-Elders; But 1. The Presbyterians account them not Lay, but Ecclesiasticke. 2. And what is the odious harm that these men do among them? They are present, and Consent to the admonishing and cenfuring of offenders. And what great harm doth that to the Church? Is it because they do not Preach? No sure; in that your Readers are much like them. What work can you Name that these Elders are appointed to, that by your Confession is not to be done? It is not the Work then, that you blame, but that these men do it. 3. But what is this to all that are in this point of your mind, and think that unordained Elders wanting Power to preach, or administer the Sacraments, are not Officers in the Church of God's appointment? As far as I can understand, the greater part, if not three for one of the English Ministers that you stand at a distance from, are of this mind, and so far against Lay-Elders as well as you, of whom I confess my self to be One. (and that Mr. Vines was One, I have shewed you in the End.) Surely then all we are none of the odious Presbyterians in your eyes. Why then is there such a distance? And are Lay-Elders as bad as Lay-Chancellors?
So also when some have been hotly condemning us as being against Bishops, I ask them what a Bishop is: and what sort of Bishops it is that they mean? And most of them are unable to give me a rational answer to either of the Questions? But some that are wiser, though they know no more sorts of Bishops but one, yet they can say, that by a Bishop they mean an Ecclesiastick Governour of Presbyters and the people. And if so, then why do they vilifie Bishops under the name of Presbyters? I have here shewed you that if this be all, then every Parish hath a Bishop where there is a Pastor that hath Chappels, and Curates under him: or any two Ministers that will subject themselves to a third, do make a Bishop. You delude yourselves and others, while you plead only in general for Bishops: We are all for Bishops as well as you. All the Question is, What sort of Bishops they must be? Whether only Episcopi gregis, or also Episcopi Episcoporum gregis: and if so, whether they must be Bishops of single Churches, as our Parishes are, or a multitude of Churches, as Diocesses are? And if the last were granted, whether these be not properly Archbishops? In all other parts of the Controversie I find, that the followers of each party go much in the dark, and take much upon trust from the Teachers whom they value, and little understand the true state of our differences: So that it is more by that common providence, commonly called Good luck, that some of them are Protestants or Christians, than from any saving grace within them. Had Papists or Mahometans but as much interest in them, as the Bishops, it is like they would have been as much for them.

As for those of you that know your own Opinions, and the Reasons of them, you must needs know that the Divines called Episcopall in England, are of two sorts, that very much differ from one another: And therefore supposing you to
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to be the followers of these differing Divines, I shall accordingly further speak to you as you are.

I. The Bishops of England, and their followers from the first Reformation, begun by King Edward the Sixth, and revived by Queen Elizabeth, were found in Doctrine, adhering to the Augustinian Method, expressed now in the Articles and Homilies: They differed not in any considerable points from those whom they called Puritans: But it was in the form of Government, and Liturgy, and Ceremonies that the difference lay.

II. But of late years a new train of Bishops were introduced, differing much from the old, yet pretending to adhere to the Articles and Homilies, and to be Fathers of the same Church of England as the rest. I know of none before Bp. Mountague of their way, and but few that followed him, till many years after. And at the demolishing of the Prelacy, they were existent of both sorts. Would you know the difference? If you have read the writings of Bp. Jewel, Pilkington, Alley, Parry, Babington, Baily, Abbot, Carlton, Morton, Usher, Hall, Davenant, with such like on one side, and the writings of the New Episcopal Divines that are now most followed, on the other side, I need not tell you the difference. And if you will not be at the labour to know it by their writings, it's like that you will not believe it if I tell you. For if you will take all on trust, I must suspect that you will put your trust in them to whom you are addicted.

The New party of Episcopal Divines are also subdivided: some of them are (if their Defence of Grotius, and Grotius his own Profession may be believed) of Grotius his Religion, that is, Papists: Others of them, though they draw as near the Grotians as Protestants may do, yet own not Popery itself. So that we have three notable parties of Episcopal Divines among us. 1. The old Orthodox Protestant
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Protestant Bishops and their followers. 2. The New Reconciling Protestant party. 3. The New Reconciling Papists, or Grotians. A brief taste of the difference I will give you.

1. The Old Episcopal party, as I said, in Doctrine agreed with the Non-conformists, and held that Doctrine that now we find in the Articles, and Homilies, and in the Synod of Dort, where Bp. Carlton, Bp. Hall, Bp. Daventry, and three more Divines of this Nation were, and had a great hand in the framing of those Canons, and by consenting, did as much to make them obligatory to us in England, as commonly is done in General Councils by the Delegates of most Nations.

But the New Episcopal Divines, both Protestants and Papists, do renounce the Synod of Dort, and the Doctrine of our Articles and Homilies, so far as it is conform thereto, in the points of Predestination, Redemption, Free-will, Effectual Grace, Perseverance, and Assurance of Salvation: following that Doctrine which is commonly maintained by the Jesuites and Arminians in these points.

2. The Old Episcopal Divines did renounce the Pope as Antichrist, and thought it the duty of the Transmarine Churches to renounce him, and avoid communion with his Church, as leprous and unfit for their communion. But the New Episcopal Divines do not only hold that the Pope is not Antichrist, but one part of them (the Protestants) hold that he may be obeyed by the Transmarine Western Churches as the Patriarch of the West, and be taken by us all to be the Principium unitatis to the Catholick Church, and the Roman Determinations still may stand, except those of the last four hundred years, and those, if they obtrude them not on others. So Bp. Bramhall, and many more: And Mr. Dow, and others tell us that the Canon Law is still in force in England, except some parts of it which
The Laws of the Land have cast out. And the Grotians teach, that the Church of Rome is the Mistress of other Churches, and the Pope to stand as the Head of the Universal Church, and to Govern it according to the Canons and Decrees of Councils: and they receive the Trent-Creed and Council, and all other Councils which the Pope receives, excepting only against some School-points, and abuse of manners among the Papists, which their Canons and Decrees condemn.

3. The old Episcopal Divines did take Episcopacy to be better than Presbyterian Equality, but not necessary to the Being of a Church, but to the Better being where it may be had. But the New Prelatical Divines of both sorts, unchurch those Churches that are not Prelatical.

4. The Old Episcopal Divines thought that Ordination by Presbyters without Prelates was valid, and not to be done again, though irregular. But the New ones take it to be No Ordination, nor those so ordained to be any Ministers, but Lay-men.

5. And accordingly the Old Episcopal Divines did hold the Forrein Protestant Churches, of France, Savoy, Holland, Geneva, Helvetia, &c. that had no Prelates, as true Churches, and their Pastors as true Ministers of Christ, and highly valued and honoured them as Brethren. But the New sort do disown them all as no true Churches, though they acknowledge the Church of Rome to be a true Church, and their Ordination valid.

6. The Old Episcopal Divines thought it lawful to join in actual Communion with the Pastors and Churches that were not Prelatical. But the New ones separate from their communion, and teach the people to do so, supposing Sacramental administrations to be there performed by men that are no Ministers, and have no authority.

7. The Old Episcopal Divines thought it meet to suspend,
silence, imprison, or undo those Godly Divines that did not bow towards the Altar, or publish to their People Declarations or Instructions for Dancing on the Lords Day, or that did preach twice a day. But many of the New ones practically told us, that this was their judgement.

Of these differences I have given you some proof hereafter: and would do here in the express words of the Authors on both sides, were it not that I should be needlessly tedious, and that I should unnecessarily offend the particular Divines of the New party who are among us, by reciting their words. More of the differences I pass by.

1. And now I would know of those of you that follow the Ancient Episcopal Divines, what hindereth you from a charitable, peaceable Communion with those Orthodox Ministers now in England, that some of you stand at a distance from? Doctrinal differences (at least, requiring such a distance) you cannot pretend. Bp Hall tells you in his Peace-maker (after cited) that there is none between you and the Foreign (Presbyterian) Churches. And as for the matter of Episcopacy, if you will insist upon the late English Frame as necessary, viz. [That there be but One Bishop over many hundred Churches, and that he have the sole power of Excommunication, and that be rule by a Lay-Chancellor, &c. and be a Lord, and seconded with a forcing power, &c.] then you will forsake the Judgement of your Leaders: For they will tell you that some of these are but separable appurtenances, some of them corruptions and blemishes, and some not Necessary. What need we any more ado? You see in the published Judgements of Bp Hall, Bp Usher, Dr Holdsworth, Forbes, and others, (after cited) that they would have all Presbyters to be Governors of the Churches, one of them having a stated Presidency or Moderatorship, and this will content them. And are we not then agreed? I am confident most of the Ministers in England
England would be content to yield you this: But what if there be some that are not of your mind concerning the stated Presidency which you desire? will you therefore uncharitably refuse communion with them? so would not your Leaders! In this therefore you will forsake them, and forsake many holy Churches of Christ, and forsake charity, and Christ himself that teacheb you another lesson. Will it not content you that you have freedom your selves to do that which seemeth best in your own eyes, unless all others be of your opinion?

But perhaps you will say that you have not Liberty your selves to practise according to this your judgement. To which I answer, 1. Your Brethren of the Ministry have not the power of the Sword, and therefore do neither deny you Liberty, nor can give it you: It is the Magistrates work. And will you separate from us for other mens doings? For that you have no rational pretence. If you know of any that persuade Magistrates to restrain your Liberty, that nothing to others: Censure, none but those that you know to be guilty.

2. I never knew that you were deprived of the Liberty of exercising such an Episcopacy as the forementioned Bishops do desire. I do not believe you could be hindered, and me that are your neighbours never hear of it. I know not of either Law or Execution against you. If you think that the clause in the Covenant, or the Ordinance against Prelacy, or the late Advice that excepts Prelacy from Liberty, are any restraint to you, I think you are much mistaken. It is only the late frame of Prelacy as it stood by Law, exercised by Archbishops, Bishops, Deans, Chancellors, &c. and that by force upon dissenters, that is taken down. You have not Liberty to force any by corporal punishment to your obedience. But you have full Liberty (for ought that ever I heard) to exercise the meer Episcopacy desired by Hall, Usher, and such like, on all that are
of your judgement, and will submit to it. That we may hold constant Assemblies of Pastors we find by experience: And in these Assemblies if you will choose one for your stated President, who will hinder you? No one I am confident; Tell us whoever suffered for so doing? or was prohibited, or any way hindered from it by any force? Nay more, if you will give this President a Negative vote, in Ordination and Jurisdiction, who will hinder you? yea who can? If twenty Ministers shall resolve that they will never Ordain, or Excommunicate any without the consent (yee or Command if you must have it so) of such a man whom they take for their President, who can or will compel them to the contrary? And all the People that are of your mind, have Liberty to join themselves with such Pastors on such terms, and submit themselves to you, if they will.

But you will say, that this is no setting up of Episcopacy, while every one that is unwilling to obey us, may refuse it. I answer, This is all that the Nature of Episcopacy requireth: And this is all that the Church saw practised (even Rome itself) for above three hundred years after Christ. And is not that now tolerable for your Communion with us, which served then for the Communion of all the Churches on earth? Is the Primitive pattern of purity and simplicity become so vile in your eyes, as to be inconsistent with Christian Communion? Let not such principles be heard from your mouths, or seen in your practises. Whether the Magistrate ought to compel us all to be of your mind or way, I will not now meddle with: but if he will not, will you therefore separate from your Brethren? Or will you not exercise the Primitive Episcopacy on Consenters, because you have not the sword to force Dissenters? And are you denied your Liberty, because you are not backed by the Sword? This concerneth other mens Liberties, and not yours. You have the Liberty of
Episcopal Government, (though not of uniting others with the Magistrates Sword) and as much Liberty ought I know as Presbyterians or Independents have (though not so much countenance) And how comes it to pass that the other modes of Government are commonly exercised upon meer Liberty, and yours is not? Is it because you have no confidence in any Arm but flesh? If your Episcopal Power be of Divine appointment, why may you not trust to a Divine assistance as well as others, that you think are not of God? If it can do nothing without the Sword, let the Sword do all without it, and retain its proper honour. If it can do less on voluntary Subjects, then other ways of Church-government can do, say so, and confess it most infirm, and give place to them. But if yours have most Authority from Christ, and spiritual force upon the Conscience, exercise it, and let us see it by experience; or else expect not that any should believe you, or take you to be resolute servants of Christ, and true to your Ministry.

But perhaps you will say, that you cannot have Communion with us, because we are schismatics: For so much Bp Usher himself doth seem to charge us with.] To which I answer, 1. Bp Usher chargeth none with Schism, but those that cast off Bishops to whom they had sworn obedience. But if I may judge of other Counties by this, there are so few of those, that they can afford you no pretence of scruple against the Communion of our Assemblies. I know not (to my remembrance) of one Minister in this County liable to this charge: but most never swore to them, and the rest had no hand in their exclusion. 2. Whoever among us did either swear to, or disobey such Bishops as Bishop Usher there assureth us were the Bishops of the antient Churches? If they set up another (intolerable) sort in stead of the Bishops which he himself requireth, judge whether it were a greater sin to swear to them, or to disobey them. 3. And
the schism which he mentioneth is not such in his own judgment as makes men uncaple of your Communion. This pretence therefore is frivolous.

Especially considering that most of us have no Prelates that so much as claim a Government over us. In this County since Bp Prideaux died (who was one of the ancient moderate sort) we know of none that ever made a pretence to the place. And are we schismaticks for not obeying a Bishop when we have none? And surely none can justly lay a claim to such a superiority, even according to the ancient Canons, unless he be first chosen by our selves, yea and the people, as a Reverend Bishop (I hope yet living) of the ancient sort hath told you, Morton Apolog. Cathol. Part. i. cap. 85. p. 257. Bellarmine himself confessing that ut Clerus & populus Episcopumeligeret, hic modus fuit in usu tempore Chrysostomi, Ambrosii, Augustini, Leonis, Gregorii. Bellarm. l. i. de Clericis cap. 9. And other of our Bishops say the same.

I conclude therefore that we are not only of one faith and Church with you, but differ so little in our opinions about lower things, that you can thence have no pretence for an alienation: And therefore with those of you that are godly and peaceable, I take it for granted that we are actually agreed. But if any will sacrifice the Churches Peace, their Charity, their souls to their parties, or passions and discontents, I leave them to God, and to the reading of other kind of Books, that tend to change an unrenewed mind.

II. And to those of you that follow the newer strain of Prelatical Divines, I shall adventure a few words, how small soever the probability is of their success. And 1. To those of you that are not departed from the Communion of all Protestants; nor gone with Grotius over to the Romanists. I beseech you, as before the Lord, proceed not in your bitterness, uncharitableness, or separation from your Brethren,
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Brethren, nor your hindering the work of God in their ministration, till you are able to produce such solid grounds for what you do, as you dare stand to at last, before the Judgement-seat of Christ. 1. Some of you charge us with no less then Heresie, as following Aerusius in the rejecting of Bishops, or equalizing Presbyters with them: and can you hold communion with Heresicks? I answer, 1. All is not heresie that every angry man hath called so, no not of the venerable Ancients. Do you indeed take your Dignity and preheminence to be an Article of our Faith? Why then was it never in the Creed? 2. Many among us are for Episcopacy, that are not for your sort of Prelacy. It is that species that our Controversie is about. 3. I shall answer you in the words of our Reverend Morton (a Prelate, though not of the Newbrain) Apolog. Cathol. Par. 1. cap. 33. pag. 96. 97. who answereth the Papis, the Papists that use against us the same objection: Non de differentia omni, sed de differentia Ordinis, seu Rote ordini (NB) quaestio est institute. Adversari, Aerusius hæreticus ordinis differentiam negat esse jure divino; idem Protestantenses: Resp. Quod idem forte sanctus Hieronymus, nec aliud Patres alii asseverant: hoc scholae vestrae Doctor primarius non ita pridem facile largiebatur: Mich. Medina, lib. 1. de sac. orig. affirmat, non modo S. Hieronymum idem in hoc cum Aerianis hæreticis sensisse, verum etiam Ambrosium, Augustinum, Sedulium, Primalium, Chrysostomum, Theodoretum, Occumenium, Theophylactum. Beliarum, lib. 4. de Eccles. milit. c. 9. Ita, (inquit valent. Jesuit. Tom. 4. disp. 9. qu. 1. punct. 2.) isti viri alioqui sanctissimi & orthodoxi—At (inquit id. ibid.) non est tolerabtilis haec responio. Probabo vero hoc non modo serendum, sed etiam omnibus alius responsis praerendum esse. Advocatus Erasmius Annot. in 1 Tim. 4. Antiquitas inter Praesibyterum & Episco-
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2. But you say, that at least we are Schismaticks, and you must not hold Communion with schism. And how are we proved Schismaticks? Why, [1. Because we have cast off Bishops. 2. Because we now obey them not.] I have:
have answered this already; to which I add:—1. It is a fine
world, when men will separate themselves from the
Churches of Christ to avoid schism, and they that are
against separation, and offer Communion to the Separatists,
must be taken to be the Schismatics themselves. It
is schism that we detest, and would draw you from, or else
what need we say so much for Concord and Communion?
2. I have told you already, that it is not one Minister of
a Multitude in our Communion that did cast off the Pre-
lates; half of them did nothing to it, and the other half
were Ordained since. 3. Nor can you truly say, that now
they refuse obedience to Bishops, where there are none to
obey, or none that command them. 4. Again I tell you, it
is not Episcopacy, but only the sinful species of Prelacy,
which the Parliament, and Assembly, and Covenanters did
cast off. And what if you think this species best? must all
think so, or else be Schismatics? And why not all Schis-
matics then that are against the Papacy, which is thought
by others the best form? I have here given you some Ar-
guments to prove your Prelacy which was cast off, to be
against the will of Christ, and the welfare of the Churches.
And I shall not believe that its schism to be against sin
and the Churches ruine. And I cannot but admire to read
in your writings, that Discipline and Piety are pretended
by you, as the things which you promote, and we destroy,
when I am most certain that the destruction of Piety and
Discipline are the very things by which you have so much
offended your Brethren; and we would heartily come as
near you as we can, so that Piety and Discipline may not
be destroyed. Had we not known that the able faithful
Preachers whom you called Puritans (conformable and
not conformable) that laboured in the word and doctrine,
were fitter to promote piety then the ignorant, drunken,
worldly Readers, and lazy Preachers, that once a day would
preach
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preach against doing too much to be saved, and had we not known, that Piety was better promoted by Learning the will of God, and praying, and meditating on the Lords Day, then by dancing; and by cherishing men truly fearing God, then by scorning, imprisoning, persecuting and expelling them; we would never have been so much against your doings as we have been. But mens salvation is not so contemptible a thing, as to be given away to humour the proud, that cannot live in Communion with any, unless they may drive them to destruction. We will not sell mens souls to you at such rates, nor buy your Communion, nor stop the reproachful mouths of any by such horrid cruelties. We talk not now to you of matters that are known by hear-say only: we see which way promoteth Piety, and which destroyeth it: we see that most of the ungodly in the land, are the farthest for your ways. You may have almost all the Drunkards, Blasphemers, and Ignorant haters of godliness in the Country, to vote for you, and if they durst, again to fight for you at any time. I cannot be so humble as to say, I am blind, and see not what indeed I see, because another tells me, that his eyesight is better then mine, and that he seeth things to be other then I see them to be. I doubt not but there are some Pious persons among you: I censure you no further then experience constraineth me. But I know that the common sense of most that are serious in practical Christianity, is against your formal ways of worship, and against the course that you have taken in this land; and the spirit of prophaneness complyeth with you, and doteth on you, in all places that ever I was acquainted in. Bear with plain truth: it is in a cause of everlasting consequence. There is somewhat in a gracious soul, like health in the body, that disposeth it to relish wholesome food, and perceive more difference between it, and meer air, or toysish kickshaws, then it can easily express. In abundance of (c)
your most applauded Preachers, the things of God were spoken with so little life and seriousness, as if they had not been believed by the speaker, or came not from the heart; yea Godliness and Diligence for Heaven, was the thing that they ordinarily preached against under the name of preciseness, and being righteous overmuch. And the Puritans were the men that Pulpits rendered most odious to the people, and your Preachers exercised their wit and zeal against; while almost all their hearers through the Land did take a Puritan to be one that was seriously Religious. Many a place have I lived in, where there was not a man that ever spoke a word against Bishops or Ceremonies; but a few there were (alas, a few) that would sometime read a Chapter in the Bible, and pray with their Families, and speak of the life to come, and the way to it, and for this they were commonly called Puritans. If a man had but mildly askt a swearer why he swore, or a drunkard why he would be drunk, or had once named Scripture, or the life to come, unless prophanely, the first word he should hear, was, [O you are one of the holy Brethren! you would not drink or swear, but you will do worse in secret! It was never a good world since there was so much talk of Scripture and Religion: but the King and the Bishops will take an order with you, and all the Puritans and Precipients in the Land.] I profess upon my common sad experience, that this was the common language of the people that were ignorant and prophan in all parts of England that ever I came in (which were not a few;) and these were the men that they called Puritans, and on such accounts. And what could the Prelates and Preachers of the Land have done more to mens damnation, then to preach them into an hatred of Puritanism, when it was known by all that lived among them, that Piety was Puritanism in their account, and no man was so free from it,
as he that would scorn at the very name of Holiness, and drink and swear, as if he had defied God. This is true, and England knows it: and if you will after this think that you have wiped your mouths clean, by saying as Mr. Pierce, that by Puritans, he means none but [men of blood, sedition, violence, despisers of dominion, painted sepulchres, Protestants frightened out of their wits, &c.] the righteous God that loveth righteousness, and hath said, Be ye holy for I am holy, will make you know to your penitent or tormenting sorrow, that the thing which commonly was reputed Puritanism in England, was no such thing as you describe: And that it's none of your wisdom to kick against the pricks, and play with the apple of God's eye, and bring men to hate the members of Christ, and then tell them you meant the members of the Devil, and to thrust men into Hell in jest: I have heard before the King many a Sermon against Puritans, which I judged impious, but yet had this excuse, that much of the auditory partly understood, that it was not Piety as such, that was directly reviled: And so perhaps it might be in the Universities, and some few intelligent auditories: but so it was not among the common people through the Land. A Puritan with them was of the same signification as a serious Christian is with me. And if you bring the Land to an hatred of such as are called Christians, and then say that by Christians you meant none but mad men, seditious, bloody, &c., you shall answer in earnest for spitting in the face of Christ in jest; and that before him that will not take your jeers or jingles, or adding reproach unto reproach for a sufficient excuse.

I know also that the casting out of the Ministers of your way, is much that offendeth you: concerning which I shall only say, that I meet with none, or very few that profess not their willingness that all men of your mind that truly fear God, and are able and diligent, should be kept in.
And if you be angry for the casting out of the ignorant, insufficient, negligent or scandalous, there's no remedy. But be ashamed to reproach us for casting out such from the service of Christ, as Julian the Apostate would have cast out from the Priesthood of his Idols: and let us crave your leave to expect as much Devotion in the servants of Christ, as he expected in his enemies. Vid. Julian. Oper. pag. 549, 550, 551, &c. fragment. [Faceffant itaque procul à nobis illeberales joci, ac petulans omne colloquium——In his occupanda sunt studia, & cum privatim, tum publice Diis fæpe supplicandum est; maxime quidem ter de die: fin minus, saltem diluculo ac sub velperam. Neque enim Sacerdotem decer, diem ullam ac noctem sine sacrificio transfigere. Est autem ut initium diei diluculum, ita noctis vespera. Itaque rationi consentaneum est, ut amborum intervallorum, velut primitiae quaedam Diis consecratur——Equidem sic statuo, sacerdotem oportere noctes atque dies purum fe ab omnibus & integrum servatorem——p. 555. Non enim mediocriter adversus Deos delinquimus cum sacras vestes ostentamus, & omnium oculis tanquam mirum aliquid objicimus. Ex quo id accidit, ut cum multi ad nos impuri homines accedant, sacra illa Deorum Symbola contaminentur. At vero nos sacerdotali uti vestae, nisi ut sacerdotibus dignum est vitam instituamur, id ipsum noxas omnes criminum, ac Deorum maxime contemptum in sele continet.—Ad obscaena illa theatrorum spectacula nullus omnino sacerdos accedat—neque cum histrione ullo vel auriga, vel saltatore, sit amicitia conjuncta, ad eorumve foras accedat.—Placeat eos ex omnibus constitut qui in Civitatibus optimi sunt, & imprimit quidem Dei, deinde vero hominum amanissimos quosque, five pauperes sint, five divites.—p. 557. Duobus
bus hisce praeditus fit ornamentis, Religione erga Deum, & in homines benignitate — Et Epist. 49. p.203. [ Sed velim omnes noftrum facerdotes omnino, qui Galatiam incolunt, vel minis impellas, vel ratione persuadeas, ut sint honesti; vel facerdotali ministerio abdices, finon una cum uxoribus, liberis, & famulis Diis colendis fedoulo animos attendant — Deinde facerdotem quemque hortare ne accedat ad spectacula, neve in taberna bibat, neuf'artem aliquam aut opificium turpe infameve exerceat. Et qui tibi in his rebus mo- rem gerunt, eis honorem tribuito: qui autem resiftunt expellito. ] Leg. & fragm. Epift. 62. We crave your leave to use the Presbyters as strictly as Julian did these Priests, and to expect as much piety and fobriety in them; and that you will not condemn all those for Puritanism, that will not be worse then this Apostle Pagan.

And for Discipline, could we have any from your Epifcopacy worth the naming, we should be the more reconcilable to it: But it hath not been, nor it cannot be. Common drunkards that were for twenty or thirty years together drunk usually once or twice a week, and abundance as prophane in other kinds, were the stated members of this Parish Church where now I live, in the Bishops dayes; and were safer from any trouble then the Puritans among them that would not imitate them. Let me here mind you of two of the following Arguments, which persuade us that your Prelacy is not of God, because it is destruotive of Dis- cipline.

1. When Epifcopacy was firft known in the Church, every Presbyterie, or Confeffus Presbyterorum had a Bishop; and every Presbyter had right to be a member of some fuch Presbyterie. And ferenfly would you have all the Presbyters in a Diocefs to be a Presbyterie, where your Bishop muft prefide for the ordinary Government of the

(c 3) Diocefs
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Diocess as one Church? Are you strangers in England? Or do you not know what abundance we have that in one Parish are every week scandalous by drunkenness, cursing, swearing, railing, or such like? And can all the Pastors travail so far to the Presbyterie so frequently without neglecting their Pastoral work? Or can all these people be persuaded without the Magistrates sword to travail so far to answer for their impiety? Will they not tell us, we have somewhat else to do? Are we not like to make them wait seven years and seven, before the most of them can have a tolerable tryal, when so many hundred Parishes, of which some one may have hundreds of obstinate scandalous persons, must all go so far, and have but one Judicature?

2. I beseech you give me leave but from Scripture, and from Dr. Hammonds Paraphrase, to lay before you the work of a Bishop, and then tell me whether one man, or ten, or an hundred can do this work for one of our ordinary Diocess, any more then one man can build a City?

1. A Bishop must be the publick Teacher of all the flock which he is to oversee. And can one man undertake this for many score or hundred Churches?

2. A Bishop must personally oversee and take care of all the flock, as Ignatius speaks, enquiring of each one by Name; and can a Bishop know and personally instruct so many hundred Parishes? These two parts of his Office I prove together: Acts. 20. 20. [I taught you publickly, and from house to house. 28. Take heed therefore to your selves and to all the flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood.

31. Therefore watch, and remember that by the space of three years, I ceased not to warn every one night and day with tears. See Dr. Hammond on the Text, who tells you that it is spoke to Bishops.

1 Pet.
The Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder——Feed the flock of God which is among you, taking the oversight thereof, not by constraint, but willingly, not for filthy lucre, but of a ready mind; neither as being Lords over God's Heritage, but as ensamples to the flock.]

See Dr. Hammond expounding it as spoken to Bishops, q. d. [The Bishops of your several Churches I exhort———take care of your several Churches, and govern them, not as secular Rulers by force (NB) but as Pastors do their sheep, by calling and going before them, that so they may follow of their own accord.]

Heb. 13. 7. Remember them that have the Rule over you, who have spoken unto you the word of God.] Dr. Hammond Paraphr. [Set before your eyes the Bishops and Governors that have been in your Church, and preached the Gospel to you———] O all you Inhabitants of Yorkshire, Lincolnshire, Norfolk, Suffolk, Essex, Middlesex, Kent, Worcestershire, &c. how many of your Parishes did ever hear a Bishop preach the Gospel to them?

Vers. 17. Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account.] D. H. [Obey those that are set to Rule you in your several Churches, the Bishops, whose whole care is spent among you, as being to give account of your proficiency in the Gospel.] O dreadful account, for him that must give it for so many thousands whose faces he never saw, and whose names he never heard, much less did ever speak a word to them!

1 Tim. 5. 17. Let the Elders that Rule well be counted worthy of double honour, especially they who...
who labour in the word and doctrine] see Dr. H. expounding it of Bishops.

1 Thes. 5. 12. And we beseech you Brethren to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and to esteem them very highly in love for their works sake] Dr. H. [Pay all due respects to the Bishops of your several Churches—Tell us ye Parishes of England, what labours have Bishops bestowed among you? or how many of you have they admonished? and which of them are you hence obliged to honour for their works sake? and is it them, or is it the Presbyters? I mention none of this as blaming Bishops for negligence; but as blaming them that will plead for, and undertake an impossible task; and after all with an hardened forehead will defend it with violence and separation from dissenters, when so many ages have told the world to their faces, that the undertaken task was never done.

3. It is the work of Bishops to confirm the Baptized: and is now made peculiar to them. D. H. [on Heb. 13. 1. To teach, exhort, confirm, and impose hands, were all the Bishops office in that place] And if so, then the examining all the persons in a Diocese, till they have just satisfaction that they are fit to be confirmed, and the actual Confirmation of them all, will be a considerable task of it self.

4. It is the Bishops work to exercise Discipline in the Church, by admonishing the unruly and disorderly, and hearing the case when the Church is told of those that have continued impenitent, and openly to rebuke them, and to cast them out by Excommunication, if they remain impenitent and unreformed. Dr. H. on Tit. 3. 10. [It is thy office and duty toward such an one, first to admonish him once or twice, and if that will not work upon him
him or reduce him, then to set a mark upon him, to inflict the censures on him, and to appoint all men to break off familiar converse with him. ] And O what abundance of work is this in the several parts, even in one Parish, much more in a Diocese, see Dr. H. on Mat. 18.17,18.

5. It is the Bishops work to take the principal care of the poor, and their flock, or the contributions for them, which contributions were made at every Assembly. See Dr. H. on 1 Cor. 12.28 e. [ The supream trust and charge was referred to the Apostles and Bishops of the Church. So in the 41. Canon of the Apostles: A Bishop must have the care of the monies, so that by his Power all be dispensed to the poor by the Presbyters and Deacons; and we command that he have in his Power the goods of the Church. So Justin Martyr Apol. 2. That which is gathered is deposited with the Prefect or Bishop, and he helps, relieves the Orphans and Widows, and becomes the Curator or Guardian to all absolutely (N B) that are in want. So Ignatius to Polycarp; After the Lord thou shalt be the Curator of the Widows. And Polycarp himself speaking of the Elders or Bishops, They visit and take care of all that are sick, not neglecting the Widow, the Orphan, or the poor. ] So Dr. H. read him further. Remember this, all you that are for our English Prelacy. See that the Bishop be at once in every Parish in his Diocese to receive the contributions. Or see that you put all into his hands and custody: see that he take care of all the poor, and widows, and orphans, in all your Country, and that all their monies be disbursed by him, or his special appointment, and be the common Overseer of the poor for his Diocese. And when you and he have tried this one seven years, come then and tell us, whether he will be any
any longer a Prelate, or you will any longer be for Prelacy. In the mean time judge in your Consciences by these passages of Antiquity cited by D. H. whether the antient Bishops had one Congregation, or many score or hundred to be their Pastoral charge?

6. Also it is a part of the Bishops work to visit the sick, and pray with them, and for them, Fam. 5. 14. Is any sick among you? let him call for the Elders of the Church, and let them pray over him. See Dr. H. that by Elders is meant the Bishops. E. Because there is no Evidence whereby these (inferiour Presbyters) may appear to have been brought into the Church so early, and because Πρεσβύτεροι in the plural, doth no way conclude that there were more of these Elders then one in each particular Church (any more then that the sick man was bound to call for more then one) and because Πρεσβύτεροι Elders of the Church was both in the Scripture stile, and in the first writers the title of Bishops: and lastly, because the visiting of the sick is ancintly mentioned as one branch of the Office of Bishops; therefore it may very reasonably be resolved, that the Bishops of the Church, one in each particular Church, but many in the Universal, are here meant.] so far Dr. H. Remember all you that are all for Prelacy, to send for the Bishop when you are sick, every person in the Diocese, according to this express command: And if he would do his work by a Deputy, remember, that in all that Diocese which was the Bishops charge in the Scripture-times, there was no Presbyter existent but himself, as is here confessed. So in the following words the same Learned Dr. further proveth from Antiquity, [that one part of the Bishops office is set down, that they are εἰκοσατριγυνοι πάντας ἀσθενεῖς, those that visit all the sick.] Let us have such Bishops as can and will do this, and our Controversie will soon be at an end about Episcopacy.
Were it not that I have spoken of these things afterwards, and fear being tedious, I should have shewed, that

7. Baptizing, 8. Congregating the Assemblies, 9. Administering the Lords Supper, 10. Guiding the Assembly in the whole publick worship, 11. Blessing the people at the dismission, and 12. Absolving the penitent; and more then all these were the works of the ancient Episcopal function. And now I leave it to the Conscience of any man that hath a grain of Conscience left him, whether one man be able, were he never so willing, to do any one of all these duties, much less to do all of them for many hundred Parishes? Can a Bishop teach them all, and Catechise and confer with all, and counsel, and comfort, and admonish all, and Govern all, and try all cases of every scandalous impenitent person of so many thousand, and Censure, and Absolve, and Confirm, and Try them for Confirmation, and receive all the Churches stock, and be the Overseer of all the poor, and take care of all the Orphans and Widdows, and visit, counsel, and pray with all the sick, and guide every Congregation in publick worship, and give the Sacrament to all, and pronounce the Blessing in every Assembly, &c. and this for a whole County or more? O wonderful, that ever this should become a Controversie among men, that vilifie others as unlearned and unwise in comparison of them? I must lay by respect to man so far, as plainly to profess, that I take these for such errors as must needs proceed from want of Piety and Conscience, and practice of the duties that are pleaded for. If these men did not talk of Governing a Church, as those talk of Governing a Navy, an Army, or a Commonwealth, that never set their hand to the work, it is not possible sure that they should thus err. O how many Bishops never tried what it is to Govern the Church, or faithfully perform any one of all these works! I solemnly profess, that with
The help of three more fellow Presbyters, and three or four Deacons, besides the greater help of abundance of Godly people here in their places, I am not able to do all this as it should be done, for this one Parish. And yet the greatest part of our trouble is taken off, by the refusal of the multitude of the ungodly to come under Discipline, or be members of our Pastoral charge. Sirs, these are not scholastick speculations! The everlasting Joy or Torment of our people lyeth upon the successful performance of these works (as we that are Christians verily believe) And therefore to Dispute, whether one man should do all this for a Diocese, is all one as to Dispute, whether it shall all be undone or no? and that is, whether we shall give up our Countries to the Devil or no? And shall the Prelatical Controversie come to this? You have no way to avoid it, but by Delegating your power to others, and casting your work upon them. But you confess that this was never done in Scripture-times, there being then no Subject Presbyters to whom it might be committed. And by what authority then can you do it? Can Episcopacy be transferred by Deputation to another? This is long ago confuted by many writers, Popish and Protestant. Do the work by another, and you shall have your wages by another. And what is your Office, but your Authority and Obligation to do your work? He therefore that you commit this to is a Bishop. So that this is but to make us Deputy Bishops. And if so, let us call them Bishops.

I have read many of your writers of late, that say we have no Government, and saith one of them, the Presbyterian Government was never yet set up in any one Parish in England.] These are strange things to be reported to English men. Perswade the world next that no man in England hath an nose on his face. Is it not known that the Presbyterian Government hath been exercised in Lon-
don in Lancashire, and in many Counties, these many years? And what Government is it that you think we want? The people are guided in the matters of God by their several Pastors. The Pastors live in Concord by Associations in many Countries. Both Pastors and People are Governed by the Magistracy: And what need we more? Look into this County where I live, and you shall find a faithful, humble, laborious Ministry, Associated and walking in as great unity as ever I read of since the Apostles days. No difference, no quarrels, but sweet and amicable Correspondency, and Communion, that I can hear of. Was there such a Ministry, or such love and concord, or such godly people under them in the Prelates reign? There was not: I lived where I do: and therefore I am able to say, there was not. Through the great mercy of God, where we had ten drunken Readers then, we have not one now: and where we had one able godly Preacher then, we have many now: and in my own charge, where there was one that then made any show of the fear of God, I hope there is twenty now: And the Families that were wont to scorn at holiness, and live in open impiety, are now devoted to the worship and obedience of the Lord. This is our loss and misery in these times which you so lament.

3. But perhaps you will refuse Communion with us, because of our differences from you in doctrine about the Controversies called Arminian. But the fierceness of many of you hereabouts doth serve but to discover your ignorance and uncharitableness. The Papists that differ among themselves about these points, can yet hold Communion in one Church: and cannot you with us? Will you be fiercer against us then the Jesuits against the Dominicans? Nay we go not near so far as they. We cleave to Augustine, and the Synod of Dort, who own not Physical Predetermination,
nation, and meddle not with Reprobation antecedent to foresight of sin, and who confess a sufficiency in Christ's satisfaction for all. And yet must we have those impotent clamors, with which the writings of Mr. Pierce and other such abound? Why then do you pretend to follow the Church of England, which Mr. Hickman hath shewed you plainly that you desert? Many of the highest Arminians are charitable peaceable men, that hate separation from their Dissenting Brethren. Curcellæus is one of the most eminent men living of that way. And how charitable and peaceable an Epistle hath he writ before D. Blondels book de Papiffa Joanna? And I hear that Mr. Hoard, the Author of the Book called Gods Love to mankind, lives in peaceable Communion with the Neighbour Ministers in Essex. And I have had Letters from many of that way with whom I Correspond, full of Christian Love and Piety, and hatred of calumny and separations. But verily I must tell you, that when we find any of you in your writings and Sermons making it your work to vilifie the Ministry, and with the Quakers to make them odious to the people, and making your jeers, and railing, and uncharitableness the life of your Sermons, we cannot but suspect that you are Popish Emissaries, while we find you in their work, or else that you are Malignant Enemies, and of the serpentine brood, whose heads shall shortly be bruised by the Lord.

4. And if it be the dispose of your Common Prayer that you separate from us for, I would know of you, whether you would have denied Communion with all that lived before it had a being. If this be your Religion, I may ask you, where was your Religion before Luther? before King Edwards daies? If you say in the Mass book (and what else can you say?) I ask you then, where was it before the Mass book had a being? Would you have denied Commu-
nion to the Apostles and all the Primitive Church for some hundreds of years, that never used your Book of Common Prayer? will you still make things indifferent, necessary?

2. One word to those of you that follow Grotius: I have shewed that he professeth himself a Papist, even in that Discussion which Mr. Pierce so magniseth as excellent. I hear Mr. Thorndike and others defend him: and some think I injure him by calling him a Papist. Wonderful! what will not be a Controversie among learned men? Are we fain among such that deny him to be a Papist, that professeth expressly to be satisfied, if evil manners be but corrected, (and school-opinions not imposed) which are contrary to Tradition and all Councils? and that professeth to own the Creed and Council of Trent, and all the Popish Councils whatsoever, and the Mistriship of Rome, and the Catholick Mastership of the Pope governing the Catholick Church according to these Councils? What is a Papist if this be none? I refer you to my Evidence in the Discovery of the Grotian Religion, and the first Chap. of the second Part of my Catholick Key, replying to Mr. Pierce. Conflute it rationally if you can. I shall now only desire you when you have read Rivet, to read a Book called Grotius Papizans, and to hearken to the testimony of an honest, learned Senator of Paris, that admired Grotius, and tells you what he is from his own mouth: and that is, Claud. Sarravius, who faith in his Epifol. pag. 52, 53. ad Gronov. [De ejus libro & libello postremis interrogatus, respondit plane Milererio Confona, Romanam fidem esse veram & finceram, solosque Clericorum mores degeneres schismati dedisse locum; ad ferbatque plura in hanc sententiam. Quid dicam e Merito quod fallo olim Paulo Agrippa non vel ab hac qua re eis maris meminist. — Deploro veris lachrymis tantam jacturam ] Here you have a credible witness, that from.
his own mouth reporteth it, that our Reformation was to Grotius a schism, and nothing but the ill manners of the Clergy gave us the opportunity. And pag. 190. Epist. ad Salmas. [Vis ergo me exerete dicere quid tentiam de postremo Grotii libro? & an omnia mihi in eo prohibentur? Rem rogas non magnam, nec adeo difficilem, quernque expedire promptum est. Tantum absit ut omnia probem, ut vix aliquid in eo reperiam, cui fine conditione calculus apponam meum. Verissime dixit ille qui primus dixit, Grotium Papizare. Vix tamen in isto scripto aliquid legi quod mirarer, quodve dixit non repente, quodve occurreret. Nunquid enim omnes istiusmodi ejusdem authoris lucubrationes erga Papistarum errores perpetuam & erga Jesuitas amorem, erga nos plus quam Vatinianum odium produnt & clamant: In Voto quod ejus nomen præfererebat, an veritus est haec præcautio profiteri?]

Had none of you owned Grotius his Popery, I would never have charged it on you. But when Grotius himself glorifieth of his adherents in England, and so many of you plainly defend him, and profess your owning of those books, and those doctrines in which his Popery is contained, (if ever Popery were known in the world) I must then crave your pardon, if I think somewhat the worse of Popery, because they that hold it are ashamed of it. For I abhor that Religion which a man bath cause to be ashamed of, and will not save him from being a loser by it, that owneth it, and standeth to it to the last. And I think that man hath no Religion, who hath none which he will openly profess and stand to.

I have at this time but these few requests to make to you, which I beseech you to answer without partiality.

1. That you will seriously consider, whether it be truly Catholick, to unchurch us, and so many Churches of Christ as
as are of our mind, as your partakers do? Because Catholicism is your pretense, consider whether you be not further from it than most people in the world?

2. Because I conceive this Book is not suited to your great objections, I desire your perusal of another that comes out with it, called A Key for Catholicks, especially the second Part, and if you cannot answer them, take heed how you continue Papists.

3. While you hold us for no Ministers or Churches, or capable of your Communion, it is in vain for us to hope for Communion with you; but we desire that you will consider of those terms of a more distant sort of Communion, which there I have propounded in the End of the first and second Part; and deny us not that much.

4. At least we beseech you, that while you are Papists, you will deal openly, and no worse with us than sober Papists that speak according to their consciences use to do. Do not let it (as the Lord Falkland speaks) be in the Power of so much per annum (nor of your factious interest) to keep you from professing yourselves to be what you are; and do not make the Protestant name a meer cloak to secure you in the opposing of the Protestant Cause, and follow not the example of Spalatensis, and the counsel of Campian and Parsons, in feigning a sort of doctrinal Puritans, and railing at Protestants under that name. Deal with us but as sober Papists do, and we shall take it thankfully. How highly doth Bodin a learned Papist extol the Presbyterian Discipline at Geneva from its effects, when among many of you it hath as odious titles as if it were some blasphemous damning thing. What sober Papist would talk as Mr. Pierce doth [p. 30. of the great abomination of the Presbyterian Directory, and not be able to name one thing in it that is abominable. Is it a great abomination to exhort and direct men to preach, and pray, and
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praise God, &c. If it be the Omission of his forms and Ceremonies, that is no Part of the book; and if it be some Directions that are against them, they that revile the Common Prayer book, as most Papists have done, or they that count such Ceremonies and Forms indifferent things, as others have done, have little reason to account that so great an abomination that directeth men to omit them. What abominable thing is imposed by the Directory? Tell us if you can. What excellent things doth Thuanus speak of the Presbyterians or Calvinists? and how highly doth he extol the most of their Leaders or Teachers whom he mentioneth? But to Mr. Pierce; what a bloody pernicious sort of men are they, unfit to live in a Commonwealth? And to Grotius; the Protestants are not only of bad lives, but by the Power of their Doctrine they are such. I have showed you in my Key for Catholicks how great the praises of Calvin are in the mouth of Papir. Maffonius, and other sober Papists; and the same may be said of others of our Divines, who are mentioned by you with most calumniating odious words. Even Maldonate the Jesuite, when he is railing at the Calvinists, confesseth of them, (in Matth. 7. 15.) that [Nothing was in their mouths but, the Lord, and our heavenly Father, and Christ, and Faith; an Oath was not heard: nothing appeared in their deeds, but Alms-deeds, and Temperance, and Modesty] Is this like your language of them? Nay, if Satan had dictated to him, how could he have uttered more falsehood and detestable calumniation than Mr. Pierce hath done, p. 73. when he saith [were Hacket, Lancaster, Arthington and others hanged for Non-conformity: or was it nothing but Ceremonial which Coppinger, &c. designed against the lives of the whole privy Council, and against the person of the Queen? were not Cartwright, and Travers, and Wentworth, and Egerton,
Egerton, and other Presbyterian Ministers privy to the plot: ] The Lord will rebuke this slanderous tongue. Did ever Cochlaeus, or Bolseck go beyond this man? How fully is it known that Hacket and his Companions were Grundletonians or Familists, just such as James Nailor, and the Quakers, (who are far nearer the Papists then the Puritans or Presbyterians) and that they madly came into London, Coppinger and Arthington, as his two Prophets, proclaiming Hacket to be Jesus Christ; and that for obstinate insisting on this Blasphemy, Hacket was hanged, and dyed blaspheming, and Arthington upon his Repentance published the whole Story of the beginning and progress of the business, as you may see it in the Book called Arthingtons Seduction. In which their madness, blasphemy, or any Treason of theirs or others, this man might as honestly have said, that Augustine, or Luther, or Cranmer had an hand, or were privy to the plot, as Cartwright, Travers, and such Presbyterian Ministers. What he hath read in Bancroft, I know not, nor much regard, till Bancroft himself be better cleared of what he is by writers charged with, concerning Ficlerus, Dolman, &c. and while he was known to be the most violent persecutor of the Puritans. But I see as the Papists will take it for a currant truth, that Luther was fetched away by the Devil, and that Calvin was stigmatized for Sodomy, and dyed blaspheming, &c. if they can but say, that one Cochlaeus or Bolseck of their own hath spoke it; so such men among us dare tell the world the most odious falsehoods of Cartwright, Travers, and the Presbyterian Ministers, if they can but say, that Bancroft said it before them. And now the rest may take it as unquestionable, when Mr. Pierce hath said it. Do these men believe that there is a day of Judgement? If they do, they make but lamentable preparation for it. And his assertion pag. 77.
that [Excommunicating Kings and killing them is the doctrine of the Presbyterians] and much more of his writing is of the same kind. To this I have given him an Answer in my Key for Catholicks, where he shall see whether Papists or Protestants are for King-killing? Had you not gone so far beyond such moderate Papists as Cassander, Hospitalius, Maffonius, Bodin, Thuanus, &c. in your enmity and bitterness against the Protestants, as clearly to contradict them, and to speak blood and venom, when they speak charitably, and honourably, we might have had more peaceable neighbours of you, though none of your Communion.

And I suppose that those who separate from us, as having no true Ministry or Churches, would have all these Ministers that they take for none, to be silenced and cast out. I do not think you will deny this to be your desire, and your purpose, if ever you should have power? And if so, what men are you? and what a case would you bring this Nation in? To your Objections I have answered in this book, and said somewhat more to you in another Preface. And upon the whole matter am forced now to conclude, that it is an Enmity to holiness in un-sanctified hearts that is the principal cause of our distance and divisions; and that the way to convince such men, as too many are that we deal with, is not Disputing, but praying to the Lord to change their hearts: And that if we could once persuade them but to the Love of God and Holiness, and to a serious practice of Christian Religion, and (if they be Bishops) to a faithful practice of those works of a Bishop which they confess are his duty, and to try Church-Government before they plead for what was never tried by them, our Controversies would then be ended: they would never more plead for such a Prelacy that destroyeth Piety, and Discipline, nor never revile the Servants of the Lord:
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nor never desire so much to promote the work of Hell, as the casting out all that they account no Ministers, and the casting off of all that they account no Ordinances or valid Administrations, would be. Farewel Disputing with such men, in order to their Conviction, and an healing peace.

Hoc non est artis, sed pietatis opus.

POSTSCRIPT.

What the Publisher of Dr. Stewards Sermon doth mean by his Commending it to my Consideration, when there is not a word in it that I am concerned in more then he, I understand not. If he thereby intimate, that I charged Dr. Steward to be of Grotius's Religion, or any other that disowneth it, he egregiously abuseth his Reader and himself. If he intend to argue that none of the Prelatical Party were Grotians, because Dr. Steward was not: Let him prove his Consequence; I disprove it, 1. From the testimony of Grotius himself. 2. From the mouths and books of those that have owned Grotius among us, even since they were acquainted with his judgement, and have owned his Votum & Discussio in particular. If his meaning (p. 3) be...
be that Dr. Steward was a Grotian, and yet no Papist: therefore Grotians are no Papists] one branch of his antecedent is false: Either he was no Grotian, or he was a Papist. Again I profess, that it is far from the desire of my soul, to raise so much as the least suspicion on any that own not the Doctrine and Design of Grotius. Disclaim it, and we are satisfied. Dr. Heylin was taken for as hot an antipuritan as most in England: and yet (in a moderate Letter to me) he disclaimeth Grotianism: which I mention, partly left any, by my naming him on another occasion in that Book, misconceive me to have accused him of this, and principally to discourage the defenders of Grotius, when such men as Dr. Heylin and Dr. Steward are against them.
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Disputation I.

Whether it be Necessary or Profitable to the right Order or the Peace of the Churches of England, that we restore the extruded Episcopacy? Neg.

Peace with Episcopal Divines to be sought, pag. 2, 3.

The Nature of Church-Government opened, pag. 5. to 14.

Twelve sorts of Bishops to be distinguished, pag. 14, 15.

Which of these may be admitted for Peace, pag. 16.

Unfixed General Ministers to do the Ordinary part of the Apostles work, are to be continued: proved, pag. 21, 22.

What Power Apostles had over other Ministers, p. 23, to 30.

The Authors Concessions for Episcopacy, pag. 30, 31.

Arguments against the English Prelacy. 1. It destroyeth Government and its end, pag. 32.

2. It gratifieth Satan and wicked men, pag. 36.

3. It unavoidably causeth divisions, pag. 37.

4. It suspendeth or degradeth all the Presbyters, pag. 38.

5. It maketh Lay-men Church-governors.

6. And oppresseth the Bishops with guilt, pag. 44.

7. It...
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7. It is the product of pride, pag.45.
8. It gratifieth lazy Ministers, pag.46.
9. It is not of God's Institution, pag.48.
10. It is contrary to God's word, pag 51.
11. It is unsafe, as never used in Scripture times.
How fully the supposition is granted us, pag.58,59.

Many Reasons proving that the Apostles (who de facto are confessed by Dr. H. to have settled no subject Presbyters in Scripture times, but one Bishop over one stated Congregation) intended not the changing of this Order afterwards, pag 63. to 74, &c.

More Arguments that Diocesan Bishops are no Scripture-Bishops, pag 75.
They are contrary to the Jewish and Apostolical Government, pag.76,77.
Proved by two Arguments more, pag.83,84.
The Confession of Episcopal writers, pag.85,86.

Against Diocesan Bishops (of many Churches) the Testimony of Clemens Romanus,p.87. (with Grotius's exposition), pag 88.
Of Polycarps and Ignatius (who is full against them) pag.88.
Of Iustin Martyr, and Gregory Neocæsariensis, pag.92,93.

Tertullian, pag.93,94.
Of Clemens Alexandr. and from the late division of Parishes, pag.96.
Ninius testimony cited by Mr. Thorndike of 365. Bishopricks planted by Patrick in Ireland, pag. 96, 97.
More cited by Usher, pag.97.
The Testimonies of Councils, pag.98. to 103.
Many weighty Consequences of the proved point, pag.103.
D I S P U T A T I O N  2.

THOSE who Nullifie our present Ministry and Churches which have not the Prelatical Ordination, and teach the people to do the like, do incur the guilt of grievous sin.

One Letter of a Minister of another County that openeth the Necessity of this Disputation, pag. 127.
Chap. 1. A Minister of Christ defined, pag. 130.
Whether Special Grace be Necessary to the being of a Minister, pag. 130, 131.
What Qualifications are Necessary, pag. 132.
Ministers Christ's Officers, pag. 133.
Must be separated to the work, pag. 134.
Who are the true objects of the Ministry, pag. 134, &c.
Whether the Pastors or Church be first, p. 136.
Whether a particular Church or the Universal be first, ibid.

The Pastors work in a particular Church, p. 137.
How far Intention is Necessary to the Validity of an administration, p. 138.
A Call to exercise after a Call to Office, p. 139.
Chap. 2. Of the Nature and Ends of Ordination, shewing what it is that is the Ordainers work, and what not, p. 141.

Chap. 3. Humane Ordination not of Constant Necessity to the Being of the Ministry, fully proved, p. 150.
Chap. 4. An uninterrupted Succession of Regular Ordination is not of Necessity, p. 168. proved.
Chap. 5. Ordination by such as the English Relates, not Necessary to the Being of the Ministry, proved, p. 178.

(f ) Objections
The Contents.

Objections Answered.

Chap 6. Ordination especially at this time by English Prelates is unnecessary, p. 190.

Chap. 7. The Ordination used now in England, and in other Protestant Churches is valid and agreeable to Scripture, and the practice of the ancient Church, p. 198. fully proved: and so our Ministry vindicated, by twenty Arguments.

Chap. 8. The greatness of their sin that are now labouring to persuade the people of the Nullity of our Ministry, Churches and Administrations: Manifested in forty aggravations, p. 240.

Chap. 9. The sinfulness of despising or neglecting Ordination, p. 252.

The distinct power of Pastors, People and Magistrates to our Call, p. 253.

Approbation of Pastors must be sought, p. 258.

What Pastors should be sought to for Ordination, p. 266.

Disputation 3.

An Episcopacy desirable for the Reformation, Preservation, and Peace of the Churches, p. 274.

Chap. 1. Of General unfixed Bishops or Ministers, p. 275.

Chap. 2. Of fixed Pastors, that also participate in the work of the unfixed, p. 286.

Chap. 3. It is lawful for the several Associations of Pastors, to choose one man to be their President durante vita, if he continue fit, p. 297.

What power shall such have? p. 301.

Chap. 4. It is lawful for the Presbyters of a particular Church to have a fixed President for life, p. 307.

Chap. 5.
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Chap. 5. Objections against the forementioned Presidency answered, p. 316.

Chap. 6. The summ of the foregoing Propositions, and the Consistency of them, with the principles of each party, and so their aptitude to reconcile, p. 335.

Chap 7. Some Instances proving that moderate men will agree upon the forementioned terms, p. 339.

Bishop Halls full Consent, p. 340, 341.

Dr. Hide (of the new party) stigmatizeth his book with the brand of irrational Separatism and Recusancy, p. 342, 343.

Bishop Ushers full Consent to us, p. 344, with Dr. Holdworths, and Dr. Forbs.

The Presbyterians Consent to the same terms. Mr. Gatakers, Mr. Gerees, the London Province, Beza's, Calvins, Mr. Rich. Vines in two Letters: Bishops can have no other power over Pastors of other Churches, then the Synods have, p. 347, 348.

Presbyterians for a Church of one Congregation, p. 348.


---

Disputation 4.

Whether a stinted Liturgy or Form of worship be a desirable means for the peace of these Churches? Proposition. 1. A stinted Liturgy is in itself lawful, Prop. 2. A stinted Liturgy in some parts of publick holy service is ordinarily necessary, Prop. 3. In those parts of publick worship where a form is not of ordinary necessity, but only lawful, yet may it not only be submitted to, but desired, when the peace of the Church doth accidentally require it, (f 2) Prop. 4.
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Prop 4. So great is the difference between men and men, times and times, that forms may be a duty to some men, and at some times, and a sin to other men, and at other times, p.368.

Prop. 5. The Ministers and Churches that earnestly desire it, should not by the Magistrate be absolutely and generally prohibited the use of a convenient stilted Liturgy, p.372.

Prop. 6. To prescribe a form of prayer, preaching (or other service where is no necessity of it) and to lay a Necessity on it, as to the thing itself, or the Churches peace, &c. and to punish, silence, suspend, excommunicate, or reproach as Schismaticks the able, godly, peaceable Ministers or People that (justly or unjustly) dare not use it, is so great a sin, that no godly Ministers should desire or attempt it, nor any godly Magistrate suffer it, p.373.

Prop. 7. The safest way of composing a stilted Liturgy, is to take it all, or as much as may be, for words as well as matter, out of the holy Scripture, p.378.

Prop. 8. Yet is it lawful to use a Liturgy that is not so taken out of Scripture as to words, p.380.

Prop. 9. The matter of a Liturgy in which the Concord of many is expected, must not be doubtful or unnecessary things, ibid.

Prop. 10. Humane forms of publick prayer or other worship (excepting the fore excepted necessary cases, as Psalms, &c.) should not be constantly used by Ministers that have liberty, and are able to pray without them: Nor should any (ordinarily) be admitted into the Ministry (except in great Necessities of the Church) that are not able to pray without such forms, p.381.

Objections on both sides, p.386.

The sum of this Dispute, p.392.
Qu. \( \text{VV} \) Whether humane Ceremonies be Necessary or Profitable to the Church?

Chap. 1. Distinctions and Propositions in order to the decision, ibid.

Chap. 2. Ceremonies forbidden, or which man hath not power to institute, are not to be imposed as profitable or lawful, p.399. which those be.

Instances of all our commonly controverted Ceremonies considered, p.409.

Chap. 3. In such unlawful impositions it is an aggravation of the sin, if Ceremonies are pretended to be Divine,

Chap. 4. If things unlawful are commanded as indifferent, or things indifferent as necessary, they are sinfully imposed: and the more, because of such pretenses, p.427.

Chap. 5. A lawful and convenient thing is sinfully imposed, when it is imposed on a greater penalty then the nature and use of it doth require, or then the common good will bear,

Chap. 6. It is not lawful to make any thing the subjects duty by a Command, that is meerly indifferent antecedently, both in it self and as cloathed with its accidents,

Chap. 7. Some things may be lawfully and profitably commanded at one Time and Place, and to one sort of People, that may not at, or to another, no nor be obeyed if commanded,

Chap. 8. Those orders may be profitable for the peace of the Churches in one Nation, that are not necessary to the peace of the Churches of many Nations,

Chap. 9. There is no meer Humane Universal Soveraign, (f3)
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Civil or Ecclesiastical over the whole Church, and therefore none to make Laws obligatory to the whole, p.448.

Chap. 10. If it be not our Lawful Governors that command us, but usurpers, we are not formally bound to obey them, though the things be lawful which they command, p.452.

Chap. 11. The Commands of lawful Governors about lawful Ceremonies, must be understood and obeyed with such exceptions as do secure the End: and not to the subverting of it, p.458.

Chap. 12. It may be very sinful to command some Ceremonies, when yet it may be the subject's duty to use them when they are commanded, p.460.

Chap. 13. The Constant use of things indifferent should not be commanded ordinarily (see the exceptions) but they should be sometimes used, sometimes not, p.464.

Chap. 14. Thirty Reasons against the imposing of our late Controverted Mystical Ceremonies, as Crossing, Surplice, &c., p.467.

Chap. 15. Reasons persuading to Obedience in Lawful things, p.483.

ERRATA.
ERRATA.

Page 10. 1. 4. r. had not been by themselves. p. 24. l. 23. for Philetas, r. Alexander.

p. 30. l. penult. for Perfect, r. President. p. 33. l. 34; 35. r. the 2000th. or 3000th. person. p. 37. l. 34. for it, r. is. p. 41. l. 9. r. Presbyterie. p. 72. l. ult. for that, r. the. p. 77. l. 24. r. occasioning. p. 78. l. 16. r. had in it. p. 81. l. 1. blot out any. l. 28. for at all, r. all. l. 29. blot out the. p. 87. l. 17. for had r. have. Marg. l. 5. r.خام. p. 88. l. 17. for Prelacy, r. Polycarp. l. 37. for there that, r. that there. p. 89. l. 2. r. Günther. p. 93. l. 3. r. he was, and l. 34. for ad, r. at. p. 94. l. 29. r. we well.

An Advertisement to prevent misunderstanding.

My exceeding scarcity of time, constraining me to write these Papers in much haste, and allowing me but a cursory perusal of them when written, and the like after the printing, for the collecting the Errata of the Press, I find by this hasty review, and by some observation of mens readiness to misunderstand me, that it is necessary to speak a little more about the following particulars, that I may be understood by such as are willing to understand me: and the mistakes of others I shall easily bear.

Sect. 1. Pag. 89. There is somewhat that requireth correction of the pen, and somewhat that requireth explanation. In translating that passage of Ignatius, [Unus panis qui pro omnibus fractus est must be written next effusus est] before [& unus Calix.] And for the following objection, though it was made by a discreet person, yet I know no ground for it: unless If. Vossius his Edition leave out [πειρη μή εκθειοοι] (which I have not now at hand, but is likely) I know not of any Greek copy that leaves it out. Indeed Bishop Ushers Latine doth, and the Vulgar Latine leaves out the translation of the next words before it [τοις λαοις δειγματικαν εν ισχαιμαν] of which faith Bishop Usher [Ex interpretatione hac excidisse videantur.] And noting the corruption of the Vulgar Translation in this very place, I there premised to my Answer,
that it might occasion a change in the Text: that it 
hath done so in many places, I think is easy to prove; but 
that it hath done so here, there is no probability, (if any 
Greek Copy be as is objected: ) and the Reasons of my con-
jecture of the possibility, are so little for a probability, 
that as I express them not, so I think them not worth the 
expressing, but rather bid you take that as non dictum. 
Though of the general I find Bishop Usher himself saying, 
both of his Latine Version [Ex ea sola integritati sue 
restitui posse Ignatium, polliceri non ausim,] and of 
the first Greek Edition [Hanc reliqui sequuti sunt edito-
tores, non ex Graeco aliquo codice alio, sed partim ex 
ingenio, partim ex veteri Vulgato Latino Interprete, 
non paucis in locis eandem corrigentes] Epil. ad Lect. 

Sect. 2. I must intreat the Reader to observe that my 
drift in this writing is not so much to oppose any form of 
Government merely as contrary to the Institution or Apo-
stolical Rule, as to plead against that which I take to be 
destructive to the Ends of Government: Not that I desire 
not a careful adhering to the sacred Rule, but I. Because 
I suppose that many circumstantialis of Discipline unde-
termined in the Word are feigned by some to be substan-
tial necessary things: and that many matters are indif-
ferent that some lay the Peace if not the being of the Church 
upon. 2. Because I so far hate contention, that if any 
Government contrary to my Judgement were set up, that 
did not apparently in the nature of it wrong the Church, 
I would. silently live under it in peace and quietness: and 
accordingly would be now loth to enter a quarrel with any 
Writers that differ from us in tolerable things: But if I 
know that their judgement reduced to practice is like to 
be the undoing of many souls, and to cast Discipline almost 
wholly out of the Church. I think it better to displease 
them.
them, then let them undo the Church without contradiction. The best is, the serious Christians of this age have experience to help them to understand the case, and I suppose my Disputation to be unto them as if I disputed before a man that is restored from want, or banishment or sickness, whether he should be reduced to the Condition from which he is restored?

Sect. 3. Some passages here will occasion the Question (as p. 5.) Whether and how far Church Government is jure Divino? But of this, in the main I am agreed with them that I dispute. To speak further, my own judgement is, 1. That the Spirit of God hath established all the Officers and worship-Ordinances of his Church; and that no new Church-office or Ordinance of worship (as to the substance) may be instituted by man; 2. But that there are many Circumstantialis about the Exercise of those Offices and Ordinances, that are not determined particularly by a Law, but are left to humane prudence to determine of, by the General directions of the Law. And so I suppose that Bishops and Presbyters are but one Office, of God's institution; but in the exercise of this Office if one for order be made a Moderator or President of the rest, or by agreement (upon a disparity of parts or interest) do unequally divide their work between them, in the exercise, it is a thing that may be done, and is fit where the Edification of the Church requireth it, but not a thing that always must be done, nor is of itself a Duty, but a thing indifferent. The following Case therefore I hence resolve.

Sect. 4. Quest. [Whether the Order of subject Presbyters might lawfully be created by Bishops or any humane Power: and whether the Order of Bishops might lawfully be created for the avoiding of Schism by the consent of Presbyters: or Metropolitans by Bishops:]
Anfw. If you understand by the word [Order] a distinct Office, none may create any of these but God. But if by [Subject Presbyters] be meant only men of the same Office with Bishops, that do for the Churches benefit subject themselves to the direction or Presidency of another, (upon some disparity in their gifts or the like) in the exercise of that Office, I suppose that this is a thing that by Consent may be lawfully done. And so I verily believe that betimes in the Church it was done, (of which anon.) So if by [Bishops] be meant no distinct Office, but one of the Presbyters chosen from among the rest, to exercise his Ministry in some eminency above the rest, by reason of his greater Gifts, or for Peace and Order, I doubt not but it is a thing that consent may do: (And accordingly the Canon Law defines a Bishop that he is [Unus e Presbyteris, &c.] So if by [a Metropolitan] be not meant another Office, but one in the same Office, by reason of the advantage of his Seat, chosen to some acts of Order for the common benefit, I doubt not but it may be done: but every such Indifferent thing, is not to be made Necessary, statedly and universally to the Church.

Sect. 5. When I do in these Papers plead that the Order of Subject Presbyters was not instituted in Scripture times, and consequently that it is not of Divine Institution, I mean as aforesaid, that as a distinct Office, or Species of Church ministers, as to the Power from God, it is not of Divine Institution, nor a lawful Institution of man, but that among men, in the same Office, some might Prudentially be chosen to an eminency of degree as to the exercise; and that according to the difference of their advantages there might be a disparity in the use of their authority and gifts, I think was done in Scripture times, and might have been after, if it had not then. And my judgement is, that ordinarily every particular Church, (such
(such as our Parish Churches are) had more Elders then one, but not such store of men of eminent gifts as that all these Elders could be such. But as if half a dozen of the most judicious persons of this Parish were Ordained to be Elders, of the same Office with myself, but because they are not equally fit for publick preaching, should most imploy themselves in the rest of the Oversight, consenting that the publick preaching lie most upon me, and that I be the Moderator of them for Order in Circumstantialls: This I think was the true Episcopacy and Presbytery of the first times. From the mistake of which, two contrary Errors have arisen: The one of those that think this Moderator was of another Office in specie, having certain work assigned him by God, which is above the reach of the Office of Presbyters to perform; and that he had many fixed Churches for his charge. The other of them that think these Elders were such as are called now Lay-elders, that is, Unordained men, authorized to Govern, without Authority to Preach, Baptize, or Administer the Lords Supper. And so both the Prelatical on one side, and the Presbyterians and Independents on the other side, run out, and mistake the ancient form, and then contend against each other. (This was the substance of what I wrote to Mr. Vines, which his subjoined Letter refers to, where he signifieth that his judgement was the same.) When Paul and Barnabas were together, Paul was the chief speaker, and yet Barnabas by the Idolaters called Jupiter. Nature teacheth us that men in the same Office should yet have the preheminence that's due to them by their Age, and Parts, and Interests, &c. and that Order should be kept among them, as in Colleges and all Societies is usual. The most excellent part of our work is publick preaching, but the most of it for quantity is the rest of the Oversight of the Church (in Instructing personality, admonishing, reproving, enquiring into the truth of accusa-
tions, comforting, visiting the sick, establishing the weak, looking to the poor, absolving, answering doubts, excommunicating, and much more.) And therefore as there is a necessity (as the experienced know) of many Elders in a particular Church of any great number, so it is fit that most hands should be most employed about the said works of Oversight, yet so as that they may preach as need and occasion requireth (and administer Sacraments) and that the eminent Speakers be most employed in publick preaching, yet so as to do their part of the rest as occasion requireth: And so the former Elders that Rule well shall be worthy of double honour, but especially these that labour in the Word and Doctrine, by more ordinary publick preaching: And such kind of seldom-preaching Ministers as the former, were in the first times, and should be in most Churches yet that are numerous.

Sect. 6. When I speak in these Papers therefore of other mens Concessions that there were de facto in Scripture times, but One Bishop without any subject Presbyters to a particular Church, remember that I speak not my own judgement, but urge against them their own Concessions: And when I profess my Agreement with them, it is not in this, much less in all things, (for then I needed not dispute against them,) but it is in this much, that in Scripture times there was de facto, 1. No meer Bishop of many particular Churches (or stated worshipping Congregations,) 2. Nor any distinct Office or Order of Presbyters, that radically had no Power to Ordain, or Govern, or Confirm, &c. (which are the subject Presbyters I mean.)

Sect. 7. Specially remember that by [Bishops] in that dispute, I mean, according to the Modern use, one that is no Archbishop, and yet no meer Presbyter, but one supposed to be between both, that is, a Superior to meer Presbyters in Order or Office, and not only in degree or modification
cation of the exercise; but below Archbishops (whether in Order or Degree:) These are they that I dispute against, excluding Metropolitans, or Archbishops from the question, and that for many Reasons.

Sect. 8. If it were proved or granted that there were Archbishops in those times, of Divine Institution, it would no whit weaken my Arguments; For it is only the lowest sort of Bishops that I dispute about: yea it confirmeth them. For if every combination of many particular Churches had an Archbishop, then the Governors of such Combinations were not mere Bishops, and then the mere Bishops were Parish Bishops, or Bishops of single Churches only: and that is it that I plead for, against Diocesan Bishops, that have many of these Churches (perhaps some hundreds) under one Bishop of the lowest rank, having only Presbyters under him of another Order.

Sect. 9. If any think that I should have answered all that is written for an Apostolical Institution of Metropolitans, or of Archbishops, or of the subject sort of Presbyters, or other points here taught, I answer them, 1. In the former my work was not much concerned; nor can any man prove me engaged to do all that he fancieth me concerned to do. 2. Few men love to be contradicted and confuted, and I have no reason to provoke them further then necessity requireth it. 3. I take not all that I read for an argument so considerable, as to need Replyes. If any value the Arguments that I took not to need an Answer, let them make their best of them: I have taken none of them out of their hands by robbing them of their Books; if they think them valid, let them be so to them. Every Book that we write must not be in folio; and if it were, we should leave some body unanswered still. I have not been a contemner or neglecter of the writings of the contrary-minded. But voluminously to tell the world of that I think.
think they abuse or are abused in, is unpleasing and unprofitable.

Sect. 10. And as to the Jus Divinum of limited Diocesses to the Apostles as Bishops, and of Archbishops, Metropolitans, &c. I shall say but this: 1. That I take not all for currant in matter of fact, that two, or three, or twice so many say was done, when I have either cross testimony, or valid Reasons of the improbability: I believe such Historians but with a humane faith, and allow them such a degree of that, as the probability of their report, and credibility of the persons doth require. 2. I take it for no proof that all that was done in all the Churches, that I am told was done in some. 3. I take the Law of Nature and Scripture to be the entire Divine Law, for the Government of the Church and World. 4. And therefore if any Father or Historian tell me, that this was delivered by the Apostles as a Law to the Universal Church, which is not contained in Scriptures, nor to be proved by them, I will not believe them; no more then I would have believed Papius and all his Millenarist followers, that pretended Tradition from Saint John; nor any more then I would have believed the Asians or Romans that pretended different times for Easter, as a Tradition Apostolical binding the whole Church. 5. If it were proved that de facto the Apostles did thus or thus dispose of a circumstance of Government or Worship, which yet is undetermined in Scripture, I take it not for a sufficient proof, that they intended that Fact for an Universal Law, or that they meant to bind all the Churches in all ages to do the like: no more then Christ intended at the Institution of his Supper to tie all ages to do it after Supper, in an upper room, but with twelve, and sitting, &c. 6. Ye or if I had found a Direction or Command from the Apostles, as Prudential determiners of a Circumstance pro tempore & loco
loco only (as of the kifs of love, hair, covering, eating things strangled, and blood, &c.) I take it not for a proof that this is an universal standing Law. One or two of these exceptions will shake off the proofs that some count strong for the universal obligation of the Church to Diocesans or Metropolitans.

Sect. 11. That the Apostles had Episcopal Power (I mean such in each Church where they came, as the fixed Bishops had) I doubt not. And because they founded Churches according to the success of their labors, and settled them, and if they could, again visited them, therefore I blame not the Ancients for calling them the Bishops of those Churches. But that each man of them was really a fixed Metropolitan, or Patriarch, or had his proper Diocese, in which he was Governor in chief, and into which no other Apostle might come as an equal Governor without his leave, this and such like is as well proved by silence as by all that I have read for it of Reason, or History, that is, the Testimonies of the Ancients. I find them sometime claiming a special interest in the Children they have begotten by their Ministry: But doubtless when Paul & Barnabas or Silas went together, some might be converted by one, and some by another within the same Diocese or City. If any man shall convince me, that any great stress doth lie upon this question, I shall be willing to give him more of my reasons for what I say.

Sect. 12. And as to them that confidently teach that the Apostles suited the Ecclesiastical Government to the Politick, and that as by a Law, for the Church universally to obey: All the controversy at present that I will trouble them with, shall be to tell them, that I never saw anything like a proof of it, to my understanding, among all the words that are brought to that purpose: and to tell them, 1. That if Paul chose Ephesus, Corinth, and other the most populous places to preach in, it was but a prudent circumstantiating of his work, according to that General Law of doing all to Edification: and not an obli-
gation on all the Pastors or Preachers of the Gospel to do the same where the case is not the same. 2. And if Paul having converted many in these Cities do there plant Churches (and no other can be proved in Scripture times) it follows not that we may plant no Churches but in Cities.

3. And if the greatest Cities had then the most numerous Churches and the most eminent Pastors fitted to them, and therefore are named with some note of excellency above the rest, it followeth not that the rest about them were under them by subjection. 4. Treasury the Bishops of the chief Cities for order sake were to call Provincial Assemblies, and the meetings to be in their Cities, and they were to be the Presidents of the rest in Synods, with such like circumstantial difference, it followeth not that they were proper Governors of the rest, and the rest to obey them in the Government of their proper charges. Nor that they had power to place and displace them. 5. Much less will it prove that these Metropolitanians, taking the name of Diocesans, might put down all the Bishops of two hundred Churches under them, and set up none but Presbyters (in order distinct from Bishops) over the flocks, besides themselves; and so the Archbishops having extinguished all the first Order of Bishops of single Churches, to take the sole Government of so many Churches, even people as well as Presbyters into their own hands. 6. And I do not think that they can prove that the Apostles did institute as many sorts of Church-Government then, as there were of civil policy in the world. All the world had not the Roman form of Government: Nor had lesser Cities the same dependence upon greater, in all other Countryes. 7. Was it in one degree of subordination of Officers only, or in all, that the Apostles suited the Ecclesiasticall Government to the Civil? If in one, how is it proved that they intended it in that one, and not in the rest? If in all, then we must
have many degrees of Officers, more then yet we have: Inferiors very many, and Superiors some of all conscience too high: then we must have some to answer the Correctors, the Consular Presidents, and the Vicars, and Lieutenants, the Pro-consuls and Prefepts, and the Emperor himself: Even one to be Universal in the Empire ( thats yet some Limit to the Pope, and will hazzard the removing of the Supremacy to Constantinople, by the Rule that the Apostles are supposed to go by.) And great variety must there be in the several Dioceses of the Empire (which Blondell hath punctually described de primatu in Eccles. pag. 511. to 519. shewing the causes of the inequality of Bishopricks and Churches.) 8. According to this Opinion the form of Church must alter as oft as Emperours will change their Policy, or Wars shall change them: And upon every change of the Priviledges of a City, the Churches Preheminence must change, and so we shall be in a mutable frame: Which if Basil and Anthymius had understood, might have quicklier decided their controversy. Yea according to this opinion, Princes may quite take down Metropolitans at pleasure, by equaling the priviledges of their Cities. The best is then, that it is in the power of our Civil Governours to disslove our obligation to Metropolitans, yea and to all Bishops too, if Cities must be their only residence, as I have shewed.

Sect. 13: As for them that pretend humane Laws for their form of Government, that is, the decrees of General Councils; I answer, 1. I disown and deny all humane Laws as obligatory to the Church Universal: It is the prerogative of God, yea the greatest point of the exercise of his So- raignty to be the Law-giver to his Universal Church. There can be no Universal Laws without an Universal Law-giver: and there is no Universal Law-giver under Christ in the world. 2. And for General Councils (since
Scripture times at least there have been no such things nor anything like them, unless the Roman Empire, yea a piece of it, be the whole world. I know therefore no humane Universal Laws, whether it be for forms of Government, Liturgies, Holy days, or any thing else.

Sect. 14. But the principal matter that tends to end our difference, is, the right understanding of the Nature of that Government that is properly Ecclesiastical: What is it that we must have Diocesans and Metropolitan to do? (besides what I have granted to Apostolical Bishops in the third Dispute?) Is it to Teach or Rule the people of the particular Churches? They cannot do it at so great distance, not knowing them nor conversing with them; at least so well as they that are on the place, as the ancient Bishops were. Is it to Rule the Presbyters only? Why then hath not every Church a Bishop to Rule the flock, but a Presbyter that is forbidden to Rule them (in all that which they call Jurisdiction themselves)? And how is it that Presbyters shall be Ruled by Diocesans, and the Diocesans by Provincials? not by force: For the Pastors have no coercive power by violence, or touching mens bodies or estates. Is it by bare commanding? Why what will that do on dissenters that disobey? shall they depose the Bishops or Presbyters that disobey them? But how? Not by any force, but command, or exhortation, or Excommunication. They can do no more that I know of. And what if they excommunicate a Pastor! Let the case be supposed as now it is among us: What if a Bishop with the few that adhere to him, excommunicated all the Pastors in the County that are not satisfied of the Divine Right of Diocesans, or of the lawfulness of all his imposed Ceremonies and Forms? The people will take it to be their duty (most generally where the Ministry hath been savingly effectual) to own their Pastors notwithstanding such an Excommunication, and the Pastors will take it to be
be their duty to go on with their work: and the excommunication will do no good (unless perhaps to make some division, and make both parties the scorn of the ungodly, or procure the rabble to rail more bitterly at their pastors, and hate all their advice, be a desirable good.) And as when the Pope excommunicated them, some Bishops again excommunicated the Pope; so some of these pastors its like would excommunicate their Metropolitans: And why a Bishop, or at least a Synod of Bishops may not cast a wicked Metropolitan out of their communion, is past my understanding to conceive.

Synods are for Communion of Churches; and if we had a Monarchical, National Church in conformity to the Commonwealth, I know not how it would stand with the Law of God, for the whole Nation to hold Communion with an Heretical Primate. A Roman Synod deposed John the thirteenth, and other Popes have been deposed by Councils. I conclude therefore, that what ever power men claim, if the Magistrate interpose not (which is extrinsick to the Church-Government in question) it will work but on mens Judgements, call it Deposing, Excommunicating, or what you please: and this power no man can take from you but by hindring you to speak. You may now depose thus and excommunicate whom you please, and when they have slighted it, or excommunicated you again, you will have done. Nay I think you do excommunicate us already: For you withdraw from our Communion, and draw many with you, and so you exercise your power (I mean it of that party that in the second Disputation I have to do with.)

Sect 15. Much of my Opposition to the English Prelacy dependeth on the supposition, that they took all the people, and not only the Presbyters for the objects of their Government, or for their charge: And I find some of the younger sort that are sprung up since their fall, in doubt of this. But 1. all men in England that know
but twenty year ago what belonged to these matters, are past doubt of it. And I have no mind to dispute against them that contradict the common knowledge of the Nation: as if they should doubt whether we had ever a King in England.

2. Read over the Canons, and the yearly Visitation Articles (which the Church-wardens ordinarily swear to present by, before they had ever read the Book, or heard what was in it) and then judge. 3. Their arguing for the sole Jurisdiction of Bishops, and that they only were properly Pastors, and that Presbyter's had not the Key of Discipline, but of Doctrine, is some evidence. 4. It is known to the Nation, that the Pastors of the Parish Churches had no power by their Laws (or sufferance) to cast out any the most enormous sinner or Heretic from the Church, nor to bring them to open confession of their sin, nor to Absolve the penitent, but by Reading of their Sentence, and publishing what they sent from their Courts; and consequently could do nothing of all the means in order hereto: (For the means cannot be used where the end is known to be impossible.) All the obstinate scandalous persons, and scorners at a holy life, we must take as members of our Churches, having no power to cast them out. Indeed we had the same power as the Church-wardens, to put our names to their presentments. But a power of accusing to a Chancellors Court is not a Power of Governing; especially when Piety under the name of Preciseness and Puritanism, was so hated and persecuted, that to have accused a man for mere profaneness would have been so far from obtaining the end, as that it was like to have been the undoing of the accuser, except he had been out of the suspicion of Preciseness (as they called it) himself. But I need not dispute this with any but those that being bred in better times (though far from what we desire) are unacquainted with the case of their Predecessor.

Sect. 16. Object. But do you not contradict your self,
(15)

Yet, in saying the Pastors were degraded or suspended, as to the exercise of so great a part of their work, and yet say here, & Pref. to the Reformed Pastor, that the Power of Discipline was given them? ] Ans. 1. In their Ordination the Bishops said to them [Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted; whose sins thou dost retain they are detained.] And in the Book of Ordination it was asked of them [Whether they would give their faithful diligence always to administer the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Realm hath received the same according to the Commandments of God? ] And the Rubric of the Common Prayer Book enableneth the Curate to admonish open and notorious evil livers by whom the Congregation is offended, and those that have wronged their neighbors, that they come not till they have openly declared that they have repented and amended. ] But 1. This doth but serve to leave them unexcusable, that acknowledged Discipline to belong to the Office of a Presbyter, when yet he might not exercise it. The Bishops in the Ordination of Presbyters enabled them to preach the Gospel: And yet they were after that forbidden to preach till they had a License; and it was put into the Visitation Articles, to present those Ministers that preached without License. If they will deny us the exercise of the Power that they first confess belongeth to our Office, we are not answerable for their self-contradictions. 2. By Discipline I suppose they mean but our Instruction, and our publishing their Orders for Penance, Excommunication, or Absolution. 3. They were the Judges of the sense of the Laws, as far as the execut has required: And the Universal practice of England, with their writings, shewed us, to our cost, their judgement. What good would it do us, if the Law had been on our side, while the Concur-
rent Judgement and Practice of the Governors denied it, and went against it. 4. He that had kept a man from the Sacrament, according to the plain words of the Rubrick, was to have been accountable for it at their Courts, and so likely (if he had been a man of serious piety, and not a persecutor of Puritans) to have been undone by it, and was like to make so little of it, as to the Ends of Discipline (all men being compelled by the Presentments to receive the Sacrament) that I never knew one (to my best remembrance) in 25 years time that I lived under the Bishops, that was kept from the Sacrament, except a Puritan that scrupled to take it kneeling. And what was this to true Church Government?

Sect. 17. Object. But either they did it according to the established Law, or not: If they did, the fault was in the Law, and not in them: If they did transgress the Law, then the fault was in mens abuse, and the Law and Order cannot be blamed. Answ. A sad case to poor ignorant miserable souls, that they must be left in obstinacy, and deprived of Gods means of Reformation without Remedy, because either the Law or Judges must be excused. The Judges are the mouth of the Law to us: that is Law in the issue to us which they unanimously call Law. If the fault were in the Law, it was time it should be altered: if it was in the Bishops universally, it was time they should be altered. Let us but have a Remedy, and enjoy Gods Ordinances, which he that is the Churches Head and King hath appointed for our benefit, and we have done.

Sect. 18. Object. But may not Bishops when they Ordain, Delegate what measure of Ministerial Power they please; and if you never received more, why should you use it? Answ. A poor relief to the forsaken Church: Deprive her of Government, and then tell us that we
we had no power! Is the Power desirable to us, if the Ordinance were not desirable to the Church? 2. What Power have Bishops, and whence did they receive it, to change the Office of Christ's Institution, or his Apostles? If so, they may turn the three Orders (which the Papists themselves say the Pope cannot alter) into as many more. Then they may create an Office for Baptizing only, and another for the Lords Supper only, and another for praying only, and so of the rest, which is worse than making Lay-elders, or then taking away the Cup in the Sacrament. Hath Christ by his Spirit instituted Church-offices, and are they now at the Bishops power to transform them? 3. If they had power to distribute the work in the exercise, part to one, and part to another, yet they have no power to deprive the particular Churches of the whole or any part; but one or more must do it, and the Office must be the same, and the power exercised to the edification, and not the confusion and corruption of the Church.

Sect. 19. Object. But the Keys were given only to the Apostles, and not to the seventy Disciples nor to Presbyters.] Answ. 1. If the seventy were only Disciples, and not Church-officers, the Ancients and the English Bishops have been much mistaken, that have so much urged it, that Presbyters succeed them as Bishops do the Apostles: But if they be Officers, then they have the Keys. 2. The Episcopal Divines, even the Papists, commonly confess that part of the Keys are given to the Presbyters: and Christ gave them together. 3. Were they given only to Apostles for themselves, or to convey to others? If to themselves only, then no one hath them now. If to convey to others, then either to Apostles only as their Successors (but there's none such) or to Patriarchs or Primates, or Metropolitans, or Archbishops only: (but none of this will please the Bishops) or to Bishops only; which I grant, taking Bishops
in the Scripture sense. And I desire to see it proved, that it was not a presumptuous Innovation in them whosoever they were, that after the days of the Apostles Ordained a new sort of Presbyters in the Church that should have no power of the Keys. 4. They that must use the Keys, must have Power to use them. But Parish Bishops must use them (as the nature and necessity of the work doth prove:) Therefore Parish Bishops must have the Power. If only one man in a Diocess of an hundred or two hundred Churches shall have the power of the Keys, we may know after all the talk of Discipline, what Discipline to expect.

Sect. 20. Objeâé. Why blame you Lay-chancellors, Registrers, Proctors, &c. when you set up Lay-elders? we are as well able to call Chancellors Ecclesiastical, as you can call Lay-elders so.] Anfw. I never pleaded for Lay-elders: If other men err, will it justify your error? But I must tell you, an unordained man in a single Parish, having power only to assist the Pastor in Government, is far unlike a Lay-Court to Govern all the Churches of a Diocess.

Sect. 21. Objeâé. Do not your Arguments against Bishops for excluding Discipline, make as much for the casting out of Ministers, of whom you complain in your Reformed Pastor for neglect of Discipline? ] Anf. 1. The Nature of Prelacy as set up in England, where only one man had the Government of so many Churches, unavoidably excludes it, if the best men were Bishops (till it be otherwise formed:) But the nature of a Parochial Episcopacy is fitted to promote it. 2. Those Presbyters that I blamed for neglecting the higher acts of Discipline, do yet keep away more prophane persons from the Lords Supper in some one Church, then ever I knew kept away in all places under the Prelates. 3. If Ministers sinfully neglect Discipline, yet as Preachers and Guides, in publick worship, &c. they are of unspeakable need and value to the Church: But few Bishops of England preached
preached ordinarily: And 4. We are desirous that Bishops shall continue as Preachers, but not as Diocesan excluders of Parochial Church-Discipline.

Sect. 22. Objeét. By pretending to agree with them that say there were no Presbyters in Scripture times, you would put down Presbyters, and then the Government of the Church will be such as you blame. Anf. It is the thing I plead for, that every Church may have such Bishops as they had in the Apostles days, and not meer (new devised Presbyters) that are of another Office and Order.

Sect. 23. Objeét. Bishops had Deacons to attend them in the Scripture times, though not Presbyters; therefore it follows not that Bishops had then but One Congregation. Anfw. Yes beyond doubt: For Deacons could not, and did not perform the Pastoral part in the whole publick worship of any stated Churches. They did not preach (as Deacons) and pray and praise God in the publick Assemblies, and administer the Sacraments: It's not affirmed by them that are against us: therefore there were no more Churches then Bishops.

Sect. 24. Objeét. But what doth your Arguing make against the other Episcopal Divines that are not of the opinion that there were no meer Presbyters in Scripture times? Anfw. 1. Other Arguments here are as much against them, though this be not (if they maintain that sort of Episcopacy which I oppose.) 2. They also confess the smallness of Churches in Scripture times: (as I have shewed out of Bishop Downam; ) and that is it that I plead for.

Sect. 25. Objeét. But if you would have all reduced to the state that de facto the Church Government was in Scripture times, you would have (as but one Church to a Bishop, so) but One Bishop to a Church, as Dr. H. Dissert. 4 c. 19, 20, 21, 22. hath proved copiously, that is,
that Scripture mentioneth no assistant Presbyters with the Bishop: and would that please you, that think a single Congregation should have a Presbytery? You should rather as he teacheth you, c. 21. p. 237. be thankful to Ignatius, and acknowledge the dignity of your Office, ab eo primario defensore astraui & propugnari.

Ans. As we make no doubt from plain Scripture to prove, (and have proved it) that single Churches had then many Presbyters (some of them at least: ) So having the greatest part of Fathers and Episcopal Divines of our mind herein, (even Epiphanius himself) we need not be very solicitous about the point of Testimony or Authority. 2. We had rather of the two have but one Pastor to a Congregation, then one to a hundred or two hundred Congregations, having a Presbyter under him in each, authorized only to a part of the work. 3. Either the distinct Office of the Presbyters is of Divine Institution, to be continued in the Church, or not. If not, Bishops or some body it seems may put down the Office. If it be, then it seems all Gods Universal standing Laws (even for the species of Church Officers) are not contained in Scripture. And if not in Scripture, where then? If in the Fathers, 1. How shall we know which are they, and worthy of that name and honor? 2. And what shall we do to reconcile their contradictions? 3. And what number of them must go to be the true witnesses of a Divine Law? 4. And by what note may we know what points so to receive from them, and what not?

But if it be from Councils that we must have the rest of the Laws of God (not contained in the Scripture.) 1. Is it from all or some only? If from all, what a case are we in, as obliged to receive Contradictions and Heresies? If from some only, which are they, and how known, and why they rather then the rest? Why not the second of Ephesus as well as the first at Constantinople. But this I shall not now further prosecute,
prosecute, unless I were dealing with the Papists (to whom
have said more of it, in another writing.)

4. Ignatius his Presbyters were not men of another Of-
lice, nor yet set over many Churches that had all but one Bi-
shop: But they were all in the same Churches with the Bi-
shop, and of the same Office, only subject to his moderation or
presidency for Unity and Order sake: and this we strive not
against, if limited by the general Rules of Scripture.

Sect. 26. Object. Those that you have to deal with
say not, that [There were no Presbyters in the Apo
stles days, but only that in the Apostles writings, the word
[Bishops] always signifies Bishops, and the word Elders
either never or but rarely Presbyters. But it is possible
for them to be in the time of those writings that are not
mentioned in those writings; and the Apostles times
were larger then their writings, as you are told Vind.
against the Lond. Minis. p. 106. ] Ans. 1. The words I ci-
ted (from Annot. in Act. i.) faithfully, which you may
peruse: which say that there is no evidence that in Scrip-
ture times any of the second Order were instituted. ]
So that it is not Scripture writings only, but Scripture
times that's spoken of. And 2. If there be no evidence of it,
the Church cannot believe it or affirm it; for it judgeth not
of unrevealed things; and therefore to us it is no Institution
that hath no evidence. 3. The Apostles were all dead save
John before the end of Scripture times: So that they must
be instituted by John only: And John dyed the next year
after Scripture times, as the chief Chronologers judge: For
as he wrote his Apocalypse about the 14th year of Domi-
tian, so his Gospel the year before Trajan, and dyed the next
year, being after the commoner reckoning, An.D. 98. and
some think more. And what likelihood, or proof at least,
that John did institute them the year that he dyed? when
he same men tell us of his excursion into Asia to plant
(i 3.) Elders
Elders (before that year, it's like.) And if they were not instituted in Scripture time, then no testimony from Antiquity can prove them then instituted. But indeed if we had such testimony and nothing of it in the Scripture itself, we should take it as little to our purpose. For doth Antiquity say that the Institution was Divine, of Universal obligation to the Church, or only that it was but a prudential limitation of the exercise of the same Office (the like I demand of other like Testimonies in case of Dioceses, Metropolitans, &c.) If only the later, it binds us not, but proveth only the licet, and not the oportet at least, as to all the Church. And then every Country that finds cause, may set up another kind of government: But if it be the former that is asserted as from antiquity, then the Scripture containeth not all Gods Universal Laws; Which who ever affirmeth, must go to Fathers or Councils instead of Scripture to-day, and to the infallibility of the Pope, or a Prophetical Inspiration to-morrow, and next—

Sect. 27. Once more to them that yet will maintain that the Apostles modelled the Ecclesiastical form to the Civil, and that as a Law to the whole Church, we take it as their Concession, that then we owe no more obedience to the Archbishop of Canterbury, then to the Civil Magistrate of Canterbury, (and especially London (who is exempted from his superiority.) And I yet know not that any Civil Magistrate of Canterbury, or York, or London, or Worcester, hath any government in this Country, except the Sovereign Rulers at Westminster be meant. And I hope our Itinerant course of Judges, will prove the right (to the Objectors) of Itinerant Apostolical Overseers of the Churches, for settlement at least.

Sect. 28. Objection. But Parishes being not divided till long after the Apostles days, there might be then no ordinary Assemblies but in the City, and yet the whole Territory
Territory adjacent be the Diocess.] Answ. Were there in the Territories persons enough to make many Assemblies, or only so few as might travel to, and joyn with the City Assembly? If the latter, it's it that I assert, as usual in the first age at least; if the former, then either all those in the Territories met for publick Worship and Communion, or not: If not, they sinned against the Law of God that obliged them there-to as well as Citizens: If they did, then they must have either Bishop or Presbyter with them, for the due performance of that worship.

Sect. 29. If any think all these stragling objections and advertisments here unseasonable, I render him this true account of them: This first Disputation was prepared only for our ordinarily Monthly Exercises here, and so written long ago, before the London Ministers Book or the Answer to it, and the rest that have followed, and therefore could not take notice of much that hath since passed, and which was not intended for publick view: But when I saw so many of the Gentry and Commonalty withdraw from the publick worship, and the ignorant and prophane had learnt to refel their Pastors Instructons, by calling him a Layman, and saw how the new separation threatened the perdition of multitudes of the people, especially was awakened by the Calls of Ministers in other Countries that were far more troubled with them then we, I thought meet to prefix this to the Second Disputation, which was it that was desired of me: and therefore to take notice of those things so late.

Sect. 30. And the common experience tells you that it is not a few that go the way that lately was singular even among the Episcopal; to which I may add the Testimony in Vindic. against the London Ministers, p. 104. [And though I might truly say that for those more minute considerations or conjectures, wherein this Doctor differs from some others he hath the suffrages of many,
many of the Learnedst men of this Church at this day (and as far as he knows, of all that embrace the same cause with him) &c.

Sect. 31. And this at least I may expect from the Reader, that if he think we argue weakly, he will confess that we argue not for worldly greatness, but go against our carnal interest. We contend against Bishopricks of the English mode, as desiring no such Wealth or Honour. Some of us have as good opportunities to have a part in that kind of Greatness if it were again introduced, as they: But I am not able alone for a Parish charge, and am loth to have more on my hands, and my accounts; which is I suppose the mind of my Brethren also.

Sect. 32. One more Advertisement I owe the Reader, that this being written so long since I was made confident by Bishop Usher, de Primordiis Eccl. Brit. that Ireland was the Ancient Scotia where Palladius, &c. planted the Gospel, which pag. 97. I have signified. But I should wrong Scotland, if I should not tell thee, that I have received such Arguments to the contrary since then, from the Right Honourable, and my highly valued friend, the Earl of Lawderdail, that I am forced to suspend my judgement in that point, till I have leisure better to study the point, being yet unable to answer the said arguments.
Whether it be Necessary or Profitable to the right order or the Peace of the Churches of England that we restore the extruded Episcopacy?

In this Question here are these three things supposed. 1. That there are yet particular Churches of Christ in England: and therefore those that conclude that there hath been no Church among us since the Diocesan Bishops were laid by, are none of them that we are now disputing with: and indeed we think so gros a conceit unworthy of a Confutation.

2. It is supposed that both the right Order and the Peace of these Churches are matters highly to be valued. 3. And also that its our duty for the obtaining of it, to do that which is necessary or profitable thereto. But the doubt is, Whether the Episcopacy in question be necessary or profitable thereto?

For the decision whereof I shall briefly tell you my Judgment, in these propositions, whereof the two first are but preparatory.

Proposition 1. A Peace with the Divines of the Episcopal judg-
ment, is much to be desired and earnestly to be endeavour'd.

Prop. 2. A certain Episcopacy may be yielded to, for the Peace (if not for the right order) of the Church.

Prop. 3. The Diocesan Episcopacy which was lately in England, and is now laid by, may not lawfully be re-assumed or re-admitted, as a means for the right Order or Peace of the Church.

1. For the first of these, I think it easy to prove that we ought to seek an Agreement in the Episcopal controversy, with those that differ from us in that point.

For, 1. They are brethren, of the same faith with us, whom we are bound to love and honour, and therefore to use all just means for peace with them. If we must as much as in us lieth, if possible, live peaceably with all men, Rom. 12. 18. much more with brethren of the same family and profession.

2. They are very many; and the far greatest (though not the purest) part of the Church is of their mind: All the Greek Church, and the Ethiopian Church, and the Jacobites, Armenians, and all other parties without the verge of the Reformation from Popery here in the West, that ever I read or heard of, are all of that way, besides all the Romane Church: And, though I know that much ignorance, and imperfection, if not superition and fouler errors may be justly charged on the Greek, Ethiopian, &c. Churches, as well as on Rome (though not Popery itself) yet I think there is scarce a good Christian that is not unwilling to call off so great a part of the Church of Christ, as these are. Indeed, he that dares so far despise all the Churches of Christ on earth except these few that are happily reformed, as to think that it is no duty of ours, to seek unity and peace with them, by all just means, I think is no meet person for us to dispute with. It is the hainous sin of Rome, to despise and unchurch Greeks, Ethiopians, and all save themselves, which I hope Protestants will never imitate, who have justly condemned them so deeply for it. Let the Donatists shut up the Church of Christ in Africa, and call the rest Cecilians; and let the Papists reduce it to the subscribers to their Trent confession, or to them only that believe in the Popes universal Headship and Government, and call all others Hereticks: yet will all true Catholicks imitate Augustine and the Councils that were called against the Donatists, who still described the Catholike Church to be, that which
was dispersed over the world, having begun at Jerusalem: and though to God's praise we dare joyfully affirm, that the most illustrious and the soundest part of it is in Europe, among the Reformed, yet dare we not say that it is all or the greatest part here; Nay we confess that we are but a small part of Christ's Church. And therefore common sobriety may tell us, that the Peace of so great a part of Christ's Church as is in all the rest of the world, is highly to be valued, and fought with all our might, in righteousness.

Moreover, even among the reformed Churches there are many for some Episcopacy or Superintendency: As the Church of England and Ireland was lately for Diocesan Episcopacy: so the Churches in Denmark, Sweden, Saxony, and other parts of Germany, Transylvania, &c. are for a lower sort of Episcopacy, called Superintendency among them.

3. And the quality of many of the Divines of that way, is such as bespeaks our greatest reverence to them, and should move us to thirst after Unity and Reconciliation with them. Many of them are men of eminent Learning and Godliness, and found in the faith.

I know that it is commonly objected, that they are generally ungodly men that are that way; and though some of them are Learned men, yet they are all, or almost all, of careless and carnal lives, or meerly formal and superstitious, and therefore their Communion is not much to be desired.

To which I answer. 1. The plain undeniable truth is that it was so here with the most of them in the Bishops' days, where ever I was acquainted: There were more Ministers in many places that would have scorned, threatened or troubled a man for a godly diligent life, then that would lead him that way by a good example. We must speak that truth that cannot be hid, whoever be displeased. To this day, too many of that way are careless and scandalous. But then Consider withal, 2. That it is but too common for the common sort even of Ministers as well as people, to be careless and bad, what ever opinions they are of: Especially if the times do discountenance practical Religiousness, the greater part are likely to follow the times, being that way also strongly inclined by nature. 3. Consider also that we have had, and have men of that Judgement that have been ex-
cellent Instruments of the Churches good, and so eminent for God's graces and gifts, that their names will be precious whilest Christ hath in England a Reformed Church: were there in all England but one such man dissenting from us, as Hooper, Fan-

rar, Latimer, Cranmer, Ridley, Jewel, Abbot, Davenant, Usher, Hall, &c. what sober Godly man would not be exceeding sollicitous for a reconciliation? I am sure (besides the godliness of their lives, and painful preaching) One Jewel, One Usher, One Davenant, hath done so much against the Roman Usurpers, as they will never well claw it off them to the last.

Moreover who knoweth not that most of the Godly able Mi-

nisters of England since the Reformation, did judge Episcopacy some of them Lawfull, and some of them most fit (for the Non-

conformists were but few:) and that even before this late trouble and war, the most, even almost all, of those that were of the late Assembly at Westminster, and most through the land, did subscribe and conform to Episcopai Government, as a thing not contrary to the word of God: so that it is evident that it is very consistent with a Godly life to judge Episcopacy lawful and fit; or else we should not have had so many hundred learned and godly men of that mind.

And I am not altogether unapt to believe, that many of them yet are so far reconcileable to it (moderated,) that if it were again established, they would submit to it as they did: For I hear but of few that have made any recantation of their former conformity; but contrarily have known divers of them profess a reconcilableness as aforesaid, as Mr. Gataker doth in one of his books express his own Judgement.

If I have proved this preparatory proposition (which I think needeth but little proof,) then have I also proved 1. That they have sinned much who have hitherto forborne the use of any means for Peace, which was in their power. 2. And that we are bound our selves to desire and seek after a peace with such men: and that we cannot discharge a good conscience while we neglect such means as is within our reach, and fit for us to use.

The second Proposition is, that [A Certain Episcopacy may be yielded to, for the peace, if not also for the right order of the Church] In the declaration of my judgement concerning this,
this, I make no doubt but I shall displease both sides; the one for yielding so much; the other for yielding no more. But

1. I live not upon men's favour, nor the air of their applause: That truth which displeaseth at present, may tend to peace, and produce it at the last, when the angry humour is allayed, or at least, when the angry age is gone.

For the clearer determination of this and the main question following, it is necessary that I here lay down 1. To open the nature of Church-Government in general: 2. To open the fence of the word [Episcopacy] and the several sorts of Bishops. And then 3. I shall tell you what sort of Episcopacy it is that I could yield to for the Churches peace.

1. I must confess I think that the greatest part of the controversy by far, is in this first question, of the nature of Ecclesiastical Government, strictly so called, which is only in the hands of Christ's Ministers, Bishops or whomsoever, commonly called Clergy-men. And concerning this (having written my thoughts more largely elsewhere) I shall now lay down these few propositions.

Prop. 1. All this power Ecclesiastical is Jure divino, given from God himself; and that either immediately, or by the meditation of the Apostle. I mean as to the determination in specie, what it shall be, and the constitution of that order and power in the Church, though perhaps some other causes, at least fine quibus non may intervene for the reception of this power by an individual person. These therefore that plead only the Laws of the Land, or only Canons of former Bishops for their standing or authority, do say nothing as to our controversy is regardable. What men do, they may undo, if there be reason for it, and if it depend on their authority, we must submit to their reason.

Prop. 2. This Divine Constitution of the Species of Church-Power and Government, is to be found wholly in the written word of God, called the holy Scriptures. This we are agreed on against the Papists, who would supply the supposed defects of Scripture by their unwritten Traditions, which they call the other part of God's word. Church Canons and Laws of men may determine of some modes and circumstances for the better execution of the Laws of God, by the People whom they are over: but they cannot make new Church Ordinances or Governments, nor convey
convey a Power which God the fountain of Power did not
ordain and convey: nor can they give what they themselves had
not. The Church-office and Authority therefore that is not
proved from the Holy Scripture, is to be taken as the fruit of
humane arrogancy and presumption. Yet I deny not but that we
may find much in Antiquity, in Fathers and Councils about mat-
ters of fact to help us to understand some Scriptures, and so to dis-
cern the matter of right.

Prop. 3. The Scripture doth not Contradict, but suppose and
confirm the light of Nature; nor doth it impose upon any man Na-
tural impossibilities, nor constitute offices which cannot be executed,
or which would destroy that end to which they are supposed to be
Constituted.

Prop. 4. Ecclesiastical Authority comprehends not the power
of the sword, nor any power of using violence to mens bodies, or
laying multlets or confiscations on their estates. The Ecclesiastical
Power which Christ ordained, was exercised for the first three
hundred years without any touching of mens bodies or purses,
before there were any Christian Princes.

Prop. 5. Magistrates are not ex nomine obliged to punish men
because they are Excommunicated (whether upon every just Ex-
communication they should punish, I will not now dispute) but
they are bound to know that their penalties be deserved, before
they inflict them; and therefore must themselves take Cogni-
sance of the Cause, and as rational agents, understand before
they act; and not blindly follow the Judgments of the Bishops, as
if they were but as Executioners where the Bishops are Judges.

Prop. 6. *The Power of the highest Church-governours is but
an Authority of Directing in the way to salvation: It is but Di-
rective: but then there is no room for the common Objection,
that then it is no greater then any other man may perform; for
it is one thing to Direct Occationally from Charity, and another
thing to Direct by Authority in a standing office, as purposely
appointed hereunto. † The Power of Church Governors is but

...
of the same nature as is the Power of a Physician over his Patients, or of a School-master over his Schollers, supposing he had not the power of the rod or actual force, but such a power as the Professors of Philosophy or other sciences had in their several Schools upon the adult (nor all so great neither; because the Laws by which we must rule, are made to our hands, as to the substantialis.) Hence therefore it is plain, that as we can bind or force no man to believe us, or to understand the truth, and to be Christians, but by the power of demonstrated Evidence; and by the light which we let in (through God's grace) into their Consciences; so neither can we cause any to execute our sentences against offenders further then by light we convince them that it is their duty: so that if all the Bishops or Presbyteries in the land should judge such or such an opinion to be heretic, and should Excommunicate those that own it as heretics; in this case if the Church do believe as the Pastors believe, they will con safest and avoid the Excommunicate person; but if they take it to be God's truth which the Pastors call heretic, they will not take themselves bound by that sentence to avoid him: nor will the Offender himself any further be sensible of a penalty in the sentence, then he shall be convinced that he erred; and if the Church avoid him, he will justify himself, and judge that they do it wrongfully, and will glory in his suffering: so that it is on the Conscience that Church-Governours can work; and no otherwise on the outward man, but mediate Conscientia.

Prop. 7. The ground of this is partly because no Church-Governours can bind any man contrary to God's word: Clave errante, & ita apparente, if the people know that he erreth, they are not to obey him against God. Yet in the bare inconvenient determination of some Circumstantialis, by which the duty is not destroyed, but is conveniently performed, the people are bound to obey their Governors, because it is not against God's determination, and because he erreth but in an undetermined point, of which God appointed him to be the orderly determiner. But if God have once determined, no mans contrary determination can oblige; nor yet if they go beyond the sphere of their own work, and determine of an alien subject, which God did never commit to their determination: else a Minister, or Bishop, might oblige every Taylor how to cut his garment, and every Shoemaker how to cut.
cut his shoe, so that they should sin if they did disobey, which is ridiculous to imagine: and if they go about to introduce new stated Ordinances or Symbols in the Church which they have nothing to do with, or in any other work shall assume to themselves a power which God never gave them, it doth no more oblige them in the former case.

Prop. 8. Another reason of the sixth Proposition, is, because the People have a judgment of discerning, whether the Governors do go according to God's word or not: else they should be led blindfold, and be obliged by God to go against God's word, whensoever their Governors shall go against it. It is not bruits or Infants, but rational men that we must rule.

Prop. 9. The three things which Church-power doth consist in, are (in conformity to the three parts of Christ's own office)


1. Church-Governors about Doctrine or Matters of Faith, are the Peoples Teachers, but cannot oblige them to Err, or to believe any thing against God; nor make that to be truth or error that is not so before.

2. In matter of Worship, Church-guides are as God's Priests, and are to go before the people, and stand between God and them, and present their prayers and prayses to God, and administer his holy mysteries, and bless them in his name.

3. The Commanding Power of Pastors is in two things: 1. In Commanding them in the name of Christ to obey the Laws which he hath made them already. And this is the principal. 2. To give them new Directions of our own, which as is said, 1. Must not be against God's Directions. 2. Nor about any matter which is not the object of our own office, but is without the verge of it. 3. But it is only in the making of under-laws, for the better execution of the laws of Christ; and those under-laws must be only the Determination of Circumstances about God's service which Scripture hath made necessary in general, but left to the Governors determination in specie; and they are such as are alterable in several ages, countries, &c. so that it had been unfit for Christ to have determined them in his word, because his word is an universal Law for all ages and countries; and these Circumstances will not bear an universal determination: else why could not Christ
Christ have done it? nay how is his Law perfect else that doth omit it? For example, God hath commanded us to read the word, preach, hear, sing, which must necessarily be done in some time, place, gesture, number of words, &c. But he hath not commanded us on what day of the week our Lecture shall be, or at what hour of the day, nor what Chapter I shall read, nor how many at once, nor what Text I shall preach on, nor what Psalm I shall sing, nor in what words I shall pray, whether imposed by others, or not, whether with a book, or foreconceived form, or not; nor whether I shall read with spectacles or without, or whether I shall discern how the time passeth by an hour-glass, or by the clock, or by conjecture without them. These therefore and other such like, must humane Prudence determine of. But with these Cautions.

1. These are mostly matters that require a various determination in several places according to the great variety of Circumstances; and therefore it is for the most part fitter for the particular Pastor of that Church, who is upon the place, and seeth the case, to determine them pro re nata, * then for Synods, or distant Prelates, to do it by general Laws or Canons binding all.

2. Though upon a small misdetermination of such a Circumstance, the people must obey, yet if it be so grossly misdetermined as to destroy the duty it self Circumstantiated, or to be notoriously against the end which it is pretended for, then they are not to obey it. As if a Pastor would appoint the People to hear in the night only, or at such unseasonable times that they cannot come, or in many the like cases.

Note also that it is one thing to prescribe these matters in a direct Regimental Respect, and that belongeth to him upon the Place; and its another thing to prescribe them for common Union or Concord among many Churches, and that belongs to a Synod; (of which anon.)

And it is most certain by sad experience, that scarce any thing hath broken the unity and peace of the Church more, then unnecessary determinations pretended to be for its unity and peace. Could men have been content to have made Gods Laws the center and touchstone of the Churches Unity, all had been well: but when they must make Canons for this Vesture, and that Gesture, and the other Ceremony, and determine in what words
all men shall pray, and how many words he shall say, or how long he shall be, and to make standing Laws upon mutable circumstances, and this without any necessity at all, but merely to domineer, as if they had been themselves ordained and entrusted with Gods worship and mens souls; such fottish Presbyters, that know not how to speak or do anything but as it is prescribed them, nor how to carry themselves soberly or reverently without being obliged which way to bow, and when and how oft, with the like. Unnecessary things made Necessary have destroyed the Churches Peace; and so blind are the Authors of it, that yet they will not see their error, though the cries, and groans, and blood of the Churches have proclaimed it so long. The Church Historie of these one thousand and three hundred years at least doth tell us that it is the Church Governours by their too much busines and overdoing in such ways, even by too bold and busie determinations about doctrines or Ceremonies, that have broken all in pieces and caused that confusion, disentention and seemingly remediless divisions in the Church.

Prop. 10. In cases which are beyond the present understanding of the people, they are bound as Learners, to submit to the judgement of their Guides: If they see no sufficient cause, either in the matter to cause them to suspect that their Teachers are mistaken, or in their Teachers to cause them to suspect them to be seducers, they owe them so much credit and respect as their Guides, as to believe them fide humani, or to suppose that they are likelier to be in the right then themselves; and therefore in matters of Doctrine not to contradict them, but to submit to learn of them, till by learning they come to that ripeness of understanding, as to be capable of discerning the errors of their Guides, and so to contradict them groundedly, if indeed they err: so also in the order of variable Circumstantial about the service of God, though the people ought not to obey their Governours, if under that pretence they should command them things sinful; yet when they are not able to see any certain evil in the thing commanded, nor so strong a probability of evil as should cause them to suspend obedience while they take better advice, in such a case it is their Duty to obey the guides of the Church. For they are certain that they are commanded to obey them that
rule over them, and watch for their souls, Heb. 13. 17. but they are not certain that in such a case it is an evil that is prescribed by them, nor is it supposed to be much probable; therefore a certain evil of disobedience must be avoided before an uncertain and improbable evil. This the very office of Church Governors doth plainly import.

Object. Then if the Minister mistake, all the people that understand not the grounds of the matter, must err for company. Answ. If by Must, you speak of their Duty, I deny the consequence: For their Duty is to be men of understanding, and to see the truth in its own evidence, and so not to err; But if by Must, you only express a Necessity of Infirmity which they have sinfully contracted themselves, then I yield all: but I say, that it is a greater sin to disobey their guides, without known reason, and consequently never to obey them in any case beyond the present knowledge of the people, then it is to follow them fide humanz in such mistakes as we have no sufficient means at present to discover. For the former will overthrow almost all Ministration and Church government.

Obj. Then it is no sin for an Ignorant man to Err with his Teacher for company. Answ. I deny that Consequence: for it is his sin to be an Ignorant man: and consequently to have any Error. But supposing him already Ignorant by his own sinfulness, and that the Ministers of the Gospel come to heal it, we may well say that it is his greater sin to disbelieve and disobey them without apparent cause, then to mistake with them where he is not able to discern the mistake.

Prop. 11. He that disobeysth the Word of God in the mouth of a Minister or Church governor, commiteth a double sin, in comparison of him that disobeysth the same word in the mouth of a private man: for beside the sin which he first committh, he breaketh also the fifth Commandment, and despiseth Christ in his Messenger: As a man that shall refuse to worship God, to use his name reverently, &c. when a private man telleth him that it is his duty, doth sin by that refusal: but if he refuse it when his own Father or Mother, or Minister command him, he also breaks the fifth Commandment besides the rest. Ministerial Authority therefore doth aggravate the sins of persons that are disobedient.

Prop. 12. Yet for all this, one private man that evinceth out
of Scripture a sin or a duty contrary to the doctrine or commands of our Guides, must be regarded in that before them; and the evidence and divine verity which be bringeth must not be refused, because Church-Governors are against it. Otherwise we should make Gods Officers to be greater than himself; and the Promulgators and Preachers of his Law, to have power to null or frustrate the known Law which they should proclaim, and that the means is to be preferred before the end, and when it destroys the end, and so ceaseth it self to be a means, which are things not to be imagined.

Prop. 13. Yet is it a great sin for any men lightly and rashly to suspect their Teachers and Rulers, and much more Councils or the whole Church; and too easily to credit the singular opinions of any private man or dissenting Pastor. But we should be very suspicious of the private man rather, and of the singular man; and therefore should search well, and see good reason for it before we credit them, though we may not refuse any truth which they shall bring.

Prop. 14. The uses of Synods or Councils, is not directly to be superiour Governors of particular Pastors and Churches; but it is Directly 1. For the Information and Edification of the Pastors themselves by the collation of their reasons and mutual advice; 2. For the Union and Communion of the said Pastors, and of the particular Churches by them: that they may agree in one, and go hand in hand to do Gods work; and so may avoid the crossing and hindering of each other, and one may not receive those to communion without satisfaction, who are excommunicated by others; and so that by this concord of Pastors they may be strengthened to a more successful performance of their duties.

But then, these Direct ends of Synods being presupposed, Indirectly they may truly be said to be for Government; Because God in general having commanded us to carry on his work as much as we can in Unity and Peace, and it being the proper work of Councils to agree upon ways of Unity, it followeth that for Unity sake it becomes our duty to submit to their just Agreements; and so that the forming of such Agreements or Canons, is consequently or Indirectly a part of Government, though Directly it is but for Unity and Concord. Pastors in Synods have the same power over their people as they have one; and therefore what Canons they make justly for the Government of the people,
as Pastors, are Directly Acts of Government: but as Assembled Pastors, and also as to the Canons by which they bind each other, they act but by consent or contract in order to concord and communion, and not by a superior power. So that Synods as Synods are Directly only Gratia Unitatis & Communions, and not Gratia Regiminis; but Indirectely and by consequence from the first use, they are after a sort Regimental.

To conclude this about the Nature of Church Government, in the two former similitudes it is somewhat apparent: For Christ calls himself the Physician that comes to heal diseased souls: and his Church is also a School, and his people are all Scholars or Disciples, and Ministers his Ufhere or under-Schoolmasters. Now the Physician may prescribe to his Patient the times, the quantities of taking Medicines, and what diet to use, and what exercise in order to his health; and also Physicians may make a Colledge, and frequently meet for mutual Edification, and Agree what Patients to meddle with and what not, and that they will not receive those Patients that run from one to another to their own hurt, and that they will use none but such and such approved Medicaments, with divers the like circumstances. But yet no Physician can either compel men to be their Patients; nor compel them (any otherwise then by persuasion) to take their Medicines, when they are their Patients; nor can they corporally punish them for any disobedience to their directions: But this they may do: they may tell them first, that if they will not be ruled, they shall be without the Physicians help, and then their disease will certainly kill them, or endanger them; and if the Patient continue so disobedient as to frustrate the means of cure, the Physician may give him over, and be his Physician no more: and this is the Power of a Church Guide, and this is his way of punishing: Only he may further acquaint them with a Divine Commission, then a Physician can do to his Patient, (at least gradually) and so press obedience more effectually on their consciences.

So a Schoolmaster may make orders for the right circumstantialating of matters in his School (supposing one Grammer enjoyned by Superiour Authority,) and he may order what Authors shall be read, and at what hours, and how much at a time, and dispose of the seats and orders of his Scholars: But yet if
he be a Teacher of the Adult, according to our case, he cannot corporally punish those that either refuse to be his Schollars, or to learn of him or obey him; but the utmost that he can do is to put some disgrace upon them while they abide in his School, and at last to shut them out. And then all the Schoolmasters in the Countray may well agree upon one Method of Teaching, and that they will not receive those without satisfaction into one School, who are for obstinacy and abuse cast out of another. But such Agreements or Meetings to that end do not make either one Physitian or Schoolmaster to be the Governour of the rest, or above another, nor yet to have the charge of all the Schollars or Patients of all the rest; so is it in the case of Ecclesiastical Assemblies.

Having said this much concerning the Nature of Church-Power and Government, I come to the second thing promised, which is to enumerate the several sorts of Bishops that are to fall under our consideration, that so we may next consider, which of them are to be allowed of.

And here I suppose none will expect that I shew them all these sorts distinctly existent; it is enough that I manifest them to be in themselves truly different.

1. And first the name [Bishop] may be given to one, that is only the Overseer or Ruler of the People of one particular Church, and not of any Church-rulers themselves: That ruleth the flock, but not any Shepherds.

2. Those also may be called Bishops, who only are Joint-Rulers with others of a particular Church, and Presidents among the Elders of that one Church for Unity and order sake, without assuming any Government over those Elders.

3. A third sort there are that are Presidents in such an Elder-ship, and withal do take a Negative voice in the Government, so that nothing shall be done without them in such affairs.

4. A fourth sort are the sole Pastors of such a particular Church that have many Ministers under them as their Curates, who are properly to be Ruled by them alone; so that the Pastor is the sole Ruler of that Church, and the Curates do only teach and otherwise officiate in obedience to him: Which is the case of
divers Ministers of great Parishes, that keep one Curate at their Parish Church, and others at their Chappels. Yet its one thing to be the sole Ruler of the Parish, and another to Rule the rest of the Elders.

5. A fifth sort of Bishops are those that are the fixed Presidents of a Classis of the Pastors of many particular Churches; who hold the title *durante vitâ*, or *quâm diu bene se gesserint*, though they are in use only while the Classis sitteth, and have only a power of Moderating and ordering things, as the foreman of a Jury, or a double or casting voice, as the Bayliff in Elections in most Corporations, or as the President in some Colleges; but no *Negative voice*, which maketh a Power equal with all the rest.

6. A sixth sort are the heads of such Classes, having a Negative voice, so that the rest can do nothing without them.

7. A seventh sort are the Presidents of Provinces or Dioceses containing many Classes, which have only a Moderating Power, but no Negative voice.

8. An eighth sort are the Bishops of particular Cities with all the Rural parts that are near it, containing many Churches; who assume the Power of Governing that Diocese to themselves alone without the Presbyters of the particular Churches, either not using them at all in matter of Government, or only consulting with them in Assemblies, but giving them no determining votes.

9. A ninth sort is a Diocesan Bishop of such a City, who doth not take upon him the Rule of the people of the Diocese (beyond his own Congregation) but only of the Pastors; supposing that the several Pastors or Presbyters have power to Rule the several Congregations, but withall that they themselves are to be ruled by him.

10. A tenth sort are such Bishops as assume the Government of these Diocesan Bishops, which are commonly called Archbishops: to which also we adjoin Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs, who assume the Power of Governing all below them: as under the seventh rank I do also for brevity comprehend Metropolitans, Primates, and Patriarchs, who assume no Governing Power over other Bishops, but only the *primam sedem*, and the moderating Power in Councils.

11. The eleventh sort are unfixed general Pastors, called Ambulatory.
bulatology, or Itinerant, that have a care of all the Churches, and are no further tied to any particulars, then as the necessary defect of their natural capacity (seeing they cannot be in all places at once,) or else the dispatch of that work which they there meet with, before they go further, and some such occasion doth require: and being excluded out of no part of the Church, further by consent for the common good, they shall exclude themselves; such, I mean, as the Apostles were.

12. The twelfth and last fort is the Judas that goes under the name of St. Peter's Successor, and Christ's Vicar General, or the Vice-Christ, who claimeth a power of Governing the whole universal Church as its Head, having Infallible power of determining Controversies, and matters of Faith, and whose Office must enter the definition of the Catholic Church, and those that separate from him are no Catholikes, or true Christians. This is he that beareth the bag, and maketh the twelfth fort.

3. I Come now in the third place to tell you, how many and which of these sorts of Episcopacy I think may be admitted for the Peace of the Church: And,

1. Of the first fort there is no Controversie among us: few will deny the just Divinum of Presbyters, as having the Rule of the people of a particular Church, and the sole Rule, supposing that there is no other Pastor over that Church but himself.

2. Of the second fort of Parish Bishops (who are meer Presidents over the whole Eldership of that particular Church, and that continually, or fixedly.) I think there is little question will be made by any, but they also will easily be admitted.

3. The third fort (A Parochial Bishop, having a Negative voice in a Parish Eldership) I should be content to admit for the Peace of the Church: but whether of it self it be desirable, I do not dispute: for if one Pastor even in a Parish may have a Negative voice among two or three Curates, it will follow that the thing itself is not unlawful, viz. for one Minister to have a Negative vote among many, and so among an hundred, if there be nothing else to forbid.

4. The fourth fort (for brevity) Comprehendeth two sorts.

1. Such
1. Such Pastors of a single Congregation, which having diverse Curates under them who are Presbyters, do yet themselves take upon them the sole Government of the people and of their Curates. I think this is intolerable, and indeed a Contradiction, or a Nulling of the Presbyters office: for it is essential to the Presbyter of any Church to be a Guide or Ruler of that Church: to put them out of all Rule therefore is to Null, or suspend the exercise of their office; which cannot stedily be done without destroying it. But then 2. if we speak of the second sort, that is, such Pastors of particular Churches, as have Curats who are Presbyters, and they govern their Curates, but take the Curates as true Governors of the flock, these as I dare not simply defend, (for if it be lawful for one Pastor to Rule two or three in a Parish, then why not twenty or an hundred, if nothing else forbid?) so I confess I should be ready to admit of them, if it might attain the Churches peace: for I see many godly Divines that are against Episcopacy, yet practice this; and will have no Curates in their Parish, that will not be Ruled by them. And there is a certain Obedience which Juniors and men of weaker parts, do owe to their Seniors and men of far greater knowledge, though the Office be the same. And the Nature of the Government being not Compulsive and Coercive, but only upon the voluntary, whose judgements approve and their wills consent, its considerable how far even a Ruler of others may voluntarily consent and so oblige himself to be Ruled by another, that could not have any power to Rule him, without that consent of his own, and voluntary Condescension.

5. As for the fifth sort, that is, [The standing President of a Classis, having no Negative voice] I should easily consent to them for order and Peace: for they are no distinct Office, nor assume any Government over the Presbyters. And the Presbyterian Churches do commonly use a President or Moderator pro tempore. And doubtless if it be lawful for a Month, it may be lawful for a year, or twenty years, or quam din se bene gesserit: and how many years had we one Moderator of our Assemblies of Divines at Westminster? and might have had him so many years more if death had not cut him off? And usually God doth not so change his gifts, but that the same man who is the fittest this month or year, is most likely also to be the fittest the next.

D

6. And
6. And for the sixth part, viz. [A President of a Classes having a Negative voice,] I confess I had rather be without him, and his power is not agreeable to my Judgement, as a thing instituted by God, or fitteft in it self. But yet I should give way to it for the Peace of the Church, and if it might heal that great breach that is between us, and the Episcopal Brethren, and the many Churches that hold of that way; but with these Cautions and Limitations. 1. That they shall have no Negative in any thing that is already a duty or a sin; for an Angel from heaven cannot dispense with God's Law. This I doubt not will be yielded. 2. That none be forced to acknowledge this Negative vote in them, but that they take it from those of the Presbyters that will freely give or acknowledge it. For its a known thing that all Church-power doth work only on the Conscience, and therefore only prevail by procuring Consent, and cannot compel. 3. Nor would I ever yield that any part of the Presbyters dissenting should be taken as Schismaticks, and cast out of Communion, or that it should be made the matter of such a breach. This is it that hath broken the Church, that Bishops have thrust their Rule on men whether they would or not, and have taken their Negative voice at least, if not their sole Jurisdiction, to be so necessary, as if there could be no Church without it, or no man were to be endured that did not acknowledge it; but he that denyeth their disputable Power must be excommunicated with them that blaspheme God himself. And as the Pope will have the acknowledgement of his Power to be inseparable from a member of the Catholike Church, and cast out all that deny it, so such Bishops take the acknowledgement of their Jurisdiction to be as inseparable from a member of a particular Church, and consequently (as they suppose) of the universal: and so to deny them shall cut men off, as if they denied Christ. This favourable not of the humility that Christ taught his followers. 4. Nor would I have any forced to declare whether they only submit for Peace, or consent in approbation; nor whether they take the Bishops Negative vote to be by Divine Institution, and so Necessary, or by the Presbyters voluntary consent & contract, as having power in several cases to suspend the exercise of their own just authority, when the suspension of it tendeth to a publiclike Good. No duty is at all times a duty. If a man be to be ordained
(19)

dained by a Presbytery, it is not a flat duty to do it at that time when the President is absent, except in case of flat necessity; why may not the rest of the Presbyters then, if they see it conducible to the good of the Church [resolve never to ordain (except in case of such necessity,) but when the President is there, and is one therein;] which is indeed to permit his exercise of a Negative vote, without professing it to be his right by any Institution? It is lawful to ordain, when the President is present; it is lawful (out of cases of necessity) to forbear when he is absent: according therefore to the Presbyterian principles, we may resolve to give him de facto a Negative voice, that is, not to ordain without him, but in necessity: and according to the Episcopal principles, we must thus do: for this point of Ordination is the chief thing they stand on. Now if this be all the difference, why should not our May be, yield to their, Must be, if the Peace of the Church be found to lie upon it. But 5. I would have this Caution too, that the Magistrate should not annex his sword to the Bishops censure, without very clear reason: but let him make the best of his pure spiritual Authority that he can; we should have kept peace with Bishops better, if they had not come armed, and if the Magistrates had not become their Executioners.

7. As to the seventh sort, viz. [A President of a Province fixed, without any Negative voice] I should easily admit of him, not only for Peace, but as orderly and convenient, that there might be some one to give notice of all Assemblies, and the Decrees to each member, and for many other matters of order: this is practised in the Province of London pro tempore, and in the other Presbyterian Churches. And as I said before in the like case, I see not why it may not be lawful to have a President quam diu se bene gesserit, as well for a moneth, or a year, or seven years, as in our late Assembly two successively were more, (as I remember) so that this kind of Diocesan or Provincial Bishop, I think may well be yielded to for the Churches Order and Peace.

8. As to the eighth sort of Bishops, viz. [The Diocesan who assumeth the sole Government of many Parish Churches both Presbyters and People] as ten, or twelve, or twenty or more, as they used to do, even a whole Dioces, I take them to be intolerable,
and destructive to the Peace and happiness of the Church, and therefore not to be admitted under pretence of Order or Peace, if we can hinder them. But of these we must speak more when we come to the main Question.

9. As for the ninth sort of Bishops, viz. [*A Diocesan Ruling all the Presbyters, but leaving the Presbyters to Rule the People*] and consequently taking to himself the sole or chief Power of Ordination, but leaving Censures and Absolution to them, except in case of Appeal to himself; I must needs say that this sort of Episcopacy is very ancient, and hath been for many ages of very common reception, through a great part of the Church; but I must also say that I can see as yet no Divine institution of such a Bishop taken for a fixed limited officer, and not the same that we shall mention in the eleventh place. But how far mens voluntary submission to such, and consent to be ruled by them, may authorize them, I have no mind to dispute. Only this I will say, that though I allow not in my judgement this sort of Episcopacy, yet I think it incomparably more tolerable than the eighth sort, which taketh the whole Government of the people from the Presbyters to themselves; And if I lived in a place where this Government were established, and managed for God, I would submit thereto, and live peaceably under it and do nothing to the disturbance, disgrace or discouragement of it. My reasons I shall not stay to produce.

10. As for the tenth sort of Bishops, viz. Archbishops, Metropolitans, Primates and Patriarchs, having not only the moderation of Synods, but also either the sole Government of all the Clergy, and chief Government of all the people, or a Negative voice in all, I am much more in judgement against them, then the former, and so much the more against them, by how much the larger their Jurisdiction is, for reasons which I shall anon have occasion to produce.

11. As for the eleventh sort of Bishops, that is [such as succeed the Apostles in the office of Preaching and Governing, to wit as unlimited universal Officers] it is a great doubt among many whether any such should be? For though it be certain that such were, yet we are in doubt whether they have any successors. For my own part, I confess myself satisfied in this, that the Apostles have Successors, though not in their extraordinary Immediate manner.
nner of Mission, nor in their extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit, yet in all that part of their office which is of standing Necessity to the Church: And I am satisfied that their general Ministry, or ambulatory preaching as unfixed officers, and their Government of the Church by Office (such as they did then use) are of standing Necessity to the Church: And therefore that as such unfixed general Officers, the Apostles de jure have Successors. And this I have formerly proved to you in my Theses de Polit. Ecclesiast. briefly thus.

Argument 1. Christ promised when he instituted this General Office to be with them to the end of the world; therefore it was his will that it should continue to the end of the world, (Mat. 28 20, 21.) It was to a Ministry that were sent to preach the Gospel to every Creature, or to all the world, and to Disciple Nations, that this promise was expressly made; therefore such a Ministry is to be continued.

Argument 2. The same work and Necessity still continueth: Fot, 1. There are still most of the Nations on earth unconverted. 2. The Converted and Congregated to be Confirmed and Governed, therefore the Office continueth.

Argument 3. We can fetch no Argument from the Apostles Example or from any Precept or Promise to them, to prove the succession of fixed Pastors, which is stronger then this by which we prove the succession of General unfixed Officers: therefore either we must yield to this, or by the same reasons as we deny it, we must deny the Ministry too: Which is not to be done.

Argument 4. The Apostles had many Associates in this General Office in their own times: Therefore it was not proper to them, nor to cease with them. Barnabas, Sylas, Timothy, Titus, Apollo, with multitudes more in those times, were unfixed General Officers, that went up and down to convert the world; and finding only to order and confirm the new gathered Churches, and then went further; sometimes returning to review, preserve, and strengthen their converts.

Argument 5. If we can prove that such unfixed General officers were
were by Christ settled in his Church, and that by such the Churches were in any sort then to be governed, then our cause is good, till the repeal or revocation of this office and order be proved. Let them therefore that affirm such a revocation prove it: for till then, we have proved enough, in proving that once it was instituted. But they cannot prove that revocation, I think, nor yet any Cessation, or that the institution was but pro tempore.

Argum. 6. It is not a tolerable thing to charge God with such a sudden Mutation of his Law or Order of Church Government without very certain proof. If we find Christ settling one way of Church Government, in his own time, and presently after, for the first age, it is a most improbable thing that he should take that down again, and set up another kind of Government to continue ever after. This seems to charge Christ with so great mutability, that it is not to be done without very clear proof. But such proof is not produced.

I know it is easily proved that the immediate Mission, and extraordinary measure of the Spirit, for Miracles, tnogues, Infallible delivery of the doctrine of Christ are ceased: But this is nothing to the general office of Preaching or Governing the Church, which is of standing use.

So that I am satisfied of this, that the Apostles as General Preachers and Governours have successors. But then I must confess myself not fully satisfied, what Governing Power it was that the Apostles had over the Pastors of the Church. I find that when Saravia, and after him, the Disputants in the Isle of Wight, do insist on this Argument from the way of Church Government by the Apostles, that their Antagonists do presently grant the Minor [that The Government of the Church at first was by men authorized to Rule the Presbyters and their Churches.] but they deny the Major, that [the Government which was then in the Church should continue till now,] because it was by Apostles, whose Office they think ceaseth. Whereas I must confess I am unavoidably forced to yield the Major, that we must have the same kind of Government that was at first instituted, unless we had better proof of a change: For the establishment of particular Churches and Presbyters was no change of the Apostles power, seeing they gave not away their power to the Presbyters nor
nor ceased to have the same Apostolical power which they had before. Only the Apostles extraordinary Mission, Gifts and Priviledges, I confess are ceased. But then I conceive that the Minor which is so easily granted, viz. [that the Apostles had the Government of the particular Presbyters] will hold more dispute, at least as to the nature and degree of their power: and were I as fully satisfied about the Minor as I am of the Major, I must by this one Argument be forced to be for the Just Divinum of Episcopacy. What at present seems truth to me, I shall lay down in these Propositions.

Prop. 1. It is certain that the Apostles were general unfixed Officers of Christ, having the care of the whole world committed to them within the reach of their natural Capacity: and that their business was to take that course in the particular management of their work, as is most conducible to the propagation of the faith through the whole world: and that in all places where they came, they had the same power over the Churches gathered, as the fixed Pastors of those Churches have. This much is past doubt.

Prop. 2. It is as certain that common prudence required them to make a convenient distribution of the work, and not go all one way, and leave other places that while without the Gospel. But some to go one way, and some another, as most conduced to the conversion of all the world.

Prop. 3. It is certain that the Apostles were not armed with the sword, nor had a compulsive coercive power by secular force, but that their Government was only forcible on the Conscience, and therefore only on the Conscientious, so far as they were such; unless as we may call mens actual exclusion by the Church and their desertion and misery the effect of Government.

Prop. 4. It is most certain that they who had the extraordinary priviledge of being eye-witneses of Christs Miracles and Life, and ear-witneses of his Doctrine, and had the extraordinary power of working Miracles for a Confirmation of their Doctrine, must needs have greater Authority in mens Consciences than other men, upon that very account, if there were no other. So that even their Gifts and Priviledges may be (and doubtles were) one ground at least of that higher degree of Authority, which they had above others. For in such a Rational...
nal perswasive Authority which worketh only on the Conscience, the case is much different from the secular power of Magistrates. For in the former, even Gifts may be a ground of a greater measure of Power, in binding mens minds. And here is the greatest part of the difficulty that riseth in our way, to hinder us from improving the example of the Apostles, in that it is so hard to discern how much of their power over other Presbyters or Bishops was from their supereminency of Office and Imperial Authority, and how much was meerly from the excellency of their Gifts and Priviledges.

Prop. 5. Its certain that the Magistrates did not then second the Apostles in the Government of the Church, but rather hinder them by persecution. The excommunicate were not punished therefore by the secular power, but rather men were enticed to forfake the Church for the saving of their lives: so that worldly prosperity attended those without, and adversity those within: which further shewes that the force of Apostolical Government was on the Conscience, and it was not corrupted by an alien kind of force.

Prop. 6. Yet had the Apostles a power of Miraculous Castigation of the very bodies of the Offenders, at least sometimes: which Peter exercised upon Ananias and Sapphira, and Paul upon Elymas, and some think upon Hymenaeus and Philebas, and those other that were said to be delivered up to Satan: certainly Paul [had in readiness to revenge all disobedience] 2 Cor. 10.6. which its like extendeth somewhat farther than to meer censures. But its most certain that the Apostle used not this power of hurting mens bodies ordinarily, but sparingly as they did other Miracles; perhaps not according to their own wills, but the Holy Ghosts. So that this did not corrupt their Government neither, and destroy the Spirituality of it. Yet this makes it somewhat more difficult to us to improve the Apostles example, because we know not how much of their power upon mens Consciences might be from such penal Miracles.

Prop. 7. The Apostles had power to Ordain and send others to the work of the Ministry. But this only by the consent of the ordained, and of the people (before they could be compleat fixed Pastors) for they forced not any to go, or any people to entertain them. And it seemeth they did not Ordain singly, but many
many together, Acts 14.23. *Timothy had his Gift by the laying on of Paul's hands and of the hands of the Presbytery, 1 Tim. 4.14. and 2 Tim. 1.6.

Prop. 8. It seems that each Apostle did exercise a Government over the Churches which were once planted: but this was principally in order to well settling and confirming them.

Prop. 9. No one Apostle did appropriate a Dioces to himself, and say, Here I am sole Governor, or am chief Governor; nor did they or could they forbid any others to Govern in their Dioces: though, as is said, they did agree to distribute their work to the publick advantage, and not to be all in one place at once: but yet successively they might.

Prop. 10. Nay it's certain that they were so far from being the sole Bishops of such or such a Dioces, that they had usually some more unfixed general Officers with them. *Paul and Barnabas went together at first: and after the Division, Barnabas and Mark, Paul and Silas, and sometimes Timothy, and sometime Epaphroditus, and sometime others went together afterward. And others as well as James were usually at Jerusalem: and all these had a general power where they came. And it cannot be proved that James was Ruler of Peter, *Paul and the rest when they were at Jerusalem, nor that he had any higher power then they.

Prop. 11. Yet it seems that the several Apostles did most look after those same Churches which themselves had been the instruments of gathering, and that some addition of respect was due to those that had been spiritual Fathers to them, above the rest, 1 Cor. 4.15.

Prop. 12. It was therefore by the General Commission of Apostleship that they Governed particular Churches pro tempore while they were among or near them, and not by any special Commission or Office of being the Diocesan or Metropolitane of this or that place. 1. It was below them, and a diminution of their honor to be so affixed, and take the charge of any particular Churches. 2. We find not that ever they did it. 3. If they had, then all the disorders and ungovernedness of those Churches would be imputable to them, and therefore they must be still with them as fixed Bishops are, seeing they cannot govern them at such a distance as makes them incapable. 4. When
Peter drew Barnabas and many more to dissimulation, and almost to betray the liberties of the Gentiles, Paul doth not say. This is my Diocess, and I must be the Ruler here: nor doth Peter plead this against him, when Paul and Barnabas fell out, whether Mark should be taken with them or not; neither of them did plead a Ruling Authority, nor say, This is my Diocess, or I am the superior Ruler; but they produced their reasons, and when they could not agree concerning the validity of each other's reasons, they separated and took their several companions and waies.

Prop. 13. It was not only the Apostles, but multitudes more that were such general unfixed Ministers: as the seventy, Barnabas, Silas, Epaphroditus. Timothy and many others. And all these also had a Power of Preaching and Ruling where they came.

Prop. 14. None of these General Officers did take away the Government from the fixed Presbyters of particular Churches; nor kept a Negative vote in their own hands, in matters of Government: for if no fixed Bishop (or Presbyter) could excommunicate any member of his Church without an Apostle, then almost all Churches must remain polluted and ungoverned, through the unavoidable absence of those twelve or thirteen men.

The Apostles therefore did admonish Pastors to do their duties, and when themselves were present had power to do the like, and to censure Pastors or people that offended: but they did not take on them the full Government of any Church, nor keep a Negative vote in the Government.

Prop. 15. It seems utterly untrue that Christ did deliver the Keyes only to the twelve Apostles as such, and so only to their Successors, and not the seventy Disciples or any Presbyters. For 1. The seventy also were General unfixed Officers, and not like fixed Presbyters or Bishops: and therefore having a larger Commission must have equal power. 2. The Apostles were not single Bishops as now they are differed from others: but they were such as had more extensive Commissions, then those now called Arch Bishops or Patriarchs. If therefore the Keyes were given them as Apostles, or General Officers, then they were never given to Bishops. For Bishops as fixed Bishops of
this or that Dioces are not Successors of the Apostles, who were General unfixed Officers. 3. It is granted commonly by Papists and Presbyterians, that Presbyters have the power of the Keyes, though many of them think that they are limited to exercise them under the Bishops, and by their Direction and Consent, (of which many School-men have wrote at large) 4. The Key of Excommunication is but a Ministerial Authoritative Declaration, that such or such a known Offender is to be avoided, and to charge the Church to avoid Communion with him, and him to avoid or keep away from the Priviledges of the Church; and this a meer Presbyter may do: he may authoritatively Declare such a man to be one that is to be avoided, and charge the Church and him to do accordingly. The like I may say of Absolution: if they belong to every authorized Pastor, Preacher and Church guide, as such, then not to a Bishop only, but to a Presbyter also. And that these Keyes belong to more then the Apostles and their Successors, is plain, in that these are insufficient Naturally to use them to their Ends. An Apostle in Antioch cannot look to the censuring of all persons that are to be Censured at Athens, Paris, London, &c. so that the most of the work would be totally neglected, if only they and their supposed Successors had the doing of it. I conclude therefore that the Keyes belong not only to Apostles and their Successors in that General Office, no nor only to Diocesan Bishops: for then Presbyters could not so much as exercise them with the Bishops in Conistory, which themselves of late allow.

Prop. 16. The Apostles were fallible in many matters of fact, and consequently in the Decisions that depended thereupon; as also in the Prudential determination of the time and season and other Circumstances of known duties. And thence it was that Paul and Barnabas so disagreed even to a parting, where one of them was certainly in the wrong. And hence Peter withdrew from the uncircumcision, and milled Barnabas and others into the same diffimulation so far that he was to be blamed and withstood, Gal. 2.

Prop. 17. In such Cases of misleading, an Apostle was not to be followed: no more is any Church-Governor now: but it is lawful and needful to dissent and withstand them to the face, and to blame them when they are to be blamed, for the Churches safety,
safety, as Paul did by Peter, Galatians 2. 1.

Prop. 18. In this Case the Apostles that by Office were of equal Authority, yet were unequal when the Reasons and Evidence of Gods mind which they produced was unequal: so that a Presbyter or Bishop that produceth better Reasons, is to be obeyed before another that produceth less Reason, or that Errth. And the Bishop of another Church that produceth better Evidence of Gods mind, is to be obeyed before the proper Bishop of that same Church that produceth weaker and worse Evidence. Yea a private man that produceth Gods Word is to be obeyed before Bishops and Councils that go against it, or without it (in that case, where the word bindeth us:) so that, in all cases where Scripture is to determine, he that bringeth the best Scripture proof, is the chief Ruler, that is, ought chiefly to prevail. Though in the determination of mere Circumstances of duty, which Scripture determineth not, but hath left to Church. Guides to determine pro re nata, it may be otherwise, so that the Apostles power in determining matters of faith, was not as Church Governors, but as men that could produce the surest Evidence.

Prop. 19. It is not easy to manifest, whether every Presbyter in prima instanitia be not an Officer to the Church Universal, before he be affixed to a particular Church, and whether he may not go up and down over the world to exercise that office, where ever he hath admittance. And if so, what then could an Apostle have done by virtue of his mere office, without the advantage of his extraordinary abilities, and privileges, which the Presbyter may not do? May an Apostle charge the people where he comes to avoid this or that seducer or heretic? So may any Preacher that shall come among them, and that by authority. May an Apostle Excommunicate the very Pastor of the place, and deprive him? why what is that but to persuade the people, and Authoritatively require them, to avoid and withdraw from such a Pastor, if the Cause be manifest? And so may any Pastor or Preacher that comes among them. For if (as Cyprian faith) it chiefly belong to the people even of themselves to reject and withdraw from such a Pastor, then a Preacher may by Authority persuade and require them to do their own duty. Yet I shall acknowledge, that though both may do
the same duty, and both by Authority, yet possibly not both by equal Authority, but an Apostle Majore authoritate, and so may lay a stronger obligation on men to the same duty; but the rest I determine not, but leave to enquiry.

Prop. 20. In making Laws or Canons to bind the Church which are now laid down in Scripture, the Apostles acted as Apostles, that is, as men extraordinarily Commissioned, illumined and enabled infallibly to deliver Gods will to the world. And therefore herein they have no Successors.

In Conclusion therefore seeing that matters of meer Order and Decency depending on Circumstances sometime rationally mutable, sometime yearly, daily, hourly mutable, are not to be determined Universally alike to all the Church, nor to all a Nation, nor by those that are at too great a distance, but by the present Pastor, who is to manage the work, and being intrusted therewith, is the fittest Judge of such variable Circumstances: and seeing for Standing Ordinances that equally belong to all ages and places, Gods word is perfect and sufficient without the Bishops Canons; and seeing that Scripture is a perfect Law of God, and Rule of Christian faith; and seeing that in the expounding of the Scripture, they that bring the best Evidence will beget the most Knowledge, and they that produce the clearest Divine Testimony, will beget most effectually a Divine belief, and those that are known to be of far greatest abilities in learning, experience and grace, and consent with the most of the Church, will procure more effectually an humane belief, then a weak unlearned inexperienced Pastor of our own; therefore the Jurisdiction of supereminent Bishops, Metropolitans, Primates and Patriarchs, will appear to be reduced into so narrow a room, and written in so small a character, that he hath need of very quick sight that can read it, and humble men may be easily drawn to think, that the Unity, Happiness, and Safety of the Church lyeth not in it, and that if it had been only for Christ and not their own Greatness, there had not been such Contention and Division made about it in the Church, as there hath been.
To draw some of this which I have said into a narrower room, I shall briefly tell you what I could heartily with both Magistrates and Ministers would speedily accomplish for the order and peace of the Church in these matters.

1. I could wish that they would choose out the ablest Godly men, and let them be appointed General Teachers, and Guides, to call the uncalled, and to order, confirm, and so take care of the Churches that are gathered: And if by the Magistrates consent and their own, they divide their Provinces, it will be but meet. These I would have to go up and down to the several Parishes in their Provinces, and to have no particular Parishes of their own, nor to take the fixed Pastors' power from them, but to take care that it be by themselves well exercised: And I would have the Magistrate keep his sword in his own hand, and let these prevail with men's consciences as far as they can; and in that way, if they would exceed their bounds, and arrogate any unjust power to themselves, we shall dissent and deny it them, and stand upon our ground, and deal with them upon equal terms, and so need not to fear them. And I have cause to think that neither Presbyterians nor all the Independents will be against such General Officers (Successors of the old ones) as I here describe: Nor the Presbyterians: for in Scotland they appointed and used such in the beginning, of their Reformation when they made Visitors of the particular Churches, and assigned to each their limited Provinces, and so they were Commissioners, to cast out Ministers, put in others; and plant Kirks, and they had several Superintendents, all which is to be seen in the Doctrine and Discipline of the Kirk of Scotland (printed not long agoe again.) And the Itinerant Commissioners in Wales that were set there to go about preaching and Reforming, doth shew that their Judgements were not against the Power.

2. I could wish that every Parish Church may have one Eldership (where they may be had) or some Elders and Deacons, with one constant Fixed, Perfect for Order and Unity.
3. I could wish that Ordination and Constitutions for Unity and Communion may be done only in Synods, less or greater: and that of many Presbyteries there may consist a Classis, as commonly called, and of many of those a Province: And that the Classical meeting may be frequent, and that some one, the fittest man, may be standing President of that Classis during life, except he deserve removal.

4. I could wish also that the Provincial Assembly (to be held once a quarter or half year in each County) may have the most able, discreet, godly Minister chosen to be the standing President also during life, unless he deserve removal.

So that here are four several sorts of Bishops that for Peace and Order I could consent to: to wit, 1. A General unfixed Superintendent. 2. A fixed Parochial Bishop President of that particular Presbytery. 3. A Classical Bishop, President of that Classis. 4. A Provincial Bishop, President of the Provincial Assembly. But there is no necessity of these.

5. Of the degree of their Power I said enough before. It is intolerable they should have a Negative vote in Excommunications and Absolutions and such Government of the people (except the Parochial Bishop) save only in case of appeals and there I leave it to each man's consideration, though I had rather they had none: But whether they should be admitted a Negative in Ruling the Pastors, I determine not: Only in case of Ordination, I would have all resolve to do nothing (except in a case of Necessity) but when the President is One: and stop there, which will permit him de facto the use of his Negative, and yet trouble no man's conscience to acknowledge de jure that it Muſt be, for to that none should be forced.

This much I could willingly yield to for reconciliation and unity: And I doubt not but I shall be sufficiently reproached by some for yielding so far, and by others for yielding no further:

AND now at last after these (not needful) preparations, I come to the main Question itself: Whether it be Necessary or Profitable: for the Right Order of Peace of the Churches, to restore the extended Episcopacy? And this I deny, and having said so,
so much already for explication, shall presently give you the Reasons of my denial; in which the rest of the necessary explication will be contained.

Argument 1. That sort of Prelacy or other Government which destroyeth the End of Government, and is certainly inconsistent with the Necessary Government and discipline to be exercised in the Churches, is not to be restored, under pretence of the Churches Order or Peace (nor can be consistent with its right Order and Peace.) But such is the Episcopacy which was of late exercised in England, and is now laid by. Therefore, &c.

The Major needs no proof; for few Christians I think, will deny it. If Episcopacy as lately here exercised, be the certain excluder of Government itself and Christ's discipline, while it only retains the empty name, then doubtless it is not to be restored.

The Minor I prove thus. If there be a very Natural Impossibility that the late English Episcopacy though in the hands of the best men in the world, should Govern the Churches as Christ hath appointed, and as they should and may otherwise be Governed; then the foresaid inconsistency and destructive-ness is apparent. But that there is such a Natural Impossibility for the late English Episcopacy to Govern the Church, thus I shall prove. 1. By shewing you what is undoubtedly necessary in Christ's Government; 2. And then what was the late English Episcopacy; and then 3. The Impossibility will appear of itself when both these are opened and compared together without any more ado.

1. And 1. It is past controversy among us, that Church Governors should watch over each particular soul in their flock, and instruct the ignorant, admonish the fallen, convince gainsayers, counterwork seducers among them, seek to reclaim the wandering, strengthen the weak, comfort the distressed, openly rebuke the open obstinate offenders, and if they repent not, to require the Church to avoid their Communion, and to take cognizance of their cause before they are cut off: as also to Absolve the penitent, yea to visit the sick (who are to send for the Elders of the Church:) and to pray with and for them, &c. yea and to go before them in the worship of God. These are the acts of Church Government that Christ hath appointed, and which each faithful Shepherd must use, and not Excommunication, and other
other Censures and Absolution alone.

2. But if they could prove that Church Government containeth only Censures and Absolution, yet we shall easily prove it Impossible for the late English Episcopacy to do that. For, 3. It is known to our sorrow that in most Parishes there are many persons, and in some greater Parishes very many, that have lived, common open swearers, or drunkards, and some whoremongers, common scorers of a godly life, and in many more of those offences, for which Scripture and the ancient Canons of the Church do excommunicate men, and we are commanded with such no not to eat. And its too well known what numbers of Heretics and Seducers there are, that would draw men from the faith, whom the Church-Governours must after the first and second admonition reject. 4. And then its known what a deal of work is Necessary with any one of these, in hearing accusations, examining Witnesses, hearing the defendants, searching into the whole cause, admonishing, waiting, re-admonishing, &c. 5. And then its known of how great Necessity, and moment all these are to the honour of the Gospel, the souls of the offenders, to the Church, to the weak, to them without, &c. So that if it be neglected, or unfaithfully managed, much mischief will ensue. Thus in part we see what the Government is.

Next let us see what the English Episcopacy is. And 1. For the extent of it, a Diocese contained many score or hundred Parishes, and so many thousands of such souls to be thus Governed. Perhaps some Dioceses may have five hundred thousand souls, and it may be London Diocese nearer a million. And how many thousand of these may fall under some of the forementioned acts of Government, by our sad experience we may conjecture.

2. Moreover the Bishop resideth, if not at London (as many of them did) yet in his own dwelling, many miles, perhaps twenty or thirty from a great part of his Diocese, so that most certainly he doth not so much as know by face, name, or report the hundredth, perhaps the thousandth, or perhaps the second or third thousandth person in his Diocese. Is it Possible then for him to watch over them, or to understand the quality of the person and fact? In Church Cases the quality of the person is of so much moment, that without some knowledge of it, the bare knowledge of the fact sometimes will not serve.
* I know Bishop Wher in his papers to the King, doth say, that by the Order of the Church of England, all Presbyters are charged (in the form of Ordering of Priests) to administer the Discipline of Christ: But the Bishops understood that only of their publishing their Censures. For no such Administration was known among us, or allowed: Nor would they suffer men to suspend them from the Sacrament, as the Rubrick in the Common Prayer Book requireth.

* 3. And then it is known that the English Episcopacy denyeth to the Presbyters all power of Excommunication and Absolution, unless to pronounce it as from the Bishop when he hath past it: And they deny him also all power so much as of calling a sinner to open Repentance, which they called Imposing Penance: and also they denied all power of denying the Lords Supper to any without the Bishops censure, except in a sudden case, and then they must prosecute it after at the Bishops Court; and there render the Reason of that suspension: So that the trouble, danger, labour, time would be so great that would be spent in it, that scarce one Minister of a hundred did venture on it once in seven and seven years, except only to deny the Sacrament to a man that would not kneel, and that they might do easily and safely.

4. And then Consider further, that if the Minister should be one of an hundred, and so diligent as to accuse and prosecute all the open scandalous offenders of his Parish, before the Bishops Court, that so he might procure that act of Government from them, which he may not perform himself, it would take up all his time, and perhaps all would not serve for half the work, considering how far he must ride, how frequently he must attend, &c. And then all the rest, or most of the Pastoral work must be neglected, to the danger of the whole Congregation.

5. It is a great penalty to an innocent man to travail so far, to the trial of his Cause. But the special thing that I note is this, that it is Naturally Impossible, for the Bishop to hear, try and judge all these causes, yea or the fifth or hundredth of them; or in some places one of five hundred. Can one man hear so many hundred as in a day must be before him, if this discipline be faithfully executed? By that time that he hath heard two or three Causes, and examined Witnesses, and fully debated all, the rest can have no hearing; and thus unavoidably the work must be undone. It is as if you set a Schoolmaster to teach ten or twenty thousand Schollars? Must they not be needs untaught? Or as if you set one Shepherd to look to two or three hundred several flocks of Sheep, that are every one of them three or four miles asunder, and some of them forty miles from some of the rest. Is it any wonder then if many of them be lost?
6. But what need we further witness then the sad experience of the Church of late? Are we not sure that discipline lay unexercised, and our Congregations defiled, and Gods Laws and the old Canons were dead letters, while the Bishops keep up the lame and empty name of Governours? How many drunkards, swearers, whoremongers, raylers, Extortioners, Scorners at a godly life did swarm in almost every Town and Parish? and they never heard of discipline, except it were one Adulterer or fornicator once in seven years within twenty miles compass (where I was acquainted) that stood in a white sheet in the Chuch: We know that there was no such Matter as Church Government exercised to any purpose, but all left undone, unless it were to undoe a poor Disciplinarian (as they therefore scornfully called them) that blamed them for neglect of Discipline. For my part, the Lord my Judge knows, that I desire to make the matter rather better then it was, then worse then it was: and I solemnly profess that for the Peace of the Church, I shoule sub- mit to almost any body that would but do the work that is to be done. Here is striving between the Episcopal, Presbyterian and Independent, who it is that shall Govern. I would make no great stirr against any of them all that would but do it effectually. Let it be done, and its not so much matter by whom it is done, as it is to have it lie undone. But I can never be for that party that neither did the work, when they might, nor possibly can do it. To be for them, is to consent that all should be undone; and that Drunkards and Railers and all wicked persons shall continue so still, or continue members of our Churches in all their obstinacy: and that there shall be nothing but the name of Government and Censure without the thing. Its hard making men of Conscience believe the contrary that have had the trial that we have had: If where good men were Bishops thus it was, what hope of better by that way? We cannot shut our eyes against so great experience. And certainly those Learned men among us that think so much Discipline may serve turn to all the Congregations in the whole Dioces, as the Bishop can perform or have a Negative Vote in, do too manifestly shew that they * are less friends to real godliness, and greater friends to sin, teach, or are themselves such as they describe, or really would promote a holy life; especially when Scorners at a godly life were favoured more then the practisers of it.
and care too little for the matter itself while they contend about
the manner or agent, then serious Christians should do. If men
once plainly shew themselves mere formalists, and would set up
a scarecrow, and pull down all true Discipline, by setting up
one man to do the work of five hundred, and making the exer-
cise of it impossible, what serious Christian will ever take their
part? Not I while I breathe: Who can choose but see that such
do seek their dignity, and Lordships, and worldly Mammon
more than then the Kingdom of Christ. I know they will be angry
with me for this language; but so are most impenitent persons
with reproofs. I would advise all of them that survive to lay
to heart before the Lord, what they did, in undertaking such
an impossible task, and leaving so many souls and Congrega-
tions without Christ's remedy, and suffering the Churches to
be so foul, while they had the Beelom in their hands.

This being so manifest that it is impossible for an English Bis-
shop to Govern as they undertook so many Congregations, I may
well next argue from the mischiefs that follow.

Argum. 2. That Government which gratifieth the Devil
and wicked men, is not to be restored under any
pretence of the Order or Peace of the Church: But such was the
English Episcopacy; therefore, &c.

The Major is undeniable, supposing that it do not this by an
avoidable accident, but by natural Necessity, as I have proved.
I confess some of the Men were so Learned and Good men, that
I think few men honour their names more than myself. But it
is the way of Government that I have spoke of.

And for the Minor, it is as plain from experience, and the argu-
ment before used. If it necessarily exclude the exercise of Christ's
discipline from most Congregations, then doth it gratifiie Satan:
But, &c.

And if it keep wicked obstinate sinners from the power of
discipline, then doth it gratifiie sinners in their Sins, and conse-
quently please Satan. But this it doth: therefore, &c.

Who knows not (for it cannot be denied) that the generality
of the rabble of ignorant persons, worldlings, drunkards, haters
of Godliness, &c. are very zealous for Episcopacy, whilst multi-
itudes
tudes of truly conscientious people have been against it? And
who knows not that they both feect their chief Motives from
experience? The ungodly found that Bishops let them keep their
sins, and troubled them not with this preciseness, but rather
drove away the precise preachers and people whom they ab-
horred. And the godly people that disliked Episcopacy,
did it principally on the same experience, observing that
they befriended the wicked, at least by preserving them from the
due rod of discipline; but exercised their zeal against them that
scrupled or questioned at least their own standing or assumed
power, or the abuse of it. And then further,

Argum. 3. 

Hat Government which unavoidably causeth se-
parations and divisions in the Church, is not to
be restored under any pretence of its Order and Peace? But such is
the English Episcopacy? therefore; &c.

I know the clean contrary is strongly pretended, and they
tell us that we may see how Episcopacy kept men in Unity,
by the many Sects that since are risen. But let it be observed,
1. That these Sects were hatched in the separation which was
caused by themselves. 2. That the increase hath been since there
was no Government at all. 3. It was not Episcopacy, but the
Magistrates Sword whose terror did attend it, that kept under
heresies in that measure that they were: Had Episcopacy stood
on its own legs, without the support of secular force, so that it
might have workt only on the conscience, then you should have
seen more Sects then now. Do you think that if Episcopacy were
in Scotland in the Case as Presbytery is now, without the Sword
to enforce it, that it would keep so much Unity in Religion as is
there? Its known in France and other places that Presbytery
hath kep more Unity, and more kept out Heresies and Schisms,
even without the Sword, then Episcopacy hath done with it.

4. But the thing that I speak of it undeniable, that it was
the pollution of our Churches that caused the Separatists in the
Bishops dayes to withdraw. This was their common cry against
us, Your Churches bear with Drunkards, Whoremongers, Rail-
ers; open Scorners at Godliness, with whom the Scripture bids
us not eat; And we could not deny it: for the Bishops did keep

See my Preface to Mr. Pierce of Gratius Religion. Were Prelacy
now tolerated only as Presbyterie and the Congrega-
gational way are, doth any man think it would cast one keep one Heresies

it so, by keeping out all effectual Discipline. Only we told them, that it was the Prelates sin, and not theirs that could not help it, and that a polluted Church might be a true Church. And so the Disciplinarian Non-Conformists were fain by many painful writings to suppress the spirit of separation, or else it had been like to have overwhelmed all; Mr. John Paget, Mr. Bradshaw, Mr. Arthur Hildersham, Mr. John Ball, Mr. Brightman, Mr. Paul Bains, Mr. Dod, Mr. Parker, Dr. Ames, and many other such, were fain to make it a great part of their business, to quench the fire of separation, which even their persecutors kindled by the exclusion of Discipline. And yet the sense of the Churches uncleanness was so deep in mens minds, that it had bred such abundance of discontented humors, that they easily broke out, and turned into this disorderly swarm which we have seen, as soon as the wars had but given them liberty.

And even to this day it is the uncleanness of our Churches, (wherein I would the Pastors were wholly innocent,) which maintaineth much of the separation, among many sober godly men. For the Churches were left so polluted by the Bishops, that in most places the Presbyters dare scarce go roundly about the cure, unless they had the help of the sword, wherein yet for my part I think them deeply sinful.

Argum. 4. That Episcopacy which degradeth all the Presbyters in the Diocese, or causeth them to suspend the exercise of an Essential part of their Office, is not to be restored under any pretence of right order, or peace. But such was the late English Episcopacy: therefore.

I confess this is the second inconvenience which followeth it, which I think utterly intolerable, where there is any possibility of a remedy. The Major I suppose will be granted. For though an Office may be unexercised for a time on some special reason, yet if it be statedly suspended, and that suspension established by Law or Custom, during the life of the Minister, this is plainly a destroying or nulling of the Office itself, and not to be endured.

And that it is not to be endured appeareth thus; that the Office of the Presbyter is of Divine Institution, and there-
fore not to be nulled by man. I never yet read or heard of any
more but one Divine of any reputation who denied that Pre-
byters as now called are appointed in the Scriptures, and I think,
that one hath destroyed his cause by it, of which more anon.
2. Because the Church cannot with any safety spare the Office
of the Presbyters, because they are many, perhaps many hun-
dred to one Prelate: and if so many of Christ’s Officers be laid by,
it is easy to see what loss the vineyard and harvest may sustain.

The Minor I prove thus: That Episcopacy which taketh from
the Presbyters the power of Church Government, and alloweth
them only the power of preaching and administering Sacraments,
and those other parts of the work which they distinguish from
Government, do thereby destroy the very Office of the Pres-
byters (and so degrade or suspend them) But the late English
Episcopacy taketh from the Presbyters the power of Church-
Governing; &c. therefore.

The Antecedent is well known by those that know their Canons,
claim and constant practice in England, till the time of their ex-
clusion. That the Consequence is currant appeareth thus: Churc’h
Government is as real and as essential a part of the Pres-
byters work and office as any other whatsoever. Therefore they
that take this from him, do destroy his Office.

The Antecedent is proved thus: if those Texts of Scripture
which mention the Office of Presbyters, Acts 20. and 14. 23.
and many other places do speak of Presbyters as now understood,
and not of Prelates, then Ruling is as much essential to their
office as Preaching. This is proved, 1. From the express words
of the several Texts, which make them Overseers of the flock,
Acts 20. 28. and to be over the people in the Lord, to whom
they are to submit, 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. and Rulers of them, whom
they must obey, as well as Preachers to them, Heb 13. 7, 17. 24.
1 Tim. 3. 4. 5. 2. Its proved from common Consent. For,
1. Those that think these Texts speak of Presbyters as now un-
derstood, do most commonly confess this sense of the Text, viz.
that it makes them Rulers; only some of them add, that
themselves must be Ruled by the Bishops. 2. He that denieth
these Texts to speak of such Presbyters, doth confess that those
of whom it doth speak, are certainly Rulers of the Church.
fitors old and new, Episcopal and others from the Apostles daies
till now, as far as we can know by their writings, did take these
Texts, at least many of them, to speak of such Presbyters:
and I think the new exposition of one man, is not to be taken
against the Exposition of the whole stream of Expositors in all
ages, without better reason to evince them to have erred, then
any I have yet seen produced. At least, all the Episcopal Di-
vines except that one man, and those that now follow his new
Exposition, must yield to what I say, upon the authority of these
Texts.

But if this Divine were in the right, and none of these Texts
be spoken of Presbyters, yet I make good my Antecedent thus.
For 1. If Presbyters be of humane Institution, then neither
Preaching or Ruling is any Essentia part of their Office by Di-
vine Institution; because they have none such: and therefore I
may say one is as essencial as the other: that is, neither is so.
But yet of their humanly instituted Office, it is as essentia a
part still: for if it be true, that there were no Presbyters in the
Church till about Ignatius his daies, yet its certain that when
they were instituted ( whether by God or man) they were as
truly made Rulers as Preachers. And therefore we find their
Ignatius still calling on the people to obey the Presbyters as well
as the Bishops. And Hierom tells us, (Epif. ad Evag.) how
long the Presbyters governed the Churches Communi Consilio,
by Common Counsel or Consent, and how themselves at Alex-
andria chose out one and made him their Bishop: and Cyprian
tells us enough of the Presbyters ruling in Council or Consilto
with the Bishop in his time: so that he would do nothing with-
out the Presbyters. Much more proof may easily be brought of
this, but that I find it now acknowledged, and so it is needless.
I will not go far, but only note a few Canons, especially of the
fourth Council of Carthage. Can.23 is, Ut Episcopus nulius
Caufam etiam abfque praefentia Clericorum suorum; aliqum ir-
vita erit fen'tentia Episophi, nisi Clericorum praefentia confirmeretur.

Can.22. Episcopus sine Consilio Clericorum Suorum Clericos
non ordinet; ita ut Civium affensus, & conniventiam, & testi-
monia quaerat.

Can. 29. Episcopus & Clerico vel laico crimen impofuerit, de-
educatur ad probationem in Synodum.
Can. 32. Irrita erit donatio Episcoporum, vel venditio, vel com-
mutatio rei Ecclesiastica, absq; conniventia & subscriptione cler-
orum.

Can. 34. Ut Episcopus in quolibet loco sedens stare Presbyterum
non patiatur.

Can. 35. Ut Episcopus in Ecclesia in consenso Presbyterorum
sublimior sedet: Intra domum vero collegam se Presbyterorum
esse cognoscat.

Can. 36. Presbyter qui per dioceses Ecclesiæ regunt, non à qui-
buslibet, &c.

Can. 37. Diaconis sita se Presbyteri ut Episcopi Ministrum
esse cognoscat.

Here you see that Bishops may not Ordain, hear any cause,
accuse a Clergy man or Lay-man, not give, sell, or Change any
Church goods, without the Presbyters: and that he is their Col-
league, and must not let them stand if he sit, and that they Rule
the Churches through the Diocesses, and that the Deacons are
Servants as well to them as to the Bishop. Aurelius and Augustine
were in this Council.

If they that think it uncertain whether Presbyters be menti-
oned in the New Testament, and that think they began about Ig-
natius his time, do mean that yet they were of Divine Apostoli-
cal Institution, then they strike in with the Papists in making the
Scriptures to be but part of God's word, and insufficient to reveal
all Divine institutions about his Church-Government, and Wor-
ship, and so we must look for the rest in uncertain Tradition. Nay
I know not of any Papist to my best remembrance that ever
reckoned up the Office of Presbyters under their meer un writ-
ten Traditions.

If they say that they are of Ecclesiastical Episcopal Institu-
ton, not by inspired Apostles, but by Ordinary Bishops, then
they make all Presbyters to be jure Episcopali, and Bishops
only and their Superiors to be jure Divino, as the Italians in the
Council of Trent would have had all Bishops to depend upon
the Pope: But in this they go far beyond them; for the Italian
and Chrysoft. may do all that a Bishop; and he addeth, Quid obstat quo minus id iis
interpretetur ut Presbyteri nominem potuerint ordinare contemto Episco poco?

And pag. 359. He shews that where Bishops are not, Presbyters do rightly ordain.
See the beginning of Bishop Ussher's Reduction of Episcopal Government.
Papists themselves thought *Presbyterie jure Divino.* 2. Either they may be changed by Bishops who set them up, or not: If they may be taken down again by man, then the Church may be ruined by man; and so the Bishops will imitate the Pope; Either they will Reign, or Christ shall not Reign, if they can hinder it: Either they will lead the Church in their way, or Christ shall have no Church: If man cannot take them down, then 1. It seems man did not Institute them; for why may they not alter their own institutions? 2. And then it seems the Church hath universal standing, unchangeable Institutions, Offices and binding Laws of the Bishops making: And if so, are not the Bishops equal to the Apostles in Law making, and Church Ordering? and are not their Laws to us as the word of God, and that word insufficient? and every Bishop would be to his Dioces, and all to the whole Church, what the Pope would be to the whole.

3. Moreover, how do they prove that ever the Apostles gave power to the Bishops to institute the order of Presbyterie? I know of no text of Scripture by which they can prove it: And for Tradition, we will not take every mans word that faith he hath tradition for his conceits, but we require the proof. The Papists that are the pretended keepers of Tradition, do bring forth none as meerly unwritten, but for their *ordines inferiores,* and many of them, for Bishops as distinct from the Presbyters; but not for Presbyters themselves. And Scripture they can plead none; For if they mention such texts where Paul bids Titus ordain Elders in every City, &c. they deny this to be meant of Elders as now, but of Prelates whom Titus as the Primate or Metropolitane was to ordain: And if it be meant of Elders, then they are found in Scripture, and of Divine Apostolical Institution.

4. If they were Instituted by Bishops after the Scripture was written, was it by one Bishop, or by many? If by one, then how came that one to have Authority to impose a new Institution on the universal Church? If by many, either out of Council, or in; if out of Council, it was by an accidental falling into one mind and way, and then they are but as single men to the Church: and therefore still we ask, how do they bind us? If by many in Council, 1. Then let them tell us what Council it was that
that Instituted Presbyterie, when and where gathered, and where we may find their Canons, that we may know our order, and what Authors mention that Council. 2. And what authority had that Council to bind all the Christian world, to all ages? If they say it bound but their own Churches, and that age; then it seems the Bishops of England might for all that have null’d the Order of Presbyters there. But O miserable England and miserable world, if Presbyters had done no more for it, then Prelates have done!

I conclude therefore that the English Prelacy either degraded the Presbyters, or else suspended totally an essential part of their office: for themselves called them Rectors, and in ordaining them said, [Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted, whose sins thou dost retain they are retained] And therefore they delivered to them the Power of the Keys of opening and shutting the Kingdom of Heaven, which themselves make to be the opening and shutting of the Church, and the Governing of the Church by Excommunication and Absolution: And therefore they are not fit men to ask the Presbyters; By what authority they Rule the Church, by binding and loosing, when themselves did expressly as much as in them lay, confer the Power on them: And we do no more then what they bid us do in our Ordination; Yea they thereby make it the very work of our office: For the same mouth, at the same time that bid us [take authority to preach the word of God] did also tell us that whose sins we remit or retain they are remitted or retained: and therefore if one be an Essential, or true integral part at least of our office, the other is so too. From all which it is evident, that if there were nothing against the English Prelacy, but only this that they thus suspend or degrade all the Presbyters in England, as to one half of their office, it is enough to prove that they should not be restored under any pretence whatsoever of Order or Unity.
Argum. 5. That Episcopacy which giveth the Government of the Church, and management of the Keys of Excommunication and Absolution into the hands of a few Lay-men, while they take them from the Presbyters, is not to be restored under any pretence of Unity or Peace: But such was the English Prelacy: therefore, &c.

The Major is plain: because it is not Lay-men that are to be Church Governors, as to Ecclesiastical Government: This is beyond Question with all, save the Congregational, and they would not have two or three Laymen chosen, but the whole Congregation to manage this business.

The Minor is known by common experience, that it was the Chancellor in his Court, with his assistants and the Regifter, and such other meer Lay-men, that managed this work. If it be said, that they did it as the Bishops Agents and Substitutes, and therefore it was he that did it by them; I answer, 1. The Law put it in the Chancellors, and the Bishops could not hinder it. 2. If the Bishops may delegate others to do their work, then it seems Preaching and Ruling, Excommunicating and Absolving may as well be done by Lay-men as Clergy men: Then they may commission them also to administer the Sacraments: And so the Ministry is not necessary for any of these works, but only a Bishop to depute Lay-men to do them; which is false and confusive.

Argum. 6. That Episcopacy which necessarily overwhelmeth the souls of the Bishops with the most hainous guilt, of neglecting the many thousand souls whose charge they undertake, is not to be restored for Order or Peace (For men are not to be overwhelmed with such hainous sin on such pretences) But such is the English Prelacy: and that not accidentally, through the badness of the men only, but unavoidably through the greatness of their charge, and the Natural Impossibility of their undertaken work. How grievous a thing it is to have the blood of so many thousands charged on him, may soon appear. And that man that undertakes himself the Government of two or three
three, or five hundred thousand souls that he never seeth or knoweth, nor can possibly to Govern, but must needs leave it undone (except the shadow of a Government which is committed to a Lay Chancellor,) doth willfully draw this fearful Guilt upon himself.

Argum. 7. That Episcopacy which is the product of Proud Ambition and Arrogancy, contrary to the express command of Christ, is not to be restored for Order or Peace. But such is the late English Prelacy: therefore, &c.

The Major is undoubted. The Minor is proved thus. Were it not for proud Ambition men would not strive to have the doing of more work then an hundred times as many are able to do, and the answering before God for as many souls: But the English Prelates did strive to have the work and account of many hundreds: therefore, &c.

The Minor is proved and known by experience. And the Major is proved thus. 1. From the common averseness that all men have to labour, excessive oppressing labour, and that spiritual too. 2. From the self-love that is naturally in all: No man can naturally and rationally desire that which would tire him, oppress him, and finally damn him, without great repentance, and the special mercy of God, unless by the power of some lust that draweth him to it. 3. And common prudence will teach men not to thrust themselves into impossible undertakings. If we see a man desirous to have the Rule of a whole County under the Prince, and that there should be no Justice of Peace, or other Magistrate to Rule there but he, though he know that he must answer it upon his life, if the County be not well Ruled, as to the punishing of all the known drunkards, swearers, adulterers, &c., in the County; may not any man see that Ambition makes this man in a manner besides himself, or else he would never set so light by his own life, as certainly and willfully to cast it away, by undertaking a work which he knoweth many men are unable to perform: And Ambition it must needs be, because Honour and Preeminency is the bait and thing contended for, and there is nothing else to do it. And how expressly doth Christ forbid this to his Apostles, telling them, [With you it shall]
not be so: but he that will be the greatest shall be the servant of all]
Luke 22:26. As the old Rimer hath it [Christus dixit quidam loco: non non sic, nec dixit joco: dixit nos ergo si? Cujus sanct? non cert? Christi] Speaking of the Prelates. I own not the Censure, but I own Christs prohibition. Certainly the Honour is but the appendix for the work fake, and the work is the first thing and the main of the office. And I would know whether they would strive thus for the work and the terrible account, without the honour and worldly gain. Nay do they not destroy the work, while they quarrel for the doing of it, for the honor fake? If it were the Churches good and the work that they so much minded, they would contend that so many should have the doing of it as are necessary thereto, and not that none should do it but they. He that would turn all the labourers out of the Harvest saving himself, in all this County, that he may maintain his own privileged, I should think doth not much mind the good of the owner, or the well doing of the work, or his own safety, if he were to answer for all upon his life.

Argum. 8. That Episcopacy which so far gratifeth lazy Ministers as to ease them of the most painful, troublesome and hazardous part of their work, is not to be restored for order or unity: but such was the late English Prelacy: therefore, &c.

The Major is undoubted. The Minor is before proved as to the work it self. And as to the quality and consequents, experience putteth it past all doubt, that the work of Government and Oversight, is incomparably more troublesome then the preaching of a Sermon, Baptizing, administering the Lords Supper, and praying with them. When we come to touch men by personal reproof, and make that publike, and that for disgraceful sins, and suspend or excommunicate them if they be obstinate, usually we do not only turn their hearts against us, but they rage against us, and could even be revenged on us with the cruellest revenge. We find that all the Preaching in the world doth not so much exasperate and enrage men, as this Discipline. I can Preach the most cutting and convincing truths, in as close a manner as I am able, to notorious wicked livers, and they will bear it patiently, and say it was a good Sermon, and some of them say that
that they care not for hearing a man that will not tell them of their sins. And yet call them to an open confession of these sins in the Congregation, or proceed to censure them, and they will rage against us as if we were their mortal enemies. The Bishops let all these men (almost) alone; and therefore never exasperated them: and so now they rage the more against us, and love the Bishops the better, because they were never so troubled by them.

And here I cannot but note, how groundless that accusation is of some Prelatical men against the Conscionable adversaries of their way, when they say, the Presbyters would fain have the Reins of Government in their own hand: which may be true of the unconscionable, that know not what it is that they undertake: but for others, it is all one as to say, They would fain have all the trouble, hatred and danger to themselves. These Objecters shew their own minds, and what it is that they look at most themselves: and therefore think others do so: its dear bought honour that is purchased at such rates of labour and danger. I here solemnly profess for my own part, that if I know my heart, I am so far from thinking it a desirable thing to Rule, much less to Rule a Diocess, that if I might so far gratifie my carnal desires, and were not under the bond of Gods Commands, and so were it not for fear of sinning and wronging mens souls that are committed to my charge, I would give, if I had it, many thousand pounds, that I might but Pray, Read, Baptize, administer the Lords Supper, though I did more then I do in them, and be wholly freed from the care and trouble of oversight and government of this one Congregation, which is further required. O how quiet would my mind be, were I but sure that God required none of this at my hands, nor would call me to any account for the neglect of it! And that this is not my case only, but the common case to find Discipline so troublesome, is apparent in this; that the whole body of the Nation (for the generality) have contended against it these many years, and in almost every Congregation in England, the greater part do either separate from the Ministers, and forbear the Lords Supper, or some way oppose it and withdraw, that they may avoid it. And most of the Ministers in England, even godly men, do much, if not altogether neglect it. So that some through a Carnal indulging of
their own ease and quiet, and to avoid mens ill will; and some through the great oppositions of the people, or for one such cause or other, do let all alone. In so much, as even here in this County where we have associated and engaged our selves to some execution of Discipline, this work goes on so heavily as we see, and need not mention further: when yet there is not a daies omission of Sermons and other Ordinances: so that its apparent that its it which all lazie, carnal, man-pleasing Ministers may well comply with, as that which suites their Carnal Interests, to be free from the toil and care of Discipline.

If you say, why then do the Bishops desire it, if flesh and blood be against it? I answer, Experience and the impossibility of performance tells us, that it is not the work, but the empty name and honour that they took up: and that indeed the flesh doth much more desire. Had they desired or been willing of the work, as they were of Lordships and Riches, they would have done it.

Argum. 9. No Episcopal, (at least which hath so many evils as aforesaid attending it) which is not of Gods Institution, should be admitted into the Church. The late English Prelacy, as to the disapproved properties before mentioned, is not of Gods Institution: therefore it is not to be admitted into the Church.

The Major is confessed by all that plead for the jus Divinum of Episcopal, or most: and with the qualification, from the ill consequents, will be yielded by all.

The Minor I prove by parts: 1. That the exclusion of Prelbyters from Rule, and the putting the Government from them into a Lay-mans hand, with the rest before mentioned, are not of Divine Institution, is proved already, as much as needs. 2. If at the present we yield a superintendency or preheminence of one Pastor before others, yet the Controversie remaineth, whether a Prelate should be only Parochial, that is, only the President of the Elders of one particular Church, or at the utmost of that with two or three, or a few neighbour small Parishes which he may well oversee, without the neglect of the Discipline. Now I know not how any man of that way can prove our
out of Scripture, that a Bishop must have more then one Parish, much less more then three or four, or a few. For it is confess
by them, for ought I know, that Scripture doth not determine
how many Presbyters, or Churches a Bishop must have under
him, (only we say he must have but one:) for the main thing
that they labour to prove is, that a Bishop is above Presby-
ters as to Ordination and Jurisdiction: and so he may be if he
be a Parish-Bishop: for a Parish-Church may have a Curate,
and 2 or 3 Chappels with Curates at them, besides Deacons;
and according to the old course, perhaps many Presbyters more
that did not publikeely preach (though they wanted not autho-
rica) but oversee the flock. Now one man may have all that
most of their Arguments require, if he be but the chief over this
Parish Presbytery.

But perhaps they will say, that according to Scripture, every
City only must have a Bishop, and therefore all the Country
about must be his Diocess, though the number of Churches and
Presbyters under him be not determined. To which I answer,
that the word Only, is not in Scripture: no Text faith that it was
Only in Cities that Churches or Bishops were to be seated. There
is no prohibition of setting them in Villages.

It will be said, that There is no example of any Bishop but in a
City. To which I answer. 1. Themselves ordinarily tell us in
cafe of Sacrament gesture, and many other things, that examples
do not alway bind affirmatively; much less can they prove that
they bind negatively; I mean, not to do that which was not
done. Can you prove in Scripture that there were any particular
Churches or Assemblies for Sacraments and other worship in
Villages? If not, then is it lawful now to have any? If not, then
all our Parish Churches in the Country are unlawful. If yea,
then why may we not have Bishops in the Countrey's without
Scripture example, as well as Churches? for we shall prove that
the reasons why there were none or few Bishops in the Country,
was for want of Churches for them to oversee. The Gospel
was not then preached, nor any Bishops placed in many Nations
of the world: it doth not follow therefore that there must be
none since. 2. The reason is evident why Churches and Bishops
were first planted in Cities; because there was the greatest
Concourse of people: not that God loves a Citizen better then a
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Country-man, or that he will have his Churches so limited to soil, or place, or situation: it is the number of persons wherever they live, that must be regarded, that the Church be not too great nor too small: but if there be the same number of people Cohabiting in the Country, as one of the Apostolical Churches did consist of, then there is the same reason to have a Church and Bishop in that Country Village, as was then for having one in a City. 3. Elders should be ordained in every Church, and therefore Bishops (for some of them say that these were Bishops.) But Churches may be in Country Villages; therefore Elders and Bishops may be in Country-Villages. 4. I prove from Scripture that there were Bishops in Villages, or out of Cities, thus. Where there was a Church, there was a Bishop. But in a Village there was a Church; therefore. The Major. I prove from Acts 14.23. compared with 1 Tim. 3. They ordained them Elders in every Church, or Church by Church: but these Elders are called Bishops in 1 Tim. 3. (and by some of that way maintained to be such.)

For the Minor I prove it from Rom. 16.1. where there is mention of the Church at Cenchrea: but Cenchrea was no City, but as Grosius speaks, Portus Corinthiorum, ut Piraeus Atheniensium, viz. ad finum Saronicum: apparet ibi Ecclesiamuisse Christianorum. Grot. in Acts 18.18. & in Rom. 16.1. vide et Downam, Defens. pag. 105. who out of Strabo faith, it was the Port that served most properly, for Asia. But Bishop Downam faith (ibid.) that Cenchrea was a Parish subordinate to the Church of Corinth, having not a Bishop or Presbytery, but a Presbyter assigned to it: so before he faith, by a Church, he means a Company of Christians having a Bishop and Presbytery.] But if he will so define a Church as that the Prelate shall enter the Definition, then he may well prove that every Church had a Prelate. And so a Patriarch may be proved to be Necessary to every Church, if you will say, you mean ony such congregations as have a Patriarch. But it was denominated a Church, Acts 14.23. before they had Presbyters ordained to them, and so before fixed Bishops: when the Apostles had converted and congregated them, they were Churches. And the Text faith that they ordained them Elders in every Church, or Church by Church; and therefore Cenchrea being a Church, must have such Elders.
Elders ordained to it, according to the Apostles Rule. And that it was a Parish with one Presbyter subject to Corinth, is all unproved, and therefore to no purpose.

5. Yet I prove that the English Prelacy on their own grounds, is not pure Divino in that it is against the word of God, according to their own interpretation; of which next.

Argum. 10. That Episcopacy which is contrary to the word of God, or Apostolical Institution, according to their own interpretation, is not to be restored. But such is the late English Episcopacy: therefore, &c.

I prove the Minor (for the Major needeth none:) according to their own interpretation of Tit. i. 5. and other Texts; Every City should have a Bishop, (and if it may be, a Presbytery) (And so many Councils have determined, only when they grew greater, they except Cities that were too small: but so did not Paul.) But the late Episcopacy of England is contrary to this: for one Bishop only is over many Cities. If therefore they will needs have Episcopacy, they should at least have had a Bishop in every City: and though we do not approve of confining them to Cities, yet this would be much better then as they were: for then 1. They would be nearer their charges, and within reach of them. 2. And they would have smaller charges, which they might be more capable of overseeing; for there would be ten or twenty Bishops for one that be now. If they say that except Bath and Wells, Coventry and Lichfield, or some few, they have but one City. I answer, its not so. For every Corporation or Burrough-Town is truly πολις; and therefore should have a Bishop. Let them therefore either prove that a Market Town, a Burrough, a Corporation, is not πολις, or else let every one of these Towns and Burroughs have a Bishop, to govern that Town with the Neighbouring Villages by the consent and help of the Presbyters of these Villages, (according to their own grounds.) And if it were so, they would be no more then Classical Bishops at most.

Perhaps they'll say that, while we pretend to take down Bishops, we do but set up more, and would have many for one, while we would have every Corporation or Parish to have a Bishop. To which I answer, its true: but then it is not the same sort of Bishops which we would exclude and which we would
multiply: we would exclude those Bishops that would undertake two or three hundred mens work themselves, and will rule a whole Diocess alone (or by a Lay Chancellor) when every conscionable man that hath faithfully tried it, doth feel the oversight of one Congregation to be so great a burden, that it makes him groan and groan again. We would exclude those Bishops that would exclude all others in a whole Diocess, that they may do the work alone, and so leave it undone, while they plead that it belongs to them to do it. If they will come into the Lords Harvest, and exclude from the work of Government, the Labourers of a whole County or two, we have reason to contradict them. But this is not to bring in more such Bishops as they that will shut out others, but to keep in the necessary labouring Bishops whom they would shut out. Nor do we shut out them themselves as Labourers or Rulers, but as the excluders of the Labourers or Rulers. If we have a Church to build that requireth necessarily two hundred workmen, and some Pillars in it to erect, of many hundred ton weight, if one of the workmen would say, that it belongs to him to do it all himself, or at least when the materials are brought to the place prepared, to rear and order and place every stone and pillar in the building, I would no otherwise exclude the vain pretender then by introducing necessary help that the work may be done; and I should think him a silly Caviller that would tell me, that while I exclude him, I do but multiply such as he; when his very fault consisted in an hinderance of that necessary multiplication.

I know that some will say, that we feign more work then is to be done; and we would have the sentence of Excommunication pass upon every light offence. I answer; that its a thing that we abhor: we would have none, Excommunicated but for obstinacy in hainous sin; when they will not hear the Church after more private admonition. But there's much more of the work of Government to be done on men that are not Excommunicable, to bring them to Repentance, and open confession, for manifestation of that Repentance to the satisfaction of the Church: but what need we plead how great the work is which every man may see before his eyes, and experience putteth beyond dispute?

Furthermore that the English Episcopacy is dissonant from all Scripture
Scripture Episcopacy, I prove thus. The Scripture knoweth but two sorts of Episcopacy: the one General, unfixed as to any Church or Country or Nation; which was not called Episcopacy in the first times: the other fixed Overseers of determinate Churches appropriated to their special charge: these were called Bishops in those times: whereas the former were, some called Apostles, from their immediate mission and extraordinary Priviledges; or Evangelists, or Fellow-labourers and helpers of the Apostles, or by the like titles signifying their unlimited indeterminate charge. But our English Bishops are neither of these: therefore not any of Scripture appointment but different from them. 1. They are not of the Apostolical Order of General Ministers: for 1. Their principal work was Preaching to convert, and congregate, and then order Churches: but our Bishops seldom preached, for the most part. 2. They were not tyed to any particular Church more then other, save only as prudence directed them pro tempore & renata, for the success of their work for the Church Universal; nor were they excluded or restrained from any part of the world as being another mans Diocess; save only as prudence might direct them for the common good, to distribute themselves pro tempore. This is apparent: 1. by Christ's Commission, who sendeth them into all the world, only by certain advantages and particular calls, fitting Peter more for the Circumcision, and Paul for the Uncircumcision, when yet both Peter and Paul and all the rest, did preach and look to both Circumcision and Uncircumcision. 2. By the History of their peregrinations and labours, which shew that they were not so fixed, whatever some writers may ungroundedly affirm. Eusebius (discrediting by fabulous mixtures the lighter sort of his Testimonies, and cenfured by some rejection by Gelasius and others) and some with him, do tell us of some such things, as some Apostles being fixed Bishops, but with no such proofs as should satisfy a man that weighs the contrary intimations of Scripture, and the discord of these reporters among themselves. Only it is certain, that nature it self would to restrain them that as they could be but in one place at once, so they could not be in perpetual motion: and prudence would keep them longest in those places where most work was to be done. And therefore Paul's three years abode at Ephesus and the neigh-

 bouring.
bouring parts of Asia, did not make him the fixed Diocesan Bishop of Ephesus.

And what I say of the Apostles, I say also of many such Itinerant unfixed Ministers which were their helpers, as Silas, Apollo, Barnabas, Titus, Timothy, &c. For though Timothy be called by some Antenaeus the first Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete; yet it is apparent they were no such fixed Ministers, that undertook a Diocel's during vita as their proper charge, which were then called Bishops; but they were Itinerant helpers of the Apostles in gathering, planting and first ordering of Churches. And therefore Titus was left in a whole Nation or large Island, to place Bishops or Elders in each City, and set things in order, and this but till Paul come, and not to be himself their fixed Bishop: and Timothy is proved by Scripture to have been unfetled and itinerant as a helper of Paul, after that he is by some supposed to be fixed at Ephesus. I will not needlessly aitum agere: let any man that is unsatisfied of this, read impartially Mr. Prins unbishoping of Timothy and Titus, and note there the Itinerary of Timothy from Scripture Texts. If therefore our Bishops would have been of the Apostles and their General helpers race, they should have gone up and down to gather and plant Churches, and then go up and down to visit those which they have planted; or if they live where all are Enchurched already, they should go up and down to preach to the ruder sort of them, and by the power of the word to subdue men further to Christ, and to see that all Ministers where they come do their duty, reproving and admonishing those that neglect it, but not forbidding them to do it, as a thing belonging only to them. And by Spiritual weapons and authority should they have driven Ministers to this duty, and not by meer secular force (of which more anon.)

2. And as for the fixed Bishops of Apostolical Institution, our English Prelacy are not like them. For the fixed Bishops established by the Apostles were only Overseers of one particular Church: But the English Prelates were the Overseers of many particular Churches. Therefore the English Prelates were not the same with the old Bishops of the Apostles institution.

The course that the Prelates take to elude this argument is by giving us a false definition of a particular Church. That we may not therefore have any unprofitable strife about words,
I shall signify my own meaning. By a Particular Church I mean an Associated or combined company of Christians, for Communion in Publick Worship, and Furtherance of each other in the way to heaven, under the Guidance of Christ's Church Officers, (one Elder or more;) such as are undivided, or Churches of the first order commonly called Ecclesia Prima, as to existence, and which contain not divers Political Churches in them. A family I mean not: for that's not a Political Church, having no Pastor. An accidental company of Christians I mean not. For those are no Association, and so no Political Church: Nor do I mean a National, or Diocesan or Classical Church, or any the like; which are composed of many particular Churches of the first order, conjunct. It is not of Necessity that they alway or most usually meet in one Congregation: because its possible they may want a capacious convenient room, and its possible they may be under perfection, so that they may be forced to meet secretly in small companies; or there may be some aged weak people or children that cannot travall to the chief place of Meeting, and so may have some Chappels of ease, or smaller meeting. But still it must be a number neither so big, nor so small as to be incapable of the ends of Association, which enter the definition; however weakness, age or other accidents may hinder some members from that full usefullness as to the main end, which other members have. So that they which are so many, or live at such a distance as to be incapable of the ends, are not such a Church, nor are capable of so being: For the number will alter the species. In a word, it cannot, I think, be proved that in the Primitive times, there was any one fixed Bishop that Governed and Overseaw any more then one such particular political Church, as was not composed of divers lesser political Churches: nor that their Churches which any fixed Bishop Overseaw were more then could hold Communion in Worship in one publick place, for so many of them as could ordinarily bear at once (for all the families cannot usually come at once:) they were not greater then some of our English Parishes are, nor usually the tenth part so great. I have been informed by the judicious inhabitants, that there are fourscore thousand in Giles Cripple- gate Parish in London: and about fifty thousand in Stepney, and forty thousand in Sepulchres. There cannot any Church in Scripture be found that
that was greater, nor near so great as one of these Parishes. No not the Church at Jerusalem itself of which so much is said: No not if you admit all the number of moveable Converts and So-journours to have been of that particular Church, which yet cannot be proved to have been so. I know Bishop Downam doth with great indignation Dispute that Diocesses were before Parishes, and that it was more then one Congregation that was contained in those Diocesses; We will not contend about the name Diocess and Parish, which by the Ancients were sometime used promiscuously for the same thing: But as to the thing signified by them, I say that what ever you call it, a Diocess, or a Parish, there were not near so many souls as in some English Parishes; nor take one with another, their Churches commonly were no more Numerous then our Parishes, nor so numerous. A Diocess then and a Parish were the same thing, and both the same as our particular Churches now are; that is, the Ecclesia prima, or Soceities of Christians combined under Church-Rulers, for holy Communion in Worship and Discipline. And there were no otherwise many Congregations in one Church, then as our Chapples of ease, or a few meeting in a private house because of rainy weather, are many Congregations in one Parish. The foresaid Learned and Godly, (though angry) Bishop Downam, faith Def. li. 2. cap. 1. page 6. that [Indeed at the very first Conversion of Cities, the whole Number of the people converted, being some not much greater then the Number of the Presbyters placed among them, were able to make but a small Congregation.] Call that Church then a Diocess or a Parish, I care not, so we come near an agreement, about the proportion of Members that the definition be not overthrown, and the ends of it made impossible by the distance, number, and unac-quaintedness of the members that cannot have any Church communion immediately one with another. If there be no communion, how is it a Church? Nay or if there be no such commun- ion as consists in mutual assistance and conjunction in Wor- ship, and holding familiarity also in our conversation (which the excommunicated are excluded from) And if a commun- ion there be, it is either Immediate by the members themselves Assembled, or else but Mediately by their Officers or Delegates. If it be only by the latter Mediately, then it is not the Ec-
clesia prima, but orta: It is an association of several Political Churches: For that is the difference between the communion of a single particular Church, and many combined Churches, that as the first is a combination of persons and not of Churches, so the communion is held among the Members in common, whereas the other being a combination of Churches, the communion is maintained orderly by Officers and Delegates, joyning in Synods, and sent from the Congregations. If therefore it be an Immediate ordinary communion of members in Ecclesiastical affairs, viz. Worship and Discipline, that is the Particular Church that I intend, call it what you will else, and whether there may be any private meetings in it besides the main body, or not, as possibly through some accidents there may be; and yet at Sacrament and on the most solemn occasions, the same persons that were at Chappels or less meetings, may be with the chief Assembly. But I shall proceed in the proof of this by the next Argument, which will serve for this and the main together.

Argum. i. That sort of Church Government may most safely be now practised which was used in the Scripture times, and that less safe which was not then used. But the Government of many Elders and particular Churches by one Bishop (fixed, and taking that as his proper Diocese, such as the English Bishops were) was not used in Scripture times. Therefore it is not so safe to use it or restore it now.

The Major is proved hence: 1. In that the Primitive Church which was in Scripture times, was of unquestionable Divine Institution, and so most pure. And it is certainly lawful to practice that Church-Government which alone was practised by all the Church in the Scripture times of the New Testament. 2. Because we have no certain Law or Direction but Scripture for the frame of Government as jure Divino. Scripture is God's sufficient and perfect Law. If therefore there be no mention of the Practice of any such Episcopacy in Scripture, no nor any precept for the practice of it afterwards, then cannot we receive it as of Divine Institution. The Objections shall be answered when we have proved the Minor.

And for the Minor I shall at this time argue from the Conces-
sions of the most Learned and Reverend man that at this time hath deeply engaged himself in defence of Episcopacy, who doth grant us all these things following. 1. That in Scripture times they were the same persons, and of the same office that were called Bishops and Presbyters. 2. That all the Presbyters mentioned in Scripture times, or then instituted (as far as we can know) had a Power of Ordination. 3. And also a Power of Ruling the Church, Excommunicating and Absolving. 4. That there was not then in being any Presbyter (such as the Bishops would have in these times) who was under the Bishop of a particular Church or Diocess. His words are these: [And although this title of Presbyters, Elders, have been also extended to a second Order in the Church, and is now only in use for them, under the Name of Presbyters, yet in the Scripture times it belonged principally, if not alone to Bishops; there being no Evidence, that any of that second order were then instituted, though soon after, before the writing of Ignatius Epistles there were such instituted in all Churches.]

5. It is yielded also by him that it is the office of these Presbyters or Bishops to Teach frequently and diligently, to reduce Heretics, to reprove, rebuke, Censure and absolve; to visit all the sick and pray with them, &c. And therefore it must needs follow that their Diocess must be no larger then that they may faithfully perform all this to the Members of it. And if there be but one Bishop to do it, I am most certain then by experience that his Diocess must be no bigger then this Parish, nor perhaps half so big. 6. And it must needs follow, that in Scripture times a Particular Church consisted not of several Churches associated, nor of several Congregations ordinarily meeting in several places for Christian communion.

Quod pro concessa sumitur (in una civitate non suisse pluralis Episcopos) Quamvis enim in una Ecclesiat aut Cattu plures simul Episcopi nuncquam fuerint, nihil tamen obtine quin in eadem civitate duo aliud tanto distinmni Cattus fuerint, duo his Apostolis ad fidem adduto, diversis forsan dilettis & aliquando ritibus disjuncti, quisque duo itidem Episcopi scorsim, & divisi simul presiderent.

Et p. 211. $21. [Et his ratio confat, quae fine Presbyterarum mentione intervenient. Episcopi Diaconis immediate adjiciantur, quia fictice in singulis Macedonico civitatibus, quanvis Episcopus esset, nondum Presbyteri constituti sunt, Diaconis tantum ados annos habiebant Episcopi adjuncti.

Mark well the stating of the question by Dr. H. Dillert. Epist. $30, 31. The controversy is not quibus demum nominibus cogniti fuerint Ecclesiarchum Rectores, sed unda num in

Singulari
munion in the solemn Worship of God, but only of the Christians of one such Congregation with a single Pastor (though in that we dissent, and suppose there were more Pastors then one usually, or often.) That this must be granted with the rest is apparent.

1. The Reverend Author faith as Bishop Downham before cited That when the Gospel was first preached by the Apostles and but few Converted, they ordained in every City and region, no more but a Bishop and one or more Deacons to attend him; there being at the present so small Store out of which to take more, and so small need of ordaining more, that this Bishop is constituted more for the sake of those which should after believe, then of those which did already.

2. And it is proved thus: If there were in Scripture times any more ordinary Worshiping Assemblies on the Lords dayes then one under one Bishop, then either they did Preach, Pray, Praise God, and administer the Lords Supper in those Assemblies, or they did not: If not, then 1. They were no such Worshiping Assemblies as we speak of. 2. And they should sin against Christ who required it. 3. And differ from his Churches which ordinarily used it. But if they did thus, then either they had some Pastor (Presbyter or Bishop) to perform these holy actions between God and the people, or not: If not, then they suppose that Lay-men might do all this Ministerial work, in Word, Sacraments, Prayer, and Praise in the name of the Assembly, &c.

And if so, what then is proper to the Ministrv? then farewell Bishops and Presbyters too. If not, then either the Bishop must be in two Assemblies at once performing the Holy Worship of God in their communion (but that's impossible:) or else he must have some assisting Presbyters to do it; But that's denied: Therefore it must needs follow that the Church order, constitution and practised Government which was in Scripture times, was this; that a single Worshipping Congregation was that particular Church which had a Presbyter or Bishop (one or more,) which watched over and ruled that only Congregation as his Diocess or his proper
proper charge, having no Government of any other Church (Congregations) or Elders. De facto this is plainly yielded.

Well: this much being yielded, and we having come so far to an agreement, about the actual Church Constitution and Government of the Scripture times, we desire to know some sufficient reason why we in these times may not take up with the Government and Church order which was practised in the Scripture times? And the Reason that is brought against it is this; Because it was the Apostles intention that this single Bishop who in Scripture times had but one Congregation, and Governed no Presbyters, should after Scripture times, have many settled Congregations, and their Presbyters under them, and should have the power of ordaining them, &c. To this I answer, 1. The Intentions of mens hearts are secret till they are some way revealed. No man of this age doth know the Apostles hearts but by some sign: what then is the revelation that Proveth this Intention? Either it must be some Word or Deed. For the first I cannot yet find any colour of proof which they bring from any word of the Apostles, where either they give power to this Presbyter or Bishop to Rule over many Presbyters and Congregations for the future: Nor yet where they do so much as foretell that so it shall be. As for those of Paul to Timothy and Titus, that they rebuke not an Elder, and receive not accusation against them but under two or three Witnesses, the Reverend Author affirmeth that those Elders were not Presbyters under such Bishops as we now speak of, but those Bishops themselves, whom Timothy and Titus might rebuke. And for more facts without Scripture words, there is none that can prove this pretended Intention of the Apostles. First, there is no fact of the Apostles themselves or the Churches or Pastors in Scripture time to prove it. For Subordinate Presbyters are confessed not to be then instituted, and so not existent: and other fact of theirs there can be none. And no fact after them can prove it. Yet this is the great Argument that most insist on, that the practice of the Church after Scripture times, doth prove that Intention of the Apostles which Scripture doth not (for ought is yet proved by them that I can find) at all express. But we deny that, and require proof of it. It is not bare saying so that will serve. Is it not possible for the succeeding Bishops to err and mistake the Apostles
Apostles Intentions? If not, then are they Infallible as well as the Apostles, which is not true. They might sin in going from the Institution: And their sin will not prove that the Apostles intended it should be so de jure, because their followers did so de facto.

If they say that it is not likely that all the Churches should so suddenly be ignorant of the Apostles Intention, I answer, 1. We must not build our faith and practice on Conjectures. Such a saying as this is no proof of Apostolical intentions, to warrant us to swerve from the sole practised Government in Scripture times. 2. There is no great likelihood that I can discern that this first practised Government was altered by those that knew the Apostles, and upon supposition that these which are pretended were their intents. 3. If it were so, yet is it not impossible, nor very improbable, that through humane frailty they might be drawn to conjecture that that was the Apostles intents which seemed right in their eyes, and suited their present judgements and interests. 4. Sure we are that the Scripture is the perfect Law and Rule to the Church for the Establishing of all necessary Offices and Ordinances: and therefore if there be no such intentions or Institutions of the Apostles mentioned in the Scripture, we may not set up universally such Offices and Ordinances, on any such supposed intents.

De facto we seem agreed, that the Apostles settled One Pastor over one Congregation having no Presbyters under his Rule: and that there were no other in Scripture time: but shortly after when Christians were multiplied, and the most of the Cities where the Churches were planted, were converted to the faith, together with the Country round about, then there were many Congregations, and many Pastors, and the Pastor of the first Church in the City did take all the other Churches and Pastors to be under his Government, calling them Presbyters only, and himself eminently or only the Bishop. Now the Question between us is, Whether this was well done or not? & Whether these Pastors should not rather have gathered Churches as free as their own? & Whether the Christians that were afterward converted should not have combined for holy Communion themselves in particular distinct Churches, and have had their own Pastors set over them, as the first Churches by the Apostles had? They that deny it, and justify
their fact, have nothing that we can see for it, but an ungrounded surmise, that it was the Apostles meaning that the first Bishops should so do: But we have the Apostles express Institution, and the Churches practise during Scripture times, for the other way. We doubt not but Christians in the beginning were thin, and that the Apostles therefore preached most, and planted Churches in Cities because they were the most populous places, where was most matter to work upon, and most disciples were there; and that the Country round about did afford them here and there a family which joyned to the City Church: Much like as it is now among us with the Anabaptists and Separatists, who are famed to be so Numerous and potent through the Land, and yet I do not think that in all this County, there is so many in Number of either of these sects as the tenth part of the people of this one Parish; nor perhaps as the twentieth part. Now if all the Anabaptists in Warwickshire, or at least that lived so near as to be capable of Church communion, should be of Mr. T's. Congregation at Beamley, or of a Church that met in the chief City, Worcester, yet doth not this intimate that all the space of ground in this County is appointed or intended for the future as Mr. T's. Diocefs; but if the successive Pastor should claim the whole County as his charge, if the whole were turned to that opinion, no doubt but they would much cross their founders mind. And (if the comparison may be tolerated) we see great reason to conceive that the Ancient Bishops did thus cross the Apostles minds. When there were no more Christians in a City and the adjoyning parts, then half some of our Parishes, the Apostles planted fixed Governours called Bishops or Elders over these particular Churches, which had constant communion in the worship of God: And when the Cities and Countreyes were converted to the faith, the frailty of ambition co-working thereto, these Bishops did claim all that space of ground for their Diocefs where the members of their Church had lived before; as if Churches were to be measured by the acres of Land, and not by the number of souls, whereas they should have done as the Bee-hives do, when they are ready to swarm, so that the old hive cannot contain them all, the swarm removes and seeks them another habitation, and makes them a New hive of their own. So when a Church grows big enough for two Churches, one part should remove
remove to another meeting place, and they should become two Churches, and the later be of the same sort as the former, and as free, and not become subject to the former, as if men had right to be Rulers of others, because they were Converted before them, or because they dwell in a walled City, and others in the Villages. This Error therefore was no contrived or sudden thing, but crept on by degrees, as Countries were Converted and Churches enlarged; we are agreed therefore de facto, that it was otherwise in the Apostles daies, and that soon after, in some places, it came to that pass as the Prelates would have it (in some degree.) But whether the Apostles were willing of the change, is the Question between us; we deny it, and expect their better proof. And till they prove it, we must needs take it for our duty to imitate that Government which themselves confess was only practised in Scripture times; supposing this the safest way.

But yet, though the proof lye on their part, who affirm the Apostles to have had such Intentions, that Pastors of single Congregations should afterward become the Pastors of many, I shal ex superabundantibus give them some Reasons for the Negative.

1. And first we are most certain that the holiest Pastors of the Reason of Church, had so much Pride and Ambition, that might possibly make them guilty of such a mistake as tended to the increase of their own power and rule. We find even the twelve Apostles contending in Christ's own presence for the Primacy, till he is put sharply to rebuke them, and tell them the Necessity of humility, and teach them better the state of his Kingdom. Paul met with many that contended against him for a preeminence, and put him upon all those defences of the dignity of his Apostleship which we find him using. Peter found it necessary to warn the Pastors.

digcitatem in Tyrannidem transisse: conqueritur de Episcoporum ambitione Nazianzenus; et propterea est non Episcopatum, certe civitatum ius perpetuum in retinenda Episcopali dignitate mutatum veller. He addeth yet more such, and concludes, that Ecclesiastical Ambition never made such progress from the Apostles daies to those, as it hath done since to ours; almost incurably. Grotius de imperio pag. 360.361.
that they should not Lord it over Gods Heritage. And John did meet with a Lording Diotrephes, that loved to have the pre-
eminence. While they lay under the Cross, the Bishops were aspi-
ing, and usurping authority over one another; or else Victor of Rome had not presumed to Excommunicate the Asian Bi-
shops for not conforming to his opinion: What abundance of unwor-
thy contentions did the Bishops of the first ages fill the Churches with? and much about superiority, who should be greatest; what should be the priviledges of their several Seas; &c. Their pride no doubt was a great cause of their contention; and those contentions necessitated the interposition of Emperors to reconcile them that could not agree of them-
selves. If the Emperors called a Council to that end, even the Council it self would fall to pieces, and make all worse, if the Magistrate did not moderate them. Had not Constantine burnt the Nicene Schedules, and done much to maintain an Uni-
on among them, the success of that Council might have been such as would have been no great encouragement to succeeding ages to seek for more. What bitter quarrels are there between the most eminent of all the Fathers and Bishops of the Church? between Chrysostom and Epiphanius; Chrysostom and Theophilus Alexandrinus; Hierom and John of Jerusalem; Jerome and Ruffinus; besides his quarrels with Chrysostom and Augustine. I open not the concealed nakedness of the Saints; but mention those publike dolesful tragedies which made the Church an amazement to it self, and a scorn to the Heathens that lived about them; witness the well known censure of Ammianus Marcellinus: when so many people shall be murdered at once in contention for a Bishoprick as were at the choice of Damasus; ambition was too predominant. The mentioning of the conten-
tions of those most excellent Bishops, and the first four general Councils, makes Luther break out into so many admiring excla-
mations, in his Treatise de Conciliis, that ever such men should so ambitiously quarrel about toys and trifles, and childish things, and that even to the disturbing of all the Churches, and setting the Christian world on a flame. Of the two Churches of Rome and Constantinople he saith, *Ita haec una Ecclesia ambitiose rixata sunt, de renibili, variissimis & nugacissimis namis, donec tandem utraque horribiliter vastata & deleta est.* pag. 175. This caused
caused Nazianzen (who complaineth so much himself of the odium or displeasure of his fellow Bishops) to profess himself to be so affected, that he would avoid all Assemblies of Bishops, because he had never seen a good end of any Synod, and which did not rather increase the evils than remove them; and his reason is not as B. Ilaquine feigneth, only because they were all Arrians; but because, The desire of contending, and of preheminency or principality, and their emulation, did overcome reason, (which Luther mentioning ib. pag. 225. wondereth that for these words he was not excommunicated as an arrant heretick) Who knoweth not, that knoweth any thing of Church history, how the Church hath been torn in pieces in all ages except the first, by the dissention of the Bishops, till the Pope drew part of them to unite in him? And who knoweth not, that knoweth any thing of the present state of the Christian world, into how many factions it is broken at this day, and almost all through the Division of these Guides? If therefore we shall imagine that the Prelates of the Church could not be tainted with so much ambition as to enlarge their own Diocesses, and gather the new Churches under themselves, when they should have formed them into the same order and freedom as were the first, we shall shut our eyes against the most full experience of the Christian world: especially when the change was made by degrees.

2. The second Reason that perswadeth me to stick to the sole practised Government in Scripture times, and not to alter it upon pretended Intentions of the Apostles, is this: Nothing that intimateth temerity or mutability, is to be charged upon the Holy Ghost; but to institute one frame or species of Church-government for Scripture times, and to change it presently into another species to all succeeding ages, doth intimate temerity or mutability; or at least, is so like it, that therefore without good proof it is not to be charged on the Holy Ghost. That they are two distinct species of Government is plain: one is the Government of a Particular Congregation, without any other Congregations or Elders under that Government: the other is the Governing of many Elders and Churches by one supereminent Prelate: and if these be not two differing sorts of Government, then let the Prelates confess that the Government which we would continue is
is of the same fort with theirs: for ours is of the first fort; and if theirs be of the same, we are both agreed.

And that the Lord Jesus Christ should settle one kind of Government de facto during Scripture time, and change it for ever after, is most improbable: 1. Because it intimateth levity, or mutability in a Law-giver, so suddenly to change his Laws and form of Government; either something that he is supposed not to have foreseen, or some imperfection is intimated as the cause. Or if they say, that it was the change of the state of the body Governed, viz. the Church: I answer, 2. There was no change of the state of the Church to necessitate a change of the kind of Officers and Government: for (as I shall shew anon) there was need of more Elders then one in Scripture times; and the increase of the Church might require an increase of Officers for Number, but not for Kind. There was as much need of assisting Presbyters, as of Deacons. I may well conclude therefore, that he that will affirm a Change of the Government so suddenly, must be sure to prove it; and the rather, because this is the Bishops own great and most considerable Argument on the other side, when they plead that the Apostles themselves were Rulers of Presbyters, therefore Rulers over Presbyters (and many Churches) should continue as Gods Ordinance: many on the other side answer them, (though so do not I) that this Ordinance was temporary, during the Apostles times, who had no Successors in Government: to which the Prelates reply, that its not imaginable that Christ should settle one sort of Church-Government for the first age, and another ever after, abolishing that first so soon: and that they who affirm this, must prove it. For my part, I am overcome by this Argument, to allow all that the Apostolical pattern can prove, laying aside that which depended on their extraordinary gifts and privileges; but then I see no reason but they should acknowledge the force of their own Medium: and conclude its not imaginable that, if God settled fixed Bishops only over particular Congregations, without any such order as subject Presbyters, in the first age, he should change this, and set up subject Presbyters and many Churches under one man for ever after.

If they say, that this is not a change of the species, but a growing up of the Church from Infancy to Maturity: I answer,
It is a plain change of the Species of Government, when one Congregation is turned into Many, and when a new order of Officers, viz. subject Presbyters without power of Ordination or Jurisdiction, is introduced, and the Bishops made Governours of Pastors, that before were but Governours of the People, this is plainly a new Species. Else I say again, let them not blame us for being against the right Species.

3. The third Reason is this: They that affirm a change (not Reason 3. of the Governours, but also) of the very nature or kind of a particular Governour or Political Church, from what it was in Scripture times, do affirm a thing so improbable, as is not without very clear proof to be credited. But such are they that affirm that Congregational Bishops were turned to Dioecesan: therefore, &c.

The Church that was the object of the Government of a fixed Bishop in Scripture times, was, [A competent Number of persons in Covenant with Christ (or of Christians) co-habiting, by the appointment of Christ and their mutual expressed consent, united (or associated) under Christ's Ministerial Teachers and Guides for the right worshipping of God in publick and the Edification of the Body in Knowledge and Holiness, and the maintaining of obedience to Christ among them, for the strength, beauty and safety of the whole and each part, and thereby the Pleasing and Glorifying God the Redeemer, and Creator,] It would be too long, rather then difficult to stand to prove all the parts of this Definition, of the first particular Political Church. That part which most concerneth our present purpose, is the Ends, which in Relations must enter the Definition: which in one word is, The Communion of Saints personally, as Associated Churches consisting of many particular Churches, are for the Communion of Saints by officers and Delegates. And therefore this communion of Saints is put in our Creed, next to the Catholick Church, as the end of the combination. I shall have occasion to prove this by particular Texts of Scripture anon. A Dioecesan Church is not capable of these Ends. What personal communion can they have that know not nor see not one another? that live not together, nor worship God together? There is no more personal communion of Saints among most of the people of this Diocese, then is between us and the inhabitans of France or Germany: For we know not so much as the names or faces of each other, nor ever come together to
any holy uses. So that to turn a Congregation into a Diocesan Church, is to change the very subject of Government.

Obj. *This is meer independency, to make a single Congregation, the subject of the Government.* Answ. I am not deterred from any truth by Names. I have formerly said, that its my opinion that the truth about Church-Government, is parcelled out into the hands of each party, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Independents, and Erastian: And in this point in Question the Independents are most right. Yet I do not affirm (nor I think they) that this one Congregation may not accidentally be necessitated to meet in several places at once, either in case of persecution, or the age and weakness of some members, or the smallness of the room: But I say only that the Church should contain no more then can hold communion when they have opportunity of place and liberty; and should not have either several settled Societies or Congregations, nor more in one such Society then may confit with the Ends. And that these Assemblies are bound to Associate with other Assemblies, and hold communion with them by the mediation of their Officers; this, as I make no doubt of, so I think the Congregational will confess. And whereas the common evasion is by distinguishing between a Worshipping Church and a Governed Church, I desire them to give us any Scripture proof that a Worshipping Church and a Governed Church were not all one, supposing that we speak of a settled society or combination. I find no such distinction of Churches in Scripture. A family I know may perform some worship, and accordingly have some Government: And an occasional meeting of Christians without any Minister, may perform some Worship without Government among them. But where was there ever a Society, that ordinarily assembled for publick worship, such as was performed by the Churches on the Lords dayes, and held communion ordinarily in worship, and yet had not a Governing Pastor of their own? Without a Presbyter they could have no Sacraments and other publike Worship. And where was there ever a Presbyter that was not a Church Governor? Certainly if subject Presbyters were not till after Scripture times, nor any settled Worshipping Church without a Presbyter (unless the people preached and administered the Sacraments,) then there could be no Worshipping Church that had not their own proper
proper Governour, nor any such Governour (fixed) that had more Churches then one.

Reason 4. The contrary opinion feigneth the Apostles to have allotted to each Bishop a space of ground for his Diocess, and to have measured Churches by such spaces, and not by the number of souls: But this is unproved, & absurd. 1. Unproved, For there is no place in Scripture that giveth the Bishop charge of all that space of ground, or of all the Christians that shall be in that space during his time. Indeed they placed a Bishop in each City, when there was but a Church in each City; But they never said, there shall be but one Church in a City, or but one Bishop in a City; much less in all the Country region. 2. And its absurd: For if the number of souls that a Church must be measured by, and not a space of ground, (so they do but co-habite;) For if in the same space of Ground, there should be twenty or an hundred times as many Christians, it would make the number so great as would be incapable of personal communion, and of obtaining Church Ends. If a Schoolmaster have a School in the chief City or Town of this County, and there come as many from many miles compass as one School can hold, and there be no more there: so long all that space may belong to his School, not for the space fake, but the number of Schollars: For if there be afterward an hundred times as many in that space to be taught, they must set up more Schools, and it were no wise part in the old Schoolmaster to maintain that all that Country pertaineth to his School, because that it was so when there were fewer. So that to measure our the matter of Churches by space of ground, and not by number of souls, is plainly against the Reason of the Relation.

Reason 5. The opposed opinion doth imply that God more regarded Cities then Country Villages, or that Churches are to be measured according to the number and greatness of Cities rather then according to the number of souls. For they suppose, that every City should have a Bishop if there be but twenty, or forty, or an hundred Christians in it: but if there be five hundred Country Parishes, that have some of them many thousand souls in them, these shall have no Bishops of their own, but be all ruled by the Bishop of the City. Now how unreasonable this is, methinks should not be hard to discern. For, 1. What is a City, and...
City to God any more then a Village, that for it he should make so partial an institution? Doth he regard Rome any more than Eugubium, or Alexandria more than Tanis, for their worldly splendor or privileges? No doubtless it is for the multitude of inhabitants. And if so, it's manifest that an equal number of inhabitants elsewhere, should have the same kind of Government.

2. Is it probable that God would have twenty thousand or an hundred thousand people in a Dioces (and in some a Million) to have but one Church-Ruler, and yet would have every small congregation in a City to have one, though there be none else under him? What proportion is there in this way of Government, that an hundred or fifty men shall have as many Governors as a Million? as if ten thousand or an hundred thousand Scholars out of a City shall have no more Rulers, than an hundred in a City; and all because one part are in a City, and the other not? Or a Phyfitian shall have but an hundred Patients to look to in a City, and if there be a Million in that City and Country, he shall also upon pain of Gods everlasting wrath undertake the care of them all? Let them that strive for such a charge look to it; I profess I admire at them, what they think. 1. Of the needs of men souls: 2. Of the terroors of Gods wrath. 3. And of their own sufficiency for such a work? Were it my case, if I knew my own heart at all, I should fear that this were but to strive to damn thousands, and to be damned with them, by undertaking on that penalty to be their Phyfitian (under Christ) when I am sure I cannot look to the hundredth man of them, and I had rather strive to be a gally-slave to the Turks, or to be preferred to rid Chaneis, or the baslest office all my dayes.

Reason 6. According to the oppossed opinion, it is in the power of a King to make Bishops to be either Congregational or Diocesan, to make a Bishop to have a Million of souls or a whole Nation in charge, or to have but a few. For if a King will but dissolve the Privilege and title, and make that no City which was a City, though he diminish not the number of souls; and if he will do thus by all the Cities, save one in his dominion, then must there be but one Bishop in his dominion. And if he will but make every countrey Town, that hath four or five hundred or a thousand inhabitants to be incorporate, and honour it with the title and priviledges of a City, then shall they have a Bishop. Moreover, thus every Prince may de jure banish Episcopacy out of his
his Dominions, without diminishing the number of Christians, if he do but disfranchise the Cities, and be of the mind as I have heard some men have been, that Cities are against the Princes interest, by strengthening the people, and advantaging them to rebellions. Also if there be any Indian Nations so barbarous as to have no Cities, though they were converted, yet must they have no Bishops: Also it would be in the Princes power de jure to depose any of those Bishops that the Apostles or their Successors are supposed to set up: For the Roman Emperator might have proclaimed Antioch, Alexandria, or any of the rest to be no Cities, and then they must have no longer have had any Bishops. And what Bishops shall Antioch have at this day?

Now how absurd all this is, I need not manifest: that whole Contreys shall have no Government for want of Cities, that Kings shall so alter Church Officers at their pleasure when they intend it not, meerly by altering the Civil Priviledges of their people; that a King may make one Diocess to become an hundred, and an hundred become one, by such means. And yet all this doth undenyably follow, if the Law be that every City, and only every City shall be a Bishops Sea where there are Christians to be governed.

Reason 7. There is no sufficient Reason given, why Subject Presbyters should not have been set up in the Scripture times, as well as after, if it had been the Apostles intent that such should be instituted. The Necessity pretended, was no necessity, and the Non-necessity is but pretended. First it is pretended that there were so few fit men that there was a Necessity of forbearance. But this is not so: For, 1. The Church had larger gifts of the Spirit then, then now, and therefore proportionable to the flocks they might have had competent men, then as well as now. 2. They had men enough to make Deacons of, even seven in a Church: And who will believe then that they could find none to make such Elders of? Was not Stephen or Philip sufficiently qualified to have been a Subject Elder? 3. They had many that prophesied, and interpreted, and spake with tongues in one Assembly, as appears, 1 Cor. 14. And therefore its manifest that there were enough to have made Ruled Elders: At least: sure the Church at Jerusalem, where there were so many thousands,
lands, would have afforded them one such, if it had been requisite.

But secondly, its pretended not to have been Necessary, because of the fewness of the people. But I answer, 1. The same persons say that in Ignatius his time all Churches had such Presbyters: And its manifest that many Churches in the Scripture times, were more populous or large, then many or most beside them were in Ignatius time. 2. Did the numerous Church at Jerusalem ordinarily meet on the Lords dayes for holy communition, or not? If they did, then it was but a Church of one Congregation (which is by most denied) If not, then the several Assemblies must have severall Presbyters (for several Bishops they will not hear of,) Doubtlesly they did not celebrate the holy communition of the Church and Ordinances of God, by meer Laymen alone. 3. What man that knows the burden of Pastoral Oversight, can say that such Churches of thousands, as Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, &c. had need of no more than one man, to Teach them, and do all the Pastoral work? and so that assisting Ruled Presbyters were then needless? If they were needless to such numerous Churches then; let us even take them for needless still, and set up no new orders which were not seen in Scripture times.

Reason 8. The Apostles left it not to the Bishops whom they established to make new Church offices and orders quoad speciem, but only to ordain men to succeed others in the offices and orders that themselves had (by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost) appointed, or else Christ before them. A Bishop might make a Bishop or a Deacon perhaps, because these were quoad speciem made before, and they were but to put others into the places before appointed. But if there were no such creature in Scripture times as a subject Presbyter, that had no power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, then if the Bishops afterward should make such, they must make a new office, as well as a new officer. So that either this new Presbyter is of the institution of Christ by his Apostles, or of Episcopal humane institution. If the former, and yet not instituted in Scripture times, then Scripture is not the sufficient rule and discoverer of Divine Institutions and Church Ordinances: and if we once forfake that Rule, we know not where to fix, but must wander in that Romane uncertainty. If the latter, then we must
must expect some better proof then hitherto we have seen, of the Episcopal (or any humane) power to make new Offices in the Church of Christ, and that of universal and standing necessity. Till then we shall think they ought to have made such Presbyters as themselves.

Reason 9. If there be not so much as the name of a Ruled Presbyter without power of Ordination, or Jurisdiction, in all the Scripture, much less then is there any description of his Office, or any Directions for his ordination, or the qualifications requisite in him, and the performance of his office when he is in it: And if there be no such Directory concerning Presbyters, then was it not the Apostles intent that ever any such should be ordained. The reason of the consequence is, 1. Because the Scripture was written not only for that age then in being, but for the Church of all ages to the end of the world: And therefore it must be a sufficient directory for all. The second Epistle to Timothy was written but a little before Paul's death. Surely if the Churches in Ignatius daies were all in need of Presbyters under Bishops, Paul might well have seen some need in his time, or have foreseen the need that was so near, and so have given directions for that office. 2. And the rather is this consequence firm, because Paul in his Epistles to Timothy and Titus doth give such full and punctual Directions concerning the other Church-officers, not only the Bishops, but also the Deacons, describing their requisite qualifications, their office, and directing for their Ordination, and conversation: Yea he condescendeth to give such large Directions concerning Widows themselves, that were serviceable to the Church. Now is it probable that a perfect Directory written for the Church to the worlds End, & largely describing the qualifications and office of Deacons, which is the inferior, would not give one word of direction concerning subject Presbyters without power of Ordination or Rule, if any such had been then intended for the Church? No nor once so much as name them? I dare not accuse Paul's Epistles written to that very purpose, and the whole Scripture, so much of insufficiency, as to think they wholly omit a necessary office, and so exactly mention the inferior and commonly least necessary, as they do.

Reason 10. The new Episcopal Divines do yield that all the Reason 10.

I. texts
texts in Timothy, Titus, and the rest of the New Testament, that mention Gospel Bishops or Presbyters, do mean only such as have power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, without the concurrence of any Superior Bishop. The common Interpretation of the Fathers, and the old Episcopal Divines of all ages, of most or many of those texts, is, that they speak of the office of such as now are called Presbyters. Lay both together, and if one of them be not mistaken, they afford us this conclusion, that the Presbyters that now are, have by these texts of Scripture, the power of Ordination and Jurisdiction without the concurrence of others. And if so, then was it never the Apostles intent, to leave it to the Bishops to ordain a sort of Presbyters of another order, that should have no such power of Ordination or Jurisdiction, without the Bishops Negative.

Reason 11. We find in Church History that it was first in some few great Cities (especially Rome and Alexandria) that a Bishop ruled many settled worshipping Congregations with their Presbyters; when no such thing at that time can be proved by other Churches: therefore we may well conceive that it was no Ordinance of the Apostles, but was occasioned afterwards, by the multiplying of Christians in the same compass of ground where the old Church did inhabit; and the adjacent parts, together with the humane frailty of the Bishops, who gathered as many as they could under their own Government when they should have erected new Churches as free as their own.

Reason 12. If the Description of the Bishops settled in the New Testament, and the work affixed to them, be such as cannot agree to our Diocesan Bishops, but to the Pastors of a single Church, then was it never the mind of the Holy Ghost that those Bishops should degenerate afterwards into Diocesan Bishops: But the Antecedent is certain; therefore so is the Consequent.

I here still suppose with Learned Dr. H. Annot. in Ath. 11. et passim, that the name Presbyter in Scripture signifies a Bishop, there being no Evidence that in Scripture time any of that Second Order, (viz. subject Presbyters) were then instituted. Though I am far from thinking that there was but one of these Bishops in a Church at least as to many Churches. Now as we are agreed de facto, that it was but a single Church that then was under a Bishop and not many such Churches (for that follows unde-
undenably upon the denying of the existence of subject Presbyterers: seeing no such Churches can be, nor the worshipping Assemblies held without a Bishop or Presbyter; so that it was the mind of the Apostles that it should so continue, is proved by the Description and work of those Scripture Bishops.

Argument 1. From Acts 20. 28, 29, 31. The Bishops instituted and fixed by the Holy Ghost were and are to take heed to all the Flock, over which the Holy Ghost hath made them overseers, to feed the Church of God, and to watch against Wolves, and to warn everyone night and day. But this cannot be done by Diocesan Bishops, nor any that have more then one Church: Therefore Diocesan Bishops are not the Bishops that the Holy Ghost hath so fixed and instituted, such as Paul describeth were to continue: and thats such as can do that work.

Argument 2. The Bishops that the Holy-Ghost settled and would have continue, (and had the Power of Ordination given them,) were such as were to be Ordained in every City and every Church, Acts 14. 23. Tit. 1. 3, 4, 5. See Dr. Hammonds Annotat. But it is not Diocesan Bishops that are such (for they are over many Churches and Cities) therefore it is not Diocesan Bishops that were settled by the Holy Ghost, nor meant in those texts.

Art. 3. The Bishops which were instituted by the Holy Ghost, and are meant in Scripture, were to watch for their peoples souls as those that must give account, Ruling over them, and to be obeyed by all, and speaking to them the word of God, Heb. 13. 7, 17, 24. But this cannot be done by a Bishop to a whole Dioces, (nor will they be willing of such an account if they be wise:) therefore it is not Diocesan Bishops that are meant in Scripture.

Argument 4. The Bishops settled for continuance in Scripture were such as all the people were to know as labouring among them, and over them in the Lord, and admonishing them, and to esteem them very highly in love, for their work sake, 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. But this cannot be meant of our Diocesan Bishop, (whom the hundredth part of the flock shall never see, hear, nor be admonished by:) therefore it is not such that were settled for continuance in the Church.

Argument 5. The Bishops settled by the Holy Ghost, must by any that are sick be sent for, to pray over them. But this a Diocesan
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cesan Bishop cannot do, to the hundredth or thousandth person in some places; therefore it is not Diocesan Bishops (but the Bishops of a single Church that are capable of these works that are meant by the Holy Ghost, to continue in the Church, and consequently to whom the power of Ordaining was committed. If any question whether the Texts afoeid do speak of subje&-Presbyters, or Bishops, I refer them to the foresaid Reverend Doctor, with whom I am agreed, that there were no subje&-Pres-

Reason 13. It was not one or two or all Churches for a year or two or more in their meer fieri or infancy before they were well formed, that consisted only of one settled worshipping Assembly and its guides; but it was the formed and stablised state of the particular Churches.

To prove this I shall briefly do these three things. 1. I shall shew it in respect to the Jewish Synagogues. 2. As to the Churches in the Apostles dayes after many years growth; even of every Church that's mentioned in the New Testament, as a particular Political Church. 3. As to some of the Churches after the Apostles dayes, mentioned by the ancients.

1. It is apparent that the Jews Synagogues were particular Congregational Churches, having each one their several Rulers, and as many Learned men suppose, they had an Ecclesiastical Judicature of Elders, belonging to each of them, where fit men could be found, and this distinct from the Civil Judicature: Or as others think, they had a Sanhedrim which had power to judge in both Causes, and one of these was in every City, that is, in Places of Cohabitation. For in every City of Israel which had one hundred and twenty families (or free persons say others) they placed the Sanhedrim of twenty three. And in every City which had not one hundred and twenty men in it, they set the smallest Judicature of three Judges, so bet there were but two wise men among them, fit to teach the Law and resolve doubts. See Ainsworth on Numb. 11. 16. citing Talmud. Bab. & Maimonides, more at large. And doubtless many of our Country Villages, and almost all our Parishes have more than 120, and every Country Village may come in, in the letter number below 120; which are to have three Elders: and that say some, was every place where were ten men. And that these were under the great Sanhedrim at Jerusalem is nothing to
the matter: For so we confess that such particular Churches as we mention, have some such General officers over them de jure, as the Apostolical men were in the Primitive Church; but not that any of these Synagogues were under other Synagogues; though one were in a great City, and the other but in a small Town. And that these Synagogues were of Divine institution, is plain in divers texts, particularly in Lev. 23.1, 2, 3. where a convocation of holiness, or a holy Convocation is commanded to be on every Sabbath in all their dwellings, which most plainly could be neither the meeting at Jerusalem at the Temple, nor yet in single families: and therefore it is not to much purpose that many trouble themselves to conjecture when Synagogues began; and some imagine it was about the Captivity: For as their controversy can be but about the form of the meeting place, or the name, so its certain that some place there must be for such meetings; and that the meetings themselves were in the Law commanded by God: and that not to be tumultuary confused un governed Assemblies. If the scourging in the Synagogues prove not this power (which is much disputed,) Mat. 10. 17. and 23. 34. Luke 6. 22. and 12. 11. and 21. 12. Acts 22. 19. and 26. 11. Yet at least, excluding men their Synagogue Communion; may John 9. 22. 34. and 12. 42. and 16. 2. But because this argument leads us into many Controversies about the Jewish customs, left it obscure the truth by occasion in quarrels, I shall pass it by.

2. I find no particular Political Church in the New Testament, consisting of several Congregations, ordinarily meeting for communion in Gods Worship; (unless as the forementioned accidents might hinder the meeting of one Congregation in one place,) nor having half so many members as some of our Parishes.

When there is mention made of a Country, as Judea, Galile, Samaria, Galatia, the word [Churches] in the plural number is used, Gal. 1. 2. Acts 15. 41. and 9. 31. 2 Cor. 8. 1. But they'll say, These were only in Cities: But further consider, there is express mention of the Church at Cenchrea, which was no City; and they that say that this was a Parish subject to Corinth give us but their words for it, without any proof that ever I could see: and so they may as well determine the whole
cause by bare affirmation, and prevent disputes. The Apostle intimatesthe no such distinction, Rom. 16. 1. 1 Cor. 11. 18, 20, 22. 16. [When ye come together in the Church, I hear that there be divisions among you. —— When ye come together therefore into one place, this is not to eat the Lords Supper.

— 16. [We have no such Custom; nor the Churches of God.] Here the Church of Corinth is said to come together into one place: And forthem that say, This is per partes, and so that one place is many to the whole; I answer, the Apostle saith not to a part, but to the whole Church, that they come together in one place, and therefore the plain obvious sense must stand, till it be disproved. And withall he calls the Christian Assemblies in the plural number [Churches:] for its plain that it is of Assembly Customes that he there speaks. So 1 Cor. 14, there is plainly expressed that it was a particular Assembly that was called the Church, and that this Assembly had it in many Prophets, Interpreters, & others that might speak. Verse 4. [He that Prophesies, Edifieth the Church] that is, Only that Congregation that heard. And Verse 5. [Except he interpret that the Church may receive Edifying] And Verse 12. [Seek that ye may excell to the Edifying of the Church.] Verse 19. [In the Church I had rather speak five words with my understanding, that I may teach others also.] And Verse 23. [If therefore the whole Church be come together into one place, and all speak with tongues] One would think this is as plain as can be spoken, to assure us that the whole Churches then were such as might, and usually did come together for holy communication into one place. So Verse 28. [If there be no Interpreter, let him keep silence in the Church:] And which is more, lest you think that this was some one small Church that Paul speaks of, he denominateth all other particular Congregations, even Ordered Governed Congregations, [Churches] too. Verse 33. For God is not the author of confusion but of peace, as in all the Churches of the Saints. So that all the Congregations for Christian Worship, are called, All the Churches of the Saints. And it seems all as well as this, so strewed with Prophets and gifted men that they need not take up with one Bishop only for want of matter to have made subject Elders of: And Verse 34. [Let your women keep silence in the Church] for it is a shame for a woman to speak in the Church.] So that so many Assemblies, so many Churches. Object.
Obj. But it seems there were among the Corinthiaps more then one Congregation by the plural [Churches.] Answ. 1. Many particular reasons of Assembling, may be called many Assemblies or Churches, though the people be the same. 2. The Epistle was a Directory to other Churches, though first written to the Corinthians. 3. Those that say, it was to Corinth, and other City-Churches that Paul wrote, need no further answer: It seems then each City had but a Congregation, if that were so. 4. Corinth was a Church near to Corinth, to whom Paul might well know his Epistle would be communicated: and more such there might be as well as that, and yet all be free Churches.

So in Col. 4. 16. [And when this Epistle is read among you, cause that it be read also in the Church of the Laodiceans, and that ye likewise read the Epistle from Laodicea.] This Church was such as an Epistle might be read in, which doubtless was an Assembly. The whole matter seems plain in the case of the famous Church at Antioch, Acts 11. 26. A whole year they assembled themselves with the Church, and taught much people.] Here is mention but of One Assembly, which is called the Church, where the people, it seems, were taught. And its plain that there were many Elders in this one Church; for Acts 13. 1: it said [There were in the Church that was at Antioch certain Prophets and Teachers] And five of them are named, who are said to Minister there to the Lord. And though I do not conclude that they were all the fixed Elders of that particular Church, yet while they were there they had no less power then if they had been such. In the third Epistle of John, where there is oft mention of that particular Church, it appears the Verse 6: that it was such a Church as before which the brethren and strangers could bear witness of Gaius Charity; And its most probable that was one Assembly; but utterly improbable that they travailed from Congregation to Congregation to bear this witness. And Verse 9, 10. it was such a Church as John wrote an Epistle to, and which Diotrephes cast men out of: which is most likely to be a Congregation, which might at once hear that Epistle, and out of which Diotrephes might earlier reject strangers, and reject the Apostle's letters, then out of many such Congregations, Gal. 1. 22. When Paul faith, he was Unknown by face to the Churches of Antio, it is most likely that they were Churches which were capable
capable of seeing and knowing his face not only by parts, but as Churches. And its likely those Churches that praised Luke, and sent him with Paul as their chosen messenger, were such as could meet to choose him, and not such as our Dioeceses are, 1 Cor. 16. 1, 2. Paul gives order both to the Church of Corinth, and the Churches of Galatia, that upon the Lord’s day at the Assembly (as it is ordinarily expounded) they should give in their part for the relief of the Churches of Judea. So that it seems most likely that he makes [Churches] and such Assemblies to be all one, Acts 14. 23. They ordained them Elders, Church by Church, or in every Church. Here it is confessed by those we plead against, that Elders signify not any subject Elders having no power of Ordination or Government; And to say that by Elders in each Church is meant only one Elder in each Church, is to forsake the letter of the text without any proved Necessity: We suppose it therefore safer to believe according to the first sense of the words, that it was Elders in every Church, that is, more than one in every Church that were ordained. And what sort of Churches these were, appears in the following verses, where even of the famous Church of Antioch its said, Verse 27, when they were come, and had gathered the Church together, they rehearsed all that God had done by them — So that, its plain that this Church was a Congregation to whom they might make such rehearsal. And Chap. 15. 3. Its said that they were brought on their way by the Church: And if it be not meant of all, but a part of the Church, yet it intimate what is aforesaid.

To conclude, though many of these texts may be thought to speak doubtfully, yet consider 1. That some do most certainly declare that it was particular stated Assemblies that were then called Churches, even Governed Churches, having their Officers present. 2. That there is no certain proof of any one particular Political Church that consisted of many such stated Assemblies. 3. That therefore the Texts that will bear an exposition either way, must be expounded by the certain, and not by the uncertain texts; so that I may argue thus.

If in all the New Testament, the word [Church] do often signify stated worshipping single Assemblies, and often is used so as may admit that interpretation; and is never once used certainly so signify many particular stated worshipping Assemblies ruled by one
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three thousand were converted at once, and five thousand at an-
other time, and the word mightily grew and prevailed, and dai-
ly such were added to the Church as should be saved: to which
some add the mention of the Miriades of believing Jews yet zeal-
ous of the Law, which the brethren mentioned to Paul, Acts
21.20. And the inftance of Ephesus and Rome come next. But
I remember how largely this business is debated between the late
Assembly at Westminster and the Difsenting Brethren, that I
think it unmeet to interpose in it any further; then to annex these
few considerations following.

1. That all that is said on that side, doth not prove certainly
that that one Church at Jerusalem was the eighth part so big as
Giles Cripple-gate Paris, or the fifth part so big as Stepney or Se-
pulchres, nor neer so big as Plimoth or some other Country Pa-
ishes. 2. That it is past doubt that the magnitude of that Body of
Believers then at Jerusalem, was partly accidental, and the mem-
ers cannot at all be proved settled cohabitants, nor that Church
as, in its first unordered Mafs be the proved to be the fittest
pattern for imitation. 3. That Christ hath not punctually determi-
ed how many members shall be in a particular Church. 4. But the
ends (being personal holy communion) are the Rule by which
humane prudence must determine it. 5. That its fitter one Church
inflance give way to many in point of our imitation, then of ma-
ny to that one, ceteris paribus. 6. That its known among us that
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give account of all. On which text Dr. Jer. Taylor in his late Book of Repentance, Pref.
faith [I am sure we cannot give account of souls of which we have no Notice ] And so
preference to personal conduct. Let them then be Bishops of no bigger a Diocess then they
can take such personal notice and conduct of, left they judge themselves.
more than are proved to have been members of that Church, may hear one man preach at the same time. I have none of the loudest voices, and yet when I have preached to a Congregation judged by judicious men to be at least ten thousand, those farthest off said they could well hear (as I was certainly informed.)

7. That its certain by many passages historickall in Scripture that men did then speak to greater multitudes, and were heard at far greater distance then now they can orderly be: which I conjecture was because their voices were louder, as in most dryer bodies (which dryer Countreys have) is commonly seen, when moister bodies have softer hoarser voices, and other reasons might concur.

8. That it is confessed or yielded that the Church at Jerusalem might all hear at once, though not all receive the Lords Supper together. And if so, then they were no more then might at once have personal communion in some holy Ordinances, and that the Teachers might at once make known their minds to.

9. And then the reason of receiving the Supper in several places seems to be but because they had not a room so fit to receive all in, as to hear in. And so we have now in many Parishes Assemblies subordinate to the chief Assembly: For divers families at once may meet at one house, and divers at another; for repetition, prayer or other duties; and some may be at Churches of ease that cannot come to the full assembly.

10. They that are for Presbyterial Churches of many Congregations, do not say, that There must be many, to make the first political Church, but only that, There may be many? If then there be no Necessary of it, 1. Should it not be for born when it appeareth to prudence most inconvenient (as frequently it will no doubt.)

2. And when it is Necessary for a peaceable Accommodation, because others think it a sin, should not a May be give place to a Must not be, in pacificatory consultations, ceteris paribus?

11. It is granted also by them, that the Pastors of one Congregation have not a charge of Governing other neighbour Congregations in Consistory, (one rather then another, which they govern not, though perhaps as near them) but by consent. And therefore as there is but a licet, not an opera, of such consent pleaded for: so while no such consent is given, we have no such charge of Governing neighbour Congregations; and none may force us so such consent.

12. And Lastly, that if a single Congregation
gregation with its own Officer, or Officers, be not a true particular Political Church; then our ordinary Parish assemblies are none; and where the Presbyterian Government is not set up (which is up but in few places of England) it would then follow that we have no true Political Churches left among us (& perhaps never had:) which I meet yet with few so uncharitable as to affirm, except the Papists and the Separatists and a few of the new sort of Episcopal Divines, who think we have no Churches for want of Bishops, (except where Bishops yet are retained and acknowledged.)

For my part I would not lay too great a stress upon any forms or modes which may be altered or diversified. Let the Church have but such a Number of souls as may be consistent with the ends and to the essence of a particular Church, that they may hold personal holy communion, and then I will not quarrel about the name of one or two Congregations, nor whether they must needs all meet together for all ordinances, nor the like. Yea I think a full number (so they be not so full or distant, as to be incapable of that communion) are desirable, for the strength and beauty of the Church; and too small Churches, if it may be, to be avoided. So that all the premises being considered, out difference appears to be but small in these matters between the Congregational and Presbyterian way, among them that are moderate.

I shall not presume more particularly to enter into that debate, which hath been so far proceeded in already by such Reverend men, but shall return to the rest of the task before promised against the Diocesan Churches as the supposed subject of the Bishops Government.

As for Scripture times and the next succeeding together, I shall before I look into other testimonies, propound these two Arguments. 1. From the Bishops office, which was before mentioned. If the office of a Bishop in those times, was to do so much work as could not be done by him for a Church any greater than our Parishes, then were the Churches of those times no greater than our Parishes: But the Antecedent is true; therefore so is the consequent. The works are before mentioned, Preaching, Praying, administering the Lords Supper, visiting the sick, reducing heretics, reproving, cenfuring, absolving: to which they quickly added too much more of their own
own. The impossibility of a faithful performance of this to more
is so undeniable, that I cannot suppose any other answer but this
that they might ordain Presbyters to assist them in the work,
and so do much of it by others. But I before desired to see it
proved by what authority they might do this. 2. Their office
and work are so inseparable that they cannot depute others to do
their work (their proper work) without deputing them also to
their office. For what is an office but the state of one Obliged and Authorized to do such or such a work? A Presbyter may
not authorize another to preach as the Teacher of a Congregati-
on, and to administer the Sacraments, without making him a
Presbyter also: Nor can a Bishop authorize any to do the work
of a Bishop in whole or by halves without making him a Presby-
ter or half a Bishop. And he is not authorized either to make new
officers in the Church, or to do his work by deputies or subli-
tutes.

2. I argue also from the Identity of that Church to which the
Bishops and Deacons were appointed for ministration. It was
not a Church of many stated Congregations, or any larger
than our Parishes for number of souls that the Deacons were
made Ministers to: therefore it was no other or bigger which
the Bishops were set over. The consequence is good: because
where ever Deacons are mentioned in Scripture or any Writer
that I remember near to Scripture times, they are still mentioned
with the Bishops or Presbyters as Ministers to the same Church
with them, as is apparent both in the seven chosen for the Church
at Jerusalem, and in Phil. 1. 1, 2. and in the Direction of Paul
to Timothy for ordaining them. And the Antecedent is proved
from the nature of their work: For they being to attend on the
tables at the Love feasts and the Lords Supper, and to look to
the poor, they could not do this for any greater number of peo-
ple then we mention; Whether they had those feasts in one house
or many at once, I determine not; but for the number of people,
it was as much as a Deacon could do at the utmost to attend a
thousand people.

I shall proceed a little further towards the times next follow-
ing; and first I shall take in my way the confession of one
or two learned men that are for Prelacy.

Grotius in his Annotat. on 1 Tim. 5. 17. saith [Sed notandum:}
In a certain city there were many Synagogues, as also many Churches. This is what Grotius and Epiphanius said: 

\[ \text{(85)} \]

So that Grotius affirmed that Bishops had not then so much as all the converted persons of a great City under their care, but the Churches and Assemblies were the same, and each Assembly had a Prelate, and in the great Cities there were many of these Churches and Prelates, and that only the City of Alexandria had the custom of having but one such Bishop in the whole City.

2. Those learned men also must grant this cause who maintain that Peter and Paul were both of them Bishops of Rome at once, there being two Churches, one of the Circumcision under Peter, the other of the uncircumcision under Paul: and that one of them had Linus, and the other Cletus for his Successor, and that this Church was first united under Cornelius; and the like they say of two Churches also at Antioch, and elsewhere. If this be so, then there is no Law of God that Bishops should be numbered by Cities, but more Bishops then one may be in one City, and were, even when Christians comparatively were a small part of them.

3. Also Mr. Thorndike and others affirm that it was then the custom for the Bishops and Presbyters to sit in a semicircle, and the Bishop highest in a Chair, and the Deacons to stand behind them: This he gathereth from the Apost. Constitut. Ignatius, Dionysius Areop. and the Jews Constitutions, (in his Apost. form page 71. and Right of the Church, &c. p. 93. 94. 95.) And if this were so, it seems that Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons were all the Officers of one such-ordered Congregation, and had not many such Congregations under them: For the Bishop could be but in one place at once, and therefore this could be the custom but of one Church in his Diocese, if he had many, whereas it is made the form of the ordinary Christian Assemblies.

The same learned man (Right of Church p. 65.) saith that
(86)

[About Saint Cyprians time, and not afore, he finds mention of several Congregations in the Country] By which it may be well conjectured what a small addition the Bishops had out of the Countreys to their City Churches, and how many Congregations they Governed in the Apostle days and after.

He affirmeth also that [the power of the Keys belongeth to the Presbyters, and that its convertible with the power of celebrating the Eucharist, and that the Reason why it belongs to them, page 98. ibid. and that [the Power of the Keys, that is, the whole power of the Church whereof that power is the root and source, is common to Bishops and Presbyters] page 128 and that to this all sides agree, page 106. and that by their Grant Deacons and others may preach, but not Rule or administer the Lords Supper: see page 118. 123. And he is far from being of their mind that think in Scripture times there was but one single Bishop without other Presbyters in a Diocesan Church: For he supposed many in a Congregation. Page 126 he saith [You see by St. Paul, 1 Cor. 14. that one Assembly, whereof he speaks there, furnished with a great number of Prophets, whether Presbyters, or over and above them. In the Records of the Church, we find divers times a whole Bench of Presbyters presiding at one Assembly.] And before he had shewed how they fate about the Bishop, and the congregation stood before them. And page 127. he saith that [Clemens the Disciple of the Apostles, in his Epistle to the Corinthians, to compose a difference among the Presbyters of that Church partly about the celebration of the Eucharist, adviseth them to agree and take their turns in it.] I confess I know not whence he hath this (doubtless not in the true approved Epistle of Clement;) but it shews in his judgement, 1. That there were then many Presbyters in the Church of Corinth. 2. And that that Church was but one Congregation, or not very many: Else what need the Presbyters take their turns, when they might have done it at once? 3. That the word Presbyter in Clemens signifieth not a Prelate. 4. And it seems this intimateth there was then no Bishop in Corinth: else no question but Clemens would have charged these disagreeing Presbyters to obey their Bishop, and used some of Ignatius language. 5. Nay if Bishops had been then known in the world, is it not likely that he would have charged them to get a Bishop if they had not, to Govern such a disagreeing Presbytery? And
And page 129, 130, 131. he shews that [ the condemning of Marcion at Rome, and of Noælius at Ephesus, are expressly said by Epiphanius, Heres. 42. num. 1. & 2. Heres. 57. num. 1. to have been done and passed by the Aft of the Presbyters of those Churches — And which is of later date, the Excommunication of Andronicus in Synesius 57. Epist. I find reported to have passed in the same fort, and all this agreeable to the practice recorded in Scripture | alledging, 1. Tim. 5. 19. Acts 21. 18. citing Cyprian Ep. 46 and the Apost. Constit. and faith, Blondell in this might have spared his exact diligence, it being granted, &c. Mr. Thorndike also tells us pag. 62. of the words of Ninus, that [ in Ireland alone, Saint Patrick at the first plantation of Christianity founded three hundred and threescore and five Bishops'] And can any man believe that all these had Cities or more then one of our Parish Churches, when all Ireland to this day hath not seven Cities, and when all this was done at the first plantation of the Gospel? I think we had this sort of Episcopacy. Even since the Reformation there is reckoned in Ireland but four Arch-bishops, nineteen Bishops. What think you then were 365. Bishops at the first plantation of the Gospel?

To proceed to some further Evidence. 1. Its manifest in Clemens Rom. Epist. to the Corinthians there is mention of no more but two Orders: the one called sometime Bishops, sometime Presbyters, the other Deacons, page 54. 55. 57. * and this he faith the Apostles did as knowing that contention would arise about the name of Episcopacy, and that they so settled the Ministerial offices that others should succeed in them when some were deceased. For my part I cannot see the least reason to be of their mind that think Clemens here doth speak only of Prelates or supereminent Bishops, (of which I refer the Reader to Mr. Burton's notes in his English Translation of Clemen. ) But suppose it were so: If at that time the Churches had none but single Bishops, it is plain then that they were but single Congregations: For no other Congregations having communion in their-then-ordinary, publike worship, cou'd be managed without a Bishop or Presby-

* Pag. 54. he faith [ Κατὰ Χαὶρεσ. & τὸ πολὺς κυριοτότες, καὶ τὸν υἱὸν τινων τῶν διακονῶν, &c.] i. e. [Per regionesigitur & urbes predicators, constituent primitias corum, approbantes in Spiritu, Episcopos & Diaconos corum quiCreditur erant.] I know that κατὰ γύρως is supposed by some to respect only the place of their preaching, and not of their settling Bishops: But the words accord nig to the more obvious plain sense do seem to extend it to both, and make no such difference at all.
ter to do the work. But for them that slight Mr. Burton & other 
mens plain Reasons concerning the judgement of Clem. Romanus,
and force his words to speak what they mean not, I desire them 
to observe the judgement of Grotius whom they profess so much 
to value: who in his Epistol. 162 ad Bignon. gives this as 
one Reason to prove this Epistle of Clemens genuine [Quod 
musquam meminit, exorsis illius Episcoporum authoritatis, que Ec-
clesiae consuetudine post Marci mortem Alexandriae, atq; eo exem-
plo alibi, introduci cepit, sed plane ut Paulus Apostolus ostendit 
Ecclesias communi Presbyterorum qui iidem omnes & Episcopi ip-
se Pauloq; dicuntur, consilio suisse gubernatas. Nam quod 
auxilia, levitas, & laitis nominat, omnia ista nomine non ad 
Ecclesiis sed ad Templum Hieros. pertinent: unde insift omnia 
recto ordine agenda, si [ndit, tanto magis Christianis] You 
see that Grotius (then,) and Clemens, in his judgement, were 
against Prelacy.

2. The very same I say of Prelacie, Epist. ad Philip. which men-
tioneth only two sorts, Presbyters and Deacons.

3. And though Ignatius oft mention three, it seems to me that 
they were all but the Governours or Ministers of one Congrega-
tion, or of no more people then one of our Parishes. In the 
Epistol. ad Smyrn. he faith[Оте]ν εν εαν τοι επικοπαθ, εκει το πλη-
θε εσα, εντερ επεν τι χριστε, ἄσα η υπανθ εφετια παρσην. 
i. e. Ubi Episcopus presens fuerit, illuc & plebs Congregatur, 
scuti & ubi Christus est omnis militia coelestis abst ] as the com-
mon interpreter translateth it, [ ut vid. est in Edit. Perieii & 
Ufserii. &c. [Ubi comparuerit Episcopus, ibi & Multitudo sit; 
quemadmodum ubi Christus, ibi omnis aetatis exercitus coelestis ] 
as Hier. Vairlenius & Videlinus translate it: Or, [ Ubi intiq;
apparet Episcopus, illic multitudo sit; quemadmodum utiq, ubi 
est Christus Jesu, illic Catholica Ecclesia ] as Ufbers old Tran-
lration. And by the Context it appeareth that this plebs, or mul-
titudo is the Church which he ruleth, and not only one Congre-
gation among many that are under him: For this doth with-
out distinction bind all the people one as well as another, to 
be where the Bishop is or appeareth, viz. in the publick Assem-
bly for Communion in Worship. It is plain therefore there that 
were not then many such Assemblies under him: otherwise all 
save one must have necessarily disobeyed this command.

And
And in the Epistle to the Philadelphians he hath [Μία μόνον ἐστὶν ἡ σοφία τῇ κυρίᾳ Ἰησοῦ, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ τὸ ἄλμα τοῦ ὀφελοῦμεν ἐκκλησία. Εἰς ὑπὲρ τοῦ τοῖσοι παρεῖν ἐγερθην, καὶ ἐν πάσην τοῖσοι ἀπεριστέρων ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, καὶ ἐν ἀγκαλίᾳ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων, καὶ τῶν διακόνων τῶν συνάντων με.]
i.e. [Una enim est caro Domini nostri Iesu Christi, & unus sanguis qui pro nobis effusus est, & unus calix qui pro omnibus nobis distributus est, unus panis qui omnibus fructus est, unus altare omni Ecclesia, & unus Episcopus cum presbyterorum Collegio & Diaconis conservis meis.]

Here it is manifest that the particular Church which in those days was governed by a Bishop, Presbytery and Deacons, was but one Congregation; for every such Church had but one Altar.

Object. But some Greek copies leave out πᾶσα τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ. Ans. 1. The corrupt vulgar translation might occasion the change of the text, faith Bishop Usher (Annot, in loc. page 40.) [intermedia illa, ex interpretatione hāc excitidisse videantur.]
2. The old translation of Bishop Usher which leaves it out, yet hath Unum Altare & unus Episcopus, &c. and the sense is the same if the other words were out. 3. Ignatius hath the like in other places, as we shall see anon; which forbiddeth such quarrels here.

Object. But faith the Learned and Godly Bishop Downeaye, (Def. li. 2. cap. 6. page 109.) the word Altar being expounded for the Communion table, is not likely, and too much favoureth of Popery: but by one Altar is meant Christ, who sanctifieth all our Sacrifices and Oblations and maketh them acceptable to God; as Ignatius expoundeth himself in his Epistle to the Magnesians: All as one run together into the Temple of God, unto one Jesus Christ as it were unto one Altar.

To this I answer, that it is some confirmation to me, that the words are so express, that so learned a man hath no more to say by way of evasion. For doubtless this is too gross and palpable to satisfy the judicious impartial reader. 1. That the very text which he citeth of the Epistle to the Magnesians doth make fully against him, I shall shew anon. 2. That it is not Christ that is meant here by the ἐν διδασκαλίᾳ, is evident. 1. In that Christ his flesh and blood are before distinctly mentioned:

N.: 2. In
2. In that the word is put in order among the external Ordinances: 3. In that it is so usual with other ancient writers and Ignatius himself to use the word θυσιαστήριον in the sense as we now take it, that it will be plain violence to imagine that it is Christ that was meant by it. And for Popery, there is no such matter of danger, in using a word Metaphorically: Otherwise we we must make the Ancients commonly to be friends to Popery; for they ordinarily call the Lords Table and the place where it stood θυσιαστήριον: I say The Table and the Sacrarium or place of its standing: for this seems plainly the meaning of Ignatius: so faith Bishop Usher Annot. in loc. ubi sup. [Altare apud Padres mensam Dominam passim denotat apud Ignatium & Polycarpum; Sacrarium quoq. | So H. Stephens Altarium Sacrarium. See what Learned Mr. Thorndike himself in his Right of the Church, &c. page 116. faith to this purpose more largely; where concerning Ignatius his use of the same word to the Ephesians he faith [Where it is manifest that the Church is called a Sanctuary or place of sacrificing: Mr. Mead in his Discourse of the name Altar page 14. feth that Ignatius by θυσιαστήριον means the Lords Table, and takes Videlius his concession, as of a thing that could not be denied. In the Epistle of Ignatius (or whoever else) to Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna he faith, Crebrius celebratur conventus Synodi; Nominationem omnes inquire. Servos & ancillas ne fastidias (as Videlius translataeth) or (as Bishop Usher old Translation) Saepe Congregationes fiant. Ex nomine omnes quare: Servos & ancillas ne despicias. 

Whether this were Ignatius or not, alls one to me, as long as I use it but historically to prove the matter of fact in those times. But surely no man should marvel if I hence gather that great Polycarp was Bishop but of one Congregation, when he must enquire or take notice of every one of his Congregation by name, even as much as servants and maids. I would every Parish Minister were so exactly acquainted with his flock!

Another passage there is in Ignatius to the same purpose, Epist. ad Magnes. [Πάντες ὁς εἰς, ἐκ τῶν ναὸν τῆς ἱερατικῆς, ὁ ἐν θυσιαστήριο, ἐκ ἱεροῦ χρίσων, ] i.e. Omnes aduant ad Templum Dei concurret, sicut ad unum Altare: sicut ad unum Χριστου, as the vulgar translation. Or as Vairlenius: [Omnes velut unus quispem in templum Dei concurret, velut...
ad unum Altare; ad unum Jesum Christum] So the old Latine in &c. The in the words foregoing he bids them [Come all to one place for prayer] Here is no room for Bishop Downams conceit, that its Christ that's meant by : For they are plainly put as distinct things: as if he should say, come all to one Altar, as to one Christ. i.e. because it is but one Christ that is there to be partaked of. All this doth so evidently prove that in those dayes a Bishop with his Presbytery and Deacons, had but one Congregation meeting at one Altar for Church Communion in the Eucharist, that it caused Mr. Mead (in his Discourse of Churches pag. 48, 49, 50. Cent. 2.) to say as followeth, having cited these words of Ignatius [Loo here a Temple with an Altar in it, whether the Magnesiens are exhorted to gather themselves together to pray: To come together in one place, &c. For it is to be observed that in these Primitive times they had but one Altar in a Church, as a Symbol, both that they worshipped but one God through one Mediator Jesus Christ, and also of the Unity the Church ought to have in itself. Whence Ignatius not only here, but also in his Epistle to the Philadelphians urgeth the unity of the Altar for a motive to the Congregation to agree together in one: For unum Altare (saith he) omni Ecclesiae, & unus Episcopus cum Presbyterio & Diaconis confervis meis. This custom of one Altar is still retained by the Greek Church: The contrary use is a transgression of the Latines, not only Symbolically implying, but really introducing a polytheism, &c. Nay more then this it should seem that in those first times, before Diocesses were divided into those lesser and subordinate Churches, we call now Parishes, and Presbyters assigned to them, they had not only one Altar in one Church or Dominicum, but one Altar to a Church, taking Church for the company or Corporation of the faithful, united under one Bishop or Pastor, and that was in the City or place where the Bishop had his See and Residence, like as the Jews had but one Altar and Temple for the whole Nation united under one high Priest. And yet as the Jews had their Synagogues, so perhaps they might have more Oratories then one, though their Altar were but one; there namely where the Bishop was. Die solis saith Justin Martyr, omnium qui vel in oppidis vel ruri degunt, in eundem locum conventus fit: Namely as he there tells us, to celebrate, and participate the holy Eucharist.
Eucharist. Why was this, but because they had not many places to celebrate in? and unless this were so, whence came it else, that a Schismatical Bishop was said constitutere or collocaire aliud Altare? and that a Bishop and an Altar are made correlatives? See S. Cyprian Epift. 40. 72, 73. de unit. Eccles. And thus perhaps is Ignatius to be understood in that forequoted passage of his "Cum omnibus Altar omni Ecclesias, & unus Episcopus cum Presbyterio & Diaconis" So far Mr. Mead.

I hope upon the consent of so admirable a Critick and learned man, it will not be so much blame-worthy in me, if I speak somewhat the more confidently this way; and say, that I think that the main confusion and Tyranny that hath overspread the Churches, hath been very much from the changing the Apostolical frame of Churches, and setting up many Altars and Congregations under one Bishop in one ( pretended particular ) Church.

I had three or four passages ready to cite out of Ignatius, but these are so express, that I apprehend the rest the less necessary to be mentioned.

The next therefore that I shall mention shall be the forementioned words of Justin Martyr Apol. 2, cited by Mr. Mead, and by others frequently to this purpose: In which I observe all these particulars full to the purpose. 1. That they had but one Assembly each Lords day for Church communion for one Church. 2. That this was for reading and prayer and the Eucharist. 3. That the President (who is commonly by those of the Episcopal judgement said to be here meant the Bishop) did preach and give thanks and administer the supper: so that it was administered but to one Congregation as under that Bishop of that Church, for he could not be in two places at once. 4. That to the Absent the Deacons carried their portion after the consecration: so that they had not another Meeting and Congregation by themselves for that end. This is all so plain that I shall think it needeth no Vindication. So that were there but these two Testimonies, I should not marvail if Bishop Downham had extended his confession a little further, when he acknowledgeth (Def. li. 2. cap. 6. page 104.) that "At the first and namely in the time of the Apostle Paul, the most of the Churches so soon after their Conversion, did not each of them exceed the proportion of a populous
(93)

populous Congregation, ] (And then we are not out in so interpreting the words of Paul and other writers of the holy Scripture.) The next that I shall mention (whoever was or when ever he lived) is Dionys. de Eccles. Hierarch, cap. 4. where he tells us that the Praefet (who was the Bishop, if there were any) did Baptize those that were converted, and the Presbyters and Deacons did but assist him: And abundance of work he mentioneth which they had with all that they Baptized, and they called all the Congregation together who joined in Prayers with the Bishop at the Baptism. All which shews that he was then the Bishop but of one particular Church, which ordinarily Assembled together for publick worship. For, 1. If he had many such Churches or Congregations under him, he could not be thus present to celebrate Baptism in them all. Nor would one only be mentioned as his charge. 2. Nor is it possible that one Bishop should with so long a way of Baptism as is there described, be able to Baptize all the persons in a Dioces such as ours, or the twentieth part of them, much less in those times, when besides the Infants of Believers, the most eminent sort of Baptism, and greatest labour, was about the multitudes of Adult Converts, that by the Gospel were daily added to the Church.

Gregory Thaumaturgus was as by force made Bishop of Neocefaras: and yet his whole Dioces or City had but seventeen Christians in it at his entrance, though when he died he found upon enquiry but seventeen Pagans, so great a change was made by the Gospel and by Miracles: But by this Dioces of seventeen souls we may conjecture what the Churches were in those times (though we should allow others to be an hundred times as great, they would not be so great as the tenth part of many Parishes in England.) See the truth of this passage in Greg. Nissen Oratio in Greg. Thaumatur. twice over he recites it. And Basil. Mag. 1. de Spir. Sanc. c. 19. And Roman. Breviar. Die 15 Novemb. And the Menolog. Grac. mentioned before Greg. Neecefas works Printed ad Paris 1622. But I shall return to some before Gregory.

The next that I shall cite is Tertullian, that well known place in his Apolog. c. 39. [Corpus sumus de conscientia Religionis & Discipline unitate & spei federet. Coimus in cœtum & Congregati- onem ut ad Deum quasi manu fatta precatiöibus ambiamus N 3 orantes.
orantes. — Cogimur ad divinarum literarum Commemorationem:

— Certè fideb sanctis vocibus pascimus, speremigimus, fiduci- 
am sigimus, disciplinam preceptorum nihilominus incultationi-
bus denarnus: ibidem etiam exhortationes, Castigationes, & cen-
sura Divina: nam & judicatur magnò cum ponderè ut apud cer-
tos de Dei conspectu; summum, futteri judicii presidiciun est 
figusita deliquerit, ut à communicatione Orationis, & conventus, 
& omnis sancti commercii relegetur. President probati quiq, seni-
ores, &c.] If I be able to understand Tertullian, it is here plain 
that each Church consisted of one Congregation, which assembled 
for Worship, and Discipline at once or in one place, and this 
Church was it that had Presidents or Seniors to guide them both 
in Worship and by Discipline. So that if there were any more 
of these Assemblies in one particular Political Church, then there 
were more Bishops then one, or else others besides Bishops exer-
cised this Discipline: But indeed it is here plainly intimated that 
Bishops were then the Guides of Congregations (single,) and 
not of Dioceses consisting of many such.

I shall put Tertullian's meaning out of doubt by another place, 
and that is, de Corona Militis cap. 3. [Eucharistiar Sacramen-
tum & in tempore victus, & omnibus mandatum à Domino,eti-
am antelucanis ritibus, nec de aliorum manu primum presidentium 
similus.] And if they received this Sacrament of none but the 
Presidents, (and that every Lords day at least, as no doubt they 
did) then they could have no more Congregations in a Church 
then they had Presidents. And (though Pamelius say that by 
Presidents here is meant also Presbyters, yet,) those that we now 
dispute against, understand it of the Prelates. And if they will not 
do, then may we will interpret the foresaid passage Apol: to be 
meant of the same sort of Presidents; and then you may soon see 
what Bishops were in Tertullian's dayes. For we have no reason 
to think that they are not the same sort of Officers which he calleth 
Presidents, and of whom he there faith, President probati Seniores.

So in the foregoing words in Tertullian, ibid. its said [Aquam 
adiuvit ibidem, sed & aliquando prius in Ecclesia sub Antifites 
manu contesamur nos renunciare Diabolo, & Pompe & angel sejus] 
Where it seems that there were no more thus initiated then the 
Antifites himself did first thus engage in the Congregation; And I 
believe they take this Antifites for a Bishop.
And here by the way let this argument be noted. Seeing its past doubt that the first sense of the word εκκλησία is the Cænas or holy Assembly it self, why should the Meeting place be so often called also Ecclesia in those times, in the borrowed sense, but only in Relation to the People there assembled? and its plain that it was but one Congregation, and not many that assembled in that place: and therefore it was from that one that the Place is called Ecclesia. That it is oft so called, besides this place of Tertullian (which seems so to use the word) I refer you to Mr. Meads exercitation of Temples, who proves it distinctly in the several Centuries. That saying of Theophilus Antiochenus ad Antolychum seems to intimate the whole that I intend [sic Deos dedit mundo qui peccatorum templo statibus & Nausfragis jactatur, Synagogas, quas Ecclesias Sancitas Nominamus in quibus veritas doctrina servet, ad quas fugientes veritatis studiis, quotquot si vari, Dei, judicium & iram evitare volunt.] So that the Churches of those times which were as Noahs Ark, and where safety was to be found for the soul, were Synagogues or Assemblies. So Tertul. de Idololatr. c. 7. pag. (mihi) 171. Tota die ad banc partem zelus fidei peroravit, ingenni Christianum ab Idolis in Ecclesiam venire, de adversaria officina in domum Dei venire. — ] See more places of Tertullian cited by Pamelaius on this place num. 29. page 177. specially see that de virg. Veland. cap. 13. p. 224.

* Clemens Alexandrinus hath divers passages to the purpose

[Prohibeamur offerre, actibus apud nos, & apud confederes ipsos, & apud plebem universam causam suam.] And [ Hec singularum tradanda sit & imanda plenus rationem, non tantum cum collegis meis, sed & cum plebe ipsa universa.] And [ Vix plebi persuadisse immo extorquere, ut tales patiatur admirati, & audire factus est fractaminis dolor, ex eo quod unus atri, alius obtinent plebe, & contra decentem, nee tamen faciliter subspectant, plebes.] How the universa plebs of many Congregations or a Diocees like ours, should be consulted and hear and do anything to admission or exclusion from Communion, and be advised with by Cyprian in all such affairs, is not easy to conceive. See his Epist. 3. 6. 10. 13. 14. 26. 31. 27. 28. 33. 40. &c.

Peruse all the citations of Blandwell de iure Plebis in Regim. Eccles. and see whether they intimate not the smallness of their Dioceeses. (Though I believe they prove no such thing as proper Government in the people,) Yet peruse all the Authors cited by him there to prove that dEccefia Math. 18. refers to the Congregation of Pastors and people together; and it will much co-firm the point in hand. I shall not recite any of them, because you may there find them in the end of Grotius de Imperio Sum. Potest.
now in hand. Stromat. li. 7. in the beginning, he mentioneth the Church and its officers, which he divideth only into two sorts, Presbyters and Deacons. But I will name no more particular persons, but come to some intimations of the point before us from customs or Practices of the Church and the Canons of Councils.

And it seems to me that the dividing of Parishes so long after (or of Titles as they are called) doth plainly tell us that about those times it was that particular Political Church did first contain many stated Congregations. And though it be uncertain when this began (Mr. Thorndike as we heard before, conjectureth, about Cyprians days) yet we know that it was so long after the Apostles, and that it was strange to less populous places long after it was introduced at Rome and Alexandria, where the number of Christians, & too much ambition of the Bishop, occasioned the multiplication of Congregations under him, and so he became a Bishop of many Churches (named as one) who formerly was Bishop but of a single Church. For if there had been enough, one hundred or fifty or twenty or ten years before, to have made many Parishes or stated Assemblies for communion in worship, then no doubt but the light of Nature would have directed them to have made some stated divisions before. For they must needs know that God was not the God of Confusion but of order in all the Churches: And they had the same reasons before as after: And persecution could not be the hindrance any more at first than at last: For it was under persecuting Emperours when Parishes or Titles were distinguished, and so it might, notwithstanding persecutions have been done as well at first as at last, if there had been the same reason. It seems therefore very plain to me that it was the increase of Converts that caused this division of Titles, and that in planting of Churches by the Apostles, and during their time, and much after, the Churches consisted of no more than our Parishes, who being most inhabitants of the Cities had their meetings there for full communion, though they might have other subordinate meetings as we have now in mens houses for Repeating Sermons and Prayer.

And as Mr. Thorndike out of N nius tells us of 365 Bishopricks in Ireland planted by Patrick; so other Authors tell
us that Patrick was the first Bishop there, or as others and more credible, Palladius the first, and Patrick next: and yet the Scots in Ireland had Churches before Palladius his dayes, (as Bishop Usher sheweth de Primordiis Eccles.Britan.798,799,800,&c.) Johannes Major de gestis scholarum li. 2. cap. 2. prioribus illis temporibus per Sacerdotes & Monachos, sine Episcopis Scotos in fide eruditos suisse affirmat. Et ita [iacante Majorem scriptum Johannes Fordonus Scotichron. li. 3. cap. 8.;] Ante Palladium adventum habitabant Scoti sive Doctores ac Sacramentorum Ministratores Presbyteros solummodo vel Monachi, ritum sequentes Ecclesia Primitiva {N. B.} Of which faith Usher | Quod postremum ab iis accepti videtur qui dixerunt (ut Johan. Semeca in Glossa Decrepti di. 93. ca. Legimus) [quod in Prima Primitiva Ecclesia communis erat officium Episcoporum & Sacerdotum: & Nomina erant communia, & officium communum; sed in secunda primitiva cæperunt distincti & nomina & officia.] So that it seems that some Churches they had before; but Palladius and Patrick came into Ireland, as Augustine into England, and abundantly increased them, and settled with all the Roman Mode; So that it seemed like a new Plantation of Religion and Churches there. Yet it seems that the Bishops settled by Patrick (save that himself an Archbishop was like our Bishops) were but such as were there before under the name of Presbyters, faith Fordon, after the rite or fashion of the Primitive Church.


And he adds the saying of Balæus; (Scriptor. Britanic.centur. 14. cap. 6.;) | [A Cæsarii illum missum ait Johannes Balæus, ut Sacerdotalem ordinem inter Scotos Romanoritum institueret. Habeant (inquit) antea Scoti sive Episcopus ac Ministros, ex verbi Divini Ministerio plebium suffragiis electos, prout Asianorum more sieri apud Britannos videbant: Sed hac Romanis, ut magis ceremoniosis atque Asianorum oribus, non placebant.] By these passages it is easy to conjecture whether they were Bishops of a County, or Bishops of a Parish that were there in those daies. For my part I heartily wish that Ireland had three hundred sixty
five good Bishops and Churches at this day, even when the whole Nation profefs themselves to be Christians, (which then they did not.)

To this purpose runs the 14. Canon Concilii Agath. (and if it were so then, much more long before) [Siquidium extra Parochias in quibus legitimus est ordinarius, conversus oratorium habere voluerit reliquis festivitatibus, ut ibi Missam audire, propter fatigationem familiae, justa ordinatione permittimus. Paschaverovero, Natali Domini, Epiphania, Ascensione domini, Pentecoste, & Natali Sancti Johannis Baptistae, & qui maxime dies in festivitatibus habentur, non nisi in Civitatibus, aut Parochiis audiant.] Here it appeareth that there was but one legitimus ordinarius, conversus in a Parish; though they tolerated an Oratory or Chappell of ease. And that a Parish here is taken for a Diocese, or such a Church as had proper to it self a Bishop and Presbyterie, as it is probable from the ordinary use of the word by Eusebius and other antients in that fence, so also from what is further said in the following Canons of this Council: And so the word Parish here may be expository of the word City, or else denote a Rural Bishoprick. For Can. 30. faith [Benedictionem super plebem in Ecclesiae fundere aut penitentiam in Ecclesiæ benedicere presbytero penitus non licebit.] And if a Presbyter may not bless the people or the penitent, (when the blessing of the people was part of the work in every Solemn Assembly for Church communion) then it is manifest that a Bishop must be present in every such Assembly to do that part which the Presbyter might not do: and consequently there were no more such Assemblies then there were Bishops. And to prove this more fully mark the very next Canon of that Council, viz. the 31. [Missas die dominico secularibus totas audire speciali ordine praecipimus, ut ante benedictionem Sacerdotis egressi populus non presumat. Quod si secerint, ab Episcopo publice confundatur.] So that its plain that on every Lords day all the people (for here is no distinction or limitation) were to be present in the publick worship to the end, and the Bishop to pronounce the blessing (whoever preached:) and openly to rebuke any that should go out before it. From whence it is evident that all such Church Assemblies for communion every Lords day were to have a Bishop present with them to do part of the work: and therefore there were:
were no more such Assemblies then there were Bishops.

In the 38. Canon of the same Council we find this written

[ Cives qui superiorum solennitatum, id est, Pascha & Natalis Domini, vel Pentecostes festivatibus cum Episcopis interesse neglexerint, quin in Civitatibus communions vel benedictionis accipienda causa postos se nesse debeat, triennio communione priventur Ecclesie,] So that it seems there were no more Church-members in a City then could congregate on the festival days for Communion and the Bishops Blessing: therefore there were not many such Congregations: when every one was to be three years excommunicate that did not Assemble where the Bishop was.

Moreover all those Canons of several Councils that forbid the Presbyters to confirm by Chrysm, and make it the Bishops work, do shew that the Dioceses were but small when the Bishop himself could do that besides all his other work.

In the Canons called the Apostles, cap. 5. it is ordained thus

[Omnium aliorum primitiae Episcopo & Presbyteris domum mittuntur, non super Altare. Manifestum est autem quod Episcopus & Presbyteri inter Diacenos & reliquos clericos eas dividunt. ]

By which it appeareth that there was but one Altar in a Church to which belonged the Bishop, Presbyterie, and Deacons, who lived all as it were on that Altar.

And Can. 32. runs thus [ Si quis Presbyter contemnens Episcopum suum, sorris collegit, & Altare alius exerceit, nihil habens quo reprehendat Episcopum in causa pietas & justitia, deponatur quasi principatus amator existens—Hac autem post unam & secundam & tertiam Episcopi obsecranem fieri conveniat. ] Which shews that there was then but one Convention and one Altar to which one Bishop and Presbyters did belong: So that no other Assembly or Altar was to be set up apart from the Bishop by any Presbyter that had nothing against the Bishop in point of Godliness or Justice.

And I believe if Bishops had a whole Diocese of two hundred or three hundred or a thousand Presbyters to maintain, they would be loth to stand to the fifty eighth Canon which makes them Murderers if they supply not their Clergies wants: But let that Canon pass as spurious.

And long after when Concilium Valesne doth grant leave to the Presbyters to preach, and Deacons to read Homilies in Country Parishes
Parishes as well as Cities, 'twixt that such Parishes were but new and imperfect Assemblies.

In the Council of Laodicea the 36. Canon is [Non eportet Presbyteros ante ingressum Episcopi ingredi Ecclesiæ, & sedere in tribunalibus; sed cum Episcopo ingredi: nisi forte aut egresset Episcopum, aut in peregrinationis commodum absit consuliter. ] By which it seems that there was but one Assembly in which the Bishop and Presbyters sate together: Otherwise the Presbyters might have gone into all the rest of the Churches without the Bishop at any time, and not only in case of his sickness or peregrination.

The fifth Canon of the Council of Antioch is the same with that of Can. Apost. before cited, that no Presbyter or Deacon contemning his own Bishop, shall withdraw from the Church and gather an Assembly apart, and set up an Altar. By which still it appears that to withdraw from that Assembly, was to withdraw from the Church, and that one Bishop had but one Altar and Assembly for Church Communion.

So Concil. Carthag. 4. Can. 35. which order the sitting of the Presbyters and Bishop together in the Church: And many decrees that lay it on the Bishop to look to the Church lands and goods, and distribute to the poor the Churches Alms, do shew that their Diocesses were but small, or else they had not been sufficient for this.

All the premises laid together, me thinks afford me this conclusion, that the Apostolical particular Political Churches were such as consisted of one only Worshipping Congregation (a Congregation capable of personal communion in publick worship) and their Overseers; and that by little they departed from this form, each Bishop enlarging his Diocese, till he that was made at first the Bishop but of one Church, became the Bishop of many, and to set up a new frame of Government, by setting up a new kind of particular Churches. And thus was the primitive Government corrupted, while men measured their charge by the circuit of Ground, thinking they might retain the old compass when they had multiplied converts, and therefore should have multiplied Churches and Bishops. *

To all this I add these observations. 1. That the very Nature of Church Government tells us that a Governor must be present...
upon the place, and for the execution: For God hath made us the Laws already, and Synods must in way of Union determine of the most advantageous circumstances for the performing of the duties which God imposeth: And particular Bishops are to guide their particular Congregations in Gods Worship, and in order thereto; Their guidance is but a subservient means to that worship: And therefore they must Rule the Church as a Captain doth his Company in fight, or a Physitian his Patient, or a Schoolmaster his School, by his own presence, and not at many miles distance by a Surrogate.

2. The doctrine which makes the first particular Political Church to consist of many stated Worshipping Churches like our Parishes, doth set on the saddle, if not also hold the stirrup for a Diocesan Bishop to get up, to head those prepared bodies.

3. Seeing the Presbyterians do confess that it is not Necessary (but lawful) for a particular Political Church to consist of many Worshipping Churches, and say, It may consist only of one: Common Reason and experience will then direct us to conclude that its best ordinarily take up with that one: seeing people that know one another, and live within the reach of each other for common converse, and ordinarily meet and join in the same public Worship, are most capable of the ends of Church Policy, and a Pastor capable of guiding such, better than other Parishes that he knows not.

4. He that makes the Pastor of one Parish the Ruler of the rest adjoining, doth lay upon him much more duty then sitting in a Presbyterie to vote in censures. For those censures are a small part of Church Government, comparatively (else most Congregations in England have little or no Government; for they have little or none of these Censures.) Yea indeed true Church Guidance or Government contains a great part, if not most of the Pastoral work, which a man would be loth to undertake over too many distant unknown Congregations: Though he may well undertake in Synods to promote Unity, and to do the best he can for the whole Church of Christ. If therefore those of the Congregational way, were as near us in other things, as in this before insisted on, (especially if they would renounce* that great mistake of the Peoples having the Power of the Keys or Government, and take up for them with a Judicium Discretionis, and

As many of them do in sense, when they hold it in terms, of which see what I have said in the Preface to the Reformazd Pa-
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and just liberty) we need not stand at so great a distance.

And lastly, If Ministers of the Gospel would tenderly weigh the greatness of their work and charge, and the dreadfulness of their account; the worth of souls, the power and prevalency of sin, the rage of all the Churches enemies, and the multitudes of them, they would sooner tremble to think of the difficulties in Governing or guiding one Congregation in the way to heaven, than grasp at more, and think themselves able to be the guides of many, and draw such a heavy burden on themselves, and prepare for such a reckoning. Left they be offended with my words, I will say the like in the words of Chrysostom (or whoever else was the Author of the Imperfect work) on Matth 20. Hom. 35. pag. (mihi) 901. [Si hac ergo sit se habent, secularem quidem primatum desiderare, est ratio non est, vel causa est: quia est justum non est, vel usile est. Primatum autem Ecclesiassticum concupiscere, neq; ratio est, neq; causa: quia neq; justum est, neq; utile. Quis exim sapiens utro se subjicere velit sint servitut, labori, dolori, & quod maxus est, periculo tali ut det rationem pro omni Ecclesia, apud justum judicem? nisi forte qui non credit Judiciunm Dei, nec timet, uti abusens primatum suo Ecclesiasstico seculariter, convertat eum in Seclusarem. Sed ne forte qui talis est in appetendo primatum, profectum pietatis pie praten- dat, dico, Nunquid qui in ordine prior est, jam & meritis est melior?] And of the Ministerial honours he faith (ibid.) Deniq, ipsi bono- res in Christo in prima quidem facie videtur honores, revera au- tem non sunt honores diversi, sed sunt diversa Ministeria: ut puta honor oculi videtur, quia illuminat Corpus: Sed ipse honor illumin- nandi non est ei honor sed Ministerium ejus.—]

So much to prove the Proposition, that the late English Episco- lopacy is not to be restored, under any pretence of Order or Peace.

Wherein I have purposely forborne the mention of its Abuses, and doeful consequents, because they may suppose that Abuse to be separable from the thing.
To save the debating of many great Controversies that break the peace and destroy or diminish the Charity of many, I may abbreviate the work, by giving you some of the true sequels of what hath been sufficiently proved.

Conf. I. The taking down of the English Episcopacy was (as to the thing) so far from being evil, and deserving the Accusations that some lay upon it, that it was a matter of Necessity to the Reformation and well being of the Churches of Christ in these Nations. It was no worse a work in itself considered, than the curing of a grievous disease is to the sick, and the supply of the necessities of the poor in their indigence. What guilt lieth upon that man, that would have all the sick to perish, for fear of injuring one Physician, that had undertaken the sole care of all the County? or that would have all the County to have but one Schoolmaster: Or an hundred Ships to have but one Pilot, and consequently to perish: How much greater is their guilt, that would have had the forementioned Episcopacy continued, to the hazzard of many thousand souls, and the abatement and ejection of holy Discipline, the pollution of the Churches, and the hardening of the wicked, and the dishonour of God? I mention not this to provoke any to dishonour them, but to provoke the persons themselves to Repentance. And I intreat them to consider, how sad a thing it is, that without any great inducements, they should draw such a mountain of guilt upon their souls. The Bishops had the temptation of Honour and Riches: but what honour or gain have you to seduce you, to choose a share with other men in their sin and punishment?

I meddle not here with the Manner of demolishing Episcopacy, but with the Matter: because I would not mix other Controversies with this. But I am confident those men that usually own the late Episcopacy, and revile them that demolish it, shall one way or other feel ere long, that they have owned a very unprofitable cause, and such as they shall wish, they had let alone, and that it made not for their honour to be so much enemies to
to the welfare of the Church, as the enemies of the abolition of that Prelacy will appear to be.

Conf. 2. Conf. II. The matter of that clause in the National Covenant, which concerneth the abolition of this Prelacy before mentioned, was so far from deserving the reproaches and accusations that are bestowed on it by some, that it was just and necessary to the well being of the Church.

In this also I purposely mean the civil controversy about the authority of imposing, taking, or prosecuting the Covenant, and speak only of the Matter of it: (to avoid the losing of the truth by digressions, and new controversies.) They that by reproaching this clause in the Covenant, do own the Prelacy which the Covenant disowneth, might shew more love to the Church and their own souls, by pleading for sickness, and nakedness, and famine, and by passionate reproaches of all that are against these, then by such owning and pleading for a far greater evil.

Conf. 3. Conf. III. Those of the English Ministry, that are against the old Episcopacy, and are glad that the Church is rid of it, are not therefore guilty of Schism, nor of sinful disobedience to their spiritual superiors.

If any of them did swear obedience to the Prelates (a tyrannical imposition that God never required, nor the Primitive Church never used) that's nothing to our present case, which is not about the keeping of oaths, but the obeying or rejecting the Prelacy in it self considered. It is not schismatical to depart from an usurpation that God disowneth, and the Church is endangered and so much wronged by, and to seek to pull up the Roots of Schism, which have bred and fed it in the Churches so long.

Conf. 4. Conf. IV. Those that still justify the ejected Prelacy, and desire the restauration of it, as they needlessly choose the guilt of the Churches desolations, so are they not to be taken for men that go about to heal our breaches, but rather for such as would widen and continue them, by restoring the main cause.

Conf. 5. Conf. V. If we had had such an Episcopacy as Bishop Hall and Bishop Usher did propound as satisfactory, (and such men to manage it,) Episcopacy and Peace might have dwelt together
together in England to this day: It is not the Name of a Bishop that hath been the matter of our trouble, but the exorbitant Species introducing unavoidably the many mischiefs which we have seen and felt.

Conf. VI. Ordination by the ejected Prelacy, in species, is not of necessity to the being or well-being of a Presbyter or Deacon. If the Species of Prelacy itself be proved contrary to the word of God, and the welfare of the Church, then the Ordination that is by this Species of Prelacy, cannot be necessary or as such desirable.

Conf. VII. A Parochial or Congregational Pastor, having assistant Presbyters and Deacons, either existent or in expectation, was the Bishop that was in the days of Ignatius, Justin, Tertullian, and that Dr. Hammond describeth as meant in many Scriptures, and existent in those days. I speak not now to the question about Archbishops.

Conf. VII. The Ordination that is now performed by these Parochial Bishops (especially in an assembly, guided by their Moderator) is, beyond all just exception, Valid, as being by such Bishops as the Apostles planted in the Churches, and nearer the way of the Primitive Church, then the Ordination by the ejected Species of Prelates is.

Conf. IX. As the Presbyters of the Church of Alexandria did themselves make one their Bishop, whom they chose from among themselves, and set him in a higher degree (as if Deacons make an Archdeacon, or Souliers choose one and make him their Commander, saith Hierom ad Evagr.) so may the Presbyters of a Parochial Church now. And as the later Canons require that a Bishop be ordained or consecrated by three Bishops, so may three of these (Primitive) Parochial Bishops, ordain or consecrate now another of their degree. And according to the Canons themselves, no man can justly say that this is invalid, for want of the Consecration by Archbishops, or of such as we here oppose.

Conf. X. Those that persuade the People that the Ordination of those in England and other Churches is null that is not by such as the English Prelates were, and that persuade the people to take them for no Presbyters or Pastors, that are not ordained
dained by such Prelates, and do make an actual separation from our Churches and Ministers, and persuade others to the like, upon this ground, and because the Ministers have disowned the English Prelacy, and withal confess that Church of Rome to be a true Church, and their ordination and Priesthood to be just or true, are uncharitable, and dangerously Schismatical (though under pretence of decrying Schism,) and many ways injurious to the Church and to the souls of men and to themselves. This will not please; but that I not only speak it but further manifest it, is become Necessary to the right Information of others.
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The Preface.

Christian Reader,

If thou be but for the interest of Christianity, more than of a party, and a Cordial friend to the Churches Peace, though thou be never so much resolved for Episcopacy, I doubt not but thou and I shall be one, if not in each Opinion, yet in our Religion, and in Brotherly affection, and in the very bent of our labours and our lives: And I doubt not but thou wilt approve of the scope and substance of this following Disputation, what imperfections soever may appear in the Manner of it. For surely there is that of God within thee, that will hardly suffer thee to believe, that while Rome is taken for a true Church, the Reformed that have no Prelates must be none: that their Pastors are meer Lay-men, their Ordination being Null: and consequently their administrations in Sacraments, &c. Null and of no Validity. The Love that is in thee to all believers, and especially to the Societies of the Saints, and the honour and interest of Christ, will keep thee from this, or strive against it, as nature doth against poison or destructive diseases. If thou art not a meer Opinionist in Religion, but one that hast been illuminated by the spirit of Christ, and felt his love shed abroad in thy heart, and hast ever had experience of spiritual communion with Christ and his Church, in his holy Ordinances, I dare then venture my cause upon thy judgement: Go

among
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among them that unchurch our Churches, and degrade our Ministers, and persuade all people to fly from them as a plague; and try their doctrine, their spirits, their public worship, their private devotion, and their whole conversation; and when thou hast done, come into our Assemblies, and spare not, if thou be impartial, to observe our imperfections: judge of our Order and Discipline, and Worship, together with our Doctrine and our lives: and when thou hast done unchurch us if thou darest, and if thou canst. We justify not ourselves or our ways from blemishes: but if thou be but heartily a friend to the Bridegroom, offer us then if thou darest, a bill of divorce, or rob him if thou darest of so considerable a portion of his inheritance. Surely if thou be his friend, thou canst hardly find in thy heart to deliver up so much of his Kingdom to his Enemy, and to set the name of the Devil on his doors, and say, This is the house of Satan and not of Christ. If thou have received but what I have done (though, alas too little) in those Societies, and tasted in those Ordinances but that which I have tasted, thou wouldst abhor to reproach them, and cut them off from the portion of the Lord.

Remember it is not Episcopacy nor the old conformity that I am here opposing. (My judgement of those Causes I have given in the foregoing and following disputation:) But it is only the New Prelatical Recusants or Separatists, that draw their followers from our Churches as no Churches and our Ordinances of Worship as none, or worse then none, and call them into private houses, as the meekest places for their acceptable worship. Who would have thought that ever that generation should have come to this, that so lately hated the name of Separation, and called those private meetings, Conventicles, which were held but in due subordination to Church meetings, and not in opposition to them, as theirs are! Who would have thought that those that seemed to disown

Recusancy,
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Recusancy, and persecuted Separatists, should have come to this? Yea that those that under Catholic pretences can so far extend their charity to the Papists, have yet so little for none of the meanest of their Brethren, and for so many Reformed Protestant Churches? Yea that they should presume even to censure us out of the Catholic Church and consequently out of heaven it self. I have after here given thee an instance in one, Dr. Hide, who brandeth the very front of his Book with these Schismatical, uncharitable сф mâta. The senseless Queres of one Dr. Swadling, and others run in the same channel, or sink. If these men be Christians indeed, me thinks they should understand, that as great (that I say not greater) blemishes, may be found on all the rest of the Churches, as those for which the Reformed are by them un-churched: and consequently they will deliver up All to Satan; and Christ must be deposed: And how much doth this come short of Infidelity? At least me thinks their hearts should tremble least they hear at last, [In not loving thee you loved not me : in despising and reproaching thee, you despised and reproached me.]

And yet these men are the greatest pretenders next the Romanists, to Catholicism, Unity, and Peace! Strange Catholicks that cut off so great and excellent a part of the Catholic Church! And a sad kind of Unity and Peace which all must be banished from, that cannot unite in their Prelacy, though the Episcopacy which I plead for in the next Disputation they can own. The summ of their offer, is, that if all the Ministers not Ordained by Prelates, will confess themselves to be mere Lay-men, and no Ministers of Christ, and will be Ordained again by them, and if the Churches will confess themselves No Churches, and receive the essence of Churches from them, and the Sacrament and Church Assemblies to be Null, invalid, or unlawfull till managed only by Prelatical Ministers, then they will have Peace and Commu-
union with us, and not till then. And indeed must we buy your Communion so dear? As the Anabaptists do by us in the point of Baptism, so do these Recusants in the point of Ordination. You must be Baptized faith one party, for your Infant Baptism was none. You must be Ordained faith the other sort, for your Ordination by Presbyters was none. The upshot is, we must be all of their Opinions and parties, before we can have their Communion, or to be reputed by them the Ministers and Churches of Christ. And on such kind of terms as these, we may have Unity with any Sect.

If really we be not as hearty friends to Order and Discipline in the Church as they, we shall give them leave to take it for our shame, and glory in it as their honour. But the question is not, whether we must have Church-Order? but whether it must be theirs, and none but theirs? Nor whether we must have Discipline, but whether it must be only theirs? Nay, with me, I must profess, the question is, on the other side whether we must needs have a Name and show of Discipline that's next to none, or else be no Churches or no Ministers of Christ? The main reason that turneth my heart against the English Prelacy is because it did destroy Church Discipline, and almost destroy the Church for want of it, or by the abuse of it, and because it is (as they exercised) inconsistent with true Discipline. The question is not, whether we must have Bishops and Episcopal Ordination. We all yield to that without contradiction. But the doubt is about their Species of Episcopacy. Whether we must needs have Ordination by a Bishop that is the sole Governor over an hundred, or two hundred, or very many particular Churches, or whether the Bishops of single Churches may not suffice, at least as to the Being of our office? I plead not my own cause, but the Churches; For I was ordained long ago by a Bishop of their own with Presbyters. But I do not therefore take myself to be disengaged from Christianity or Catholickism, and
and bound to lay by the Love which I owe to all Christ's members, or to deny the Communion of the Churches, which is both my Duty, and I am sure an unvaluable Mercy. And I must say, that I have seen more of the Ancient Discipline exercised of late, without a Prelate, in some Parish Church in England, than ever I saw or heard of exercised by the Bishops in a thousand such Churches all my days. And it is not Names that are Essential to the Church, nor that will satisfy our expectations.

We are for Bishops in every Church; And for Order sake, we would have one to be the chief. We dislike those that dis-obey them in lawful things, as well as you. But let them have a flock that is capable of their personal Government, and then we shall be ready to rebuke all those that separate from them, when we can say as Cyprian (Epift. 69. ad Pupian.) [Omnis Ecclesiae populus collectus est, & adunatus, in individua concordia fibi junctus. Soli ilii foris remanerint, qui et si intus essent, ejiciendi fuerant — Qui cum Episcopo non est, in Ecclesia non est (that is, in that particular Church.) Cyprian had a people that could all meet together to consult or consent at least about the Communion or Excommunication of the members. Epift. 55. Cornel. he tells Cornelius how hard the people were to admit the lapsed or scandalous upon their return if the mani-festation of repentance were not full. The Church with whom the person had Communion, was then it that had a Bishopp, and was no greater than to be capable of the Cogni- zance of his cause, and of receiving satisfaction by his personal penitence.

Brethren! (for so I will presume to call you, whether you will or not) Some experience hath persuaded me, that if we had honestly and faithfully joyned in the practice of so much of Discipline, as all our principles require, it would have helped us to that experimental knowledge (by the bles-
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Sing of God) which would have brought us nearer even in our Principles, than our idle Disputations, separated from practice will ever do. As Augustine said of the disputes de causa mali (Lib. de utilitatis. Credendi, cap. 18.) Dum nimis quaeunt unde sit malum, nihil reperient nihili malum [so I may say of these disputes, while we thus dispute about the causes of disorder and division, we find nothing but disorder and division.

It is easy to conjecture of the ends and hearts of those that cry down Piety as preciseness, while they cry up their several ways of order: it seems they would have ordered impiety: and their order must be a means to keep down holiness, which all just order should promote. Those men that can fall in with the most notoriously ungodly, and favour and flatter them for the strengthening of their interest, do tell us what Discipline we may expect from them. If they tell us that our Churches also are corrupted, and all are not truly or eminently godly, we can say to them as Augustine (lib. de utilitatis. Credendi. cap. 17.) [Pauci hoc faciunt; pauciores bene prudenterq; faciunt: sed populi probant, populi audient, populi faveant] ye we can say much more.

But for those that go farther, and clap the prophanest railers on the back, and hiss them on to hiss at those that differ from them, and are glad to hear the rabble revile our Ministry and our Churches, in taking part with their Prelacy and Liturgy, they tell us lowder what unity and order they desire, and what a mercy of God it is, that such as they have not their will: and though among themselves the flanders and reproaches of such men may go for credible or be accepted as conducing to their ends; yet in the conclusion such witnesses will bring no credit to their cause, nor with just men much discredit ours; at least it will not diminish our reputation with God, nor abate his love.
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love, nor hinder his acceptance, and then we have enough. 

Saith (Cyprian Epift. 69. ad Pupian) Quafi apud lapsos & prophanos, & extra Ecclesiam politos, de quorum peckoribus excerserit Spiritus Sanctus, esse aliquid pos-

lit nisi mens prava, & fallax lingua, & odia venenata, & sacrilega mendacia, quibus qui credit, cum illis ne-

cesse est inventari, cum judici dies vederit.] That is 

[As of with the scandalous and proflane, and those that are without the Church, from whose breasts the holy Spirit is departed, there could be any thing but a naughty mind, and a deceitful tongue, and venomous hatred, and sacrilegious lies; and those that believe them must needs be found with them when the day of judgment comes.]

Me thinks rather the hatred, and railing of the an-

godly should intimate to you that our Ministry is of God! why else do all the most obstinately wicked maligne us as their enemies, though we never did them wrong? why seek they our destruction, and are glad of any Learned men that will encourage them in their malignity, and to strike in with any party that are against us; when all the harm we wish or do them, is to pray for them, and persuade them, and do our best to save them from damnation! As Cyprian (ubi sup.) said to Pupian [ut etiam qui non credebant Deo Episcopum constituenti, vel Diabolo crederent Episco-
pum proscritenti] so say I [They that will not believe Gods testimony of our Ministry, let them believe the De-

vils testimony, as the confession of an enemy, that by the mouths of the wicked revileth us as Ministers, and persecu-
tus us for doing our Masters work.

Another reproach is commonly laid upon our Ministry by those that vilifie them in order to their ends, viz. that they are bojes, and raw and unlearned and manage the work of God so coarsely as tends to bring it into contempt. I would there were no ground for this accusation at all: but
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I must needs say, 1. That no men are more unmeet than you to be the accusers. Have you so corrupted the Ministry with the insufficient and ungodly, that we are necessitated to supply their places with men that are too young; and now do you reproach us, because we imperfectly mend your crimes? yea, because we work not impossibilities? It is the desire of our souls, that no able useful man may be laid by, however differing in smaller matters, or controversies of policy? But we cannot create men, nor infuse learning into them; but when God hath qualified them, we gladly use them; the best that can be had are chosen; and what can be done more? And I hope you will acknowledge, that godly and tolerably able young men are fitter than impious, ignorant Readers.

We excuse no man's weakness: but to speak out the truth, too many of the adversaries of our Ministry accuse our weakness with greater weakness; when they are unable or undisposed themselves to manage the work of God with any of that gravity, and seriousness as the unspeakable weight of the business doth require, they think to get the reputation of learned able men, by an empty, childish, trifling kind of preaching; patching together some shreds of sentences, and offering us their Centons with as much ostentation, as if it were an uniform, judicious work. And then they fall a jeering at plain and serious Preachers, as if they were some ignorant bawling fellows, that were nothing but a voice, and had nothing to produce but fervent nonsense. Brethren, will you bear with us a little, while we modestly excuse our simplicity which you condemn. We will not say, that we can speak wisdom to the wise, nor make ostentation of our Oratory: but we must tell you that we believe what we speak, and somewhat feel it; and therefore we endeavour so to speak what we believe and feel, that others also may believe and feel us. If a man speak smilingly, or not affectionately of very great affecting things, the hearers
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Use to say, You are but in jest; and they believe him not, because he speaks as one that doth not believe himself. It is not wit but Levity and Stupidity that we renounce. As Seneca saith, we refuse not an eloquent Physitian: but it is not eloquence, but Healing that we need: the easing of our pains, and saving of our lives, and not the clawing of our ears. We dare not speak lightly or triflingly of Heaven or Hell. We more condemn our selves when we find within us but a dull apprehension of these exceeding great eternal things, then we do for want of neat expressions. A vain curiosity in attire, doth show that substantial worth is wanting. We most abhor the preaching of false doctrine: and next, that manner of preaching Truth that causeth an airy levity in the hearers; and when the manner seemeth to contradict the matter. One taste or sight of Heaven or Hell would put you into another pass your selves. Truly Brethren (though I am one myself, that have the least advantages to vie with you in that wherein you glory, yet) there are many among them whom you thus despise, that have wits inclined to as much unruliness and luxuriancy as yours: but being ballanced with the sense of everlasting things, and seasoned with the Light and Life of Christ, they are as careful to keep under and rule their wit, as others are diligent to feed its wantonness, and make ostentation of it to the world. It will shortly appear but ingenuous folly which was not animated and regulated by Christ. The wisdom of the world is foolishness with God: and the foolishness of God is wiser then men, 1 Cor. 1. 25. &c. We find the most experienced Learned Divines betake themselves to the plainest style, and much more addicted to the ancient simplicity, then green, inflated, empty brains. When we displease both our selves, and our queasy, cove and aery auditors by the homeliness of our style, we usually hear more of the success of those sermons, then of those wherein by a wordy
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wordy Curiosity, we procure from the acry more applause. Saith Augustine (de Catechiz. lib. cap. 2.) Nam & mihi semper prope sermo mens displacet — sic & tu eo ipso quod ad te sapius adductur baptizedi — debes intelligere n nita displicer aliis sermonem tueum ut displicer tibi: nec invenitum te debes putare, quod ea quæ cernis non explicas ita ut cupis; quando forte ut cupis nec cernere valeas.] Our business is to teach the ignorant, to convert the impertinent, and to edifie and confirm the weak; and therefore if repetitions; and homely expressions, with all the seriousness we can use, be found the fittest means to attain these ends, we shall study them and not decline them; though some dislike them. Augustine de doctrin. Christ. lib. 4. cap. 12. Qui ergo dicit cum docere vult, quamdiu non intelligitur, nondum se existitmet dixisse quod vult ei quem vult docere: quae et si dixit quod ipse intelligit, nondum ille (illi, dixisse putandus est, a quo intellectus non est: si vero intellectus est, quocunque modo dixerit, dixit.)

I confess when I heard a through passed preacher in the Prelates reign, experience taught me presently to expect three great infirmities in him, viz. stumbling, spoiling, and tiring: stumbling either in doctrine, conversation, or both; especially in a stony way: spoiling even the clearest of his Brethren, and that both in the Pulpit, and behind their backs. For most of the wounds we have from such are in our back parts, though we never said. They can most effectually confute us when we do not hear them. As one of them that I knew, divided his Text into one part, and so do many of them their Disputations: they are best at Disputing alone, when there is none to contradict them. They are better gun-men than sword-men. Eminus fortissimi; cominus—more valiant a far off than n e at hand:
hand: and making more use of powder than of bullet; the
noise exceeding the execution: and being nearest them-
selves, it is a wonder that their Consciences start not at the
report. It is the reward of these pugnacious souls, to
be cried up as victorious, and to have their triumph at-
tended by their like: and it is enough to prove them victors
that they can but crow and erect the crest. And if they
are soon tired we must not wonder; for they preach at too
high rates to hold out long. Funkeis are not for full meals;
and feasting must not be all the year. When they preach
but seldom, they justified it by telling us, that one of their
sermons was worth ten of theirs that preach'd so often: and
half a crown was as good as six: six pence.

For my part, I do not undervalue their wit, nor envy
them the honour of it; but I would fain have things Divine
to be Divinely handled; and the weightiest matters to be
spoken of in the most serious weighty manner. And I
would not have a school boy when he hath said a Declama-
tion, to think that he is more learned then Scotus or Oc-
kam, because he hath a smoother style: nor to think that
he hath done a gallanter piece of work, then he that hath
read a Lecture in Metaphysicks. I am much inclined to
honour their parts; I value the wit of a Comedian, when
I value not the employment of it. I have often heard a
Rustical Justice call a fiddler a Rogue, that called himself
a Musician; and perhaps he puts him in the stocks, that
thinks he deserves a Prince's ear: when I have thought of
their art, and forgotten the abuse, I have been apt to pity
their case. I could be well content that so great an Artist
as Nero perish not; let him live as an Artist, but not as an
Emperor. I honour and love the learning and industry of
the Jesuits: let them be encouraged as Learned, but not as
Jesuits. Let them all be used in that which they are good
for. But a Comical wit is not enough to make a Minister of
the
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the Gospel of salvation. Counters can jingle as well as gold. If such must be Bishops, let them be Diocesans, (so they be kept without a sword) for when they have an hundred Churches, they will trouble them but seldom, with their preaching: and that may be endured for a day that cannot for a year.

If you think I have turned my excuse of a plain and serious ministry, into a recrimination, or seemed guilty of what I blame, consider of what and to whom I speak.

I am far from a contempt of learning, or encouraging ignorant insufficient men, or justifying any ridiculous unseemly deportment, or any rash, irrational expressions, in the work of God. And I earnestly intreat the servants of the Lord to take heed of such temerity and miscarriages, and remember what a work they have in hand and how much dependeth on the success, and that the eyes of God and men are on them, and that it is no light matter to an honest heart, that Christ and his cause should be dishonoured by our weaknesses, and our labours should hereby be frustrated, and sinners hardened in their impiety. But yet I must say, that many that are but low in Learning, have greater abilities (by grace and use) to manage the great essentials of Christianity, and set home a necessary truth upon the heart, and deal with ignorant dead-hearted sinners, than many very learned men did ever attain to. And I confess I could wish for the service of the Church, that some such (now private) less learned men, in great Congregations were yoked with some learned men that are less fit for lively roving application; that they might lovingly go together, the one confessing his defect in learning and the other his defect in application, and the unlearned depending for guidance from the more learned, in cases of difficulty, where his abilities fall short; that so they might be both as one able Minister, communicating the honour of their several abilities to each other.
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other to supply and cover each others defects. But if such a thing should be attempted (though agreeably to the Churches practice for many hundred years after Christ) what an outcry should we have from the men now in hand, against Mechanicks and unlearned men! and how many would reproach their work that cannot mend it! I have been long, on this subject: I will end it with this story.

Gregory Nylen tells us in his relation of the Life of Gregory Thaumaturgus, that this holy man then Bishop of Neocelea, was so famous by his miracles and successes that the Neighbour Countreys sent to him, to preach and plant Churches among them. Among others Comana a neighbour City sent to him, to come and plant a Church and Bishops among them. When he had stayed a while, and preached and prepared them, and the time was come that he was to design them a chief Pastor (or Bishop) the Magistrates and principal men of the City were very busy in enquiring anxiously and curiously, who was of most eminent rank and splendour, excelling the rest, that he might be chosen to the office and dignity of being their Bishop. For Gregory himself had all these Ornaments, and therefore they thought their Pastor must have them too. But when it came to choice they were all to pieces, some for one and some for another: so that Gregory looked to heaven for Directions, what to do. When they were thus taken up with proposing men of splendor and eminency, Gregory (remembering Samuels anointing David,) exhorted them to look also among the meanest: for possibly there might be found among them some of better qualifications of mind: Whereupon some of them signified, that they took it as a contumelie and scorn, that all the chief men for eloquence, dignity and splendor should be refused, and that Mechanicks and tradesmen that labour for their living should be thought fitter for so great an office. And saith one of them to him in derision, If you will pass
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by all these that are chosen out of the best of the citizens, and go to the scum and basest of the people for a Pastor for us: its best for you even to make Alexander the Collier a Priest, and let all agree to choose him. The good man hearing these scornful words, it struck into his mind to know who that Alexander the Collier was? Whereupon they brought him presently with laughter, and set him in the midst of them cowled and half-naked, and ragged and sordid, and thus stood Alexander among them. But Gregory suspected somewhat better by him, then they that laughed at him; and thereupon taking him out of the company, and examining his life, he found that he was a Philosophick man, that being of a very comely person, and loth it should be any occasion of incontinency, and also renouncing the vanities of the world, had dedicated himself to the life of a Collier, that his person and worth might be hid from men, and his mind be kept in an humble frame. Whereupon Gregory appointeth some to take away Alexander, and wash him and cloath him with his Pastoral attire, and bring him into the Assembly as soon as they had done. In the meantime Gregory goes to the Assembly, and fals a preaching to them of the nature of the Pastoral office, and the holiness of life required thereto, entertaining them with such speeches, till Alexander was brought, and comely adorned in Gregories garments was set before them. Whereupon they all fell a gazing and wondering at Alexander: and Gregory falls a preaching to them again of the deceitfulness of judging by outward appearances, about the inward worth of the soul, and that Satan had obscured Alexander, lest he should subvert his kingdom. To be short, he ordaineth Alexander their Bishop (a Pastor of a single Church.) And when they desired to hear him preach, he shewed that Gregory was not deceived in him: His sermon was sententious and full of understanding: but because he had no flowers of Oratory, or exactness and curiosity
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...osity of words, one that was a curious bearer despised him, who it is said was by a vision brought to repent of it. And thus despised Alexander the Collier was made Bishop (or Pastor) of Comana, when the great ones were rejected: and afterward proved a champion for Christ, to whom he passed in martyrdom through the flames. I have recited this for their sakes that deride the gifts of God in men whom they account unlearned: but not to encourage any to thrust themselves on so great a work without Ordination and due qualifications.

Object. But it is Ordination itself that is wanting to the Pastors of the Reformed Churches, and therefore they are no Pastors, &c. Answ. The contrary is manifested in this ensuing Disputation. This separating Principle is it that I here purposely contend against. For it is cast in to divide and to destroy: and to quench such granado's and fire-works of the Devil, is a necessary work for them that will preserve a Church Peace.

I read in Thuanus of a Bishop in France that turning Protestant, took his Popish consecration for insufficient, and was again elect and ordained by the Protestant Ministers, without a Prelate, to be a Prelate. But that Presbyter Ordained by a Presbytery of Protestants should be reordained by a Prelate, and that as necessary to the being of their office, is strange doctrine to all the Protestant Churches. It was rejected commonly by the English Bishops, even by A. B. Bancroft himself. Saith Firmilian (inter Epist. Cypriani) [*Omnis potestas & gratia in Ecclesia constituta est, ubi praesidet Majores natur, qui & baptizandi, & Manus imponendi & ordinandi possident potestatem] i.e. All Power and Grace is placed in the Church where Elders do preside, who possess the power of Baptising, Imposing hands, and Ordaining.

I know it will be said that Firmilian speak of Bishops on--
The Preface.

ly. But I believe not that he spoke of such Bishops only as we have in question, or that he did not plainly speak of Presbyters as such. For he speaks of the plenitude of Power and Grace in the Church: and therefore intended more then what was proper to a Prelate. 2. He mentioneth Elders, Majores nau, in general without distinction. And 3. His president is plainly related to the Church(as the ubi shews:) it being the People and not the Elders over whom these Elders are said to preside. And 4. Baptizing is first instanced, which was known to be commonly the work of Presbyters, and never appropriated to the Prelate. So that the same persons that did Baptize, even the Elders of the Church, according to Fimilian, did then possess the power of laying on hands and of ordaining. But these things are more fully discussed in what followeth. And if any either adversary or friend would see the Reformed Churches Ministry and Ordination more fully vindicated, I refer them to Voetius against Jansenius Desperata causa Papatus: which if I had read before I had written this Disputation, I think I should have spared my labour.

Reader, if others are too busie to mislead thee, I may suppose thee unwilling to be misled, especially in a matter of so great concernment: For faith Blessed Agustine, Multos invenimus qui mentiri velint, qui autem falli reminisc dol Doctrin. Christ. I. i. cap. 36.) And therefore as thou lowest Christ, his Church, and Gospel, and the souls of others and thine own, take heed how thou ventur'st in following a sect of angry men, to unchurch so great and excellent a part of the Catholich Church, and to vilifie and depose so great a number of able faithfull Ministers of Christ, as those that had not Prelatical Ordination.

And if you are Gentlemen, or unlearned men, that for want of long and diligent studying of these matters, are uncapable of judging of them, and therefore take all on the Authority of those whose Learning and parts you most esteem, I beseech
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Beseech you before you venture your souls on it any further, procure a satisfactory answer to these Questions.

1. Whether the Reformed Churches that have no Prelates, have not abounded with as learned men as any one of those that you admire of a contrary judgement?

2. If you are tempted to suspect men of partiality, whether they that plead for Lorship, honour and preferment, or they that plead against it, and put it from them, are more to be suspected, cæteris paribus?

3. If you will needs suspect the Protestant Ministers of partiality: what ground of suspicion have you of them that were no Ministers: such as the two Scaligers, whose learning made them the admiration of the Christian world, even to Papists as well as Protestants: and yet were cordial friends to those Reformed Churches which these men deny and draw men to disown. Such also as Salamptius, that hath purposely wrote about the subject: with abundance more.

4. If these are not to be trusted, why should not Bishops themselves be trusted? were not Bishop Usher, Andrews, Davenant, Hall, and others of their mind, as learned pious men as any whose Authority you can urge against them?

5. If all this be nothing, I beseech you get a modest resolution of this doubt at least: whether the concurrent judgement of all the Protestant Churches in Christendom, even of the English Bishops with the rest, should not be of more authority with any sober Protestant, than the contrary judgement of those few that are of late risen up for the cause that you are by them solicited to own. It is a known Truth that the generality of the Bishops themselves and all the Protestant Churches in the world, have owned them as true Ministers that were ordained by Presbyteries, without Prelates: and have owned them as true Churches that were guided by these Ministers, and have taken them for valid administrations that were performed by them. And are your few Recusants that would draw you
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so separation of greater Learning, authority and regard, then all the Protestants in the world besides? I beseech you, if you will needs take things upon trust, consider this, and trust accordingly. Though I must say it is pitty that any truly Catholick Christian should not have better grounds than these, and be able himself in so palpable a case to perceive his duty.

For my own part, my conscience witnesseth that I have not written the following Disputation out of a desire to quarrel with any man, but am drawn to it, to my great displeasure, by the present danger and necessity of the Churches, and by compassion to the souls that are turned from the publick Ordinances, and engaged in the separation, and also of the Churches that are divided and troubled by these means. The sad complaints of many of my Brethren from several parts have moved my heart to this undertaking. Through Gods Mercy, I have peace at home: but I may not therefore be insensible of the divisions and calamities abroad. I shall adjoin here one of the Letters that invited me, and no more, because in that one you may see the scope and tenour of the rest, and that I trust not on this displeasing work, without a Call, nor before there is a cause. The passages that intimate an over-valuing of my self, you may charitably impute to the Authors juniority and humility, with some mistake through distance and disacquaintance.

One of the Letters that invited me to this task.

Reverend
Reverend Sir,

Understanding by the Preface to the Reader before your Gildas Salvianus, that you intend a second part, wherein you promise to speak of the way how to discern the true Church and Ministry, I make bold to present you with the desire of some Godly Ministers: viz. that if you see it convenient, you would do something towards the vindication of the present Churches and Ministers from the aspersions of the new Prelatical party in England. It is a principle much made of by many of the Gentry and others, that we are but Schismatical branches broken off from the true body; and this by faithfull tradition is spread amongst them: the learning of some rigid Prelatical Scholars is very prevalent with them to make them thus account of us. With these men we must be all unchurched for casting off Diocesan Episcopacy: though we be found in the faith, and would spend our selves to save souls, and the main substance of our Ordination (at least) cannot be found fault with; yet because we had not a Bishop to lay his hands on us, we are not sent from God. Of what consequence this opinion may prove, if it spread without being checked, an ordinary apprehension may perceive. I can guess something from what I observe from those of this leaven already, that our most serious pains will be little regarded, if our people take this infection; when we would awaken them, we cannot, because they take it that we have no power to teach them. It must not be men of mean parts that must undertake more fully to wipe off this reproach; for the learned adversaries are tall Cedars in knowledge in comparison of many of us: and if men of parts do not grapple with them herein, they will easily carry the vote in many mens judgments; for they judge that the greater Scholars by far certainly have the better in the contest. Sir, we beseech you that you would improve your acquaintance in Antiquity for our help in this case. Not that we would engage you in wrangling with particular men by name, who will not want words: but however you would evidence it that our Ordination by Presbyters is not void, and of no effect. I have this reason ready to give for this request: for (besides what I had formerly heard) I was lately with some of those not of the meanest influence, who urged Episcopacy as of absolute necessity, affirming that this order the Church of God ever observed; and that it was doublets of Apostolical institution, being a thing of Catholic tradition, and that's the best standard to interpret Scripture by. What then are we arrived at, that have forsaken the whole Church herein? Though I am little versed in the Ancients, yet I tell them we acknowledge that soon after the Apostles times the name Bishop came up as distinct from the Presbyters; but then I call for their proof that the Primitive Bishops had the power of jurisdiction over Presbyters, or that to him only ordination was appropriated. I tell them also that we have certain evidence that in some Churches these Bishops were made by Presbyters.
Presbyters, so was the custom in Alexandria: and when did ever the Church judge them to be no Bishops or Ministers? And also of Tertullian President probation quoq Seniores, and of Cyprians Salvator Collegias pacis & concordiae vinculo: and that doublets if Cyprian be to be believed, the Church was then ruled by the joint consent of its Presidents, of whom one was indeed the President or Moderator, who yet called himself a presbyter, and the Presbyters' frater (not filios as it was of late.) This answer I have had from some of them, that the Church in those times was much under the cloud, being imperfect, and had not that liberty to settle Diocesan Episcopacy in that glory, which the Apostolical institution aimed at, and that the Church was then what it could be, and not what it would be. Do you judge of its weight. For my part, I am most humbled at the reading of Ignatius (whom Dr. H. so strenuously found) and cannot tell how to evade that Testimony in the behalf of Episcopacy, if it be indeed the testimony of the true Ignatius. But in itself his phrase is much unlike either that of Clemens, or of Cyprian in this case. Its great pity that Dr. Bloudel vouches his eyes, and so we are bound of on dying of more of his labours in this point. His Notion of the Episcopopat's residue is a very pretty one, and it were well if we had fuller evidence added to that which be hath endeavoured after in his Preface, to his Apology for Hierom.

Or if your judgement about the power of every single Pastor were fully improved, it would conduce much to the clearing of these controversies. I could methinks be glad of the practice of those proposals which Bishop Usher hath made in a late printed sheet: But these angry Presbyters who now oppose us are of a higher brain. But I ran out too far and forget whom I am writing to. Truly I am deeply sensible what mischief these seeds which are yet but thin-sown (as I may say) may grow up to in time; I know not how it is with you; but with us, I fear ten for one at least would be easily drawn to such an opinion of us, if the temptation were somewhat stronger, multitudes observing how civil transactions have run in a round, begin also to think we shall also arrive at our old Church-customs again: now if these Episcopal means judgement should but be dispersed more abroad, how easily would it make these people think that we have deluded them all this while, and so will not regard us! Alas! What a sad thought is it if I should study and preach and pray for men's souls, and yet be rejected as one that had no charge of them as a Minister, laid on me for God! I see you for what you said in your Christian Concord: and I treat you would enlarge further on this subject, as you see convenient: That the Scriptings in the Ministry may be furnished with arguments against our adversaries from such able hand as yours are.

I have done; only I shall deplore your pardon for my interrupting you in your other business; and if I shall hereafter crave your assistance and direction in some cases, I pray you excuse me if uncivil, and wouche safe to let me hear from you: for I am about to settle where the charge is great. The Lord continue you among us, that you may be further an instrument of good. I rest,

Jan. 8.
1657.

Your Affectionate friend and weak
Brother M. E.

Affote.
Assert. Those who nullifie our present Ministry and Churches, which have not the Prelatical Ordination, and teach the people to do the like, do incur the guilt of grievous sin.

CHAP. I.

Sect. 1. For the making good this Assertion,
1. I shall prove that they groundlessly deny our Ministry and Churches; and 2. I shall shew the greatness of their sin.

In preparation to the first I must
1. Take some notice of the true Nature of the Ministerial function; and 2. Of the Nature and Reasons of Ordination.

Sect. 2. We are agreed (ore tenus at least) that the Power and Honour of the Ministry is for the Work, and the Work for the
the Ends, which are the revelation of the Gospel, the application or conveyance of the benefits to men, the right worshiping of God, and right Governing of his Church, to the saving of our selves and our people, and the Glorifying and Pleasing God.

Sec. 3. So that [A Minister of the Gospel is an Officer of Jesus Christ, set apart (or separated) to preach the Gospel and thereby to convert men to Christianity, and by Baptism to receive Disciples into his Church, to congregate Disciples, and to be the Teachers, Overseers, and Governors of the particular Churches, and to go before them in publick worship and administer to them the special Ordinances of Christ, according to the word of God; that in the Communion of Saints, the members may be edified, preserved, and be fruitful and obedient to Christ; and the Societies well ordered, beautified and strengthened; and both Ministers and People saved; and the Sanctifier, Redeemer and the Father Glorified and Pleased in his People now and for ever]

Sec. 4. In this Definition of a Minister, 1. It is supposed that he be competently qualified for these works: For if the Matter be not so far Disposed as to be capable of the Form, it will not be informed thereby. There are some Qualifications necessary to the being of the Ministry, some but to the well being. Its the first that I now speak of.

Sec. 5. Before I name them, lest you misapply what is said, I shall first desire you to observe this very necessary distinction: Its one thing to ask, Who is to take himself for a called and true Minister; and to do the work, as expecting Acceptance and Reward from God; and its another thing to ask, Whom are the people (or Churches) to take for a true Minister, and to submit to as expecting the Acceptance and blessing of God in that submission from his administrations. Or its one thing to have a Call which will before God justify his Ministry and another thing to have a Call which will before God justify the Peoples submission, and will justify in foro Ecclesia, both him and them. And so its one thing to be a Minister whom God and Conscience will justify and own, as to Himself; and another thing to be a Minister to the Church, whom they must own, and God will own and bless only as to their good.

In the first sense, none but truly sanctified men can be Ministers.
ministers; but in the latter an unsanctified man may be a Minister. As there is a difference among Members between the Visible and Mystical, (of which I have spoken elsewhere.) So is there between Pastors. Some have a Title that in foro Ecclesiae or Ecclesia judicet will hold good, that have none that is good in foro Dei: In one word, the Church is bound to take many a man as a true Minister to them, and receive the Ordinances from him in faith, and expectation of a Blessing upon promise; who yet before God is a sinful invader, an usurper of the Ministry, and shall be condemned for it.

As in worldly Possessions, many a man hath a good Title before men, and at the bar of man, so that no man may disturb his Possession, nor take it from him, without the guilt of theft, when yet he may have no good Right at the bar of God to justify him in his retention. So it is here.

Sect. 6. It is too common a case in Civil Governments (the ignorance of which occasioneth many to be disobedient.) A man that invadeth the Soveraignty without a Title, may be no King as to himself, before God, and yet may be truly a King as to the People. That is, He stands guilty before God of Usurpation, and (till he Repent, and get a better Title) shall be answerable for all his administrations as unwarrantable: And yet, when he hath settled himself in Possession of the Place, and exercise of the Soveraignty, he may be under an obligation to do justice to the people, and defend them, and the people may be under an obligation to obey him and honour him, and to receive the fruits of his Government as a blessing. Mens Title in Conscience and before God (for Magistracy and Ministry) themselves are most to look after, and to justify; and its often crakt and naught, when their Title in foro humani may be good, or when the people are bound to obey them. And those miscarriages or usurpations of Magistrates or Ministers which forfeit Gods Acceptance and Blessing to themselves, do not forfeit the blessing of Christs Ordinances and their administrations to the Church: For it is the guilty and not the Innocent that must bear the loss. A Sacrament may be as effectual, and owned by God, for my benefit, when it is from the hand of a man that shall be condemned for administering it, as when it is from the hand of a Saint that hath a better call, supposing still that I be innocent of his usurpation or error.
This necessary distinction premised, I say, that special Grace is necessary to that Call of a Minister that must be warrantable and justifiable to himself before God; but it is not necessary to that call that’s justifiable before the Church, and is necessary to our submission and to the blessing of the Ordinances and their Validity to our good.

Sect. 7. But yet here are some Qualifications essentially necessary, to Dispose the man to be Receptive of the Ministry, coram Ecclesia (though saving grace be not.) As 1. It is of necessity that he be a Christian by Profession; and so that he Professes that faith, repentance, love, obedience, which is saving. For the Minister in question is only a Christian Minister: and therefore he must be a Christian, & aliquid amplius by profession.

2. It is therefore Necessary that he Professes and seem to Understand and Believe all the Articles of the faith, that are essential to Christianity, and do not heretically deny any one of these (whatever he do by inferior Articles.)

3. He must be one that is able to preach the Gospel: that is, in some competent manner, to make known the Essentials of Christianity: or else he cannot be a Minister at all.

4. He must be one that understandeth the Essentials of Baptism, and is able to administer it (Though the actual administration be not alway necessary.)

5. He must understand the Essentials of a particular Church, and profess to allow of such Churches as God’s Ordinance, or else he cannot be the Pastor of them.

6. He must Profess to Value and Love the Saints, and their communion: Or else he cannot be a Minister for the communion of Saints.

7. He must Profess and seem to understand, believe, and approve of all the Ordinances of Christ which are of Necessity to Church-communion.

8. And he must be tolerably able to dispense and administer those Ordinances: Or else he is not capable of the office.

9. He must Profess and seem to make the Law of God his Rule in these administrations.

10. And also to desire the saving of mens souls, and the welfare of the Church, and Glory and Pleading of God. If he have not beforehand all these Qualifications, he is not capable of the Ministry.
Ministry, nor can any Ordination make him a true Min-
ister.

Sect. 8. If you demand my proof, it is from the common prin-
ciples that 1. The form cannot be received but into a disposed capable
matter: but such are no disposed capable matter: therefore,
&c. —— 2. The office is for the work: and therefore
presupposes a Capacity and ability for the work. The office
containeth 1. An Obligation to the Duty: But no man can be
obliged to do that which is Naturally Impossible to him (though
a Moral Impossibility may stand with an obligation to duty, and
a Natural only as founded in the Moral) 2. It containeth an
Authority or Power to do the work: But such Power (which is
but a Right of exercising Natural Abilities) doth presuppose
the Abilities to be exercised: Natural Power; is presupposed to
Civil Authority. 3. It is Essential to such Relations that they
be for their Ends: And therefore where there is an apparent in-
capacity for the end, there is as apparent an incapacity of the Re-
lation. But enough of this.

Sect. 9. 2. A Minister is [an officer of Christ,] and there-
fore receiveth his Authority from him, and can have none but
what he thus receiver. And therefore 1. He hath no Soveraigny
or Lordship over the Church; for that is the perogative of Christ.
2. He hath no degree of underived Power, and therefore must
prove his Power, and produce his Commission before he can ex-
pect the Church to acknowledge it. 3. He hath no Power to
work against Christ, or to destroy the souls of men, or to do
evil: (Though he hath a Power by which occasionally he may
be advantaged to evil, yet hath he no Authority to do it:) For
Christ giveth no man power to sin, nor to do any thing against
himself. 4. He deriveth not his authority from man (though
by man, as an instrument, or occasion, he may) The People
give him not his Power: The Magistrate gives it not: The Or-
dainers (Bishops or Presbyters) give it not, any further then
(as I shall shew anon) by signifying the will of Christ that in-
deed giveth it, and by investling men in it by solemn delivery.
The Choosers may nominate the person that shall receive it; and
the Magistrate may encourage him to accept it; and the Or-
dainers may Approve him and Invest him in it: but it is Christ
only that gives the Power as from himself. As in Marriage, the
persons.
persons consent, and the Magistrate alloweth it as valid at his bar; and the Minister blesseth them and declareth God's consent: But yet the Power that the Husband hath over the wife is only from God as the conferring cause; and all that the rest do is but to prepare and dispose the person to receive it; save only that consequently, the consent of God is declared by the Minister. Of which more anon, when we speak of Ordination.

Sect. 10. 3. A Minister is a man [separated, or set a part] to the work of the Gospel. For he is to make a calling of it, and not to do it on the by. Common men may do somewhat that Ministers do, even in preaching the Gospel: but they are not [separated or set apart so to it, and so entrusted with it, nor make a Calling or Course of employment of it.] Ministers therefore are holy persons in an eminent sort, because they have a two-fold sanctification. 1. They are as all other Christians sanctified to God by Christ through the Spirit, which so devoteh them to him, and brings them so near him, and calls them to such holy honourable service, that the whole Church is called a Royal Priesthood, a Holy Nation, &c. to offer spiritual sacrifice to God. And Christ hath made them Kings and Priests to God. But 2. They are moreover devoted and sanctified to God, (not only by this separation from the world, but) by a separation from the rest of the Church to stand nearer to God, and be employed in his most eminent service! I mention not mans Ordination in the Definition, because it is not essential to the Ministry, nor of Absolute Necessity to its being (of which anon.) But that they be set apart by the will of Christ and sanctified to him, is of Necessity.

Sect. 11. 4. These Ministers have a double subject to work upon, or object about which their Ministry is Employed. The first is [The world, as that matter out of which a Church is to be raised.] The second is, Believers called out of the world.] These Believers are, [Either Only Converted, and not invested in a Church State; or such as are both Converted and Invested:] These latter are either [such as are not yet gathered into a particular Church, or such as are.] For all these are the objects of our office.

Sect. 12. 5. Accordingly the first part of the Ministerial office is to Preach the Gospel to unbelievers and ungodly ones for their Conversion. This therefore is not, as some have imagined,
ned, a common work, any more then preaching to the Church: Occasionally \textit{ex Charitate}, only another man may do it. But \textit{ex Officio}, as a work that we are separated and set a part to and entrusted with, so only Ministers may do it. No man hath the Power of Office; but he that hath the Duty or Obligation, to make it the trade or business of his life, to preach the Gospel (though bodily matters may come in on the by.)

Sect. 13. 6. Hence it appears that a man is in order of Nature a Preacher of the Gospel in General, before he be the Pastor of a particular flock: though in time they often go together: that is, when a man is ordained to such a particular flock.

Sect. 14. 7. And hence it follows that a man may be ordained sine Titulo or without a particular charge, where the Converting preparatory work is first to be done.

Sect. 15. 8. And hence it appeareth that a Minister is first in order related to the unbelieving world, as the object of his first work, before he be related to the Church existent: either Catholick or particular: And that he is under Christ first a Spiritual Father, to beget children unto God, from the unbelieving world, and then a Governor of them. If others have already converted them to our hands, and saved us that part of our work, yet that overthroweth not the order of the parts and works of our office, though it hinder the execution of the first part (it being done to our hands by others in that office.)

Sect. 16. 9. The second part of the Ministers work is about Believers meerly converted, together with their Children, whom they yet have power to Dedicate to God: And that is to Invest them in the Rights of a Christian, by Baptism in solemn Covenanting with God the Father, Son and Holy Spirit. And these are the next Material objects of our Office.

Many of the Ancients (Tertullian by name, and the Council of Eliberis) thought that in case of Necessity, a Lay-man (though not a Woman) may Baptize: If that be granted, yet must not men therefore pretend a Necessity where there is none. But I am satisfied 1. That Baptism by a private man, is not ep nomine a Nullity, nor to be done again: 2. And yet that it is not only a part of the Ministers work to Baptize and approve them that are to be Baptized, \textit{ex officio}, but that it is one of the greatest and highest actions of his office: Even an eminent exercise
ercise of the Keyes of the Kingdom, letting men into the Church of Christ: it being a principal part of their Trust and power to judge who is meet to be admitted to the Priviledges and fellowship of the Saints.

Sect. 17. 10. The third part of the Ministers work is about the Baptized, that are only entred into the universal Church (for many such there are,) or else the unbaptized that are Discipled, where the former work and this are done at once: And that is, to congregate the Disciples into particular Churches for Holy Communion in Gods Worship, &c. They must do part of this themselves in Execution. But he leads them the way, by Teaching them their duty, and provoking them to it, and directing them in the execution, and oft-times offering himself or another to be their Teacher, and Leading them in the Execution. So that it belongeth to his office to gather a Church, or a member to a Church.

Sect. 18. 11. Hence is the doubt resolved, Whether the Pastor, or Church be first in order of time or Nature? I answer: The Minister as a Minister to Convert and Baptize and gather Churches, is before a Church gathered in order of Nature and of time. But the Pastor of that particular Church as such, and the Church it self whose Pastor he is, are as other Relations, together and at once; as Father and Son, Husband and Wife, &c. As nature first makes the Nobler parts, as the Heart and Brain and Liver; and then by them as instruments formeth the rest; And as the Philosopher or Schoolmaster openeth his School, and takes in Scholars; and as the Captain hath first his Commission to gather Soldiers: But when the Bodies are formed, then when the Captain or Schoolmaster dieth, another is chosen in his stead; So is it in this case of Pastors.

Sect. 19. 12. Hence also is the great controversy easily determined, Whether a particular Church or the universal be first in order, and be the Ecclesia Prima: To which I answer 1. The Question is not de ordine dignitatis, nor which is finally the Ministers chief End: For so it is past controversy that the Universal Church is first. 2. As to order of existence, the universal Church is considered either as consisting of Christians as Christians, converted and Baptized: or further as consisting of Regular Ordered Assemblies, or particular Churches. (For all Christians are
are not members of particular Churches: and they that are, are yet considerable distinctly, as meer Christians and as Church-members (of particular Churches) And so its clear, that men are Christians in order of Nature, and frequently of time, before they are member of particular Churches: and therefore in this respect the universal Church (that is, in its essence) is before a particular Church. But yet there must be one particular Church, before there can be many. And the Individual Churches are before the Association or Connection of these individuals. And therefore though in its essence and the existence of that essence the universal Church be before a particular Church (that is, men are Christians before they are particular Church-members;) yet in its Order, and the existence of that Order, it cannot be said so: nor yet can it fitly be said that thus the particular is before the universal. For the first particular Church and the universal Church were all one (when the Gospel extended as yet no further) And it was simul & semel an ordered universal and particular Church: (but yet not qua universal) But now, all the Universal Church is not Ordered at all into particular Churches: and therefore all the Church universal cannot be brought thus into the Question. But for all those parts of the universal Church that are thus Congregate (which should be all that have opportunity) they are considerable, either as distinct Congregations independent; and so they are all in order of nature together (supposing them existent:) Or else as Connexed and Associated for Communion of Churches, or otherwise related to each other: And thus many Churches are after the Individuals, & the single Church is the Ecclesia prima as to all Church forms of Order; and Associations are but Ecclesia orta, arising from a combination or relation or Communion of many of these.

Sect. 20. The fourth part of the Ministerial work is about particular Churches Congregate, as we are Pastors of them. And in this they subserve Christ in all the parts of his office.

1. Under his Prophetical office, they are to Teach the Churches to observe all things whatsoever be hath commanded them: & deliver & open to them that Holy doctrine which they have received from the Apostles that sealed it by Miracles, and delivered it to the Church. And as in Christ's name to persuade and exhort men to duty, opening to them the benefit, and the danger of neglect.

2. Under
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2. Under Christ's Priestly office they are to stand between God and the People, and to enquire of God for them, and speak to God on their behalf, and in their name, and to receive their Publick Oblations to God, and to offer up the sacrifice of Praise and Thanksgiving on their behalf, and to celebrate the Commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ upon the Cross; and in his name to deliver his Body and Blood, and Sealed Covenant, and benefits to the Church.

3. Under his Kingly office (a Paternal Kingdom) they are to Proclaim his Laws, and Command obedience in his Name, and to Rule or Govern all the flock, as Overseers of it, and to reprove, admonish, censure, and call out the obstinately impenitent, and confirm the weak, and approve of Professions and Confessions of Penitents, and to Absolve them, by delivering them pardon of their sin, in the name of Christ.

Sect. 21. 14. This work must be done for the ends mentioned in the Definition. To his own Safety, Comfort, and Reward, it is necessary that those Ends be sincerely intended. For the comfort and Satisfaction of the Church and the validity of the Ordinances (Sacraments especially) to their spiritual benefit, it is necessary that these ends be professed to be intended by him; and that they be really intended by themselves.

Sect. 22. 15. By this the Popish case may be resolved, whether the Intention of the Priest be necessary to the Validity and Success of Sacraments? The reality of the Priest's Intention is not necessary to the Validity of them to the people: For then no ordinance performed by an hypocrite were Valid; nor could any man know when they are Valid and when not. But that they may be such administrations, as he may comfortably answer for to God, his sincere Intention is Necessary. And that they be such as the People are bound to submit to, it is necessary that he profess a sincere Intention: For if he purposely Baptize a man ludicrously in professed jest or scorn, or not with a seeming intent of true Baptizing, it is to be taken as a Nullity and the thing to be done again. And that the ordinances may be blessed and effectual to the Receiver upon Promise from God, it is necessary that the Receiver have a true intent of receiving them to the ends that God hath appointed them. Thus and no further is Intention necessary to the validity of the Ordinance and to the success.
The particular ends I shall not further speak of, as having been longer already than I intended on the Definition.

Sect. 23. But the principal thing that I would desire you to observe, in order to the decision of our controversy, hence, is that the Ministry is first considerable as a Work and Service, and that the Power is but a Power to be a servant to all, and to do the work. And therefore that the first Question is, Whether the great burden and labour of Ministerial service may be laid on any man without Ordination by such as our English Prelates? Or whether all men are discharged from this labour and service on whom such Prelates do not Impose it? If Magistrates, Presbyters and People conspire to call an able man to the work and service of the Lord, whether he be justified for refusing it, whatsoever the Church suffer by it, meerly because the Prelates called him not?

Sect. 24. Though the formentioned works do all belong to the Office of the Ministry, yet there must be Opportunity and a particular Call to the exercise of them, before a man is actually obliged to perform the several acts. And therefore it was not without fence and reason that in Ordination the Bishop said to the Ordained,[Take thou authority to Read or to preach the word of God, when thou shalt be thence to lawfully called] Not that another call of Authority is necessary to state them in the office, or to oblige them to the Duty in General: But we must in the invitation of people, or their consent to hear us, or other such advantagious accidents, prudently discern when and where we have a Call to speak and exercise any act of our Ministry. Even as a Licensed Physitian must have a particular Call by his Patients before he exercise his skill. This call to a particular act, is nothing else but an intimation or signification of the will of God, that hic & nunc we should perform such a work: which is done by Providence causing a concurrence of such inviting Circumstances that may perswade a prudent man that it is reasonable.

Sect. 25. A man that is in general thus obliged by his office to do all the formentioned works of the Ministry, (that is, when he hath a particular call to each) may yet in particular never be obliged to some of these works, but may be called to spend his
life in some other part of the Ministry, and yet be a compleat Minister, and have the obligation and Power to all, upon supposition of a particular Call; and not be guilty of negligence in omitting those other parts. One man may live only among Infidels, and uncalled ones, and so be obliged only to Preach the Gospell to them in order to Conversion, and may die before he seeth any ready to be baptized: Another may be taken up in Preaching and Baptizing, and Congregating the Converted, and never be called to Pastoral Rule of a particular Church. Another may live in a Congregated Church where there is no use for the Discipling- Converting - Preaching of the Gospel, and so may have nothing to do but to Oversee that particular Church and Guide them in holy Worship. And in the same Church if one Ministers parts are more for Publick preaching, and another's more for Private instruction, and acts of Guidance and Worship; if one be best in expounding, and another in lively application; they may lawfully and fitly divide the work between them: and it shall not be imputed to them for unfaithfulness and negligence that one forbear eth what the other doth. For we have our gifts to the Churches edification: Thus Paul saith he was not sent to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel: Not that it was not in his Commission, and a work of his office: but quoad exercitium he had seldom a second particular Call to exercise it, being taken up with that Preaching of the Gospel, and settling and confirming Churches which to him was a greater work.

Sect. 26. This Ministry before described (whether you call it Episcopatum, Sacerdotium, Presbyteratum, or what else is fit) is but one and the same Order (for Deacons are not the Ministers defined by us:) It is not distinguished into various Species: Even the Patrons of Prelacy, yea the Schoolmen and other Papists themselves, do ordinarily confess, that a Prelate and Presbyter differ not Ordine, but only Gradu. So that it is not another office that they subscribe to Prelates, but only a more eminent Degree in the same Office. And therefore they themselves affirm, that in Officio the Power of Ordination is in both alike (the office being the same) But that for the honour of the Degree of Prelacy, for the unity of the Church, Presbyters are hindered from the Exercise of that Ordination, which yet is in their Power and Office.
Sect. 27. As far as Ordination is a part of the Ministerial Work, it is comprised in the aforementioned acts, [of Congregating, Teaching, Ruling, &c.] and therefore is not left out of the Definition, as it is a duty of the office: though it be not expressed among the Efficient causes, for the reason above mentioned: and because I am now more distinctly to treat of it by itself, and to give you further reasons hereof in the explication of the Nature and Ends of this Ordination.

CHAP. II.

Of the Nature and Ends of Ordination.

Sect. 1. Hat we may know how far the Ordination in question is necessary to the Ministry, and whether the want of it prove a Nullity, we must first enquire what goes to the laying of the Foundation of this Relation; and how many things concur in the efficiency, and among the rest, what it is that the Ordainers have to do as their proper part; and what are the reasons of their Power and Work.

Sect. 2. As all that deserve the name of men, are agreed that there is no Power in the world but from God the Absolute Sovereign, and first Cause of Power: so all that deserve the name of Christians are agreed that there is no Church Power but what is from Christ the head and Sovereign King of the Church.

Sect. 3. As the will of God is the Cause of all things: And nothing but the Signification of it is necessary to the conveying of mere Rights: So in the making a man a Minister of the Go-
pel, there needeth no other principal efficient cause then the
Will of Jesus Christ, nor any other Instrumental Efficient, but
what is of use to the signifying of his Will: So that it is but in
the nature of signas that they are Necessary. No more there-
fore is of Absolute Necessity, but what is so necessary to signifie
his will. If Christ's will may be signified without Ordination,
a man may be a Minister without it: (Though in other respects
he may be culpable in his entrance, by crossing the will of Christ
concerning his duty in the manner of his proceedings.)

Sect. 4. There is considerable in the Ministry, 1. Beneficium.
2. Officium. 1. The Gospel, pardon, salvation-Ordinances are
those great Benefits to the sons of men, which the Ministry is to
be a means of conveying to them: And is it self a Benefit as it
is the means of these Benefits. In this respect the Ministry is
a Gift of Christ to the Church, and his Donation is the necessary
act for their Ministration. But of this gift the Church is the
subject. He giveth Pastors to his Church. 2. But in conjun-
tion with the Churches Mercies, the Minister himself also par-
takes of mercy: It is a double Benefit to him to be both recep-
tive with them of the blessing of the Gospel, and to be instrumen-
tial for them in the conveyance, and to be so much exercised in
so sweet and honourable, though flesh-displeasing and endanger-
ing work. As in giving Alms, the giver is the double receiver;
and in all works for God, the greatest Duties are the greatest
Benefits, so is it here. And thus the making of a Minister is a Do-
nation or act of bounty to himself. Christ giveth to us the Office
of the Ministry, as he giveth us in that office to the Church. As
a Commanders place in an Army is a place of Trust and Honour
and Reward, and so the matter of a gift, though the work be to
fight and venture life.

Sect. 5. The Duty of the Minister is caused by an Obligation;
and that is the part of a Precept of Christ: And thus Christ's
command to us to do his work doth make Ministers.

Sect. 6. From the work which the Ministers are to perform,
and the command of Obedience laid upon the people, ariseth their
duty, in submission to him, and Reception of his Ministerial
work; And in Relation to them that are to obey him, his office
is a superiour Teaching Ruling Power, and so is to be caused by
Commission from Christ, as the fountain of Power that is to com-
mand both Pastor and People.

Sect
Sect. 7. So that the Ministry consisting of Duty, Benefit, and Power, (or Authority,) it is caused by Preceptive Obligation, by Liberal Donation, and by Commission. But the last is but compounded of the two first, or a result from them. The Command of God to Paul, e.g. to Preach and do the other works of the Ministry, doth of itself give him Authority to do them. And Gods command to the People to hear and submit, doth concur to make it a Power as to them. And the Nature and ends of the work commanded are such as prove it a Benefit to the Church; and consequentially to the Minister himself. So that all is comprehended in the very imposition of the Duty: By commanding us to preach the word, we are Authorized to do it, and by Doing it we are a Benefit to the Church, by bringing them the Gospel and its Benefits.

Sect. 8. Our Principal work therefore is to find out on whom Christ imposteth the Duties of Church Ministration: And by what signs of his will, the person himself and the Church may be assured that it is the Will of Christ, that this man shall undertake the doing of these works.

Sect. 9. And therefore let us more distinctly enquire, 1. What is to be signified in order to a Ministers Call; and 2. How Christ doth signify his will about the several parts; and so we shall see what is left for Ordination to do, when we see what is already done, or undone.

Sect. 10. 1. It must be determined or signified that a Ministry there must be. 2. And what their Work and Power shall be. 3. And what the Peoples Relation and duty toward them shall be. 4. What men shall be Ministers, and how qualified. 5. And how it shall be discerned by themselves and others which are the men that Christ intends.

Sect. 11. Now let us consider 1. What Christ hath done already in Scripture, 2. And what he doth by Providence, towards the determination of these things. And 1. In the Scripture he hath already determined of these things, or signified that it is his Will, 1. That there be a standing Ministry in the Church to the end of the world: 2. That their work shall be to preach the Gospel, Baptize, Congregate Churches, Govern them, administer the Eucharist, &c. as afore-mentioned. 3. He hath left them Rules or Canons for the directing them; (in all things of constant universal
universal necessity) in the performance of these works. 4. He hath described the persons whom he will have thus employed, both by the Qualifications necessary to their Being, and to the Well-being of their Ministration. 5. He hath made it the Duty of such qualified persons to desire the work, and to seek it in case of need to the Church. 6. He hath made it the Duty of the people to desire such Pastors, and to seek for such and choose them or consent to the choice. 7. He hath made it the Duty of the present Overseers of the Church to Call such to the work, and Approve them, and Invest them in the office (which three acts are called Ordination, but specially the last.) 8. He hath made it the Duty of Magistrates to encourage and protect them, and in some cases to command them to the work, and set them in the office by their Authority. All these particulars are determined of already in the Laws of Christ, and none of them left to the power of men.

Sect. 12. The ordainers therefore have nothing to do to judge 1. Whether the Gospel shall be preached or no, whether Churches shall be Congregate or no, whether they shall be taught or governed or no? and Sacraments administered or no? 2. Nor whether there shall be a Ministry or no Ministry? 3. Nor how far (as to the Matter of their work and power) their office shall extend, and of what Species it shall be? 4. Nor whether the Scripture shall be their constant universal Canon? 5. Nor whether such qualified persons as God hath described, are only to be admitted, or not. 6. Nor whether it shall be the duty of such qualified persons to seek the office, or the Duty of the People to seek and choose such, or of Pastors to ordain such? or of Magistrates to promote such and put them on? None of this is the Ordainers work.

Sect. 13. If therefore any man on what pretence soever, shall either determine that the Gospel shall not be preached, nor the Disciples Baptized, the Baptized Congregated, the Congregations governed, the Sacraments administered, &c. or that there shall be no Ministers to do those works; or if any man Determine that which will infer any of these; or if he pretend to a Power of suspending or excluding them, by his Non-approbation, or not-authorizing them; he is no more to be obeyed and regarded in any of this Usurpation, then I were if I should make a Law,
Law, that no King shall reign but by my nomination, approbation or Coronation. And if any man under pretence of Ordaining, do set up a man that wants the Qualifications which Christ hath made necessary to the Being of the Ministry, his Ordination is Null, as being without Power, and against that Will of Christ that only can give Power. And so of the rest of the particulars forementioned: Where the Law hath already determined, they have nothing to do but obey it. And though the miscarriages of a man in his own calling do not always nullifie his acts, yet all that he doth quite out of the line of his Office are Nullities.

Sect. 14. We see then that all that the Law hath left to the Ordainer is but this: In General, to Discern and judge of the person that is Qualified according to the Description of the Law; and particularly to call him out to the work, if he need excitement, and to Try and Approve him, before he be admitted, and to Invest him, or solemnize his admittance, at his entry. So that the sum of all is, but to find out the qualified person, because he is not named by the Law.

Sect. 15. And even in this the Ordainers are not the only Discerners, or Judges; but the person himself, the People and the Magistrates, have all the forementioned parts in the work. And God himself goes before them all, and by providence frequently points them out the man whom they are bound to choose, Ordain, accept and submit unto: and that by these particular acts.

Sect. 16. 1. As God doth plainly describe the persons in the word, so he doth Qualifie them accordingly by his Gifts: and that of three sorts: Even, his special Graces (necessary so far as was before mentioned) Ministerial Abilities of Knowledge and utterance, and a desire after the work, for its ends. 2. God useth to Qualifie so small a number thus, compared with his Churches Mercies, that whether they should be Ministers (in general) or not, is seldom matter of controversy to prudent men, or at least a doubt that's more easie to decide. 3. God useth by Providence to give some one man, by advantage of parts, acquaintance, opportunity, interest, &c. a special fitness for one place and people above other men, and so to facilitate the decision. 4. God useth to stir up the hearts of the Church to choose or consent to the person thus qualified. 5. And he useth to stir up desires or consent in the heart of the person to be the Pastor.
of that particular flock. 6. And he useth oft times to procure him Liberty, if not some call from the Magistrate. 7. And also to remove impediments in his way. 8. And to assist ordainers in discerning the qualifications of the person, when the work comes to their hands. All this God doth providentially.

Sect. 17. By this much it appeareth, that the Ordainers do not give the power as from themselves to others; nor doth it pass through their hands. They are but the occasions, and the Instruments of Inauguration or solemn possession, when their interposition is due. It is the standing Act of Christ in his Law that giveth the Power immediately, I say immediately, as without any mediate receiving and conveying cause, that is directly efficient of the Power itself, though not so immediately as to exclude all Preparations, and perfecting Instruments, accidentall causes & other means. As in case of Marriage, it is the woman's consent that is of Necessity to the designation of the Person that shall be her husband. But it is not her Consent that properly giveth him the power of an husband over her. For that is done by God himself, in that Law by which he constituteth the husband to be head of the wife, and determineth in specie of his power, which one determination immediately conferreth the power on all individual persons, when once they are chosen and named: so that the Elector of the person doth but prepare and dispose him to receive the power, and not give it. He doth but open the door and let men in to the Ministry, & not give it. Its one thing to bring the person to the Pool that healeth; that he may be the man that first shall enter: and its another thing to heal him: Its one thing to Judge of the person that shall receive the Power, immediately from God, and another thing to give it him our selves.

Sect. 18. Its thus in the case of Magistrates Power, in which means interest hath ever been more discernable to the world and beyond controversy then in the power of Ministers. Though here there be a certain specification that dependeth on the will of man, yet the Power itself is immediately from God, and men do but choose the person that shall receive it, and present him to God, and solemnly inaugurate him. And for my part, I think I shall never consent to any side that will needs give more to men (whether Presbyters, Prelates, or people) in making a Minister, then in making a King. All power is of God; the powers that be are ordained of God.
Sect. 19. If any doubt of this (as I perceive by many writings, they do) I shall, to spare the labour of a Digression, refer them to the copious unanswerable labours of abundance of Protestants that have written in England for the Royal Power: But instead of more, let them but read Spalatensis, and Saravia and Bilson, and rest satisfied, or confute them before they expect any more from me.

Sect. 20. As in the making of Bayliffs for our Corporations, either the people, or the Burgesses, have the power of choosing, and the Steward or Recorder hath the power of swearing him, and performing the Ceremonies: and yet none of these confer the power, but only design the person, who receives the power from the Prince alone, by the Charter of the Cities or Towns, as his Instrument: so is it in the ordaining of Ministers. The People may choose, and the Pastors may invest, but its God only by the Gospel Charter that confers the power from himself.

Sect. 21. Hence it is plain that the Argument is vain that's commonly used by the Prelates, from Nemo dat quod non habet. For it falsely supposeth that the Ordainers are the givers of Power (the matter-error in their frame.) Christ hath it, and Christ giveth it. Men give it not, though some of them have it: For they have it only to use and not to give. When the People choose a King, they give him not the Power, but God giveth it to the man whom the people choose. When our Corporations choose their Bayliff, the choosers give him not the Power; for they had it not themselves; but they determine of the man that immediately from the Prince Charter shall receive it: Nor doth the Recorder or Steward give it Primarily, but only Instrumentaliter & perfective by a Ceremonial inauguration. So the People give not Pastors the Power: Nor the Ordainers, but only complementally.

Sect. 22. From what is aforesaid also it appeareth, that the work of the Ministry is founded first in the Law of nature itself, which upon supposition of mans misery and his recovery by Christ, and the Promise and means appointed for application, requireth every man that hath Ability and Opportunity, to do his best in the Order appointed him by God, to save mens souls by proclaiming the Gospel, and using Gods appointed means, for the great and blessed Ends that are before us.
Sect. 23. Hence it also appeareth that God's first command (partly in Nature and partly in the Gospel) is that [The work shall be done, the Gospel shall be preached, Churches gathered and governed, Sacraments administered:] and that the Precept de ordine is but secondary and subservient to this. And if at any time, alterations should make Ordination impossible, it will not follow that the duty Ordered ceaseth to be duty, or the precept to oblige.

Sect. 24. The Scriptures name not the man that shall be a Pastor, yet when it hath described him it commandeth the Described person duly to seek admittance, and commandeth the People, ordainers and Magistrates to [Choose and Appoint these men to the Ministerial work.] Now these Precepts contain in each of them two distinct determinations of Christ. The first is [that such men be Ministers.] The second is [that they offer themselves to the office, and that they be Accepted and Ordained.] For the first is implied in the latter. If the Sovereign Power make a Law, that there shall be Physicians licensed by a Colledge of Physicians to Practice in this Common-wealth, and describe the persons that shall be licensed; This plainly first concludes that such persons shall be Physicians, and but secondarily de ordine that thus they shall be licensed: so that if the Colledge should License a company of utterly insufficient men, and murderers that seek men's death, or should refuse to License the persons qualified according to Law, they may themselves be punished, and the qualified persons may act as Authorized by that Law, which bindeth quod materiam, and is by the Colledge (and not not by them) frustrate quod ordinem. So is it in this case in hand.

Sect. 25. Hence it appeareth that [Ordination is one means conjunct with divers others, for the Designation of right Qualified persons, described in the Law of Christ) for the reception and exercise of the Ministerial office. And that the ends of it are 1. To take care that the office fail not: and therefore to call out fit men to accept it, if modesty or impediments hinder them from offering themselves, or the people from nominating them. 2. To Judge in all ordinary cases of the fitness of persons to the office, and whether they are such as Scripture describeth and calls out. 3. And to solemnize their admittance, by such an investiture, as when Possession of a House
is, given by a Ministerial tradition of a Key; or Possession of 
Land by Ministerial delivery of a twig and a turf, or as a 
Souldier is lifted, a King Crowned, Marriage Solemnized, after 
consent and Title, in order to a more solemn obligation, and plen-
nary possession; such is our Ordination.

Sect. 26. Hence it appeareth that as the Ordainers are not ap-
pointed to Judge whether the Church shall have Ordinances 
and Ministers, or not (no more then to judge whether we 
shall have a Christ and heaven, or not:) but who shall be the man; 
so it is not to the Being of the Ministry simply, and in all Cases 
that Ordination is necessary, but to the safe being and order of 
admittance, that the Church be not damned with by intruders.

Sect. 27. Ordination therefore is God's orderly and ordinary 
means of a Regular admittance; and to be sought and used 
where it may be had (as the solemnizing of Marriage.) And 
it is a sin to neglect it wilfully, and so it is usually necessary ne-
cessitate Præcepti, & Necesffitate medii ad ordinem & bene effe.
But it is not of absolute Necessity Necessitate medii ad effer Minis-
terii, or to the Validity or Success of our office and Ministrations 
to the Church; nor in cases of necessity, when it cannot be had, 
is it necessary necessitate præcepti neither. This is the plain truth,

Sect. 28. There are great and weighty Reasons of Christ's 
committing Ordination to Pastors. 1. Because they are most 
Able to judge of men's fitness, when the People may be igno-
rant of it. 2. Because they are men doubly Devoted to the 
Church and work of God themselves, and therefore may be sup-
posed (regularly) to have the greatest care and most impartial 
respect to the Church and cause of God. 3. And they must (regu-
lary) be supposed to be men of greatest piety and and holiness (or 
else they are not well chosen.) 4. And they being fewer, are fitter 
to keep Unity, when the people are usually divided in their 
choice. 5. And if every man should enter the Ministry of him-
self that will judge himself fit, and can but get a People to 
accept him, most certainly the worst would be oft foremost to 
men, (before they are lent,) and for want of humility would 
think themselves fittest (the common case of the Proud and Ignorant) and the People would be too commonly poisoned by 
heretical smooth-tongued men; or more commonly would 
please and undoe themselves, by choosing them that have most 
interest.
interest in them, by friends or acquaintance, and them that will most please and humour them, and instead of being their Teachers and Rulers, would be taught and ruled by them, and do as they would have them. Order is of great moment to preserve the very being of the Societies ordered, and to attain their well-being. God is not the God of Confusion but of Order, which in all the Churches must be maintained: No man therefore should neglect Ordination without necessity: And these that so neglect it, should be disowned by the Churches, unless they shew sufficient cause.

CHAP. III.

Ordination is not of Necessity to the being of the Ministry.

Sect. 1. Having shewed what the Ministry is, and what Ordination is, and how the work is imposed on us, and the Power conferred, I may now come up to the point undertaken, to shew the sin of them that Nullifie all our Ministers calling and administrations, except of such as are ordained by the English Prelates. And for the fuller performance of this task, I shall do it in these parts. 1. I shall shew that Ordination itself by man is not of Necessity to the being of a Minister. 2. I shall shew that much less is an uninterrupted succession of Regular Ordination (such as either Scripture or Church Canons count valid) of Necessity to the being of Church or Ministry. 3. I shall shew, that much less is an Ordination by such as our English Bishops ne-
necessary to the Being of the Ministry. 4. I shall shew that yet much less is an Ordination by such Bishops rebus sic stantibus, as now things go, of necessity to the being of the Ministry.

5. I shall shew that without all these pretences of necessity for a Presbyterian Ordination, the present way of Ordination by this & other Reformed Churches is agreeable to the Holy Scripture, and the custome of the Ancient Church, and the postulata of our chief opposers. 6. I shall then shew the greatness of their sin that would Nullifie our Ministry and administrations. 7. And yet I shall shew the greatness of their sin that oppose or wilfully neglect Ordination. 8. And lastly I shall return to my former subject, and shew yet how far I could with the Episcopal Brethren accommodated, and propound somewhat for a Peace.

Sect. 2. I shall be much briefer on all these, then evidence would invite me to be, because I apprehend the most of them to be of no great necessity to our cause, we having enough without them, and left men should think that we need such Medium more than we do; and because of my exceeding scarcity of time which forceth me to do all hastily.

And for the first that [Humane Ordination is not of Absolute Necessity to the Being of the Ministry] I argue as followeth. Of this Vactius hath written at large de desperata causa Popans, to which I refer the Reader.

Arg. 1. If the Necessity of Ordination may cease (as to single persons) and the Necessity of Ministration continue (or if the obligations to each are thus separable) then is not Ordination of Necessity to the Being of the Ministry. But the Antecedent is true which I shall prove by parts (for the consequence is past all doubt, nor will any I suppose deny it.)

Sect. 3. That the obligation to be Ordained may cease to some persons, I prove by instances in certain cases. And in case of a mans distance from any that should Ordain him. As if one or many Christians were cast upon the Coasts of any Indian Heathen or Mahometan Nation, as many have been. There is no ordination Possible: and therefore not necessary or due. And to return for it to the Christian part of the world, may be as impossible: and if not, yet unlawfull by reason of delay.

Sect. 4. And 2. In case of the great Necessity of the People that cannot bear the absence of such as are able to teach them so long, as while he travaileth many hundred or thousand miles for Ordination;
As Basil in another case writes to the Bishops of the West, that if one of them (the Eastern Bishops) should but leave their Churches for a very small time, much more for a journey into the West, they must give up their Churches to the Wolves to be undone before they return; And this case is ordinary abroad.

Sec. 5. And 3. That in case by Civil wars or enmity among Princes, men be unable to travaile from one of their Countries into the other for an Ordination (which else oftentimes cannot be had) for the Turks and Persians, and the Indian Mogol, and the Tartarians and many other Princes, by such wars may make such passage an impossible thing: Nor is it like they would suffer their subjects to go into the enemies country.

Sec. 6. And 4. in case that Princes (Infidels or others) should persecute Ordination to the Death: I do not find that it were a Duty to be ordained, if it would cost all men that seek it their lives, and so made them uncapable of the Ends of Ordination: (For the dead preach not.) If we were all forbid to preach on pain of death, I know we should not forbear, unless our places were so supplied, that mens souls were not apparently endangered by our omission. But he that may preach without Ordination, can scarce prove it a duty to seek Ordination when it would cost him his life. Or if he will plead it in Paper, he would soon be satisfied in tryal.

Sec. 7. And 5. In case that the Generality of Bishops within our reach turn Hereticks, (as in many parts of the East in the Arrian revolt, when scarce seven Bishops remained Orthodox) Or in case of a National Apostacie, as in the Kingdoms of Nubia, Tenduc, and many more that by the conquest of Infidels have revolted.

Sec. 8. And 6. Ordination is no duty in case that Bishops confederate to impose any unlawfull oaths or other Conditions on all that they will ordain. As the Oath of the Roman Prelates containing divers falshoods and unlawful passages doth make all Roman Ordination utterly impious and unlawfull to be received; and therefore not necessary.

Sec. 9. And 7. In case that Bishops themselves (whom those that we now speak to do suppose to have the whole Power of Ordination) should either have a design to corrupt the Church, and
and ordain only the unworthy, and keep out such as the Necessities of the Church requireth, or set up a destructive faction, or by negligence or any other cause should refuse to ordain such as should be ordained; In all these cases Ordination is impossible to them.

 Sect. 10. And 8. In case that death cut off all the Bishops within our reach, or that the remnant be by sickness, or banishment or imprisonment hindered, or by danger affrighted to deny Ordination, or by any such means become in inaccessible, Ordination must here fail.

 Sect. 11. And 9. In case that Bishops through contention are unknown, as Bellarmine confesseth it hath been at Rome, that the wisest could not tell which was Pope: Especially if withall both parties seem to be such as are not to be submitted to, Ordination fails.

 Sect. 12. And 10. In case of Prophetical immediate calls from God, which many had of old, and God hath not bound himself from the like again, though none have reason to expect it, and none should rashly presume of it: In all these ten cases Ordination faileth.

 Sect. 13. And that it doth so, needs no proof: the Instances prove it themselves. Briefly 1. Nemo tenetur ad impossibile: But in many of these cases Ordination is Impossible: therefore, &c.

 Sect. 14. And 2. Nemo tenetur ad inhumation: No man is bound to sin: For Turpe est impossibile in Law. But in many of these cases or all, is plainly sin: therefore &c.

 Sect. 20. And 3. Cessante fine cessat obligatio. The means are for the end: But in many, if not all these cases, Cessat finis, & ratio medii: therefore cessat obligatio.


 Sect. 22. And now I am next to prove that when the Obligation to Ordination ceaseth, yet the Obligation to Ministerial Offices ceaseth not, but such must be done.

 And 1. I prove it hence, because the obligations of the common Law of Nature cease not upon the cession of a point of Order: But if the Ministerial works should cease, the Obligation

 X

 and
ons of the Law of Nature must cease.—— Here I have two
points to prove. 1. That the Law of Nature (supposing the
work of Redemption already wrought; and the Gospel and Or-
dinances established) obligeth men that are able and have Op-
portunity to do the work of Ministers. 2. And that this Law is
not ceased when Ordination ceaseth.
Sec. 23: The Law of Nature prohibits cruelty, and requireth
Charity, and to shew mercy to men in greatest necessities accor-
ding to our ability: But to suspend the exercise of the Ministeri-
al office, were the greatest cruelty, where there is Ability and
opportunity to exercise it: and to exercise it is the greatest work
of Mercy in all the World. Nature teacheth us to do good to all
men while we have time, and to save them with fear, pulling them
out of the fire, and to love our neighbours as our selves; and there-
fore to see a man, yea a town and Country and many Countries,
lie in sin and in a state of misery, under the Wrath and Curse of
God, so that they will certainly be damned if they die in that
condition, and yet to be silent, and not Preach the Gospel to
them, nor call them home to the state of life, this is the greatest
cruelty in the world, except the tempting and driving them to
hell. To let the precious things of the Gospel lie by unrevealed,
even Christ and pardon and holiness, and eternal life and the com-
munion of Saints, and all the Church Ordinances, and withal to
suffer the Devil to go away with all these souls, and Christ to
lose the honour that his grace might have by their conversion,
certainly this in itself considered is incomparably more cruelty
to men, then to cut their throats, or knock them on the head, as
such, and as great an injury to God as by omission can be done.
I need not plead this argument with a man that hath not much
unmind himself, much less with a Christian. For the one is taught
of God by nature, to save men out of a lesser fire then Hell, and
a lesser pain then everlasting torment, to the utmost of his
power; And the other is taught of God to love his bro-
ther and his neighbour as himself. If the Love of God dwell
not in him that seeth his brother in corporal need, and shutteth
up the bowels of his compassion from him; how then doth
the love of God dwell in him, that seeth his brother in a state of
damnation. Curst by the Law, an enemy to God, and within a
fire, or everlasting death, abd.
afford him the help that he hath at hand, and all because he is not ordained.

Sect. 24. Let this be considered of, as in any lower case. If a man see another fall down in the streets, shall he refuse to take him up, because he is no Physician? If the Country be infected with the Plague, and you have a Sovereign medicine that will certainly cure it with all that will be ruled, will you let them all perish, rather then apply it to them, because you are not a Physician, and that when the Physicians are not to be had? If you see the poor naked, may no one make them cloaths but a Taylor? If you see the enemy at the Walls, will you not give the City warning, because you are not a Watch-man, or on the Guard? If a Commander die in fight, any man that is next may take his place in case of Necessity. Will you see the field lost for a point of Order, because you will not do the work of a Commander? A hundred such cases may be put, in which it's plain, that the substance of the work in which men can do a great and necessary good, is of the Law of Nature, though the regulating of them in point of order is oft from Positive Laws. But the Cessation of the obligation of the Positives about Order, doth not disoblige us from the common Law of Nature: For then it should allow us to lay by humanity.

Sect. 25. To this some may say, that [It's true we may preach in such cases, but not as Ministers, but as private men: and we may baptize as private men in Necessity: but we may do nothing that is proper to the Ministry.] To this I answer. God hath not made the Consecration of the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, nor yet the Governing of the Church, the only proper acts of the Ministry. To preach the word as a constant service, to which we are separated, or wholly give up ourselves, and to baptize ordinarily, and to congregate the Disciples, and to Teach and Lead them in God's worship, are all as proper to the Ministry as the other. And these are works that mens eternal happiness lieth on. If you would have an able gifted Christian in China, Tartary, India, or such places, (supposing he have opportunity) to speak but occasionally as private men, and not to speak to Assemblies, and wholly give up himself to the work, and gather Churches, and set afoot all Church Ordinances among them, you would have him unnaturally cruel to mens souls. And if you would have him give up himself to these works, and yet not be
be a Minister, you speak contradictions. For what is the office of a Minister, but [a state of Obligation and power to exercise the Ministerial acts?] As its nothing else to be a Physitian, supposing abilities, but to be obliged and impowred to do the work of a Physitian] The works of the Ministry are of Necessity to the salvation of mens souls; Though here and there one may be saved without them by privater means, yet this nothing to all the rest: It is the salvation of Towns and Contreyes that we speak of. I count him not a man, that had rather they were all damned, then saved by an unordained man.

Sect. 26. The End of Ordination caeleth not, when Ordination caeleth: the Ministerial works and the benefits to be thereby conveyed, are the Ends of Ordination: therefore they cease not. This is so plain that I perceive not that it needs explication or proof.

Sect. 27. Nature and Scripture teach us, that Ceremonies give place to the substance, and matters of meer Order give place to the Duty ordered; and that Moral Natural duties cease not when meer Positives cease: But such is the case before us. Ordination is the ordering of the work: If that fail, and the work cannot be rightly Ordered, it follows not that it must be cast off, or forborn. On this account Christ justified his Disciples for plucking ears of Corn on the Sabbath day. Necessity put an end to the Duty of Sabbath keeping; but the duty of preserving their lives continued. On this account he justified his own healing on the Sabbath day; sending them to study the great rule [Go learn what this meaneth, I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice:] So here, he will have Mercy to souls and Contreyes, rather then Ordination: On this account he faith, that [The Priests in the Temple break the Sabbath and are blameless] and he tells them [what David did when he was hungry, and they that were with him, how he eat the Shewbread, which (out of Necessity) was not lawful for him to eat, but only for the Priests] and yet he sinned not therein.

Sect. 28. Moreover, the Church it self is not to cease upon the ceasing of Ordination, nor to hang upon the will of Prelates. Christ hath not put it in the power of Prelates, to deny him a Church in any countries of the world. For he hath first determined that particular Churches shall be. (and that determination...
nation ceaseth not, ) and but secondly that they shall have Pastors thus ordained: He is not to lose his Churches at the pleasures of an envious or negligent man: But so it would be if Pastor must cease when Ordination ceaseth: For though without Pastors there may be communities of Christians, which are parts of the universal Church, yet there can be no Organized Political Churches. For 1. Such Churches consist essentially of the Directing or Ruling Part, and the Ruled Part (as a Republik doth.) 2. Such Churches are Christian Associations for Communion in such Church Ordinances which without a Pastor cannot (ordinarily at least,) be administered: And therefore without a Pastor the Society is not capable of the End, and therefore not of the form or name; (though it be a Church in the fore-granted sense.) Nay indeed, if any should upon necessity do the Ministerial work to the Church, and say he did it as a Private man, it were indeed but to become a Minister pro tempore, under the name of a private man: If Paul had not his Power to destruction but to Edification, neither have Prelates: And therefore the Acts are null by which they would destroy the Church. Their Power of Ordering it (such as they have) occasionally enableth them to disorder it (that is, if they miss in their own work, we may submit:) but they have no authority to destroy it, or do any thing that plainly conduceth thereunto.

Sect. 29. The ceasing of Ordination in any place, will not either disoblige the people from God's publick Worship, Word, Prayer, Praise, Sacraments; Neither will it destroy their Right to the Ordinances of God in Church communion. But this it should do, if it should exclude a Ministry; therefore, &c. — The Major is proved, 1. In that the Precept for such publick worship, is before the precept for the right ordering of it. He that commandeth the Order, supposeth the thing ordered. 2. The Precept for publick worship, is much in the Law of Nature, and therefore indispensable; and it is about the great and Necessary duties that the honour of God, and saving of men, and preservation of the Church lieth on: It is a standing Law to be observed till the coming of Christ. And the Rights of the Church in the excellent Benefits of Publick Ordinances and Church order, is better founded then to depend on the Will of ungodly Prelates. If Prince and Parliament fail, and all the Governors turn enemies.
to a Common wealth, is hath the means of Preservation of it self from ruine left in its own hands; or if the Common wealth be destroyed, the Community hath the Power of self preservation, and of forming a Common wealth again to that end. The life and being of States, specially of mens eternal happiness, is not to hang upon so slender a peg as the corrupt will of a few Superiors; nor a Necessary End to be wholly laid upon an uncertain and oft unnecessary means. The children lose not their Right to Food and Rayment, nor are to be suffered to famish, when ever the Steward falls out with them, or falls asleep, or loseth the Keyes. Another servant should rather break open the doors, and more thanks he shall have of the Father of the family, then if he had let them perish, for fear of transgressing the bounds of his calling. If incest (that capital disorder in procreation) were no incest, no crime, but a duty, to the Sons and daughters of Adam in case of Necessity (because Order is for the End and thing ordered) then much more is a disorderd preservation of the Church and saving of souls and serving of God, a duty, and indeed at that time, no disorder at all.

Sect. 30. 7. Moreover, if the failing of Ordination, should deprive the world of the preaching of the word, or the Churches of the great and necessary benefits of Church Ordinances and Communion, then one man (yea thousands) should suffer (and that in the greatest matters) for the sin and willfulness of others, and must lie down under such suffering, lest he should disorderly redeem it. But the consequent is against all Justice and Reason: Therefore the Antecedent is so to.

Sect. 31. In a word, it is so horrid a conclusion, against Nature, and the Gospel, and Christian sense, that the honour of God, the fruits of Redemption, the being of the Church, the salvation or comfort of mens souls, must all be at the Prelates mercy, that a considerate Christian cannot (when he is himself) believe it: that it should be in the power of heretical, malicious, or idle Prelates to deny God his honour, and Christ the fruit of all his sufferings, and Saints their Comforts, and sinners their salvation, and this when the remedy is before us, and that it is the will of God that all these evils should be chosen before the evil of an unordained Ministry; this is an utterly incredible thing.
Sect. 32. Argument 2. Another Argument may be this: If there may be all things essential to the Ministry without humane Ordination, then this Ordination is not of Necessity to its Essence; But the Antecedent is true; therefore so is the consequent. That there be a people qualified to receive a Pastor, and persons qualified to be made Pastors, and that God hath already determined in his Law that Pastors there shall be, and how they shall be qualified, is past all dispute; So that nothing remains to be done by man (Ordainers, Magistrates or People) but to determine who is the man that Christ describeth in his Law, and would have to be the Pastors of such a flock, or a Minister of the Gospel, and then to solemnize his entrance by an Investiture. And now I shall prove that a man may be a Minister without the Ordainers part in these.

Sect. 33. If the will of Christ may be known without Ordination, that this man should be the Pastor of such a People, or a Minister of the Gospel, then may a man be a Minister without Ordination. But the will of Christ may be known, &c. ergo.

Sect. 34. Nothing needs proof but the Antecedent (For it is but the signification of the will of Christ that conferr'd the Power, and imposed the Duty;) And that his will is sometime signified concerning the individual person without Ordination, is apparent hence: 1. The Description of such as Christ would have to preach the Gospel, is very plain in his holy Canons (in the Scripture.) 2. His Gifts are frequently so eminent in several persons, as may remove all just occasion of doubting, both from the persons themselves and others. 3. Their suitableness to a People by interest, acquaintance, &c. may be as notable. 4. The Peoples common and strong affection to them, and theirs to the People, may be added to all these. 5. There may be no Competitor at all; or none regardable or comparable, and so no controversy. 6. The Necessities of the People may be so great and visible, that he and they may see that they are in danger of being undone, and the Church in danger of a very great loss or hurt, if he deny to be their Pastor. 7. The Magistrate also may call and command him to the work. 8. The People and he may consent, and they may unanimously choose him, and he Accept their choice. And in all these the will of Christ is easily discerned, that this is the person whom he would have to undertake the Ministry.
Sect. 35. For where there are so many evident signs of his Wills and Characters agreeing to the description in the Law, there the will of Christ may be discerned, and it may be known that this is the described person. But these are here supposed (or enough of these: ) And indeed it is no very strange thing for all or almost all these to concur, where there are persons of excellent qualifications.

Sect. 36. And 2. Where there is no Controversie, or room for a Controversie, the determination may be made without a Judge: (The principal reason and use of Ordainers is, that there may be standing Judges of the fitness of men, to prevent the hurt of the Church by the withdrawing of the Worthy, and the intrusion of the unworthy: ) But here is no Controversie, or place for Controversie: therefore, &c.

Sect. 37. But I suppose some will say that [Though the Approbation of the Ordainers be not always of Necessity: because the person may be easily known without them; yet their Investing the person with the Power is of Necessity, because without that he is but a person fit for the Office, but cannot receive it till some authorized persons shall deliver it ] Because the great mistake is involved in this objection, I shall answer it fully.

Sect. 38. The Law it self is it that directly gives the Power, and Imposeth the Duty, when the person is once determined of that falls under it: There needs no more but the signification of the Will of Christ, to confer the Power or Benefit, or impose the Duty. As an act of Oblivion pardoneth all the described persons; and an Act that imposes any burden or office upon every man of such or such an estate or parts, doth immediately by itself oblige the persons; though some Judges or others may be appointed to call out the personas, and see to the execution (who do not thereby impose the duty) so is it in this case. Gods Law can Authorize and oblige without an Ordainer sometimes.

Sect. 39. The Investiture performed in Ordination by man, is not the first Obligation or Collation of the Power, but only the solemnization of what was done before. And therefore though it be necessitate praecipi: a duty, and ordinarily necessary to Church Order and preservation, yet is it not necessary to the Being of the Ministerial Office or Power.
Sect. 40. And this will be made apparent, 1. From the common nature of all such subsequential Investitures and inaugurations, which are necessary to full possession and exercise of Power sometimes, but not to the first being of it, nor to the exercise neither in cases of Necessity, when the Investiture cannot conveniently be had.

Sect. 41. Ordination (as to the Investing act) is no otherwise necessary to the Ministry, then Coronation to a King, or lifting to a Souliour, or solemn investiture and taking his Oath to a Judge, or other Magistrate, &c. But these are only the solemn entrance upon Possession and exercise of Power, supposing a sufficient Title antecedent; and in cases of Necessity, may be unnecessary themselves; and therefore so is it here as a like case.

Sect. 42. 2. If want of Investiture in cases of Necessity, will not excuse the determinate person from the burden of the Ministerial work, then will it not prove him destitute of the Ministerial Authority: (For every man hath Authority to do his Duty, in that he is obliged to it;) But the Antecedent is plain; If once I know by certain signs, that I am a man that Christ requireth to be employed in his work, I durst not totally forbear it, in a case of such exceeding moment, for want of the regular admittance, when it cannot be had; while I know that the work is the End, and the Ordination is but the means; and the means may promote the end, but must not be pleaded against the End, nor to destroy it; it being indeed no Means, when it is against the end. Ordination is for the Ministry, and the Ministerial Office for the Work, and the Work for God's honour and men's salvation: And therefore God must be served, and men must be saved, and the Ministry to those ends must be used, whether there be Ordination to be had or not. Necessity may be laid upon us, without Ordination, and then woe to us if we preach not the Gospel. The Law can make Duty without an Ordainer.

Sect. 43. If this were not so, a lazy person that is able for the Ministry, might by pleasing or bribing the Ordainers, be exempted from abundance of duty, and escape the danger of Guilt and Judgement upon his Omission. And truly the burden is so great to flesh and blood, if men be faithful in their Office,
office, the labour so unceasing, the people so unconstant, ungrateful and discouraging, the worldly honours and riches so tempting which may be had in a secular life, with the study and cost that fits men for the Ministry, and the enemies of our work and us are so many and malicious, and times of persecution so frequent and unwelcome, that if it were but in the Prelates power to exempt all men at their pleasure, from all the trouble and care and danger and sufferings of the Ministry, they would have abundance of Solicitors and Suitors for a dispensation; especially where the Love of God and his Church were not very strong to prevail against temptations (for this would free them from all fear.)

Sect. 44. 3. If a man and woman may be truly husband and wife without a solemn Marriage, then a Minister and People may be truly conjoined in their Relations and Church-State without his solemn Ordination. For these are very near of a Nature. A private Contract between themselves may truly make them Husband and Wife: and then the standing Law of God conveyeth to the man his Power, and obligeth him and the woman to their duties, without any Instrumental investiture: And yet if there be opportunity it is not lawful for any to live together in this relation, without the investiture of Solemn Matrimony, for Order sake, and to prevent the fornication and bastardy, that could not be avoided if Marriage be not Ordinarily publick. Just so it is a very great sin to neglect a Ordination ordinarily, and where it may be had, and tendeth to the bastardy of the Ministry, and of Churches, and soon would most be illegitimate if such course were taken. And yet if Pastor and People go together without Ordination, upon private Contract, in case of Necessity, it is lawful: And if there be no Necessity, it is sinful, but yet doth not Null the Baptism, and other Ministerial administrations of any such person, to the Church of Christ, or the upright members.

Sect 45. 4. If a man may be a true Christian without Baptism, and have Christ and pardon and Justification and eternal life without it, then may a man be a true Minister without Ordination. For no man can reasonably plead that Ordination is more necessary to a Minister than Baptism to a Christian. Even the Papists that make a Sacrament of it, and ascribe to it an indelible
delible Character, must needs set it somewhat lower than Baptism. Baptizing is commonly called our Christening, as that in some sort makes us Christians. And yet for all that the true use of Baptism is but to solemnize the Marriage between Christ and us, and to Invest and inaugurate them in a state of Christia-
nity solemnly, that were indeed Christians before. And the Papists themselves confess that when a man first repenteth and believes (with a faith formata Charitate) he is pardoned, and in a State of Salvation before Baptism, and shall be saved upon the mea Votum Baptismi, if in case of Necessity he die without it (Though the partial Proctors will damn the infants for want of Baptism, that never refused it, when they save the parents that have but the desire.) No doubt but Constantine, and many other, that upon mistake deferred their Baptism, were nevertheless Christians; and judged so by the Church both then and now. And yet to neglect it wilfully were no small sin. So if in our case, men want Ordination, they may be really Ministers, and their Ministriations Valid; but it is their very great sin, if their wilful neglect be the cause that they are not Ordained.

Sect. 46. As Baptism is the open badge of a Christian, so Ordination is the open badge of a Minister: and therefore though a man may be a Christian before God without Baptism, yet Ordinarily he is not a Christian before the Church without Baptism, till he have by some equivalent Profession given them satisfaction: And therefore if I knew men to be utterly unbaptized, I would not at first have Communition with them as Christians. But if they could manifest to me that Necessity forbade them, or if it were any mistake and scruple of their consciences that hindered them from the outward Ordinance, and they had without that Ordinance made as publick and bold a profession of Christianity, and satisfactorily declared themselves to be Christians by other means, I would then own them as Christians, though with a disowning and reprehension of their error; Even so would I do by a Minister: I would not own him as a Minister unordained, unless he either shewed a Necessity that was the Cause, or else (if it were his weakness and mistake) did manifest by his abilities and fidelity and the consent and acceptance of the Church, that he were truly cal-
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And if he did so, I would own him, though with a difference of opinion and reproof of his mistake, and omission of so great an duty.

Sect. 47. 5. There is not a word of God to be found that makes Ordination of absolute Necessity to the being of the Ministry; therefore it is not so to be esteemed. The examples of Scripture shew it to the regular way, and therefore Ordinarily a duty: but they shew not that there is no other way.

Sect. 48. Object. It is sufficient that no other way is revealed; and therefore till you find another in Scripture, this must be taken for the only way. Answ. 1. Scripture is the Rule of our Right performance of all duties: We cannot imagine that in the Rule there should be the least defect; and therefore no precept or imitable pattern of sin in the smallest matter is there to be found. And yet it followeth not that every sin doth nullifie a Calling, because there is no Scripture warrant for that sin. All that will follow is, that no other way is innocent or warrantable: and that only when necessity doth not warrant it. 2. I have shewed already that there are other ways warranted in some cases in the Scripture: And I shall shew anon that as great omissions nullifie not the office.

Sect. 49. Object. But how shall they preach unless they be sent? faith Paul, Rom. 10. Answ. But the question is, Whether no man be sent that have not humane Ordination? The text doth not affirm this. Let that be God's Ordinary way: but yet it followeth not there is no other. If God send them however, they may preach; as Eusebius, Frumentius, Origen, and others did of old.

Sect. 50. Argument 3. He that hath the Talents of Ministerial Abilities, is bound to improve them to the service of his Master and best advantage of the Church: But such are many that cannot have Ordination: ergo — Concerning the Major, note that I say not, that every man that is able is bound to be a Minister, much less to enter upon the sacred function without Ordination: For 1. Some men that have Abilities may want liberty and opportunity to exercise them. 2. Others that have Ministerial Abilities, may also have Abilities for Magistracy. Physick, Law, &c. and may live in a Country where the exercise of the latter is more Necessary and useful to the good
good of men, and the service of God, then the exercise of the Ministry would be. For these men to be Ministers, that either want opportunity, or may do God greater service other ways, is not to improve their Talents to their Masters chiefest service: But still the general obligation holds, to improve our Talents to the best advantage, and do good to as many as we can, and work while it is day. And therefore 1. Such a man is bound (if he be not otherwise called out first) to offer his service to the Church and seek Ordination: And if he cannot have it upon just seeking, in case of Necessity, he is to exercise his Talents without it: lest he be used as the wicked slothful servant, that hid his Talent, Mat. 25.

Sed. 51. If this were not so, it would follow that the Gifts of God must be in vain, and the Church suffer the loss of them at the pleasure of Ordainers: and that the fixed universal Law that so severely bindeth all men, as good Stewards to improve their Masters flock (their Time, abilities, interest, opportunities) might be dispensed with at the pleasure of Ordainers. And that God hath bound us to seek in vain, for Admittance to the exercise of the Talents that he hath endowed us with: and that even in the Necessities of the Church, which are not things to be granted.

Sed. 52. Object. By this doctrine you will induce disorder into the Church, if all that are able must be Ministers, when they are denied Ordination: For then they will be the judges of their own abilities, and every brain-sick proud Opinionist, will think that there is a necessity of his Preaching; and so we shall have confusion, and Ordination will be made contemptible by Pretences of Necessity!

Sed. 53. Answ. 1. God will not have the Necessities of mens souls neglected, nor allow us to let men go quietly to damnation, nor have his Churches ruined, for fear of occasioning the disorders of other men. Its better that men be disorderly saved, then orderly damned: and that the Church be disorderly preferred, then orderly destroyed! God will not allow us to suffer every Thief and Murderer to rob or kill our neighbours, for fear left by defending them, we occasion men to neglect the Magistrate: Nor will he allow us to let men perish...
perish in their sickness, if we can help them, for fear of encouraging the ignorant to turn Physicians. 2. There is no part of God's service that can be used, without occasion of sin to the perverse: Christ himself is the fall as well as the rising of many; and is a stumbling stone and Rock of offence: and yet not for that to be denied. There is no just and reasonable cause of men's abuse in the doctrine which I here express. 3. True Necessity will excuse and Justifie the unordained before God, for exercising their Abilities to his service. But pretended counterfeit necessity will not Justifie any; And the final judgement is at hand, when all things shall be set strait, and true Necessity and counterfeit shall be discerned. 4. Until that day, things will be in some disorder in this world, because there is sin the world, which is the disorder. But our Remedies are these, 1. To teach men their duties truly, and not to lead them into one evil to prevent another, much less to a mischief destructive to men's souls, to prevent disorder. 2. The Magistrate hath the sword of justice in his hand, to restrain false pretenders of Necessity; and in order thereto, it is he, and not the pretender that shall be judge. And 3. The Churches have the Power of casting the pretenders (if the case deserve it) out of their communion; and in order thereto, it is not he, but they that will be Judges. And other remedies we have none till the last day.

 Sect. 54. Quest. But what would you have men do that think there is a Necessity of their labours, and that they have Ministerial abilities? Ans. 1. I would have them lay by pride and selfishness, and pass judgement on their own Abilities in Humility and self-denial. If their Corruptions are so strong that they cannot (that is, they will not) do this, that's long of themselves. 2. They must not pretend a Necessity where is none. 3. They must offer themselves to the Tryal of the Pastors of the Church that best know them. 4. If in the judgement of the godly able Pastors that know them, they are unfit, and there is no need of them, they must acquiesce in their judgement. For able Godly men are not like to destroy the Church or envy help to the souls of men. 5. If they have cause to suspect the Pastors of Corruption, and false judgement, let them go to the other Pastors that are faithful.
full. 6. If all about us were corrupt, and their judgements not to be rested in, and the persons are assured of their Ability for the Ministry, let them consider the State of the Church where they are: And if they are sure (on Consultation with the wisest men) that there is a Necessity, and their endeavours in the Ministry are like to prevent any notable hurt, without a greater hurt, let them use them without Ordination, if they cannot have it. But if they find that the Churches are so competently supplied without them, that there is no Necessity, or none which they can supply without doing more hurt by offence and disorder then good by their labours, let them forbear at home, and go into some other Countries where there is greater need (if they are fit there for the work.) if not, let them fit still.

Sect. 55. Argument 4. If unordained men may Baptize in case of Necessity, then may they do other Ministerial works in case of Necessity: But the Antecedent is the opinion of those that we now dispute against. And the Consequence is grounded on a Parity of Reason: No man can shew more for appropriating the Eucharist, than Baptism to the Minister.
CHAP. IV.

An uninterrupted Succession of Regular Ordination, is not Necessary.

Sect. 1. Having proved the Non-necessity of Ordination itself to the Being of the Ministry, and Validity of their administrations, I may be the shorter in most of the rest, because they are sufficiently proved in this. If Ordination itself be not of the Necessity which the adversaries do assert, then the Regularity of Ordination cannot be of more Necessity than Ordination itself: Much less an uninterrupted Succession of such Regular Ordination: Yet this also is asserted by most that we have now to do with.

Sect. 2. By Regular Ordination, I mean in the sense of the adversaries themselves, such as the Canons of the Church pronounce not Null, and such as by the Canons was done by such as had Authority to do it: in special, by true Bishops (even in their own sense.)

Sect. 3. And if the uninterrupted succession be not Necessary, then neither is such Ordination at this present Necessary to the being of the Ministry: For if any of our predecessors might be Ministers without it, others in the like case may be so too. For we live under the same Law, and the Office is the same thing now as it was then.

Sect. 4. Argument 1. If uninterrupted Regular Ordination of all our Predecessors be Necessary to the Being of the Ministry,
ftry, then no man can know that he is truly a Minister of Christ. But the Consequent is false, and intolerable; therefore so is the Antecedent.

Sect. 5. The truth of the Minor is apparent thus. 1. If we could not be sure that we are true Ministers, then no man could with comfort seek the Ministry, nor enter into upon it. For who can have encouragement to enter a calling when he knows not whether indeed he enter upon it or not? and whether he engage not himself in a course of sin, and be not guilty as Uzzah of medling with the Ark unlawfully? especially in so great and tender a case where God is so exceeding jealous.

Sect. 6. And 2. who can go on in the Calling of the Ministry, and comfortably do the work, and bear the burden, that cannot know through all his life, or in any administration, whether he be a Minister or a Usurper? What a damnum must it cast upon our spirits, in Prayer, Praise, administration of the Eucharist, and all publick worship, (which should be performed with the greatest alacrity and delight) when we remember that we are uncertain whether God have sent us, or whether we are usurpers, that must one day hear, [Who sent you? Whence had you your Power? and who required this at your hands?]

Sect. 7. And the Consequent of the Major (that we are all uncertain of our Call and office, both Papists and Protestants) is most clear (in case of the Necessity of such successive Ordination.) For 1. No man ever did, to this day demonstrate such a succession, for the Proof of his Ministry. Nor can all our importunity prevail with Papists (Italians or French) to give us such a proof. 2. It is a thing impossible for any man now alive, to prove the Regular Ordination of all his Predecessors, to the Apostles' days, yea or any Ordination at all. How can you tell that he that ordained you, did not counterfeit himself to be Ordained? Or at least that he was not ordained by an unordained man? or that his Predecessors were not so? It is a mean impossibility for us to know any such thing; we have no Evidence to prove it.

Sect. 8. Object. But it is probable though not certain: for the Church proceedeth by such Rules, and taketh the matter to be
of so great weight, that there is no probability that they would suffer any to go for Pastors or Bishops that are unordained, in so great a case.

Answ. 1. All this is no certainty: and therefore no proof: and no satisfaction to the mind of a Minister, in the forementioned doubts. 2. Yea we have so great reason to be suspicious in the case that we cannot conclude that we have so much as a probability.

Sect. 9. For, 1. We know that there is so much selfishness and corruption in man as is like enough to draw them to deceit. Ordainers may be bribed to consecrate or ordain the uncapable, and the Ordained or Consecrated may be tempted to seek it in their incapacity; and many may be drawn to pretend that they were Ordained or Consecrated when it was no such matter. And so there is not so much a a Probability.

Sect. 10. 2. And we know that there were so many heresies abroad, and still have been, and so much faction and Schism in the Church: that we cannot be sure that these might not interrupt the successio, or that they drew not our predecessors to counterfeit a Consecration or Ordination when they had none, or none that was regular.

Sect. 11. 3. And we know our selves that the thing hath been too usual. When I was young, I lived in a village that had but about twenty houses. And among these there were five that went out into the Ministry. One was an Old Reader whose Original we could not reach. Another was his son, whose self-Ordination was much suspected: The other three had Letters of Orders, two of them suspected to be drawn up and forged by him, and one that was suspected to Ordain himself. One of them, or two at last were proved to have counterfeit Orders, when they had continued many years in the Ministry. So that this is no rare thing.

Sect. 12. Among so many temptations that in so many ages since the Apostles dayes, have befallen so many men, as our predecessors in the Ministry, or the Bishops predecessors have been, it were a wonder if all of them should scape the snare: So that we have reason to take it for a thing improbable, that the succession hath not been interrupted.

Sect. 13. And we know that in several ages of the Church the Prelates
Prelates and Priests have been so vile, that in reason we could expect no better from men so vicious, then forgery and abuse; he that reads what Gildas and others say of the Britifh, and what even Baronius, much more Espencaus, Cornelius Mus. and others say of the Romanists; yea he that knows but what state the Bishops and Priests have been in and yet continue in, in our own days, will never think it an improbable thing that some of our predecessors should be guilty either of Simony or other vice that made them uncapable, or should be meer usurpers under the name of Bishops and Ministers of Christ.

Sect. 14. Argument 2. If uninterrupted Regular Ordination of all our Predecessors be Necessary to the Being of the Ministry, then can no Bishop or Pastor whatsoever comfortably Ordain: For who dare lay his hand on the head of another, and pretend to deliver him authority in the name of Christ, that hath no assurance (nor probability neither) that he hath any Commission from Christ to do it? But the Consequent will be disowned by those that dispute against us? therefore so should the Antecedent be also.

Seet. 15. Argument 3. If there be a Necessity of an uninterrupted Succession of true Regular Ordination, then no man can know of the Church that he is a member of, or of any other Church on earth, that it is a true Church. (By a Church I mean not a Community, but a Society: not a company of private Christians living together as Christians neighbours, but a Politick Church consisting of Pastor and people associated for the use of publick Ordinances and Communion therein:) But the consequent is false; — &c.

Seet. 16. The Major, or consequent is certain: For no man can know that the Church is a true Political Organized Church, that knows not that the Pastor of it is a true Minister of Christ. Because the Pastor is an Essential constitutive part of the Church in this acceptance. And I have proved already that the truth of the Ministry cannot be known upon the Opponents terms. And for the Minor, I think almost all Church members will grant it me. For though they are ready enough to accuse others, yet they all take their own Churches for true, and will be offended with any that question or deny it.

Seet. 17. Argument 4. If there be a Necessity of an uninterrupted
rupted succession of true Ordination, then cannot the Church or any Christian in it, know whether they have any true Ministerial administrations, whether in Sacraments or other Ordinances. For he cannot know that he hath a Minister, cannot know that he hath the administration of another Minister, but the consequent is untrue, and against the comfort of all Christians, and the honour of Christ, and is indeed the very doctrine of the Infidels and Papists, that call themselves Seekers among us.

Sect. 18. Argument 5. If the Churches and each member of them are bound to submit to the Ministry of their Pastors without knowing that they are regularly ordained, or that they have an uninterrupted succession of such Ordination, then are they quoad Ecclesiam true Pastors to them, and their administrations valid, though without Ordination or such a succession. But the Antecedent is true, and granted by all that now we have to deal with. Though they will not grant a known unordained man is to be taken for a Minister, or one whose succession had a known interdiction; yet they will grant that if the Nullity be unknown, it freeth not the people from the obligation to their Pastors.

Sect. 19. Bellarmine (lib 3. de Eccles. c. 10.) was so stalled with these difficulties that he leaves it as a thing that we cannot be resolved of; that our Pastors have indeed [* Potestatem Ordinis & Jurisdicticionis *] that is, that they are true Pastors. And he faith that [* Non habemus certitudinem nisi Moralem, quod illi sint vere Episcopi. *] But when he should prove it to us that there is a Moral Certainty, he leaves us to seek and gives us not so much as a ground to conjecture at any probability.

Sect. 20. But he faith that we may know that [* Some Pastors at least are true: or else God had forsaken his Church. *] A sw. But what the better are we for this, if we know not, which they are that are the true Pastors, nor cannot possibly come to know it?

Sect. 21. But he faith that [* Quo i Christi locum tenent, & quod debemus illi obedientiam * may be known: and thereupon he faith that [* Certe sumus certitudinem inallibili quod illi quos vidimus sint veri Episcopi & Pastores nostri: Nam ad hoc non requiritur, nec si des nec Character Ordinis, nec legitima Electio, sed solum su
hubentur pro talibus ab Ecclesia. ] From all this you may note
1. That they are veri Episcopi & Pastores nostri, that were never
ordained, if they are but reputed so by the Church, 2. That
we may know this by infallible Certainty, 3. And that we owe
them obedience as such. So that as to the Church they are
true Pastors without Ordination, and consequently to the Church
a succession is unnecessary.

Sect. 22. Yet of such Usurpers he saith [ Eos quidem non esse
in se veros. Episcopos, tamendenee pro talibus hubentur ab Ec-
clesia, deberi illis obedientiam, cum conscientia etiam erronea
obliget. ] So that they are not veri Episcopi in se: and yet they
are veri Episcopi & Pastores nostri, if Bellarmine say true;
And the words have some truth in them, understood according
to the distinction which I before gave, Chap. 1. Sect. 5, 6. He
hath no such Call as will save himself from the penalty of usur-
pation (if he knowingly be an usurper ) but he hath such a Call
as shall oblig: the Church to obey him as their Bishop or
Pastor.

Sect. 23. But his reason[ Cum conscientia etiam erronea obliget] is a deceit;
and neither the only, nor the chief reason, nor any
reason. Not the only nor chief reason; because the obligation
aristeth from God, and that is the greatest. Not any reason;
1. Because indeed it is not an Erroneous Conscience, that tells ma-
ny people that their usurping Bishops or Pastors are to be obe-
yed as true Ministers. For as it is terminated on the Pastors act
or state, it is no act of Conscience at all, and therefore no er-
or of conscience. For conscience is the knowledge of our own
affairs. And as it is terminated on our own Duty of obeying
them, it is not Erroneous, but right; For it is the will of God,
that for order sake we obey both Magistrates and Pastors that
are setled in Possession, if they rule us according to the Laws of
Christ; at least, if we do not know the Nullity of their call.
2. And its fale: that an Erroneous Conscience bindeth, that is, makes
us a Duty; For at the same instant it is itself a sin, and we are
bound to depose it, and change it, and renounce the error.
It doth but intangle a man in a Necessity of sinning till it be laid
by. But it is God only that can make our duty, and cause such
an obligation.

Sect. 24. From the adversaries Concessions then an uninter-
srupted
rupted succession, or present true Ordination is not of Necessity to the being of the Ministry, Church or Ordinances quoad Ecclesiam: for the Church is bound to obey the usurpers, and that as long as they are taken for true Pastors. Which is as much as most Churches will desire in the case.

Sec. 25. And the consequence is easily proved: For where God obligeth his Churches to the obedience of Pastors (though usurpers) and to the use of Ordinances and their Ministration, there will he bless the Ministry and those Ordinances (to the innocents, that are not guilty of his usurpation) and that obey God herein. And consequently the Ordinances shall not be Nullities to them. God would never set his servants upon the use of a means which is but a Nullity; nor will he command them to a duty, which he will blash to them when he hath done without their fault. Its none of the Churches fault that the Bishop or Pastor is an usurper, while they cannot know it, and that any of his Predecessors were usurpers since the Apostles days. And therefore where God imposes duty on the Church and prescribeth means, (as Baptism, Prayer, the Lords Supper, Church Government, &c.) it is certain that he will not blame it, but bless it to the obedient, nor punish the Church for the secret sin of I know not who, committed I know not where nor when, perhaps a thousand years ago.

Sec. 26. Argument 6. As other actions of usurpers are not Nullities to the innocent Church, so neither is their Ordination: and consequently, those that are Ordained by usurpers, may be true Ministers. If their Baptizing, Preaching, Praising, Consecration and administration of the Eucharist, singing and loosing, be not Nullities, it follows undoubtedly on the same account, that their Ordinations are not Nullities: and consequently, that they are true Ministers whom they Ordain; and succession of a more regular Ordination is not of Necessity, to the Ministry, Church or Ordinances.

Sec. 27. Argument 7. If such uninterrupted succession be not Necessary to be known, then is it not Necessary to the Being of the Ministry or Validity of Ordinances administered; But such a succession is not Necessary to be known: therefore——The Consequence of the Major is plain, because
cause the Being or Nullity of Office and administrations, had never been treated off by God to men, nor had it been revealed, or a thing regardable, but that we may know it: Nor doth it otherwise attain its ends. And that it is not necessary to be known, I further prove.

Sect. 28. If this succession must be known, then either to the Pastor, or to the Church, or both: but none of these: therefore — 1. If it must be known only to the Pastor, then it is not Necessary as to the Church. And yet it is not Necessary to be known to the Pastor himself neither. For (as is shewed) its impossible for him to know it, so much as by a Moral Certainty. His Predecessors and their Ordinations were strange to him. 2. Not to the Church. For it is not possible for them to know it: Nor likely that they should know as much as the true Ordination of their present Pastor according to the Prelatical way, when it is done so far out of their sight.

Sect. 29. If the foresaid uninterrupted succession be necessary to the being of our Ministry, or Churches or Ordinances, then is it incumbent on all that will prove the truth of their Ministry, Churches or Ordinances, to prove the said succession. But that is not true; for then none (as is aforesaid) could prove any of them. Either it is meet that we be able to prove the truth of our Ministry, Churches and administrations, or not. If not, then why do the adversaries call us to it? If yea: then no man among the Churches in Europe (on their grounds) hath any proof; and therefore must not pretend to the Ministry, Churches or Ordinances, but we must all turn Seekers to day, and Infidels to morrow, by this device.

Sect. 30. Argument 8. The Ministry of the Priests and Levities before the incarnation of Christ, and in his time, was not Null, though they wanted as much or more than such a succession of right Ordination: therefore it is so still with the Gospel Ministry. The Antecedent I shall more fully manifest nearer to the end: Only now observe, that when Abiathar was put out by Solomon; and when such as were not of the line or Genealogie of the Priests, were put as polluted persons from the Priesthood (Neh. 7. 64, 65. and 13. 29, 30. Ezra 2. 62.) yet
yet were not any of their administrations taken to have been Null.

Sect. 31. Argument 9. If the Ministration or Governing acts of Usurping Princes may be Valid, and there need no proof of an uninterrupted succession to prove the validity, then it so also in the Ministry: But the Antecedent is certain; therefore, &c. The Validity of the consequence from the parity of Reason I shall manifest anon.

Sect. 32. Argument 10. If an uninterrupted Succession of Canonical or true Ordination be Necessary to the Being of the Church, Ministry and Ordinances, then Rome and England have lost their Ministry, Churches, and Ordinances. But the Consequent will be denied by the adversaries; therefore so also must the Antecedent, if they regard their standing.

Sect. 33. Though this be the Argument that I have the greatest advantage to press the adversary with, yet because I have made it good already in two or three other writings (in my Key for Catholicks, and my Safe Religion, and Christian Concord) I shall say but little of it now. But briefly this may suffice:

1. For the Church of Rome, if either Herefie, Infidelity, Sodomie, Adultery, Murder, Simony, violent intrusion, ignorance, impiety, want of due election, or of due consecration, or plurality of Popes at once, can prove an interruption of their succession, I have shewed them already where its proved; But if none of these prove it, we are safe our selves.

Sect. 34. But Grotius (in Discus. Apolog. Rivet.) pleads for them, that if any interruption have been made at Rome, it hath been made up from other Churches.] Answ. 1. That is not proved, but nakedly affirmed. 2. Nor will it serve the Papists turn, that must have all Churches hold from Rome and her succession, and Rome from none, nor to be patcht up from their succession. 3. De facto the contrary is certain: For 1. Those other held their Ministry as from the universal Headship of the Pope; and therefore had themselves their interruptions in the former interruptions of Rome (as being but her members:) and therefore were not capable themselves of repairing of her breaches, 2. The successors of the illegitimate Popes (such as deposed Engenius, &c.) and men as bad as they, have continued the succession: And the Bishops that were consecrated by power received from the illegitimate
genuine Popes, were the only persons that were the repairers of the breach. And yet the Pope will hardly yield that he received his power from any of these. 3. There have been greater defects in the succession then this of Consecration, even of due Election, Capacity, yea of an office itself which Christ will own. The Vice-chancellor of the Pope is no office of Christ's planting.

Sect. 35. And 2 For the English Prelates, as they are unable to prove their uninterrupted succession, so the interruption is proved, in that they derived and held their Power from the Vice-chancellor of Rome, and that quasalis, for so many ages. This was their own profession: and all that they did was as his Ministers by his Authority, which was none.

Sect. 36. Objection. But this nulled not the true Authority which they received from the Pope or Prelates as Prelates. Answer. The Pope was incapable of giving them Authority (and whether the Prelates as such were so too, we should enquire anon.) And though I grant that (where the person was fit) there was yet a Ministry valid to the Church and perhaps to themselves in the main; yet that is because Canonical Ordination is not of Necessity to the Being of the Ministry, (but by other means they might be then Ministers, though this corruption was conjunct, that they received their Power imaginarily from Rome) but that the said Canonical succession was interrupted, by this Papal tenure, and many a delinquency, is nevertheless sure, and sufficient to inforce the Argument as to them that now are our adversaries. But so much shall suffice for the Non-necessity of this succession of a true and Regular Ordination.
ORDINATION BY SUCH AS THE ENGLISH PRELATES, NOT NECESSARY TO THE BEING OF THE MINISTRY.

Sect. 1. Have made this work unnecessary by the two former Chapters: For if no Ordination be of Necessity to the Being of the Ministry, nor an uninterrupted Succession Necessary, then doubtless an Ordination by these Prelates in Specie is not Necessary at present, or as to Succession. But yet ex abundanti I add.

Sect. 2. Argument 1. Ad hominem, I may well argue from the Concession of the English Prelates themselves and their most zealous adherents; And their judgements were 1. That such a succession as aforesaid of right Ordination was not of Necessity, And for this they that write against, the Papists do commonly and confidently dispute.

Sect. 3. And 2. They maintained that the Protestant Churches that had no Bishops were true Churches, and their Ministers true Ministers, and so of their administrations. This was so common with them that I do not think a dissenting vote can be found, from the first Reformation, till about the preparations for the Spanish match or little before.

Sect. 4. I have in my Christian Concord cited at large the words of many, and the places of the writings of more, as 1. Dr. Field, 2. Bishop
2. Bishop Downham, 3. Bishop Jewel, 4. Saravia, 5. Bishop Alley, 6. Bishop Pilkington, 7. Bishop Bridges, 8. Bishop Bilson, 9. Alexander Nowel, 10. Grotius (their friend then) 11. Mr. Chysenhal, 12. The Lord Digby, 13. Bishop Davennant, 14. Bishop Prideaux, 15. Bishop Andrews, 16. Chillingworth, 17. (To which I now add) Bishop Bromhall (of Schism) 18. Dr. Fern, 19. Dr. Steward (in his answer to Fountains letter (these of the later, or present sort) 20. And Bishop Usher (whose judgement of it is lately published by Dr. Bernard at his own desire) 21. And Mr. Mason (in a Book of purpose for justification of the Reformed Churches) hath largely pleaded this cause. 22. And Dr. Bernard faith that Dr. Overall was judged not only to consent to that Book, but to have a hand in it. 23. And no wonder when even Bancroft himself (the violentest of all the enemies of them called Puritans in those times) is said by Spotswod (there recited by Dr. Bernard) to be of the same mind, and to give it as his judgement, that the Scotch Ministers (then to be Consecrated Bishops) were not to be reordained, because the Ordination of Presbyters was valid.

Sect. 5. These Novel Prelatical persons then, that so far different from the whole stream of the Ancient Bishops and their adherents, have little reason to expect that we should regard their judgement above the judgement of the English Clergy, and the judgement of all the Reformed Churches. If they can give us such Reasons as should conquer our modesty, and persuade us to condemn the judgement of the Prelates and Clergy of England, &c. all other Churches of the Protestants, and adhere to a few new men of yesterday, that dare scarcely open the face of their own opinions: we shall bow to their Reasons when we discern them: But they must not expect that their Authority shall so far prevail.

Sect. 6. And indeed I think the most of this cause is carried on in the dark: What Books have they written to prove our Ordination Null? and by what Scripture Reasons do they prove it? The task lieth on them to prove this Nullity, if they would be regarded in their reproaches of the Churches of Christ. And they are not of such excessive Modesty, and backwardness to divulge their accusations, but sure we might by this time have expected more than one volume from them, to have proved.
and no Ministers and Churches if they could have done it; and till they do it; their whisperings are not to be credited.

Sect. 7. Argument 2. If that sort of Prelacy that was exercised in England was not necessary it self, yea if it were sinful, and tended to the subversion or exceeding hurt of the Churches; then is there no Necessity of Ordination by such a Prelacy. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent. The Antecedent hath been proved at large in the foregoing Disputation. Such a Prelacy as consists in the undertaking of an impossible task, even for one man to be the only Governor of all the souls in many hundred Parishes, exercising it also by Lay men, and in the needful parts, not exercising it all; a Prelacy not chosen by the Presbyters whom they Govern, yea suspending or degrading the Presbyters of all those Churches, as to the governing part of their office, and guilty of the rest of the evils before mentioned, is not only itself unnecessary, but sinful, and a disease of the Church which all good men should do the best they can to cure. And therefore the effects of this disease can be no more Necessary to our Ministry, then the burning of a feather, or swelling of a Typanum, is necessary to the body.

Sect. 8. No Bishops are Necessary but such as were in Scripture times: But there were none such as the late English Bishops in Scripture times: Therefore the English Bishops are not necessary. He that denyeth the Major, must go further in denying the sufficiency of Scripture, then I find the Papists ordinarily to do: For they will be loth to affirm that any office is of Necessity to the Being of the Church or of Presbyters, that is not to be found in Scripture, or that was not then in Being: Therefore so far we are secure.

Sect. 9. And for the Minor, I prove it thus. If the English Bishops were neither such as the unfixed General Ministers, nor such as the fixed Bishops of particular Churches, then were they not such as were in Scripture times. But they were neither such as the unfixed General Ministers, nor such as the fixed Bishops of particular Churches: therefore, &c.

Sect. 10. Besides these two sorts of Ministers, there are no more in the New Testament. (And these are diversified but by the exercise of their office, so far as they were ordinary Ministers,
fers to continue. ) The unfixed Ministers ( whether Apostles, Evangelists or Prophets ) were such as had no special charge of any one Church as their Dioceses, but were to do their belt for the Church in general, and follow the direction and call of the Holy Ghost for the exercising of their Ministry. But its known to all that our English Bishops were not such. They were no ambulatory itinerant Preachers: they went not about to plant Churches, and confirm and direct such as they had planted: but were fixed to a City, and had every one their Dioceses, which was their proper charge ( but Oh how they discharged their undertaking! )

Sect. 11. Object. The Apostles might agree among themselves to divide their Provinces, and did accordingly, James being Bishop of Jerusalem, Peter of Rome, &c. Answ. No doubt but common reason would teach them when they were sent to preach the Gospel to all the world, to disperse themselves, and not be preaching all in a place, to the disadvantage of their work: But 1. Its one thing to travail several ways, and so divide themselves as itinerants; and another thing to divide the Churches among them, as their several Dioceses to which they should be fixed: Which they never did, for ought is proved. 2. And its one thing prudently to disperse themselves for their labour, and another thing to claim a special power, over a Circuit or Diocese as their charge, excluding a like charge and power of others. So far as any man, Apostle or other, was the Father of souls by their conversion, they owned him a special honour and love, which the Apostles themselves did sometimes claim: But this was nothing to a peculiar Diocese or Province. For in the same City ( as Jerusalem ) some might be converted by one Apostle, and some by another. And if a Presbyter convert them, I think the adversaries will not therefore make them his Dioces, not give him there an Episcopall Power, much less above Apostles in that place. Nor was this the Rule that Dioceses could be bounded by, as now they are taken.

Sect. 12. Nor do we find in Scripture the least intimation that the Apostles were fixed Diocesan Bishops, but much to the contrary. 1. In that it was not consistent with the General charge, and work that Christ had laid upon them to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every
every creature: How would this stand with fixing in a peculiar Dioceses?

Sect. 13. And 2. We find them answering their Commission in their practice, going abroad and preaching and planting Churches, and sometimes visiting them in their passage, but not setting on them as their Dioceses; but going further, if they had opportunity, to do the like for other places. Yea they planted Bishops in the several Cities and Churches which they had gathered to Christ. Though Paul said three years at Ephesus and other adjacent parts of Asia, yet did not all that abode prove it his peculiar Dioceses: (And yes its hard to find again so long an abode of Paul or any Apostle in one place.) Elders that were Bishops we find at Ephesus, Acts 20 and some say Timothy was their Bishop, and some say John the Apostle was their Bishop: but its clear that it was no peculiar Dioceses of Paul.

Sect. 14. And 3. We still find that there were more then one of these general itinerant Ministers in a Place, or at least that no one excluded others from having equal power with him in his Province, where ever he came. Barnabas, Silas, Titus, Timothy, Epaphroditus, and many more were fellow-labourers with Paul in the same Dioceses or Province, and not as fixed Bishops or Presbyters under him, but as General Ministers as well as he. We never read that he said to any of the false Apostles that fought his contempt [This is my Dioceses, what have you to do to play the Bishop in another mans Dioceses?] Much less did he ever plead such a Power, against Peter, Barnabas or any Apostolical Minister: Nor that James pleaded any such prerogative at Jerusalem.

Sect. 15. And therefore though we reverence Eusebius and other Ancients, that tell us of some Apostles Dioceses, we take them not as infallible reporters, and have reason in these points partly to deny them credit from the word of God. The Churches that were planted by any Apostle, or where an Apostle was longest resident, were like enough to reckon the series of their Pastors from him: For the founder of a Church is a Pastor of it, though not a fixed Pastor, taking it as his peculiar charge, but delivering it into the hands of such: And in this fence we have great reason to understand the Catalogues of the Antients and
and their affirmations that Apostles were Bishops of the Churches. For Pastors they were; but so that they had no peculiar Diocess, but still went on in planting and gathering and confirming Churches. Whereas the Bishops that were settled by them (and are said to succeed them had) their single Churches which were their peculiar charge; They had but one such charge or Church, when the Apostles that lead in the Catalogues had many; yet none so as to be limited to them. And why have we not the Diocess of Paul and John, and Matthew and Thomas, and the rest of the twelve, mentioned, as well of Peter and James? Or if Paul had any, it seems he was companion with Peter in the same City (contrary to the Canons that requireth that there be but one Bishop in a City.)

Sect. 16. Its clear then that the English Bishops were not such Apostolical unfixed Bishops as the itinerants of the first age were. And yet if they were, I shall shew in the next Argument that its nothing to their advantage; because Archbishops are nothing to our question. And that they were not such as the fixed Bishops of Scripture times, I am next to prove.

Sect. 17. The fixed Bishops in the Scripture times had but a single Congregation, or particular Church for their Pastoral Charge: But our English Bishops had many (if not many hundred) such Churches for their charge: therefore our English Bishops were not of the same sort with those in Scripture. The Major I have proved in the former Disputation. The Minor needs no proof, as being known to all that know England.

Sect. 18. And 2. The fixed Bishops in the Scripture times had no Presbyters, at least, of other particular Churches under them, (They Governed not any Presbyters that had other associated Congregations for publick Worship.) But the English Bishops had the Presbyters of other Churches under them (perhaps of hundreds:) therefore they are not such as the Scripture Bishops were. There is much difference between a Governour of People and a Governour of Pastors; Episcopus gregis, & Episcopus Episcoporum, is not all one. None of us faith, Cyprian in Concil. Carthagin. calleth himself, or takes himself to be Episcopus Episcoporum. No fixed Bishops in Scripture times were the Pastors of Pastors, as least, of other Churches.

Sect.
Sect. 19. This I suppose I may take as granted de facto from the Reverend Divine whom I have cited in the foregoing Disputation, that faith (Annotat. in Art. 11.) that [Although this Title of Presbyterorum Elders, have been also extended to a second order in the Church; and now is only in use for them, under the name of Presbyters: yet in the Scripture-times it belonged principally, if not alone to Bishops; there being no Evidence that any of that second Order were then instituted; though soon after, before the writing of Ignatius Epistles, there were such instituted in all Churches] So that he granteth that de facto there were then no Presbyters but Bishops, and they were not instituted: and therefore Bishops had no such Presbyters to Govern; nor any Churches but a single Congregation: For one Bishop could guide but one Congregation at once in publick worship; and there could be no Worshipping Congregations (in the sense that now we speak of) without some Presbyter to guide them in performance of the worship.

Sect. 20. So faith the same Learned man, Dissertat. 4. de Episcop. page 208, 209. [in quibus plures abso; dubio Episcopi fuere, nulliq; adhuc quos bodie dicimus Presbyteri.] And therefore he also concludes that the Churches were then Governed by Bishops assisted by Deacons without Presbyters, instancing in the case of the Church of Jerusalem, Acts. 6. and alluding the words of Clem. Roman. Καθα μετα της θείης Κρύπτων ηθισθαι τώς αυτής αυτών, εις επίσκοπος κε διακόνος, &c. (How Grotius was confident that Clemens was against their Episcopacy, I shewed before.) To the same purpose he cite the words of Clemens Alexandrinus in Euseb. of John the Apostle, concluding [Ex his ratio constat quare sine Presbyterorum mentione interveniente, Episcopis Diaconis immediate adjicientur, quia scilicet in singulis Macedoniae civitatibus, quamvis Episcopus esset, nondum Presbyteri constituti sunt; Diaconis tantum apol. υπερηφανων ιδιοι, Episcopis adjunctis.] Dissertat. 4. cap. 10. Sect. 19, 20, 21. So also cap. 11. Sect. 2. & alibi passim.

Sect. 21. Object. But though de facto there were no Bishops ruling Presbyters then, nor ruling any more than a single Worshipping Church, yet it was the Intention of the Apostles that they should afterwards enlarge their Dioceses, and take the care of many Churches, and that they should ordain that sort of subject Presbyters that were not instituted in Scripture-times. Answ. Do you prove the
the secret Intention of the Apostles to be for such a Mutation, and then we shall be satisfied in that. But till then it is enough to us that we have the same Government that de facto was set up by the Apostles, and exercised in Scripture times. And that its granted us that the office was not then instituted which we deny: For it is the office of such subject Presbyters having no Power of Ordination that we deny.

Sect. 22. Object. But though in Scripture times there were no Bishops over many Churches and Presbyters, yet there were Archbishops that were over many. Ans. Because this objection contains their strength, I shall answer it the more fully. And I. If there were no subject Presbyters in those times, then Archbishops could rule none. But there were none such, as is granted: therefore, &c. And what proof is there of Archbishops then?

Sect. 23. Their first proof is from the Apostles: But they will never prove that they were fixed Bishops or Archbishops. I have proved the contrary before. But such an itinerant Episcopacy as the Apostles had (laying by their extraordinaries) for my part I think should be continued to the world and to the Church (of which after.)

Another of their proofs is from Timothy and Titus, who, they say, were Archbishops. But there is full evidence that Timothy and Titus were not fixed Bishops or Archbishops, but Itinerant Evangelists, that did as the Apostles did, even plant and settle Churches, and then go further, and do the like. See and consider but the proofs of this in Prins unbishoping of Timothy and Titus. Such Planters and Itinerants were praemortem the Bishops of every Church where they came, (yet so as another might the next week be Bishop of the same Church, and another the next week after him, yea three or four or more at once, as they should come into the place.) And therefore many Churches as well as Ephesus and Crete its like might have begun their Catalogue with Timothy and Titus: and many a one besides Rome might have begun their Catalogue with Peter and Paul.

Sect. 24. Another of their proofs is of the Angels of the seven Churches which they say were Archbishops. But how do they prove it? Because those Churches or some of them were plant-
ed in chief Cities, and therefore the Bishops were Metropolitans. But how prove they the consequence? By their strong imagination and affirmation. The Orders of the Empire had not then such connection and proportion, and correspondency with the Orders of the Church. Let them give us any valid proof that the Bishop of a Metropolis had then (in Scripture times) the Bishops of other Cities under him, as the Governor of them, and we shall thank them for such unexpected light. But presumption must not go for proofs. They were much later times that afforded occasion for such contentions as that of Basil and Anthymius. (Whether the bounds of their Episcopal Jurisdiction should change as the Emperors changed the State of the Provinces?) Let them prove that these Asian Angels had the Bishops of other Churches, and the Churches themselves under their jurisdiction, and then they have done something.

Sect. 25. But if there were any preheminence of Metropolitans near these times, it cannot be proved to be any more then an honorary Primacy: to be Episcopus prima sedis, but not a Governor of the rest. How else could Cyprian truly say (even so long after) as is before allledged, that none of them was a Bishop of Bishops, nor imposed on others, but all were left free to their own consciences, as being accountable only to God?

Sect. 26. Yea the Reverend Author above mentioned shews (Dissert. de Episcop. 4. cap. 10. Sect. 9, 10, & alibi) that there were in those times more Bishops then one in a City, though not in una Ecclesia aut Coen. And the like hath Grotius oft. So that a City had oft then more Churches then one, and those Churches had their several Bishops: and neither of these Bishops was the Governor of the other, or his Congregation: much less of the remoter Churches and Bishops of other Cities. And this they think have been the case of Peter and Paul at Rome, yea and of their immediate successors there. And so in other places (Lege Dissert. 5 c. 1.)

Sect. 27. When the great Gregory Thanamaturgus was made Bishop of Neocasarea, he had but seventeen Christians in his City; and when he had increased them by extraordinary successes, yet we find not that he had so much as a Presbyter under him. And if he had, its not likely that Musonius, his first and chief entertainer, would have been made but his Deacon, and be the only man
man to accompany him and comfort him in his retirement in the persecution, and that no Presbyter should be mentioned: which shews that Bishops then were such as they were in Scripture-times (at least in most places) and had not many Churches with their Presbyters subject to them, as Diocesan Bishops have. And when Comana, a small place not far off him, received the faith, Gregory Ordained Alexander (the Collar) their Bishop, over another single Congregation, and did not keep them under his own Pastoral charge and Government: Vid. Greg. Nyphen in vita Thaumatur.

Sect. 28. But because that our Diocesan Bishops are such as the Archbishops that first assumed the Government of many Churches, and because we shall hardly drive many from their presumption, that Timothy and Titus were Archbishops (besides the Apostles,) I shall now let that supposition stand; and make it my next Argument that,

(Argument 3.) Ordination by Archbishops is not necessary to the Being of Ministers or Churches. Our English Bishops were indeed Archbishops: therefore Ordination by them is not Necessary——] It is not the Name, but the office that is pleaded Necessary.

Sect. 29. And for the Major, I think it will not be denied. All that I have to do with, Protesants and Papists, do grant the Validity of Ordination by Bishops. And for the Minor, it is easily proved. The Bishops that are the Governors of many Churches and their Bishops, are Archbishops. The Bishops of England were the Governors of many Churches with their Bishops: therefore they were Archbishops. The Major will be granted. And for the Minor I prove it by parts: 1. That they were (by undertaking) the Governors of many Churches. 2. And of many Bishops.

Sect. 30. Hethat is the Governor over many Congregations of Christians associated for the publick worship of God and holy communion and Edification, under their proper Pasteors, is the Governor of many Churches. But such were our English Bishops: therefore, &c. That such Societies as are here defined are true Churches, is a truth so clear, that no enemy of the Churches is able to gainsay with any shew of Scripture or reason, they being such Churches as are described in the Scriptures. And 2. That our Ministers were true Pasteors, if any will deny, (as the Papists
and Separatifs do: I shall have occasion to say more to them anon.

Sect. 31. Argument 4. If Ordination by such as the English Bishops be of Necessity to the Ministry and Churches, then was there no true Ministry and Churches in the Scripture times, nor in many years after: But the consequent is false; therefore so is the Antecedent. The reason of the Consequent is because there were no such Bishops in those times; and this is already proved, they being neither the Itinerant Apostolical sort of Bishops, nor the fixed Pastors of particular Churches; besides which there were no other.

Sect. 32. Argument 5. If Ordination by such as the English Prelates be Necessary to the Being of the Ministry and Churches, then none of the Protestants that have not such Prelates (which is almost all) are true Churches or have true Ministers: But the Consequent is false; therefore so is the Antecedent. Of this I shall say more anon.

Sect. 33. If none of the Protestants Churches that have not such Bishops are true Churches, and have not a true Ministry, then neither Roman, Greek, Armenian, Ethiopian, &c. or almost any through the world are true Churches: For they are defective in some greater matters, and chargeable with greater errors than these. But the Consequent is false; therefore so is the Antecedent. He that denieth all these to be true Churches, denieth the Catholic Church: And he that denieth the Catholic Church, is next to the denying of Christ.

Sect. 34. Having thus proved that there is no necessity of Ordination by such as the English Prelates, I have withall proved that men are not therefore ever the less Ministers, because they have not their Ordination, nor our Churches or Ordinances ever the more to be disowned.

Sect. 35. Yet where there is no other Ordination to be had, it may be a duty to submit to theirs: Not as they are Episcopi extinctus (as even Grotsins calls them) or of this species, but as they are Pastors of the Church, notwithstanding such superfluities and usurpations.

Sect. 36. It is not the duty therefore, but the sin, of any man that was Ordained by such Prelates to a lawful office, to disclaim and renounce that Ordination (as some do.) For it is not every irregularity.
irregularity that nullifieth it: There may be many modal circumstantials; or accidental miscarriages that may not Null the the substance of the Ordination it self.

Sect. 37. Yet it must be concluded, that we may not be willfully guilty of any sin in the modes or accidents: But that may be a sin in the Ordainer, which the Ordained may not be guilty of, as doing nothing that signifieth an approbation of it, but perhaps disowning it.

Sect. 38. If we have been guilty of submitting to a corrupt ordination, as to the accidents, we must disown and repent of the sinfull mode and accidents, though not of the Ordination it self in substance. As we must bewail the errors and infirmities of our preaching, prayer, and other holy duties, without renouncing the duty it self, which is of God, and to be owned.

Sect. 39. As to the Question of some, Whether a man may be twice Ordained, in case he suspect his first Ordination: I answer, 1. You must distinguish between a General Ordination to the office of the Ministry, and a special Ordination to a particular Church. (As the licensing of a Physician; and the sealing him over a City or Hospital.) The first may be done but once, in case it be truely done: but the second may be done as oft as we remove to particular Churches: Though yet both may be done at once, at our first Ordination; they are still two things; Even as Baptizing a man into Memberschip of the universal Church, and taking him into a particular Church. Its not like that the separation and Imposition of hands on Paul and Barnabas, Act. 13. 2,3. was to their first Apostleship.

Sect. 40. If a man have weighty reasons to doubt of his first Ordination, his safest way is to renew it, as is usuall in Baptism, with a [Simon Baptizatus es Baptizote] If thou be not Ordain-ed I Ordain thee. This can have no danger in such a case.
Ordination at this time, by English Prelates especially, is unnecessary.

Sect. 1. Besides what is said against the Necessity of such Prelatical Ordination in itself, I conceive that more may be said against it as things now stand from several accidental reasons, which make it not only unnecessary but sinful, to the most.

Sect. 2. As 1. The Obligation that was upon us from the Law of the Land, is taken off (which with the Prelates themselves is no small argument when it was for them) So that we are no further now obliged, then they can prove us so from Scripture Evidence; and how little that is, I have shewed before. The English Prelacy is taken down by the Law of the Land: we are left at Liberty from humane Obligations at least.

Sect. 3. If any man say, that it is an unlawful power that hath made those Laws by which Prelatical Government is taken down. I answer, 1. It is such a Power as they obey themselves, and therefore they may permit others to obey it. They hold their estates and lives under it, and are protected and ruled by it; and profess submission and obedience, for the generality of them. And when another Species of Government was up, that commanded me to take an engagement, to be true to the Government as established without a King and House of Lords, when our Consciences refused that Engagement as unlawful, the generality of
of the contrary minded took it (even all that I was acquainted with, that were put upon it) so that I may take it for granted that they judge the power which they obey themselves, to be obeyed by others.

Sect. 4. And 2. I would be glad to hear from them any regar-
dable proof that those that Governed when Paul wrote the 13th Chapter to the Romans had any better Title to their Govern-
ment; let them review their own late writings on that subject, and they may have arguments enough that are Valid ad hominem at least.

Sect. 5. The Laws of the Land do make the Acts even of an Usurper Valid while he is in possession, and make it treason to them that do against him that which is treason if it were against a lawfull Prince: and therefore if we granted them what they here affirm, it would be no advantage to their cause. Subject must look at the present Governours with peaceable subjection: For if they be left to try their Princes titles, and suspend obedience upon their single opinions, you know what will follow.

Sect. 6. And 3. It will be hard to prove that many a Prince that hath ruled in England, had a better Title: Its known that many of their Titles were naught; and yet their Lawes are Valid still, or were so to Posterity. And how can they convey a better title to their Heirs than they had themselves? If you say that the Consent of the People gave them a better, I must return that if that will serve, the people in Parliaments (more then one) and in their real subjection, have consented to this. But this is a subject that requireth much more to be said of it, or nothing at all: and therefore I shall take up here, with this little which he present cause makes necessary.

Sect. 7. And I may add a further Reason; that we are not only disoblidged by the Laws from former Prelacy, but we are ob-
liged against it. The Rulers have deposed and forbidden it, And in lawful things it is a duty to obey our Governours. And that the demolishing of the Prelacy, is a lawful thing (in it self considered: For I meddle not with the manner at this time.) I have said enough before to prove. It hath been usual for Princes to decafe bad Priests, and heretical or contentious Bishops, and to correct disorders, and restrain usurpations of Prelates among themselves. And if any such thing be now done by
by our present Governours, I know not any thing of that necessity in the English Species of Prelacy, as will warrant us to obey them.

Sect. 8. And it is a thing that is inconsistent with the Peace and Unity of these Churches: Which is another reason. For 1. We have seen the ill effects of it (which I am not willing to open to the worst.) 2. And the multitude of the most conscientious people are against it. 3. And the generality of the most conscientious faithful Ministers are against it; So that it could not be restored, without the apparent ruine of these Churches. 4. And a Learned Reverend Assembly of Divines, chosen out of the several Counties by a Parliament, were against it. 5. And many Parliaments have been against it. 6. And the generality of their adherents in the two Nations, that then lived in their Power, have taken a Solemn Covenant against it. Not against all Episcopacy, but against the English sort of Prelacie. So that it cannot be restored, without incomparably much more hurt, then the continuance of it would have done good, and without setting all these Churches on a flame: So far is it now from being a likely means of Unity or Peace among us.

Sect. 9. And if yet they plead the obligation of the ancient Laws (which is most insisted on by many,) I must by way of just excuse, remember them of one thing, which it's like they do not forget: that if those Laws are still in force to oblige us to seek Ordination from the Prelates, and to Authorize the Prelates to Ordain, notwithstanding the Laws of later Powers that have repealed them, then it must needs follow that those later Powers are taken for no Powers: and consequently that the same Laws do oblige the Prelates to put the Oath of Allegiance and Supremacy, as to some other Power, upon the Ordained before they lay hands upon them, and oblige the Ordained to take those Oaths, as well as to be so Ordained. For if they be yet of force in one, they are of force in both. And so no man can be Ordained by you without being guilty of that which the present Laws make Treason, and forfeiting his life: which I know nothing in the cause that requireth him to do.

Sect. 10. And I think I may conclude that it is your own judge-
judgement, that men should rather forbear your Ordination, then hazard their lives, or violate the present Laws, because when a Declaration or Order came forth not long ago, prohibiting men of your persuasion that had been sequestred to Preach or Administer Sacraments, the generality of you presently obeyed it, and some wrote for the forbearance that they practised. And if an Ordained man should obey the present power, by forbearing to preach and administer Sacraments, or may forbear these to escape a temporal danger; much more may men do so about your sort of Ordination.

Sect. 11. Moreover 4. We shall be guilty of a fixed Schism among the Reformed Churches, and of making the healing of our breaches impossible, if by our compliance we own your dividing Principle, that [No other are true Ministers or Churches but such as have your Manner of Ordination.] For by this Rule all the Ministers in these and other Protestant Nations must be degraded, or taken for no Ministers, and all the Churches for no true Churches (though perhaps they may be confessed Christian Communities,) Nor the Ordinances and administrations true. And do you think these are likely terms for Peace? Will they ever be yielded to by so many Churches? Or is it a desirable thing? Should Rome be so much gratified? And our Churches ruined? and the souls of millions cast away, and sacrificed to your opinions, or Peace? While your Prelacy pretended to no more, but to be the best sort of Government, and your Church to be the best of Churches, we could submit to you in all things that were not flatly sinful: But when you will be the only Churches, and unchurch all others, even the most flourishing Churches for knowledge and holiness, and when you must be the only Ministers, and others must be none, unless they will be Ordained by you; this is enough to put a sober man to a stand, whether he shall not be guilty of notorious schism, by complying with so schismatical a principle, if he subject himself voluntarily to a Prelacy that hath such principles and pretences, and to an Ordination that is administered on these grounds and terms. This was not the ground, nor these the principles of the former English Prelates: and therefore we were more capable of subjection to them.
them or Communion with them. We could have lived in their Communion and in the Communion of the rest of the Protestant Churches that have no Prelacy. But if by innovation, you have made such a change, as that we must separate from all the Reform'd Churches and Ministers that have not your kind of Ordination, if we will be your subjects or be Ordained by you according to your grounds, its time for us to look about us, that we escape that separation and schism, that you would lead us into and engage us in by your way of Ordination.

Sect. 12. Among your selves there are many that affirm that if the Pope would have been content with his old Patriarchal Power, and principium unitatis, or primacy of Order, and wave his last four hundred years determinations, or at least not obtrude them on other Churches (as Bishop Bromhall speaks) they could have held communion with him, that now cannot; If Rome would have been content to be a Member of the Catholick Church, though pretentiously the noblest, they could have owned it: But when it will be The Catholick Church, and separate it self from all the rest, unchurching all that are not subject to them, and united in their Government, they then drive us further from Communion with them. Imitate them not in any degree in this Notorious schism and separation. Be contented to be Ministers and Churches; and tell not Christ, he hath none but you, and such as you; and tell not Satan, that the Kingdom of Christ is thus cut short, to the honour or rejoicing of his adversary.

Sect. 13. It was not so ridiculous as sad to me, to read in Mr. T.'Ps. Self-revenger against Mr. Barlee, pag. 37. and Ordination called a ["Notorious Comœ Tragedie, equally sad and ridiculous, which he and others lately afept in Daintry Church, intituled by the Actors, An Ordination of Mifters, but by many of the Spectators, An Ordination of Lay Preachers to be Lay-preachers still, and (without repentance) for ever uncapable of the Priesthood, by being Ordained by such Priests as were uncapable of Ordaining.] Thus Mr. P.

Sect. 14. And it seems he was of the same judgement, (whoever he was) that would have abused Bishop Usher, by giving out that he told him, that [as for Holland, he question-
ed if there was a Church among them, or not, or wordsfully to that Purpose] Against which abuse of the Dr. the Bishop was fain to vindicate himself. See page 124, 125. Of his Posthumous Judgement.

Seft. 15. Moreover, 5. We know not of almost any Bishops in England, by whom men may be Ordained. Four or five Reverend Learned men of that degree are commonly said to survive among us (whom we much honour and value for their worth.) But as these are so distant, and their residence to the most unknown, so the rest (if there be any) are known to very few at all, that I can hear of: Its famed that many Bishops there are; but we know it not to be true, nor know not who they be: and therefore it cannot well be expected, that their Ordination should be sought. If they reveal not themselves and their Authority, and do not so much as once command or claim obedience from the generality of Ministers, how can they expect to be obeyed? If they plead the danger of persecution, I answer, 1. What Persecution do they suffer that are known (above others of their way? ) 2. If that will excuse them (when we never heard of any that suffered the loss of a penny for being known to be a Bishop, since the Wars were ended) then it seems, they take the Being of the Ministry and Churches to be but of small moment, that are not worthy their hazzard in a manifestation of their power: And if this excuse them from appearing, it must needs in reason excuse others from knowing them, obeying them, and submitting to them.

Seft. 16. And when they shall declare themselves to be our Bishops, they must in all reason expect that the proof of it as well as the naked affirmation, be desired by us. For we must not take every man for a Bishop that faith he is so. They must shew us according to the Canons that the Clergy of the Diocese lawfully Elect them, and Bishops Consecrated them, which are transactions that we are strangers to. If they take the secret Election of six or seven or very few in a Diocese, to be currant, because the rest are supposed to be uncapable by Schism; 1. Then they shew themselves so exceedingly unjust as to be unmeet for Government, if they will upon their secret presumptions, and unproved suppositions;
cut off or censure so many parts of the Clergy, without ever accusing them, or calling them to speak for themselves, or hearing their Defence. 2. And if upon such presumptuous Censures you make your selves Bishops besides the Canons, you cannot expect obedience from those that you thus separate from, and censure unheard.

Sect. 17. It's known that the English Bishops (as Grotius himself affirmeth) were chosen by the King according to the custom here, the Chapter being shadows in the business: And if the King may make Bishops, be may make Presbyters; and then Ordination is unnecessary. But if you say that the Consecrators make them Bishops, and not the Kings Election, then Rome had many Bishops at once, when ever three or four Popes were consecrated at once (which mars all succession thence derived,) and then if some Bishops consecrate one, and some another, both are true Bishops of one Diocess, and many Pastors may be thus Ordained to one Church.

Sect. 18. And it concerneth us before we become their subjects, to have some credible Evidence that they are so Orthodox, as to be capable of the place. And the rather because that some that are suspected to be Bishops (how truly I know not) have given cause of some suspicion: Either by writing against Original sin, or by owning Grotius's Religion, (which what it was I have shewed elsewhere,) or by unchurching the Protestant Churches, and Nullifying their Ministry that have not their kind of Ordination, while they take the Roman Ordination to be Valid, and their Church and Ministry to be true, with other such like.

Sect. 19. And 6. If we should now, when better may be had, subject our selves to the Ordination and Government of the abolished Prelacy, we should choose a more corrupt way of administration, and prefer it to a more warrantable way: (That this way is corrupt, is proved in the former Disputation. That a way more warrantable may be had, I shall prove anon.) Though submission to a faulty way in some cases of Necessity is excusable, yet when we have our choice, the case is altered.

Sect. 20. And a tender Conscience hath very great reason to fear left by such voluntary subjection, they should incur moreover this double guilt: 1. Of all the hurt that this corrupt form
2. And of all the hurt that it might do again if it were introduced: which is neither small, nor uncertain: He that hath seen the fruits that it brought forth but for a few years before the abolition, and weighs the arguments brought against it, methinks should fear to be the restorer of it.

Sect. 21. If any man (as Mr. Thorndike and others do) shall write for a more regular sort of Episcopacy, it is one thing to find a tolerable Bishop in his Book, and another thing to find him existent in England: For we know not of any New sort of Regulated Episcopacy planted: and therefore must suppose that it is the Old sort that is in being. Let them bring their Moderate forms into existence, and then its like that many may be more inclined to submit to their Ordination: but their moderate principles having not yet made us any Moderate Episcopacy, I see not how we should be ever the more obliged for them to submit to the Old: but rather are the more justified in disowning it, when their own reformed modell is against it.
CHAP. VII.

The Ordination used now in England and in other Protestant Churches, is Valid, and agreeable to Scripture and the Practice of the Ancient Church.

Sect. 1. Having already proved that the late English Bishops Ordination is not of necessity; it is satisfactory without any more ado, to them that would nullifie our Ministry and Churches that have not their Ordination. But because we may meet with other adversaries, and because in a case of so much weight, we should walk in the clearest light that we can attain, for the satisfaction of our own Consciences, I shall further prove the Validity of our Ordination, and the truth of our Call, and Ministry, and Churches.

Sect. 2. Argument 1. The Ordination is Valid which is performed by such Bishops as were instituted and existent in Scripture times. But our Ordination (used in England and other reformed Churches) is performed by such Bishops as were instituted and existent in Scripture times: therefore such Ordination is Valid.

The Major will not be denied (being understood with a supposition of other requisites that are not now in controversy: )
For those that we have to deal with do grant, that such Bishops as are mentioned, Acts 20. 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1. Phil. 1. 1. and in other passages of Scripture, had the power of Ordination, and that it belonged not only to the Apostles and Evangelists, and (such as they call) Archbishops; but that the fixed Bishops of particular Churches had it.

Sect. 3. The Minor I prove thus (that our Ordination is by Scripture Bishops.) The Scripture Bishops were the Pastors of Particular Churches, having no Presbyters subject to them. Most of our Ordainers are such Pastors: therefore most of our Ordainers are Scripture Bishops.

Sect. 4. The Major is asserted at large by the forelaid Reverend Dr. H. H. Annot. in Art. 11. b. p. 407. Where he shews that [Although this title of *Presbyter* has been also extended to a second order in the Church, & is now only in use for them, under the name of Presbyters, yet in the Scripture times, it belonged principally if not only to Bishops, there being no evidence that any of that second order were then instituted——] So that the Scripture Bishops were the Pastors of single Churches having no Presbyters under them; for there were no inferior Presbyters (that had not the Power of Ordination) instituted in those times. This therefore may be taken as a granted truth.

Sect. 5. And that our Ordainers are such, is commonly known: 1. They are Pastors: (it is but few of the Prelates that denied this:) They are *Rectors* of the People, and have the Pastoral charge of souls. 2. They are Pastors of Particular Churches. 3. They have (for the most part at least) no subject or inferior Presbyters under them: therefore they are Scripture Bishops.

Sect. 6. Object. The difference lyeth in another point: The Scripture Bishops had the Power of Ordination: Your Pastors have not the Power of Ordination: therefore they are not the same. Answ. That is the thing in Question. I am proving that they have the power of Ordination, thus: In Scripture times all single Pastors of single Churches had the Power of Ordination, there being no other instituted: But our Ordainers are the single Pastors of single Churches; (and of Christ's institution:) therefore they have the Power of Ordination. If the Pastors now are denied to be such as were instituted in Scripture times,

1. Let
1. Let them shew who did institute them, and by what authority. 2. The sole Pastors of particular Churches were instituted in Scripture times: But such are ours in question, therefore, &c.

Sect. 7. There is no sort of Pastors lawfull in the Church but what were instituted in Scripture times: But the sort of Pastors now in question are lawfull in the Church: therefore they were instituted in Scripture times: The Minor will be granted us of all those that were Ordained by Prelates: They would not Ordain men to an office which they thought unlawful. The Major is proved thus: No sort of Pastors are lawful in the Church but such of whom we may have sufficient evidence that they were instituted by Christ or his Apostles: But we can have sufficient evidence of none but such as were instituted in Scripture times, that they were instituted by Christ or his Apostles: therefore no other sort is lawfull. The Major is proved in that none but Christ and such as he committed it to, have power to institute new Holy Offices for Worship in the Church; But Christ hath committed this to none but Apostles (if to them,) therefore, &c. Whether Apostles themselves did make any such new Office; I will not now dispute; but if they did, 1. It was by that special Authority which no man since the planting of the Churches by them can lay claim to, or prove that they have. 2. And it was by that extraordinary guidance and inspiration of the Holy Ghost, which none can manifest to have been since that time communicated.

Sect. 8. Moreover, if there were a Power of instituting new Offices in the Church since Scripture times, it was either in a Pope, in Councils, or in single Pastors. But it was in none of these: not in a Pope; for there was no such Creature of long time after, much less with this authority: Not in a Council: For 1. None such was used: 2. None such is proved. 3. Else they should have it still. Not in every Bishop, as will be easily granted.

Sect. 9. If such a Power of instituting New Church-Offices were after Scripture times in the Church, then it is ceased since, or continueth still; Not ceased since. For 1. The Powers or officers then left continue still: therefore their authority continueth still. 2. There is no proof that any such temporary power was given to any since Scripture times. Nor doth any such continue still; Otherwise men might still make us more New Offices, and so we should not know when we have done, nor

should
should we need to look into Scripture for Christ's will, but to the will of men.

Sect. 10. Argument 2. No men since Scripture times had power to change the Institutions of Christ and the Apostles, by taking down the sort of Pastors by them established; and setting up another sort in their stead. But if there be lawful Pastors of particular Churches that have not power of Ordination, then men had power to make such a change. For the sort of Pastors then instituted were such as had but one Church, and were themselves personally to guide that Church in actual Worship, and had the power of Ordination, and there was no subject Presbyters, nor no single Pastors that had not the Power of Ordination: All single Pastors of particular Churches had that Power then: But all, or almost all such single Pastors of particular Churches are by the Dissenters supposed to be without that Power now: Therefore it is by them supposed that Christ's form of Church Government and sort of Officers are changed, and consequently that men had power to change them, for they suppose it lawfully done.

Sect. 11. Argument 3. The Pastors of City Churches may ordain (especially the sole or chief Pastors:) Many of our present Ordainers are the Pastors of City Churches (and the sole or chief Pastors in some Places:) therefore they may ordain. The Major is proved from the doctrine of the Dissenters, which is, that every City Church should have a Bishop, and that every Bishop is the chief (and sometimes only) Pastor of a City Church. If they say that yet every Pastor (though the sole Pastor) of a City Church is not a Bishop: I answer, that then they will infer the same power of changing Scripture Institutions, which I mentioned, and disproved before. Let them prove such a Power if they can.

Sect. 12. The Minor is undeniable, and seen de facto, that many of our Ordainers are such Pastors of City Churches, and that of two sorts: some of such Cities as have both the Name and Nature of Cities: And some of such Cities as have truly the nature, but in our English custom of speech have not the name: such as are all Corporations, in the several Market Towns of England.

Sect. 13. Argument 4. Those Pastors that have Presbyters
under them, have power of Ordination: But very many English Pastors at this day have Presbyters under them: therefore they have Power of Ordination: By Presbyters I mean not men of another office, but gradually inferior in the same office. The Major is proved ad hominem from the Concessions of the Dissenters: For (though I rarely meet in their disputes for Bishops, with any Definition of a Bishop, yet) This is it that they most commonly give us as the Essential difference of a Bishop, that he is one that is over Presbyters. Yea this agreeth with their higher sort of Bishops that they say were in the Church in Ignatius dais, when subject Presbyters were instituted: and therefore those Pastors may ordain that are of that higher sort of Bishops.

Sect. 14. The Minor is notorious: Many of our Pastors in Market Towns and other large Parishes have a curate with them, in the same Congregation, and one or two or more Curates at several Chappels of ease, that are in the Parish. And these are under them 1. De facto, being chosen and brought in by them, Ruled by them, and paid by them and removed by them. 2. De jure, the Bishops and Laws of the Land allowed this.

Sect. 15. Argument 5. The stated or fixed President of a Presbyterie may Ordain (with his fellow Presbyters) But many of our Parish Pastors are the fixed Presidents of Presbyteries: therefore they may ordain. The Major I take for granted by all that hand to the Ordinary descriptions of a Bishop: For the stated President of a Presbyterie, is not only a Bishop, in the judgement of Forbes, Bishop Hall, Bishop Usher and such other, but is indeed the Primitive Bishop in their judgement, and such a Bishop in whom they would rest satisfies, and do propose such for the Churches Peace.

Sect. 16. And the Minor is notorious: For 1. In the most of our ordered Churches there is a Presbyterie of Ruling Ecclesiastick Elders. 2. In many there are divers preaching Presbyters (which may satisfy them that are against meer ruling Elders) as I shewed before. And if these be not inferior to the chief Pastor in Ecclesiastical Degree, yet they are his Compresbyters, and he is (in all Parishes that I know where, Curates or Affiliants are) their stated President or Moderator, so that we have in all such Congregations (according to the doctrine of the Bishops them-
0°3) not only such Bishops as were in the Apostles' days, when there was no Subject of Presbyters, but also such Bishops as were in Ignatius' days, when the fixed President or Bishop had many Presbyters, to whom he was the President or Moderator.

Sect. 17. Yea if you will make his Negative voice Essential to a Bishop, (which Moderate Episcopal men deny), yet commonly this agreeth to such Parish Bishops as have Curates under them: For in the Presbytery they have ordinarily a Negative Voice.

Sect. 18. Yea where there are no such Presbyteries with a President, it is yet enough to prove him a Bishop, that he hath Deacons under him, or but one. Deacon: faith Dr. H. H. Annotat. in Act. 11. b. [When the Gospel was first preached by the Apostles, and but few converted, they ordained in every City and Region, no more but a Bishop, and one or more Deacons to attend him, there being at the present so small store out of which to take more, and so small need of. Ordaining more — ]

Sect. 19. Argument 6. The Moderator or President of many Pastors of particular Churches assembled, may Ordain, and his Ordination is Valid. But such a Moderator or President is ordinarily or frequently One in our Ordinations: therefore they are Valid. The Major is granted by many of the Dissenters, and all their principles, I think; do infer it: For such a one is a Bishop, not only of the Apostolical institution: Nor only such as was in Ignatius' days, but such an Archbishop as next afterward sprung up. When it is not only one Church and its Presbyters that are under him, but the Presbyters (or Bishops) of many Churches that he is Moderator or President of, methinks those that are for the highest Prelacy, should not deny the Validity of his Ordination.

Sect. 20. But two things will be here objected: The one is, that he was not consecrated to this Presidency or Moderatorship, by Bishops. To which I answer, 1. That Consecration is not of Necessity to such a Bishop, according to the principles of Episcopal Divines; it being no new Office or Order that they are exalted to, but a new Degree; Ordination (which was received when they were made Presbyters) may suffice, and is not to be iterated. 2. The Election of the Presbyters served (as Hierom testifieth) in the Church of Alexandria; therefore it may
serve now: (of which more anon.) 3. He is chosen by true Bishops, as is shewed.

Sect. 21. The other Objection is, that our Presidents are bus pro tempore, and therefore are not Bishops. To which I answer, 1. That in some Places they are for a long time, and in some for an uncertain time. Dr. Twis was Moderator of the Synod at Westminster, for many years together, even during vita; and Mr. Herle after him was long Moderator: The London Province hath a President for many moneths; even from one Assembly to another. 2. I never yet met with an Episcopal Divine, that maintained that it was essential to a Bishop, to be such durante vita: I am sure it is not commonly aserted. If a man be made the Bishop of such or such a Diocese; for one and twenty years, or for seven years, it will be said to be irregular; but I know none of them that have averred it to be so great an Error as nullifyeth his Power and administrations. And if it may stand with the Being of Episcopacy to be limited to seven years, then also to be limited to seven moneths, or seven weeks, or days: Especially when (as usually with us) they fix no time at the first Election, but leave it to the liberty of the next Assembly to continue or to end his power. Let them prove that affirm it, that duration for life is essential to a Bishop.

Sect. 22. Argument 7. Where all these formentioned qualifications of the Ordainer do concur, (viz. 1. That he be the Pastor of a particular Church, and the chief Pastor of it, and the Pastor of a City Church, and have Deacons and Presbyters under him, and be the fixed President of a Presbyterie, and the Moderator or President of a larger Presbyterie of the Pastors of many Churches;) there (according to the principles, even of the rigidest sort of Diffenters;) the Ordination is Valid: But all these formentioned qualifications do frequently concur to some of our present Ordainers in England: therefore even according to the more rigid Diffenters, their Ordination is Valid: The premises are so plain that they need no confirmation.

Sect. 23. Argument 8. Ordination by a Presbyterie is Valid. But in England and other Reformed Churches we have Ordination by a Presbyterie: therefore our Ordination is Valid. The Major is proved from 1 Tim. 4. 14. [Neglect not the gift that is in thee which was given thee by Prophecy; with the laying on of the hands of the Pres-
Presbyterie. Also from Act. 13. 1, 2, 3. They were the Prophets and Teachers of the Church of Antioch that imposed hands on Barnabas and Saul, (whether it were for their first Ordination to the Office, or only for a particular Mission. I now dispute not.) The Church of Antioch had not many Prelates, if any: but they had many Prophets and Teachers, and these and none but these are mentioned as the Ordainers. As for them that say these were the Bishops of many Churches of Syria, when the Text saith they all belonged to this Church of Antioch, they may by such presumptuous contradictions of Scripture lay much, but prove little.

Sect. 24. As for them that grant us, that there were no subject Presbyters instituted in Scripture-times, and so expound the Presbyterie here to be only Apostles and Bishops of the higher order, I have shewed already, that they yield us the Cause: though I must add, that we can own no new sort of Presbyterie, not instituted by Christ or his Apostles. But for them that think that Prelates with subject Presbyters were existent in those times, they commonly expound this Text of Ordination by such subject Presbyters, with others of a Superior rank or degree, together: Now, as to our use, it is sufficient, that hence we prove that a Presbyterie may ordain: and that undeniable a Presbyterie consisted of Presbyters, and so that Presbyters may ordain. This is commonly granted us, from this Text. That which is said against us by them that grant it, is, that Presbyters did Ordain, but not alone, but with the Bishops.

Sect. 25. But, 1. if this were proved, its nothing against us: for if Presbyters with Bishops have power to Ordain, then it is not a work that is without the reach of their Office, but that which belongeth to them; and therefore if they could prove it irregular for them to Ordain without a Bishop, yet would they not prove it Null. Otherwise they might prove it Null, if a Bishop Ordain without a Presbyterie, because according to this Objection they must concur. 2. But indeed, they prove not that any above Presbyters did concur in Timothy's Ordination, whatever probability they may shew for it. And till they prove it, we must hold so much as is proved and granted.

Sect. 26. As for 2 Tim. 1. 6, it is no certain proof of it. It may be Imposition of hands in Confirmation, or for the first
giving of the Holy Ghost after Baptism (ordinarily used by
the Apostles) that is there spoken of: which also seemeth pro-
bable, by the Apostles annexing it to Timothe's Faith, in which
he succeeded his Mother and Grandmother; and to the fol-
lowing effects of [the Spirit of Power, and of Love, and of a
sound mind,] which are the fruits of Confirming Grace: ad-
monishing him, that he be not ashamed of the Testimony of our
Lord; which is also the fruit of Confirmation. However the
probability go, they can give us no certainty, that Paul or any
Apostle had an hand in the Ordination here spoken of: when
the Text faith that it was [with the laying on of the hands of the
Presbyters] we must judge of the office by the name: and
therefore we are sure that there were Presbyters. 2. And
if there were also any of an higher rank, the Phrase encour-
geth us to believe, that it was as Presbyters, that they imposed
hands in Ordination.

Sect. 27. Argument 9. If Bishops and Presbyters (as
commonly distinguished) do differ only Gradus, non Ordine; in
Degree and not in Order, (that is, as being not of a distinct
office, but of a more honourable Degree in the same office) then
is the Ordination of Presbyters valid, though without a Bishop
(of that higher Degree) But the Antecedent is true: there-
fore so is the Consequent. The Antecedent is maintained by
abundance of the Papists themselves; much more by Protestants.
The reason of the Consequence is, because ad ordinem pertinent
ordinare. Being of the same office, they may do the same work.
This Argument Bishop Usher gave me to prove that the Ord-
ination of meer Presbyters without a Prelate is valid, when I ask
him his Judgement of it.

Sect. 28. Argument 10. If the Prelates and the Laws they
went by did allow and require meer Presbyters to Ordain, then
must they grant us that they have the Power of Ordination:
But the Antecedent is true, as is well known in the Laws, and
common Practice of the Prelates in Ordaining: divers Presbyters
laid on hands together with the Bishop: and it was not the Bi-
shop but his Chaplain commonly that examined and approved:
usually the Bishop came forth, and laid his hands on men that he
never saw before, or spoke to, but took them as he found them
presented to him by his Chaplain: so that Presbyters Ordained
as well as he, and therefore had power to Ordain.

Seet. 29. If it be Objected that they had no power to Ordain without a Bishop. I answer, 1. Nor a Bishop quoad exercitium, without them, according to our Laws and Customs, at least usually. 2. Ordaining with a Bishop proveth them to be Ordainers, and that it is a work that belongeth to the order or office of a Presbyter: or else he might not do it at all, any more than Deacons, or Chancellors, &c. may. And if it be but the work of a Presbyters office, it is not a Nullity, if Presbyters do it without a Prelate, if you could prove it an irregularity.

Seet. 30. Argument 11. If the Ordination of the English Prelates be valid, then much more is the Ordination of Presbyters, (as in England and other Reformed Churches is in use,) But the Ordination of English Prelates is valid, (I am sure in the judgement of them that we dispute against:) therefore so is the Ordination of English Presbyters much more.

Seet. 31. The reason of the Consequence is, because the English Prelates are more unlike the Bishops that were fixed by Apostolical Institution or Ordination, then the English Presbyters are, as I have shewed at large in the former Disputation: the Scripture Bishops were the single Pastors of single Churches, personally guiding them in the worship of God, and governing them in presence, and teaching them by their own mouths, visiting their sick, administering Sacraments, &c. And such are the English Presbyters: But such are not the late English Prelates that were the Governors of an hundred Churches, and did not personally teach them, guide them in worship, govern them in presence, and deliver them the Sacraments, but were absent from them, all save one Congregation. These were unliker to the Scripture fixed Bishops, described by Dr. H. H. then our Presbyters are; therefore if they may derive from them a Power of Ordination, or from the Law that instituted them, then Presbyters may do so much more.

Seet. 32. Argument 12. If the Ordination of Papist Bishops be valid, much more is the Ordination of English Presbyters so; but the Antecedent is true, in the judgement of those against whom we dispute: therefore the Consequent must be granted by them on that Supposition.

Seet. 33. The reason of the Consequence is, because the Papist Bishops
Bishops are more unlike to the Scripture Bishops, and more uncapable of ordaining, then the Presbyters of the Reformed Churches are. For 1. The Papist Prelates profess to receive their Power from a Vice-christ, at least quoad exercitium, of media conferendi, which Protestant Presbyters do not. 2. The Papist Bishops profess themselves Pastors of a new Catholick Church, which is headed by the Papacy as an essential part; and which Christ will not own (as such:) But so do not the Protestant Presbyters. 3. The Papist Prelates Ordain men to the false Office of turning Bread into the Body of Christ by the way of Transubstantiation, in their Consecration, and offering it as a Sacrifice for the quick and dead, and delivering this as the very Body of Christ, and not Bread to the Communicants, and persuading them that it is such, and holding and carrying it to be Worshipped by them with Divine Worship, and the like: But the Protestant Presbyters are Ordained, and do Ordain others, to that true Office of a Presbyter or Pastor, or Bishop which Christ hath instituted. 4. The Papist Prelates have abundance of false doctrines, and practices in Worship, which the Protestant Presbyters have not. 5. And they have no more to shew for a Power of Ordination, then our Presbyters have: so that these, with many the like considerations, will prove, that if the Papists Ordination be Valid, that of the Protestant Churches by Presbyters is so much more. And doubtles, they that plead for a succession from the Papist Prelates, do hold their Ordination Valid.

Sect. 34. Argument 13. If the Protestant Churches that have no Prelates be true Churches (in a Political sense,) and the Ordinances among them valid, and to be owned and received, then are the Pastors of those Churches true Pastors, though they have no Ordination but by Presbyters. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent. The reason of the Consequence is clear, and granted by them that we have now to do with: Because the Pastors are essential to the Church as Political, and the said Ordinances of Publick worship, (as the Lords Supper,) and Government, cannot be allowable without them, nor such as the people should submit to or receive. This therefore we may take as granted.

Sect. 35. And for the Minor, that the Protestant Churches are
are true Churches that have no Prelates. 1. There are so few of
them that have Prelates, that he that will unchurch all the rest,
I suppose (when he plays his game above board) would take
it for an injury, to be accounted a Protestant himself. 2. If
the Churches of the West called Papists, and the Churches of
Africa, Asia, and America, be true Churches of Christ, and
have true administrations, then (much more confidently may
we affirm that) the Protestants are so too. But the Antecedent
is maintained by those that we now dispute against, (except-
ing the Papists, who yet maintain it as of their own Church)
therefore, &c.

Sect. 36. The reason of the Consequence is, because the Pa-
pists, Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Syrians, Egyptians, Aba-
sines, &c. have much more to be said against them then we have:
And if the lesser (or supposed) imperfection of the Protestant
Churches do unchurch them, (for wanting Prelates,) then
the many great, and real defects of the other Churches will
unchurch them much more. Especially this holds as to the Church
of Rome, which yet is taken by the Difsenters to be a true Church,
and by some of them, at least, denied to be the seat of Anti-
christ. Their Vicechrist and usurping head, and all the Minis-
try that hold by him, afford us other kind of Arguments against
their Church, then want of Prelates can afford them or others
against our Churches.

Sect. 37. And if any will deny the Antecedent so far as to
unchurch all the Churches in the world, that are more defective
then the Protestants, he will blot out of his Creed the Article of
the Catholick Church, and being a Seeker or next one to day, is
like to be an Infidel ere long, as I shall further shew, when I speak
of the sinfulness of such.

Sect. 38. Argument 14. If the Administrations of a Usur-
ping Presbyter to an innocent people are Valid (and not Nul-
lities, ) then the Ordination of an Usurping Ordainer to an In-
nocent expeftant, is Valid: (and consequently the Ordination
of Presbyters is Valid, if they were Usurpers, as they are un-
justly laid to be. ) But the administrations of usurping Pref-
byters to an Innocent people are Valid: therefore, &c.

Sect. 39. The Antecedent is granted by Bellarmine himself
(in the place before cited) who faith that no more is required to
oblige the people to obey him, and submit, then that he be re
puted a Pastor: And all must say so, 1. That will not rob the innocent of the Benefit of Gods Ordinances, because of an usurpers fault. 2. And that will not leave the people, almost commonly, in an utter uncertainty, whom they should take for a Pastor and obey; and when the Ordinances are Valid for their good.

Sec. 40. The Consequence is made good by the Parity of Reason that is in the two cases. If usurpation cause not a Nullity, invalidity or unprofitableness in one case, to the innocent receiver, no nor make it his Sin to receive, no more will it in the other. For there is no Reason for any such difference. Nay if it be a duty to submit to an unknown usurper, in several cases, in receiving the Sacraments, hearing, praying, &c. so is it a duty in such cases to receive Ordination.

Sec. 41. ObjeA. But the usurping Presbyter doth nothing but what belongeth to the office of a Presbyter: but the usurping Ordainor doth that which belongeth not to the office of a Presbyter: and therefore his action is a Nullity, as being extra proprium forum.

Sec. 42. Ans. I. It is proved before to belong to the office of a Presbyter to Ordain: 2. But suppose it were not; yet the objection is vain: because it is the office of a Bishop that the Ordaining Presbyter doth pretend to, and which you imagine that he doth usurp. They say that subject Presbyters (quod ordinem vel Officium) are no creatures of Gods appointment; and therefore they renounce that Office; and claim that office which you call Episcopacy, and hath the Power of Ordination. The quarrel between us is not about meer Bishops (such as Dr. H. H. describeth as aforesaid.) These are not denied: but the Parish Ministers profess themselves such Bishops: But it is about the other sort of Presbyters, subject to Bishops, that the quarrel is: For they say, that the Church should have none such, and Dr. H. H. faith there is no Evidence that any such were instituted in Scripture times. Now as a pretended Presbyters administrations are Valid to the innocent receiver of the Sacrament, so a pretended Bishops administration in Ordination is as Valid to the innocent, ceteris paribus.

Sec. 43. Argument 15. They that have the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven, have the power of Ordination: But Parochial all Pastors called Presbyters have the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven.
Heaven: therefore they have the power of Ordination.

Sect. 44. The Minor is granted commonly by Papists and Protestants, as to some of the Keyes, but it is by many denied as to other. They say that every Pastor hath the Key of doctrine and of Order, but not the Key of Jurisdiction. But Christ gave the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven together and never divided them. Therefore they are not to be divided. He did not give one Key to one, and another to another, but all to the same men: And what God hath joined together, let no man put asunder. 2. The Apostles in delivering these Keyes to others, are never found to have separated them. For Subjects Presbyters were not instituted in Scripture-times: Therefore all that were then Ordained Presbyters had all the Keyes together, and so that of Jurisdiction (as it is called) with the rest. 3. That Presbyters had the Key of Order, will prove that they may 29. p. 64, Ordain, as is aforesaid. 4. But that English Presbyters had the Key of Jurisdiction is proved. 1. In that they were with the Bishop to Ordain by Imposition of hands. 2. In that they were by the Book of Ordination charged to administer Discipline: though this was diffused, and the Prelates frustrated their power.

Sect. 45. I shall recite the words of Reverend User for the proof of this, Reduction of Episcopacy, &c. [By Order of the Church of England all Presbyters are charged (in the Book of Ordination) to administer the Doctrine of Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Realm hath received the same; and that they might be better understand what the Absentes sin:] Lord hath commanded therein, the exhortation of St. Paul nec locum to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus is appointed to be read unto them at the time of their Ordination, Take heed unto your selves and to all the flock, among whom the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to Rule the Congregation of God which he hath purchased with his Blood. Of the many Elders who thus in common ruled the Church of Ephesus, there was one President, whom our Saviour in his last sum cum collegis meis...
Epistle unto this Church in a peculiar manner filleth the Angel of the Church of Ephesus. And Ignatius in another Epistle written about twelve years after unto the same Church, calleth the Bishop thereof. Betwixt the Bishop and the Presbyterie of that Church, what an harmonious consent there was in the ordering of the Church Government, the same Ignatius doth fully there declare, by the Presbyterie with St. Paul, understanding the Community of the rest of the Presbyters or Elders who then had a hand not only in the delivery of the Doctrine and Sacraments, but also in the Administration of the Discipline of Christ: For further proof of which we have that known Testimony of Tertullian in his General Apology for Christians: In the Church are used exhortations, chastishments and divine censure, for judgment is given with great advice as among those who are certain they are in the sight of God; and it is the chiefest foreboding of the judgment which is to come, if any man have so offended that he be banished from the Community of Prayer, and of the Assembly, and of all holy fellowship. The Presidents that bear rule therein are certain approved Elders, who have obtained this honour not by Reward, but by good report, who were no other (as he himself intimates) elsewhere, but those from whose hands they used to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

For with the Bishop who was the chief President, (and therefore saith by the same Tertullian in another place, summus Sacerdos for distinction sake,) the rest of the dispensers of the Word and Sacraments joined in the common Government of the Church, and therefore where in matters of Ecclesiastical judicature, Cornelius Bishop of Rome used the received form of gathering together the Presbyterie, of what persons that did consist, Cyprian sufficiently declareth, when he wisheth him to read his Letters to the flourishing Clergy which there did preside or rule with him. The presence of the Clergy being thought so requisite in matters of Episcopal audience, that in the fourth Council of Carthage it was concluded, That the Bishop might hear no mans cause without the presence of the Clergy; and that otherwise the Bishops sentence should be void, unless it were confirmed by the presence of the Clergy.
which we find also to be inserted into the Canonps of Egbert, who was Archbishop of York in the Saxon times, and afterwards into the body of the Canon Law itself.

True it is that in our Church this kind of Presbyteryal Government hath been long disused, yet seeing it still professeth that every Pastor hath a right to rule the Church (from whence the name of Rector also was given at first unto him) and to administer the Discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the restraint of the exercise of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in this Realm; no man can doubt but by another Law of the Land, this hinderance may be well removed.

Sect. 46. And indeed the stream of Antiquity, and the Authors that are principally rested on for Episcopacy, are full against them that deny the Government of the people to the Presbyters; and it is the principal mischief of the English Prelacy, thus to degrade (or quod exercitium to suspend at least) all the Presbyters from their office: Not as it is a denying them any part of their honour (that's not to be much regarded;) but as it is a discharging them of their work and burden, and consequently leaving the Churches ungoverned. And for the Government of Presbyters themselves, in Cyprians days the Bishop did not, could not, Ordain, or censure any Presbyter without his Clergy, and Councils have decreed that so it should be. Yea and the plebs unius afo also was consulted with by Cyprian.

Sect. 47. And now I come to the Major of my Argument, which I prove thus. Either Ordination is an act of the exercise of the power of the Keyes, or of some other power: But of no other power: therefore of the Keyes. If it be the exercise of any other power, it is either of a secular power, or an Ecclesiastick: but neither of these, therefore of no other. Not of another Ecclesiastick power: for there is no Ecclesiastical power, (at least which Ordination can be pretended to belong to) but the power of the Keyes; not of a secular power; for that be-longeth not to Ministers, nor is it here pretended.

Sect. 48. And I think it will appear that the power of Baptizing, and judging who shall be taken for Christians, and who not, and the power of administering the Eucharist and Eucharistic actions in the Church, is as great as this of Ordination, especially
especially supposing that a Presbyterie must concur in this, and a single Presbyter may do the other. And therefore the one being granted them, the other cannot be denied.

Seet. 49. Argument 16. If the administrations of the Priests and Teachers in Christ's dayes among the Jews was Valid to the people, then the Ordination of our Presbyteries, and the administrations of our Priests so ordained are Valid to the people and receivers now: But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent. This Argument is managed so frequently and copiously by our Ministers heretofore against the Separatists, that I shall need to say but little of it.

Seet. 50. The Antecedent is proved easily from Scripture. Acts 13, 27. & 15. 21. shew that Moses and the Prophets were read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day, and Luke 16. 29. shews that it was the peoples duty to hear them, Mat. 23. 1, 2, 3. Then spoke Jesus to the multitude and to his Disciples saying, The Scribes and the Pharises sit in Moses seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do: but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not. ] Mat. 8. 4. Mark 1. 44. Luke 16. 29. But go thy way, shew thy self to the Priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which Moses commanded, &c. So that it was the peoples duty to hear, and submit to the Teachers and the Priests.

Seet. 51. The reason of the Consequence is, because these Priests and Teachers had not so good a Call as our Presbyters, to their Office, but were lyable to far more exceptions. The Priests were not of the line that God had by his Law appointed to succeed in the Priesthood: the succession had long failed, as to the just title of the Successors. The Priesthood was bought for money of the Civil Powers: and instead of being the Priest for life, he was oft changed every year: chosen by a Pagan Prince, and by him displaced: and most think there were two at once. The Scribes and Pharises had abominably corrupted the Law by their traditions and false expostions: and their Calling was much more defective then ours: so that if they must pass yet for Ministers of God, and their administrations be valid, then so must Presbyters and their administrations be esteemed much more. I know we need not this odious comparison of our Ministry with the Priests or Pharises, but to shew the adver-
faries the odiousness of their accusations, and grossness of their inferences.

Sect. 52. Argument 17. If Presbyters may make a Bishop, then they may make a Presbyter. But they may make a Bishop: therefore they may make (or ordain) a Presbyter. The Consequence of the Major is proved thus. 1. They that may confer the higher Degree, may confer the lower: the place of a Bishop is supposed the higher Degree, and the place of a Presbyter the lower. 2. The Bishops themselves require more power in or to the Consecration of a Bishop, then to the Ordination of a Minister, called a Presbyter. The latter may be done, according to their Canons, by one Bishop (with assisting Presbyters;) but the former must have three Bishops at the least.

Sect. 53. To this it is commonly answered, that Præcite the Ordination of a Presbyter, is a greater work then the making of a Bishop; and therefore the Major is denied. To which I reply. 1. I speak not of a Greater work, because the word greater is ambiguous, and may signify the greater change in regard of the Terminus a quo, which is not it that I intend. But the addition of an higher degree of power, may require more power to the effecting it, then the giving of the Lower degree, though the lower be praæcite the greater change: for the higher is the greater change as to the terminus ad quem; and as Episcopacy comprehendeth or supposeth Presbyterie, so the power of making a Bishop comprehendeth or supposeth the power of Ordaining Presbyters. It may be praæcite, (or cum praæcisione, as the Schoolmen speak;) it may be a greater work to make a beggar to be the chief Prince next to the King in a Kingdom: and yet fine praæcisione and in regard of the terminus ad quem it is a greater work to make him afterward a King; and doubtless the addition of this Power requireth the Greater power to effect it.

Sect. 54. Otherwise, if the Diffenters will stand to their answer, we shall from their own grounds infallibly overthrow their cause thus. It is a greater work to Baptize then to Ordain or Confirm; therefore he that may Baptize, may Ordain and Confirm. Just as making a Presbyter is cum praæcisione, and in respect to the terminus a quo, a greater work then Consecrating or making a Bishop; so Baptizing is cum praæcisione and in respect to the terminus a quo, a far greater work then Ordination;
the one making a Christian, and the other a Minister of a Christian. See Aquil. in Scotel. in 4. sent. d. 7. q. 2. pag. 816. of Confirmation.

Sect. 55. It is only the Minor therefore that will hold dispute, which I prove from the well known words of Hierom to Evagrius (which Bishop Usher told me he allledged to King Charls at the Isle of Wight to this end, when he was asked by him for an instance of Presbyters Ordaining) [Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui ceteris præponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trabens Christi Ecclesiam rumperet. Nam Alexandria à Marco Evangelista usque ad Hieroclæm & Dionysium, Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsoi gradum collocatum, Episcopum nominabant: quomodo ejus exercitus Imperatorem faciat: aut Diaconi elgant de se, quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent.] Presbyters then made the first Bishops at Alexandria.

Sect. 56. To this it is answered, that it was only Election of Bishops that Hierom ascribeth to the Alexandrian Presbyters, and not Ordination of them; for that was done by some other Bishops: and that it is Ordination that makes a man a Bishop.

Sect. 57. To this I reply: 1. Hierom here undertakes to tell us, how Bishops were made at Alexandria; but maketh not the least mention of other Ordination or Consecration, then these words express as done by the Presbyters: And therefore till they prove it, we must take the affirmation of another Ordination to be but the groundless presumption of the Assertors. 2. Hierom doth purposely bring this as an argument, to prove the identity first, and the meanness afterward, of Bishops and Presbyters, that [Presbyters made Bishops:] which would have been no argument, if it was not Presbyters but Prelates that made them, and if the Presbyters only chose them; for, 3. The people may choose a Bishop, as well as the Presbyters, and ordinarily did it: and yet this proveth not that the people were near the Bishop in degree; that which the people themselves may do, and frequently did, is not the only thing that Hierom here ascribeth to the Presbyters: but such is the Election of a Bishop: therefore, &c. 4. It is the Original or first making of Prelates at Alexandria that Hierom here speaks of, which he shews was from the Presbyters consent. This appeareth plainly in his words.
words (though some can make the plainest words to signify what they would have them). For 1. He begins with a [Presbyteris, id est Episcopis, ] and 2. proceedeth from many scripture passages, to prove them in scripture times the same: and that not only quod nomen, but officium; for 3. When he had done with the Testimonies of Saint John in his two Epistles, he immediately addeth [Quod antem postea manus electus est, quiccatris praponefetur &c. ] where note, both that [manus qui cataris praponefetur ] is more then the bare name: and also that [ Postea ] referreth to the date of John's Epistles, and therefore he plainly averreth, that it was after John's Epistles, that [one was chosen to be before the rest. ] 5. And to the Answer I further reply, that here is all that was done, and all that was needfull to be done, ascribed to the Presbyters: For 1. They elected one. 2. They did in excelliori gradu electum collocare, place him in an higher degree, and 3. Episcopum nominabant: they named him the Bishop (by way of excellency.) And if Election and placing him in the Degree, and giving him peculiarly the name, be not Ordination, then Ordination is but some Ceremoni; for these contain the substance. 6. And Hierom expressly resembelth this action of the Presbyters to an Armies making an Emperour or General; as if he had said, As the Army makes an Emperour (Imperatorem faciunt ) so Presbyters made the Bishop: but the Army so made the Emperour, that they left it not to another power to make him (and to them only.) So that it is both [Making a Bishop ] that is here ascribid to the Presbyters, and [such a making ] as leaveth him not unmade, to the making of another. 7. And he resembelth it to the making of an Arch-deacon, supposing that the Deacons do it. 2. Judge of the person (quem industrium noverint. ) 3. And give him the name ( & Archi diaconum vocant. ) 8. And he affirmeth this to be (semperr) the constant custom of the Alexandrian Presbyters, till the dayes of Heraclias and Dionysius: intimating that then the custom changed: but what custom was then changed? Not the Election of a Bishop by the Presbyters, (with the people) for that continued long after: and therefore it must be the Constitution, which afterward was done by Neighbour Bishops in Consecration, but till then by the Election, Collocation, and nomination of the Presbyters of that City-Church.

Alphonsus à Cittio both maintain that Hierom's opinion was indeed the same that from his plain and frequent expressions we averre it to be, and rebuketh them that pretend the contrary. Hector Benthians (before cited) faith (Scot. Hftor. 1. 7. fol. 128. b.) that Ante Palladium Populi Suftringis ex Monachis & Cullis pontifices adjurerent. No Bishop then ordained them but Presbyters.

And Balbus ( Cont. 14. c. 6. ) faith that beareant antea Scotia fuis Episcopos ac Minifloros ex orbi Divini Menfifterio plebium suffragis electos, prout Athenorum more fieri apud Britanniies videbant.
Having shewed thus, that Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and in the beginning called them by the same name, he affirmes that [Omnis Apostolorum successores sunt] that is, All these Bishops. 10. And he plainly affirmes that the difference is made by Riches and Poverty: He is the greater that is the richer, and he is the inferior that is the poorer. [Potentia divitiarum & pascpertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorum Episcopum facit.] Let any impartial Reader peruse the Epistle itself, and condefine of these ten passages, and then believe if he can, either that Hierom did imply that other Bishops made these Alexandrian Bishops, and not the Presbyters, or that these Presbyters altered but the name, and gave not the Bishop his new degree, or that this was not a thing that was now de novo in remedium schismatis contrived or performed by them. There is evidence enough against these conceits.

Sect. 58. And further, for them that think it was but the name that was now changed, I would ask them these few Questions, (supposing them to be of their mind, that tell us that Inferior Presbyters were not instituted in Scripture-times, and that it was only Prelates that are called Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture.) 1. Is it not strange, that when after Scripture-times, a New Office was made, it should not have a new Name also; but should have the same name with the old superior office? 2. And is it not strange that both names of the superior Office (Bishop and Presbyter) should be commonly given to the new inferior Office, at the first? 3. And strange that the Church must afterward be put to change the names, and retrench or recall the name of a Bishop from the new sort of Presbyters, and confine it to the old, leaving (as old) the name of a Presbyter to the new inferior Office. 4. And if in Scripture-times (in the days when John wrote his Epistles and Revelation) the names of Bishop and Presbyter were both appropriated to Prelates, there being no Inferior Presbyters then instituted; and yet from Mark the Evangelist, the Alexandrian Presbyters brought back the name of a Bishop to the Prelates, retaining the name Presbyter themselves, Quo pro How long time was there after the Institution of Inferior Presbyters, till the regulating of their names, from the days of Mark? About thirty four years backward. Mark dyed in the eighth year of Nero, and the Presbyters
Presbyters made Ariannus Bishop after his death, who continued twenty two years, even from the eighth of Nero, to the fourth of Domitian, as Euseb. in Histor. Eccles. l. 2. cap. 23, & lib. 3. cap. 12, & in Chronic. & Hieronym. in Catalog. & ex Unit. Usher Annu. Vol. 2. ad an. Dom. 67. pag. 677. And Helvius and others are near the same time. And faith Helvius, John wrote the Revelations about the fourteenth year of Domitian, and wrote his Gospel about the first year of his Successor Nerva. So that Mark dyed about thirty six years (or thirty four at least) before John wrote his Gospel; so that here you have your choice, whether you will believe, that subject Presbyters did regulate the names of themselves and Bishops, and did elect (or make, Bishops thirty six years before they were instituted themselves; or whether you will believe, that yet at the death of Mark there were no inferior Presbyters at Alexandria, and so no superior Bishops, for all this that Hierom doth report.

Sect. 59 As for the Episcopal Divines that dissent from the Principle of the forecited Learned Author (who faith that there is no evidence that any of the second sort of Presbyters were instituted in Scripture times) I need not deal with them in this Disputation: for all of them that ever I yet met with, do grant the validity of Presbyters Ordination, and the truth of the Reformed Churches and their Ministry, and Ordinances: otherwise it were easie enough to vindicate all these from them also, if they denied them.

Sect. 60. Argument 18. Ad hominem. If the late English Prelates had a lawful call to their Prelacy, then much more have Ministers Ordained by Presbyters a lawfull call to their Ministry. But the Prelates say that they had a lawfull Call to their Prelacy therefore, & c. The reason of the Consequence (which only will be denied) is, 1. Because the Presbyters are Ordained to an Office that is of Christ's Institution; but the Prelates are Consecrated to an Office that is not of Christ's Institution, but against it, and against the light of Nature (in taking on them the impossible Government of an hundred, or many hundred Churches) as was shewed in the former Disputation. 2. Because the Prelates hold an uninterrupted Succession of Legitimate Ordination necessary to the Being of their Prelacie (I mean, such as now we dispute against, hold this) but so do not
the Presbyters. The said dissenting Prelates are still upon their Non quod non habet; which therefore we may urge upon them. And 1. They cannot prove an uninterrupted Succession themselves, on whom it is incumbent, according to their principles, if they will prove their Call. 2. We can prove that they are the successors of such as claimed all their Power from the Roman Vicechrist, and professed to receive it from him, and hold it of him as the Catholick Head, and so that their Ordination comes from a seat that hath had many interruptions, and so had no power of Ordination, by their Rule: For when the succession was so oft and long interrupted, Non habet: and therefore all that followed must be usurpers and no Popes: and those that received their Offices from them must be no Officers: But the Presbyters that Ordain will give a better proof of their Call then this.

Sect. 61. Argument 19. Where the Office is of Gods Institution, and the persons are endued with Ministerial abilities, and are Orderly and duly designed and separated to the Office of the sacred Ministry, there are true Ministers, and Valid administrations. But all these are found in the Reformed Churches that have Ordination without Prelates: therefore, &c. The Major is undeniable, as containing a sufficient enumeration of all things necessary to the Being of the Ministry.

Sect. 62. The Minor is proved by parts. 1. That the Office of a Presbyter is of divine institution, is confessed by most: And I suppose those that deny it to be of Scripture institution, will yet have it to be Divine: But if they deny that, yet it sufficeth us, that it is the same officer that they call a Bishop, and we a Presbyter; that is, the chief Pastor of a particular Church.

Sect. 63. 2. And that the persons are duly or competently qualified for the Ministry, nothing but Ignorance, Faction and Malice, that ever I heard of, do deny. (Supposing the humane frailties, that make us all insufficient gradually for these things) The Ignorant that know not what the Ministerial qualifications are, do judge as carnal interest leadeth them. The Factious rail at all that be not of their mind. Grotius thought the opinions of the Calvinists made them unfit materials for the Catholick Edifice that by his Pacification he was about to frame. So do most other Sects, reject those as unworthy that suit not with their
their minds. And malice (whether animated by Heresie, Prophaness or Carnal interest) will easily find faults, and unweariedly flander and reproach: But besides such I meet with none that dare deny the competent abilities of these Ministers.

Sec. 64. And 3. That the persons are orderly and duly separated to the work of the Ministry is thus proved. Where there is a separation to the Ministry by mutual Consent of the person and the flock, and by the Magistrates authority, and by the approbation and Investiture of the fittest Ecclesiastical officers that are to be had, there is an orderly and due separation to the Ministry; But all this is to be found in the Ordination used in England and other Reformed Churches, without Prelates: therefore &c. This proves not only the Validity of their Ordination, but the full Regularity.

Sec. 65. God himself (as hath been shewed) doth by his Law appoint the Office of the Ministry, imposing the duty upon the person that shall be called, and giving him his power, by that Law. And then there is nothing to be done, but to determine of the person that is to receive this power and solemnly to put him in Possession by Investiture. Now the principal part of the former work is done also by God himself: by his Qualifying the person with his eminent Gifts, and giving him opportunities and advantages for the Work. So that the people and Odainers have no more to do but to find out the man that God hath thus qualified, and to elect, approve and invest him; and usually he is easily found out, as a candle in the night. So that the two great acts by which God maketh Ministers, is his Instituting Law that makes the office, and his Spiritual and Natural Endowments given to the person; which the Church is but to find out, and call into use and exercise. And therefore we may still truly say, that the Holy Ghost maketh Pastors or Overseers of the Church, as well as formerly he did (Acts 20.28.) because he giveth them their Gifts, though not such Miraculous Gifts as some then had; By his common Gifts of Knowledge and Utterance, and his special Gifts of Grace, it is the Spirit that still makes Ministers, and still Christ giveth Pastors to the Church.

Sec. 66. It is therefore to be noted that, Eph. 4. 6, 7, 8, 11. the way of Christ's giving officers to his Church is said to be by [giving Gifts to men:] and the diversity of Offices is founded in the
diversity of the Measure of Grace, (or these Gifts)—[To every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Therefore he saith, Ascending on high he led captivity captive, and gave Gifts to men (ξηρα πρατη) — And he gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers] So that giving Gifts, and giving Apostles, Prophets, &c. are here made the same work of God: Not that the Trial and Approbation of these gifts is hereby made unnecessary, but that this is God's principal act by which he giveth Pastors and Teachers to the Church, and by which the Officers are distinguished. For the Church is to discern and submit to those that are thus gifted: and to follow the Spirit, and not either contradict or lead him. When God hath thus gifted men, the main work is done, for making them Ministers (if withall he give them opportunities and advantages for the work) and it is the Churches Duty to own and Approve these Gifts of God, and to do their parts to introduce the person: And if the Ordinators refuse this, in case of Necessity, the gifted person is bound to improve his Gifts without them. I say [in case of Necessity] using the best Order that is left.

Sect. 67. This being premised, I come to the Argument (§. 64.) And the Major is undeniable, because there are all things enumerated, that are Necessary to the determination of the person qualified, that is to receive the power from Christ.

Sect. 68. And the Minor I prove by parts. 1. That our Ministry have usually the peoples consent, is a known case that needs no proof: 2. So is it that they have the Magistrates allowance, and his Authority appointing Approvers for their Introduction, and allowing Ordination and commanding Ministerial Works.

Sect. 69. And doubtless the Magistrate himself hath so much Authority in Ecclesiastical affairs, that if he command a qualified person to preach the Gospel, and command the people to receive him, I see not how either of them can be allowed to disobey him: (Though yet the party ought also to have recourse to Pastors for Ordination, and people for consent, where it may be done.) And Grotius commendeth the saying of Musculus, that would have no Minister question his Call, that being qualified, hath the Christian Magistrates Commission. And though
this assertion need some limitations, yet it is apparent that Magistrates power is great about the Offices of the Church. For Solomon put out Abiathar from the Priesthood, and put Zadok in his place, 1 Kings 2. 27, 35. David and the Captains of the host separated to Gods service those of the sons of Asaph and of Heman and of Jeduthun who should Prophecie with Harps, &c. 1 Chron 16. 4. And so did Solomon, 2 Chron. 8. 14, 15. They were for the service of the house of God, according to the Kings Order, 1 Chron. 25. 1, 6. And methinks those men should acknowledge this, that were wont to stile the King [In all causes, and over all persons the suprem Head and Governor.]

Sect. 70. But 3. We have moreover in the Ordination of the Reformed Churches, The approbation and solemn Investiture of the fittest Ecclesiastical Officers that are to be had. And no more is requisite to an orderly Admission. There being nothing for man to do, but to determine of the qualified person, and present him to God to receive the power and obligation from his Law; it is easy to discern, that where all these concur (the Peoples Election or Consent, the Magistrates Authority, the determination of fit Ecclesiastical Officers, and the qualification and consent of the person himself,) there needs no more to the designation of the man. Nor hath God tied the essence of the Church or Ministry, to a certain formality, or to the interest or will of Prelates: nor can any more ad ordinem be required, but that a qualified person do enter, by the best and most orderly way that is open to him in those times and places where he is. And that we have the fittest Approvers and Ordainers, I prove.

Sect. 71. If the most of the Protestant Churches have no other Ecclesiastical Officers to Ordain but Presbyters, then is it the most fit and orderly way to enter into the Ministry in those Churches by their Ordination, and those Presbyters are the fittest that are there to Ordain. But the Antecedent is a known truth. If any in denial of the Consequence say, that the Churches should rather be without Ministers then have Ordination by such, they are confuted by what is said before.

Sect. 72. And if you say, that they should have Bishops, and it is their own fault that they have not; I answer, Suppose that were a granted truth, it can reach, but to some that have the Rule.
Rule: It is not the fault of every Congregation, or exponent of the Ministry: It is not in their power to alter Laws and forms of Government: and therefore they are bound to enter by the fittest way that is open to them.

Sect. 73. Moreover, even in England; the Presbyteries are fitter for Ordination then the present Bishops: (as to the Nation in general): therefore the Ordination by Presbyteries is done by the fittest Ecclesiastical officers, and is the most regular and desirable Ordination.

Sect. 74. I prove the Antecedent by comparing the Ordination of the Presbyteries and the present Prelates. 1. I have before shewed that the English Prelacy is more unlike the Primitive Episcopacy, then our Parochial Presbytery or Episcopacy is; and therefore hath less reason to appropriate to themselves the Power of Ordaining. 2. The Ordaining Presbyters are Many, and known persons; and the Prelates few, and to the most (and except three or four, to almost all that I am acquainted with ) unknown. 3. The Presbyters Ordain Openly where all may be satisfied of the impartiality and Order of their proceedings: But the Prelates Ordain in Private, where the same satisfaction is not given to the Church. 4. Hereupon it is easy for any vagrant to counterfeit the Prelates secret Orders, and say he was Ordained by them, when it is no such matter; and who can disprove him? But the publick Ordination of Presbyters is not so easily pretended by such as have it not, and the pretence is easily discovered. 5. The Prelates for ought I hear, are very few, and therefore few can have access to them for Ordination: But Presbyteries are in most countreyes. 6. The Prelates, as far as I can learn, Ordain Ministers without the peoples consent over whom they are placed, and without giving them any notice of it before hand, that they may put in their exceptions if they dissent. But the Presbyters ordinarily require the consent of the people; or at least will hear the reasons of their dissent. 7. The Presbyteries Ordain with the Magistrates allowance, and the Prelates without and against them. Those therefore that are Ordained by Prelates usually, stand on that foundation alone, and want the consent of People and Magistrates; when those that are Ordained by Presbyteries have all. 8. Ordination by Prelates is now pleaded for on Schismatical grounds, and in submitting
mitting to it, with many of them, we must seem to consent to their Principles (that all other Ordination is Null, and the Churches are no true Churches that are without it.) But Presbyteries Ordain not on such dividing terms. 9. We hear not of so much care in the Prelates Ordinations in these or former times, as the Presbyteries; I could give some instances even of late of the great difference, which I will not offend them with expressing. 10. Most of them that we hear of, Ordain out of their own Diocesses, which is against the ancient Canons of the Church. 11. Some of them by their Doctrines and their Nullifying all the Reformed Churches and Ministry that have no Prelates, do shew us that if they had their will, they would yet make more lamentable destructive work in the Church then the hottest persecutors of their late predeceffors did. For it is plain that they would have all the Ministers disowned or cast out, that are not for the Prelacy. And what a case then would this land (and others) be in? (Of which more anon.) So that we have reason to fear that these are destroyers, and not faithful Pastors. I speak not of all, but only of the guilty: For again I say, we very much Reverence such Learned, Worthy men as Bishop Morton, Bishop Brownrigg, and some others yet surviving are. 12. The Ordination by Prelates, as things now stand, endangereth mens liberty in the exercise of the Ministry, by some things in the Manner which I shall not mention. Review the rest that I said before in Cap. 5. and 6. and then judge, Whether he that in these dayes is Ordained by a Learned Grave Presbytery (and perhaps where a City Pastor is Moderator or President, and many of the Ordainers are the fixed Presidents or Bishops of a Parochial Church, having a Presbytery where they preside,) I say, Whether such be not separated to the Ministry in the most orderly way that is now to be found eifistent? and come not in at the door that God would have them to enter at.

Sect. 75. It is strange that those men (among the Papists) that allow of the Cardinals choosing a Pope, and exercising so much Government as they do over all the Christian world, and all this under the name of Presbyters of Rome, should yet be against Ordination by such Presbyters as are indeed Parochial Bishops, and accuse it to be a Nullity. I see not how these things cohere.
Se<ft. 76. But yet many Papists are more moderate in this, than those at home that we now deal with. That Erasimus, Richardus Armachanus, Guilel. Durantes, and many more of them, were on our side in this point, is commonly known, and manifested by abundance of our writers, some of them Bishops, and some Episcopal Divines themselves.

Se<ft. 77. And divers of their Schoolmen do maintain that the
[Ordo Episcopalis non differt a Caracithere Sacerdotali, nisi sic ut forma intensa a se ipsa remissa] as Socinus relateth (in 4. Sent. d. 25.) the sentence of Paludanus, which Voetius recites.

And the same Socinus, and Voetius after him do cite Anreolus, proving that Gradus Episcopalis & Sacerdotum non sunt distinctae potestates, &c. Quia Sacerdos authoritate Papa potest Sacerdotem in istiuere. Ergo non differunt potestas Episcopalis & Sacerdotis, nisi sic ut potestas impedita & non impedita: quae tamen est eadem. Antecedens probatur, quia omnis virtus activa, non impedita, potest transfundere seipsum. To the same purpose Cusanus and many more.

Se<ft. 78. Hence it is that Presbyters have of old had a place in Councils, yea and a suffrage too; and the Council of Basili did decide and practise it: which is allowed by many of the Papists. And hence it is that divers of the Papists do make Episcopal preeminency to be but of Ecclesiastical Institution.

Se<ft. 79. That the Chorepiscopi did ordain, and their Ordination was Valid, though they were not accounted Bishops (any otherwise then our Parochial Bishops are) is a thing that hath been spoken of so oft, and by so many, even Bishops themselves, that I shall pass it by.

Se<ft. 80. And faith Voetius, even among the Papists, the Abbots and such regular Prelates that are no Bishops, and the Chapter of Canons may Ordain; yea and exercise other acts of Jurisdiction, as excommunicating, &c. It is not therefore proper to the Bishops.

Se<ft. 81. It is therefore as Hierom speaks of Confirmation by a Bishop only, in honore Sacerdotii, a matter of Ecclesiastical institution for Order, and not of Divine institution that Presbyters without Prelates should not Ordain: As Leo first Bishop of Rome faith (Epistol. 86. ad Episcop. Gall. & German.) there are Quadam Sacerdotibus Prohibitis per Canones Ecclesiasticos.
It is the Canons that forbid Presbyters to Ordain, and not the Scriptures that never knew a Presbyter without the power to Ordain.

Sect. 82. Were there no Ordainers to do that office, or none but such as would oblige us to sin, it were God's regular way to enter by the Peoples choice and the Magistrates authority without them, this being in such case the open door: therefore it is more evidently God's Regular way, when we have both these and the best Ministerial Ordination besides, that is on good terms to be had. I do not only here plead that such a Ministry is not Null (as I did before) but that the entrance in such a case is not sinfull.

Sect. 83. There being nothing left to men herein, but the due designation of the person (before the reception of his power from God) the Peoples Election it self may serve for that designation, where Ministerial Approbation is not to be had. But the ordinary course, where Neceffity doth not prohibit us, is that all three concur, viz. The Consent of the people, because we cannot Teach and Rule them against their wills: 2. The Approbation of the Ministry, because they are best able to judge of mens abilities. 3. The Allowance of the Magistrate, for the orderly and advantageous exercise of our office. But the first is of the greatest neceffity of the three.

Sect. 84. That the people have power of Election, when just authority (Civil or Ecclefaftical) doth not suspend it or limit it, is so easily proved that it is commonly confessed. Its well known that for many hundred years the people had in most or many Churches the Choice of their Bishops or Pastors, or joyned with the Presbyterie and Ordainers in the choice. Blondellus, Voetius and many more have sufficiently proved this and other parts of the peoples interest, by unanswerable evidence.

Sect. 85. Cyprian faith that this is by Divine Ordination, Epift. 68. ( edit Goulartii ) p. 201. [ Propser quod plebs obsequens praeceptis Dominiciis, & Deum metuens, à peccatore præposito separare se debet, nec se ad Sacralegi Sacerdotis sa- crificia miscere, quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi: Quod & ipsum videmus de Divina autoritate descendere, ut Sacerdos plebe presente, &c. ]
sub omnium * oculus deligatur, & dignus aequi, idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur —— Coram omni Synagoga subest Deus constitut Sacrodos, id est, insinuit & ostentavit Ordinationes Sacrodales non nisi sub populi assistentis conscientia fieri oportere, ut plebe presente vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita pradicentur: & sit Ordinationis justa & legitima, quae omnium suffragio & judicio sueris examinata. Quod postea secondum Divina Magisteria observatur in Actis Apostolorum quando de Ordinando in locum Judae Episcopo Petrus ad plebem loquitur, surrexis inquit Petrus in medio discipulorum: quid autem cura in uno: Nec hoc in Episcoporum tantum & Sacerdorn, sed in Diaconorum Ordinationibus observasse Apostolorum animadversiones, de quibus & ipsos in Actis eorum scriptum est: Et convocaverunt, inquit illi duodecim totam plebem discipulorum —— Quod utique idcirco tam diligenter & cuncte convocata plebe tota gerebatur, nec quis ad altaris Ministerium, vel ad Sacerdotes locum indicium obrepere. Ordinari enim nonnamquam indignos non secundum Dei voluntatem, sed secundum humanum presumptionem, & hoc Deodisplicer, quae non veniant ex legitima & justa Or- natione, Dens ipse manifestat per Olee Prophetam dicens, sibi ipsi consituerunt Regem, & non per me. Propter quod diligenter de traditione Divina & Apostolica observatione observandum est & tenendum, quod apud nos quosque, & effer Provincias universas ten- tur, ut ad Ordinationes vete celebrazandas, ad camp plebem cui prepos- situs ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provincia proximis quiq; conveni- niant, & Episcopus deligatur plebe presente, qua singularum vitam plexifime novit, & minucjusq; actum de eis conversatione perspexit. † Quod & apud vos factum videmus in Sabini collega nostro ordinatione, ut de universa fraternitas suffragio & de Episcoporum qui in praesentia convenissent, quiq; de eo ad vos literas fecerant judicio, Episcopatus ei desferretur, & manus ei in locum Basilidis imponeretur. † And so he goes on to shew that even the Bishop of Rome, restoring of Basiliades, was not valid to rescind the foresaid Ordination of Sabinius, which was thus made by the Bishops on the peoples suffrages. And yet our Diosceans have
have, alas, too commonly thrust on the people against their consent, such unworthy persons, as of whom we may say as Cyprian (ibid.) of these, [Cumq; alia multa sint & gravia delicta quibus Basilides & Martialis implicati tenentur; frustra tales Episcoporum sibi usurpare conantur, cum manifestum sit ejusmodi homines nec Ecclesia Christi posse praesse, nec Deo sacrificia efferrre debere.] I have cited these words at large, because they are full and plain to shew us the practice of those times, and are the words of an African Syrach, and not of Cyprian alone, and shew that then the People had the chiefest hand in the Election or designation of the person, which is it that I have now to prove.

Sect. 86. Pamælius himself while he seeks to hide the shame of their Prelates Ordination, from the light of these passages of Cyprian doth yet confess and say, [Non negamus veterem Electionis Episcoporum ritum, quo plebe presente, immo & suffragiis plebis eligi solent. Nam in Africa illum observatum constat ex electione Eradii Successoris D. Augustini, de quo existat Epistola ejus. 120. In Gracia atate Chrysost. ex lib. 3. de Sacer. In Hispanis ex hoc Cypriani loco, & Isidor. lib. de Officiis. In Galliis, ex Epist. Celestin. Pap. 2. Rome, ex iis que supradiximus, Epist. ad Anton. Ubij; etiam alibi ex Epist. Leonis 87, Et perdurasse cam consuetudinem ad Gregor. 1. usq; ex ejus Epistolis: immo & ad temporae usq; Caroli & Ludovici Imperatorum, ex 1. lib. Capitolorum corundem satis constat.] This full confession from the mouth of an adversary, may save me the labour of many more allegations concerning the judgement and practice of the ancient.

Seet. 87. He that would see more may find enough in Voetius de Desparata causa Papæ us lib. 2. c. 12. Sect. 2. & passim. And in Blondel. de jure plebis: & Goulartius on the foresaid notes of Pamælius on Cyprian p. 205. Among others he there citeth those known Canons of the Carthage Councils, three and four out of Gratian: [Nullus ordinetur clericus nisi probatus, vel examine Episcoporum, vel populi testimonio] Et [Episcopus sine concilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinat, ipsis civium conniventiam & testimonium quaerat] (What and where is that Clergy without whose Council our Prelates Ordain not; and that people whose suffrages they require?) And saith Goulartius, [Observanda est Caroli ut & Ludovici Constitutio] Sacrorum Can-
nonum nonignari, ut Deine mine sacrosancta Ecclesia suo liberius potius honor, assensum Ordinis Ecclesiasticorum præbimus, ut Episcopi per Electionem Cleri & populi, secundum statuta Canonum eligantur. ] Its certain then that the people were sometime the sole choosers, and the Pastors the approvers; and sometime the People and the Pastors joynt Electors; and sometime the Pastors chose, but forced none on the people, against or without their Consent (as Pamellius confesseth) till Popular tumults, divisions, and other reasons occasioned the change of this ancient Custom. And therefore it is most certain, that an Election by the people may be a valid determination of the person.

Seer. 88. And the person being once sufficiently determined of, the power and obligation doth fall upon him immediately from God; so that were it not that the Pastors Approbation is part of the Determination, there would be nothing left for Ordination, but the solemnizing of their entrance by Investiture, which is not essential to the Ministerial Office, but ad bene esse, makes to a compleat and orderly possession, where it may be had; and where it cannot, Election may suffice.

Seer. 89. Voetius, de Desperata causa Papatus, lib. 2. sect. 2. cap. 20. doth by seven Arguments prove against Fanstius, Electionem tribunere Ministerium: & esse propriiss fundamentum. The first Argument is from the Definition of Election: the second from the Canon Law, which giveth a Bishop his power before Consecration, and gives the Pope a power of governing the Church before he is inthroned or Consecrated. The third is a similibus, in Oeconomie and Policie: the foundation of marriage-union is mutual Consent, and not Solemnization. Coronation (faith he) doth not make a King (he means, not fundamentally, but compleatively,) but hereditary Succession or Election. He may well be a King without Coronation, as (faith he) the custom is in Castile, Portugal, &c. The King of France dependeth not pro ipse regni on the Archbishop of Rheims, but faith Barclay, hath the right and honour of a King before his Coronation. An elect Emperour governeth before his Coronation. Quoad potestatem administrandi regni (Gallici) unius & Coronatio nihil addunt inquit Commentator sanctionis pragmatic, fol. 4. His fourth Argument is from the nature of all Relations; quæ posto fundamenta & termino, in sub-
He calleth dicatur existere: atqui Solemnizatio, seu Conssecratio, seu Ordination, seu Investitura (ἐπιτομονδὸν vocant pares Graci) illa externa quam nos confirmationem dicimus, neque est fundamentum, neque terminus Ministerii, aut Ministri; sed legitima electio & xecleutia Ecclesia est fundamentum Ministerii, & ista vel illa particularis Ecclesia est terminus, in quo est correlatum Oves seu discipuli, ad quod referetur relation Doctoris seu Pastoris.

Though some of this need explication and limitation, yet it is worthy consideration.) His fifth Argument is from the Confessions of the Adversaries, citing Sylvest. Prieras, Immanuel Sa, Ompbrisus, Navarrus, yea Bellarmine and Pope Nicolas, who maintain that In summum Pontificem post Electionem nulla alia requiriatur confirmatio; quia statim ut electus est suscipit administrationem. And to this agree their Practice, who at the Council of Trent had many Bishops merely Elect, and Elect Cardinals are admitted to Elect a Pope. His sixth Argument is, Quod Conssecratio seu Investitura potest absque aliquo in Casu: Electio autem nunquam: ergo fundamentum Ministerii seu potestatis Ecclesiastica est Electio & non Conssecratio; which he endeavour to confirm. My opinion of the fundamentum potestatis, I have expressed in my Christian Concord otherwise: but yet I consent, as is there expressed, to the Necessity of the peoples Consent to our Office.

Sect. 90. Argument 20. If those in the Reformed Churches that are Ordained by Presbyters, have as good a call to the Ministerial Office, as the Princes of the Nations (yea any one of them) have to their Soveraignty or Power, then are they true Ministers of Christ, and their administrations valid to the Churches, and their Ministry to be received. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent. And I prove them both.

Sect. 91. The Secular power will be granted, as to the most (at least) of Christian Princes and other Soveraigns: when the Holy Ghost commandeth Submission to the Higher Powers, even when they are Heathen, and come in as Nero did, Rom. 13, we may well take it for granted that Christian Magistrates, that have no better title then he, are such as we must be subject to: even those that have not so lawful an entrance, as may justify their possession, or free them from the guilt of flat Usurpation.
before God, may yet be such, while they are in possession, as we must be subject to for Conscience sake: and all their administrations are as valid to the innocent subjects, as if they had as good a title as the best. They that deny this, must overthrow almost all the Common-wealth's on Earth, and turn Subjection into Rebellion.

Sect. 92. The Consequence then is proved from the parity of Reason, in both cases. The title of such Princes is so far good, as that Subjection is due to them, and their Government valid: our title to the Ministry is at least as good as theirs: therefore submission or obedience is due to us, and our administrations valid to the Church. And that our title is as good as theirs, will appear by a due comparison.

Sect. 93. 1. God is equally the Author of our Office, and of theirs. He that appointed the Magistrate to Rule by force, appointed the Ministry to Teach, and Guide, and Worship publickly before the Church. There is no Power but of God: even Magistrates could have none, unless it were given them from above. 2. Usurpation therefore is a sin in Magistrates as well as Ministers. And there is the same reason, why it should invalidate their actions, as ours, if we were guilty of it. 3. The Dissenters rule [Nemo dat quod non habet] concerneth the Magistrate as much as the Minister, and somewhat more. A man may do more in works of service to others without a special Office, than in Magisterial Government: Magistracy is a Relation that must have a foundation or efficient cause, as well as Ministry. If a Giver that himself hath the Power given, is necessary to make Ministers, then also to make Magistrates (which yet is false in both, if you speak of humane Donation to the Sovereign) The effect can no more be without a cause in them than in us. 4. If the Election or Consent of the people be enough to make a Magistrate, or to be the foundation or donation (as they suppose) of his authority, then much more may the election or consent of the people, with the approbation and investiture by Presbyters, and allowance of the Magistrate, prove those in question to be true Ministers. 5. No Prince on earth that ever I heard of, can prove any thing like an uninterrupted succession of legitimate Princes from a Predecessor immediately authorized by God. If Hereditary Princes that are the Success-
fors of Usurpers are not to be obeyed, it will be hard to find an Hereditary Prince that is to be obeyed: so that their case is worse then the case of Ministers.

Sect. 94. For, though 1. No Pastors on Earth can prove an uninterrupted Succession of persons lawfully Ordained. 2. Nor is it necessary to prove a Local succession; because God hath not tyed his Church to Towns or Countries, and a Church and Pastor that are banished into another Land, may there be the same Church and Pastor, though in and of another place: yet 1. We have a succession of possession in the Office itself. 2. And a succession of actual Ordination in great probability: no man can prove against us that we receive our Ministry from any that were not actually Ordained. Yet this much is not Necessary to our Office.

Sect. 95. Object. But Christ hath tyed the Office of the Ministry to a legitimate Ordination; but he hath not tyed the Magistracy to a lawful Title. Answ. Here are two falshoods barely affirmed, or implied. One is that a just Title is less necessary to the Magistrate then the Minister; when the Reason of both is the same. Title is the foundation of Right. Magistracie is a Right of Governing. No Relation can be without its Foundation. The other is, that God hath tyed the Office of the Ministry to a legitimate Ordination. This is unproved, and I have proved the contrary before. It is our Duty to enter by Legitimate Ordination where it may be had; and thus we do. But if any of our Predecessors (perhaps a thousand or five hundred years ago) did enter otherwise, that doth not invalidate our Ordination or Ministry, nor is it any of our sin.

Sect. 96. As Ministers were at first Ordained by Imposition of hands, so Kings were chosen by God, and (in the Church) anointed by a Prophet, or special Officer of God; and sometime by the people (that is, by their suffrages appointing it, or consenting to it) as appeareth, 1 Sam. 10. 1. & 15. 17. & 16. 13. & 24. 6. 2 Sam. 2. 4. 7. & 5. 3. & 12. 7. & 19. 10. 1 Kin. 1. 45. & 5. 1. 2 Kin. 11. 12. & 23. 30. 2 Chron. 22. 7. so that there is as much in Scripture for this manner of their investiture, as there is for Ministers Ordination by imposition of hands; yet may they be Kings that have no such Investiture; much less all their predecessors. We then that have a due Investiture, may prove
prove our Ministry, whatever our predecessors had.

Sect. 97. I come now to the Arguments of the adversaries of our Ministry, which I need not stand long on, because they are few and scarce considerable, and sufficiently answered in what is said. And first its said by a Learned man (Dissertat. de Episcop. contra Blondel, Præmonit. ad Leitor. sect. 4. 13.) [Nos illud in hâc disputatione pro concessâ posseum censebimus. Neminem rectè dare quod non habet: eumque aut eos qui hoc potestate indui nullâ sibi fuerint. sine violâtione aut sacrilegia quodam sibi arrogare aut assumere aut aliis aequi à Deo non vocatis, aut missis communicare neuntiâ quâm posse. [Illud hic nobis unicum meminisse sufficit, unum quemque in Anglica Ecclesia ab Episcopis ordinatum Presbyterum, nulla ordinandi alior facultate (aut per se, aut quâ quolibet comparâm catu munitem) præsitum esse, nec igitur eam sibi relictum arrogare posse, quam si Dianorum, immo Laicorum munem, aut plures, tali potestate nullatenus indui, idem autem sit.] The summ is: Presbyters have not this power: therefore they cannot give it.

Sect. 98. Answ. If the Argument run thus [No man can give that which he hath not: Presbyters have not the Office of a Presbyter: therefore they cannot give it.] I then deny the Minor: They are not Presbyters, if they have not the Office of a Presbyter: that therefore which they have (to speak in the Dißenters language) they may give.

Sect. 99. But if the Argument be this [No man can give that which he hath not: Presbyters have not a power of Ordaining: therefore they cannot give a power of Ordaining.] I answer as followeth. 1. We receive not our Office by the Gift of man, whether Presbyters or Prelates. The Power is immediately from Christ, and men do but open us the door, or determine of the person that shall from Christ receive the power, and then put him solemnly into possession. It is the first Error of the adversaries, to hold that this power is given by men as first having it themselves. In the Popes case Bellarmine himself will grant us this (Respons. ad 7 Theol. Venet. p. 246. 232.) [Sapè (inquit) jam dictum est, Electionem Cardinalium non conferre potestatem, sed designare tantummodo personam, cui Deus potestatem tribuit.] And yet that [Insummo Pontifice post electionem nulla alia requisitum confirmatio, quia statim ut electus est, suscipit administrationem,
stiationem, ut declarat Nicol. Papa Can. in nomine, dis. 23. pag. 175. And of the Power of Princes, the Dissenters will grant it (for we have it in their writings) that the Power is from God immediately, though the people may elect the person. You will thrust out all Princes of the world by this Argument, and say, [No man giveth that which he hath not: the people have not a Power of Government: therefore they cannot give it.] I would answer you as here: God hath the Power, and he giveth it: but the people that have it not, may design the person that shall receive it from God: as the Burgess of a Corporation may choose a Major or Bayliff to receive that power from the Sovereign (by the Instrumentality of a Law or Charter) which they had not themselves to use or give. And so a Presbyterie (and sometime the people alone) may design the person that shall receive the Office of the Ministry from God, though they had it not themselves to use or give.

Sect. 100. Resp. 2. By this Argument and its supposition, none are true Ministers that are Ordained by Prelates: for they have not the Power of the Ministry to Give, but only to Use: no Ordination is a Giving of the Power, save only by way of Investiture, which supposeth a Title and Right before, and is not of absolute necessity to the Possession: for in several cases it may be without it.

Sect. 101. Resp. 3. A man may Instrumentally give or deliver both Right and Investiture in that which he hath not himself, nor ever had. Your servant may by your appointment, deliver a Leaf, a Deed of Gift, a Key, or twig and turf, for Possession of house and lands, though he never had house or lands or possession himself. It is sufficient that the Donor have it, that sends him.

Sect. 102. Resp. 4. Presbyters have the Power of Presbyters, or the Ministerial Office: and if they can give that (which certainly they have,) then they can give a Power of Ordaining other Presbyters. For to Ordain others, is no more then they do themselves in giving the Power or Office which they have: therefore if they may do it, those that they give their Power to may do it; that is, may also give others that power which they have.

Sect. 103. But as to our case in hand, it sufficeth that we prove,
prove, that Presbyters may give others the Office of Presbyters; whether this Office contain a Power of Ordaining, is another Question, but soon dispatch, if this be granted: because (as is said) to Ordain is nothing else but to invest others with the Office or Power which we have our selves.

Sect. 104. Resp. 5. The Argument maketh more against the Prelates Ordination, on another account; because that (as is proved already) that Species of Prelacie that was exercised in England (the sole Governours of an hundred or two hundred Churches) is so far contrary to the Word of God, that we may boldly conclude, that as such, they have no power to 
sise or give: their very Office is humane, and destructive of the true Pastoral Office: and therefore as such, they have less pretence of Divine Authority, then Presbyters, whose Office is of God. Yet do I not make their Ordination Null, because they were Presbyters as well as Prelates, and also were in Possession of the place of Ordainers, and had the Magistrates authority.

Sect. 105. Resp. 6. Presbyters have a Power of Ordaining: it is already proved. And to your confirmation (where you say that the Bishops gave them no such Power: therefore they have it not:) I answer: 1. I deny the Consequence. God gave it them: therefore they have it without the Bishops gift. 2. If by [Giving] you mean but an accidental Caufation, or the action of a Caufation qua non, or a designation of the Person that shall receive it, then I deny the Antecedent. The Prelates (and Electors) designed the person, and also invested him solemnly in the Office, which containeth this Power of Ordination which you deny them.

Sect. 106. Obj. The Prelates expressed no such thing in their Ordination. Anf. 1. It being not the Prelates but Christ that makes the Office, we must not go to the words of the Prelates, but of Christ to know what the Office is, though we may go to the Prelates (while the work was in their hands) to know who the person is. If a Prelate Consecrate a Prelate, and yet mention not particularly the works that are pretended to belong to a Prelate, you will not think him thereby restrained or disabled to those works. He that Crowneth a King, and they that choose him, though they name not the works of his Office and Power, do thereby choose him to all those works that belong to a King.
God hath set down in his Word, that the Husband shall be the Head or Governor of his Wife: if now the woman shall choose a certain person to be her Husband, and the Minister or Magistrate solemnize their Marriage, without any mention of such Governing Power, the Power doth nevertheless belong to the man; because God hath specified by his Law the Power of that Relation, and the man is Lawfully put in the Relation that by the Law of God hath such a Power: so is it in the case in hand.

Sect. 107. But yet 2. I add, that the Prelates and the Laws of England gave to Presbyters a Power of Ordination. For in all their Ordinations, the Presbyters were to lay on hands with the Prelate (and did, in all Ordinations that I have seen.) And if they actually imposed hands and so Ordained, it was an actual profession to all that they were supposed to have the power of Ordination, which they exercised.

Sect. 108. Obj. But they had no Power given them to do it without a Prelate. Answ. 1. By Christ they had. 2. You may as well say, that Bishops have no Power to Ordain, because they were not (ordinarily at least) to do it without the Presbyters.

Sect. 109. Obj. Saith the foresaid Learned Author (Dissert. Pramonit. sect. 10. 11.) Unum illud dubens interrogarem, an Hieronymus, dum hic esset, & Presbyteratu secundario suggestur partiariâ tantum induxis potestate, praesente, sed spreto & inuper habito Episcopo, Diaconom aut Presbyterum ordinare (aut Presbytero uni aut alteri adjunctus) recte potuerit? si affirmetur, dicatur fodes, qua demum ratione ab eo dictum sit Episcopum sola ordinazione (et ergo ordinazione) à Presbytero determinatum esse] sin negetur, quamodo igitur Presbytero Anglicano, cui nullam, qua non Hieronymo potestatem, &c.—— Answ. 1. This is none of our case in England: we Ordain not, praesente sed spreto Episcopo: but most Countreyes know of no Bishop that they have, but Presbyters. 2. Hierom might have Ordained with his fellow-presbyters, according to the Laws of Christ, but not according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, that then obtained, or bore sway. 3. Hierom plainly tells you, that it is by Ecclesiastical appointment for the prevention of Schisme, that Bishops were set up so far as to have this power more than Presbyters.
Presbyters, in the point of Ordination. 4. The English Presbyters are Parochial Bishops, and have an Office of Christ's making, and not of the Prelates; and are not under those Ecclesiastical Canons that restrained Hierem from the exercise of this power. And therefore whereas it is added by this Learned Author [Quid hui dicemtem reponi, aut opponi pessit, fatoe equidem me non adeo Lyceum esse at perspiciam] he may see that he could scarce have set us an easier task then to answer his dilemma.

Sect. 110. The second and their principal objection is, that We have no precept or example in the Church for Presbyters Ordaining without Prelates; therefore it is not to be done. Answ. I. I told you before how Bishop Usher told me he answered this Objection to King Charles. viz. from the example of the Church of Alexandria where Presbyters made Bishops, which is more.

Sect. 111. But 2. I answer, you have no example in Scripture or long after that ever Prelates of the English sort, did ordain, nor any precept for it, nor was such a Prelacy then known, as is proved; and therefore their Ordination hath less warrant then that by Presbyters.

Sect. 112. And 3. I have told you before of Scripture warrant for Ordination by a Presbyterie, and also by the Teachers and other Officers of a single Church, as was the Church of Antioch. Prove that there was any Bishop.

Sect. 113. Lastly, it is confessed by the Dissenters that such Presbyters or Bishops as are mentioned, Act. 20. Phil. 1. 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1, &c. had power of Ordination: But according to the judgement of most of the Fathers (that ever I saw or heard of, that interpret those texts) it is Presbyters that are meant in all or some of those texts. It is granted us also by the Dissenters that the chief or sole Pastors of single Churches in Scripture-times did ordain, and had the power of Ordination: But the Presbyters of England, and other Protestant Churches are the chief or sole Pastors of single Churches; therefore, &c.

Sect. 114. Object. 3. But the English Presbyters have broken their Oaths of Canonical obedience, and therefore at least are schismatical. Answ. 1. Many never took any such oath, to my knowledge: For my part I did not. 2. The particular persons that
that are guilty must be accused: and neither must they be judged before they speak for themselves, nor yet must others be con-
demned for their sakes. In these parts, there is not one Presby-
ter I think of ten, who differs from the Prelates about Ordinati-
on, that ever took that oath. And therefore it is few that can
be called Schismaticks on that account. Yea 3 And those few that
did take that Oath, have few of them that I know of, done any
thing against the Prelates.

Sec. 115. Object. 4. The English Presbyters have pull'd
down the Prelates, and rebelled against them; and therefore at least
are guilty of Schism. Answ. 1. The guilty must be named and
heard: their case is nothing to the rest. It is not one of ten I think,
perhaps of twenty, that can be proved guilty. 2. It was not
the Scripture Bishops that they Covenanted against or opposed:
but only the irregular English Prelacy before described: And
the endeavour of reforming this corrupted Prelacy, and reducing
it to the Primitive frame, is in it self no Schism.

Sec. 116. Object. 5. Ignatius commandeth them to obey
the Bishops and do nothing without them. Answ. 1. Ignatius also
commandeth them to obey the Presbyters as the Apostles of Christ,
and to do nothing without them. 2. The Bishops that Ignatius
mentioneth were such as our Parish Bishops or Presbyters are,
that have a Presbyterie to assist them: They were the chief Pa-
fors of a single Church, as is before proved out of Ignatius, and
not the Pastors of hundreds of Churches.

Sec. 117. I shall trouble the Reader with no more of their
objections, seeing by what is said already, he may be furnished
to answer them all: but I shall now leave it to his impartial sober
consideration, whether I have not proved the truth of our Mini-
istry and of the Reformed Churches, and the Validity of our ad-
ministrations, and of our Ordination it self?

CHAP.
CHAP. VIII.

The greatness of their sin that are now labouring to persuade the People of the Nullity of our Ministry, Churches and administrations.

Sect. I. Having laid so fair a ground for my application, I think it my duty to take the freedom to tell those Reverend persons that oppose us in this point, the Reasons why I dare not joyn with them, and the guilt that I am persuaded they heap upon their own souls; Wherein I protest it is not mine intent to make them odious, or cast disgrace upon them (for I do with great reluctance obey my Conscience in the performance of this task:) but my intent is, if it be the will of God to give success so far to these endeavours, 1. To humble them for their great and hainous sin and save them from it; 2. And to save the Church from the divisions and disturbances that is already caused by them and their opinion; 3. However seven Bishops were deposed, seven Presbyters were Ordained Superintendents by Johan Bugenhagius Pomeranus a Presbyter of Wittenberge in the Presence of the King and Senate at the chief Church in Hassia: See Vit. Bugenhagii in Mach. Adam, vii. Germ. Theolog. page 315.
to discharge my Conscience and tell them plainly, what frightneth me from their way.

Sect. 2. And 1. It seems to me (upon the grounds before expressed) that those men that would Nullifie all the Protestant Ministry, Churches and administrations, that have not Prelates, are guilty of schism, and are plain Separatists. They depart from truly Catholick principles. That man hath not the just Principles and Spirit of a Catholick, that can on such a pretence as this degrade or nullifie so many Learned, Godly Ministers, and unchurch so many excellent Churches of Christ; they make a plain Schism, and separate from us on as weak grounds as the ancient Separatists did, whom yet they account an odious generation. And the writings of Paget, Ball, Bradshaw, Hilder- sham, Bernard, and the rest that defend our Ministry and Churches against the old Separatists, will serve in the main to defend them against these new ones, which therefore I refer the Reader to peruse. Many of the same Arguments are as forcible against this adversary.

Sect. 3. 2. And by this means they condemn themselves that have spoken so much against the Separatists, calling them Brownists, Schismatics, and the like; and now take up the cause (in the name) that in them they so condemned. Will they turn Schismatics that have spoken against Schismatics so much?

Sect. 4. 3. By this means also they exceedingly wrong the Lord Jesus Christ, by seeking to rob him of his inheritance: by telling him that his Churches are none of his Churches, and his Ministers are none of his Ministers, and his Ordinances are not his Ordinances indeed. Let them first prove that Christ hath renounced these Ministers, or unchurched or denied these Churches, or given them a bill of divorce: and then let them speak their pleasure. But till then they were best take heed what they do, lest they have not the thanks from Christ which they expect.

Sect. 5. 4. They go against the plain commands of Christ, and examples of his servants: Christ himself bid concerning such as cast out Devils in his name, but followed him not [Forbid him not; for there is no man that shall do a Miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me: for he that is not against us is on our part, Mark 9. 37, 38, 39. He liked not their humour that
that would have the substance of so good a work forbidden, for want of a due circumstance, mode, or accident. He commandeth us to Pray the Lord of the Harvest to send Labourers into his Harvest, because the Harvest is great, and the Labourers are few: And these men would have multitudes of Labourers thrust out, in the necessity of the Churches. Paul rejoiced that Christ was Preached, even by them that did it in strife and envy, thinking to add affliction to his bonds. But these men would silence them that preach in sincere compassion of men's souls. Moses would not forbid Edlad and Medad prophecyng, but wisteth that all the Lords people were Prophets. While men do good and not harm, or more good then harm in the Church, I should see very good grounds, yea and necessity for it, before I should silence them, or be guilty of silencing them.

Sect. 6. 5. They manifest a great deal of selfishness and pride, that dare thus consent to the injury of Christ, and the Church and souls of men; because they may not bear that Rule which is according to their principles and spirits. Self-denial would do much to cure this.

Sect. 7. 6. And yet they do as self-seekers commonly do, even seek after misery and destruction to themselves. While they look (its like) at the honour, and forget the work, they plead for such a load and burden, as is enough to break the backs of many, even for the doing of a work that is so far beyond their strength, that its a mere impossibility. How can one man do the works which Scripture layeth on a Bishop, for a hundred or two hundred Churches? and for thousands that he never sees or hears of?

Sect. 8. 7. And above all, I admire how the heart of a considerate Christian, can be guilty of so great cruelty to the souls of men, as these men would be, if they had their will, in the practice of their principles? What if all the Churches that have no Prelates were unchurch'd? the Ministers cast out as no true Ministers, or the people all prevailed with to forsake them, what would be done for the thousands of the poor ignorant careless souls that are among us? when all that all of us can do is too little, what would be done if so many and such were laid aside? How many thousands were like to be damned, for want of the means,
means, that according to the ordinary way of God, might have procured their conversation and Salvation?

Sect. 9. If they say, that others as good as they should possess the places: I answer, they speak not to men of another world, but to their neighbours, that well know that there are few to be had of tolerable worth to possess one place of very many, if all that they oppose were cast out or forsaken. Do we not know who and what men they are that you have to supply the room with?

Sect. 10. If they say that more obedient men would soon spring up, or many of these would change their minds, if they were forced to it; I answer, 1. So many would be unchanged as would be a greater loss to the Church (if it were deprived of them) than ever Prelacy was like to repair. 2. And what should become of poor souls the while your young ones are a training up? 3. And in all ages after, the Church must lose all those that should dissent from your opinion.

Sect. 11. If you say that, It is not your desire to silence all these Preachers that you disown: I answer, How can that stand with your doctrine or your practice? Your Doctrine is, that they are Lay-men, and no true Ministers, nor to be heard and submitted to as Ministers, nor Sacraments to be received from them. And would you not have them then cast out? 2. Your practice is to disswade the people (especially the Gentry that are near you) to separate and disown them accordingly; and it is done in many places. And would you not cast them out, whom you would have forsaken?

Sect. 12. If you say, It is your desire that they should forsake their error and obey you, and so be continued and not cast out: I answer, 1. But that is not in your power to accomplish, nor have you reason to expect it. They are willing to know the mind of God as well as you, and perhaps search as diligently, and pray as hard as you; and yet they think that it is you that are in the wrong; you see that for many years the Reformed Churches have continued in this mind: And it appears that if they will not turn to your opinion, you would have them all cast out or forsaken. Christ shall have no servants, nor the Church any Pastors that will not be in this of your Opinion.

Sect. 13. 8. Hereby also you would run into the guilt of a more
more grievous persecution, when you have read so much in Scripture against persecutors, and when you have heard of and seen the judgements of God let out upon them. It is an easy matter for any Persecutor to call him that he would cast out, a Schismatrick, or Heretick, but it is not so easy to answer him that hath said, _He that offendeth one of these little ones, it were better for him, &c._ God will not take up with fair pretences or false accusations against his servants; to justify your persecution.

Sect. 14. 9. Yea you would involve the people of the Land, and of other Nations, in the guilt of your persecution; drawing them to joyn with you, in casting out the faithful labourers from the Vineyard of the Lord. This is the good you would do the people, to involve their Souls into so deplorable a state of guilt.

Sect. 15. If you say, _It is you that are persecuted_, as I read some of you do: I answer. 1. If it be so, you are the more unexcusable before God and man, that even under your persecution, will cherish, defend and propagate such a doctrine of persecution, as strikes at no less then the necks of all the Reformed Ministers, and Churches that are not Pratical, at one blow.

2. For my part, I have oft protested against any that shall hinder an able Godly Minister from the service of Christ and the Church, if he be but one that is likely to do more good then harm. But I never took it to be persecution to cast out Drunkards, scandalous, negligent, insufficient men, where better may be had to supply the place: no more then it is persecution to suppress an abusive Alehouse, or restrain a thief from making thievery his trade. 3. The present Governors do profess their readiness to approve and encourage in the Ministry any Godly, able, diligent men that will but live peaceably towards the Commonwealth. And I am acquainted with none (as far as I remember) of this quality, that have not liberty to preach and exercise the Ministerial Office. 4. But if you think you are persecuted, because you may not Rule your Brethren, and persecute others, and take upon you the sole Government of all the Churches in a County, or more, we had rather bear your accu- sations, then poor souls should bear the pains of Hell, by your neglect and persecution: if you are persecuted when your hands are held from striking: what are your Brethren, that cannot by your
your good will have leave laboriously to serve God in a low estate, as the servants of all, and the Lords of none?

Sect. 16. 10. By this means also you shew your selves impenitent in regard of all the former persecutions that some of you and your predecessors have been guilty of. Abundance of most learned Godly men have been silenced, suspended, and some of them persecuted to banishment, and some to death. The world hath had few such men for exemplary abilities, diligence and holiness, as Hilderesham, Bradshaw, Bayn, Nicols, Brightman, Dod, Ball, Paget, Hering, Langley, Parker, Sandford, Cartwright, Bates, Ames, Rogers, and abundance more, that some suffered unto death, and some were silenced, some imprisoned, &c. for not conforming to the Ceremonies: besides Eliot, Hooker, Cotton, Norton, Cobbot, Davenant, Parker, Noyes, and all the rest that were driven to New England; and besides Ward and all that were driven into Holland: and besides the thousands of private Christians that were driven away with them: And besides all the later more extensive persecution of such as were called Conformable Puritans, for not reading the Book for dauncing on the Lords day, and for not ceasing to preach Lectures, or on the Evening of the Lords day, and such like. All this I call to your mind, as the sin that should be lamented, and heavily lamented, and not be owned, and drawn or continued on your own heads by impenitencie; and how do you repent, that would do the like, and take your selves to be persecuted, if your hands are tyed that you may not do it? For my own part, I must profess, I had rather be a Gally-slave, or Chimney-sweeper, yea or the basest vermine, than be a Bishop with all this guilt upon my soul, (to continue,) how light forever many make of it, and how impenitently forever they justify themselves.

Sect. 17. 11. Yea more, after all the warnings you have had, in the waies and ends of your predecessors, it seems that you would yet incomparably outstrip the most of them in persecution, if you had your way. For few of them did attempt, or make any motion, for degrading or denying most of the Protestant Ministers in Europe, or such a number as in England and Scotland are not Ordained by Prelates, and to unchurch all their Churches. This is far higher then these before you.
Se&. 18. 12. And take heed left continuing in such a sin, after both prohibitions and judgements, you should be found fighters against God, if those that despise the Ministers of Christ, despise Christ himself, what shall we think of them that do it themselves, and teach men so to do, and have pleasure in them that do it? It's fearful to draw near that forlorn Condition of the Jews, 1 Thes. 2.15,16. [— and have persecuted us: and they please not God, and are contrary to all men; forbidding us to speak to the Gentiles that they might be saved, to fill up their sins alway: for the wrath is come upon them to the uttermost.]

Se&. 19. 13. It is apparent that your doctrine and practice tendeth to let in the old ejected rabble of drunken, ignorant, ungodly persons into the Ministrie. (And what can be more odious to the most Holy God!) For if once you cast out all those that have not Prelatical Ordination, or all that are against it, (especially after a former Ordination,) you must take in such as these, and with Jeroboam, make Priests of the vilest of the people, or else the places must be vacant: for we know that there are not able godly men to be had of your mind to supply the vacant places.

Se&. 20. 14. Your doctrine doth tend to harden malignant wicked men in their enmity against a faithful Ministrie; and we see this unhappy success of it by experience. Our doctrine is so much against the inclination and interest of the flesh, and men are by corrupted nature at such an enmity to God, and all that is truly Spiritual and Holy, that we have as many enemies as hearers, till Grace do either restrain or change them. But when they have such an irritation and encouragement as this, and that from men that would be reputed as Godly as the best; then no wonder if they are hardened in their malignity. When we would instruct them and mind them of their everlasting state, and help to prepare them for their latter end; they are told by Learned men, that we are no Ministers but Lay-men and Schismatics, and that it is their sin to own us, or receive the Ordinances of Christ from us as Ministers: and so the poor people turn their backs on us, and on the Assemblies and Ordinances of God; and being taught by wise and learned men to disown us and despise us, they follow their drunkenness, and worldliness, and ungodliness with greater security, and with less remorse: for now
now they have a defensive against the galling doctrine of those precise Preachers, that would not let them alone in their sins: they were wont to be disturbed at least by Sermons, and sometime they purposed to return, and were in the way of Grace, and in some hope: but now they are taught by Learned Godly Divines to keep out of hearing, they can go on and sin in peace.

Sect. 21. 15. By this means also you rob God of his public like worship: People are taught to turn their backs on it: you teach them that it is better that God have no public like Ministerial worship at all, in Prayer, Praises, Sacraments, &c. then that he should have it from any but Prelatical Ministers! O sacred doctrine! And if you had your wills for the silencing or ejecting of all that are not Ordained by Prelates, how many hundred Church doors must be shut up in the Christian world, or worse!

Sect. 22. 16. By this means all Impiety would be cherished and let loose. When once the mouths of Ministers were stopped, the mouth of the swearer, and curser, and railer, and scorners at Godliness would be open: and so would be the mouth of the drunkard and glutton. If all that can be done, be so much too little, as experience tells us, what a case would the Nations be in, and how would iniquity abound, if Ministers were cast out?

Sect. 23. 17. Yea it might endanger the Churches, by the introduction of Infidelity or Heathenism it self. For nothing is more natural as it were, to corrupted man: and if once the Ministry be taken down, and they have none, or those that are next to none, Infidelity and Atheism will soon spring up: And it will be a more dangerous sort of Infidelity, then is among many of the open Infidels, because it would be palliated with the name of Christianity, and leave men further from conviction, then some that never heard of Christ.

Sect. 24. 18. And it is a temptation to Infidelity and Contempt of the Church and Ministry, when men shall see that one party of Christians doth thus unchurch another. They will think that they may boldly say that of us, which we say of one another: one party unchurcheth all the Papists: these that we are now speaking to, do unchurch all the Protestant Churches that
that are not Prelatical. The Papists unchurch all but themselves, and so among them, they leave Christ but a very small part of his inheritance.

Sect. 25. 19. Yea I fear that by Consequence (and too near and plain a Consequence) they dissolve the Catholike Church itself. And if it be so, let them judge whether their doctrine subvert not Christianitie? I use no violence for the inference. If want of Prelatical Ordination do Null the Protestant Ministers and Churches, then it must needs follow that far greater defects (and more against the vitals of the Church) will do as much to unchurch the Romanists, the Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, Ethiopians, Egyptians, &c. But alas, how easy is it to prove that all these have far greater defects than the Presbyterian Protestant Churches! and so the whole must fall together.

Sect. 26. 20. By all these means they joyn with the Quakers, and Seekers, and Drunkards in opposing the same Ministrie that they oppose. You are no true Ministers of Jesus Christ, say the Quakers, Seekers, and other Sects; so also say these that now we are speaking of: and if they preach their doctrine, and side with them against the servants of Christ, let them be afraid left they partake of their Spirit and Reward.

Sect. 27. 21. Their doctrine and practice tending to grief the hearts of the most experienced gracious souls. Should all the Ministers becast out that are not Prelatical, and the places supplied, as they must be in their stead, with such as can be had, O what a day would it be to honest humble souls, that were wont to delight themselves in the publick worship of God, and to find instruction, and admonition, and consolation suitable to their necessities! If now they should have all turned to what the Doctrine of these men portends, their souls would be as in a Wilderness, and famine would consume them, and they would lament as David in his banishment, and the Jews in their captivity, to think of the daies that once they saw.

Sect. 28. 22. And doth it not imply a great deal of unbodiness and enormity to Reformation, when men dare thus boldly unchurch the most of the Reformed Churches, and pass such desperate nullifying censures on the most holy, able, painful Ministers of the Gospel? O how many of them are studying, and watch-
watching and praying for their people day and night, and teach-
ing them publickly and from house to house, and that some-
times with tears, willing to spend and be spent for their Salva-
tion, not seeking theirs but them; and when they have done
all, they are reproached as no Minifters of Christ, and the peo-
ple taught to disown them and forfake them. Is this a sign of a
son of God, that is tender of his honour and interest? or of a
Holy Gracious soule?

Sect. 29. 23. At least by this means the hands of Minifters
are weakened in their work, and their difficulties increased, and
their hearts grieved, because of their peoples misery. O if they
could have but a free unprejudiced hearing with poor sinners
fome good might be done! But they will not hear us, nor
come near us, or speak to us: Especially when they are taught to
forfake us by fuch men. I would not be the man that should thus
add burden and grief to the faithful Minifters of Christ, upon
fuch an account, for all the Bifhopricks on earth.

Sect. 30. 24. They also diftract the minds of Christians, when
they hear men thus degrading and unchurching one another;
so that weak persons are perplexed, and know not what to think
nor what Church or Religion to be of: yea it is well if many be
not tempted hereby to be of no Religion at all: when they hear
them condemning one another.

Sect. 31. 25. These shew too much formality and Ceremonious-
ness, when they fo much prefer their own opinion, about acircum-
stance, Ceremony or Mode, before the very being of the Chur-
ches and Miniftry, and the substance of worship it self, and the
Salvation of men fouls: As if it were better for Churches to be
no Churches, then not Prelatical Churches: or for fouls to be
condemned, then to be saved by men that are not Prelatical. I
speak not these things to exasperate them (though I can expec-
to better:) but in the grief of my soule for the sad condition that
they would bring men into.

Sect. 32. 26. They lay a very dangerous snare, to draw Mi-

nifters to be guilty of casting off the work of God. Flesh and
blood would be glad of a fair pretence for so much liberty and
ease. O how fain would it be unyoked, and leave this labou-
rious, displeasing kind of life! And when such as these fhall
perswade them that they are no Minifters, they may do much to

gratifie
gratifie the flesh. For some will say, I am as a l Mit, between both ways; I cannot see the lawfulness of Prelacy: and yet they speak so confidently of the nullity of all other callings, that I will forbear till I am better refloved. Another will say, I find my self to be no Minister, and therefore free from the Obligation to Ministerial Offices: and I will take heed bow I come under that yoke again, till I have fuller resolutions. Another will scruple being twice Ordained, and so will think it safer to surcease. At least they tempt men to such resolutions, that would discharge them from so hard a work.

Sec. 3. 3. 27. By this means also they make the breaches that are among us to be uncurable, and proclaim themselves utterly unreconcileable to the most o the Protestant Churches. For if they will have no reconciliation or commotion with them, till they shall confess themselves no Churches, and cast off all their Ministers, they may as well say hastily, they will have none at all. For no reasonable man can imagine or expect that ever the Churches should yield to these terms. When they are declared no Ministers or Churches, you cannot then have Communion with them as Ministers or Churches.

Sec. 3. 4. 28. And it is easie to see how much they befriend and encourage the Papists in all this. Is it not enough that you have vindicated the Pope from being the Antichrist, but you must also openly proclaim that Rome is a true Church, their Priests true Priests, their Ordinances and Administrations Valid, but all the Protestant Churches that are not Prelatical are indeed no Churches, their Ministers no Ministers, &c. Who would not then be a Papist rather than a member of such a Protestant Church? How can you more plainly invite men to turn Papists, unless you would do it expressly and with open face? Or how could you gratifie Papists more?

Sec. 3. 5. 29. And truly if all these evils were accomplished, the Ministers forsaken, iniquity let loose, the Ordinances profane by unworthy men, &c. we could expect nothing but that the judgments of God should be poured out upon us for our Apostacy: and that temporal plagues involuntary should accompany the spiritual plagues that we have chosen, and that God should even for sake our land, and make us a by word and an
hissing to the Nations: and that his judgments should write as
upon our doors, This is the people that wilfully cast out the Mi-
nisters and mercies of the Lord.

Sect. 36. 30. And if all this were but accomplished, in the
Conclusion I may be bold to ask, what would the Devil himself
have more, except our damnation itself? If he were to plead
his own cause, and to speak for himself, would he not say the
very same as these Learned, Reverend Disputers do? would he
not say to all our graceless people, Hear not these Ministers: they
are no true Ministers: Joyn not in Communion with their Churches,
they are no true Churches? I doubt not but he would say many
of the same words, if he had leave to speak. And should not a man
of any fear be afraid, and a man of any piety be unwilling to
plead the very cause of Satan, and say as he would have them
say, by accusing so many famous Churches and Ministers, as
being none indeed, and drawing the people so to censure them
and forsake them; This is no work for a Minister of Christ.

Sect. 37. Besides what is here said, I desire those whom it doth
concern, that are afraid of plunging themselves into the depth of
guilt and horror, that they will impartially read over my first
sheet for the Ministry, which further shews the aggravations of
their sin that are now the opposers and reproachers of them.
Consider them, and take heed.

Sect. 38. But again I desire these Brethren to believe, that as it
is none of the Prelatical Divines that I here speak of, but those
that thus nullifie our Church & Ministry, while they own the Mi-
nistry and Church of Rome, so it is none of my desire to provoke
even these, or injure them in the least degree: But I could not
in this sad condition of the Church, but propound these hainous
evils to their consideration, to provoke them to try, and to take
heed lest they should incur so great a load of guilt, while they
think they are pleading for Order in the Church. How can there
be any charity to the Church, or to our brethren in us, if we can
see them in such a gulf of sin as this, and yet say nothing to them,
for fear of provoking them to displeasure?

Sect. 39. And I think it necessary that all young men that are
cast by their arguings into temptations of falling with them into
the same transgressions, should have the case laid open to them,
that they may see their danger; and not by the accusations of
K k 2 Schism
Schism be led into far greater real Schism, with so many other sins as these.

Sect. 40. Yet is it not my intent to justify any disorders or miscarriages that any have been guilty of in opposition to the Prelacie. And if they can prove that I have been guilty of any such thing myself, I shall accept of their reproof, and condemn my sin as soon as I can discern it. Only I must crave that the usual way of presumption, affirmation, or bare names of crimes be not supposed sufficient for Conviction, without proof, and before the cause is heard. And also I do profess that for all that I have here said against the English Prelacy, and though I earnestly desire it may never be restored, yet were I to live under it again, I would live peaceably and submissively, being obedient, and persuading others to obedience, in all things lawful.

CHAP. IX.

The sinfulness of despising or neglecting Ordination.

Sect. 1. It is a thing so common and hardly avoided, for men in opposing one extremity, to seem to countenance the other, and for men that are convinced of the evil of one, to run into the other as the only truth, that I think it necessary here to endeavour the prevention of this miscarriage: and having said so much against the Necessity of Prelatical Ordination, and in some cases of any, I shall next shew the greatness of
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of their sin that despite or neglect Ordination when it may be bad.

Sect. 2. For the right understanding of what is to be said, I must again remember you, that though it be not at the Ordinaries will to deprive the Church of Ministers, and it is none of the Question which they have to resolve, Whether the Church shall have Ministers or none: (and therefore there may be Ministers without them, if they would hinder or refuse;) And though it be not the Question which is put to their decision, What kind of Ministers the Church shall have (for that Christ hath determined of;) nor yet what Qualifications are necessary to them, (for that also Christ hath already set down;) yet is it a great and weighty case that is put to the decision of Ordinaries, that is, whether this man be thus qualified as Christ hath described and required in Ministers? and whether he be the fittest person (or fit at least) for the particular charge to which he is called? And the right determining of this question is a thing that the Churches welfare doth very much do depend upon.

Sect. 3. And therefore it is the decision of this one Question, that Ministers, People and Magistrates themselves, must all contribute their powers and endeavours too in their several places. All that they have to do is but to see that the Churches have fit men, even such as are qualified as God requireth. The People must choose fit men: or consent to them when chosen for them: The Pastors must try them, and Approve them, and only them that are fit: The Magistrate must encourage, assist and defend fit men, and forbid such as are intolerably unfit, and not permit them to abuse the name and Ordinances of Christ, and wrong his Church.

Sect. 4. This treble guard at the door of the Church doth much tend to its security, and preservation from the great evils that intruders may introduce. And each party of the three hath a special interest which should make them careful of the business. 1. The people have great reason to have a hand in it, and to be careful: For it is their Souls for which their Overseers watch, and their Salvation that is concerned in it. And he that will not trust his Son with any Tutor without due choice, nor his state with every Lawyer, nor his body with every Physician, nor his land, or cattle with every servant, but will choose the best,
best, hath reason to know upon whose care he trusteth his soul. For though it may be some excuse, it will be no justification of them that lie in sin and misery, to say, Our Teachers did mislead us. For if the blind lead the blind, it is both that fall into the ditch: And as Cyprian faith (with the rest of his Colleges,) Epift. 68. (alias Li. 1. Ep. 4.) [Propter quod plena diligenta, explorationes sinceræ, oportet eos ad Sacerdotium delegi, quos a Deo confert andiri. Nec sibi plebs blandiatur, quasi immunes esset a contagio delicti possit cum Sacerdotum peccatores communicans, & ad injustum arq; illicitum præpeti sui Episcopatum consensum suum commodans, &c.——— ] Besides the work of the Ministry is Teaching and Persuasive, and the success is only on the Willing: and seeing we can do nothing on them for their good against their wills, or without their own Consent, it is needful therefore that some way or other their Consent should be procured, unless we would frustrate all our labour, and mis our end. And also, a Church is a Society Voluntarily conjoined for holy Worship and Living: and therefore it is contrary to the nature of it, that they should have Pastors, or be members and not Consent.

Sect. 5. And 2. For the Magistrate, there is great reason that he have his part also in the work: For the honour of God must be his End; the Law of God his chiefeft Rule; the Church of Christ his chiefeft Subjects; and the work of Christ, his chiefeft care and business. And seeing he Ruleth from Christ, and by Christ, and for Christ, it is necessary that he take care of the quality, and entrance, and carriage of Ministers, on whom Christ's work and honour doth so much depend.

Sect. 6. Yet is there here a special difference between the works of these several parties in admitting men into the Ministry. The proper or necessary work of the people, is but to discern and consent: Whether they be the first Electors, is a matter of indifferency in itself, & is sometime fit, and sometime unfit. The Magistrates work is not to Ordain Ministers; but carefully to Oversee the Ordainers and the People, that they put in none but worthy men: And if he find that they miscarry, he is not (ordinarily at least) to take the work upon him, and Ordain fitter men himself; but to correct them to whom the work belongs, for their male-administration, and restrain them from mildoing, and urge them by due means to do it better, or cause them to be displaced that are
are unreformable, that better may be chosen in their stead, that
will be faithfull.

Sect. 7. And 3. The reason of the Ministers interest in the
work, I shall more at large lay down anon. And though there
be a possibility of frequent differences arising, through disa-
greement of these three several parties, yet Christ would rather
use this treble guard for caution, then for the preventing of divi-
sion, lay open his Church to the injury of intruders.

Sect. 8. And remember again, that it is not in the Power of Ma-
gistrats, Ordainers, People and all to make a Minister of Christ,
of a man that wanteth the Essential Qualifications: Ex quois
lignis non sit Mercurius. He that is not qualified for the works
Essential to a Minister, cannot by Ordination be made a Mini-
ster: No more then the bare stamp can make currant money
of a piece of lead, when the Law makes the Metal Essential to
currant Coin: And no more then a license will make him a School-
master that cannot read: or him a Pilot, that knows not how to
Rule the ship: faith Cyprian ubi sup. [Sed enim desiderio tuic
vestro, non tam nostra concilia, quam Divina praecipio repon-
ident; quibus jam pridem mandatur voce celesti, & Dei lege prescri-
batur, quos & quales opereat deservire altari, & Sacrificia Di-
vina celebrare. (Here he citeth Scripture ) Qua cum pradita
& manifesta sint nobis, praecepit Divinis necesse est obsequia nostra
deserviam: Nec personam in ejusmodi rebus accipere, aut aliquid
eniquam largiri potest humana indulgentia ubi intercedis, & le-
gem tribuit Divina prae scriptio. ] God gives not men authority
to contradict his Law, or to Ordain a man incapable of Ordina-
tion; nor introduce the form, where the matter is undisposed
for it.

Sect. 9. Perhaps some will ask, What should be done, in case that
these three parties disagree: If the Magistrate would have one
man, and the Ordainers another, and the people a third, or if two
of them go one way, and the third another? To which I answer,
There are many things that must be taken into consideration
for the right resolving of the case. Either the persons nominated
are equal or unequal: Either they are all capable, or some of
them incapable: Either the welfare of that Church dependeth
on the choice: or else it may be somewhat an indifferent case.
1. If there be but one Minister to be had, and the Dissenters
would
would have none, then it is past controversy, that the Dissenters are to be disobeyed. 2. If one party would have a Godly, Able Minifter, and the other would have an incapable, intolerable person, then it is past doubt, that the party that is for the worthy person ought to prevail, and it is his duty to insist upon it, and the duty of the rest to yield to him. 3. If any will make a controversy in this case where there is none, and say, [You say this man is fittest, and I say the other man (that is incapable) is fittest, and who shall be judge?] The party that is in the right must hold to their duty, till they are persecuted from it, and appeal to God, who will judge in equity. If a blind man say to a man that hath his eye-sight [You say that you see; and I say that I see, you say that it is day, and I say it is night; who shall be believed?] It is not such words that will warrant a wife man to renounce his eye-sight. God will judge him to be in the right that is so indeed. 4. But if really the several parties are for several Ministers that are all tolerable, yet if there be any notable difference in their fitness, the parties that are for the less fit, should yield to the party that is for the more fit. If you say, They discern is not, I answer, that is their sin, which will not justify them in a further sin, or excuse them from a duty. They might discern, if they were not culpable, in so great a difference; at least whom they are bound to take for the most fit. 5. But if there be no great inequality, then these Rules should be observed. 1. The Magistrate should not deny the people their Liberty of choice, nor the Ministers their Liberty in Approbation or disallowance: but only Oversee them all, that they faithfully do their several duties. 2. The Ministers should not hinder the people from their Choice, where both parties nominated are fit, but content themselves with their proper work. 3. The People should not insist upon their choice, if the Ministers to whom it belongeth, do disallow the person, and take him to be unmeet, and refuse to ordain him: because obedience in such cases is their duty, and a duty that cannot tend to their loss, at least not to so much hurt to them as the contrary irregular course may prove to the Church. 4. If Magistrates or Ministers would make the first choice, and urge the people to consent if the person be fit, it is the safest way for the people to obey and consent, though it were better for the
the Rulers to give them more freedom in the choice. 5. If a people be generally ignorant (in too great a measure,) and addicted to unworthy men, or apt to divisions, &c. it is their safest way to desire the Ministers to choose for them. Or if they will not do so, it is the safest way for the Ministers to offer them a man: Yet so that Magistrates and Ministers should expect their Consent, and not set any man over them as their Pastor without consent some way procured. 6. But if they are no Church, but uncalled persons, and it be not a Pastor of a Church, but a Preacher to Convert men, and fit them for a Church-state, that is to be settled, then may the Magistrate set such a man, and force the people to hear him preach. 7. If Necessity require not the contrary, the matter should be delayed, till Magistrate, Ministers and people do agree. 8. The chosen Pastors should decide the case themselves: They should not accept the place, and Consent, till all be agreed, unless there be a Necessity. And if there be, then the greatest necessity should most sway. If the Magistrate resist, he will forcibly prohibite and hinder you from preaching. If the Ministers resist, they will deny you the right hand of fellowship. If the people resist, they will not hear nor join in worship nor obey. All these if possible should be avoided. The Peoples consent (to a Pastor of a Church) is of Necessity. We cannot do the work of Pastors without it. And therefore neither Magistrates or Ministers can drive us on where this is wanting (unless it be only to seek it, or only to do the work of Preachers to men without.) Unity and Communion with Neighbour-Churches is so much to be desired, that nothing but Necessity can warrant us to go on without it. And the Magistrates restraint is so great a hinderance, that nothing but Necessity can warrant us to cast out selves upon it. And therefore out of cases of Necessity, the Ministers nominated should not consent till all agree: But in cases of Necessity, the souls of men and the worship of God, must not be disregarded or neglected, though neighbour-Churches or Ministers disown us, or Magistrates persecute us.

 Sect. 10. Remember these Distinctions for the understanding of what follows. 1. Its one thing to be Approved, and another thing to be Solemnly Invested. Ordination consisteth of these two parts. 2. We must difference between Ordination, by one Pastor,
Pastors, and by many. 3. Between Ordination by Pastors of
the same Church, or of many Churches. 4. Between Ordi-
nation by sufficient or insufficient Ministers. 5. And between
Ordination by Neighbour Ministers or Strangers. 6. And be-
tween Ordination by Divided Ministers, and Concordant. On
these premised I propose as followeth.

Sect. 11. Prop. 1. Approbation by Ministers is ordinarily to
be sought and received by all that will enter into the Ministry.
I gave some Reasons before, Chap. 2. Which here I shall enlarge,
by which the sinfulness of Neglecting this Approbation may
appear.

Sect. 12. Reaf. 1. It is the way that God hath appointed us
in Holy Scripture, and therefore to be followed. They that
Ordained Elders or Bishops in the Churches, did more then Ap-
prove them, but could do no less, 1 Tim. 4. 14. Timothy was
ordained by the Imposition of the hands of the Presbyterie,
1 Tim. 3. 15. Paul giveth Timothy the description of Bishops
and Deacons, that he may know how he ought to behave himself
in the house of God, which is the Church, &c. That is, that
he may know whom to Approve of or Ordain, Tit. 1. 5. Titus
was to Ordain Elders in every City, Acts 13. 1; 2, 3. The
Prophets and Teachers in the Church at Antioch did separate
Barnabas and Paul to the work, with Fasting and Prayer, and
imposition of hands. It was the Apostles that Ordained them
Elders in every Church, Acts 14. 23. Suppose it must be read
[by Suffrages] as many would have it, that proveth no more
but that the People did consent: But still it is Paul and Barnabas
that Ordained them Elders, though with the peoples suffrages,
and it is they that are said to fast and pray in the next words.
Acts 6. 3. Expressly shews that the People chose the Dea-
cons, and the Apostles ordained them [Look ye out among
your selves seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost
and wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business. But I shall
cut short this part of my task, because so much is said of it already
by many that have written for Ordination, to whom I shall re-
fer you.

Sect. 13. Reaf. 2. If there be not a standing regular way for
Trying and Approving such as enter into the Ministry, then men
will be left to be their own judges, and if they can but get the
consent
content of any Congregation, will presently be Pastors. But this course would tend to the ruin or confusion of the Church, as I shall manifest by evidence.

Sec. 14. 1. If all men may enter into the Ministry that will, upon their own persuasion that they are fit, the most proud, self-conceited, worthless men will be the readiest to go, and if they can get hearers, will most abound in the Church; and the people will quickly have heaps of Teachers. For we all know that many of the Ignorant are least acquainted with their ignorance: and commonly the Proud have the highest thoughts of themselves, and think none so fit to Teach and Rule as they. And what could be more to the shame and hazard of the Church, then to have it taught and guided by such ignorant unworthy men?

Sec. 15. 2. Moreover, Humble men are so conscious of their weakness, and sensible of the burden and greatness of the work, that they think themselves unworthy, and therefore would draw back; and so by their forbearance would give way to the aforesaid proud intruders. And thus the Church would soon be darkened, defiled, and brought low, if all men were their own judges.

Sec. 16. 3. Moreover, it is the common disposition of Erroneous and Heretical persons to be exceeding zealous for the propagating of their errors, and bringing as many as is possible to their mind. So that if all be left to themselves, the most Heretical will run first, and carry their filth into the house of God, and seduce and undo men instead of saving them.

Sec. 17. 4. By this means also the Covetous and fordid worldlings will crowd in: and men will do by Preaching, as they do by Ale-selling, even make it their last Trade when others fail: and he that breaks in any other Trade, if he have but any volubility of speech, will presently turn Priest; till the Office and Ordinances of God seem vile, and be abhorred by the people. This must be the Consequent if all be left to their own judgement.

Sec. 18. 5. And it is too known a case, that the people will bid such persons welcome, and so they will make a match. The erroneous and giddy party will have such as are suitable to them. And the Covetous party will have him that will do their work best cheap: if they will preach for nothing or for little, he shall
shall be a man for them, though he would lead them to perdition. If it be possible, they'll take it, if it cost them nothing. And many there be that will have their own kindred or friends to make Priests of, and all that they have interest in must join with them on the account of friendship. And the childish injudicious sort of Christians will follow them that have the smoothest tongues, or best opportunities and advantages to prevail with them. And so they will be tossed up and down, and carried to and fro with every wind of doctrine, according to the cunning wiles and subtilty of men, by which they lie in wait to deceive.] Eph. 4. 14. And they will be carried about with divers and strange doctrines, Heb. 13. 9.

Sect. 19. Real. 3. And when the Ministrerie is thus corrupt (by making every man judge of his own fitness) the Church will be corrupted, and degenerate into a common state, and cease to be a Church (if Reformation do not stop the gangrene.) For it commonly goeth with the Church according to the quality of the Ministrerie. An ignorant Ministrerie, and an ignorant people; an erroneous Ministrerie, and an erring people; a scandalous Ministrerie, and a scandalous people commonly go together. Like Priest, like people is the common case.

Sect. 20. Real. 4. And by this means Christianity itself will be dishonoured, and seem to be but a common religion, and so but a deceit; to the great dishonour of Jesus Christ; for the world will judge of him and his cause, by the lives of them that teach it and profess it.

Sect. 21. Real. 5. And by this means God will be provoked to depart from us, and be avenged on us for our dishonouring him. If he would spew out of his mouth lukewarm Laodicea, what would he do to such degenerate societies? If most of the seven Churches, Rev. 2 & 3, had their warnings or threatenings for smaller faults, what would such corruptions bring us to, but even to be plagued or forsaken by the Lord?

Sect. 22. Real. 6. If you should be men of ability and fitness for the work your selves, that enter without Approbation and Ordination, yet others might be encouraged by your example that are unfit: and if you once thus set open the door, you know not how to keep out woollers and swine: all the persons before described will take the opportunity, and say, Why may
not we enter unordained, as well as such and such?

Sect. 23. Real. 7. By this means also you will leave many sober godly persons unsatisfied in your Ministry, as not knowing whether they may own you as Ministers or not; & how much you should do to avoid such offence, I think you might perceive.

Sect. 24. Real. 8. By this course also you will walk contrary to the Catholike Church of Christ, and that in a cause where you cannot reasonably pretend any necessity of so doing. Ever since Christ had a Ministry on earth, the constant (ordinary) way of their admittance hath been by Ministerial Ordination. If any man despise this, and be contentious, we have no such Custome, nor the Churches of God. Is it a design befitting an humble man, a Christian, a sober man, to find out a new way of making Ministers now in the end of the world? as if all the Ministers from the Apostles days till now, had come in at a wrong door, and wanted a true Calling? This is too near the making a New Ministry: and that's too near the Making of a new Church: and that's too near the feigning of a new Christ. The Church hath many promises, that the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it; that Christ will be with her Ministers to the end of the world, they being given by him for the perfecting of the Saints, and edifying of the Body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, &c. Eph. 4. 12, 13. And therefore we must not easily believe, that the Ministry of the universal Church have been falsely called or admitted until now, and you have found out a better way at last.

Sect. 25. Real. 9. You would bring that irrational confusion into the Church of the living God, which is not to be introduced into the basest Commonwealth or society in the world. You have more wit then to let all men play the Phylistians: but will first have them tryed by men of their own Profession: or else the lives of many may pay for your Licentiousness. You will have Schoolmasters approved by them that have Learning, before you will commit your children to their trust. And shall every man be a Teacher and Ruler that will in the Church of Christ, as if it were the only confused contemptible Society in the world? God is not the God of Confusion, but of Peace, as in all the Churches, faith the Apostle, 1 Cor. 14. 33.
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Sect.
Sect. 26. Real. 10. Do but consider how high, and holy, and honourable a Calling it is to be a Minister of the Gospel: and then it will appear, that it is horrible profanation of Holy things, to suffer all that will, to invade it. They are to be the Embassadors of Christ, and speak as in his Name, and to be Stewards of his Mysteries and Household, and to stand near him, as at his altar, and to dispense his treasure, to magnifie and praise his Name, and to administer his holy Sacraments, &c. And should all that will, be taught to usurp or invade such an holy Calling?

Sect. 27. Real. 11. Consider also, how great a Trust it is that is committed to all that are Ministers of the Gospel. The souls of men are committed to them: the Mysteries of God, the precious promises and glad tidings of Salvation are committed to them: the order and affairs of the house of God are committed to them: those that are Christ's Sheep, his Jews, his Friends, his Brethren, his Spouse, his Members, and as the apple of his eye, are committed to them. And is it suitable to so great a Trust, that men untried, unapproved, that do but think well of themselves, and their own doings, shall at their pleasure take so great a charge? What man of honour and wit among you, will give every man leave to be your Steward, that hath but folly and pride enough to think himself fit for it? and will not rather choose your Stewards your selves?

Sect. 28. Real. 12. And is it not evidently notorious Cruelty to the souls of men, to cast them upon every unworthy fellow that will but be impudent enough to undertake the charge? Do you set so light by mens everlasting Joy or Torment? You would not so contemnuously cast away mens lives: and will you so contemnuously cast away their souls? And what a contempt is it of the blood of Christ, that the purchase made by it should be thus neglected? You will lock up your money, and look to your goods, and take care of every good of your estates: and shall the souls of men, and the blood and the inheritance of Christ be no more regarded? This is unjust.

Sect. 29. Real. 13. Yea and it is a way of Cruelty to the men themselves, if every man that is sick of self-conceit, or Pride, shall have leave to exercise it, and run themselves into unspeakable guilt, by undertaking such works as they are no way able for: Alas, have not these poor sinners transgressions enough
enough of their own already, but you must encourage them to draw the blood of souls, and the sins of so many others upon their heads? O what a burden do they take upon them! and what a dreadful danger do they run into? Had you faith and any pitty of souls, you would rather study to do your best, to prevent mens destroying of themselves and others, and falling altogether into the ditch. I know you'll say, that you are guilty of no such thing: it is the saving, and not the destroying of souls that you intend by being Ministers unordained: but your intentions will not justify your cruel and destructive practices. Its plain that you teach men by your doctrine and example to be their own judges of their fitness for the Ministry, or to neglect the judgement of the Pastors of the Church: and what better can this court produce?

Sect. 30. Real. 14. Either you are fit for the Ministry, or unfit: if fit; why should you be afraid of trial? He that doth evil comes not to the light: it is a sign of an ill cause that cannot endure a just trial. But if you are unfit, is it not better to forbear?

Sect. 31. Real. 15. Your very refusing of a trial doth give the people sufficient reason to question your call and fitness for the work, or your humility at least: for humble men think meanly of themselves, then to judge themselves meet for such great employments, when they have not the encouragement of men that are more fit to judge: the good men of old were wont to run away from a Bishoprick, or Pastoral dignity in the sense of their unfitness: so that the Bishops were fain to seek and send after them: and Gregory of Neocearea was Ordained by Phedimus when he was three days journey from him, even against his will; and then charged by him in the name of Christ to yield unto the Call. And what then shall we think of that sort of men, that think themselves so good and worthy, as to run on their own heads, without due approbation?

Sect. 32. Real. 16. It is natural for man to be Partial in his own Cause: insomuch as no law or equity will allow men to be witnesses or judges for themselves in the smallest civil controversy: and shall they be judges of themselves in so great a cause? Are not others more impartial?

Sect. 33. Real. 17. You cast away your own encouragement
ment and support, and create vexation to your own Conscienc-ces. There are so many difficulties to be conquered in this work, and so many sufferings to be endured, that if a man be not clear that his Call was good, he is like to be left to great discomforts. We have exceeding great labours to undergo: we have abundance of enemies and impediments to strive with: we have many a scorn and unthankful return, and perhaps imprisonment or death to undergo: we are our selves, alas, too weak and insufficient, and must depend on God for daily helps. And with what confidence can you expect his help, if you Call your selves, and enter not by his Approbation? And how will you ever go through all this, and suffer so much with Christian comfort, when you cannot say that you are sent of God, and have nothing but your own overweening conceits of it? Could you but say, [I entered by the way that God appointed, and was not my own Judge] you might have some more boldness and confidence of Gods assistance.

Sect. 34. Real. 18. The most that plead against Ordination, that are worthy the name of sober Christians, do plead but against the Necessity of it, and cannot deny it to be lawful: and should not all the reasons before mentioned prevail with you to submit to a lawful thing?

Sect. 35. Real. 19. And if it be thus undeniable, that men must not be their own Judges, it will soon appear that Ministers are the standing Judges of mens fitness for this work, because no other Judges are appointed to it, or capable of it. It must be an ordinary stated way of Approbation, that can give us satisfaction: for if God had left the case at large, for men to go to whom they will, it would be all one as to go to none at all, but to be Judges themselves. And if a standing way of Approba-tion must be acknowledged, let us enquire where it is to be found: and look which way you will, and you shall find no other, but this which is by men of the same Calling with them, that are to be Ordained.

Sect. 36. For 1. Magistrates it cannot be: none that I know pretend to that. Magistrates in most of the world are Infidels: and therefore cannot there be Ordainers: and none of them hath the work committed to them by Christ, nor do any that I know, assume it to themselves.
Sect. 37. And 2. The people it cannot be: For 1. No man can shew a word of precept or example for it; nor prove that ever God did give them such a power: Consent or Election is all that can be pretended to by them. 2. It is a work that they are commonly unable for: the Schollars may as well Try and Approve of their Schoolmasther. We confes the People must by a judgement of discretion, endeavour to find out the best they can: but if they had not helps, and if they were also called to a judgement of direction and decision, what work would they make? Do the Major vote, ( or the Minor either ) in most or almost any Congregations, understand whether a man know the meaning of the Scripture, or to be able to defend the truth, or whether he be Heretical or found in the faith, &c.? God would not set men on a work that is thus beyond the line of their Capacity. It is a thing not to be imagined, that they that call us to be their Teachers, should already be commonly able to Judge whether we are found or unfound, and able to teach them or not: for this importeth that they know already as much as we ( for wherein they are ignorant, they cannot judge of us. ) And if they know as much already, what need have they of our Teaching? 3. And it is contrary to the subjection and inferiority of their Relation: they that are commanded to learn and obey us as their Guides, may yet consent or choose their Teachers, when Approved, or to be Approved by abler men; but they cannot be imagined to be appointed by God to Ordain their own Overseers: this is a most ungrounded fiction.

Sect. 38. Real. 20. On the other side, it is the Pasteors of the Church, and only they that are fitted to be the standing Approvers or Ordainers, as will appear in these particulars. 1. It is they that are justly supposed to be of competent abilities to try a Minister. If here and there a Gentleman or other person be able, that is a rarity, and therefore no standing way for the Church in Ordaining Ministers can be gathered thence. 2. Ministers are doubly devoted to God and to his Church: and therefore should have, and ordinarily have, the tenderest care of the Church. 3. It is justly supposed that Ministers are ordinarily the most pious and conscionable men that are to be had ( or else they are too blame that choose them to be Ministers ) And therefore they may be expected to be most faithful in the work. 4. And
they are fewer, and have lesser perverting interests, and therefore are like to be less divided in such determinations, then the people that are so many, and of so many interests and minds, that if it were not for the Moderation of Magistrates and Ministers, they would almost everywhere be all to pieces, one being for one man, and another for another; some for one of this mind and way, and some for one of another; some for the Orthodox, and some for the Heretical. 5. Lastly, it is Ministers, whose Office God hath eyed Ordination to, and who have time to wait upon it as their duty: so that lay all this together, and I think the first Proposition is proved, for the Necessity (ordinarily) of the Pastors Approbation, and the sinfulness of neglecting it.

Sect. 39. Prop. 2. It is not only the Pastors of one particular Church, but also the Pastors of Neighbour churches that hold Communion with that Church, that should regularly Approve or Ordain Ministers: though I deny not but he may be a Minister that hath no Ordination but by the Pastors of a particular Church, yet I conceive that this is not a regular course.

Sect. 40. My reasons are these. 1. Because if it be ordinarily tied to the Pastors of the same Church only to Ordain, then it will be done ordinarily without any Pastors at all. For most particular Churches in the world have but one Pastor: and when he is dead, there is none left to Ordain; and therefore others or none must do it in such cases.

Sect. 41. And 2. If there be one left, and all the power be left in him, the welfare of the Church would run too great an hazzard: if every man shall be Ordained a Minister that can procure the Approbation of a single Pastor, the Church will be subjected to most of the lamentable miseries before mentioned, supposing that men were judges for themselves.

Sect. 42. And 3. We find in Scripture, that it was not the way appointed by the Holy Ghost, for single Pastors to Ordain. The forecited Texts and examples are a sufficient proof.

Sect. 43. If any say, that the Ruling Elders may concur, I answer. Though I make no great matter of it, nor would not raise a contention about it, yet I must say, that I never yet saw any satisfactory proof, that ever God did institute such Elders as
as this Objection meaneth, in the Church: that is, 1. Such as are not Ordained, but come in by mere Election. 2. And such as have the Power of Discipline and Oversight without Authority to preach or administer the Sacraments. I think these are but humane creatures; though I doubt not but there may be such as *actually shall forbear* preaching and administration of the Sacraments, when some of their colleagues are fitter for it.

Sect. 44. But 2. If such an Office *can* be proved, I despair of seeing it proved from Scripture, that they have authority to Ordain. 3. And how can they have Authority, when most of them have not Ability? And I think it is supposed that they have not Ability to Preach, in them that deny them Authority; and if they want Ability to Preach, it's two to one but they want Ability to Try and Approve of Preachers. 4. And how come they to have Power to Ordain others, that are not Ordained themselves, but are admitted upon bare Election? 5. And this course would prostitute the Churches to unworthy men, as aforesaid.

Sect. 45. And 4. It is not a contemptible Consideration, that the chief Pastor of every particular Church, hath ever since the second Century at least, been Ordained by the Pastors of other Churches. And how it was before, we have but very defective Evidence, except so much as is left us in the Holy Scriptures, of which we have spoke before.

Sect. 46. And 5. The Church of Christ is a Chain of many links: a Society united in Christ the Head, consisting as a Republic-like of many Corporations, or as an Acedemy of many Colleges: and a greater Union and Communion is requisite among them, then among the parts of any other Society in the world. And therefore seeing it is the duty of Neighbour Pastors and Churches, according to their Capacity to hold Communion with that particular Church and its Pastors, it seems reasonable, that they have some antecedent Cognisance and Approbation of the persons that they are to hold Communion with.

Sect. 47. And 6. It is considerable also, that whoever is according to Christ's institution Ordained a Minister of a particular Church, is withall (if not before) Ordained a Minister *simply*; that is, one that may as a separated Messenger of Christ, both preach for the Conversion of those without, and gather Churches where there are none, and *pro temore* do the Office.
of a Minister, to any part of the Catholike Church, where he cometh and hath a Call. And therefore as he is simply a Minister, and the Unconverted world, or the Universal Church are the Objects of his Ministry, the Pastors or Members of that particular Church where he is settled, have no more to do in Ordaining him than any other. As a Corporation may choose their own Physician, Schoolmaster, &c. but cannot do any more than other men, in Licensing a man to be in general a Physician, Schoolmaster, &c. So may a Church choose who shall be their Teacher, but not who shall be simply a Teacher or Minister of Christ, any more than an other Church may do, that's further from him.

Seet. 48. And 7. It is also considerable, that it is the safest and most satisfactory way to the Church and to the Minister himself, to have the Approval of many. And it may leave more scruple concerning our Call, when one or two or a particular Church only do Approve us.

Seet. 49. And 8. It is granted in their writings by those that are for Ordination by a particular Church only, that the Concurrence of more is Lawful: and if Lawful, I leave it to Consideration, whether all the forementioned accidents make it not so far convenient, as to be ordinarily a plain duty, and to be preferred where it may be had.

Seet. 50. Yet do I not plead for Ordination by Neighbour Pastors, as from a Governing Authority over that particular Church: but as from an interest in the Church Universal, and all its Officers within their reach, and from an interest of Communion with Neighbour Churches.

Seet. 51. And it is observable in Scripture, that the Itinerant Ministers, that were fixed and appropriated to no particular Church, for continuance, (such as the Apostles and Evangelists were, and Titus, Timothy, and such others) had a Principal hand in the work of Ordination wherever they came. It was they, that Ordained Elders in every City, in every Church.

Seet. 52. Prop. 3. If any shall cull out two or three or more of the weakest, unjudicious, facile Ministers, and procure them to Ordain him, his course is irregular, and his call unsatisfactory, though the formal part be obtained to the full. For it is not for meer formality, but to satisfy the person called, and the Church,
Church, and to secure the Ministry and sacred works and souls of men, from injury by Usurpers, that God hath appointed the way of Ordination: And therefore it is fraud, and not obedience, for any man so to use it, as to cheat himself and the Church with a formality, and frustrate the Ordinance, and mis its ends.

Sect. 53. Prop. 4. If any man, avoiding the Orthodox and Unanimous Ministry, shall apply himself for Ordination to some divided schismatical or heretical persons, that will Approve him, and Ordain him, when the others would reject him, this also, as the former, is fraud and self-deceit, and not obedience; upon the last mentioned grounds. It is the basest treacherous kind of sinning, to turn God's Ordinances against himself; and to sin under the shelter and pretence of an institution. By using the means in opposition to its end, they make it no means, and use it not as a means at all. Though Pastors must Ordain, yet is it not all kind of Pastors-Ordination that should satisfy an honest meaning man; but that which hath the qualifications suited to the Rule and end.

Sect. 54. In such cases of unjust entrance, if the People sinfully comply, and the man have possession, it may be the duty of some particular persons, that cannot help it, (having done their own parts in disowning it,) to submit, and not therefore to separate from the Church, except in desperate extraordinary cases (not now to be enumerated.) And all the administrations of such a man shall be not only Valid to the innocent, but without any scruple of conscience may be used and received, with expectation of a promised blessing.

Sect. 55. But yet quoad debitem it is the Churches duty (except in Cases of Necessity) to disown such intruders, and to suspect and suspend obedience, to those that indirectly enter, (by a few ignorant, or schismatical Ordainers, refusing the trial of the unanimous abler Orthodox Ministry) till they have either persuaded the man to procure their Approbation, or have themselves sought the Judgement of the said United Ministers concerning him. And seeing all the Churches of Christ should be linked and jointed together, and hold communion and correspondence, according to their capacities, the Members of a particular Church are bound in reason, and to
those ends, to advise in such suspicious cases with neighbour Churches, and not to receive a Pastor that comes in by way of Discord, or that neglecteth or refuseth the concordant way. For he that entrencheth in a divisive way, is like to govern them accordingly, and still to shun the Communion of the Brethren.

Sect. 56. This Cyprian fully shews in the fore-mentioned Ep. 68. p. 201. persuading the people to shun the unworthy though they were Ordained by Bishops, adding [Ordinari nonnumquam indignos, non secundum Dei voluntatem, sed secundum humanam presumptionem; & hæc Deo dislicere, qua non veniant ex legitima & justa Ordinatione, Deus ipse manifestat, &c. —— ] Necessity may justify some things that otherwise would be irregularities: but when [Per urbes singulas (that is, in every Church) Ordinati sunt Episcopi, in aetate antiqui, in fide integri, in pressura probati, in persecutione proscripti, ille super eos creare alios pseudo-Episcopos autem] this is a fact that the people should disown. And [Qui neq; unitatem spiritus nec conjunctionem pacis observat, & se ab Ecclesia vinculo, atq; a Sacerdotum collegio separat, Episcopi nec potestatem possit habere, nec honorem, qui Episcopatus nec unitatem voluit tenere, nec pacem. Cyprian Epist. 52. ad Antonian.

Sect. 57. Prop. 5. Solemn Investiture is the last part of Ordination, by which the man that by consent of the people and himself, and by the Pastors Approbation, had received from Christ a Right to the Power and Honour, and Priviledges, and an Obligation to the Duties of the Office, is solemnly introduced and put in Possession of the place.

Sect. 58. Though in some cases a man may exercise the Ministry upon the foresaid Approbation and Election (which are most necessary) without this solemn investiture, yet is it ordinarily a duty, and not to be neglected: And the people should require the performance of it: I need not stand upon the Proof: for it is proved before by what was laid for Approbation, seeing they have ever gone together. Though fundamentally he be a Christian that hath entered Covenant with Christ: yet before the Church he is Visibly no Christian that hath not been Baptized, or at least made open Profession of that Covenant. Though fundamentally they are Husband and Wife that are contracted, or knit together by private Consent; yet in form Civili; in Law sense,
fence, and before men, they must be solemnly married, or else they are judged fornicators. And should any fantastical persons seek to call by this publick investiture or solemn Marriage, as unnecessary, he would but let in common Whoredoms: The solemnity or publication in such Cases is of great Necessity. And its much conducible to the greater obligation of Pastor and people to be solemnly engaged together; and to have solemn Prayer for Gods blessing, tendeth to their prosperity.

Sect. 59. When men are Ordained only to the Ministry in General, it may be done in one place as well as another, (that is otherwise convenient.) But if they are also Ordained to be Pastors of a Particular Church, it is the fittest way by far, that they be Ordained in the face of the Church, that the people and they may be mutually engaged, &c. Though yet this be not absolutely necessary.

Sect. 60. And thus I have dispacht, with the brevity intended, this weighty point, concluding with these two requests to my Brethren that shall peruse it: 1. That before they let out their displeasure against me for contradicting any of their conceits, they would humbly, impartially, and with modest self-suspicion, both study and pray over what they read, and not temerariously rush into the battell as pre-engaged men. 2. That they will alway keep the faith and charity, and self-denial and tenderness of Christians upon their hearts, and the great Ends and Interest of Christ and Christianity before their eyes; and take heed how they venture upon any controverted points or practice, as a Means that certainly contradieth the Spirit of Christianity, and the great Ends (the Churches Unity, Peace and Holines, &c.) which all true means are appointed, and must be used to attain. And whereunto we have already attained, let us walk by the same Rule, and mind the same things, Phil. 3. 16. Rememering that in Christ Jesus neither circumcision availeth, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature. And as many as walk according to this Rule, Peace be on them and Mercy, and on the Israel of God, Gal. 6. 15, 16.

Finis, May 19. 1658.
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AN
Episcopacy Desirable for the Reformation, Preservation, and Peace of the Churches.

CHAP. I.

Of General unfixed Bishops or Ministers.

§ 1. This is but delusory dealing of them that make the world believe that the question between the Prelatical Divines and the rest of the Reformed Churches, is, Whether the Church should be Governed by Bishops? This is a thing that is commonly granted: But the controversy is about the Species of Episcopacy: Not whether Bishops, but
but what sort of Bishops should be the ordinary Governours of the Church of Christ?

§. 2. And therefore it is also very immethodical and unsatisfactory of most that ever I read for Episcopacy, that plead only for Episcopacy in General, but never once define that sort of Episcopacy which they plead for, but go away with it as smoothly when the question is unstated, as if they understood themselves, and others were capable of understanding them; and so they lose their Learned labours.

§. 3. I have already in the first Disputation told you among ten several sorts of Episcopacy, which they be that I think desirable, and which I judge tolerable, and which intolerable. And I have there already given you the Reasons why I judge such a general unfixed Bishop to be of standing use to the Church and world, as here we are speaking of: and therefore I shall forbear here the repeating of what is said already.

§. 4. That the world and Church should still have such a General Itinerant unfixed Ministry, as that was of the Apostles, Evangelists and others, having there already proved, I have nothing to do more but to shew the use of it, and to answer the objections that some very learned Reverend Divines have used against it.

§. 5. The principal use of a general Ministry, is for the converting of the unconverted world, and Baptizing them when converted, and Congregating their Converts into Church order, and settling them under a fixed Government. And the next use of them is, to have a Care, according to the extent of their capacity and opportunities, of the Churches which they have thus Congregated and settled, and which are settled by other Ministers.

§. 6. Let it be remembred that we are not now disputing of the Name, but of the Thing: It is not whether such an Officer of Christ be to be called an Apostle or an Evangelist, or a Prophet, or a Bishop, or a Presbyter: But whether unfixed general Ministers, to gather Churches and settle them, and take the care of many, without a special Pastoral charge of any one above the rest, were appointed by Christ for continuance in his Church: This is it that I affirm, and have already proved.

§. 7. Nor yet is it any of our Question, Whether the difference between these general unfixed Ministers and ordinary fixed Presbyters,
byters, be in point of Authority or of exercise only. Whether they are two distinct Species of the Ministry, or but one of the same Office in Species, variously exercised: I have given in my thoughts of this before, so far as I can yet reach: But if it be granted that some should ordinarily exercise their office generally and ambulatorily over many Churches, as others ordinarily must exercise it fixedly in one particular Church, I shall not contend whether they are to be called One Office or two: nor yet whether the fixed Minister may not extraordinarily upon a special reason, do the same work as the itinerant Minister in the same way. But Ministers there must be for both these work.

§. 8. And that some should make the general work before mentioned their ordinary business, and not take the pastoral Charge of any particular Church, I conceive (besides the former proofs) is further manifest, 1. In that the work of Converting Unbelievers, and bringing them into a fitness for Church Communion, is the work that is to go first, and is the greatest work: Its the greatest in weight (præcifically considered, and as to the terminus à quo of the change that it effects:) and it is the greatest in regard of opposing difficulties: the winning of a soul, which rejoyceth Angels, and rejoyceth Jesus Christ himself, will have so much of Satans malice to oppose it, and hath so much resistance in the heart of the sinner, that it requireth the whole work (in ordinary) of those Ministers that are specially called hereunto.

§. 9. And 2. Withal it commonly falls out, that there are far greater numbers to be converted, than to be Governed after Conversion: If it be not so in some Countries (where the face of God hath shined most effectually) yet in others, and in most it is: even in the far greatest part of the world. O how many millions of souls are there that perish for lack of knowledge, and know not for want of teaching; and never heard of Jesus Christ in any likely manner to prevail, in all their lives? Surely such multitudes of Miserable souls, yea Nations, require Ministers wholly set upon this work.

§. 10. And 3. It ordinarily falls out too, that the unconverted unbelieving part of the world do live at a great distance from the Churches of Christ: and therefore the same man that is
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Pastor of a Church hath not opportunity to speak to them. Or if they live in the same Country, they seldom meet in greatest numbers in the same Assemblies: And therefore when the Pastor is upon his own work, it is requisite that there be some to speak to the rest.

§. 11. And yet I doubt not but as there are hypocrites in most Churches, and among us many that by their ignorance, or impiety we have cause to judge to be yet no Christians, are our Ordinary hearers, so the Pastors of the Churches may and must endeavour their conversion, and much suit their preaching to the condition of such souls. But yet those millions that in other parts of the world (and perhaps in Ireland, Wales and the Highlands of Scotland, too many such may be found) that neither know what Christianity is, nor are the Ordinary hearers of a fixed Ministry, and live not within the reach of such, should have a Converting Itinerant Ministry for themselves.

§. 12. Moreover, 4. The Pastoral work is self so great, and the charge that we take of particular Churches, and our obligation to them so strict, that it will usually self take up the whole man, and will not allow a Pastor time for the other work on those a distance yet uncalled, without neglecting the souls that he hath undertaken to oversee.

§. 13. And 5. For want of such general Ministers, the state of persons is in some places confounded, and the world and the Church are thrust together, as if there were no difference to be made. Because there are no Ministers known but Pastors, therefore there are no People known but as Christians, where yet the very knowledge of Christianity is too rare. Whereas if (where numbers and distance make it necessary) the preparing Ministry had first done their part, it would have prevented much dangerous confusion, and self-deceit that followeth hereupon in many places.

§. 14. And 6. By the mistaken supposition, that such general or unfixed Ministers are ceased, men have been drawn to set Lay-men upon the greatest and noblest work of the Ministry: and a conceit is hence risen among some, that because this is not proper to the Pastors of a Church, therefore it is not a Ministerial work, but the work of gifted Brethren: And hereupon uncalled men are tempted to exercise it: and by laying aside
aside the officers appointed hereunto by Christ, the burden is cast on the weakest men.

§. 15. Yea 7. By this means many Ministers themselves understanding not the Nature and extent of their own Office, when they do but preach to any that are not of the Church that they have charge of, imagine that they preach but as meer Laymen; and if they preach for the Conversion of unbelievers, they profess it to be no act of their office: which is an act that hath more inconveniences then I shall now express.

§. 16. And 8. Which is worst of all, by supposing that no Ministers are now to be appointed for the Conversion of Infidels, and gathering and planting Churches, it is come to pass that the most necessary work in all the world is neglected, cast off, and almost quite unknown in the world: except Mr. Eliots and a few with him in New England, and some of the Jesuites and Fryars in the East-Indies and America, who have been sent, or have adventured themselves for the Converting of the Nations. Were it but known and considered, how much of the Will of Jesus Christ is to be fulfilled by this most blessed work, Princes would have studied it, and contributed their assistance; and many would have been ready to have offered themselves to God for the work, when now it is looked on as no part of our duty, not only because that sluggishness and cowardize calleth it impossible, and the adventure unreasonable; but also because we think it was a work that was proper to Apostles and Evangelists; and Ministers are now tyed to their proper flock. And thus the poor unbelieving world is left in their sin.

§. 17. And 9. I doubt by this mistake and neglect we forfeit the benefit of that special promise, in too great a measure, Mat. 28. 20. and miss of that eminent assistance and presence of Christ with our Ministry, that otherwise we might expect. If we did go into the world, and preach the Gospel to the Nations (having used our industry first to learn their languages,) we might expect that Christ would always be with us to the end of the world, in a way of assistance and owning of our Labours, answerable to our engagements for him, and service to him. Were we deepler engaged for Christ, and did with Peter cast our selves into the Sea, or walk on the Waters at his
Call, we should find Christ acting as if he were answerably engaged for our indemnity, or at least for our eminent encouragement and reward. If ever we might expect Miracles again, it would be upon our engagement in the antient work; though I know that even for this they are now no more necessary, nor I think, promised.

§. 18. And 10. We do hereby seem to accuse Christ unjustly of Mutability, supposing that he had settled one sort of Ministry and Government in his Church for one Age only, and then changed it for another, that is ever after to continue alone. I know the extraordinary work of that age (to plant Churches by new doctrine and Miracles, and reveal the new Articles of Faith and Practice in Scripture to the world) did require such enablements thereto, which ordinary works do not require: and therefore the Apostles, as immediately sent, and as inditing Scriptures, and working Miracles, and Prophetically bringing new Revelations, have no Successors. But the Apostles as preaching to the Nations, and as planting Churches, and as settling them, and taking care of their prosperity after they had planted them, and as exercising their Ministry itinerantly, as not fixed to a special charge, thus they have Successors, the work being ordinary, and such as should be done now as well as then; and must continue while the necessity of it doth continue.

§. 19. There needeth no other proof of this, then by observing that it was not Apostles only, but all the Ministry at first, that was thus unfixed and itinerant; and that the Apostles assumed such to their assistance, and employed them all their days in this work.

§. 20. The seventy Disciples as well as the Apostles were at first by Christ sent forth in this Itinerant way, for the Conversion of the inhabitants of Judæa. And thus John the Baptist had preached before them. And after Christ's Resurrection and Ascension, it was not only the Apostles, but it was they that were scattered abroad, that went everywhere preaching the Word, Acts 8:4. And who were these? [Acts 8:1. They were all scattered abroad throughout the regions of Judæa and Samaria, except the Apostles.] And the Evangelists of those times are confessed to have exercised this Itinerant Ministry: so did Barnabas, Silas, Mark, Epaphroditus, Tychicus, Trophimus, Timothy,
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Timothy, Titus, Luke, and others ordinarily. It was the first and most ordinary way then of exercising the Ministry.

§. 21. And if we lived our selves in Heathen or Infidel Countreys, we should be soon taught by experience, that this must be still an ordinary work. For what else is to be done till persons be converted and brought into the Church? They must be made Disciples before they can be used as Disciples, and taught to observe all things that Christ hath commanded.

§. 22. But against this it is objected, 1. That the Apostles were extraordinary Officers, and therefore have no Successors. To which I answer, 1. That I have before shewed in what they were extraordinary, and in what not: in what they have no Successors, and in what they have. As Apostles sent immediately by Christ to Reveal a new doctrine, and confirm it by Miracles, they have no Successors: but as general Ministers of Christ to convert souls, plant Churches, and take a care of many, they have Successors; call them by what name you please. 2. And what if the Apostles have no Successors? Had the seventy Disciples none? Had Apollo, Titus, Timothy, Silas, Barnabas, &c. none? Had all the Itinerant converting Ministers of those times none, that were not affixed as Pastors to a particular Church?

§. 23. Obj. 2. But at least in the extent of their charge the Apostles were extraordinary, in that they were to preach the Gospel to all Nations. I answer; in point of exercise, being furnished with tongues and Miracles for the work, they were obliged to go further, or to more Nations then most particular Ministers are now obliged to go: but that is not because we want Authority, if we had ability and opportunity, but because we want ability and opportunity to exercise our Office. The Apostles were not bound to go into every Nation of the world, inclusively; but to avoid none, but go to all, that is, to as many as they could. Otherwise they had sinned in not going to Mexico, Peru, Brazil, the Philippine or Molucco Islands, to Japan, China, &c. And it is our duty to extend our Ministry for the Conversion of as many as we have Ability and opportunity to do. That which was common to the planting and watering Ministry in the Apostles dayes, was not proper to the Apostles: but to go up and down the world to Convert, and Baptize, and plant, and water Churches,
Churches was then common to such (as Apollo, Silas, &c.) therefore, &c.

§. 24. Obj. 3. But (say others) the Apostles were not at last such unfixed Ministers as you imagine, but fixed Diocesan Bishops. Peter was Bishop of Antioch first, and of Rome after: Paul was Bishop of Rome: James of Jerusalem, &c. — Ans. That any Apostle was a fixed Bishop, taking on him duranta vita the special Pastoral charge of one particular Church or Diocese, as his peculiar, is 1. Barely affirmed, and therefore not to be believed. 2. And is contrary both to the tenor of their Commission, and the History of their Ministrations. And 3. Is also contrary to Charity it self, and therefore not worthy of any credit. The Apostles were not so lazy or uncharitable, as to affix themselves to Parishes or Dioceses, and leave the Nations of the world in their unbelief; and to cease the work that they were first sent upon, before the necessity of it ceased. Peter and Paul were Bishops of Rome, as they were of other Churches which they planted and watered, and no more: even as Paul was Bishop of Ephesus, Philippi, Corinth, &c. And James was either no Bishop of Jerusalem, or no Apostle (but as many think, another James,) Indeed pro tempore not only an Apostle, but other Itinerant Ministers were Bishops of the places where they came; that is, were Officers of Christ, that might exercise any act of their Office (Teaching, Governing, administering Sacraments, &c.) to any people that gave them a Call, or so far as opportunity and need required. And so I doubt not but every Minister now may do in any Church on earth. If he be invited to stay a day, or week, or month among them, and do the work of a Minister, yea or if he be invited but to preach a Sermon to them, he may do it, not as a private man, but as a Minister in general, and as their Teacher or Pastor pro tempore, & ad hoc, that give him the invitation. For though the first Call to the Ministry, separating us to the Gospel of God, do give us our Authority in general to perform any Ministerial act; yet I have before shewed that a further Call is needful for the particular exercise of this power; and this is usually by the people: who may sometime call a man to be their stated Pastor, and sometime but to exercise some one Pastoral act, or else to exercise all but pro tempore, as there is need.

§. 25.
§ 25. And by this means it came to pass that the line of Succession in many Churches is drawn down from the Apostles, by Ensentius, Hierom, and other ancient writers. Not because the Apostles were the stated fixed Bishops of those Churches, as the Successors were; but because they first planted and Governed them, and were their Bishops pro tempore till they had settled Bishops over them; and then went and did the like by other places: so that one Apostle, or Evangelist, or unfixed Minister, might be the root of Succession to many Churches, even as many as they first planted: but their Successors had but one Church.

§ 26. Object. 4. But what use is there among us for such Ministers as these, when all the Nations are Converted from Insidelity already? Answ. 1. If there were no use of such with us, we must not forget the lamentable necessity of them abroad in the world. 2. As I before said, experience of the ignorance and unbelief of many about us in the best Parishes, doth cause me easily to believe that in Ireland, and part of Scotland, and Wales, and other places where settled Ministers are few, such an Itinerant Ministry is of necessary use among us. 3. But yet where there are settled Teachers enough, they may be spared: for if we had Parishes that had not the knowledge of Christ, it is a greater work of mercy to such a Parish, to settle a converting Teacher among them to fit them for a Church-state, that so they may have frequent Teaching, then to send them but now and then a Sermon. But where Ministers are not so plentiful, it were a great sin for an able man to confine himself to one Town or Parish, and neglect the Countrey round about. 4. And also there is use for Itinerants to water and take care of the Churches which are planted, as the Apostles and others formerly did.

§ 27. Concerning these unfixed Ministers, I add these following Propositions. 1. That such Ministers may not deprive the fixed Pastors of any of their Power: they may not disable them from Governing their own Churches as fully as if there were no Itinerant Ministers. If they are admitted pro tempore to assist the Churches where they come, that will not enable them to hinder them, or assume a Lordship or a Rule over the Pastors of the Churches.

§ 28. 2. These Itinerant unfixed Ministers, are not so obliged to perpetual motion, but that they may reside for a con-
derable time in a place, either for the following on the work of
Conversion, where they find a plenteous harvest, or for setting
Churches, or surprizing heresies or disorders, or because of
their own disability to travail. And thus Paul laid at and about
Ephesus in Asia three years, Act. 20. 31. Their lay must be
prudentially apportioned to their work and opportunities.
§. 29. 3. No Itinerant Minister can (of himself) exclude
another from his Province, and appropriate it to himself, and say,
Here I will work alone, or here I have greater Authority then you;
May it was usual for these Ministers to go by companies, or more
then one (as Paul and Barnabas, Paul and Silas, Paul and
Timothy, Titus, &c.) so that it was no mans Province or Dio-
ceses where they came. For they that Convert Souls to Christ
and not to themselves, and Baptize into his name and not in their
own, do know the greatness of the work and burden, and there-
fore are glad of all the assistance they can get: when those that
do nothing, are the men that thrust others out of the Vineyard,
and say, This is my Diocess or Province; you have nothing to do
to labour here.

§. 30. 4. Yet may there lawfully and fitly be a Prudential
distribution or division of their Provinces among such unfixed
Converting Ministers: for to be all together and go one way,
must needs be a neglecting of most of the world, and so not a
wise or faithful performance of the work of Christ. And there-
fore some should go one way, and some another, as may most
promote the work.

§. 31. And ordinarily it is most convenient, that there go
more then one to the same people, (and therefore they will not
be like a fixed Diocesan Bishop) for they have many wyes
need of mutual assistance: one would be oppressed with so great
a work, and have many disadvantages in the performances. Paul
used not to go alone.

§. 32. The persons to be exercized in this ambulatory Mini-
stration, may be determined of, and their Provinces distri-
Teachers of the Church at Antioch must send or separate Saul and Barnabas, for the special work in which the Holy Ghost would implore them, Acts 13.1,2, which seems to me, to be but a secondary Call to some special exercise of their former Office, one way rather than another. Thus also by mutual agreement their Provinces may be allotted and divided.

§. 33. 2. By the Magistrates appointment and command also, may this be done. Though he make not Ministers, yet may he do much in assigning them their Provinces, Seats, and Stations: and it is our duty to obey his Commands in such cases if they be not plainly destructive to the Church: much more if they are beneficial to it.

§. 34. 3. Also by a Ministers own discerning of a fit opportunity to do good, either by the Magistrates bare permission, the peoples invitation, or their willingness, or not opposing; or though they do oppose, yet some other advantages for the work may be discerned, or Hopes at least. Now though the Call of Ordination must be from the Pastors of the Church; and neither Magistrates nor people can make us Ministers, yet the Call of Opportunity may be from the people and Magistrate, more commonly then any. And he that is already a Minister, needs not always another Call for the exercising of his Ministry, save only this Call by Opportunity. He had his Authority by that Call that placed him in the Office; which was done at first, and must be done but once. But he hath his Opportunity and station for the exercise of that Authority by the people and Magistrates, and perhaps may receive it over and over many times.

§. 35. 5. This way of exercising the Ministry is not alike necessary in all times and places; but with great variety; it is exceeding necessary in some Countreys, and not in others, but useful in some degree in most as I conceive.

§. 36. If the Question be, whether such a Ministry be useful in these Dominions, or not? I have answered before, that in some darker and necessitous parts, where ignorance doth reign, and Ministers (or able ones at least) are scarce, there such an exercise of the Ministry is necessary: but in other parts it is not of such necessity: yet much work there may be for such, or for those in the next Chapter mentioned, in most Countreys: of them therefore I shall next speak.
CHAP. II.

Of fixed Pastors that also participate in the work of the unfixed.

§. 1. It is not only the unfixed Ministers that may lawfully do the fore-described work, but the fixed Pastors of particular Churches may take their part of it, and ordinarily should do somewhat toward it: though not so much as they that are wholly in it.

§. 2. I shall here shew you, 1. What such may do. 2. On what terms. 3. And then I shall prove it. And 1. They may as Ministers of Christ, go abroad to preach where there are many ignorant or ungodly people in order to their Conversion. 2. They may help to Congregate Believers into holy Societies, where it is not already done. 3. They may Ordain them Elders in such Churches as they Congregate. 4. They may oft enquire after the welfare of the Neighbour Churches, and go among them, and visit them, and strengthen them, and admonish the Pastors to do their duties. 5. They may instruct and teach the Pastors in publike exercises. 6. They may exercise any acts of Worship or Discipline upon the people of any particular Church, which giveth them a due invitation thereto. 7. They may publicly declare that they will avoid Communion with an impious or heretical Church or Pastor.

§. 3. But 2. As to the mode or terms, it should be thus performed. 1. No Pastor of a single Church must leave his flock a day or hour without such necessary business as may prove his Call to do so. We must not feign a Call when we have none; or
or pretend necessities. He that knows his obligations to his particular charge, and the work that is there to be done, methinks should not dare to be stepping aside, unless he be sure it is to a greater work.

§. 4. And 2. No Pastor of a Church should be busy to play the Bishop in another man's Diocese, nor suspect or disparage the parts or labours of the proper Pastor of that Church, till the sufferings or dangers of the Church do evidently warrant him, and call him to assist them.

§. 5. 3. No Minister of Christ should be so proud as to overvalue his own parts, and thereupon obtrude himself where there is no need of him (though there might be need of others) upon a conceit that he is fitter than other men to afford assistance to his Brethren. When the case is really so, he may judge it so: especially when his Colleagues or fellow Ministers judge so too, and desire him to the work: but Pride must not send out Ministers.

§. 6. 4. A Minister that hath divers fellow Presbyters at home, to teach and guide that Church in his absence, may better go out on assisting works than other men. And so may he that hath help that while from Neighbour Presbyters, or that hath such a charge as may bear his absence for that time, without any great or considerable loss.

§. 7. 5. And a man that is commanded out by the Magistrate, who may make him a Visiter of the Churches near him, may lawfully obey; when it would not have been fit to have done it without such a command, or some equivalent motive.

§. 8. 6. A man that is earnestly invited by Neighbour-Ministers or Churches, that call out to him, Come and help us, may have comfort in his undertaking, if he see a probability of doing greater good then if he denied them, and if they give him satisfactory reasons of their Call.

§. 9. 7. Men of extraordinary abilities, should make them as communicative and useful to all as possibly they can: and may not so easily keep their retirements, as the Weak may do.

§. 10. 8. And lastly, No man should upon any of these pretences usurp a Lordship over his Brethren, nor take on him to be the stated Pastor of Pastors, or of many Churches as his special
cial Charge. It is one thing to do the common work of Ministers abroad, by seeking men’s Conversion, and the planting of Churches, or else to afford assistance to many Churches for their preservation, establishment or increase: and it is another thing to take charge of these Pastors and Churches, as the proper Bishop or Overseer of them. The former may be done; but I know no warrant for the later.

§. 11. That fixed Ministers may do all these forementioned works, with the aforesaid Cautions, I shall briefly prove. 1. By some general Reasons, speaking to the whole; and 2. By going over the particulars distinctly, and giving some reason for each part.

§. 12. And 1. It is certain that a Minister doth not cease to be a Minister in general, nor to be an Officer authorized to seek the Discipling of them without, and Congregating them, by his becoming the Pastor of a particular Church: therefore he may still do the common works of the Ministry where he hath a Call, as well as his Pastoral special work to them that he hath taken special care of. As the Physician of an Hospital or City may take care also of other persons, and cure them, so he neglect not his charge.

§. 13. 2. A Minister doth not lay by his Relation or Obligations to the unconverted world, nor to the Catholike Church, when he affixeth himself to a special charge. And therefore he may do the work of his Relations and Obligations, as aforesaid. Yea those works in some respects should be preferred, because there is more of Christ’s interest in the Universal Church, or in many Churches than in one; and that work in which the most of our ultimate End is attained, is the greatest work: that in which God is most honoured, the Church most edified, and most honour and advantage brought to the Gospel and cause of Christ, should be preferred: But ordinarily these are more promoted by the Communication of our help to many (as aforesaid) than by confining it to one particular Church. The commonest good is the best.

§. 14. 3. Of-times the Necessity of such Communicative labours is so apparently great, that it would be unmercifulness to the Churches or souls of men to neglect them. As in case of Reforming and settling Churches (upon which Luther, Me-
Lanchthon, Chytraeus, Bugenhagius, Pomeranus, Calvin, and others were so oft employed. As also in case of retilling some destructive heresies: In which case one able Disputant and prudent adviser, and person that hath interest in the people, may do good to thousands, even to many Countries, and more then multitudes of others could do. And God doth not set up such lights to put under a bushell, nor warrant any man to hide his talents; nor doth he bestow extraordinary gifts for ordinary service only, but would have them used to the utmost advantage of his cause, and for the greatest good of souls.

§. 15. 4. And it is not the taking up of another calling or Species of Ministerial Office: For the Ministry is one office distinct from that inferior sort of Ministry of Deacons) and containeth the power and obligation of doing all this, when we have particular calls: It is but the exercise of the same office which we had before: We do but lay our selves more in some parts or acts of that office, then more retired Pastors do.

§. 16. And 5. It belongeth to the Magistrates to take care of the Church and the right exercise of the gifts of their subject Ministers: and therefore if they command one man more labour then another, even the Planting, or Visiting of Churches, it is our Duty to obey them.

§. 17. More particularly: 1. That a fixed Pastor may preach abroad among the unconverted. I hope none will deny. It was the ancient custom of the fixed Bishops, besides the feeding of their flocks, to labour the Conversion of all the Countries about them that were unconverted: The example of Gregory of Neo-cesarea may suffice, who found but seventeen Christians in the City, but converted not only all that City (except seventeen) but also most of the Countries about, and planted Churches, and ordained them Bishops. And so have abundance others done, to the increase of the Church.

§. 18. And 2. That fixed Bishops may congregat new Churches where there are none, of such as they or others do convert, is in the foresaid constant practice of the Pastors of the ancient Churches, put part doubt. But so, as that they ought not to Congregate those Churches to themselves, and make themselves the Bishops or Archbishops of them, when they have a special charge already; but only settle them under Bishops of their own: And
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this
this is but by directing them in their duties, and trying the
person, and inveilling him that is to be their Pastor. Whether one
or more must do this work, I have spoken already in the former
Disputation.

§ 19. 3. And that such as thus convert a people, or Con-
gregate them, may (according to the fore-mentioned Rules )
Ordain them Pastors, by the people's suffrages or Consent, is al-
so sufficiently proved in that foregoing disputation: and therefore
may be here past by.

§ 20. 4. And that such may take care of all the Churches
within their reach, so far as to do them what good they can, is
plain in the Law of Nature that requireth it; and in the general
commands of the Gospel seconding the Law of Nature; while
we have time we must do good to all men; Especially to the
household of faith. And its plain in the Nature of the Catholick
Church and of its members, and in the nature of the work of
Grace upon the soul. We are taught of God to love one anoth-
er: and the End of the Catholick Society is, (as of all Soci-
eties) the common good, and the Glory of God: and the Nature
of true members is to have the same care one for another, that so
there may be no schism in the body, and that they all suffer and
rejoice with one another, in their hurts, and in their welfare,
1 Cor. 12. 25, 26. It is therefore lawful for Pastors to improve
their talents upon these common grounds.

§ 21. 5. That such settled Pastors may Teach or Preach to one
another, is a thing not doubted of among us. For we commonly
practice it at Lectures and other meetings of Ministers, as
formerly was usual at visitations, and Convocations. And if
it be lawful to teach Ministers, then also to do those lesser things
before and after mentioned. Yet do we not preach to one anoth-
er as Rulers over our Brethren, but as Ministers of Christ,
and Helpers of them in the work of grace. As when one Phy-
sitian heareth another, he doth it as a Physician, helping and
advising a Brother in necessity; but when he cureth one of his
Hospital, he doth it as a Physician performing his trust to one of
his charge. So when a Pastor preacheth to Pastors, he doth it
not as a private man, but as a Pastor obliged to help his Bre-
thren: But when he preacheth to his People, he doth it as
one
one that hath the charge of their souls, and is their guide to life everlasting.

§. 22. 6. And that Pastors may exercise acts of Discipline and administer the Sacraments to other Congregations, upon a sufficient Call, is evident from what is said already. If they may Preach to the Pastors themselves, they may help to Rule the flock: For, as is said, they cease not their Relation to the Church of Christ in general, by being engaged to one Church in particular. If general Ministers, such as Apostles, Evangelists, &c. might administer the Sacraments where they came in Churches that were not any of their special charge above others, then may other Ministers of Christ do it upon a sufficient Invitation, though the Congregation be none of their special charge: And in so doing, they act not as private men, nor yet as the stated Pastors of that flock, but as Pastors, Assistant to the stated Pastors, and Ruling pro tempore the people under them in that Assisting way: Even as a Physician helpeth another in his Hospital, when he is desired, and the neither as a Private Ordinary man, nor as Superior to the Physician of the Hospital, nor as the stated Physician of it himself, but as the temporary assistant Physician of it. Or as a Schoolmaster helpeth another in his School for a few days in Necessity, as his temporary assistant.

§. 23. 7. And upon the same grounds it will follow that one Church or Pastor on just occasion may avoid Communion with another, and declare that they so resolve to do; and this without usurping any Jurisdiction over them, it being not the calling out or Excommunicating of a member of our charge, as the Rulers of that Church, but the obeying of a plain command of the Holy Ghost, which requireth us to Avoid such, and have no company or Communion with them, and with such no not to eat: And therefore it is a fond Argumentation of the Papists, that would conclude their Pope to be Head and Governor, as far as they find he ever did excommunicate.

§. 24. He that doubteth of any of this, must not first enquire, Whether a Minister have so much Power, but first Whether he may be obliged to so much work and suffering as his duty. And then he shall find that if there were no special examples or commands, yet the general commands, which require us to do good
while we have time to all, to be the servants of all, and seek their salvation, &c. do as certainly oblige us to particular duties, as if they were named.

§. 25. Object. That cannot be: For, a General command of doing good to all, obligeth not a Minister any more than another man: But it obligeth another man to Preach, administer Sacraments, &c. therefore it obligeth not a Minister. Answ. To the Major I answer, that 1. It may oblige to more, where it obligeth not more, as to the Essence of the obligation. 2. The General command obligeth several men to several acts according to their several Abilities, opportunities and capacities. If all be required to improve their Masters flock or talents, yet all are not required to improve the same talents, because they have not the same: But one hath Riches to improve, and the general command obligeth him to improve that talent: And another hath strength, another interest and friends, another wit, and another learning, and every man is bound to improve what he hath, and not what he hath not. The command of Doing good to all doth oblige a Physician to help to cure men, and a Magistrate to benefit them by Government, and a Lawyer by Counsel for their estates, and a Minister by the works of a Minister, for their salvation. If you should say that [this General command doth bind a Magistrate, or a Physician no more than another man: but it bindeth not another man to do good by Ruling or by Physick, therefore neither doth it bind them;] would not the fallacy be obvious? So is it here.

§. 26. It being proved that such Assistant Ministerial works may be performed by a fixed Pastor to those about him, and within his reach, it will clearly follow that convenient means may be used to bring this to performance, and help the Churches to the actual benefit of such Assistance. And by the three forementioned ways it may be done. As 1. If the Pastor and People of any Neighbour Church, or the people alone, where there is no Church, do invite such men to come and help them.

§. 27. And 2. The Neighbour Pastors may agree together for the persuading of the fittest men among them to undertake such Assurances: as is usual in the setting of Lectures; and as in this County we have successfully for above these two years used the help of four Itinerant Lecturers, that have taken their several
several circuits, one Lords day in four, (which was every Lords day among them all) to help their neighbours.

§. 28. And if the Invitation of a People, or the Agreement of Pastors may do this, no doubt then but the prudent Government of a Magistrate may do it. And he may appoint Certain Pastors their bounds and Circuits, and appoint them to afford convenient assistance to the Pastors and people within those bounds. And thus he may make them Visitors of the Churches and Country about them, in which visitation, they may Teach and do other Ministerial offices by Consent; and may by the Magistrates command, take notice whether the Churches be duly constituted and Governed, and may acquaint the Magistrate how things are; and may fraternally Reprove the Negligent Pastors and people where they come; And also may provoke them to Reformation, both of Church Constitution and Church-administrations; And these visitors may give notice to the neighbour Churches, of such Pastors as they find unfit for the Ministry, that by consent they may be disowned by the rest.

§. 29. And though one Pastor have not of himself (as a Pastor) so much Power over any of his Brethren, as to require him to come to him to give him an account of his wayes, yet 1. The Associated Pastors may desire him to appear among them to give them satisfaction, when there is matter of offence: (For one may better travail to many, then many to one.) And 2. The Magistrate may lawfully command Ministers to appear before such Pastors as he hath appointed to be Visitors; and then it will be their duty in obedience to the Magistrates command.

§. 30. Yet Magistrates must take heed that they put not the sword into the hands of Ministers, nor enable them with coercive power, by touching mens bodies or estates: We do not only forbear to claim such a power, but we disclaim it, yea and humbly and earnestly beseech the Princes and Senates of Christian Common-wealths, that they would keep the sword in their own hands, and not put it into the hands of any Ministers, and then we could better bear the claims and usurpations, not only of Exorbitant or transcendent Prelates, but of the Pope himself. Let them come unarmed, and have no weapon but spiritual, the word of God, and then we shall less fear them. The Divisions, and
tyranny, & bloodshed through the Churches hath been by trust ing coercive Magisterial power in the hands of Ministers of the Gospel. Though I confess I think it not a thing unlawful in itself for a Minister to be a Magistrate also, yet I think that nothing but necessity can warrant it; and so much as hindereth him from the work of his calling (which requireth a whole man) without this necessity, is utterly unlawful. Were there a Country that had no other persons tolerably fit, I doubt not but the same man that is a Minister or Pastor, might be a Justice of Peace, Parliament man, or a Prince: But while there are others that are capable of bearing these burdens, he is not worthy to be a Minister of the Gospel, that would with the least of them upon his shoulders. Either Magistracy or Ministry is enough for one. Had the English Prelates been armed with none but spiritual weapons, they had never appeared so terrible or so odious.

§ 31. It seemeth a course that suiteth with the state of the present Churches among us, to have in every County, three or four such able, faithfull Pastors to be by the Magistrate made Visitors of the rest, not giving them any power of medling with mens bodies or estates, but joining with them a Magistrate as a Justice or Commissioner, that one may persuade, and the other constrain, as far as the Sovereign Power shall think fit. This is not to set up any New office or the least part of an office in the Church. As it is meerly accidental to the Being of a Phisitian, whether he be tied to a City, or to an Hospital, or to a County, or to no place; but practice as he findeth opportunity; these being but the various modes of using the same * Office and works; so may we truly say of the Ministry.

§ 32. Yet is there no such necessity of this appointment of Visitors or Superintendents, or Assistants by the Magistrate, or by agreement of Ministers, or any such course, as if the Being, or the welfare of the Church were laid upon it. For without any such Elections or Appointments, the Graces and Gifts of the Spirit of Christ will shew themselves, and be communicative for the Edification of the Churches. We see by common experience, that where no one man is commanded or commended by the Magistrate to the care of many Churches, above his brethren, yet some men are as diligent and faithfull in doing good to all within their reach, as if they had been chosen and nominated to the
the work. Many able painfull Ministers of Christ, that thirst for mens salvation, do go up and down among the ignorant, or weak, and preach in seasion and out of season, notwithstanding the burden of their particular flocks, which they faithfully bear.

§. 33. And the parts and graces of these men do win them audience and respect where they come, without any Humane Authority to awe men. In almost all parts of our Countrey we have either settled or movable Lectures: and when do we see a thin Congregation before a lively rowling Minister, or any man of great ability in the work? No, but we see the Temples crowded; and find that the people reverence and hearken to such men as these, in whom the Spirit of God appears.

§. 34. Yea and the Ministers themselves will consult with the Wise, and Love the good, and learn of those that are ablest to teach them: and imitate the ablest preachers as near as they can. So that I may truly say, that there is a certain kind of Natural, or rather, spiritual Episcopacy everywhere exercised in the Church. A great light that burneth and shineth above others, will draw the eyes of many to it: and if it be set on a hill it will hardly be hid. Calvin was no Prelate; and yet his Gifts procured him that Intereft, by which he prevailed more then Prelates for the conformity of the minds of many to his own. There is scarce a Country but hath some able judicious Minister, who hath the Intereft of a Bishop with the rest; though he have no higher an office then themselves. Gods Graces deserve and will procure respect. Even in Civil Councils, Courts, Committees, we see that some one of leading parts, is the Head of the rest though their authority be equal.

§. 35. And indeed the conveniences and inconveniences are such on both sides, that it is not an easie matter to determine, Whether appointed Visitors or Superintendents, be more desirable then these Arbitrary Visitors that have the Natural Episcopacy of Intereft procured by their meer abilities. On the one side, if Magistrates appoint such Visitors, the people, yea and many Ministers will the more easily submit, and hear, and obey, and more unanimously concur, then if we offer our assistance without any such appointment: Thats the convenience: But then heres the inconvenience: The Magistrate may choose an unworthy man, and then
then he may be feared, but not honoured nor loved; but greater lights will be greater still, let the Magistrate set the lesser on never so high a Candlestick: And then the Ministers and people will measure their esteem of the man according to his worth, and that will irritate his displeasure; For when he is lifted up he either looks to be valued by his *Height*, and not his *Light* or *Worth*, or else that his *Light* should be judged of by his *Height*. And as this will turn to heart-burnings and divisions, so the esteem that is procured by humane Constitution, will be more humane, and ordinarily less Divine, then the calling and work of a Divine requireth. On the other side, if none be appointed by the Magistrate, but every man go forth in the strength of his zeal and Abilities; we are like to be cast on many disadvantages with carnal temporizing men, and to have less unity among our selves: But then that unity, and peace, and respect, and success that we have will be more voluntary and pure.

§. 36. The best way then, if we could hit it, seems to be the joining of both these together. To have such Magistrates as will appoint only the most judicious, able, faithfull Ministers to be Visitors of the Churches, that shall go forth both in the strength of the Spirit of Christ, with eminency of gifts, and also in the strength of the Magistrates Commission. But if this cannot be attained, I shall not long for constituted Visitors or Superintendents; but shall be content with the Holy Ghosts appointment.

§. 37. It is therefore the most Christian course to lay no greater stress on these modes and forms of Ministration then they will bear; and therefore to live obediently and peaceably under either of them; obeying such Visitors as are appointed by the Magistrate, and honouring the graces of the Spirit, where there is no such appointment; and not to think the Church undone when our conceits about such things are crost.

CHAP.
It is Lawfull for the several Associations of Pastors to choose one man to be their President, durante vita, if he continue fit.

§ 1. Come next to speak of a third sort of Ministry, which hath a greater resemblance to the ancient Episcopacy, then any of the rest: Yea indeed is the same that was exercised about the second or third Century after Christ. And that is, the fixed Presidents of the Presbyters of many Churches, associated. In the first settlement of Churches, there was either a single Pastor to a single Church; or many Pastors, in equality, at least of Office: And whether from the beginning or afterward only, one of them became the stated President, is very uncertain: of which anon. But when the Churches increased in magnitude, and many Congregations were gathered under one Presbytery, then that Presbytery also had a stated President, as the Congregational Presbyteries perhaps had before. And thus he was an Archbishop under the name of a Bishop, that awhile before was either unknown, or else must needs be esteemed an Archbishop.

§ 2. That these men should take the Pastoral charge of many Churches, or that they should suspend the Governing Power of the
the Presbyters, upon pretence of a Presidency, or superiority, is I think, a matter not warrantable by the word of God.

§. 3. But that such Associations of the Pastors of many Churches should ordinarily be, for the sake of Union and Communion; as also that it is lawful for these Associatied Ministers to choose one among them to be their President, is granted by all.

§. 4. But all the question is, Whether these Presidents should be only pro tempore, or durante vita, supposing that they forfeit not the trust? I shall not say much of the point of convenience; but I affirm, that of itself it is lawful to choose a President that shall be fixed durante vita, si tam diu bene se gesseris. Yea it is lawful now in England, as things stand.

§. 5. And 1. It may suffice for the proof of this, that it is nowhere forbidden in Nature or in Scripture; directly or by consequence: and, therefore it is lawful: Where there is no law, there is no transgression: They, that say that it is a thing forbidden, must prove it from some word of God, which I think, they cannot do.

§. 6. 2. If it be lawful to choose a fixed President for half a year, or a year, or seven year, then is it lawful to choose and fix such a President for life (on supposition still of a continued fitness) But it is lawful to choose such a one for a year, or seven year: therefore also for life.

§. 7. The Antecedent is granted by the Presbyterian, Congregational and Erastian party, (which are all that I have now to do with:) For all these consented that D. Twiss should be President of the Synod at Westminster, which was till his death: or else was like to have been till the end; And so another after him. And ordinarily the Provinces and Presbyteries choose a President till the next Assembly. And I remember not that ever I heard any man speak against this course.

§. 8. And then the Consequence is clear, from the parity of Reasons: For 1. Seven years in contracts is valued equal with the duration of a mans life. 2. And no man can give a Reason to prove it lawful to have a President seven years, or a quarter of a year, that will not prove it lawful in itself to have a President during life. And Accidents must be weighed on both sides, before you can prove it Accidentally evil; And if it be but
but so, it may be one time good, if by accident it be another time bad. The weightiest accident must preponderate.

§. 9. 3. Order is a thing lawful in Church Assemblies and Affairs: the stated Presidency of one, is a stated Order in Church Assemblies: therefore it is lawful that all things be done in Order, is commanded, 1 Cor. 14. 40. And therefore in general Order is a duty, which is more then to be Lawful. And though the particular ways of Order may yet be comparatively indifferent, yet are they Lawful, as the Genus is necessary.

§. 10. And that this Presidency is a point of Church Order, is apparent in the nature and use of the thing: and also in that it is commonly acknowledged a matter of Order in all other societies or Assemblies, though but for the low and common affairs of the world: in a Jury you will confess, that Order requireth that there be a Foreman: and in a Colledge that there be a Master: and that an Hospital, a School, and all Societies, have so much Order at least as this, if not much more. And why is not that to be accounted Order in the Church, that is so in all other societies?

§. 11. 4. That which maketh to the Unity of the Churches or Pastors (and is not forbidden by Christ) is both lawful and desirable: But such is a stated Presidency: therefore, &c. The Major is grounded. 1. On nature it self, that tells us how much of the strength, and beauty, and safety of the Church, and of all societies doth consist in Unity. The Minor is apparent in the Nature of the thing: 1. That Presidency makes for Unity, is confess by all the Churches that use it to that end. 2. And the continuance of the same makes somewhat more for Unity then a change would do: there being some danger of division in the new elections: besides other and greater inconveniences.

§. 12. 5. The person that is most fit (Consideratis Considerandis) should be chosen President: But one and the same person ordinarily is most fit durante vita: therefore one and the same person should be continued President. God doth not use to change his gifts at every monethly or quarterly Sessions of a Classis or Provincial Synod. Either the President chosen was the fittest at the time of his choice, or not: if he were not, he was ill chosen: if he were so then, it's like he is so still, at least for a long time. And a man's ability is so great and considerable a qualification
cation for every employment, that it must be a very great accident on the other side that must allow us to choose a man that is leas able. A change cannot be made in most places, without the injury of the Assembly and of their work. The worthiest person therefore may lawfully be continued for the work fake.

§. 13. 6. That way is lawful that conduceth to the Reconciliation of dissenting and contending Brethren (supposing it not forbidden by God.) But such is the way of a stated Presidency, during vita: therefore, &c. Though the Major be past doubt, yet to make it more clear, consider, that it is 1. A Learned party (as to many of them) with whom this Reconciliation is desired: and therefore the more desirable. 2. That it is a numerous party: even the most of the Catholike Church by far. All the Greek Church, the Armenian, Syrian, Abassine, and all others that I hear of, except the Reformed, are for Prelacy: and among the Reformed, England and Ireland had a Prelacy; and Denmark, Sweden, part of Germany, Transilvania, have a superintendency as high as I am pleading for at least. And certainly a Reconciliation, and as near a Union as well may be had, with so great a part of the Church of Christ, is a thing not to be despised; nor will not be by considerate moderate men.

§. 14. And it is very considerable with me, that it is the future and not only the present Peace of the Churches that we shall thus procure. For it is easy to see that Episcopacy is neither such an upstart thing, nor defended by such contemptible reasons, as that the Controversie is like to die with this age: undoubtedly there will be a Learned and Godly party for it; while the world endureth; unless God make by Illumination or Revelation some wonderful change on the Sons of men, that I think, few men do expect. And certainly we should do the best we can to prevent a perpetual disention in the Church. Were there not one Prelatical man now alive, it were easy to foresee there would soon be more.

§. 15. Yet do I not move, that any thing forbidden by God should be used, as a means for Peace or Reconciliation with men. It is not to set up any Tyranny in the Church, nor to introduce any new Office that Christ hath not planted: it is but the orderly disposal of the Officers and affairs of Christ, which is pleaded for.

§. 16.
§ 16. Object. But (some will say) your Minor yet is to be denied; for this is not a way to Reconciliation. A stated Presidency will not please the Prelates that have been used to the sole Jurisdiction of a whole County, and to sole Ordination. Answ. 1. We know that the moderate will consent. 2. And some further accommodation shall be offered anon; which may satisfy all that will shew themselves the Sons of Peace: 3. If we do our duty, the guilt will no longer lie on us, but on the refusers of Peace: but till then, its as well on us as on them.

§ 17. 7. That which is lawfully practised already by a Concurrency of judgements, may lawfully be agreed on: But the Presidency (or more) of one man in the Assemblies of Ministers, is in most places practised (and that lawfully) already: therefore, &c. There is few Associations, but some one man is so far esteemed of by all, that they give him an actual or virtual Presidency; or more: why then may they not agree expressly so to do?

§ 18. 8. Lastly, The so common and so antient practice of the Churches, should move us to an inclination to reverence and imitation, as far as God doth not forbid us, and we have no sufficient reason to deter us: of which more anon.

§ 19. Yet are not they to be justified that raise contentions for such a Presidency, and lay the Churches Peace upon it. I see not yet but that it is a thing in it self indifferent, whether a man be President a moneth, a year, or for his life: and therefore I plead only for condescending in a case indifferent, for the Churches peace: though accidentally order may make it more desirable in one place: and jealousies, and prejudice, or danger of usurpation, may make it less desirable in another place. But none should judge it necessary or sinful of it self.

§ 20. If you ask, What Power shall these stated Presidents have? I answer. 1. None can deny, but that it is fit that in every Association of Churches, there should be a certain way of Communication agreed on. And therefore that some one should be chosen to receive such Letters or other matters that are to be Communicated, and to send them, or notice of them unto all. This is a service, and the power of doing such a service cannot be questionable while the service is unquestionable.

§ 21. 2. It is meet that some be appointed to acquaint the

rest,
refl, as with business, so with times and places of meeting: the
nomination of such times and places, or the acquainting others
with them when agreed on, is a service that none can justly que-
tion: and therefore the lawfulness of the power to do it, may not
be questioned.

§. 22. ObjeA. But what's this to Government? this is to make
them Servants, and not Governors. Answ. It is the more agree-
table to the will of Christ, that will have that kind of greatness
fought among his Ministers, by being the servants of all.

§. 23. But 3. He may alfo be the Stated Moderator of their
Disputations and Debates; this much I think will easily be grant-
ed them; and I am sure with some (as I shall shew anon) this
much would seem satisfactory. The Principal President or Ma-
fter of a Colledge is thought to have a convenient precedence
or superiority, though he have not a Negative voice. And why
the President in an Association of Pastors should have a greater
Power, I see as yet neither necessity nor reason.

§. 24. But 4. If Peace cannot otherwise be obtained, the
matter may be thus accommodated, without violation of the
Principles or Consciences of the Episcopal, Presbyterian, or Con-
gregational party. 1. Let it be agreed or consented to, that no
man be put to profess, that it is his judgement, that Bishops
should have as jure divino a Negative voice in Ordination. This
was never an Article of Faith: it is not necessary to be put
among our Credenda. It is only the Practice that is pretended
to be necessary, and a submission to it. Seeing therefore it is not
to be nimbred with the Credenda, but the agenda, let A@tion
without professed Belief suffice. 2. Yea on the same reasons,
if any man be of a Contrary judgement, and think himself bound
to declare it modestly, moderately, and peaceably, let him have
liberty to declare it, so his practice be peaceable. 3. This being
premised, Let the President never Ordain, except in case of nece-
sity, but with the presence or consent of the Assembly of the Asso-
ciated Pastors. 4. And let the Pastors never Ordain any, except in
cases of Necessity, but when the President is there present, nor with-
out his Consent. And in Cases of Necessity (as if he would de-
prive the Churches of good Ministers, or the like) the Episcopal
men will yield it may be done.

§. 25. If some think the President Must be one, and others
only
only think he May be one; it is reasonable, if we will have peace, that our May be yield to their Must be. For so we yield but to what we confess lawful: but if they should yield, it must be to what they judge to be sinful. If it be not lawful to hold their Must, that is, that a Bishop hath a Negative voice, yet is it lawful to forbear de facto to Ordain till he be one, except it be in case of Necessity.

§. 26. If in an Association there be a company of young or weak Ministers, and one only man that is able to try him that is offered to the Ministry, as to his skill in the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and his Philosophy, &c. is it not lawful here for all the rest to consent that they will not Ordain any, except in cases of Necessity, but when the foresaid able man is one? Who can doubt of this? And if it be lawful in this case, it is much more lawful; when both the ability of the said person, and the Peace of the Churches doth require it: or if it be but the last alone, I think it may well be yielded to.

§. 27. But (the Episcopal men will object,) if every man shall have leave to Believe and Profess a Parity of Ministers, the President will but be despised, and this will be no way to Peace, but to Contention. Answ. You have but two remedies for this, and tell us which of them you would use. The first is, to force men by Club-law to subscribe to your Negative voice, or not to hold the contrary: The second is, to cast them all out of the Communion of the Churches, that are not in judgement for your Negative voice, though they be Moderate, Peaceable, Godly men. And he that would have the first way taken, is a Tyrant, and would be a Cruel Persecutor of his Brethren as good as himself. And he that would take the second way, is both Tyrannous, and Schismatical, and far from a Catholike peaceable disposition; and if all must be cast out or avoided by him, that are not in such things of his opinion, he makes it impossible for the Churches to have peace with him.

§. 28. But they will further object: If in Necessity they shall Ordain without the President, this Necessity will be ordinarily pretended; and so all your offers will be in vain. Answ. Prevent that and other such inconveniences, by producing your weightier reasons, and persuading them; or by any lawful means: but we must not have real Necessities neglected, and the Churches ruined.
ruined, for fear of men's unjust pretences of a Necessity; that's but a sad Cure.

§. 29. But on the other side it will be objected, This is but patching up a peace. If I think that one man hath no more right then another to a Negative voice, why should I seem to grant it him by my practice? Answ. As when we come to Heaven, and not till then, we shall have perfect Holiness; so when we come to Heaven, and not till then, we shall have perfect Unity and Peace. But till then, I shall take that which you call Patching, as my Duty, and our great Benefit. If you think one man have not a Negative voice, we neither urge you to say that he hath, nor so much as to seem to own his claim. You shall have leave in the publick Register of the Association, to put it under your hand, that [Not as owning the claim of the Presidents Negative voice, but as yielding in a Lawful thing for Peace, you do Consent to forbear Ordaining any without him, except in Cases of Necessity.] This you may do, without any shew of contradicting your Principles, and this is all that is desired.

§. 30. Quest. And may we not for peace sake, grant them as much in point of Jurisdiction, as of Ordination, and Consent to do nothing without Necessity, but when the President is one, and doth Consent? Answ. Either by Jurisdiction you mean Law making, or Executive Government. The first belongs to none but Christ, in the substance of his Worship; and the Circumstances no man may Universally and Unchangeably determine of but pro re nata, according to emergent occasions, the Magistrate may make Laws for them; and the Pastors may make Agreements for Concord about them; but none should determine of them without need; and therefore here is no work for Legislators (the Usurpers that have grievously wronged the Church.) And for Executive Government, either it is over the People, or over the Pastors. To give a Negative voice to the President of an Association of the Pastors of many Churches, in Governing the People of a single Church, is to set up a new Office (a fixed Pastor of many Churches) and to overthrow Government, and introduce the noxious lorf of Prelacy, which for my part, I intend, not to be guilty of. And for proper Government of the Pastors, I know none but God and Magistrates that have that Power. Every Bishop, faith Cyprian, and the Council of Carthage, hath Power of
of his own will, and is responsible for his actions to God, and none of us are Episcopi Episcoporum, Bishops of Bishops. But there is a Communion among Pastors and Churches to be exercised, and so an avoiding or rejecting from Communion: and this some call (improperly) a Government. And in this, for my part, I should content, where peace doth require it, that we will not agree upon the rejecting of any Pastor of our Association (no more then to the Accepting or Ordaining of them) without the President, but in cases of Necessity: and that just on the terms expected about Ordination.

§. 31. As for instance, in a particular Church, there is a Communion to be held among all the members, though none of them but the Officers are Governors of the Church. And in many cases where the People Consent is needful, its common to stand to a Major vote: and so great a stress is laid on this, that by many of the Congregational way the Government of the Church is laid to be in the Major vote of the people: and yet 1. This is indeed no Government that belongs to them; but Consent to Communion or Exclusion; and 2. No Scripture doth require a Minor part to stand in all cases to the decision of a Major vote, nor give a Major vote any Rule over the Consciences of the Minor part (shew us this voting power in Scripture.) And yet 3. All agree, that upon natural Reasons and General Rules of Scripture, the Churches are allowed, yet obliged, in lawful things, for maintaining Unity and Peace, to stand to the judgement of a Major vote, (in Cases that belong to them to vote in) though there be no particular word for it in the Scripture: Even so Associate Pastors have not a proper Government of one another, neither by Presidents or Major votes, (though over the people they have,) but are all under the Government of God and the Magistrate only. And yet they may in acts of Consent about Communion or Non-communion with one another, prudentially agree, to take the Consent of the President, or of the Major vote of Pastors, or of both, where Peace, or Order, or Edification requireth it: except in cases of Necessity.

§. 32. Quest. But what will you take for a Case of Necessity? which you will except? Answ. 1. If the President be dead. 2. Or sick, or absent and cannot come. 3. Or if he be malignant, and wilfully refuse to Consent that the Church be well provided for.
or Governed. 4. And withal supposing that without the great
hurt or hazzard of the Churches, we cannot delay the business,
till he be one, or do Consent. 5. Especially if he be set in enmi-
ty against the welfare of the Church: and by pretence of a sus-
pending vote would destroy the Church, and bring in unworthy
hurtful persons or things. In all such Cases of Necessity, its
time to lay by our humane Rules for peace and Order.

§. 33. Objeft. But who shall be judge of this Necessity? 
Answ. The Magistrate only shall be the Compelling Judge. The
people shall be the Discerning Judges: the Pastors shall at least
have as much power as the People: each of them shall Discern,
so far as they must obey and execute. And God only shall be the
final Judge.

§. 34. Objeft. But this will but cause Divisions and Confu-
sions; while the President thinks one thing Necessary, and the
Pastors another, and the People another. Answ. I answered this
before. Reason must not be cast by, and the Churches ruined,
and poysion and destruction taken in, on pretence of such incon-
veniences. If such a Case of difference fall out, each man will
execute as he discerneth or judgeth, (being to answer for his
own actions, and having none that can undertake to answer for
him) And when we all come to the Bar of God for final Judgement,
his that was in the right shall be justified, and he that falsely
pretended Necessity against duty shall bear the blame.

§. 35. Objeft. But in the mean time, the Churches will be
divided. Answ. 1. I told you there is no more hope of a perfect
Unity on earth, then of perfect Holiness. 2. When two evils are
before us, (though neither must be chosen, for Evil is not an
Object of choice; unless as seeming good, yet) the Greater Evil
must be first and most studiously repelled. And the deformity
and destruction of the Churches, and the casting out of the
Gospel and Worship of God, is a greater Evil then disorder
about good actions, and differences about some Circumstances of
Necessary works.

§. 36. All this that I have said about the Negative ( de facto,
though not de jure ) that I would have Confented to for peace,
I intend not to extend to those Cases and Countries where peace
requireth it not, but rather the contrary: much less to encon-
trage any to think such a Negative Necessary in it self. Some
things
things may be Lawfully granted that are unlawfully and upon mistake desired,
§. 37. Lastly understand also, that when I speak of yielding to this Negative voice in Ordination, to the President of such an Association, I intend not to exclude the Presbyterie of a particular Church (where it is sufficient) from the said Power and exercise of Ordination: of which I am to speak, in the following Chapter, which is of the President of such a Presbyterie.

CHAP. IV.

It is Lawful for the Presbyters of a particular Church, to have a fixed President, during life.

§. 1. Come now to the most Ancient fixed Bishop that the Church was acquainted with, except the mere Episcopus Gregis, the Overseer of the flock; and that is, A President of many Elders in one particular Church. The Diocesan Bishop was long after this. The first Bishops (if you will call them so) in the Church were the first mentioned Itinerant Bishops that were sent abroad to convert souls and gather Churches, and afterward took care to water and confirm them. The next sort of Bishops (and the first so called) were the fixed Pastors of particular Churches, that cannot be proved to have any superiority over Presbyters. The third
fort of Bishops (in time, and the first fixed Bishops that were superiours to other Pastors) were these Presidents of the Presbyteryes of particular Churches. And these are they that now we have to speak of. And I shall prove that it is not unlawful to have such.

§ 2. But first I must tell you what I mean; and shew you that such may be had among us. I have in one of the former Disputations, defined a particular Church. It should ordinarily consist of no more then may hold personal Communion together in Gods publick Worship. But yet take notice, 1. That it tendeth to the strength and honour of it, that it be not too small; but consisting of as many as are well capable of the Ends. 2. And it is lawful for these to have some other meeting places for part of the Church, besides the principal place which is for the whole. Chappels of ease may lawfully be made use of, for the benefit of the weak, and lame, and aged, that cannot always or often come to the common Assembly. And where such Chappels are not, it is lawful to make use of convenient houses. Yea if there were no Place to be had, sufficiently capacious of a full Assembly, or else if persecution forbad them to meet, it might still be but one Church, though the members met in several houses ordinarily: as five hundred in one, and three hundred in another, or one hundred only in several places, every one going to which house he pleased, and having several Pastors that in Society and by Consent did guide them all. But though somewhat disorderly may be born with in cases of necessity; yet 1. As it is Necessary to the Ends, and so to the Being of a particular Church that they be a Society capable of personal Communion, and the personal Teaching, Guidance and Overseight of the same Pastors, So 2. It is desirable, as much tending to Order and Edification, that all of them that are able do frequently meet in one Assembly, for the Worshipping of God with one heart and mouth. And this is the Church I speak of.

§ 3. It is not of necessity to the Being of such a particular Church, that it have more Pastors then one: And when one only is the Pastor or Governour, that one alone may do all the works of a Pastor or Governour (For what else is his Office, but the State or Relation of a man obliged and authorized to do such works?)
The Learned Dr. H. H. thinketh that the Apostles planted none in Scripture times but single Pastors or Bishops (called also Presbyters) in every Church, with Deacons under them, without any other Presbyters (subject or assistent) over that Church. This I conceive cannot be proved, nor so much as the probability of it; nay I think, at least a probability, if not a certainty of the contrary may be proved, of some Churches. But yet it is most likely that it was so with many Churches. And reason tells us, that the thing being in it self indifferent, was suited by the Apostles to the state of the particular Churches that they planted. A small Church might well have a single Pastor, when a large Church, especially in times of persecution, when they must assemble in several houses at once, required more. Some places might have many persons fit for the Office, and some but one: Which cases must needs have some Variety.

§. 4. Where there are more Pastors in such a Church, then one, I know of no Necessity that one should have any superiority over another: nor can I prove that it was so from the beginning. Some Divines of the Prelatical Judgement think that this was an Ordinance of the Apostles, at the first planting of such Churches; Others of them think that it was of their appointment, but not actually existens till after Scripture times. Others of them think, that as Hierom faith, it began when factions rose in the Church, not by Divine Ordination, but Ecclesiastical agreement, for the preventing or cure of schism.

§. 5. The first Church that we find it in, in History, is that of Alexandria. And Alexandria was a place exceedingly given to sedition, tumults, and divisions: the contentions between Cyril and Orestes, the murder of Hypatia by Peter and his company, the assault made upon Orestes by Ammonius & the other Nitrian Monks, and many such feats in the days of Theophilas, Dions, and up to the beginning, do shew what they were. And Socrates faith of them expressly, li. 7. cap. 13. that [The people of Alexandria above all other men, are given to Schism and contention; for if any quarrel arise at any time among them, presently bainsous and horrible offences use to follow, and the tumult is never appeased without great blood-shed.] Such were the Alexandrians.

§. 6.
§. 6. But yet it is certain that the Original of this custom, of setting up one as President or chief Presbyter in a particular Church, cannot be found out, so as to say, by whom and when it was first brought in. But if it began upon the death of Mark at Alexandria, it must needs be long before the death of John the Apostle, (in that Church, whatever other Churches did.) But it seems that there was then a difference and indifferency in this point, and that other Churches did not presently imitate the Churches of Alexandria and Rome herein. He that reads Clemens Epistle to the Corinthians without partiality, I think will be of Grotius mind (before cited, Epist. ad Gal. ad Bignon.) that Clemens knew not any such Prelacy among the Corinthians, when he wrote that Epistle: And so we may say of some other Witnessees and Churches in those times, and afterwards in many places.

§. 7. It is not another Order of Ministers, or Office, that was in such Churches distinct from the Presbyters that afflicted them. Their Presidents or Eminent Bishops were not made then Episcopi Episcoporum, vel Pastores Pastorum, as having an Office of Teaching and Governing the other Pastors, as Pastors have of teaching and Governing the flock. But they were only the chief Presbyters, or chief Bishops or Pastors of that Church, as an Archdeacon is to the Deacons when he is made such by their choice, as Hierom's comparison is (ad Evag.)

§. 8. Nor is it lawful now, even in the smallest Parish for any One to assume such a superiority over any Presbyters (though such as have their maintenance from him, and are chosen by him, and are called, his Curates) as if he were of a Superior Order or Office, and so the Governor of the other as his inferior.

§. 9. But yet that a Primacy of degree, or Presidency, or stated Moderatorship of one in such a Church and Presbyterie, is lawful, I think with small labour may be evinced. And All the Arguments before used, for the Presidency of one in an Association, will prove this Parochial Presidency with advantage.

§. 10. 2. It is a thing that is constantly or very ordinarily practised among us already, with common approbation, or without contradiction, as far as I have heard. Many places have one Minister only that is presented by the Patron; and this one Pastor hath divers with him (or as the common saying is, Under him:)
him: ) If it be a great Congregation, many have a Curate or assitant in the Town with them, and other Curates at Chappels that depend on that Town. Though there be but one Chappel in this Parish where I live, yet this Church hath three or four Presbyters, and three or four Deacons. And the Law of the Land doth give one Minister only the Maintenance (called the Benefice) and the Power of the Temple, and the calling of Assemblies, and the choice of Curates, whom he is to maintain. And they that are chosen and maintained by him, must and will be ruled by him; at least in all circumshtantial things. It belongs not to them to Rule even the People contrary to Gods word; nor in substantials to institute new Ordinances of Worship: But in circumshtantials which are left to humane determination (as time, place, particulars of order, decency, &c.) no doubt but the chief Pastors in each Parish, do exercise actually a Negative Vote, and the Curates do nothing without their consent. So that this sort of Presidency being common among us, without contradiction I may take it for granted that it hath the common consent. And if any allow not of so much as is commonly used, yet a Presidency is a far lower thing.

§. 11. 3. This sort of Presidency, (yee with such a Negative voice as in the foregoing Chapter is granted,) is usually grounded on Nature and the General Rules of Scripture, and warranted by them. Nature teacheth us, that the younger and more ignorant and unlearned, should (proportionably) submit to the Elder and Wifer, and in a sort be Ruled by them. And Scripture saith the same, 1 Pet. 5. 5. [Ye younger submit your selves unto the Elder.] Even the aged Woemen (that were no Officers) must teach the younger, Tit. 2. 4. Now it commonly falls out that in every Parish that hath many Ministers, there is but one that is aged, or grave, and that one commonly is more Learned and judicious than the rest, who are usually some young unexercised men. Now in such cases, (which is common) no man can deny that authority to age or Wisdom that is naturally due to it, nor exempt the younger ignorant men from that submision which naturally they are bound to. Equality of Office may stand with inequality of gifts and age, and consequently of duty.

§. 12. 4. The good of the Church requireth it that this dis-
proportion of Ministers gifts in one and the same Congregation should be the ordinary case (And rules must be fitted to ordinary cases, rather then to extraordinary.) For God doth not (as we see by long and sad experience) below his excellent gifts so commonly, as that one Church (ordinarily) should have many Learned able men: There are but few that are of eminency for judgement and other Ministerial abilities: Not one for many Parishes: If therefore many of these should be placed together in one Church, it would be against the common good, and an unjust ingrossment, and injurious unto others. Providence therefore by the rarity of eminent parts, doth teach us to make it the ordinary course, that in every Congregation where there are many Pastors, some one of chiefest parts be chosen to be standing Moderator of the rest.

§. 13. 5. That which is lawfull for Private men to do towards one another, is lawfull Prudentially for Pastors that are conscious of their own imperfection, to do towards one that they think more able then themselves. But it is lawful for Private men to be subject one to another in humility: therefore it is lawfull for such Pastors, 1 Pet. 5. 5. [Tea all of you be subject one to another, and be clothed with humility.] A voluntary subjectio to another, in lawfull actions, is nowhere forbidden, but here commanded; and is a great part of Christian self-denial: and therefore lawful.

§. 14. 6. And it is a thing that dependeth so much on the Wisdom and will of Presbyters, that no man can hinder it. I can make another Minister a Bishop to me, whether other men will or not. Honor est in honorante. I can 1. In judgement esteem him more able, yea or more authorized, then other men. 2. And I can have recourse to him for advice. 3. And I can give him a Negative vote in all my Ministerial Actions, so far as they are left to humane determination: I can resolve to do nothing in such matters, but by his consent. And if I find reason for this in his abilities, and my disabilities, it is Lawfull. The thing therefore being Lawfull, and such as none can hinder me from, I see not why it may not be made the matter of Consent, when the Churches Peace requireth it.

§. 15. 7. Moreover, as Divisions justly provoked the Churches at first to think of such lawful means, for the cure: so our Divisions
Divisions, or danger of them, do make it as Necessary, or convenient, now as then. We see to our shame, that in most or many Congregations, Ministers that are equal or near to an equality in parts and place, can hardly agree and live in peace: but they are jealous of one another, and envying each others esteem and interest (Though I confess this is so odious a vice, that its an abominable shameful thing, that any Minister of Christ should be tainted with it: but so it is, we cannot hide it.) And therefore it is our ordinary course to have such a disparity of age, and parts, and interests, that one may have the preheminence, and some rule, and the rest be ruled by him.

§. 16. 8. Lastly, the Antiquity and speedy Universality of this course, is a strong argument to make men moderate in the point. For 1. It seemeth a most improbable thing that all the Churches, or so many, should so suddenly take up this Presidency, Prelacy, or Disparity without scruple or resistance, if it had been against the Apostles minds. For it cannot be imagined that all these Churches that were planted by the Apostles, or Apostolical men, and had seen them and conversed with them, should be either utterly ignorant of their minds, in such a matter of public-like practice, or else should be all so careless of obeying their new received doctrine, as presently and unanimously to consent to a change, or endure it without resistance. Would no Church or no persons in the world, contend for the retention of the Apostolical institutions? Would no Church hold their own, and bear witness against the corruption and innovations of the rest? Would no persons say, [you go about to alter the frame of Government newly planted among us by the Holy Ghost; It was not thus in the dayes of Peter, or Paul, or John; and therefore we will have no change.] This seems to me a thing incredible, that the whole Church should all at once almost so suddenly and silently yield to such a change of Government. And I do not think that any man can bring one testimony from all the volumes of Antiquity to prove that ever Church or person resisted or disclaimed such a change, in the times when it must be made, if ever it was made, that is, in the first or second ages.

§. 17. Yea 2. It is plain by the testimony of Hierom before mentioned and other testimonies of antiquity, that in Alexandria, at least, this practice was used in the dayes of the Apostles them-
For they testifie that from the days of Mark the Evangelist till the days of Heroclas and Dionysius, the Presbyters chose one from among them, and called him their Bishop. Now it is supposed by the best Chronologers that Mark was slain about the sixty third year of our Lord, and the tenth of Nero; and that Peter and Paul were put to death about the sixty sixth of our Lord, and thirteenth of Nero, and that John the Apostle died about the ninety eighth year of our Lord, and the first of Trajan, which was about thirty five years after the death of Mark. Now I would leave it to any mans impartial consideration, whether it be credible that the holy Apostles, and all the Evangelists or Assistants of them, then alive, would have suffered this innovation and corruption in the Church without a plain disowning it, and reproving it: Would they silently see their newly established Order violated in their own days, and not so much as tell the Churches of the sin and danger? Or if they had indeed done this, would none regard it, nor remember it, so much as to resist the sin? These things are incredible.

§. 18. And I am confident if the judicious godly people had their choice, from the experience of what is for their good, they would commonly choose a fixed President or chief Pastor in every Church. Yea I see, that they will not ordinarily endure that it should be otherwise. For when they find that God doth usually qualify one above the rest of their Teachers, they will hardly consent that the rest have an equal power over them. I have seen even a sober unanimous Godly people, refuse so much as to give their hands to an Assistant Presbyter whom yet they loved, honoured and obeyed, though they were urged hard by him that they preferred, and all from a loathness that there should be a parity. I know not one Congregation to my remembrance, that hath many Ministers, but would have one be chief.

§. 19. Object. But, (the Prelatical men will say) our Parishes are not capable of this, because they have commonly but one Pastor, nor have maintenance for more. Answ. I. Though the greater number have but one yet it is an ordinary case to have two, or three, or more, where there are Chappels in the Parish, and the Congregations great, as in Market Towns. And if ever we have Peace and a settled faithfull Magistrate that will do his part
for the house of God, we shall certainly have many Ministers in great Congregations: Or else they are like to be left, desolate; For Ministers will over-run them, for fear of undertaking far more work then with their utmost pains they are able to perform.

§. 20. And 2. There are few Congregations I hope, of Godly people, but have some private men in them that are fit to be Ordained Assistant Presbyters, though not to govern a Church alone (without necessity) yet to assist a Learned, judicious man, such as understand the body of Divinity, (as to the great and necessary points) and are able to pray and discourse as well as many or most Ministers, and to exhort publicly in a case of need. He that would imitate the example of the Primitive Church (at least in the second Century) should Ordain such as these to be some of them Assistant Elders, and some of them Deacons in every Church (that hath such;) and let them not teach publicly, when a more learned, able Pastor is at hand to do it; but let them assist him in what they are fittest to perform; Yet let them not be Lay Elders: but authorized to all Pastoral administrations, and of one and the same office with the Pastor, though dividing the exercise and execution according to their abilities and opportunities; and not comming in without Ordination, nor yet taking up the Office only pro tempore. And thus every Parish, where are able Godly men, may have a Presbyterie and President.

§. 21. Till then 3. It is granted by the Learned Dr. H. H. that it is not necessary to the being of a Bishop that he have fellow Presbyters with him in that Church: If he have but Deacons it may suffice. And this is easie to be had.

§. 22. And indeed 1. The parts of many very able Christians, are too much buried and loft as to the Church, for want of being drawn into more publick use. 2. And it is it that tempteth them to run of themselves into the Ministry, or to preach without Ordination. 3. And yet few of these are fit to be trusted with the Preaching of the word, or guiding of a Church alone, no nor in equality with others: for they would either corrupt the doctrine, or divide the Church. But under the inspection and direction of a more Learned judicious man, as his assistants, doing nothing against his mind, they might be very serviceable.
to some Churches. And such a Bishop with such a Presbyterie and Deacons (neither Lay, nor usually very Learned) were the ancient fixed Governours of the Churches, if I can understand antiquity.

CHAP. V.

Objections against the Presidency forementioned, answered.

§. 1. BUT it is not likely but all these motions will have Difsenters on both sides; it were strange if in a divided age and place, and among a people engaged in so many several parties, and that so deeply as now men are, there should any healing remedy be propounded, that should not have abundance of opposers: Most men are prejudiced and affected at their Education; or opportunities, or parties, or several interest sway them. And therefore I expect that most should reject all that I say, and some of them with much reproach and scorn. Our disease were not so great and dangerous, if it could but endure the remedy. But let us consider some of their Objections.

§. 2. Objection. 1. The unpeaceable men of the Prelatical way will say [This is but to turn a Bishop into a Parish-Priest; and to make him the Ruler of a Parish and a Curate or two, and in many places, of no Ministers at all: A fair Promotion. It seems you would leave them but a name and shadow, and make them to be contemptible.

§. 3. Answer. 1. Remember that I grant you also the Presidency.
of Associations, &c. which you may call an Archbishopsrick if you please. 2. Is it honour that you contend for, or labour and service to the Church? If honour, you must get it by being the servants of others, and not by being Lords of the Clergy or heritage of God. If you are seeking honour of men, and founding offices in the Church, by such directors as ambition, you are not the men that we can hope for Peace or Holiness from, and therefore can have little treaty with you, but to lay by your wickedness. But if it be service that you contend for, in order to the Churches good, try first whether a Parish will not find you work enough. I have tried it, and find that if I were ten men, I could find as much as I am able to do, in this one Parish. Though I do as much as I am well able night and day, and have so many helpers, yet it is so great a trouble to me, that my work and charge is quite too great for me, that I have been often tempted to desert it, and go to a smaller place: And nothing stays me but this consideration, that God requires no more then I can do, and that its better do what I can then nothing: and that if I leave them, the next is like to do no more. Could I but speak with each man in my Parish by personal Instruction, once a moneth, or once a quarter, or half a year, it would put me into high expectations of making a very great change among them, by this means: But when I am not able to speak to them past once a year, or two years, I must needs fear lest the force of former words will be lost before I come again. And yet must you needs have more work and service, and more souls to answer for? To deal plainly and faithfully with you, Brethren, impartial standers by conceive that its time for you rather to be more diligent in a smaller charge, and to lament your negligence in your Parishes, and publickly to bewail that you have by your idleness betrayed so many souls, letting them alone in their ignorance and ungodliness, and commonly doing little in your charges, but what you do at Church in publick. Overseers think that most of you are fitter for smaller charges rather then for greater. I doubt this will offend many. But you were better use it to your Repentance and Reformation, then your offence.

§ 4. And 3. I pray you consider how your Passion and partiality, maketh you contradict your selves. Do you not use to reprove the Presbyters, that they would all be Bishops, and they would...
would have a Bishop in every Parish, and so are against Bishops, that they may be Bishops themselves? And what is a Parish Bishop to great a prize for our Ambition, and yet is it so contemptible to yours? Are we proud for seeking to be Parish Bishops, and do you take it as an empty name or shadow? At least then confess hereafter, that your Pride is so much greater then ours, that the Mark of our Ambition is taken by you to be a low dishonourable state.

§. 5. And 4. I would intreat you impartially to try, whether the Primitive Apostolick Episcopacy fixed in particular Churches were not a Parochial Episcopacy? Try whether I have not proved it before? And if it were, will you pretend to antiquity, and Apostolick institution, and yet despise the primitive simplicity, and that which you confess was settled by the Apostles? Let the Elders carry it without any more ado.

§. 6. And 5. At least say no more that you are for Episcopacy, and we against it: when we are for Episcopacy as well as you. It is only your transcendent, or exorbitant sort of Episcopacy that we are against. Say not still that we have no Power of Ordination, because we are not Bishops; but because we are only Bishops of one Church. Put the controversy truly as it is, Whether it be lawful for the Bishop of one Church with his Presbyter to Ordain? Yea or whether many such Associated may Ordain? Or rather, whether it be tied to the Bishop of many Churches (as you would have it:) that is, Whether Ordination belong to Archbishops only? Is not this the controversy?

§. 7. And then 6. Why do you in your Definitions of Episcopacy (which you very seldom and sparingly give us) require no more then a Parochial Episcopacy, and yet now despise it as if it were no Episcopacy at all? Tell us plainly what you mean by a Bishop? I thought you meant a Primus Presbyterorum, or at least, a Ruler of People and Presbyters? And is not this to be found in a Parish Bishop, as well as in a Bishop of many Parishes, or Churches? Change your Definition from this day forward, if you must have a change of the thing defined, as it seems you must.

§. 8. And I would know whether you can prove that it is Essential to a Bishop to have more Churches or Parishes then one? Prove it if you are able. Was not great Gregory of Naos, a Bishop
Bishop with his seventeen souls? And was not Alexander (the Collier) whom he Ordained at Comana, a Bishop, though but of a small Assembly? Do not some of you confess, that Bishops in Scripture-times had no subject Presbyters, and consequently had but a single Congregation? If then a Parish or Congregational Bishop were a true Bishop, why may he not be so still?

§ 9. ObjeÇ. 2. But the Church under Christian Princes should not be conformed to the model of the Church under persecution: Shall Bishops have no more power and honour now then they had then? We see in Constantines days a change was made. Must they be tied to a Parish now, because they were Bishops only of a Parish in Scripture-times?

§ 10. Answ. 1. We would not have them persecuted now, as they were then, nor yet to want any due encouragement or assistance that a Christian Magistrate can afford them. But yet we would have God's Word to be our Rule, and Bishops to be the same things now as then, and we would not have men make the prosperity of the Church a pretence for altering the Ordinances or Institutions of Christ, and making such changes as their conceits or ambitious minds incline them to. We shall never have a Rule nor fixed certainty, if we may change things, our selves on such pretences. Proceed not then to Antiquity, as you do.

§ 11. And 2. I have in the former Disputation proved by many Reasons, that it was not the mind of the Apostles themselves, that the Parochial or Congregational Churches which they planted, should be changed into another sort of Churches. Nor is there any reason for it, but against it, in the prosperity of the Church, and piety of Magistrates. For 1. Pious Magistrates should help to keep, and not to break Apostolical institutions. 2. And pious Magistrates should further the good of the Church, and not hurt it to advance ambitious men.

§ 12. For 3. Ministers are for the Churches, and therefore no change must be made on such pretences that is against the good of the Churches. If every Parish or Congregation then, were meet to have a Bishop and Presbytery of their own, why shall the Church be now so abused, as that a whole County shall have but one Bishop and his Presbytery? If every Hospital or Town had a Physician with his Apothecaries and Mates, in your Fathers dayes, would you be their benefactors, by procuring that all
all the County shall have but one Physitian with his Apothecaries? Or if every School had a Schoolmaster in your Forefathers dayes, will you say, there shall be but one in your dayes, in a whole County? Do you thus think to honour Physicians and Schoolmasters, to the ruine of the people and the Schools? So do you in your advancement of Bishops. Upon my certain experience I dare affirm it, that every Parish of four or five thousand souls, yea of a thousand souls, hath need of such a Presbyterie for their Oversight. And is not he that hath a County on his hands, like to do less for this Town or Parish, then if he had no more then this? If your Bees swarm, you will not keep them all still in an hive, nor think of enlarging the hive to that end: but you will help the swarm to an hive of their own. If your Children marry, you will rather settle them in Families of their own, then retain all them and all their Children in the Family with your selves. So if a Bishop of one Church should Convert all the Countrey, he should rather settle them in several Churches, proportionable to their numbers and distances, then to call them all his own Church.

§. 13. Object. 3. But by this means the Church would be pestered with Bishops. What a number of Bishops would you have, if every Parish-Priest were a Bishop? We read not of such numbers as this would procure, in the ancient times.

§. 14. Answ. 1. I find where Christ commandeth us to pray the Lord of the harvest to send forth Labourers (that is, more Labourers) into the harvest, because of the greatness of the harvest. But I find not where he once requireth us to pray or wish that there may not be too many, for fear of pesterling the Church, or diminishing the honour of the Clergy. Mens purses, I warrant you, will hinder the over-abounding of them; and Gods providence doth not enrich too many with abilities and willingness for the work. Do you undertake that they shall not be too bad; and I dare undertake they will not be too many.

§. 15. And 2. Is it not the felicity and glory of the Church which you object as an inconvenience or reproach? O blessed time and place that hath but enow that are able and faithfull! But I never knew, nor heard, nor read of the age that had too many that were good and faithfull in the work. Would you not have a chief Schoolmaster in every School, or Town, for fear
fear the Land should be pestered or overwhelmed with School-masters? Why how can there be too many, when people will imploy no more then they need? O miserable Church that hath such Bishops, that are afraid Gods vineyard should be furnished with labourers, left their greatness and honour should be diminished! Do you not see how many thousand souls lie still in ignorance, presumption and security for all the number of labourers that we have? And see you not that six parts of the world are Infidels, and much for want of Teachers to instruct them? And yet are you afraid that there will be too many? What could the enemy of the Church say worse?

§ 16. Object. We do not mean too many Teachers, but too many Bishops; that is, too many Governors of the Church. Answ. I. God knoweth no Governors Ministerial but teachers: It seems you would have somewhat that you call Government, and leave the labour of Teaching to others: As if you knew not that it is they that are especially worthy of the double honour that labour in the word and doctrine, 1 Tim. 5. 17. Or as if you knew not that even the Government of Pastors is mostly by teaching. 2. Government and Teaching go together, and are both necessary to the Church; and the diminishing the number of Governors and of Teachers is all one: As a Physician doth Govern all his Patients in order to their cure, and a Schoolmaster all his Schollars in order to their learning; so doth a Pastor all his flock, in order to their sanctification and salvation. And for the Government of the Ministers themselves, the number shall be increased as little as may be. Parish Bishops will Govern but a few; and therefore they can wrong but few, by their mis-government.

§ 17. Objection. 4. But by this means we shall have unworthy, raw, and ignorant men made Bishops: What kind of Bishops shall we have, if every Parish Priest must be a Bishop? Some of them are boys, and some of them empty, silly souls to make Bishops of.

§ 18. Answ. I shall lay open the nakedness of this Objection also, so that it shall be no shelter to domineering in the Church. 1. Awake the sparks of humility that are in you, and tell us openly, whether you think your selves more able worthy men to Govern a County, or a hundred Parishes, then such as we are to Govern one? Though I have been many and many a time tempted with Jonas to run away from the charge that is cast upon
upon me, as a burden too heavy for me to bear, and I know my self to be lamentably insufficient for it: yet I must profess, that I am so proud as to think my self as able to be the Pastor or Bishop of this Parish, as most Bishops in England, yea or any one of them, to be the Pastor and Governour of a County, or an hundred or two hundred Parishes. Were you humble, or did you dwell at home, or take an account of your own abilities, when you reproach others as unable to be the Bishops of a Parish, and think your selves able to be the Bishops of a Diocess and contend for it so eagerly?

6. 19. And 2. I further answer you: We will leave you not a rag of this Objection to cover your nakedness. For if any Pastors or Parish Bishops be more ignorant then others, and unfit to Teach and Rule their flocks without the assistance, teaching or direction of more able men, we all agree that its the duty of such men to Learn while they are Teachers, and to be Ruled while they are Rulers, by them that are wiser. For as is said, a Parity in regard of office, doth not deny a disparity of gifts and parts: And we constantly hold, that of men that are equal in regard of office, the younger and more ignorant should learn of the aged that are more able and wise, and be Ruled by their advice, as far as their insufficiency makes it necessary. And will not this suffice?

§. 20. And 3. If this suffice not, consider that Associated Pastors are linked together, and do nothing in any weighty matters of common concernment (or of private, wherein they need advice) without the help and directions of the rest. And a young man may govern a Parish by the advice of a Presbyterie and also of Associated able Pastors, as well as such Bishops as we have had, have governed a Diocess.

§. 21. And yet 4. If all this suffice not, be it known to you that we endeavour to have the best that can be got for every Parish: and Novices we will have none, except in case of meer necessity: And we have an act for rejecting all the insufficient, as well as the scandalous and negligent: and any of you may be heard that will charge any among us with insufficiency. Sure I am we are cleansing the Church of the insufficient and scandalous that the Prelates brought in, as fast as we can: if any prove like them, that since are introduced, we desire that they may
speed no better. What side soever they be on, we desire able
faithfull men, and desire the ejection of the insufficiant and un-
faithfull. And youth doth not alway prove insufficiency. Wit-
ness Timothy, whose youth was not to be despised. At what age
Origen and many more of old began, is commonly known. Vige-
litus was Bishop at twenty years of age (the Tridentine Bishop)
We will promise you that we will have none so young to be
Parish Presbyters, as Rome hath had some Popes and Cardinals
and Archbishops and Bishops. Nor shall any such ignorant in-
sufficiant men, I hope, be admitted, as were commonly admitted
by the Prelates.

§. 22. Object. 5. But the Apostles and Evangelists had a larger
circuit then a Parish, and therefore so should their Successors have?
Answ. I grant you that they had a larger circuit, and that here-
in, and in their ordinary work they have Successors: And we
consult that you shall be their Successors. Gird up your loins,
and travail about as far as you please, and preach the Gospel to
as many as will receive you (and sure the Apostles forced none)
and convert as many souls as you can, and direct them when
you have done in the way of Church-communion, and do all
the good that you can in the world, and try whether we will hin-
der you. Have you not liberty to do as the Apostles did? Be
ye servants of all, and seek to have all, and take on you thus
the care of all the Churches, and see who will forbid such an Epis-
copacy as this?

§. 23. Object. 6. But it seems you would have none compelled
to obey the Bishops; but they only that are willing should do it: and
so men shall have liberty of conscience, and anarchy and parity and
confusion will be brought into the Church. Answ. 1. I would have
none have liberty for any certain impiety or sin: And yet I
would have no sin punished beyond the measure of its deserts.
And I would not have preachers made no Preachers (unless the
Church may spare them) because their judgements are against Di-
ceesan Bishops: and therefore I would have none silenced or sus-
pended for this. 2. And what is it that you would have that better? Would you have men forced to acknowledge and sub-
mit to your Episcopacy? And how? Small penalties will not
change mens judgements, nor consciences. Silencing or death
would deprive the Church of their labours: and so we must
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Note our Teachers left they disobey the Bishops. If this be your cure, it disgracest your cause. We desire not Prelacy at so dear a rate. Its a sad order that destroyes the duty ordered.

§. 24. Object. But this is to take down all Church-Government, if all shall have what Government they list. Answ. 1. Was there no Church-Government before the days of Constantine the Emperour? 2. Do you pretend to antiquity, and fly from the Antient Government as none? You shall have the same means as all the Bishops of the Church had for above three hundred years to bring men to your obedience: and is that nothing with you? Why is it commonly maintained by us all, that the Primitive state was that purest state, which after times should strive to imitate, if yet it was so defective as you imagine? 3. And why have you still pretended to such a power and excellent usefulness in the Prelatical Government, if now you confess that it is but anarchy, and as bad as nothing, without the inforcement of the Magistrate? What Magistrate forceth men to obey the Presbyteries now in England, Scotland, or many other places? 4. Yet it is our desire, that the Magistrate will do his duty, and maintain order in the Church, and hinder disorders, and all known sin: but so, as not to put his sword into the hand or use it at the pleasure of every party that would be lifted up. Let him prudently countenance that way of Government, that tendeth most to the good of the Churches under his care; but not so as to persecute, silence, or cast out, all such as are for a different form, in case where difference is tolerable. 5. And in good sadness, is it not more prudent for the Magistrate to keep the sword in his own hands if really it be the sword that must do the work? If Episcopal Government can do so little without the compulsion of the Magistrate, so that all the honour of the good effects belongeth to the sword, truly I think it prudence in him to do his part himself, and leave Bishops to their part, that so he may have the honour that, it seems, belongs unto his office, and the Bishop may not go away with it, nor the Presbyterie neither. Let the secular Bishop have the honour of all that Order and unity that ariseth from compulsion: and good reason, when he must have the labour, and run the hazard if he do it amiss; and let the Ecclesiastical Bishops have the honour of all that order and unity that ariseth from their management
of the spiritual sword and Keyes. 6. And lastly I answer, that this is not the subject that you and we have to dispute of. It is Ecclesiastical Government by Ministers, and not secular by Magistrates that is our controversy. It is of the Power left by Christ to Pastors and not to Princes.

§ 25. Obje&. But at least those should be excommunicated that deny obedience to their Bishops: that is a Power that is left in the Bishops themselves, whether the Magistrate consent or not. Answ. 1. Excommunication is a sentence that should fall on none but for such gross and hainous sin, if not also obstinacy and impenitency in them, as is mentioned in Scripture: Using it in cases of controversy and tolerable differences, is but a tearing and dividing the Church. 2. We take it not for our duty to excommunicate you, because you are for Diocesan Prelacy: therefore you should not take it for yours to excommunicate others because they are against it. For 3. If your species of Episcopacy be such as I have proved it, you have more need to repent and amend, and ask forgiveness of God and men, than to excommunicate them that are not of your opinion, and for your sin. 4. But if you take this to be your duty, who hath hindered you from it these twelve years? You had liberty, for ought I know, to have discharged your consciences, and to have excommunicated us all. 5. But you might so easily see what was like to come of it, that it is no wonder that you forbore. If such a Ministry and such a people as are now your adherents ( whose description I forbear) should execute your sentence, and cast us and our adherents out of their communion, what contempt would it bring upon you in England? The Ale-houses would be shut up for the most part, against us: But that and the rest, would be easily born: I think this is not your way.

§ 26. Obje&. 7. But what need you form us a new sort of Episcopacy? were we not well enough before? Why did you pull down that which was well planted, and now pretend to commend a better to us? We were well if you had let us alone.

§ 27. Answ. 1. But We were not well, because you would not let us alone. The Ministers that were silenced, and imprisoned, and banished, and the thousands of people that were fain to follow them, and all those that were undone by your prosecutions in England, were not well. But this is a small matter: The ignor.
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norant Congregations that had ignorant and drunken guides, where Piety was scorned as Puritanism, and impiety made a thing of nothing, and where Satan was so commonly served; the many hundred Congregations in England that never knew what true Discipline meant, nor never saw in all their lives, a drunkard, oppressor, raider, blasphemer, either cast out, or penitently confess his sin, before the Church, all these were not well, though you were well. 2. Whether we were well before, I have shewed in my first Disputation, and thither I refer you. 3. And whether we have brought in a new Episcopacy, or only cast out a new one, and desire to bring in the Old, we are content to put it to an equal tryall. We all concur in offering you this motion. Let the oldest stand, and the newest be cast out.

§. 28. Object. 8. Judge now by the effects: The Episcopacy which you blame, did keep up Order and Unity in the Church: It kept under those weeds of heresie and error that since sprung up: We had then no Quakers, nor Seekers, nor such other Sects as now abound: This swarm of Errors shows which Government is best.

§. 29. Answer. This is a gross fallacy, a non causa pro causa: to which I return you my answer in these seven considerations. 1. You tell us of the good that you think you did: but you tell us not of the hurt. I hope I love Divisions or Heresies as little as ever a Bishop in England: and yet I must profess that I had rather an hundred times, have things continue as they are with all our swarms of heresies, then to be restored to their ancient pass. Our loss is as great as Josephs in being removed from the Prison to Pharaohs ungodly family: I mean in spirituals (of seculars anon.) I know not of an Anabaptist, Separatist, Quaker or any other Sectary in the Town that I live in, for all this noise; unless you will take a few Infidels for Sectaries, or a few ignorant Papists, or those of your own way. But on the other side, I hope there are many hundreds that truly fear God, that formerly were drowned in ignorance and ungodliness. The families that were wont to curse and swear and rail at Godliness, do now worship God, and set up holy instructions and cast out sin: and this is our change. And in some measure, I have reason to believe that it is so in other places also.

§. 30. 2. The Errors of the times are many of them your own, and therefore you claim against your selves. It is of your own selves
§. 31. 3. There were Heresies and Sects even in the dayes of Prelacy. Had you not then the Familists, the Grunletonians, (such as Hacket, and Coppinger, and Arbington) and the Anabaptists, and Separatists, and Antinomians, and Papists, and such like? besides the contentions between the Arminians and Antiarminians, and the contentions raised by Episcopacy it self; and the Ceremonies that it upheld? Who were they that rose up against the Bishops, and pulled them down, if there were Unity under them, as you pretend?

§. 32. 4. The truth is, it was the Magistrate and not Episcopacy that kept that Unity and Peace among us which we had; and that kept under Heresies so much as they were kept under. Take not therefore the Magistrates honour to your selves. Who would have attended your Courts, or submitted to your censures, had it not been for fear of the Secular power? I think but few. You know the He eticks themselves obeyed you not for Conscience sake, Nor would they have regarded your Excommunication, if the Magistrate would have let them alone. If it was the spiritual sword in your hands that kept out Heresies, why did you not keep them out since, as well as then? You have the same power from Christ now as ever you had. And I hope the fears of persecution will not hinder you from your duty: especially when you can name so few that have suffered for exercising Church discipline by Episcopal power! at least this was no hinderance a few years ago. For my part, I heartily wish you free from persecution, if you are not. But again I tell you, that which I suppose you know, that as free a Toleration of Prelacy in England as there is of Presbyterie, were the likelyest way to bring you into perpetual contempt. For we cannot but know,
know, that besides a few Civil engaged Gentlemen, Ministers and others, your main body would consist of those that for their notorious impiety, scandal or ignorance, are thought unmeet for Church-communion by others: and that when you came to exercise Discipline on them, they would hate you and fly from you as much as ever they did from Puritans: and if you did indulge them, and not reform them or cast them out, your Church would be the Contempt of the sober part of the world, and your own sober members would quickly relinquish it for shame. For [the Church of England] if you would needs be so called, would be taken for the sink of all the other Churches in England. This is a clear and certain truth that is easily discerned, without a Prophetick spirit: and the dishonour of all this would reflect upon your Prelacy.

§ 33. 5. And further, I answer your Objection; that it is not the insufficiency of other Church-government in comparison of Prelacy, that was the inlet of our Heresies and Divisions; but it was the Licentiousness of a time of war, when all evil spirits are turned loose, and the subtlety of the Papists that have taken advantage to spawn among us the Quakers, and Levellers, and Beheemists, and other Paracelsians, and the Seekers to confound and dishonour us if they could, and to promote their cause. And in times of war, especially when such changes in the Civil state ensue, and so many adversaries are watching to sow tares, such things are common.

§ 34. 6. And you cannot say, that it comes from the insufficiency of other Government in comparison of yours, because you see no other Government setted instead of yours, so far as to be seconded by the sword or secular power; no nor so far as to have a word of command or persuasion to the people to obey it, (except an Ordinance that in most places was hindered from execution:) nor is there any one Government so much as owned alone by the Magistrate. Besides, that the Civil power it self restraineth not those that you speak of, as to the most of them.

§ 35. 7. Lastly, if you would compare your Prelacy with other Government, compare them where the case is equal. Hath not Presbyterie in Scotland, and in France (with much less help and countenance from the Magistrate) kept our Heresies and divisions,
§ 36. And yet I must add, that the multitude of Sects and Heresies that sprung up in the first, and second, and third Ages, was no such dishonour to the form of Government then used in the Church, as should encourage any man to dislike or change it. If it was Prelacy that was used, then swarms of Sects and Heresies may come in notwithstanding Prelacy (even in better hands than yours.) But if it were not Prelacy that was then the Government, Heresies are no more a shame to that Government now.

§ 37. I know many Readers will think, that this writing that purposely comes for Peace, should not be guilty of repeating and remembering the faults of others, nor speak to them so plainly as is liker to exasperate than pacify. But to these I say, 1. Their Objections which they insist on, cannot be answered but by this opening of the truth. And 2. The truth is, those men that own all the abuses and persecutions of the late Prelates, and are impenitent as to their guilt, and wish and would have the same again, are no fit materials for a concordant frame. If their business be destroying, they will never well join with us in building and in healing. Repentance is the best Ingredient in our Salve. We consent to the same conditions that we propose, and will thank them if they will help us to Repentance; especially of such sins as are destructive to the Churches peace.

§ 38. And the Godly, Moderate Episcopal men do concur with us in the blaming of the abuses of their party. Say that good and peaceable Bishop Hall in his modest offer to the Assembly, pag. 3. [I should be a flatterer of the times past, if I should take upon me to justify or approve of all the carriages of some, that have been entrusted with the Keys of Ecclesiastical Government: or to blanch over the corruptions of Consistorial Officers: in both these there was fault enough to ground both a Complaint and Reformation: and may that man never prosper, that desires not an happy reformation of whatsoever hath been, or is amiss in the Church of God.]

§ 39. Object. 9. But it is not only the abuses of Episcopacy, but the thing it self that hath been Covenant'd against in England, and opposed: nor is it only the English Prelacy, but all Episcopacy:
and therefore your motion for another species is like to find but small acceptance.

§. 40. Answ. It is not true that all Episcopacy hath been Covenanted against or taken down in England. Nor is it true of any of the sorts of Episcopacy which I have here mentioned. It was only that which was then existent that was taken down, and only the English frame of Arch-bishops, Bishops, Deans, and the rest, as here they Governed, that was Covenanted against. Of which I shall speak more anon in answer to the Objections of others.

§. 41. Objeft. 10. You have covetously seized on the Revenues of the Bishops, and made your selves fat with their Possessions, and this was the prize that you aimed at in taking them down. Answ. The world seeth the falshood of this slander, in the open light; and therefore for your credit sake, you were best recant it. England knoweth that the Bishops lands were sold, and given to the Souldiers, and not to the Presbyters. It maintained the Army, and not the Ministry. And that the Dean and Chapters lands is gone the same way, or the like, to pay the debts of the State. And that Presbyters have none of them all, fave that here and there one that had about ten, or twenty, or thirty pound a year, have somewhat in Augmention, that the Churches may not be left to Readers, and blind Guides, as they were in the Prelates dayes. I that have a fuller maintenance then most in all the Country where I live, do receive but about eighty pound and sometimes ninety pound per annum: and did I need to pull down Prelacy for this?

§. 42. Come now to the Objections of the other side, who will be offended with me for consenting for peace, to so much as I here do? And 1. Some will say, that we are engaged against all Prelacy by Covenant, and therefore cannot yield so much as you do, without the guilt of perjury.

§. 43. Answ. That this is utterly untrue, I thus demonstrate. 1. When the Covenant was presented to the Assembly, with the bare name of [ Prelacy ] joyned to Popery, many Grave and Reverend Divines desired that the word [ Prelacy ] might be explained, because it was not all Episcopacy that they were against.
against* And thereupon the following Concatenation in the parenthesis was given by way of explication: in these words, [that is, Church-government by Arch-bishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Deans and Chapters, Archdeacons, and all other Ecclesiastical Officers, depending on that Hierarchy.]. By which it appeareth that it was only the English Hierarchy or frame, that was Covenanted against: and that which was then existent, that was taken down.

§. 44. 2. When the house of Lords took the Covenant, Mr. Thomas Coleman that gave it them, did so explain it and profess, that it was not their intent to Covenant against all Episcopacy: and upon this explication it was taken: and certainly the Parliament were most capable of giving us the due sense of it; because it was they that did impose it.

§. 45. 3. And it could not be all Episcopacy that was excluded, because a Parochial Episcopacy was at the same time used and approved commonly here in England.

§. 46. 4. And in Scotland they had used the help of Visitors for the Reformation of their Churches, committing the care of a County or large Circuit to some one man, which was as high a sort of Episcopacy at least, as any I am pleading for. Besides that they had Moderators in all their Synods, which were temporary Bishops.

§. 47. 5. Also the chief Divines of the late Assembly at Westminster, that recommended the Covenant to the Nations, have professed their own judgements for such a Moderate Episcopacy as I am here defending: and therefore they never intended the exclusion of this by the Covenant.

§. 48. Obje&. 2. By this we shall seem mutable, while we take down Episcopacy one year, and set it up again the next. Answ. We desire not the setting up of that which we have taken down: and therefore it is no mutability.

§. 49. Obje&. 3. But this will prepare for the restauration of the old Episcopacy. By such degrees it invaded the Church at first: and if we let in the preparatory degree, the rest in time is like to follow; all that we can do is little enough to keep it out.

§. 50. Answ. 1. If we had no other work to do, we would do this as violently as you desire: but we have the contrary extreme to take heed of and avoid; and the Churches Peace, if it
may be, to procure. 2. As we must not take down the Ministry, left it prepare men for Episcopacy, so neither must we be against any profitable exercise of the Ministry, or desirable Order among them, for fear of introducing Prelacy. 3. Nor is there any such danger of it, as is pretended: as long as the Magistrate puts not the sword into their hands, and no man can be subject to them, but by his own Consent, what need we fear their encroachments on our liberties. 4. It is not in your power to hinder the Species of Episcopacy that is pleaded for, from being introduced: but only to withhold your own consent, and hinder peace and unity. For any Minister that will, can esteem another his superior, and be ruled by him, and do nothing without his consent: these are the actions of his own free-will. 5. As long as you are free from violence, if you find an evil or danger, you may draw back

§. 51. Objeť. 4. Have we not smarted by them late enough already? shall we so soon be turning back to Egypt? Answ. That which you have smarted by, we desire you not to turn back to; but that which is Apostolical, pure, and profitable to the Church, and that is not Egypt.

§. 52. Objeť. 5. You do all this for Peace with Episcopal Divines: and where is there any of them that is worthy so studious a Pacification? Do they not commonly own their former impieties and persecutions? Are they not meer formalists and enemies to practical Godliness? Would they not ruine the Church, and do as they have done, if they had power? Hath God brought them down for their own wickedness, and shall we set them up again?

§. 53. Answ. 1. All are not such as you describe: Many of them are godly able men, that desire and endeavour the good of the Church. 2. If there were none in this age worthy of our communion; yet, if we will have a lasting peace, we must extend the terms of it so far as to comprehend all that are fit for Communion. And such we may easily know, there will be of this opinion throughout all ages. 3. And most of the Churches in the world being already for a higher Prelacy, then this, we should agree with them as far as well we may.

§. 54. Objeť. 6. But the Parliament have enlaced in the settlement of the Civil Government, that Popery and Prelacy shall not be tolerated. Answ. That is, the English Prelacy excluded by the Covenant,
ventant, and that, as it would be exercised by violence, and forced upon dissenters. It's known what Prelacy was in England; and they cannot rationally be interpreted to speak against any but what was among us, and taken notice of under that name. You see the same Power allow a Parochial Episcopacy, and also Approvers of all that are admitted to publick preaching; and you see they allow an Itinerant Ministry in Wales: and they join Magistrates and Ministers for the ejecting of the insufficient Minister; and they never forbad or hindered a stated Presidency, or anything that I have pleaded for: yea they continued a Moderator of the Assembly at Westminster for many years, even to his death. And what fuller evidence would you have that it is not any such Episcopacy whose liberty they exclude, under the name of Prelacy? Only they would not have the Hierarchy by Law-Chancellors to govern the Church, and that by force of the secular power annexed unto theirs: and so they deny them Liberty to deprive all other men of their liberty. But this is nothing to the matter in hand.

§. 55. To conclude, let it be noted, in answer to all other objections, that the Presidency, or preeminence pleaded for, doth enable no man to do harm; but only give themselves advantage to do good. They can hinder no man from preaching, or praying or holy living, or improving his abilities to the good of the Church: Nor can they Govern any man further then they have his own Consent. All which being well considered, I may conclude that this much may be granted in order to the healing and Reforming of the Churches.
CHAP. VI.

The sum of the foregoing Propositions, and the Consistency of them with the Principles of each party, and so their aptitude to Reconcile.

§ 1. The sum of all that I have pronounced is, that though we cannot, we may not embrace the Government by Prelacy, as lately exercised here in England (how confidently soever some appropriate the title of the Church of England to the adherents of that frame,) yet would we not have the Church ungoverned, nor worse governed, nor will we refuse for peace such a kind of Episcopacy as is tolerable in the Church. And there are four sorts of Exercise of the Ministry, which if you please, you may call Episcopacy, which we shall not refuse when it may conduce to Peace.

§ 2. I. We shall consent that the Ancient Parochial Episcopacy be restored: that is, that in every Parish that hath a particular Church, there may be a Pastor or Bishop settled to govern it, according to the word of God: And that he may be the chief among the Presbyters of that Church, if there be any: And may assume fit men to be assisting Presbyters to him, if there be such to be had. If not, he may be content with Deacons. And these Parochial Bishops are most antient, and have the Power of Ordination.

§ 3.
§. 3. Yet do we not so tye a Church to a Parish, but that in places where the ignorance, infidelity, or impiety of the people, or the smallness of the Parishes is such, as that there are not fit persons enough in a Parish to make a convenient particular Church, it may be fit for two, or three, or four (in necessity) Neighbour Parishes to joyn together, and to be formed into one particular Church. The several Ministers keeping their stations, for the teaching of the rest as Catechumens, but joyning as one Presbytery, for Governing of that one particular Church, that is Congregate among them. And having one President, without whom nothing should be done in matters left to humane determination. Yet so, that the Presbyters be not forced to this, but do it freely.

§. 4. II. We shall consent that these Parish Churches be Associate, and that in every Market Town (or such convenient places as shall be agreed on) there may be frequent meetings of the Pastors, for Communion and Correspondency; and that one among them be their standing Moderator during vita, or their President (for so I would call him rather then Bishop, though we would leave men to use what name they please) And to him should be committed the Communicating of times and places of meeting, and other busineses and Correspondencies. And the Moderating of the debates and disputations.

§. 5. And for my part, I would consent for peace that de facto no Ordination be made in either of the foresaid Presbyteries, without the President, but in cases of Necessity: so be it 1. That none be compelled to own any other Principle of this Practice, then a Love of Peace; and none be compelled to profess that he holdeth the President to have de jure a Negative voice: yea that all have liberty to write down on what other Principles they thus yeild, that the Practice only may suffice for Peace.

§. 6. II. We shall consent also, that one in a Deanry or Hundred, or other convenient space, may by the Magistrate be chosen a Visitor of the Churches and Countrey about him; having Power only to take notice of the State of things, and gravely to admonish the Pastors where they are negligent, and exhort the people, and provoke them to Holiness, Reformation and Unity, only by persuasions from the Word of God. Which is no more then any Minister may do that hath opportunity: only we desire the
the Magistrate to design a particular person to do it (requiring Ministers and people to give him the meeting,) because that which is every man's work is not so well done, as that which is specially committed to some. And we desire that he may acquaint the Magistrate how things are.

§. 7. And to avoid the inconveniences of dividing these works, we are desirous that these two last may meet in one man: and so he that is chosen by the Pastors, the President of their Association, may be chosen his Visitor by the Magistrate, and do both; which may be done by one in every Market-town (which is truly a City in the ancient sense) and the circumjacent Villages. Yet this we cannot make a standing Rule (that one man do both) because the Pastors must choose their President, and the Magistrate his Visitor; and it is possible they may not always concur. But if the Magistrate will not choose such a Visitor, the Pastors may. But then they can compel none to meet him or hear him.

§. 8. I. V. Besides these three (or two, whether you will) before mentioned, we shall consent that there be a general sort of Ministers, such as the Apostles, Evangelists, and others in those times were, that shall have no special charge, but go up and down to preach the Gospel, and gather Churches where there are none, and contribute the best assistance of their Abilities, Interest and Authority for the reforming, confirming, and right ordering of Churches. And if by the Magistrate Command, or Ministers consent there be one of these assigned to each County, and so their Provinces prudentially distinguished and limited, we shall not dissent. Yet we would have such but where there is need.

§. 9. V. Besides these four sorts of Bishops, we are all agreed on two sorts more; 1. The Episcopi gregis, or Pastors of every Congregation, whether they have any assistant Presbyters or no, or being themselves but such assistant Presbyters. 2. The Magistrate, who is a secular Bishop, or a Governor of the Church by force. And we desire the Magistrate to be a nursing
Father to the Church, and do his duty, and to keep the sword in his own hand; and for forcible deposing Ministers, or any punishment on body or estate, we desire no Bishops nor other Ministers may be authorized thereto: But if Pastors exclude an unworthy Pastor from their Communion, let the Magistrate only deprive him forcibly of his place and maintenance, if he see cause. When the Council of Antioch had deposed Paulus Samosatenus, he would not go out of the house: And all the Bishops in the Council could not force him out, but were fain to procure the Heathen Emperor Aurelian to do it. It lyeth as a blot on Cyril of Alexandria that he was the first man that arrogated and exercised there a secular Coercive Power, under the name of a Bishop of the Church.

§ 10. There is enough in this much to satisfy any moderate honest men for Church-government, and for the healing of our Divisions thereabout: And there is nothing in this that is inconsistent with the Principles of the moderate of any Party.

§ 11. 1. That a Church organized, called by some Ecclesia prima, should be no greater then I have mentioned, is not contradictory to the Principles of the Episcopall, Presbyterians, Congregational or Erastian. Indeed the two first say, that it may be bigger: but none of them say, It must be bigger. The Presbyterians instances of the Church of Jerusalem (which served to the highest, cannot be proved neer half so great as some of our Parishes) and such other Churches, are but for the may be, and not for the must be. And therefore if they be peaceable, this will make no breach.

§ 12. 2. That Parochial Churches and Associations have fixed Presidents, is nothing contrary to any of their Principles, as far as I am able to discern them.

§ 13. 3. That Pastors may be lawfully appointed to visit and help the Country and the neighbour Churches, and exhort them to their duty, and give the Magistrate information of their state, is a thing that none can justly blame, any more then preaching a Lecture among them. Nor do I know any party that is against it, (of these four.)

§ 14. And 4. That there may be more General Ministers to gather, and take care of many Churches, I think none of them will deny. Sure the Itinerant Ministers in Wales will not; Nor yet
yet that these may have their Provinces distinguished. If I could imagine which of all these sorts would be denied, I would more fully prove it, yea and prove it consistent with the Principles of each party; but till then it is vain.

§ 15. The only point that I remember, like to be questioned, is, the consenting to forbear Ordination in several Presbyteries, till the President be one, except in case of Necessity: And nothing is here questionable, that I observe, but only Whether it be consistent with the Principles of the Congregational party, seing they would have all Ordination to be by the Elders of their own Church, and where there are none, that it be done by the people without Elders. To which I answer, 1. That we here grant that a Congregational Presbyterie with their President may ordain an Elder for that Congregation. 2. The Moderate Congregational men do grant us that the Elders or Pastors of other Churches may lawfully be called to assist them in Ordination, though they think it be not necessary. It is not therefore against their Principles to do so. For sure they may do a lawful thing, especially when the Churches Peace doth lie so much upon it as here it doth.

§ 16. I conclude therefore that here are healing Principles brought to your hands, if you have but healing inclinations to receive them. Here is a sufficient remedy for our Divisions, upon the account of Church-government, if you have but hearts to entertain them, and apply them. But if some on one side will adhere to all their former excesses and abuses, and continue impenitent, unchurching the best of the Protestant Churches that are not Prelatical (while they unchurch not the Church of Rome:) and if others on the other side will stily refuse to yield in things that cannot be denied to be lawful, yea and convenient for the Churches, and see more by all their own conceits than by the Peace of Brethren, and consequently the prosperity of the Church, we must leave the care of all to God, and content our selves that we have done our duty.
Some instances to prove that moderate men will agree upon the foregoing terms.

§ 1. Is it not then a hopeless work that I have motioned, and the parties will not agree upon these terms, I shall shall next prove to you that the godly and moderate of each party, are agreed already (at least the Episcopal and Presbyterians, and I think the rest: ) and that its in Practice more then Principles that we disagree.

§ 2. I will begin with the Episcopal Divines, of whom there are two parties, differing much more from one another, than the one of them doth from the Presbyterians. The ancient Bishops and the moderate of late, did maintain the Validity of Ordination by Presbyters, and own the Reformed Churches that had other, supposing their Episcopacy useful to the perfection or well being of a Church, but not necessary to the being of it. And this sort of men (who also agree with us in doctrine) we could quickly be reconciled with. But of late years there are many Episcopal Divines sprung up, that embracing the Doctrine called Arminianism, do withal deny the Being of the Ministry and Churches that want Prelatical ordination: and with these there is no hope of concord, because they will have it on no other terms than renouncing our Churches and Ministry, and being again ordained by them, and thus coming wholly over to them. These separate from us, and pretend that our Churches have no true Worship (wonderous audacity,) and our Ministers are no true Ministers, and call the Church into private houses (as D. Hide expressly in his [Christ and his Church] in the beginning of the Preface; and many others.) Of whom I spoke before.

§ 3. That the ancient English Bishops that hold to the doctrine of the Church of England, and are peaceable men, are easily agreed
agreed with us, I first prove from the example of Reverend Bishop Hall. In his Peace-maker he hath these words, [Page 46, 47, 48, 49. The Divisions of the Church are either General between our Church and the other Reformed; or Special with those within the bosom of our own Church; both which require several considerations. For the former, blessed be God, there is no difference in any essential matter between the Church of England and her Sisters of the Reformation: We accord in every point of Christian Doctrine without least the variation. (NB.) Their public Confessions and oaths, are sufficient convictions to the world, of our full and absolute agreement; the only difference is in the form of outward administration: Wherein also we are so far agreed, as that we all profess this form not to be essential to the being of a Church (NB.) though much importing the well or better being of it, according to our several apprehensions thereof; and that we do all retain a reverent and loving opinion of each other in our own several ways: not seeing any reason why so poor a diversity should work any alienation of affection in us, one towards another: But withall, nothing kinder but that we may come yet closer to one another, if both may resolve to meet in that Primitive Government (whereby it is meet we should both be regulated) universally agreed on by all antiquity; wherein all things were ordered and transacted by the Consent of the Presbytery, moderated by one constant President thereof: the Primacy and perpetual practice whereof no man can doubt of that hath been the writings of Clemens and Ignatius, and hath gone along with the History of those primitive times — We may well rest in the judgement of Mr. John Camero, the Learned Divine, he is spoke without envy, that the Church of Scotland hath afforded in this last age: [Nullus est dubitandi, locus, &c. There is no doubt at all, saith he, but that Timothy was chosen by the Collège of the Presbyters, to be the President of them, and that not without some authority over the rest, but yet such as have the due bounds and limits.] And that this was a leading case, and common to other Churches, was never denied by any author. Words may not break square, where the things are agreed. If the name of a Bishop displeases, let them call this man a Moderator, a President, a Superintendent, an Overseer; Only for the fixedness or change of this person, let the ancient and universal practice of Gods Church be thought worthy to oversway. And if in this one point (NB.) wherein the distance is so narrow, we could condescend to each other,
ether, all other circumstances and appendances of varying practices or opinions, might without any difficulty be accorded. But if there must be a difference of judgement in these matters of outward Policy, why should not our hearts be still one? why should such a diversity be of Power to endanger the dissolving of the bond of brotherhood? May we have the grace but to follow the truth in Love, we shall in these several traits overtake her happily in the end; and find her embracing of Peace, and crowning us with blessedness. 

So far Bishop Hall; so that you see that only the fixing of the Moderator or President will satisfy such as he: and so with him and such as he, for my part I am fully agreed already.

§ 4. And here by the way, because there are so many Episcopal separatists of late, that hazzard the sou's of their partial followers, and because the right habituating of the mind with Peace is an excellent help to a sound understanding, and the escaping the errors and hainous sins that Faction engageth too many in, I therefore make it my request to all that read these lines, but soberly to read over that one Book of Bishop Hall's called the Peace-maker, once or twice: which if I could procure, I think I should do much to the Peace of these Churches, and to the good of many endangered souls, that by passionate and factious leaders are misguided.

§ 5. The same Reverend man in his Humble Remonstrance hath these words, Pag. 29, 30, 31. [The second is intended to raise envy against us, as the uncharitale censurers and condemners of these Reformed Churches abroad, which differ from our Government: wherein we do justly complain of a slanderous aspersio cast upon us: We love and honour those Sister Churches, as the dear spouse of Christ; we bless God for them; and we do heartily wish unto them that happiness in the Partnership of our administration, which I doubt not but they do no less heartily wish unto themselves, Good words you will perhaps say; but what is all this fair complement, if our all condemn them? For if Episcopacy stand by Divine right, what becomes of these Churches that want it? Malice and ignorance are met together in this unjust aggravation: 1. Our position is only affirmative, implying the justifiablenesse and holiness of an Episcopal calling, without any further implication: Next, when we speak of Divine right, we mean not an express Law

* And Mr. Burroughs Irenicon.
of God requiring it upon the absolute Necessity of the Being of a Church (what hinderances never may interpose) but a Divine institution warranting it where it is, and requiring it where it may be had. Every Church therefore which is capable of this form of Government, both may and ought to affect it — but those particular Churches to whom this power and faculty is denied, lose nothing of the true essence of a Church, though they miss some thing of their glory and perseverance. — And page 32. [Our form of Government — differs little from their own, save in the perpetuity of their ἐπισκόπως or Moderatorship, and the exclusion of that Lay-Presbyterian which never till this age had footing in the Christian Church.] — — — And Pages 41, 42. [Alas my Brethren, while we do fully agree in all these, and all other Doctrinal and Practical points of Religion, why will you be so uncharitable, as by these frivolous and causeless Divisions to rend the seamless coat of Christ? Is it a Title, or a Retinue, or a Ceremony; a Garment, or a Colour, or an Organ Pipe, that can make us a different Church, while we preach and profess the same saving truth, while we desire (as you profess to do) to walk conscientiously with our God according to that one Rule of the Royall Law of our Maker, while we oppose one and the same common enemy, while we unfeignedly endeavour to hold the unity of the Spirit in the bonds of Peace? — For us, we make no difference at all (in the right and interest of the Church) betwixt Clergy and Laity, betwixt the Clergy and Laity of one part and of another: we are all your true Brethren; we are one with you, both in heart and brain, and hope to meet you in the same heaven: but if ye will needs be otherwise minded, we can but bewail the Churches misery and your sin. —] You hear how this good Bishop was far from a separation.

§ 6. How contrary to this is the foresaid writing of Dr. Hide (which I instance in, because it is come new to my hand) who stigmatizeth the front of his book with the brand of separation, and that of one of the most rigid and unreasonable kinds. Thus he begins, ["When Conscientious Ministers cannot associate in the Church, and Conscientious Christians cannot go to Church; and Customary Christians go thither, either to little purpose, because to no true worship, or to great shame, because to no true Ministers, tis fit the Church should come to private houses — Doth
Doth he not begin very wisely and charitably? What could the most Schismatical Papist say more? What! no true worship! no true Ministers! and but Customary Christians that come thither? Yes, and that's not all: he pursues it with an exprobration, that we are false from our Religion, (p. 4.) and yet that's not all: he adds, "Here seems yet to be a very bad certainty of their Religion; and how can there be a better Certainty of their salvation? unless (that we may gratifie their singularity more than our own veracity) we will say, There may be a company of good Christians out of the Communion of Saints, or a Communion of Saints out of Christ's Church. Should we laugh or weep at such a man as this? What! no communion of Saints, but with the separating party of the Prelates? Unhappy we that live in England, and can meet with so small a number of these Saints. Is the Catholike Church confined to this party? and Salvation to this Church? Transcendent Papal arrogancy! Its well that these Prelates are not the only Key-keepers of heaven! for we see how we should then be used. I must tell this Dr. and all of his mind, that it is an easier way to Heaven, then we dare hope to come thither by, to joyn our selves to their separating Communion of Saints, and live as the most that we are acquainted with, that are of that Saint-like Communion. He had been better have talked at these rates to men of another Age or Nation, then to us that see the lives of their adherents. We never changed our Religion nor our Church. What if he read his prayers, and I say mine without book; or what if he pray in white, and I in black? or what if he kneel in receiving the Eucharist, and I sit or stand? or what if he use the Cross in baptism, and I baptize no better than the Apostles did without it; do these or such like make us to be of two Religions? Do I change my Religion, if I read with a pair of spectacles, or if I look towards the South or West, rather then the East &c.? We see what these men would make the Christian Religion to be. Were the Apostles no Christians, because they had no kneeling at the Eucharist, nor Cross in Baptism, nor Surplice, nor (at least our) Common Prayer-book, &c? Dare you say they were no Christians? or yet that Christian Religion was one thing then, and another thing now? And for our Churches, we do not only meet in the same places, but we have the same doctrine, the
the same worship (in every part, though he talk of our no true worship; as if Praying, Praising God, &c. were no true worship:) the things changed were by the imposers and defenders (see Dr. Burgess's Rejoynder) professed to be no parts at all of worship, but mere accidents; we have the same people, save here and there a few that separate by yours and others seducement, and some vile ones that we cast out; we have abundance of the same Ministers that we had. And yet must we have no worship, Ministry, Communion of Saints, or Salvation, because we have only a Parochial and not a Diocesan Episcopacy? For looth we have lost our Religion, and are all lost men, because our Bishops have but single Parish churches to oversee (which they find a load as heavy as they can bear,) and we have not one Bishop to take the Government of an hundred or two hundred Churches. At Rome he is a damned man that believeth not in the Pope: and is out of the Catholike Church, because he is out of the subjecti

on of the Pope: and with these men, we are lost men, if we never so much believe in Christ, because we believe not in an Archbishop, and are out of the Catholike Church and Communion of Saints, because we will not be ruled by such Rulers as these. And what's all this, to such Counties as this where I live, and most else in England that I hear of, that know of no Bishop they have (and they rejected none,) nor doth any come and command them any Obedience? Must we be unchristened, unchristian, and damned, for not obeying, when we have none to obey, or none that calls for our obedience? But I shall let these men pass, and leave them in their separation, desiring that they had Catholike spirits and principles. This much I have said to let men see, that there is no possibility of our union with this sort that are resolved on a separation; and that it is not these Novelists and Dividers, but the ancient Episcopal party of England that we can easily agree with.

§ 7. The next that I shall instance in, that was agreed with these Principles of ours, is the late Reverend and Learned Bishop Usher, of whose Concord with us, I have two proofs. The one was his own profession to my self. The other is his own writings, especially his Propositions given in to King Charles, now printed, called [The Reduction of Episcopacy to the form of Synodical Government, received in the ancient Church] which...
(345)

consistence of four Propositions (having first proved that all Presbyters have the power of Discipline and Church-government:) the first alloweth the single Rector of the Parish to take notice of the scandalous, reprove, admonish, and debar them from the Lords Table. The second is, that in every Rural Deanry, all the Pastors within the Precinct, may by the Chorepiscopus or Suffragan, be every month Assembled in a Synod, and according to the Major part of their voices, he conclude all matters that shall be brought into debate before them, as Excommunication &c. The third is, for a Diocesan Synod once or Twice a year, where by the consent of the Major part of the Rectors, all things might be concluded by the Bishop or Superintendent, call him whether you will, or in his absence, by one of the suffragans, whom he deputes to be Moderator. The fourth is for Provincial and National Synods in like sort.

§ 8. And when I had perused these papers, (in M.S.) I told him that yet one thing was left out, that the Episcopal party would many of them think at more then he, and that is, a Negative voice in Ordination in the President, to which and the rest I proposed this for accommodation in brief [1. Let every particular or Parish Church have a Bishop and Presbyters to assist him, where possibly they can be had. 2. Let all these Associate and their several Associations have a stated President. 3. Let all men be at liberty for the name, whether they will call him a Bishop, President, Moderator, Superintendent, or the like. 4. And for the Negative voice in Ordination, let all Ministers of the Associations agree that de facto they will not Ordain without him, but in Cases of Necessity, but let every man be left free to his own Principles on which he shall ground this practice, and not be bound to consent, that de jure a Negative voice is due to the President.] These terms did I propose to the Bishop for Accommodation, and intreated him to tell me plainly his judgement, whether they are satisfactory and sufficient for the Episcopal party to yield to for Peace and Communion? and his answer was this [They are sufficient, and moderate men will accept them, but others will not, as I have tried: for many of them are offended with me for propounding such terms.] And thus this Reverend Bishop and I were agreed for Peace in a quarter of an hour; (the truth of which, I solemnly profess:) and so would all the Ministers and Christians.
in England, if they were not either wiser or foolisher, honester or dishonester then he and I. And this I leave on Record to Posterity, as a testimony against the dividers and contenders of this age, [That it was not long of men of the temper and principles of this Reverend Arch bishop and myself, that the Episcopal party and their dissenting Brethren in England, were not speedily and heartily agreed: for we actually did it.] To no honour of mine, but to the honour of this peaceable man, and the shame of the unpeaceable hinderers or refusers of our Reconciliation, let this testimony live, that Posterity may know whom to blame for our Calamities; they all extoll Peace when they reject it and destroy it.

§. 9. For a third witness of the Reconcileableness of the Moderate Episcopal party on these terms, I may well produce Dr. Holdsworth; who subscribed the same Propositions of Bishop Usher to the King; and therefore was a Consenter to the same way of Accommodation.

§. 10. A fourth witness is Dr. Forbs of Scotland, who having written purposely a Book called his Irenicon, for Accommodation on such terms, I need to say no more of him, but refer you to the Book. I shall name no more of the Episcopal party. These four are enow to my purpose.

§. 11. That the Presbyterians (of England specially) are willing to close upon these terms of a fixed Moderator, I prove, 1. By the profest Consent of that Reverend Learned servant of Christ Mr. Thomas Gataker, a Member of the late Assembly at Westminster, who hath professed his judgement of this matter in a Book against Lilly. I refer you to his own words, for brevity sake.

§. 12. My next witness, and for brevity, many in one, shall be Mr. Geree, and the Province of London, citing him in their Region Divinum Ministerii, pag. Append. 122. the words are these [That the Ancient Fathers in the point of Episcopacy, differ more from the high Prelate than from the Presbyterian: for the Presbyterians always have a President to guide their actions, which they acknowledge may be perpetual durante vita modo bene geste; or temporary to avoid inconvenience, which Bilson takes hold of as advantageous, because so little discrepant, (as he saith) from what he maintaineth.] See the rest there.

§. 13.
§. 13. 3. Beza (the Leader against Prelacy) faith, de grad. beza. Minif. Evang. Instituti Divini est, ut in omni coena Presbyterorum unus sit qui ordine praebat & praest reliquis. It is of Divine Institution that in every Assembly of Presbyters, there be one that go before and be above the rest. And dividing Bishops into Divine, Humane, and Diabolical, he makes the Humane tolerable Prelacy to be the fixed President.

§. 14. 4. Calvin (who is accused for ejecting Episcopacy) besides what he writes of it to Card. Sadolet, faith, in his Institut. lib. 4. cap. 4. §. I. [Ea cautione totam suam Oeconomiam compulerunt (Ecclesia veteris Episcopi) ad unicum illum Dei verbi normam, ut facile videris nihil fere hac parte habisse a verbo Dei alienum.] §. 2. [Quibus ergo docendi munus in iustitiam erat, eos omnes nominabant Presbyteros. Illi ex suo numero in singulis civitatibus unum eligebant, cui specialiter dabant titulum Episcopi: ne ex equalitate, ut fieri solet, dissidia nascerentur. Neque tamen sic honore & dignitate superior erat Episcopus, ut Dominium in Collegas haberet: sed quas partes habet Consul in Senatu, ut referat de negotiis, sententias roget, consulendo, monendo, hortando, aliis praebat, authority sua totam actionem regat; & quod decretum Communi Consilio fuerit, exequatur: id munus sustinebat Episcopus in Presbyterorum coetu] & §. 4. fine [Gubernationem sic constitutis nonnulli Hierarchiam vocarunt, nomine (ut mihi videtur) improprio, certe scriptoris instituto: Cavere enim voluit Spiritus sanctus, ne quis principatum aut dominationem somniaret, quern de Ecclesia gubernatione agitur. Verum si rem, omissa vocabulo, intueamur (N.B.) reperimus veteres Episcopos non aliam regendae Ecclesiae formam voluisse fingere ab ea quam Deus verbo suo prescripsit] This he writes after the mention of Archbishops and Patriarchs, as well as of Bishops governing in Synods.

§. 15. Where by the way let me give you this observation, that Bishops Governing but in Synods can have no other power of Goverment then the Synods themselves have: But Synods themselves as such are not directly for Government, but for Concord and Communion of Churches, and so consequently for well-governing the several flocks: Nor hath a Synod any Governing Power over a particular Pastor, as being his superior appointed to that end: but only a Power of Consent or Agreement.
ment: to which for unity, and communion fake, he is consequently obliged; not by Virtue of Gods Command, that requireth us to obey the Higher Power (for three Pastors are not made so the Rulers of one) but by virtue of Gods commands that require us to do all things in Unity, and to maintain the Peace and Concord of the Churches, and to avoid Divisions and discord.

§. 16. If any think that this doth too much favour the Congregational way, I must tell him that it is so true and clear, that the Episcopal men that are moderate acknowledge it. For instance: the Reverend Bishop Usher did, without asking, of himself profess to me that it was his judgement [that certainly Councils or Synods are not for Government but for Unity, and that a Bishop out of Council hath the same Governing Power as all the Council, though their vote may bind him for Unity to consent.]

§. 17. This being so, it must needs follow that an Archbishops, or the President of a National, Provincial, Dioecesan, or Classcall Assembly, or of any Association of the Pastors of many Churches, hath no superiour Governing power over the Parochial or Congregational Bishop of one Church; but only in concurrence with the Synod, a Power of Determining by way of Agreement, such points as he shall be obliged for Unity and Communion to consent to and perform, if they be not contrary to the word of God. This evidently follows from this Reverend Archbishops doctrine, and the truth.

§. 18. And if any shall think that the Presbyterians will not yield that a particular Church do ordinarily consist but of one full Congregation, I confute them by producing their own Concessions: in the London Ministers Fús Divinum Ministerii. Append. pag. 123. they plainly say, that [The later (Bishops) were Dioecesan, the former (that is the Bishops of the first or ancient times) were Bishops only of one Congregation] And pag. 82. they say [These Angels were Congregational, not Dioecesan: In the beginning of Christianity, the number of Believers, even in the greatest Cities were so few, as that they might well meet, κοινωνίαν καὶ δόξαν, and τό Ἐκκλησίαν, are all one in Scripture.] Thus far they yield to the Congregational men.

§. 19.
§ 19. 5. One other witness of the Presbyterians readiness to accommodate on these terms, I shall give, and no more, and that is Mr. Richard Vines, a man that was most eminent for this management of the Presbyterian cause in the Assembly, and at University Bridge Treaty, and in the Isle of Wight; the Papers there presented to the King are to be seen in Print. When we did set up our Association in this County, I purposing to do nothing without advice, and designing a hearty closure of all sober Godlymen, Episcopal, Presbyterian, Congregational and Erastian: did consult first about it by Letters with Mr. Vines, and in his answer to mine, he approved of the design, and thought our distance very small, and yielded to a fixed Presidency, though not to a Negative voice: (which I would have none forced to.) Because they are too long to put into this section, I will adjoin that part of his Letter that concerns this subject, prefixing one that went next before it, against the selling of the Church lands, that the Bishops may see how little such men as he consented to it or liked it; and may take heed of charging them with Sacrilege.

§ 20. Lastly the Erastians are known to be for Episcopacy itself, so be it, it come in by the power of the Magistrate. And that nothing proposed crosteth the Principles of the Congregational men, I have shewed before: But whether really we shall have their consent to a Peace upon these proposed terms, I know not; because their writings that I have seen, do not meddle with the point, save only one Congregational man; Mr. Giles Firmin, hath newly written for this very thing, in his Treatise of Schism against Dr. Owen, page 66, 67, 68. I desire you to read the words to make me the labour of transcribing them. In which he giveth us to understand, that some of the Moderate Congregational Party, will join with us in a Reconciliation on these terms: Whether many or all will do so, I know not. Let their præfide shew whether they will be the first or the last in the Healing of our Divisions. But if they refuse, we will not for that refuse to Love them as Brethren, and Study to perform our duty towards them: as knowing that we suffer much more when we come short of our duty and love to others, then when they come short of their duty and love to us.

Y y 3 Mr. Richard
Reverend Friend,

Received your two last; and as for a Schoolmaster I shall do the best I can to propound one to you, &c. As for your Question about Sacrilege, I am very near you in present opinion. The point was never stated nor debated in the Isle of Wight. I did for my part decline the dispute: for I could not maintain the cause as on the Parliaments side: and because both I and others were unwilling, it was never brought to any open debate: The Commissioners did argue it with the King: but they went upon grounds of Law and Policy; and it was only about Bishops Lands: for they then averred the continuance of D. and Chapter Lands to the use of the Church. Some deny that there is any sin of Sacrilege under the Gospel: and if there be any, they agree not in the definition: Some hold an alienation of Church goods in case of necessity; and then make the necessity what and as extensive as they please. The most are of opinion that whiles the Church lies so unprovided for, the donations are not alienable sine Sacrilegio. If there were a surplusage above the competent maintenance it were another matter. It is clear enough that the Donors wills are frustrated, and that their General intention and the General use, viz. the maintenance of Gods worship and Ministers, should stand, though the particular use might be superstitions. I cited in my last Sermon before the Parliament (unprinted) a place touching Sacrilege out of Mr. Hildersham on Psal. 51. It did not please. You may find the words in his book by the Index. If his description of it be true, then you will still be of your own mind. I dare encourage no purchasers; but do desire to have some more of your thoughts about it, and I shall return you mine: as I do my thanks for your excellent and worthy esteemed Treatise which you vouchsafed to prefix my name before: Sir, I have no more time or paper but to subscribe myself.

Your truly loving Friend


R. Vines.
Sir

Though I should have desired to have understood your thoughts about the point of Sacrilege, that so I might have formed up my thoughts into some better order and clearer issue than I did in my last: yet to shew unto you how much I value this correspondence with you, I am willing to make some return to your last. And first touching the Schoolmaster intended, &c. —— The Accommodation you speak of is a great and a good work for the gaining into the work such useful parts and interests as might very much heal the discord, and unite the strength of men to oppose destructive ways, and in my opinion more feasible with those men than any other, if they be moderate and godly: for we differ with them rather about some pinacles of the Temple than the foundation or abbutresses thereof. I would not have much time spent in a formula of doctrine or worship: for we are not much distant in them and happily no more than with one another: But I would have the agreement attempted in that very thing which chiefly made the division, and that is Government; heal that breach and heal all: there begin and therein labour all you can. What influence this may have upon others I know not in this exulceration of men's minds: but the work speaks it self good, and your reasons for the attempting of it are very considerable. For the Assembly, you know, they can meddle with just nothing but what is sent unto them by Parliament or one house thereof (as the order faith) and for that reason never took upon them to intermelle therein. What they do in such a thing, must be done as private persons, and not as in the capacity of Assembly men, except it come to them recommended by the Parliament. The great business is to find a temperament in ordination and government, in both which the exclusion or admittance of Presbyters (Dies causa) for a shadow, was not regular: and no doubt the Presbyters ought and may both teach and govern as men that must give account of souls. For that you say of every particular Church having many Presbyters, it hath been considered in our Assembly, and the Scripture speaks fair for it, but then the Church and City was of one extent: no Parishes or bounds assigned out to particular men (as now) but the Ministers preach in circuitu or in common and stand in relation to the Churches as to one Church, though
meeting hapyly in divers houses or places ( as is still the manner of some Cities in the Low Countries:) If you will follow this model, you must lay the City all into one Church particular, and the Villages half a dozen of them into a Church; which is a business here in England of vast design and consequence. And as for that you say of a Bishop over many Presbyters, not over many Churches; I believe no such Bishops will please our men; but the notion as you conceive it, hath been and is the opinion of learned men. Grotius in his commentary on the Acts in divers places and particularly Cap. 17. faith, that as in every particular Synagogue (many of which was in some one City) there was a metoruapayot; such was the Primitive Bishop: and doubtless the first Bishops were over the community of Presbyters as Presbyters in joint relation to one Church or Region; which Region being upon the increase of believers, divided into more Churches, and in after times those Churches assigned to particular men: yet by the Bishop continued Bishop over them still. For that you say, be had a Negative voice, that: more then ever I saw proved, or ever shall, I believe for the first two hundred years; and yet I have laboured to enquire into it. That makes him Angelus princeps, not Angelus praeses as Dr. Reignolds faith Calvin denies that, & makes him Consul in Senate, or as the Speaker in the house of Parliament, which as I have heard that D. B. did say, was but to make him fore-man of the Jury. Take heed of yeilding a Negative voice. As touching the Introduction of ruling Elders, such as are modelled out by Parliament, my judgement is sufficiently known: I am of your judgement in the point. There should be such Elders as have power to preach as well as rule: I say power; but how that will be effected here I know not, except we could or would return to the Primitive nature and constitution of particular Churches: and therefore it must be helped by the combination of more Churches together into one as to the matter of Government, and let them be still distinct as to Word and Sacraments. That is the easiest way of accommodation that yet occurs to my thoughts. Sir I fear I trouble you too long, but it is to shew how much I value you and your Letters to me: for which I thank you, and rest

Yours in the best bonds

Septemb. 7.

R. Vines.

Though
With Mr. Vines here yield not the Negative Voice to have been de facto in the first or second age, not to be de jure, yet he without any question yielded to the stating of a President, durante vita, if he prove not unworthy, (which was one chief point that I propounded to him.) And I make no doubt but he would have yielded to a voluntary Consent of Presbyters de facto not to ordain without the President, but in case of Necessity: But that I did not propound to him. And the difficulties that are before us de facto in setting up a Parochial Episcopacy which he mentioneth, I have cleared up already in these papers, shewing partly that the thing is already existent, and partly how more fully to accomplish it. All would be easie, if Holy, Self-denying, Charitable hearts were ready to entertain and put in execution the honest, healing Principles that are before us, and obvious to an ordinary understanding: Or (if still the Pastors will be contentious) if Holy, Peaceable Magistrates would seriously take the work in hand, and drive on the slothful and quarrelsome Ministers to the performance of their duty.

The Episcopacy of the Protestant Churches in Poland.


N. B. Quoniam à prima Ecclesiarum in minoris Poloniae Provincia, Reformatione, usque & consuetudine receptum est, ut e senioribus hisce omnium Distriictuum, quorum nomina 36. recensuimus, unus Primarius, sive in ordine Primus, qui vulgo Superintendens Ecclesiarum minoris Polonia vocatur, Synodisque Provincialibus presidet; totius Synodi Provincialis auctoritate, consensu ac suffragii eligatur, ac, non quidem per impositionem manuum, (propter evitandam Primatus aliquid suspicicionem, aut juris ac potestatis aliquid in castos seniores speciem,) benedictione tantum, fraterna appreciation, Officiorum que hocce concernunt munus praebit, piisq; totius Synodi precibus, Regiminis duntaxat & Ordinis boni in Ecclesia Dei causa, inauguratur ad declaratur; No.
The Churches of the Bohemian Confess. called Unitatis Fratrum, have among the Pastors of the Churches, their Conseniors, and Seniors, and one President over all. 

[Seniores five superattendentes Ecclesiarum Bohemicarum & Moraviarum, &c. — plerumq; è Consenioribus eligentur, ac per impositionem Manuum publicamq; inaugurationem, in munus Senioratus ordinantur ac consecruntur. Et longa consuetudine in Ecclesiis trium harum provinciarum receptum est, ut è senioribus unus Primarius (five in ordine Primus) quem vulgo illi Presidentem vocant, non eligatur quidem, nec peculiariter Ordinetur, sed post decessum aliorum, ipso Ordinationis tempore prior succedat.]
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Qu. Whether a stinted Liturgy, or form of Worship, be a desirable means for the Peace of these Churches?

Necessary prolixity is not so acceptable to the Reader that loves both Truth and time, but that I may take it for granted that you desire me to leave out superfluities in this Dispute. 1. The Etymologists shall be better agreed among themselves of the derivation of λειτουργία and λειτουργία, before I will trouble you with their judgments. But we are commonly agreed that λειτουργία is oft used for any Ministration, but more strictly, and usually for a publick Ministration, or any work of publick office; and yet more strictly from the Septuagint, Ecclesiastick writers have almost confined it to Holy Ministration, or publick service or Worship of God. The several uses of the word in Scripture, and prophane and Ecclesiastick Writers, you may find in so many Lexicons at pleasure, that I shall pass by the rest. Bellarmine doth too grofly pretend that when it is applied absolutely to holy things, the word is taken always in the New Testament, for a Ministration in
sacrificing. A little observation may confute that mistake. Nor is it agreeable either to Scripture or the use of the Antient Church, to call only Forms of publick worship that are written, by the name of a Liturgy. Whether it were Form, or no Form, Written or not written, Premeditated or extemporaneous, Words or Actions, all the Publick holy Ministration, or service of God, was of old called The Churches Liturgy: And so men may be for a Liturgy that are not for a Prayer Book. But latter times have most-used the word for those stinted forms, that some call Offices containing both the Rubrick or Directory, and the Form of words prescribed as the matter of the service. And seeing that those that now we speak to, understand it in this sense, we must speak as they do, while we are speaking to them.

2. Note that it is not any one part of Publick Worship that we speak of alone, either Prayer, Praise, or other part, but we speak of the whole frame, and therefore of a Liturgy, or Prescribed Words in General, because that is the controversy that the times call us to decide.

That which I take to be the Truth, and useful to our Healing, I shall lay down in these ten Propositions following.

Prop. 1. A stinted Liturgy is in itself Lawfull.

2. A stinted Liturgy in some parts of publick holy Service is ordinarily necessary.

3. In the Parts where it is not of Necessity, it may not only be submitted to, but desired when the Peace of the Church requires it.

4. There is so great difference between Ministers, and People, and Times, that it may be convenient and eligible to some, at some times, and not to others, and at other times.

5. The Ministers and Churches that earnestly desire it, should by the Magistrate be generally or absolutely forbidden the use of a convenient Prescribed Liturgy.

6. To prescribe a frame of stinted Service, or Prayer, &c. and for a Necessity, or the Peace of the Church upon it, and to punish, suspend, excommunicate, or reproach the able, peaceable, and holy Ministers, or people that (justly or unjustly) scruple the use of it, is so great a sin, that no conscientious Ministers should
should attempt it, or desire it, nor any Godly Magistrate suffer it.

7. The safest way of composing such a Publicke Form, is to take it all, for matter and words, out of the Holy Scriptures.

8. Yet is not this of such Necessity, but that we may join in it, or use it, if the form of words be not from Scripture.

9. The matter of a common Liturgy, in which we expect any General Concord, should not be any unnecessary things, much less things doubtful, or forbidden.

10. Forms of Publick Prayer should not be constantly used by Ministers that are able to pray without them: and none else should be admitted ordinarily to the Ministry, but such as are able competently to pray without such Forms; unless in great Necessities of the Church.

These ten Propositions are the sum of all that I shall trouble you with, which I shall now review, and prove in order.

Prop. 1. **A Stinted Liturgy is in itself lawful.**

This is thus proved:

Argument 1. That which is not directly or consequentially forbidden by God, remaineth lawful: A stinted Liturgy is not directly or consequentially forbidden by God: therefore it remaineth lawful.

The Major is undoubted, because nothing but a Prohibition can make a thing unlawful. Sin is a transgression of a Law: Where there is no Law, there is no transgression: And yet I have heard very Reverend men answer this, that it is enough that it is not commanded, though not forbidden. Which is plainly to deny both Scripture and Civil Principles: Precept makes Duty, or a Necessity ex præcepto: Prohibitions make an action sinfull, which is prohibited; as Precepts prove an Omission sinfull of the Duty commanded. But Licitum which is between Duty and sin, is that which is neither commanded nor forbidden. And such an act is not Actus Moralis, being neither good nor evil.

Here note these two things. 1. That though we say that a Liturgy is in itself lawful, and that all things not forbidden are Lawfull,
Lawfull; yet in the actuall exercise *hic & nunc*, it will be hard
to find one actuall use of it, which is not a duty or a sin. For
though I am not of their mind that think every act both simply
and respectively considered is a duty, or a sin (For 1. then every
act must be *Actus Moralis*, and so deliberate and chosen, which
is not true; as for instance, the winking of the eye, &c.
2. Then nothing were indifferent. 3. Then every act must have a
Reason for it. 4. And the Consciences of Christians must be
perpetually tormented: as e. g. to give a reason when I walk,
why I set the right foot forward before the left; or when two
eggs of a bigness are before me, why I take one rather than the
other: these are not moral acts.) Yet I must needs think that
in the worship of God, it's hard to imagine such a case, in which
the using of a Liturgy will do neither good nor harm: Or in
which a man cannot discern, whether it be like to do more good
or harm: and so make it the matter of election or refusal. And
therefore as Paul makes *Marriage indifferent in itself* when its
hard to find a case, in which it shall not be a duty or a sin to
particular persons, so say I of the point in question: and yet possi-
bly sometime such cases there may be. A man sometimes in Pru-
dence may find that constantly to use a form would be to him
a sin, by reason of the ill consequents, and so it would be con-
tantly to disuse it: And therefore may find himself bound (by
accident) sometimes to use, and sometimes to disuse it: And yet
may see no reason at all, as to the particular day and hour, why
he should use or disuse it; this day rather than another, or in the
the Morning rather then the Evening.

2. Note also that God being the supreme Lawgiver of the
Church, having by *Moses* given a Law to *Israel*, did in general
command, *Deut. 12. 32.* that they should *add nothing thereto, nor
take ought therefrom*: And consequently, we may conclude it
prohibited under the Gospel; Nay indeed the very prohibition of
self-idolizing makes it a sin for any man to arrogate that Legis-
lation which is the Prerogative of God. For that were to deifie
himself. And so this General prohibition doth make all un-
warrantable Additions to be sinfull, that is, all Additions
which God hath not authorized men to make. But then, such
additions are not sinfull formally, because not commanded, but
because forbidden by the General prohibition of [not adding.]

Now
Now for the Minor, that a stinted Liturgy is not forbidden, we need no other proof then that no Prohibition can be produced. If it be prohibited, it is either by some special Prohibition, or by the General prohibition of not adding: But it is by neither of these, therefore not at all. Speciall prohibition I never yet saw any produced. God hath nowhere forbidden a form of Prayer. And the General prohibition of not adding, extends not to it. For it is the Worship of God which is the matter that we are there forbidden to add: But the Praying with a form, or without a form, as such, are neither of them any part of the worship of God; nor so intended ( as we now suppose ) by them that use it: It is but an indifferent Mode or Circumstance of Worship, and not any part of Worship. 2. If Prayer with a form be an Addition to Gods Worship, then so is praying without a form ( for God only Commands Prayer, but neither commands a form, nor that we forbear a form ) But the Consequent is false, as the Opponents will confess; therefore so is the Antecedent. 3. Undetermined mutable Modes and Circumstances are none of the prohibited Additions, but left to humane determination. But such is the form in question. God hath bid us Preach, but not told us whether we shall study a form of express words always before hand, but left that to prudence: more instances will be added under the next Argument; and therefore I shall now forbear them.

Argum. 2. The Prudential Determination of such Modes and Circumstances of worship as God hath left to humane Determination, is Lawfull. A stinted form or Liturgy may be such a Determination; therefore a stinted form or Liturgy may be ( or is in itself) lawfull.

The Major is past doubt, if the Hypothesis be first proved, that some modes and circumstances of worship are left to humane Prudential Determination. And thats easily proved thus.

Those Modes or Circumstances of worship which are Necessary in General, but left undetermined of God in specie, are left by God to humane Prudential Determination: ( else an Impossibility should be necessary. ) But many such there are that are Necessary in General, but left undetermined of God in
in specie, therefore many such are left to humane Prudential Determination.

The Minor is sufficiently proved by instances. God hath made it our Duty to Assembly for his Publick Worship: But he hath not told us in what place; nor in what seats each person shall sit. Yet some place is necessary: and therefore it is left to mans Determination. Nor hath he tied us for weekly Lectures to any one day; nor on the Lords day, to begin at any one certain hour: and yet some day and hour is necessary: which therefore man must determine of. So God hath commanded us to read the Scriptures: But hath not told us whether they shall be printed or written; whether we shall read with Spectacles or without; what Chapter we shall read on such or such a day; nor how much at a time; Ministers must preach in season and out of season: But whether they must stand or sit, or what text they shall preach on, or how long, and whether in a prepared form of words or not, whether they shall use notes, or not, or use the Bible, or recite texts by memory, &c. none of these things are determined by God; and therefore are left to humane prudential determination. Abundance of such undetermined circumstances may be enumerated about Singing, Praying, Sacraments and all duties.

Now that the form of Liturgy is of this nature is manifest; God hath bid us Pray; but whether in fore-conceived words, or not, or whether in words of other mens first conceiving or our own, or whether oft in the same words or various, and whether with a Book or without, these are no parts of Prayer at all, but only such undetermined Circumstances or Modes as God hath left to our prudential Determination: And the aforementioned Instances, about Reading, Preaching Singing, &c. are as pertinent to our question as this of Prayer, they being all parts of the Liturgy, or publick service, as well as this.

Argum. 3. There are many express Examples in Scripture for forms of Gods service: therefore they are unquestionably lawful. The Psalms of David were of common use in the Synagogues and Temple-worship, and also in Private; and indited to such ends. Hezekiah commanded the Levites to sing Praise unto the Lord, with the words of David and of Asaph the seer, 2 Chron. 29,30. The 92. Psalm is entitled. [A Psalm or song for the Sabbath.
Sabbath day [Psal. 102 is entitled, A Prayer of the afflicted when he is overwhelmed, and poureth out his complaint before the Lord.] The rest were of ordinary publike use. Psalms are Prayers and Praises to God for the most part: and both as Prayers, and Praises, and as Psalms, they are part of the Liturgy. 

I Chron. 6.7. [On that day David delivered first this Psalm, to thank the Lord, into the hands of Aphabet and his brethren.] The song of Moses is delivered in form. Exod. 15. And the Saints in the Revelation 15.3. are said to sing the song of Moses, Numb. 10.35, 36. there is an oft-repeated form of Moses prayer. There is a form for the people, Deut. 21. 7,8. Judg. 5. there is Deborah's Song in form. There is a form of Prayer, Joel 2.17. 

Abundance more may be mentioned but for tediousness I shall now only add, 1. That the Lords Prayer is a form directed to God as in the third person, and not to man only as a Directory for prayer in the second person: it is not [Pray to God your Father in Heaven that his Name may be hallowed, his Kingdom come, &c.] But [Our Father which art in Heaven, Hallowed be thy Name, &c.] And it seems by the Disciples words that thus John taught his Disciples to pray, Luk. 11.1. So that we have in the Scripture the mention of many set forms of service to God, which therefore we may well use.

Argum. 4. It is lawful to pray to God in the set words that we find in Scripture: but so to pray (in the set words of Scripture) is a form; therefore a form is Lawful.

I do not here plead example, as in the last Argument, but the Lawfulness of praying in Scripture words. They that deny this must be so singular and unreasonable, as that there is no need of my confutation for the manifesting of their error. And that it is to us a set form if we take it out of Scripture, as well as if we compose it, or take it out of another Book, is past all question. A multitude of the prayers of holy men are left on record in the Scripture, beside those that were the prescribed forms of those times: He that will but turn to his Concordance to the word [O Lord] and then to all the cited Texts, shall find many score, if not hundred Texts that recite the prayers of the Saints; which when we use, we use a form, which we there find written.

Argum. 5. Christ hath left us his Approbation of such forms: therefore
therefore we may use them.

His Approbation is proved, 1. By his owning and citing Davids Psalms, Luk. 20. 42. & 24. 44. &c. 2. By his using a Hymn with his Disciples at the Pasover or Eucharist, which we have great reason to think was a form that had been of use among the Jews. But however, if Christ had newly then composed it, yet was it a form to his Disciples. 3. By his thrice repeating the same words in his own prayer. 4. By his teaching his Disciples a form, as John taught his. 5. By his never expressing the least dislike of the old Jewish custom of using forms: nor doth Scripture anywhere repeal it, or forbid it. 6. The Apostles command the use of Psalms and Hymns, which cannot be ordinary in the Church without forms. All this proves Christ's approbation.

Argum. 6. Argum. 6. If it be lawful for the people to use a stinted form of words in publike prayer, then is it in itself lawful for the Pastors: but it is lawful for the people: for the Pastors prayer (which they must pray over with him, and not only hear it) is a stinted form to them, even as much as if he had learnt it out of a Book. They are to follow him in his method and words, as if it were a Book prayer.

Argum. 7. Argum. 7. It is lawful to use a form in Preaching: therefore a stinted Liturgy is lawful. 1. Because preaching is a part of that Liturgy. 2. Because the reason of the same for prayer, as for that in the main. Now that studied formed Sermons are lawful, so commonly granted, that it shall save me the labour of proving it (which were easie.)

Argum. 8. Argum. 8. That which hath been the practice of the Church in Scripture times, and down to this day, and is yet the practice of almost all the Churches of Christ on earth, is not like to be unlawful: but such is the use of some stinted forms of publick service: therefore, &c. That it was so in the Jews Church, and approved by Christ, I have shewed. That it hath been of antient use in the Church since Christ, and is at this day in use in Africk, Asia, Europe, even among the Reformed Churches in France, Holland, Geneva, &c. is so well known, that I think I need not stand to prove it: yea those few that seem to dispute it, do yet use it, in Psalms, and other parts of worship, of which more anon.
Prop. 2. A Stinted Liturgy in some parts of publick holy service is ordinarily necessary.

This Proposition is to be proved by instances, and the proof of the parts. The parts where a set form is usually necessary, I shall enumerate desiring you by the way to understand, 1. That I speak not of an Absolute Necessity ad finem, as if no other could be accepted; but a Necessity of Duty: it ought to be done, as the best way. 2. That I say but [ordinarily] as excepting some unusual cases.

1. The Communication or revelation of the will of God to the Church by Reading of the Holy Scriptures, is part of the publick service of God. As Moses and the Prophets were read every Sabbath day, so by parity of reason should the Gospel; and Paul required the publick reading of his Epistles, Act. 13. 27. & 15. 21. 2 Cor. 3. 15. Luk. 16. 29. Col. 4. 16. 1 Thes. 5. 27. Rev. 1. 3. But this Reading of the Scriptures is the using of a set form in publick service. For they are the same words that we read from day to day, and usually must read.

2. The Publick Praying of God by singing of Psalms, is a part of publick worship: and a most excellent part, not usually to be omitted. But this part of worship is ordinarily to be used in a stinted form: because the gift of composing Psalms ex tempore without a prepared form, is not usual in the Church: and if it were so to one, it is not to the rest that must use this worship. Had we not stinted forms of Psalms, we should have ill-favoured work in the Church.

3. Baptism is usually to be administered in a form of words: for Christ hath prescribed us a form, Matt. 28. 19. [Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost] I think few sober men will think it ordinarily meet to dilute this form.

4. The use of a form in the Consecration and Administration of the Lords Supper (though not through the whole action) is ordinarily most fit: for Christ hath left us a form of words, Take ye, Eat ye, &c.] which are most exact, and safe, and none can mend. And Paul reciteth his form, 1 Cor. 11. And small alterations in the very words of Baptism, or Delivering the Lords
Lords Supper, may easily corrupt the Ordinance in time.

5. The very Sacramental Elements and Actions arestinted forms of Administration, which none may alter. As the washing with water, the breaking of bread, and pouring out of wine, and giving them, and taking them, and eating and drinking, &c. These are real forms, not to be changed, at least without Necessity, if at all.

6. The Blessing of the people in the Name of the Lord, was done by a prescribed form of old, Num.6:23, and is usually to be done in a form still. For in all these forementioned parts of worship, should we still use new expressions, when so few and pertinent must be used, we should be put to disuse the fittest, and use such as are less fit.

7. In our ordinary Preaching a form (not imposed, unless in cases of great Necessity and unfitness, but) of our own premeditating, is usually fittest: I think few men are so weak as to prefer (with most preachers) unprepared Sermons, before those that have more of their care and study. And then at least, the Text, Method, and somewhat of the words must be premeditated, if not all.

8. Ordinarily there should be somewhat of a form in Publick Confessions of the Churches faith. For how else shall all concur? And it is a tender point to admit of great or frequent mutations in: so that in Baptism, and at other seasons when the Christian faith is to be openly professed by one, or more, or all, a form that is exact, is usually meet to be retained; though in many personal Cases, explicatory enlargements may do well.

9. If there be not a frequent use of many of the same words, and so somewhat of a form, in Marriage, Confirmation, Absolution, Excommunication, the danger will be more, then the benefit by mutation will be.

10. And with some Ministers (of whom anon) even in Prayer especially about the Sacraments, where there must be great exactness, and the matter ordinarily, if not always the same, the ordinary use of a form may be the best and fittest way.

In the most of these Cases 1. The Nature of the thing sufficiently proves the ordinary fitness of a form. 2. The constant Practice of almost all Churches (if not all) is for it: even
they that scruple forms of Prayer, use constantly forms of Praise, of Reading, of Sacraments, &c. 3. The rest are proved fittest as aforesaid by the Apostles generall Rules, 1 Cor. 14. 26, 40. Let all things be done to Edifying: and Let all things be done decently and in order. Now in the cases before mentioned, the Edification of the Church (to say nothing of Order) requireth the ordinary use of forms.

Prop. 3. In those parts of publack worship where a form is not of ordinary necessity, but only Lawfull, yet may it not only be submitted to, but desired, when the Peace of the Church doth accidentally require it.

This Proposition needs no proof, but only explication. For he is far from the temper of a Christian that sets so light by the Peace of the Church, that he would not use a Lawfull means for the procurement of it, when Paul would become all things to all men to save some, and would eat no flesh while he lived rather then offend his weak brother.

But here you must take these cautions, lest you misunderstand this Proposition.

1. The Peace of the whole Church must be in our eye, before the peace of a part; and of a great and more considerable part, rather then of a smaller, cateris paribus.

2. It is supposed that (besides the simple lawfulness of the thing) there be also no other accidental inconveniencies on the other side (that will follow the use of a form) that is of sufficient moment to weigh down the argument from the Churches Peace. For when a thing is only good or evil, (I mean, necessary or sinfull,) by Accident, and not in itself, we must consider which side hath the most weighty accidents, and accordingly must choose or refuse it.

3. It is not the fulfilling of the humours of every unreasonable expectant, or every proud Magisterial usurper that is the Peace of the Church, that now we speak of: If a few proud men will hold no Peace with us, unless we will serve God in their unnecessary forms, as if none had wit enough but they, to know in what words the Churches should serve God: and all must speak but what
what they teach them, it is not the humoring of these Proud
intrurers that is the Peace thus to be bought.

4. We must look to the future as well as the present Peace of
the Churches: And therefore if any will hold no Peace with us
now, unless we will own some formal Engine that is like to make
hereafter more division then unity in the Churches, (by laying
the Unity or Peace of the Church on things that will not bear it,
and making things necessary, that are not necessary, nor to be
made so) in such cases, it is not our duty to betray the gene-
ral or future Peace of the Church for our private or present
Peace.

5. The desireableness of this Peace of the Church which we
must seek, must be much judged of by its tendency to the pro-
motion of holiness, the saving of mens souls, the furthering of
the Gospel, and prosperity of the Church in spiritual respects:
For a Peace that undermineth and betrayeth these, is not desire-
able. The means is to be valued by its tendency to the attain-
ment of the End.

6. There is need therefore of very great prudence, to compare
things with things, for a man to know how to carry himself in
such cases. For imprudent overights, or laying greatest stress
on smallest things, and slighting greater, will make men live in
constant sin by abusing things indifferent.

But still the Proposition holds good with these cautions, that
forms and such like indifferent things are to be used or difused
much with respect to the Churches Peace.

---

Prop. 4. So great is the difference between men and men, times
and times, that forms may be a duty to some
men, and at some times, and a sin to other men, and at other
times.

As to private men in their families, it may be one mans du-
ty to use a form, or book, and another mans sin, so is it with
Ministers also in the Assemblies. Three distinctions (among
others) are obvious, in which this is manifest.

1. Some Ministers are better able to perform Gods pub-
lick worship (except in the fore-expected cases) without
a form: and some are better able to do it by a form.

2. Some
2. Some Ministers have a People that are scrupulous of using forms, and some have people that scruple the disposing them, and some have both sorts mixt.

3. Some Churches live under Magistrates that command a form, or with Churches that unanimously agree on a form; and others live in times and places where there is no such commands or Agreements. And according to these differences it may be one man's duty, and another's fin to use some forms.

1. Gods work should be done in the most edifying manner. Where Ministers are able to perform the publick prayers of the Church in the most profitable manner without a form, there it is their duty to dispose a form, unless some other greater accident preponderate. Still remember that for Psalms and other fore-expected parts, I take it for granted that ordinarily a form is necessary. But our main question now is of Praying and Preaching, and that especially with respect to one standing form that is not usually varied in Prayer, and an imposed form, or composed by others, in Preaching. It should be the ordinary case of the Church that Ministers should be able to dispose without a constant form of words, to the people's greater edification. But yet it is not always so. And where it is not, it is better for Ministers to use a form, then to do worse, and dishonour the work of God, and wrong the Church by their erroneous or over-rude defective management. I know the great objection will be, that such men are not fit to be Ministers, and that its better to have none. But this is sooner said then proved. I am far from desiring any man to undervalue the precious mercy of an able Ministry, and from wishing for formalities and reading Pastors instead of the learned able guides that we here enjoy. I hope I should do or suffer as much as another to prevent so great a Calamity as an ignorant, unable, or negligent Ministry. But yet I am fully satisfied of it, that its better for the Church to have Readers then none.

1. Consider that there have been some very Learned able Divines (Doctors of Divinity) that by age, or other decay of Memory, or natural impediments disabling them from extemporaneous performances, cannot do anything in the worship of God without the help of Notes or books; or at least without preparation
ration for expressions; when yet upon preparation, and by convenient helps, they excell many extemporary men.

2. The Necessities of the Church may require an allowance or toleration of such as have not ability to compose extemperate Prayers, or Sermons, no nor to prepare such upon deliberation neither, but meerly read the Sermons and Prayers composed by others. I know some will not believe that such should be Ministers; But they would have them only read as private men, rather then the people should have nothing: For they think that a man that cannot preach or pray is no more capable of being a Minister, then a man that cannot command an Army is capable of being a Commander, &c.

But 1. Let such brethren consider that there may be all abilities essentially requisite to a Pastor, without the ability of praying or preaching without a form (Though still I pray God to save us from a Necessity of such.) A man that can teach men the substance of the Christian Religion, and administer the Sacraments, and oversee and govern the flock, hath as much ability as is necessary to the Being of a Pastor. But those may have all this that cannot fitly preach or pray without a form. They may be godly men, able in conference to instruct the people in the substance of Religion, and to read the Scriptures, and the Holy writings of godly men, and to administer Sacraments, and prudently and diligently guide the people. And by the same rule as you will conclude it better that (e.g.) Wales, Ireland, &c. have private men to read good books, rather then none, left they turn heathens; I may also conclude that it is better for them to have Churches and Pastors of this weaker sort, then to have none, and leave their children unbaptized, and live without the Sacraments, and Church-Communion, and Government.

2. Consider I beseech you (which moves me more then anything else) the state of the Christian world. In Ethiopia, Syria, Armenia, Russia, Grecia, and abundance of other Churches of Christ there are very few Preachers, but meer Readers. And can any man think that it is best for all these Churches to be without Ministers, and Sacraments, rather then to have such? O that God would give them better! But till then, I shall pray that he
he will continue these among them, rather than leave them destitute. I know many godly judicious men, of able parts for conference, that yet are unable to compose a Sermon (though if they could, it were a form) that yet I am confident by Reading such Practical Books as are now extant, and by prudent oversight, might be tolerable Pastors for many a Congregation in Wales, that now have none.

2. In a time and place where no obligation by Magistrates Commands, or Churches Agreements is laid upon us for the use of forms, I am fully persuaded we should make no more use of them, then Necessity compelleth us to do: But the thing being lawfull, the Command of a Magistrate, or the agreement of the Churches may go far in moving us; And indeed must prevail with us, unless in cases where there are weightier Accidents to weigh down on the other side. For obedience and Agreement or Concord in Lawfull things is our duty, where we have not some greater reason to forbid it. There is much difference between men that are left at liberty, and men that are bound by lawfull Governours. Yea though they do not well-in-commanding, yet may we be bound to obey, when the matter is such as belongeth to their jurisdiction, and not forbidden by God.

3. A man is also much to regard the minds of his people: not out of man-pleasing disposition, but in order to their good. Prudence will tell us which way is likeliest to attain our Ends. Food is to be fitted to mens tempers and constitutions, and Physick, to their diseases. If a Church be so weak that they cannot bear the diffuse of forms, and others so weak that they cannot bear the use of them, the Pastor must fit his practice to their Edification, till he can bring them to a wiser judgement, that so they may receive that which indeed is most fit to edifie them. Prudence must guide us in the circumstances of worship, which are left to our Determination; that we may vary them as the condition of our flock requireth, to their good; (of which more anon:)

Bb b 2  Prop.
Prop. 5. Prop. 5. 

TH E Ministers and Churches that earnestly desire it, should not by the Magistrate be absolutely, and generally prohibited the use of a convenient stinted Liturgy.

Note here that I speak not of the desires of any inconsiderable persons, contrary to the desires of that whole Church. If a few ignorant or wilfull people should be eager for a form, when the Pastor is able and willing to manage the work of God without it, and the Congregation professeth that it hindereth their Edification (by what accident soever, I am not now questioning,) it is fit that those unreasonable persons should be denied their desires (in that Church) rather then the whole Congregation. Also if the Magistrate should perceive that a whole Congregation, or many, or the Pastors themselves are eager for some one particular form, out of a corrupt humour, and in any ill design to the disturbance of the Churches Peace, or that they will needs have an unlawfull Form, that for matter is erroneous, or for manner absurd, or apt to breed un reverence, or hinder Edification, the Magistrate should prohibit this: Yet so, that Prudence and Moderation measure out his penalties in such a fort, as that he Churches Edification be not hindered by his over-rigorous correcting mens dis tempers.

But out of these and such like Cases, when it is meer weakness that causeth Pastors or people to be set upon a (lawfull) form, The Magistrate ought not to prohibit them by such refrains, as shall deprive them of the liberty of worshipping God, or hinder their Edification.

The Reasons of this Proposition are these. 1. Because the thing being Lawfull, no Power should causelessly restrain men from the use of Lawfull things. God having left men to their Liberty, none should without great reason deprive them of it.

2. The Magistrate should not hinder the Peoples Edification in the manner of Gods worship: But in many places a stinted Liturgy is most for the peoples Edification. Therefore, &c. Whether it be the Ministers' weakness, or the peoples, that makes it most usefull to them, yet when the Magistrate cannot cure that
that weakness, he must bear with them. It was the weakness of Nicodemus that made him he could not bear the day-light, in coming to Christ; yea and such a weakness, as shewed, or was joyned with an unregenerate state, and yet Christ would rather teach him privately then not at all.

3. Where Consciences are scrupulous, and think it a sin to worship publickly without a form, (though it be their error yet) the Governors are not to drive them away from it; because then they will not publickly Worship God at all: And no worship is worse then a lawful form of worship.

4. A Minister that is for the Necessity of a form (though erroneously) may be in other respects so usefull to the Church, that he should not be laid by and lost to the Church for such a thing as this.

5. The use of some forms (as aforesaid) being necessary, and of other forms, not only lawfull, but of almost common reception through all the Churches on earth, Governorsshould be very cautious in denying men liberty in that which almost all the Churches have Liberty in, and more; even that which is their constant use.

Prop. 6. To prescribe a Form of Prayer, Preaching (or other service where is no Necessity of it) and to lay a Necessity on it, as to the thing it self, or the Churches Peace, &c. and to punish, silence, suspend, excommunicate, or reproach as Schismatics, the able, godly, peaceable Ministers or People, that (justly or unjustly) dare not use it, is so great a sin, that no Godly Ministers should desire or attempt it, nor any godly Magistrate suffer it.

This was the great sin of the late Magistrates and Prelates in England; and it is the main difference between their party and others at this day. The Magistrate doth not forbid men using a form or Liturgy (though they forbid one particular Liturgy more strictly then I could wish:) But there is a very few of these men that I know of, that can be contented with a Liberty of using it themselves, if they may not have all others compelled to do as they do, and go to God with the words that they have formed for them, or that are best in their esteem. They must
must be all Schismatics that will not use their form, and the Churches Peace must be laid upon it, and no man must be thought meet to preach or pray that will not be of their opinion, but the ablest Pastors of the Church must be silenced and cast by, if they will not use the Common-Prayer. The sinfulnesss of this practice shall be manifested in the next dispute more fully, to which I reserve the most of my reasons against it: In the mean time let these few be well considered.

1. It is a certain way to the Division of the Church: when men will lay its Unity or Peace on that which will not bear it, they are the most desperate disturbers and dividers of it. If one form of Prayer or Preaching had been necessary to the Churches Unity or Peace, Christ or his Apostles might as easily have composed it, as they did other necessaries. Nay experience tells us, that it is not held necessary by men themselves: For the Romanists use one or more forms: and the Grecians another, and the Ethiopians another, and so of other Churches. In the Bibliotheca Patrum how many Liturgies have they given us? And if no one of all these is necessary to all Churches, then not to any one Church, further then accidents, and mens impositions make it necessary. And no man should make that necessary, that is not some way necessary before. It is easy to know that either the Form as such, or somewhat in the Form, is like to be scrupled by some, even godly, able men: and so it will prove an engine of division. The Church hath been brought to that torn divided condition, that it is in, by this arrogancy of domineering imposers, that must lay its Peace on their unnecessary devices: and will not let us have unity in Christ and his Institutions and peace upon his terms.

2. By this means the people will be involved in the guilt of bitter contending, and hating all that conform not to their way, and uncharitably reproaching them as Schismatics; and consequently of disliking the very doctrine that they preach, or hold; and the way they take; and thus if uncharitableness, and all this sin, the off-spring of it, be the way to Hell, then you may see what a notable service they do to Satan, and how they enslave and undo mens souls, that make such forms of common Necessity to the Unity or Peace of the Church.

3. By this means they will involve themselves and the Magistrate
in the guilt of persecution: For no better will it prove, even in many cases where the refusers scruples are unjust.

4. By this means they will hinder the Edification of the Church. What if a Minifter have a Congregation that (suppose upon mistakes) do scruple these forms, and by prejudice or weakness are hindered from serving God with cheerfulness and profit, where they are used; must we be bound to deny them that mode of worship which their weakness doth require? and to force them to that which will not down with them? Must a Phyfitian be bound to give all his Patients one kind of dyet? What if it be wholesome? Will you say, If that will not down with him, he shall have none: let him die? This is contrary to the end of our office: we are commanded to do all to Edification, which this doth contradict.

5. It is contrary to the Office, Power and Trust of the particular Paftors of the Church, to be thus compelled in variable things. As it is the office of a Phyfitian to judge what dyet and phyfick to prescribe his Patients, and to vary it as persons do vary in their tempers and diseases, and to vary it with the same persons, as their condition changeth and requireth it: and as it would be foolish Tyranny against the very office of the Phyfitian to restrain him from this exercise of his prudence by a Law, and to tye him to give one kind of food or phyfick to all, so is it in our present case. What is a Paftor, but the guide of a Congregation in the worship of God? &c. And if Magiftrates and Bishops take this work out of their hands by their unnecessary prescriptions, they so far prohibit him to do the work of a Paftor. What a grief is it to a Minifter (that being in the place, and knowing the people, is the most competent Judge what is fit for them) to be constrained by men that know not the state of his flocks, to cross their Edification, and to be forbidden to use his prudence and due power for their spiritual good?

6. And what a sinful arrogant usurpation is this, for any man to be guilty of? It is Chrifs that hath given his Minif ters their Power, and that for Edification: and who is he that may presume to take it from them? If they are unworthy to be Minif ters, let them not be Ordained, or let them be degraded or deposed. But if they must be Minif tres, let them do the work
of Ministers; lest as he that despiseth them, despiseth Christ, so he that restrains them from their duty, and depriveth them of the exercise of their power unjustly, be found one that would arrogate an authority over Christ.

7. And what intolerable Pride is this, for a few Bishops to think so highly of themselves, and so basely of their more judicious Brethren, as if no man must speak to God but in their words? These forms of Prayer are conceived and invented by some body. And why should the Conceiver think so highly of his own understanding, as if he were fit to teach a whole Nation what they must daily say to God? and why should he think so unworthily of all others in comparison of himself, as if none but he (and his Companions in this usurpation) knew how to pray or utter their minds, but by his dictates or prescriptions? Is this Humility?

8. Moreover this Impostition of forms (as before described) doth discover too much Cruelty to the Church: when they had rather Ministers were cast aside, and the people left in darkness, then Ministers should teach them, and worship God with them, that will not tie themselves to the very words that they devise for them. What abundance of ignorant, drunken Readers and other Ministers were suffered in England, while the learned, godly, painful Ministers were cast out, and silenced, or persecuted, because they would not conform to all the forms and ceremonies imposed by the Bishops? And so how many thousand souls may we think are gone to Hell, through the ignorance or ungodliness of their Guides, as if their damnation were more desirable, than their salvation by the teaching of Ministers that dare not use the Common Prayer Book and Ceremonies? I know they will say, that such Schismatical Preachers do more hurt by breaking the Churches peace, than they do good by converting souls. But who was it that laid these snares in their way? Who laid the Churches peace upon your inventions? Had not the Church a sure Rule, and an happy order, and unity, and peace, before your Common prayer Book or Ceremonies were born? Why must the Church have no peace but upon such terms? Who made this Necessity, that all men must be taken for intolerable Schismatics that dare not flint themselves in the publick worship by your impositions? Will you not be confound-
ed before God, when these Questions must be answered? The Church might have kept both Peace and her Pastors, if you had let all alone as the Apostles left it, and had not turned the forms of your Devotions to be a snare for others.

9. And it is great unmercifulness to the Souls of particular men, when you will drive them into such snares, and compell them to go against their consciences in indifferent things: what ever is not of faith is sin. And whether they believe it good or bad, you will compell them to practise all that you impose. Have you not Con- sciences your selves? Do you not know what it is for a man to be driven against his Conscience? If not, you are no Christians: and then no wonder if you want the Charity and compassion of Chris- tians, and so easily for nothing, abuse and injure the Christian cause.

10. And in this doing, you deal unjustly, and do not as you would be done by. You would have Liberty your selves now to use a Liturgy: And why should not others have Liberty to dispose it? Either you take it for a thing Necessary in it self, or for Indifferent. If it is Necessary, then you are so much the more arrogant and injurious to the Churches, and your usurpa- tion is the more intolerable, and you do much to Justifie them that deprive you of your own liberty: For I know no Liberty that you should have to make universal Laws for the Church: or to make new duties by your own meer wills, or turn Indifferent things into Necessary, and so to multiply our work, and burden, and danger; and to silence, suspend or excommunicate all that dare not submit to your usurped Dominion. But if you take it for a thing in it self Indifferent, whether we pray in a Form of prescribed words, or not, then as we are content that you have your Liberty on one part, you have as just cause to allow us our liberty on the other, and to do as you would be done by.

11. And by these Impostions, you set up a New Office or Power in the Church, Consisting of a New Legislation, and a Government of the Church by such new humane Laws. We know no Law- giver but 1. Christ as to universal Laws of standing necessity to the Churches, in the matters of Salvation. And 2. Magistrates to make by-laws under Christ for a just determination of those mutable circumstances that ought to be determined by humane Prudence; and 3. The Ministers or Pastors of particular Church-
es to direct and guide the people as there is cause. As for Bishops or Councils, we know of no Legislative Power that they have over their Brethren, though Agreements they may make, which may be obligatory, 1. by consent, as other contracts, 2. and in order to unity, where the case requireth such Agreements. But to set up a New sort of Jurisdiction in the Church, by Legislation to make Forms and Ceremonies obligatory, and by Executions to punish Pastors that will not practice them, is a dangerous device.

12. Lastly by this means you will harden the Papists, that by their Inventions and Impositions have divided the Church, and been guilty of so much usurpation and tyranny; For how can we condemn that in them that is practised by our selves? And though in number of Inventions and Impositions they exceed, yet it is not well to concur with them in the kind of unnecessary Impositions, and so far to justify them in their injury to the Church.

If none of these or other Reasons will alloy the Imperious distemper of the Proud, but they must needs by a usurped Legislation be making Indifferent things become necessary to others, and domineer over mens Consciences, and the Church of God, we must leave them to him, that being the Lord and Lawgiver of the Church, is Jealous of his Prerogative, and abhorreth Idols, and will not give his glory to another, and that delighteth to pull down the Proud, and humble them that exalt themselves.

But yet how far an Agreement or voluntary Consent of the Churches is desirable as to a Liturgy, I shall shew more anon.

Prop. 7. T

HE safest way of composing a stnted Liturgie, is to take it all, or as much as may be, for words as well as matter, out of the Holy Scriptures.

Reas. 1. This way is least liable to scruple, because all are satisfied of the infallible Truth of Scripture, and the fitness of its expressions, that are not like to be satisfied with mans. And it is a laudable disposition in the Creature to prefer the words of God before all other, and therefore not to be discouraged in any.

Reas. 2. This way tends most to the peace of the Church. All will unite in the words of God, that will not unite in the forms
forms and words of men. If they understand not a word of God, yet knowing it to be true, they will not quarrel with it, but submit: But if they understand not the words of men, they will be ready to suspect them, and so to quarrel with them, and so the Churches peace will be broken. Besides, the judgements of men being fallible, many will suspect that it is possible there may be some error in their forms, though we see them not; and God should be worshiped in the surest way.

Reaf. 3. There is no other words that may be preferred before the words of God, or stand in Competition with them: and therefore me thinks this should easily be decided.

Objekt. But the Scripture hath not forms enough for all the Churches uses. Anfw. It hath matter and words for such Forms. Without any additions, save only terms of Connection, the sentences of holy Scripture may suffice the Church for all its uses, as to forms.

Objekt. But men may speak untruths in Scripture words if they will, and by misplacing and misapplying them, may make them speak what was never meant in them. Anfw. But 1. When they use no expository terms of their own, but merely recite the words of Scripture, the perverting them will not be so easy or common: And 2. When they have placed them how they please, the people are left at liberty to interpret them according to the sense they have in the Scripture, and not according to what men's misplacing may seem to put upon them: when we professedly make our forms out of God's word, we do as it were tell the people that they must give each sentence its proper interpretation as its meant in Scripture, because we pretend not to change it, but to use it. But when it's our own words that we compose our own imposed forms in, the people are left more uncertain of the soundness. For the maker is the Interpreter.

Objekt. But the Church hath antient venerable forms already; and who may presume to alter them?

Anfw. 1. Hath it any that are more Ancient or more venerable then the Scripture? undoubtedly it hath not, nor any but must stoop to Scripture. 2. All that is in the words of Scripture, we are contented be continued (at least.) 3. If it were lawful for the first devisers or compilers of these Forms, to make
make a new Liturgy, when the Church had so many before; then is it lawful for others to do the like. And if the compilers of the first of those Liturgies, might make a new one in their own words, why may not others make a new one in the Scripture words, that will be new only as to the connexion of Sentences? 4. The Church of Rome that is most for their forms, have yet so often innovated, that they have no reason to condemn it in others.

Prop. 8. Though it be safest and most venerable in Scripture words, yet is not this of so great necessity, but that we may lawfully use a Liturgy that is not thus taken out of Scripture.

As long as the matter is agreeable to Scripture, it is more for Conveniency, then necessity, that the words be thence, as is easily proved.

1. In our Preaching we judge it lawful to speak words that are not in the Scripture: therefore by parity of reason, we may do so in Prayer.

2. In our extemperate Prayers we judge it lawful to use our own words that are not taken out of Scripture: therefore we may do so in a Liturgy.

3. Some persons may be so strange to Scripture language, that for a time more familiar Phrases may be more edifying to them.

4. Words are but to express our minds: If therefore our words are congruous expressions of sound and well ordered conceptions, they are not only lawful, but convenient. And therefore it is not warrantable for any man to quarrel with expressions because they are not Scriptural, nor to scruple the use of Liturgies, because the forms are not in the words of Scripture.

Prop. 9. The matter of a common Liturgy in which we expect any general Concord, should not be any doubtfull or unnecessary things.

1. It should impose no doubtfull or unnecessary ceremonies.
Prop. 10. **Humane Forms of publick prayer, or other worship (excepting the fore-exceptioned Necessary cases, as Psalms, &c.) should not be constantly used by Ministers, that have their liberty, and are able to pray without them: Nor should any be ordinarily admitted into the Ministry (except in the great necessities of the Church) that are not able to pray without such forms.**

In this Proposition are these considerable points implied, and expressed. 

1. That it is not unfit to have forms by the common Agreement of the Pastors, to be used when its meet (as is before and after expressed.) There are few Nations in the world, so well provided for with able Ministers, but that some places must be supplied with men that have need of forms of Prayer, if not of Preaching, composed by others. And therefore it is fittest that such should have Forms that are Agreed on by all. And therefore I doubt not but when we came newly out of Popery, and had not a full supply of preachers, it was a wise and lawful course to compose a common form of Prayer. For, 1. It will be the surest way to keep out unsoundness and abusive passages: when nothing is allowed as a publick form but what hath obtained the common consent. 2. It will be the way of fullest concord: when forms are necessary, there is more of Concord...
in it, to have one (that is approved), then to have as many as men please. 3. The Churches may the better know whom to hold communion with in Prayer, (though the Pastors may be unable to pray without forms,) when they know the substance of their Prayers. 4. The Magistrate may the better do his duty and be responsible for the service that is offered to God, even by the weakest Pastors, and see that God's name be not abused. It is therefore desirable that a Common Liturgy be extant.

2. And for the use of it, let these Rules contained in the Proposition be observed.

1. Let no man be ordained a Minister that is not able to Pray without a Form, in such a manner as is not dishonourable to the worship of God, unless the Necessity of the Churches shall require it: All friends of the Churches will agree to this, that the Church have the ablest Pastors that can be got.

2. But because it is not to be hoped for that all the Churches can be thus supplied (at least in haste,) if the Ordainers or Approvers shall appoint any to the work in Wales or other necessitous places, that are not able competently to administer Sacraments, &c. without a Form of Prayer, let them try such to use the Form Agreed on.

3. If they approve only of such as are able to do it without a form, but yet so weakly (some of them) as is less to the Churches Edification, then the form would be, let such be advised, sometimes to use the Form, and sometime to forbear it, till they are more able.

4. And that it may be no dishonour to the publick Form, that it is used only by the weak, let the Ablest Ministers sometime use it, but with these cautions: 1. Let them not be compelled to it against their judgements, but persuaded. 2. Let not the ablest use it so frequently as the weak, (unless their own judgement require it.) Let the weaker use it oftener, and the Abler more seldom.

5. Let neither of them (that can competently worship God without it) use it Constantly; but sometime use it, and sometime forbear it. And this is the main point that I intend in this Proposition, and therefore shall now briefly give my Reasons for.

Reason 1. The constant use of forms (and so of Ceremonies and
any Indifferent things) doth potently tend to perswade the people that they are matters of Necessity, and not indifferent. All the words that you can use will not satisfy them that it is indifferent, if you use it not Indifferently. We see by experience the power of custom with the vulgar.

But you will say, What if they do overvalue it as necessary, what danger is in that? I answer very much. 1. They will offer God a blind kind of service, while they place his worship in that which is no part of worship (as forms are not, as such) but an indifferent circumstance. 2. They will hereby induced to uncharitable censures of other Churches or persons that think otherwise, or disuse those customs. 3. They will be strongly induced to rebel against their Magistrates and Pastors, if they shall judge it meet to change those customs. 4. They will turn that stream of their zeal for these indifferent things, that should be laid out on the matters of Necessity: and perhaps in vain will they worship God, by an outside hypocritically worship, while they thus take up with men's Traditions. 5. They will forsake God's own Ordinances, when they cannot have them clothed with their desired mode. All this we see in our days at home. The most ignorant and ungodly do by hundreds and thousands, reject church discipline, and Sacraments, and many of them the Prayers and Assemblies themselves, because they have not the Common Prayer, or because the Churches kneel not at the Lord's Supper in the act of Receiving, and such like. So that it is a grievous plague to our peoples souls to be led into these mistakes, and to think that Circumstances and things indifferent, are matters of Necessity.

And yet on the other side, left the constant disuse of all convenient forms, should lead the people into the contrary extreme, to think them all unlawful (and so to be guilty of the like uncharitable censures and evils as aforesaid.) I think it safest, that the ablest men should sometime use them. And this Indifferent use of them, will lead the people to indifferent thoughts of them, and so they will not provoke God by blind worship, nor be so ready to fly in the faces of their Ministers when they cross them herein, as now they are. For example, what a stir have we if men may not kneel at the Sacrament, or
if the dead (in case of Ministers absence, or other hinderance) have not somewhat said over them at the grave; and in some places, if Ministers go not in procession in Rogation week, and many such like customs. If these were sometime used (in a good and lawfull way) it would keep men from mistaking them to be unlawfull; and if they were sometime disused, people would not take them as things necessary, nor so hate and reproach both Ministers and brethren that neglect them, or do not always humour them herein, yea or that were against them: nor would men separate on these accounts.

Real. 2. The constant use of Forms of Prayer depriveth people of their Ministers gifts, and potently tendeth to work the people into a dull formality, and to a meer outside heartless kind of service, Which is as great an enemy to serious Devotion, and consequently to mens salvation, as almost any thing thats to be found among professed Christians in the Church. How dangerously and obstinately do such delude themselves, and think that they are as uprightly religious as the best? and so refuse all the humbling convincing light that should bring them to a change, and blindly misapply the promises to themselves, and go on in meer presumption to the last: and all because they thus draw neer to God with their lips, and say over a form of words, when their hearts are far from him, and they know not, or observe not what they say.

And that constancy in Forms doth potently tend to this dead formality, we need no other proof than experience. How hard doth the best man find it to keep up life and seriousness in the constant hearing or speaking of the same words? If you say that it is our fault; I grant it: but it is an uncurable fault while we are in the flesh: or at least its few that ever are very much cured of it, and non wholly. Theres much also in nature itself to cause this. A man that delighteth in Musick is weary of it, if he have constantly the same instrument and tune: or at least cannot possibly have that delight that Variety would afford him. So is it in recreations, and oft in dyet, and other things. Novelty affecteth: Variety pleaseth: Commonness dulleth us. And though we must not therefore have a New God, or a New Christ, or a New Gospel (the fulness of these affordeth the soul a daily variety), and also their perfect
(385)

feft goodness is such as leaves no need of a variety in kind, yet is it meet that Ministers should have a gratefull variety of Manner, to keep up delight and desire in their people. A sick stomack cannot take still the same Physick, nor the same dish. I know that an ancient prudent man, especially the Learned Pastor himself, that better comprehends what a form of words contains, can make a much better use of forms, than younger Christians can do. But I think with all, I am sure with the generality, (to whom we must have respect) a constant form is a certain way to bring the Soul to a cold insensible formal worship.

And on the other side, if a form be Constantly disused, and people have not sometimes a recitall of the same, again and again, it may tend to breed a childish levity, and giddyness in Religion; as if it were not the matter, but mere Novelty and variety that did please; And so it may also easily make Hypocrites, who shall delude themselves with conceits that they delight in God and in his word, when it is but in these novelties and varieties of expression, that they are tickled and delighted; and their itching ears being pleased, they think it proves a work of saving grace on the heart. And therefore to fix Christians and make them sound, that they grow not wanton in Religion, and be not as children carried up and down with variety of doctrines or of modes, I think it would be useful to have a moderate reasonable use of some forms as to the manner, as well as often to inculcate the same matter; Avoiding still that constancy that tends to dull their appetites, and make them weary or formal in the work.

Reaf. 3. The constant use of a stinted Liturgy, or form of Prayer, doth much tend to the remissness and negligence of the Ministry. When they know that the duty requireth no exercise of their invention, and that before the Church they may as well perform it with an unprepared as with a prepared mind, it will strongly tempt them (and prevail too commonly) to neglect the stirring up of their gifts, and the preparing of their minds. When they know that before men they may (in Reading a Prayer) come off as well without any regard to their hearts, as with the greatest seriousness of devotion, we must expect that most should do accordingly: For we see that Ministers are men, and too many D d d
are carried as well as others, with the stream of temptation. But those Prayers and other duties that depend upon their parts, require preparation, or at least some present care and diligence for the awakening of their hearts, and excitation of their faculties.

Real. 4. But the principle danger of a constant use of prescribed forms is, left it should let in an unworthy Ministry into the Church. For though I had rather have as weak Ministers as I before described, then none; yet it will be very dangerous when such are tolerated because of Necessity, lest the negligence of Ordainers and Approvers will take advantage of this, and pretend necessity where there is none, or hearken to them that come with such pretences, and so undo the Church by an ignorant insufficient Ministry; so hard is it for men to avoid one extreme without running into another. Now the utter prohibition of tinted forms will prevent this, but not without an evil on the other side. And therefore to avoid the evils on both sides, I think it would be best to let such forms be used, but unconstantly, unless by men that will lie under the dishonour of being able to do no better. And that dishonor will hinder men from being in them, and the frequent exercise of other men's gifts, will awaken them to their duty, and the necessity of it will as well keep out insufficient men as if there were no form at all. For an insufficient man can no more perform the work once a day without a form, than twice a day. I shall add no more Reasons, because they that write against forms of Prayer, though they run too far, have said enough of the inconveniences. The motion that I make being for a voluntary and an unconstant use of them, I must expect to meet with objections on both sides, which I shall briefly answer.

Object. 1. Those that are utterly against forms, will say that I am opening under pretence of Peace and Liberty a way to let in an unlawful worship and a lazy insufficient Ministry. To which I answ. 1. For them that take all forms to be unlawful, I think them fitter for compassion than disputes, and judge their reason to be as low as the Quakers that cry down the use of hour-glasses, and sermon-notes, and preaching on a Text of Scripture. 2. And for the rest of the objection, it is answered before. The use of a Liturgy in the way described, will not more Com-
tenance a lazy insufficient ministry, nor hurt the Church, then if there were none.

Object. 2. But what need is there of it? Are we not well without it? why would you disturb our peace, to please the adversaries? Answ. 1. We are not without a Liturgy, as shall be further shewed, and therefore you cannot lay we are well without it. 2. Some yong weak Ministers (we must speak the truth) do wrong both Baptism and the Lords Supper by many miscarriages, for want of further helps. 3. Wales and many parts of England must be supplied with Forms, or be without, which is worse. 4. The Consciences of many of those that you call adversaries (and I call Brethren) must be indulged with the liberty of a convenient form, or else we shall not walk charitably.

On the other side it will be objected, by them that would have all men forced to the constant use of forms, 1. that If we have not forms, men may vent what they please in prayer: some raile in prayer, and some vent error, and some rebellion, &c. Answ. 1. This Argument makes against all Prayer of Ministers, but what is prescribed. For if you force them to a form, and yet give them leave with their Sermons to use also either extemporate or formed Prayers of their own, they may as well ven rebellion, herefie or malice in them, as if they had no Liturgy at all. And if you would have Ministers use no prayer but what they read out of the imposed books, for fear of these inconveniences, you will shew your selves enemies to the Church, and cure an inconvenience with a mischief. 2. And if men were forbidden all prayer but by the Book, yet it is more easie to vent error or malice in a Sermon. So that unless you tie them also to forbear preaching save out of an imposed book, you are never the better. And if you would do so, you are sorry helpers of the Church. 3. You have a better remedy then these at hand. Put no such Insufficient men, or Hereticks into the Ministry, that will so abuse prayer: or if they be crept in, put them out again, and put better in their places, that will not abuse it. If some Physisitians kill men by ignorance or malice, will you tie them all to go by a Book and give but one medicine, or will you not rather cast out the unworthy, and licence only able men?
Object. 2. Object. 2. But how can I joyn with a Minister in prayer, if I know not before hand what he will say, when for ought I know he may pray blasphemy or heresie?

Answ. 1. By this objection, you take it to be unlawful to joyn with any prayers at all, whether publick or private, but what you know before: And so it seems you think all prayer but what is by the book, unfit for any but a solitary person. And if this be your mind, that your Book, Prayers must needs shut out all others, blame not men so much to shut out your Book, when you so far provoke them. 2. According to this Objection you must not send for the Minister to pray with you when you are sick, or in trouble, unless he eye himself to your Book. And why then may not another do it as well as he; or at least, the fifyest man that can read as well as the most able? 3. It is the work of the Minister, to be the peoples mouth in prayer to God, and therefore if he fail in the manner of his own work, it is his sin, and not yours, and you may no more refuse for that to joyn with him, then subjects may refuse to obey the sovereign power, because of some miscarriages, yea or to fight for them, and defend them. 4. Your presence signifieth not your consent to all that you hear from a Minister: And your Heart is not to follow him in evil, but in good: and therefore seeing you are at liberty, what cause of scruple have you? 5. It is supposed that no man is ordinarily admitted, or tolerated in the Ministry, that will so abuse prayer that men may not lawfully joyn with them. If they are such, cast them out: If you cannot cast them out, if they are Hereticks or Blasphemers, come not near them. But if they are men fit for to be tolerated in the Ministry, you have reason to trust them so far in their office, as not to expeft Heresies or Blasphemies from them, till you hear them: And if you hear them guilty of such, after a First and Second admonition avoid them. But let not wicked uncharitable censures be an argument against the worship of God. You know not but a Physician may poison you, and yet you will choose the best you can, and then trust your lives with him. You may much more do so by a Minister, because you proceed not by so implicate a faith in the matters of your Salvation. You may refuse any evil that the Minister offereth.

Object. 3. Object. 3. But many of them speak nonsense and unreverent Words,
words, and abuse God's worship. An sw. Get better in their head, that are able to do God's work in a more suitable manner. But see that your quarrelsome capricious wits, do not odiously aggravate imperfections, or make faults where there are none. And remember that you have not Angels, but men to be your Pastors; and therefore imperfections must be expected: But a blessing may accompany imperfect administrations. But if People, Patron, and Ordainer will choose weak men, when they may have better, they may thank themselves. A Common Prayer book will make but an imperfect supply, instead of an able Minister: Though in some cases I am for it, as aforesaid.

Object. 4. But prayer is a speaking to God: and therefore men should say nothing but what is exactly weighed before hand.

An sw. 1. We grant all this. But men may weigh before hand the matter of their requests, without preparing a form of words: or a man may fore-consider of his words, without a Prayer-book. 2. Preaching is a speaking in God's name, as though God Speak by us, and as Christ's embassadors in his stead. 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20. And to speak as in Christ's stead, and God's name, requireth as great preparation, as to speak to God in the people's name. It seems more, as it were to represent Christ in speaking, then to speak to Christ while we represent but the people. And therefore by this argument you should let no man preach neither, but by a book prescribed. 3. God is not as man, that looks most at oratory and fine words. It is an humble, contrite, faithful, honest heart that he looks at: And where he sees this, with earnest desires, and that the matter of Prayer is agreeable to his will, he will bear with many a homely word. One Cold request, or the least formality and dulness of affection, and carelessness and dilettement of the mercy, is more odious with God, then a thousand Barbarisms, and Slangisms, and unhandsome words. Yet the tongue also should carefully be looke to: but men should not mistake themselves, and think that God judgeth by the outward appearance, and as man judgeth. 4. Still I say, get Ministers that are able to do better if you have insufficient ones. A man on a common prayer-book is likelier to provoke God, by a careless, heartless, customary service, and meer lip labour, let the the words be never so exact, then another (that fears God) is like to provoke him by disorderly or unhandsome words: Though both should be avoided.
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Object.
Object. 5. Object. 5. Our minds are not able to go along with a Minister on the sudden, unless we knew what he will say before hand.

Answ. A diligent soul that marketh what is said, may with holy affections go along with a Minister without knowing what he will say before hand. The experience of Christians confuteth this objection. 2. And this would not only plead for a form, but shut out all other prayer: which is sufficient to disgrace it with any understanding man.

Object. 6. Object. 6. The publick Prayers of the Church are they that we must own by our concurrence: His own conceived Prayers are but the Private Prayers of the Minister. Answ. The Minister is a publick person, and his prayers publicly made for and in the Church, are as much the Publick prayers of that Church as if they were read out of an imposed Book: But indeed when many Churches Agree in a form, that form may so far be called the Common Prayers of all those Churches: but its no more the Publick Prayers of any one Church then sudden conceived prayer is. And when there is no form, yet the matter may be the Common Prayer of all Churches.

Object. 7. Object. 7. But what confusion will it make in the Church if one Congregation shall have a Form, and another none, and every man shall be left to do what he list in Prayer?

Answ. This is the voice of that Ignorance, Pride, and Dividing usurpation that hath caused all the Schisms and troubles of the Church. Must the Churches have no Peace but on your imposed terms? Must none be endured, but all cast out of the Church of God that dare not lay your forms of prayer, though they are as wise and pious and peaceable as you? Nothing but Proud arrogancy and uncharitable cruelty will say so. 2. But if we must needs all Agree in the manner of our Prayers, we must shut out all forms, and agree all to be without them (which yet I consent not to.) For there is no one Form that you can expect that all should agree in, that's of humane invention: Not but that we may well do it: but it will not be.

3. How had the Church Unity before any of your forms were known? 4. If it be no blemish for several Nations to have several Forms, and manners, it is tolerable for several Congregations, 5. How did the Ancient Churches maintain their Unity, when Liturgies were in use, and the variety was
so great as is commonly known? Many Churches had no singing of Psalms (Vid. Pamel. in Cyprian, de Orat. Dom. Not. 6.) Others used it by the whole Assemblies (See Ball’s Friendly Tryal, page 60. citing the Authors that attest it.) Other Churches did use to sing by course, or two at a time. (See it proved by Ball ibid. out of many witnesses.) This variety, and much more consisted then with Unity, and may do now, when forced uniformity will not. 6. We are all now at Liberty what Gesture we will use in singing Psalms, &c. and is here any discord hence arising? But men were forced to kneeling only in Receiving the Lords Supper, and there came in discord. Mens fancies makes that seem confusion that is no such thing. No more then that all that hear or pray, have not the same coloured cloaths, complections, &c.

Object. 8. But should not men obey Authority in forms and matters of indifference? Answ. They should, if they be indeed indifferent. But should Authority therefore ensnare the Church with needless Impostations? All men will not be satisfied of the Indifference. I have heard many say that they would preach in a fools Cap and Coat if Authority command them. But is it therefore fit that Authority should command it? All men will not judge it lawfull to obey them in such cases, and so there will be needless snares laid to intrap and divide men.

Object. 9. But antiquity is for set forms, and therefore No- Object. 9. velty, must not be permitted to exclude them.

Answ. 1. Let Scripture be the Rule for deciding this, which is the chief witness of Antiquity: and let the oldest way prevail. 2. Forms were at first introduced in Variety, and not as necessary for the Churches Unity to Agree in one: And they were left to the Pastors-Liberty; and none were forced to any forms of other mens composing. When Basil set up his New forms of Psalmodie and other Worship, which the Church of Neocesarea were so offended at, he did not for all that impose it on them, but was content to use it in his Church at Cesarea.

Object. 10. No man can now say what is the worship of God among us, because there is no Liturgy, but its mutable as every person pleases.

Answ. We have a Liturgy, and are agreed in all the parts of worship. To have forms or no forms is no part of it, but a circumstance or mode.
The Summ.

The Sum is this: 1. We have already a printed Liturgy. 1. A form of Doctrine in Scripture, 2. Real forms in Sacraments. 3. A verbal form in Baptsizing. 4. A form in delivering the Lords Supper. 5. A Creed (used at Baptism) as a form of confession. 6. We Read the Psalms as Liturgical forms of praise and prayer. 7. We have forms of singing Psalms. 8. We have a form of blessing the people in the End. 9. And of Excommunication (see the Government of the Church, &c.) 10. And of Absolution. 11. And of Marriage. 12. And Ministers preparation makes much of their Sermons a form. 13. And they are at liberty to pray in a form if they Please.

2. No more is necessary (of it self) unless (accidentally) Authority or Peace, &c. require it.

3. If Peace, &c. require a form, let it be one, by common Agreement as near as may be taken out of Scripture, even in words, and as much of the old as is consistent with this Rule retained.

4. Let it not contain any doubtful or unnecessary things, but be as much certain and necessary for the matter as may be.

5. Let none be forced to use it, but such as by Ordainers or Approvers, are judged insufficient to worship God without it, and yet are allowed or Tolerated in the Ministry.

6. Let no Tolerated Ministers be Absolutely forbidden to use it.

7. Let none be suffered to lay the Unity and Peace of the Church on it, and suspend, excommunicate or reproach all that dissent from them in using or not using it.

8. In times of Liberty, let none use it constantly (but the unabl before excepted.) But let the weaker use it oftener, and the abler seldom, yet sometimes (voluntarily, and ceteris paribus, still looking to the state of their flocks, and fitting all to their Edification.)

9. When Magistrates command it, or the Agreement of Pastors and Peace of the Churches (though accidentally by mens infirmity) require it, let none refuse the frequent use of lawfull forms.

10. But let none desire or endeavour the introducing of any such Necessity of this or any indifferent thing, that is not first Necessary by some considerable antecedent occasion to the Edification of the Church.

This much will please the moderate, but not the self-conceited.

FINIS.
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Qu. Whether Humane Ceremonies be Necessary or Profitable to the Church?

CHAP. I.

Distinctions and Propositions in order to the Decision.

§. 1. The discussion of the Controversy about the Etymologie of the word \[Ceremony\] is unnecessary to our ends, and would be more troublesome then usefull. Whether it be derived \(ab\) oppida \(Cera\) re, or \(à\ carendo\), or \(à\ Caritate\), or \(à\ Cerere\), as several mens conjectures run, or rather as Scaliger and Martinins think, from Cerns, which \(in\ \text{veteri lingua erat sanctus}\); it sufficeth us that it signifieth a sacred rite. Servius saith that all sacred things among the Greeks were called \(éρυθα\), and among the Latines \(Ceremonie\); But by \(Ceremonies\) we mean only external Rites or Orders \(in\) or \(about\) the worship of God. And by \(Humane\), we mean such...
as are devised and appointed to be used, by men, without any special Revelation from God, or any extraordinary inspiration of his Spirit, by which the institution might have been justly ascribed to God as the certain principal cause.

§. 2. There is so much ambiguity partly in the terms, and partly in the supposed or implied passages that will rise before us in the dispute, that I judge it necessary to make the way to the true decision of the controversy, and your right understanding of it by these distinctions following, and then to lay down the truth in certain Propositions.

§. 3. Dis. 1. We must distinguish between such Ceremonies as God hath left to humane determination in his worship, and such as he hath not so left; but hath either 1. Exprefly forbidden them in particular. 2. Or in a General prohibition forbidden them, or 3. Hath given no man authority to institute them. So great difference is there between things that commonly go under the name of Ceremonies, that they are not in this Controversie to be confounded, if we would not lose the truth.

§. 4. Dis. 2. We must distinguish between Ceremonies commanded by man as in God's name, and, by pretence of a Commission from him, and such as are only commanded in men's own names, or at least on pretence of nothing but a General Power.

§. 5. Dis. 3. We must distinguish between Ceremonies commanded by men as necessary duties or means of worship, and such as are only commanded as indifferent things.

§. 6. Dis. 4. We must distinguish between Ceremonies imposed by a Lawfull Magistrate, or Church-Governours, and such as are imposed by usurpers, or men without authority.

§. 7. Dis. 5. We must distinguish between Ceremonies imposed as Universally to be practised by all ages, or all people, in the Church at least, and such as are imposed only on some one Congregation or Nation by their proper Governours, and that as things mutable, that upon special occasion were taken up, and may so be laid aside again.

§. 8. Dis. 6. We must distinguish between Ceremonies commanded as things necessary to the being of the Church or Worship, or only necessary to the Order and convenient administration, and better being of them (in the judgement of the imposers.)

§. 9. Dis. 7. We must distinguish between the absolute command
mand of Governors imposing such ceremonies, upon grievous penalties, or without tolerations; and the simple recommending them, or requiring them to be used with (expressed or implied) exceptions.

§. 10. Diu. 8. We must very much difference the several Countries where such things are imposed, and the several sorts of People on whom, and the several seasons in which they are imposed, and thence foresee the effects or consequents that are like to follow.

§. 11. Diu. 9. We must distinguish between the Commanding of such Ceremonies, and the Obeying of such Commands. Its one thing to ask whether it be necessary, profitable, or lawful to impose them? and another whether it be necessary or lawful to use them when commanded?

§. 12. Diu. 10. We must distinguish between that which is Necessary or Profitable to the order or Peace of one Church or Nation: and that which is necessary or profitable to the order, peace or unity of many Churches or Nations, among themselves; or supposed to be so.

§. 13. These Distinctions premised to remove ambiguity; I lay down that which I conceive to be the truth in these Propositions following; which having mentioned, I shall re-assume and confirm such of them as seem of nearest concernment to the Question.

§. 14. Prop. 1. Such Ceremonies as God hath wholly exempted from humane power to determine of, or institute, or hath given man no power to institute, are not necessary, or profitable to the Church, nor may they lawfully be instituted by man.

§. 15. Prop. 2. In such unlawful Impositions, it is a great aggravation of the sin, if men pretend that they are the Institutions of God, or that they have a Commission from God to institute or impose them, when it is no such matter; and so pretend them to be Divine.

§. 16. Prop. 3. If things unlawful (either forbidden, or that want authority) are commanded as indifferent, it is a sinful command; but if commanded as parts of God's Worship or necessary to the Being or well being of the Church, it is an aggravation of the sin.

§. 17. Prop. 4. Things indifferent, lawful and convenient, are sinfully Commanded when they are pretended to be more necessary than they are, and as such imposed.

Eee 3

§. 18.
§ 18. Prop. 5. A thing convenient and profitable, is sinfully commanded, when it is commanded on a greater penalty, than the nature and use of it doth require, and the common good will bear.

§ 19. Prop. 6. It is not lawful to make any thing the subject's Duty by a command, that is merely Indifferent, antecedently both in itself, and as cloathed with all accidents.

§ 20. Prop. 7. Some things may be lawfully and profitably commanded at one time and place, and to one sort of People, that may not be lawfully commanded at another time, or to another people; no nor obeyed, if so commanded.

§ 21. Prop. 8. Those Orders may be Profitable for the Peace of the Churches in one Nation, or under the Government of one Prince, that are not necessary or profitable in order to the unity or Peace of the Churches under divers Princes.

§ 22. Prop. 9. There is no meer humane Universal Sovereign Civil, or Ecclesiastical over the Catholic Church, and therefore there is no power given to any from God, to make Laws that shall universally bind the Catholic Church.

§ 23. Prop. 10. If it be not our own Lawfull Governors Civil or Ecclesiastical, but Usurpers that command us, we are not therefore bound to obey them, though the things be lawfull.

§ 24. Prop. 11. The Commands of lawfull Governors about lawfull Ceremonies are ordinarily to be understood with exceptions, though there be none express, as that in certain cases it is not their will that such commands should bind us.

§ 25. Prop. 12. It may be very sinfull to command some Ceremonies, which may lawfully, yea must in duty be used by the subject when they are commanded.

§ 26. Prop. 13. Though they are not Commanded, nor called Necessary, but professed to be indifferent, yet constantly to use Indifferent things, doth breed that custom which maketh them to be taken as necessary by the people, and usually doth very much hurt.

§ 27. Prop. 14. Yet certain things that are commonly called Ceremonies may lawfully be used in the Church upon humane imposition, and when it is not against the Law of God, no person should disobey the commands of their lawfull Governors, in such things.

§ 28. Having laid together these Propositions, I shall review them, in a very short explication and confirmation, and insist more largely on those of chief concernment.

CHAP.
Such Ceremonies as God hath forbidden, or given man no Power to institute, are not to be imposed on the Church, as profitable or lawfull.

§ 1. HAT some Ceremonies (things commonly so called) may Lawfully be commanded, and some not, methinks should easily be yielded. I meet with none that are against all indeed, though some think the name [Ceremony] unfitly applied to those Circumstances which they consent to: And that any should think that the wit and will of Ceremonie-makers hath no bounds imposed by God, is most unreasonable. All the business therefore is to know what God hath authorized Governors to institute, and what not?

§ 2. And here they that claim a Power of introducing new Institutions, must produce their Commission, and Prove their power if they expect obedience. For we are not bound to obey every man that will tell us he hath such Power.

§ 3. For the right understanding of this, it must be supposed, as a Truth that all Protestants are agreed in, that the written word of God is his law for the government of the universal Church to the end of the world; and consequently that it is sufficient in its kind, and to its use, and consequently that nothing is to be introduced, that shall accuse that law of imperfection, or which did belong to God himself to have imposed by
by his law. If we once forsake the Scripture sufficiency (whatever the Papists or Infidels vainly say against it,) we have nothing left in which we may agree.

§. 4. God hath already in his written Laws, instituted his publick worship-ordinances: and therefore he hath done it perfectly: and therefore he hath not left it unto man to come after him and mend his work, by making other ordinances of worship, as to the substance of them. He hath given us one faith, and no man may preach another, and one Baptism, and no man may institute another: and so of the like. If any one bring another Gospel, though an Angel, he is to be accursed, Gal. 1. 7, 8.

§. 5. Yet is it in the Power of man to determine of such Modes and Circumstances as are necessary to the performance of that worship which God hath instituted in his word: And therefore lawfull Governors may in such cases bind us by their commands.

§. 6. The things that are committed to humane determination, are such as are commanded in general by God himself (either in Scripture or nature,) but are left undetermined in specie, vel individuo: so that it is not a thing indifferent, whether a choice or determination be made or not, but only whether it be this or the other that is chosen by the determination. But where the thing itself in general is not necessary, or no humane election or determination necessary, because God himself hath determined of it already, there men are not to meddle, as having no authority from God.

§. 7. I shall first give some instances of the former sort (the Lawfull Ceremonies) and then name the latter (that are unlawfull,) which I shall afterward give my reasons against. And it is left to humane determination what place the Publick assemblies shall be held in. God having commanded us to frequent such assemblies, and not forsake them, doth oblige us to some place in general, and to a fit place. He that bids us preach, and hear, and pray, and assemble to these ends, doth plainly bid us, do this somewhere. It is impossible to meet, and not in a Place. And in that he hath not determined of any place himself, he hath left it to our reasons to determine of as occasion shall require. God hath not commanded to build a Temple
Temple in such a place rather than another: or to go thither to worship rather than another place (but by consequence and general directions:) nor hath he determined what place the Minister shall stand to preach in, or where all the people shall have their seats. All these are but the circumstances of a holy action, which are left to humane prudence.

§. 8. 2. It is left to man to determine of the Time of holy duties, except only where God hath determined of it already. As that the Lords day shall be the Day for publick holy Assemblies, is a thing that God himself hath determined; and here we have nothing to do but to discern his determinations and obey them: But withall he hath in Generall commanded us to preach in season and out of season, and to Assemble frequently, on several great occasions: And here he hath not determined of the Time, but left it to humane prudence upon emergent occasions, and according to their several cases, to determine of what hour on the Lords day we shall begin; how long the Sermon shall be; what hour the Assembly shall be dismissed: what days the Lords supper shall be administered, and how oft: when any shall be Baptized: what day the Lecture shall be on; or any more private meetings for edification: what hour, or just how oft men must pray in secret, or with their families: these with the like are undetermined by God (and good reason, as I shall shew anon,) and left to our selves and to our Governors: Some Time or other we are commanded by God himself to choose.

§. 9. 3. It is left to the determination of humane Prudence, what Utensils to employ about the publick worship of God. For these in Generall are commanded by God, and so made necessary; as also in the nature of the thing. He that commanded us to do the work, that is not to be done without convenient Utensils, doth thereby command us virtually the use of instruments fit for the work. What form and proportion the Temple where we meet shall have, is left to men: whether we shall preach in a Pulpit? and what shall be its shape? where we shall read? whether we shall Baptize in a River, or Pond, or Spring, or Font, or Basin, and what materials, whether Stone or Silver, or Pewter, &c. they be made of? whether we shall receive
receive the Lords supper at a Table, or in our seats, and whether the Table shall be of wood or stone? whether it shall be round, or long, or square? whether it shall stand in the East or West end of the Temple, or the middle? whether it shall have rails, or no rails? whether the Bread be of wheat or other convenient grain? what vessel the Bread shall be put in? and what grape the wine shall be made of? and what vessel it shall stand in? and be delivered in? whether a cup, or other like vessel? whether of silver, wood, or pewter, &c? All these are left to humane prudence. In general, it is necessary that some such utensils in each case there be; but the special sort is left indifferent to our choice. So also the Bibles themselves, whether they be Printed, or Written, and in what hand, or colour? Whether bound, or in a Role? are things indifferent in themselves, and left to humane reason to determine. The like may be said of other utensils of worship, necessary in general.

§ 10. 4. God hath not determined in what language the Scripture shall be read or preach to such or such a congregation (though by the general Rule, that all be done to edification, and that we speak to the understanding, there is sufficient direction for it.) But be that commandeth us to preach, implyeth that we translate the Scripture, and preach and read in a language fittest for the peoples edification. And if (as in many places of Wales) there be two languages equally understood, we may indifferently choose that which we think most agreeable to the general rules.

§ 11. 5. The Scripture hath commanded us in general to sing Psalms: but it hath not told us whether they shall be in Rithme, or Meeter, or in what tune we shall sing them. These modes are left to humane Prudence to determine of.

§ 12. 6. When there are divers Translations of the Scripture in the same language, or divers versions of the Psalms in the same language (as in England, here are the old version, the New England version, Mr. Rous's first, and his second (or the Scots,) Mr. White's, Bishop Kings, Sands's, Mr. Bartons, &c.) God hath not told us which of all these we shall use, but given us general directions, according to which our own Reason, or our Governors should make choice.

§ 13. 7. God hath commanded us to Read the holy Scriptures, and to expound them to the people, that they may understand
and practice them: But he hath not told us what Book of Scripture, or what Chapter we shall read at such a day, or on such or such occasions; nor yet what order we shall observe in Reading; whether we shall begin the Scripture, and go on to the end; or whether we shall read more frequently some subjects of greatest use, and which? These therefore are left to humane prudence to determine of by generall rules.

§. 14. 8. Though God hath commanded us to Read the Scripture, and to sing Psalms, &c. yet hath he not told us just how much we shall read at a time, or sing at a time: and therefore this also is a matter left to humane Determination.

§. 15. 9. Though God hath commanded us to Preach the Gospell, and told us what to preach, and given us generall Rules for our direction, yet hath he not told us what text, or subject we shall preach on such or such a day: nor yet what Method we shall follow, there being various methods, sutable to severall Texts and people: It is left therefore to humane prudence to choose both Subject, Text and Method.

§. 16. 10. God that hath commanded us to pray, and praise him, and preach, &c., hath not told us just what words we shall use in any of these holy exercises. He hath indeed given us the Lords Prayer, which is our Rule for matter, and Method, and a lawfull form for words: but he hath not tyed us to this only, nor told us what words we shall use besides this: whether we shall use words long before premeditated (call’d a form) or only such as are immediately or neer before our speaking premeditated, or in speaking, adapted to the matter in hand? whether our premeditated prayers shall be expressed in our own words, or such as are prescribed us by others? whether such forms shall be expressed in Scripture words, or not? whether we shall sing the Psalms of David, or compose any Evangelical Hymns our selves? whether many Churches shall use one and the same form of words, or various? whether our Sermons, and Catechisms, and Confessions of faith, shall be a studied or prescribed form of words, or the matter and method only studied? &c. These, with many other such like, are left by God, as things undetermined, that men may determine of them prudentially as occasions require, according to his directions.

§. 17. 11. He that hath commanded us to express our minds
in severall cases about his worship, (as in Confession of our sins, in Profession of our faith, in choosing of our Pastors, in Consenting to the calling out, or taking in, or restoring of members, in renewing promises of obedience, and the like) hath hereby made a Profession necessary in general, and so hath made it our duty to signify our Consent in all these cases, by some convenient signe. For mans mind is not known to others, but by signs. But he hath not tied us absolutely to any particular sign. If a Confession of faith be read, and we are called to signify our Consent, or if we are called to signify our Consent to be Church members, or to be guided by our Pastors, or submit to Discipline, God hath not tied us in such Cases, whether we shall signify this Consent by speaking, or by subscribing our names (Isa. 44 3, 4, 5.) or by lifting up the hand, or by laying it on a Book, (as in swearing) or by standing up, or suchlike. A sufficient Signification or Profession of our minds is necessary; but the special sign is left to our own, or our Governors determination. Of which I shall speak more anon.

§ 18. To this end, and on these terms was the sign of the Cross used heretofore by Christians, and to this end they used standing in publick worship every Lords day (forbidding kneeling,) and afterward standing up at the Creed: as also adoring with their faces towards the east, &c. They used these only as significations of their own minds, instead of words; As the Prophets of old were wont by other signs, as well as words to prophesie to the people. And as Eusebius tells us how Constantine measured the length and breadth of a man on the earth with his spear, to tell the Covetous how little must serve them (only a grave place) after death. And I dare not condemn the Cautelous use of such Professing signs as these: Though the tongue be the chief instrument, yet not the only instrument to express the mind; and though words be the ordinary sign, yet not the only sign. Dumb men must speak by other signs: And usually more silent signs are fitter for Assemblies, to avoid disturbance: And sometimes more Permanent signs (as subscription, or a stone or pillar of Remembrance, as Job 24, &c.) are more desirable. And this is left to humane prudence.

§ 19. And therefore I durst not have reproved any of the ancient Christians, that used the sign of the Cross, merely as a Professing:
Professing signal action, to shew to the Heathen and Jews about them, that they believed in a Crucified Christ, and were not ashamed of his Cross. The occasional, indifferent use of this, when it is meerly to this end, I durst not have condemned. Nor will I now condemn a man, that living among the enemies of a Crucified Christ, shall wear a Cross in his hat, or on his breast, or set it on his doors, or other convenient place, meerly as a professing sign of his mind, to be but instead of so many words, &c.

[ I thus profess myself the servant of a Crucified Christ, of whom I am not ashamed.] Whether these things be fit or unfit, the time, place, occasion, and other circumstances must shew: but the Lawfulness I dare not deny.

§. 20. He that hath commanded us to celebrate the publick worship, and to preach, pray, praise God, &c. doth imply in this command that we must do it in some gesture or other: For it is impossible otherwise to do it. But he hath not tied us to any one: In prayer we may kneel or stand: In singing Praises (and Petitions) to God, we may kneel, stand, or sit: At the Lords Table, though we have an example of sitting at the celebrating and receiving that Sacrament, yet no express command, nor a certain obligation. It is therefore left to humane prudence, to order our gestures by the general Rules, of Order, Decency, Edification, &c. in Preaching, Praying, Hearing, Singing, Receiving, &c. For God hath not tied us himself to any one particular gesture.

§. 21. God that hath required us to celebrate his worship, doth imply that we must do it in a decent Habit: Nakeness is a shame: Cloathing we must wear: but he hath not told us what it must be: Whether Linnen or Woollen: whether black or white: or of what shape and fashion: This therefore is left to humane Prudence.

§. 22. God that hath commanded us to celebrate his Praise and other publick worship, hath left it to our Liberty and Prudence to make use of such Helps of Nature, or of Art, as may most conduce to further our obedience, and stand in a due subserviency to his institutions. As for instance: he that hath commanded us to study his word and works, hath not preferred me a certain Method for my studies, nor told me what Languages or Sciences I shall learn, nor first learn: nor what Authors...
I shall read in Logick, Physicks, Metaphysicks, &c. It is implied that in all I use the best helps, and in the best order that I can. So he that bids me read the Scripture, hath not tied me to read only a Printed, or only a Written Bible; nor to read with spectacles or without. He that hath commanded me to Preach, hath not told me whether I must write my Sermon before or not; or use Notes for the help of my memory, or not; but hath left these to be determined as general Rules, and emergent accessions and circumstances shall direct us. And he that hath commanded us to preach and pray, hath not told us whether we shall use the help of a Book, or not: nor whether we shall use an hour-glass or a clock to measure our time by. He that hath commanded us cheerfully and joyfully to sing his Praises, hath not told us whether we shall use the meetre, or any melodious tune to help us: or whether we shall use or not use a Musical Instrument: or the help of more Artificial fingers, or choristers? These are left to our reason to determine of, by general rules which nature and Scripture have laid down.

§. 23. 15. In Civil actions, that are Religious only, finally, and by Participation, and not any acts of special worship, it is lawfull to use Symbolical Rites, that are in their kind near of kin to Sacraments in their kind, and may be called, Civil Sacraments: such is the sealing and delivery of Indentures, or other Covenant writings: and the delivery of Possession of a house by a Key, and of the Temple by a Book and Bell-ropes, and of Land by a twig and turf; and of Civil Government by a Crown, or Scepter, or Sword, &c. And such is the use of a Ring in Marriage.

§. 24. 16. Though God hath commanded that certain persons thus and thus qualified shall be elected and ordained Ministers of Christ, and separated to the Gospel of God; yet hath he not nominated the individual persons, but left it to man to choose them, according to the directions that he hath given them: Prudence therefore is here the judge.

§. 25. In all these cases, it is no usurpation, nor addition to the word or institution of God, for man to determine: It is but an obeying of Gods commands: All these are Necessary in their Gensis, and commanded us of God, and the Species (or individuals in the last case) nowhere by the word of God determined of:
so that if we must not determine of them our selves, the Scripture should contradict it self, or oblige us to natural impossibilities. Had God said, [Thou shalt Pray, at some Time, Place, in some Habit, Gesture, &c. but neither I, nor thou shall determine what,] this had been no better.

§. 26. Most of these forementioned particulars, are but abusively or improperly called Ceremonies, they being only the determination of Circumstances and Modes, and subervient common helps, which are Religious only Relatively and by Application, being in themselves but such common modifications as are necessary in Civil and Common moral actions. Yet because the word [Ceremonie] is an equivocal, let them be so called.

§. 27. Though all these things are left to humane Determination, and so are Indifferent in themselves, before; yet may they become Accidentally Necessary or unlawfull. And though man must Determine of them, yet not as he list, without a Rule: but by those sufficient General directions which God hath given in Scripture, and the End and Nature of the work. And to cross these directions is a sin in him that doth determine.

§. 28. Though all these are left to humane Prudence, yet not alwaies to the Governors to be passed into Laws, and forced on the subjects. Most of the points forementioned, ought not to be statedly determined by Law, but left to him that is upon the place to determine of, according to variation of occasions (of which anon.)

§. 29. Yet if just Authority shall (injuriously) determine of them, it may be the subjects duty to obey; except in some cases to be after mentioned; Because they are not matters alien to their Power, and without their line: but only its an imprudent over-doing in a work that is belonging to them, in its manner and season to be done.

§. 30. Having shewed you what man May determine of, in worship: I shall next shew you what he may not determine of: or what is exempted from his power. And 1. Some things as to the Substance. 2. Other things only as to the Manner, are out of mans power.

§. 31. 1. No man may bring a New Revelation, which he received not from God, (whether it be about greater or smaller points,)
points; and say to another, or himself, This you or I am bound to believe, by a Divine faith: For nothing but a Divine Revelation can be the material object of a Divine faith.

§. 32. 2. And as far is it from the power of this man, to say [I received not this from God, but yet you are bound to believe it as from me, with a faith as certain and confident, as a faith Divine.] For this were to equal man with God.

§. 33. 3. And far is it from the power of man to obtrude at all upon another any supernatural matters, and Command him to believe them, though but with a humane faith, when he cannot prove that the things are committed to him, nor give men an Evidence of their Credibility. He may not say [Though God revealed not these supernatural matters to me, yet hath he given me Authority to command you to believe them, or made it your duty to believe them, when I speak them, though without Evidence of Credibility.] So that there are three sorts of things: about matters of Belief that man may not do. The first is, that he may not Counterfeit a Divine Revelation: and the 2. is, he may not command men to believe his lawfull humane testimony, with a faith equal to Divine: and 3. he may not command so much as a humane faith to supernatural assertions which he had no authority to utter. I speak this about mens power in matters of faith, as preparatory to that about worship.

§. 34. In like sort, 1. Man may not say [This God hath commanded you in or about his worship] when it is not so: For this were to belie God, and to add to his Law, as if it said that which it doth not say. Here none I hope will gainsay me.

§. 35. And 2. No man may of his own head Command anything in or belonging to the worship of God: but he must have either a Special or General warrant and command from God himself to do it. Gods Law must either make the thing Necessary in specie, and so leave man nothing about it but to second it by his Law, and see it executed; or else Gods Law must make the thing Necessary in genero, and so leave man to determine of the species (as is oft said.) But where neither of these are done by God, man hath no Power for the imposing of that thing.

§. 36. More particularly, 1. God hath not left it to the
Power of man to add to the ten commandments any universal precept for obedience. 2. Nor to add to the Lords Prayer and other holy Scripture, any general article of request to God. 3. Nor to add any officers to his Church, that are strictly Divine, or for Divine uses. 4. Nor to add any substantial ordinance of worship. 5. Nor to add any substantial part of holy Discipline. 6. Nor to institute any new Sacrament in the Church, or any thing that hath the Nature of a Sacrament, though it have not the name.

§ 37. It seemeth to me that Mystical signs stated by man in Gods publick worship, directly to work grace on his soul from God, and that as instituted, and also to oblige man to God again, are unlawfully brought into the Church.

§ 38. By what hath been said, you may see which of the late English Controverted Ceremonies, I take to have been Lawful, and which unlawful. Too many years did I spend long agoe about these controversies; and the judgement that then I arrived at, I could never find reason since to change, notwithstanding all the changes of the times, and the helpes I that have since had; And it was and is as followeth.

§ 39. 1. About Episcopacy (which was the principal point, concomitant with the Ceremonial Controversie) I have given you my thoughts before. 2. The ceremonies controverted among us, were especially, The surplice, the gesture of Kneeling in Receiving the Lords supper, the ring in Marriage, Laying the hand on the Book in taking an Oath, the Organs and Church musick. Holy daies, Altars, Rails, and the Cross in Baptism. (To say nothing of the matter or form of the Prayers.)

§ 40. And 1. If the surplice be Imposed by the Magistrate (as it was) who is a lawfull Governor, and that directly but as a Decent Habit for a Minister in Gods service, I think he needlessly strained his Power, and finfully made an engine to divide the Church, by making such a needless law, and laying the Peace of the Church upon it; But yet he medled with nothing but was within the reach of his Power in the general. Some Decent Habit is Necessary; Either the Magistrate or the Minister himself, or the Associated Pastors must determine what. I think neither Magistrate nor Synod should do any more then hinder undecency: But yet if they do more, and yea all to one Habit, (and suppose...
it were an undecent Habit) yet this is but an imprudent use of Power. It is a thing within the Magistrates reach; He doth not an alien work, but his own work amis: and therefore the thing in it self being lawful, I would obey him, and use that garment, if I could not be dispensed with. Yea though secondarily the whiteness be to signify Purity, and so it be made a teaching sign, yet would I obey: For secondarily, we may lawfully and piously make Teaching signs of our food and rayment, and every thing we see. But if the Magistrate had said that the Primary reason or use of the Surplice was to be an instituted sacramental sign, to work grace on my soul, and engage me to God, then I durst not have used it, though secondarily it had been commanded as a decent garment. New Sacraments I durst not use, though a secondary use were lawful.

§ 41. 2. And for Kneeling at the Sacrament, I doubt not at all, but the imposing it, and that on such rigorous terms, tying all to it, and casting all out of the communion of the Church, or from the participation of the Sacrament that durst not use it, was a very grievous sin, and tended to persecution, injustice, and Church-dividing. It is certainly in a doubtful case the safest way to do as Christ and his Apostles, and the universal Church did for many hundred years. That none should Kneel in publick worship on the Lords day, no not in Prayer, much less in receiving the Eucharist, was a Custom so ancient and Universal in the Church, that it was everywhere observed before general Councils were made use of; and in the first general Council of Nice, it was made the last Canon; and other general Councils afterward renewed it, so that I know not how any Ceremony can possibly pretend to greater Ecclesiastical Authority then this had. And to cast out all from Church Communion in Sacraments that dare not go against the examples of Christ and his Apostles, and all the Primitive Church, (who long received the Eucharist in another gesture) and against the Canons of the first and most famous, and other succeeding general Councils, this is a most inhumane part. Either the gesture is indifferent in itself or not: If it be, how dare they thus divide the Church by it, and cast out Christians that scruple it, when they have these and many other reasons of their scruples (which for brevity I omit.) If they say that Kneeling is of itself Necessary, and not Indifferent, because it is Reverent &c. then 1. They make Christ an Imperfect Lawgiver:
...which worship, though intent, might as well be scrupled: go and peace. Ful, pure tradition, yet they will at other times stand, and many of them sit at prayer, and sit at singing Psalms of Prayer and Praise to God, and yet when Christ doth invite them to a feast, they dare not imitate his Apostles and universal Church in their gesture, lest they should be sinfully un reverent.

§. 42. But yet, as sinfully as this Gesture was imposed, for my part I did obey the impostors, and would do, if it were to do again, rather than disturb the Peace of the Church, or be deprived of its Communion. For God having made some Gesture necessary, and confined me to none, but left it to humane Determination, I shall submit to Magistrates in their proper work, even when they miss it in the manner. I am not sure that Christ intended the example of himself and his Apostles as obligatory to us that shall succeed. I am sure it proves fitting lawful: but I am not sure that it proves it necessary: (though very convenient) But I am sure he hath commanded me obedience and peace.

§. 43. 3. And for the Ring in Marriage, I see no reason to scruple the lawfulness of it: For though the Papists make a Sacrament of Marriage, yet we have no reason to take it for any ordinance of Divine worship: any more then the solemnizing of a contract between a Prince and People. All things are sanctified and pure to the Pure: but that doth not confound the two Tables, nor make all things to be parts of Worship that are sanctified. The Coronation of a King is sanctified as well as Marriage, and is as much a Sacrament as Marriage, and the Ceremonies of it might as well be scrupled: especially when God doth seem to go before them by the example of Anointing, as if he would confine them to that Ceremonie; which yet was none of his intent, nor is it much scrupled.

§. 44. 4. And though the taking of an Oath be a sort of worship,
worship, yet not the natural worship of the first Commandment, nor the instituted of the second, but the Reverent use of his name: in the third; so that it is not primarily an act of worship, but Redeemingly, and consequently: it being the principal use of an Oath to Confirm the Truth, and End strife, by appealing to God, which appellation is indeed an acknowledgment of his Government and Justice. And the laying the hand upon the Book, or Kissing it, is but a professing sign of my own Intentions, such as my words themselves are: and therefore is left to humane choice, and a lawfull thing. And I have met but with very few, among all our Ceremonies, that questioned this.

§. 45. 5. And for Organs or other instruments of Music, in Gods worship, they being a Help partly natural, and partly artificial, to the exhilarating of the spirits, for the praise of God, I know no argument to prove them simply unlawful, but what would prove a cup of wine unlawful, or the tune and measure, and melody of singing unlawful. But yet if any would abuse it; by turning Gods worship into carnal Pomp, and levity, especially by such non-intelligible singing, or bleating as some of our Choristers used, the Common people would have very great reason to be weary of it, as accidentally evil.

§. 46. 6. And as for Holy days, there is great difference between them: Those are lyable to most question that are obtruded on the Church with the greatest confidence. As for such days as are appointed upon some emergent occasions, that arose since Scripture was indited, and are not common to all times and places of the Church, there is no more question whether the Magistrate may command them, or the Pastors agree upon them, then whether a Lecture-day, or fast-day, or thanksgiving-day may be commanded, or agreed on: some time for Gods worship, besides the Lords Day must be appointed: And God having not told us which, the Magistrate may, on fit occasions: And this is no derogation from the sufficiency of Scripture: For the occasion of the day was not extant, when the Scripture was written: such occasions are various according to the various State of the Church in several ages and Countries. And therefore to keep an Anniversary day of Thanksgiving, such as we keep on the fifth of November for our deliverance from the Papists' powder plot, is no more questionable, than to keep an Lecture. Nor for my
my part do I make any scruple* to Keep a Day in Remembrance of any eminent servant of Christ, or Martyr, to praise God for their doctrine or example, and honour their Memorial. But the hardest part of the Question is, whether it be lawful to keep days, as holy, in celebrating the memorial of Christ's Nativity, Circumcision, Easter, Transfiguration, Ascension, and such like? And the great reasons of the doubt are, 1. Because the occasions of these holy days was existent in the Apostles' days: and therefore if God would have had such days observed, he could as easily and fiely have done it by his Apostles in the Scripture, as he did other the like things. 2. And this is a business that if it were Necessary, would be Equally necessary to all Ages and Parts of the Catholick Church. And therefore it cannot be necessary, but it must be the Matter of an universal Law. And God hath made no such Law in Scripture: And so Scripture sufficiency, as the Catholick Rule of faith and universal Divine obedience, is utterly overthrown: which if we grant, and turn Papists to day; we shall have as strong temptations to make us turn Infidels to morrow, so poor is their evidence for the supplemenal Traditional Law of God. 3. And God himself hath already appointed a day for the same purposes as these are pretended for. For the Lords Day is to commemorate the Resurrection, as the great Triumphant act of the Redeemer, implying all the rest of his works: so that though it be principally for the Resurrection, above any single work of Christ, yet also for all the work of Redemption: And the whole is on that day to be commemorated with holy Joy and Praise. Now when God himself hath set apart one day in every week to commemorate the whole work of Redemption, it seems an accusing of his Institutions of insufficiency, to come after him to mend them, and lay we must have an anniversarv day for this or that part of the work. 4. The fourth Commandment being one of the Decalogue, seems to be of so high a nature, that man is not to presume to make the like. Else why may we not turn the ten commandments into twenty or a hundred? But it seems a doing the same or of like nature to what God hath done in the fourth commandment, if any will make a necessary stated holy day to the universal Church. 5. And it seems also that these Holy days (excepting Easter and Whifonide and other Lords days), are but of later introduction. Many passages of Anti-
The story seems to intimate, that Christmas Day itself was not of
many hundred years after Christ. I remember not any before
Gregory Nazianzen: that seem to speak of it. The allegations
out of spurious authors, and that of later date, such as the coun-
terfeit Clement, Dionysius, Cyprian, &c. are brought to deceive
and not to convince. 6. Yea more, the time was a matter of
controversie among the Churches of the East and West, for many
hundred years after Christ. Epiphanius, and the Churches of India
and all those Eastern parts, took the sixth of Janurary to be the
day (see Casaubones Exercitae, on this: and Cloppenburgius more
fully in Thef.) Chrysostome faith, it was but ten years before he
wrote that Homilie that the Church at Constantinople was per-
swaded by them at Rome to change their account of the day: And
is it possible that, when for about four hundred years or more the
Churches were utterly disagreed of the day, that it was then
Commonly kept as an Holy day? The keeping of it would surely have
kept a common knowledge of the day: Or at least, the difference
of observation would have raised contention, as the difference
about Easter did: can any believe that the famous Council of
Nice, and the vigilant Emperour, that were so exceeding impatient
of a diversity of observations of Easter, would have let a diver-
sive observation of Christmas alone, without once thinking or
speaking of it, when they were gathered about the like work,
if the Church had commonly observed it then as a Holy day?
Or was the Church of India where Christ arose, in any likely-
hood to have lost the true account of the day, if it had been ob-
served by Apostolical Tradition from the beginning? 7. And it
seems that God did purposely deny us the observation of this
Day, in that he hath certainly kept the time unknown to the world.
The confidence of some bewrayes but their ignorance. Chrono-
logers are never like to be agreed of the year, much less of the
moneth or day; some think we are four years too late, some two
years, &c. Many think that Christ was born about October (as
Scaliger, Broughton, Beroaldus, &c.) and many still hold to the
old Eastern opinion, for the Epiphany being the Nativity, on
Jan. 6. and others are for other times; but none are certain
of the time. 8. Sure we are, where there is no Law, there is no
Transgression: but here is no Law of God commanding Christ-
mas day or the other Holy daies; therefore there is no trans-
gression
transgression in not keeping them. And then 9. it is not so sure that
there is no transgression in keeping them; therefore the surer
side is to be taken. 10. And it seems strange that we find not
so much as any ancient general Council making any mention
of Christmas or such days (though of the Martyrs days some do.)
All these reasons (which I run over hastily) and many more
(which for brevity I pretermit) do seem to make it a very
hard question, whether the keeping of this sort of Holy days be
lawfull.

§. 47. And it is not to be much stuck at, that a Day to Christ
doth seem more necessary and pious, then a Day in commemo-
ratio of a Martyr, or a particular Mercy: For in the highest
parts of Gods worship, God hath left man least to do, as to
Legislation and Decisions: and usurpations here are far most
dangerous. A weekly Day is somewhat more then an Ann versary:
And yet I think there is few of the contrary minded, but
would doubt whether man might impose on the Church the ob-
servation of another weekly Holy day, in commemoration of
Christ's Nativity. The worship of God is a more excellent and neces-
fary thing, then the veneration due to a worthy person; And yet
we have not so much liberty to make new waies of worshiping
God, as of veneration to men. So is it here, though even the
Days that are for the memorial of the Saints, are ultimately for
the honour of God; yet those that are set apart directly and
immediately to commemorate the work of Redemption,
are Relatively much higher, and therefore seem to be more
exempted from the Determination of humane laws.

§. 48. By this and much more, I am fully satisfied, 1. That
the keeping of these days is a thing of it self unnecessary: 2. And
that there being none on earth that can justly pretend to a
power of univerfal Government over the whole Catholic
Church, it is certain that none on earth can bind the Catholic
Church to such observances; (The Canons of Pastors are Author-
riscative Directions to their own flocks that are bound to obey
them, so it be in lawful things; but to other Churches, or to
their fellow Pastors they are but Agreements, and how far they
bind, I shall shew anon.) 3. And even in a single Church, or
a Province, or Nation, I am satisfied that it is a great sin for
Magistrates or Pastors to force all that scruple it, to the observa-
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tion of these daies, and to lay the unity or Peace of their Churches
on it, and to cast out, cenfure, reproach, or punish them that
dare not obey such impositions for fear of finning against God.
And it is a most disingenuous thing to insnurate and put into
the minds of men accusations of the Impiety of the dissenters;
and to perfwade the world that it is irreligiousness, or humorous
singularity, when it is so known a thing to all that know them,
that the persons that scruple or disown these daies, do ordinarily
walk in uprightness and the fear of God in other matters, and
profess that it is only a fear of breaking the Laws of God
that keeps them from conformity to the will of others: and
that they are reproached by the multitude of the observers of
these daies, for their spending the Lords Day in Holy exercises,
which the reproachers spend too much in idleness, sensuality
or prophanes; and it is not long since many of them were cast
out of the Ministerial service or suspended, for not reading
a Book authorizing Dancing and other recreations on the Lords
day. In a word, to reproach them as Precifians and Puritans,
for the strictness of their lives, and yet at the same time to per-
fwadem en that they are ungodly for not keeping Holy daies,
or not kneeling at the Sacrament, is not ingenuous dealing,
and draws too near the Manners of the Pagans, who called the
Christians ungodly, because they durft not offer their sacrifices,
and when they dragd them to the judgement-seats, they cryd
Tollite impios, as if themselves were the Godly men: I compare
not the matter of the caufes here, but only the temper of the
persons, and manner and justice of proceedings.
§. 49. And yet for all this I am resolved, if I live where fuch
Holy daies as these are observed, to cenfure no man for observing
them, nor would I deny them liberty to follow their judgements,
if I had the power of their Liberties; provided they use not
reproach and violence to others, and seek not to deprive them
of their Liberties. Paul hath fo long agoe decided these caufes,
Rom. 14. & 15. that if men would be Ruled by the word of
God, the controversie were, as to the troublesome part of it,
at an end. They that through weakness observe a Day to the
Lord, that is not commanded them of God, should not judge
their brethren that observe it not: and they that observe it not,
should not defpife or set at naught their weaker (though cen-
venio-
rious) brethren that observe it; but every one should be fully persuaded in his own mind. The Holy Ghost hath decided the case, that we should here bear with one another.

§. 50. Yea more, I would not only give men their Liberty in this, but if I lived under a Government that peremptorily commanded it, I would observe the outward reft of such a Holy day, and I would preach on it, and joyn with the Assemblies in Gods worship on it. Yea I would thus observe the Day, rather then offend a weak brother, or hinder any mans salvation, much more rather then I would make any division in the Church. I think in as great matters as this did Paul condescend when he circumcized Timothy, and resolved to eat no flesh while he lived rather then offend his brother, and to become all things to all men for their good. Where a thing is evil but by accident, the greatest Accidents must weigh down the les. I may lawfully obey and use the day, when another doth unlawfully command it: And I think this is the true case.

§. 51. 7. And for the next ceremony, the Name and form of an Altar, no doubt it is a thing indifferent, whether the Table stand this way or that way: and the Primitive Churches used commonly the names of Sacrifice, and Altar, and Priest, and I think, lawfully: for my part, I will not be he that shall condemn them. But they used them but metaphorically, as Scripture it self doth, Heb. 13. 10. 15. 16. Rom. 12. 1. Ephes. 5. 2. Phil. 2. 17. & 4. 18. All believers are called Priests, and their service, Sacrifices, 1 Pet. 2. 5, 9. Rev. 1. 6. & 5. 10. & 20. 6. I conceive that the dislike of these things in England (the form and name of an Altar, and the Rails about it) was not as if they were simply evil: But 1. because they were illegal innovations, forced on the Churches without Law, or any just authority. And 2. because the way of those times did cause men to suspect, that somewhat worse was intended to be brought in by such preparatives: especially when the Ministers were cast out.

§. 52. 8. But of all our Ceremonies, there is none that I have more suspected to be simply unlawful then the Cross in Baptism. The rest, as I have said, I should have submitted to rather then hinder the Service or Peace of the Church, (had I been put to it: For living in those daies in a Privileged place, I had my liberty in all save Dais and the Gesture.) But this I durst never
never meddle with. And yet I know that many think it as
reasonable, and more venerable than any of the rest. Yet dare
I not peremptorily say that it is unlawful: nor will I condemn
either Antients or Moderns that use it: nor will I make any
disturbance in the Church about it, more then my own forbear-
ance will make: only my own practice I was forced to suspend,
and must do if it were again imposed on me, till I were better
satisfied. The Reasons that most move me, I shall give you in
the end, but some of them take at the present.

§. 53. 1. This is not the meer circumstance of a Duty, but a
substantial humane ordinance of worship: nor is it necessary in
genere that man ordain any such symbolical Mystical signs for
Gods worship: And therefore it is a matter totally exempt
from humane Power: There must be some Time, some place,
some gesture, some vesture, some utensils, &c. But you cannot
say that, There must be some teaching symbols, or mystical signs,
stated by humane institution in Gods worship: There is no
command to man in Scripture de genero to institute any such
thing. And therefore in the case of Circumstantialis I shall usu-
ally (of which more anon) obey the Magistrate, even where
he doth mistake, because it is his own work, though he misdoe
it: But here his action is like that of a judge in alieno foro, in
another court, where he hath no power, and therefore his
judgement is null: It is not an act of Authority to make and
state new mystical signs (that are such in their primary use,) in
Gods worship: For there is no Power but of God: And
God hath given no such power: They that say, he bath, let
them prove it if they can. Natural and Artificial helps we
disallow not: But Instituted signs, that have what they have by
Institution, and that as a solemn stated ordinance, I know not that
ever God required or accepted from the invention of man.
I doubt this will prove a meer usurpation, and nullity, and
worse.

§. 54. 2. Yea I suspect it will prove a humane Sacrament:
either fully a Sacrament, or so near akin to Sacraments, as that
man hath nothing to do to institute it. The common prayer
faith, that [a Sacrament is an outward visible sign of an inward
spiritual grace, given to us, ordained by Christ himself, as a means
whereby we receive the same, and a pledge to assure us thereof] (in
the
the Catech.) Let us try by this definition whether the Cross in Baptism as used in England be a Sacrament.

§. 55. And 1. I may take it for granted that the want of the Name, makes it not to be no Sacrament. And 2. whereas in the definition, it is said that it is [ordained by Christ himself] that belongs to a Divine Sacrament only, and not to a humane Sacrament devised by usurpers. Otherwise you must say, that there is no such thing possible as a humane Sacrament imposed by usurpers on the Church: what if all the essentials of a Sacrament, such as are found in Baptism and the Lord’s supper, be invented by man, and forced on the Church, is it therefore no Sacrament? or only, no Divine Sacrament? However, let us not differ about bare names and words: It is the same thing that you call a Sacrament, when God is the ordainer: and sure it will not prove it lawful because man is the ordainer; that’s it that makes it unlawful, because he wants authority, and acts as an usurper. The Papists affirm that man hath not power to make new Sacraments; no not the Pope himself. Let not us go further.

§. 56. And 1. the outward visible sign here is the Cross made in the forehead. 2. The inward and Spiritual grace is, a holy Resolution to fight manfully under the banner of Christ, and to persevere therein. The Cross signifieth the Instrument of the sufferings of Christ, and that we do own this Crucified Saviour, and are not ashamed of him, and will manfully fight under him.

So that here is 1. a signification of Grace to be wrought on the Soul, and given us by God. 2. an engagement to perform the duties of the Covenant ourselves. On God’s part, we are to receive by this sign, both Qualitative or actual Grace, and Relative Grace. 1. The Cross is to teach our understandings, and help our memories, and quicken up our dull affections, by minding us of a Crucified Christ and the benefits of his Cross.

§. 57. That it is ordained for this use, appeareth from the words (anon to be recited) in the use of it, and by those words prefixed before the the Common prayer-book, [of Ceremonies; why some are abolished, and some retained] where they say that they [be not dark and dumb Ceremonies, but are so set forth that every man may understand what they do mean, and to what use they do serve:] and [that they are such as are apt to stir up every Christian to the use of repentance and humility.]

Thus we see, that every Man is to receive what is there in the action of the water and word, and by the outward sign of the Cross, to be daily recited, and to be meditated upon in the eye of the beholder, and in the ear of the hearer, and in the heart of the understanding, to the great profit and comfort of the soul.
the dull mind of man, to the remembrance of his duty to God, by some notable and special signification, whereby he might be edified.]

So that this and such other (if there be more such) are appointed by their signification to teach the Understanding, and stir up the dull mind of man to the remembrance of his duty to God: Which are good works, but to be done only by good means.

§ 58. And that this is a way of working Grace in the same kind as Gods word and Sacraments do, is undeniable. For the word and Sacraments do work Grace but Morally, by propounding the object, and so objectively Teaching, Remembering, and Ex
citing, and thus working on the Understanding, Memory, and Will, and Affections. However the spirit may work within, its certain that the ordinances work no otherwise. And not only Pro
testants are agreed on this, but one would think that the Jesuits and all of their mind should be most of all for it. For faculties, they that will not confess any Physical determination of the but make all operations both of Word, Sacraments, and Spirit it self, to be but Sausalory or Moral, one would think should hold more tenaciously then others, that Sacraments work Grace but Morally. And if no Sacraments do more then objectively Teach and excite; and the Cross is appointed to do as much in this, then there is no difference between them to be found.

§ 59. And then for Relative Grace, it is plain, that by the sign of the Cross as well as by Baptism, we are entered into a state of Christianity; and so it is an Investing Sacramental sign; it lifteth us under the banner of Chrift Crucified: And that is the very essential nature of the Sacrament of Baptism it self. As Lifting inverte the soldier in his Relation, and consequently in his Priviledges, so doth Baptism by Gods appointment; and Croffing is supposed by mans appointment, to invest men in the Relation of the soldiers of Jesus Christ.

§ 60. Yea (more then is expressed in the Definition of a Sacrament in the Common prayer-book) if you judge it essential to a Sacrament to be an engaging Covenanting sign, the Cross is instituted to this end. Yea more then that; if you judge it essential to a Sacrament, to be an engaging sign in the very Covenant of Grace is self, and not only in some particular promise, this also is the end of its appointment. It is to engage our selves to a Crucified Christ as our Captain and Saviour by his Cross, and to
bind our selves to the Duty of Soldiers or Christians to our lives end: and consequently to teach us to expect the privileges of faithfull servants and Soldiers from a Crucified Christ.

§. 61. All this is expressed in the very words of Ministerial application, in the common Prayer-book: which are these [we receive this Child into the Congregation of Chrift's flock, and do sign him with the sign of the cross, in token that hereafter he shall not be ashamed to confess the faith of Chrift crucified, and manfully to fight under his banner, against sin, the world, and the Devil, and to continue Chrift's faithfull soldier and servant unto his lives end. Amen.] So that you see here it is used as a lifting, investing, Covenant sign, engaging us to be Chrift's soldiers, and not to be ashamed of his Cross, or to confess his faith, and manfully to fight, &c. and to persevere. What's wanting here to make a Sacrament?

§. 62. Yet had it been but a bare Professing sign, like writing or lifting up the hand, to signify consent, instead of words, I doubt not have concluded so hardly of it: And thus it seems in ancient times it began to be brought into use: and the voluntary use of the cross on several occasions, in many countries at this day, both seem to be no other. But, for my own part, I dare not be guilty by consent, of making a humane Sacrament, or stating such an engaging Sacramental sign, to all these uses, in the publick worship of God. I had rather suffer or leave my Ministry, than venture on this, while I see so much to make me fear that it is a sin. But again I say, as I reverence the ancients that used the cross (I think amidst, and yet more warrantably than we,) so I presume not to censure them that judge it lawful; but only give the reasons that make me doubt, and rather think it to be unlawful, though still with a suspicion of my own understanding, and a love and honour to dissenters.

§. 63. As for the Common prayer itself, I never rejected it because it was a form, nor thought it simply unlawful, because it was such a form, but have made use of it, and would do again in the like case. But I must needs say, 1. That the fcrubbing it into such abundance of small parcels seemeth to me very inconvenient. It seems too light and ludicrous to toss sentences so formally between the Priest and Clerk, and to make such
a multitude of Prayers consisting but of a sentence, or two at
most: And it seemeth to be tautologie and vain repetition to
repeat over the same word so oft: and a taking of God's
name in vain, or too unreverently, to begin with his Titles and
Attributes, and end with his name again, and the merits or sake
of Christ, and this at almost every sentence: as if we had done
with him, and were taking our leave, and had forgot somewhat
that called us to begin again: and thus we begin and end, and
begin and end again, it may be twenty times together. 2. But
the enforcing imposition of these Prayers, is most to be condem-
ed; of which I have spoken, in the former Disputation. But
for my part, I cenSure none that use them, nor take them to be
therefore men of another Religion or worship: It is but a modal
difference in the same worship.

§. 64. The Emperor Constantine was very much for Liberty
for Dissenters, and against persecution of them, upon tolerable
differences: yet he himself was wont to write Prayers and Orati-
ons or Sermons of his own making (Euseb. in vita Constant. l. 4.
c. 55. & 32. & 29.) and readeth some common prayers him-
sely to the Congregation in his house, c. 17. (For he made his
house a Church, and preached in it ordinarily himself, though
he was both a Lay-man, and unbaptized; His sermon about
Christianity to the Clergie is published by Eusebions: and he
preached a funeral Oration about the Immortality of the soul
in his ordinary preaching place, a little before his death: Euseb.
ib. c. 55. & c. 29. &c. 17.) He giveth his soldiers a form of
Prayer, ib. c. 20. commanding them that were Christians to ob-
serve the Lords Day, and spend it in holy exercises, and not to
labour on that day, (ib. c. 18. 19. 23.) and also to honour
the Holy days consecrated to the Martyrs, (c. 23.) that is, to
their memorial. And commanding the very Heathen soldiers
to pray as they could, though not in the Church but in the fields
together. And in none of this dare I condemn him.

§. 65. The sum of all that I have said, is this; that Man
may determine of modes and circumstances of worship, Necessary
and Commanded in genere, but not determined by God in specie.
But to make new worship-ordinances, or institute Sacraments, or
Sacramental signs, or anything else, for which in genere he hath
no commission, this is simply unlawful.
§. 66. But this is not all: There is a second thing unlawful, also; and that is the misdetermining of those same modes and circumstances, which he is authorized to determine. For he is (as is said) to do it by Gods General Rule. Here therefore we must thus conclude. 1. that every misordering of such great affairs, is the sin of them that do it. 2. But yet that the subject is not exempted from obedience by every such mistake of the Governor: but by some, he is.

§. 67. If the mischoosing of such circumstances by Church-governors, be but an inconvenience, and do not destroy the ordinance itself, or frustrate the ends of it, we are to obey: 1. For he is the judge in his own work, and not we: 2. the thing is not sinfull, though inconvenient. 3. Obedience is commanded to our lawfull Governors. Of this we shall say more in the last Chap.

§. 68. But if a Governor so misdetermine but a mode or circumstance, as will overthrow the substance and end of the worship, I would not obey, except some greater evil were like to follow my not obeying at that particular season, then the frustrating of the duty itself would come to: As for example; If a Governour make a new Sacrament, I will not obey, because his command is null, and the thing simply evil. If he miscommand a Circumstance of Time, or Place, or Gesture, I will consider the consequents. If he command the solemn Assemblies to be held a mile or two or three from the people, I will obey him, if it be but as far as I can go without frustrating the work itself. But if he command us all to go ten miles or twenty miles to worship, I would obey for some time to avoid a greater evil; but ordinarily I would no more obey, then if he forbad all Christian assemblies, for it comes all to one. So if he command the Assemblies to be at break of day, or after sunset, I would obey. But if he command that we Assemble only at midnight, what should I do then? The thing is not simply unlawful: He doth but misdo his own work. And therefore for some times I would obey, if it were necessary, to avoid a greater evil. But if he make it the ordinary case, I would not obey: because it destroyeth the worship itself in a manner, as if he simply forbad it, and this he hath no power to do. An inconvenient gesture I would use in obedience, and to avoid a greater evil: But I would
would not obey him that would command me to stand on my head alwayes in hearing. An unhansome vesture I would use in obedience to a lawfull Governour, and to avoid a greater evil: But not so ridiculous a vesture as would set all the people on laughing so as to frustrate the work that we assemble for.

§. 69. In all such cases where Governours act not as usurpers in a matter that they have no authority in, but only misdo their own work, it much concerneth the subjects to foresee what's like to be the Consequents of their obeying or disobeying, and accordingly to do that which tendeth most to the Ends of the work: still holding to this Rule, that we must obey in all things lawfull.

§. 70. And when we do obey in a case of miscommanding, it is not a doing evil, that good may come of it, as some do misconceive: But it is only a submitting to that which is ill commanded, but not evil in him that doth submit. It is the determiner that is the cause of the inconvenience, and not the obeyer. Nor is it inconvenient for me to obey, though it be worse perhaps to him that commandeth. While he sinneth in commanding, he may make it my Duty to obey.

CHAP.
Prop. 2. In such unlawfull impositions (as aforementioned) it is an aggravation of the sin, if Governors pretend that their Ceremonies are Divine.

§ 1. Shall be brief in the rest, having been so long on the former. The reason of this Proposition is clear: because 1. As is aforesaid, such pretenders do falsely accuse the Lord, and corrupt his word, and add to it their own inventions: contrary to those severe prohibitions, Deut. 12. 32. Rev. 22. 18.

§ 2. 2. Because it shews that man to be a false Prophet, or false teacher, that will say, Thus saith the Lord, when God hath not spoken it: and that will take the name of God in vain, affixing it to a lye. And as many judgements are threatened to such, so people are commanded not to hear them.

§ 3. 3. It tendeth to the destruction of all Divine faith and obedience: while the fictions of men are pretended to be doctrines or Laws of God, it tendeth to confound things Divine and Humane; and so to bring the people to a loss, that they shall not know what is the will of God, and what the will of men.

§ 4. Let men therefore take heed how they affirm their Ceremonies to be Divine: as the Papists do, that feign them to be
be of Apostolical Tradition. Some presume to tell the world, that it is God by Apostolical Tradition that hath instituted Christmas day, or other such Holy days, (besides the Lord's day,) or that hath instituted the Cross in Baptism, or the fast of Lent, yea and some of their common prayers; abundance of humane inventions are thus audaciously fathered on God, which is enough to make people the more cautious in receiving them: and I am sure makes it a more hainous sin in the imposers. We justly take it to be an odious thing of Hereticks and Papists, to affix the names of Clemens, Dionysius, Ambrose, Austin, and other holy ancient writers, to their forgeries, and corrupt writings: And how much greater is their sin, that dare affix the name of God himself to their Ceremonious inventions or traditions?

§. 5. Such persons forsake the doctrine of the common prayer-book, where the Ceremonies are confessed to be humane inventions. The foresaid Preface [of Ceremonies, &c.] begins thus: Of such Ceremonies as be used in the Church, and have had their beginning by the Institution of man; some at the first were of Godly intent and purpose devised, and yet at length turned to vanity and superstition: some entred into the Church by indiscreet devotion, and such a Zeal as was without knowledge: and because they were wicked at the beginning, they grew daily to more and more abuses; which not only for their unprofitableness, but also because they have much blinded the people, and obscured the Glory of God, are worthy to be cut away, and clean rejected. Other there be, which although they have been devised by man, yet it is thought good to reserve them still—so that you see here is no pretence to a Divine institution, or Apostolical Tradition, but all is the devices of man.

§. 6. And after it is there said [that the Ceremonies which remain are retained for a Discipline and order, which upon just causes may be altered and changed, and therefore are not to be esteemed equal with Gods Laws.] And I hope the justness of the cause by this time is apparent.
Prop. 3. & 4. If things unlawful are commanded as indifferent, or things indifferent as Necessary, they are sinfully imposed, and the more, because of such pretenses.

§ 1. H E calling things Indifferent, that are unlawful, will not make them Indifferent. If men will invent and introduce new Sacraments, and when they have done, say [we intend them not for Sacraments or necessary things, but as indifferent accidents of other Duties,] this will not make them things indifferent: For it is not the altering of a name that maketh it another thing.

§ 2. If things Indifferent be imposed as Necessary, they become a sin to the Imposer, and oft-times to the Practiser. For 1. It is a falsification, when the thing is pretended to be Necessary that is not: And untruths in Laws, are far from being commendable. 2. It tends to deceive men's understandings, to esteem things Necessary that are not. 3. It tends to draw men to vain endeavours: while they use those things as Necessary (Duties or Means) that indeed are none, they lose their labour by the mistake. 4. It tendeth to corrupt men's Affections, by breeding in them a false kind of zeal for the things that they mistake to be so necessary.

§ 3. Yea worse; it tends to engage men in parties and divisions.
devisions, and persecutions against dissenters: or at least, to destroy their charity, and make them have contemptuous thoughts of their brethren, and perhaps censorious bitter words; when all is false, and founded in their mistakes. For who will not think harder of him that differeth from him, or opposeth him in a Necessary point (or that he takes for such) then in a thing Indifferent? the greater the matter, the greater will be your distaste.

§. 4. Yea more, it will make men Impenitent in such sins. For if once they think their ceremonies to be Necessary, they will think it no sin, but a service of God, to vilifie them that are against them, as schismaticks, and singular, and proud, and humorous, and what not?

§. 5. As therefore it is a haynous sin of the Papists, to impose their ceremonies on pain of damnation (if they were the judges, wo to others,) so is it no small aggravation of their sin, that pretend a Necessity (of Dury or Means) of any their Ceremonies, when there is none such. Multitudes take the keeping of Christmas day, and such other, the Kneeling in receiving the Lords Supper, &c. to be things of themselves necessary, so that a Governour should sin that should alter or dispence with them, or the persons sin that do not use them. What, say they, shall we not keep a Day for Christs Nativity? shall we be so unreverent as not to kneel when we receive, &c.? And thus they alter the things to themselves, by feigning them to be in themselves Necessary, which are not so.

§. 6. Yet doth not every such mistake of another, no not of the imposers, make that a sin to me which was indifferent. Otherwise all my Liberty were in the power of another mans conceits: and he might make all my meat, drink, cloaths, time, place, gesture, &c. in specie, to be unlawfull, by commanding them as necessary, or under some unsound notion: But this is not so.

§. 7. But in such cases, though they cannot so destroy our liberties, yet may they make it our duties sometime to forbear that which else we need not to forbear, lest our practice make others take it as a Necessary thing; and sometime though we must obey or do the action, yet may it become our duty, to signify (in a convenient way,) that we disclaim the conceit of a Necessity.
Prop. 5. A lawfull and convenient thing is sinfully commanded, when it is commanded on a greater penalty then the nature and use of it doth require, or then the common good will bear.

§ 1. When the penalty exceedeth the crime, it is injustice. There may be injustice as well in punishing an offender too much, as in punishing him that is no offender, with a smaller punishment. But if the penalty be destructive to the Church or common good, it is an aggravated injustice.

§ 2. When Magistrates therefore are disposed to punish men for crossing their wills in the matters of God, it nearly concerns them to look about them, and take heed first what they punish them for, and then, with what kind of punishment they do it. If it be Good and not Evil that men are punished for, it is persecution. If it be really evil, either its great or small, publick or private, &c. If it be an evil that endangereth the Commonwealth, or Church, or the souls of men, let them punish men in such a way as best tends to the security of the society or souls of men that are endangered. But if the person in his calling or station be useful to the Church, or Commonwealth, let him not be so punished as to be made unuseful. If the Bishops had punished Non-conformists as Recusancy was punished,
punished, with paying twelve pence a day &c. I should, comparatively, scarce have blamed them: For it had been but to make Ministers fare harder, or live poorer, or work for their livings, or to pay their penalties, and the Church might still have had their labours: but to silence and suspend them, and that when there were no better to supply the room (then such as were put in,) this was to punish the Church of Christ, and the souls of men (and that with everlasting punishment) for the (real or supposed) faults of the particular ministers: which was not just.

§. 3. Object. But (faith the Preface to the common prayer-book) though the keeping or omitting of a Ceremony in itself considered, be but a small thing; yet the wilful and contemptuous transgression and breaking of a common order and discipline, is no small offence before God.

§. 4. Answ. 1. You should therefore put no such snares on men by your commands, as to impose upon them needless things, when you think the penalty of disobeying you will be damnation, 2. But how came you to see into the hearts of men, that their non-conformity is wilful and contemptuous? when they themselves profefs that they would obey you if they durst. They think they stand at the brink of Hell, and should wilfully sin against God if they did obey you: and you come behind them, with silencing and imprisonment, and drive them on, while they cry out to you for compassion, and protest that they are ready to obey as far as they can see the lawfulness of the thing: and yet you say, its wilfulness and contempt. 3. And why doth not your Laws except from punishment all those that conform'd not, that were not wilful or contemptuous? The Act for conformity makes the penalty to be Imprisonment half a year for the first fault: a year for the second, and during life for the third, besides deprivation: and Imprisonment during life for the second offence, if the person have no Benefice: and this is besides the Ecclesiastical censure. 4. If the work of Church Governors be to make small matters great, and make that damnable that before was lawful, and this without any necessity at all, it will tempt the people to think such Governors to be the plagues of the earth.

§. 5. I confess it is lawful for me to wear a Helmet on my head
head in preaching: but it were not well, if you would institute
the wearing of a Helmet to signify our Spiritual militia, and
then resolve that all shall be silenced and imprisoned during life
that will not wear it. It is lawful for me to use spectacles, or
to go on crutches: But will you therefore ordain, that all men
shall read with spectacles, to signify our want of spiritual light:
and that no man shall go to Church but on crutches, to signify
our disability to come to God of our selves? So in circumstances,
it is lawful for me to wear a feather in my hat, and a hay-
rope for a girdle, and a haircloth for a cloak. But if you should
ordain that: if any man serve God, in any other habit, he
shall be banished, or perpetually imprisoned or hanged, in my
opinion you did not well: especially if you add, that he that
disobeyeth you must also incur everlasting damnation. It is in
it selflawfull to kneel when we hear the Scriptures read, or when
we sing Psalms: but yet it is not lawful to drive all from hear-
ing and singing, and lay them in prison, that do, it not kneeling.
And why men should have no communion in the Lords Supper
that receive it not kneeling (or in any one commanded gesture,) and
why men should be forbidden to preach the Gospel, that
wear not a linnen surplice, I cannot imagine any such reason
as will hold weight at the bar of God.
§ 6. If you say, why should not be obeyed in indifferent
things? and why should men trouble the peace of the Church?
I answer. 1. Subjects must obey in all things lawful. 2. But
your first question should be, why you should command, and
thus command unprofitable things? will you command all men to
wear horns on their head in token of pushing away their spiritu-
all enemies, and will you resolve that God shall have no service,
nor men any Sacraments or Church communion, no nor the
liberty of the common air, nor salvation neither, unless they will
obey you? And then will you condemn them, and justify your
selves by saying [why should not the Church be obeyed?]
3. You govern not perfect but imperfect men; and therefore you
must rule them as they are, and fit your laws about things indiffer-
rent to their state, and not expect perfection of understanding and
obedience from them, when God himself expecteth it not:
suppose therefore they manifest their imperfection in not dis-
cerning the Lawfulness of your commands, professing that they
are
are ready to obey them, if they durst; the question that neerlyer concerneth your own consciences (that are the imposers) to discuss, is, what reason you have to drive all men from Gods Church and service, that (suppose through their imperfection) dare not conform themselves in worship to your pleasure? Where hath God set you on such a work, or given you any such commission? 4. And where you say, *They should not disturb the Church*; I answer, Are you so blind that you see not that it is you that disturb the Church? If you will make such laws without necessity, which common wit and reason may tell you, all men are never like to be satisfied in and obey, and then cast out all that will not obey them, as the disturbers of the Church, this is but an aggravated self-condemning. If they be guilty, you are so much more; If they sin and disturb the Church by disobedience, you disturb it much more sinfully, by laying such snares as shall unavoidably procure it, and then taking occasion by it, to make a greater disturbance by your cruel execution. If the Fly offend and deserve death by incautelous falling into the Spiders web, what doth the Spider deserve, that out of her own bowels she doth this net in the way, and kills the Fly that's taken in it? (yet draw no venom from the similitude, for it runs not on all four, nor is it my meaning to apply the venom to you.) Your own actions most concern your selves. Try whether you do well in commanding and punishing, as well as whether others offend in disobeying. I shall provoke all to obedience in things lawful: But if they should obey you (more perfectly then God,) you may yet be condemned for your wicked cruel Laws.

CHAP.
Prop. 6. It is not lawful to make any thing the subject's duty by a command, that is merely indifferent antecedently, both in itself, and as clothed with its accidents.

The reason is evident: because nothing but Good can be the just matter or object of the Governours desire: and therefore nothing but Good can be the just matter of his Laws. By Good I mean, Moral, or Civil Good, or Relative Physical Good: the Good of Profit, or Honour. And by [indifferent] I mean not [that which is neither a flat sin, nor a flat absolute duty.] For so an Indifferent thing may be sometime commanded. Nor do I mean any Middle thing between Bonum Metaphysicum and non bonum: for there is none such. But I mean by indifferent, that which is not antecedently Appetible, a Desirable Good, though it be not itself an evil to be avoided, or a hurtfull thing. Bonum publicum, the common good is the End of Government, and therefore it must be somewhat conducing to the Common good, (or at least to the good of some particular person) that is the just object of the Governours desire, and matter of his law. For nothing but Good, doth conduce to Good, of itself. Nay it is therefore Good, bonitate mediæ.
medi, as a Means, because it conduceth to that which is Good; benificat finis, as an End; or that is desirable for itself. Desire hath no object but quid appetibile, a Desirable Good. And a Governour should make no Laws but for somewhat that is desirable to himself as Governour.

§. 2. And 2. Nothing should be made the matter of a Law but what is Desirable to the Commonwealth, as well as to the Governour. For men must be Governed as men. Punishments indeed are not desirable for themselves: but yet by accident they are desirable to the Common good: and the matter of Precepts should be much more desirable then Punishment.

§. 3. And 3. If unprofitable things be made the matter of Laws, it will tend to the contempt of Laws and Government: and people will think it a burden and not a benefit, and will desire to be freed from it; and this will tend to the dissolution of Societies.

§. 4. And 4. All Government is from God, and for God, and should be by him: God is the Beginning and End, the first efficient and ultimate final cause of all just Government: And therefore all the parts of it must favour of the Goodness of the first Efficient, and be levelled at God as the ultimate end, which nothing but Good is a means to. Of him, and by him, and for him are all things, Rom. 11. 36.

§. 5. Moreover 5. If idle words and idle thoughts be sins that must be accounted for, then idle Laws much more. And idle they must be if they be about unprofitable things. And they are not only idle themselves, but occasion idle words and actions in others.

§. 6. Moreover 6. It is the judgement of the Imposters that disobedience to their Laws is a sin against God, which deserveth condemnation; (For Protestants know no venial sins, and Papists take sins against the Popes and Councils Decrees to be Mortal.) But it is a cruelty next to Diabolical, to lay before men an occasion of their Damnation for Nothing. When they first make their Laws, they know (or else they are unworthy to be Governours) that some will obey them, and some will not. If therefore they think that some (and many) will incur the guilt
guilt of sin unto damnation by their disobedience, they must have somewhat of greater worth then the souls of those men to encourage them to make those Laws. For had there been no such Laws, there would have been none of that transgression, and consequently no damnation for it.

§. 7. Yea 7. It is sufficient to prove that nothing but some Good may be the Master of a Law, in that they inflict penalties, and so great penalties upon the breakers of them, There must be a proportion between the Precept and the Sanction. The Commination or penal part of the Sanction, depriveth men of some Good: and therefore it should command, as great a good at least as it depriveth men of: Especially when the penalty is to be cast out of the Church and service of God, this is not to be done for nothing.

§. 8. Queft. But is it not the Law that is the Rule of Moral Good? and consequently nothing Good or Evill, but as Conform or Disconform to the Law? And if so, then nothing but things indifferent must be commanded. For all things are Morally indifferent, till the Law take away the Indifference, by its precepts or prohibitions.

§. 9. Anfw. You must distinguish between Divine and Humane Laws, and Primary and Subservient Laws, and between the several sorts of Good before mentioned. And so I answer, 1. The Law is not the Rule of Natural Good, though it be of Moral. And therefore that which is commanded, is supposed to have some Natural Good or aptitude to be a Means of Good, that so it may be the fit matter of a command. 2. Gods Laws are the Primary Laws, which are the first Rule of Moral Good. Mens Laws are but Subservient, to procure the due execution of Gods Laws. And therefore in the greatest cases the Indifference is taken off before by the Law of God: and mens laws are to second Gods Laws, and rather to drive men on to that which already is their duty, then to make them new duties. Though New duties also they may make in subserviency to, and for the performance of the Old. But there must be a Physical Goodness, which is the Aptitude of the matter to attain the End as a means, before that matter can justly receive the impress of a command, and be made a Duty. Gods own Law of Nature is Antecedent to his Positive Laws: and in supernatural
Positives, there is a supernatural adapting of the Matter before it receive the supernatural stamp of a Duty.

§ 10. Object. But if a Magistrate may not make Laws about Indifferent things, then may he not make any Laws at all: For Evill may not be commanded: And that God which God hath commanded already, having a higher stamp then mans authority, needs no such Law.

§ 11. Answ. I have heard this Argument insisted on in the reign of the Ceremonies, above any other: but it deserveth not such high esteem. For 1. The work of the Magistrate, at least about the worship of God (and so of the Pastors) is not directly to make new duties: but to procure Obedience to the Laws of God. And therefore they are to command the same things again that God hath commanded, and to forbid the same that he hath forbidden. If a Magistrate make a Law, and see it disregarded, he may make another to quicken men to obedience and execution of the former. 2. And this is not vain, though it have the stamp of a higher authority before (unless you will say that humane Government is vain;) For Magistrates are seen when God is unseen: Corporal penalties are felt, when Hell fire is unseen, unfelt, and too little believed. Present things have an advantage for operation. 3. And we grant that some things neither commanded nor forbidden before, may be commanded or forbidden by a Magistrate, so they be not Indifferent as to their Usefulness and Aptitude, to be a means for the obtaining of that which is the end of the command.

§ 12. It is charged on Mr. Jacob by Dr. John Burgess and others, as an error, that he thought nothing indifferent at all: and Dr. Burgess confuteth him by instancing in various gestures in bearing, where it is indifferent which we use; and if I have two Eggs of a quality and quantity equal, before me, it is indifferent which I eat: therefore, &c.

§ 13. To this I say, 1. Many things simply considered are Indifferent (as to marry or not marry, which Paul disputeth of,) which yet being cloathed with accidents, or Circumstances, shall ordinarily be a Duty, or a sin in the Use to a particular person. 2. Nothing is Indifferent between Lawfull and Unlawfull; but many things are Indifferent between an Duty and a Sin. 3. I conceive that where any thing is Indifferent between
between Duty and Sin, in the Use, as Circumstantiacted, it is not actus humanus, a proper morall act. But as Permission is vainly numbered with proper acts of Law, it being but a Non impedire, a Negation of an act; so Indifference is as vainly annumerated to the products of a Law. For there needs no act of Law to make a thing Indifferent, that is Neither commanded nor forbidden. For instance, it is Indifferent for me to wink with my eyes ordinarily, because it is not a Moral act that a man is to use his reason about, to bring every twinkle of the eye to an Election, or Retusal; but we may leave it to Natural instinct. So in Dr. Burgenes instances, Whether I sit or stand at Sermon, (if I be equally disposed, & ceteris paribus) is not a humane Moral act; Whether I eat this Egg or that when they are equal, is not a Moral act: Nor do I properly Choose, but take indifferently without choice. And where there is no use of choice, the act is not Moral, except in the Intention of the end, or in deliberating accesses.) Yet I grant that Moral acts may be exercis'd about these objects: A scrupulous mind may be put to consider, whether this Gesture or that, this Egg or that is to be chosen: but it must conclude, that neither is to be chosen, but either to be taken Indifferently. Which is but to say, that the Deliberation was a Moral act; but the choosing was not, for it was but a Taking, and not a Chosing: And the Deliberation stop'd before it came to a choice, yea and purposely avoided it, concluding that the object was not a Matter of choice, and the act was not to be a Moral act: Morality hath but two Species, Good and Evil: and Indifference is no third Species, but a Negation of Morality: viz. of Good or Evil.

§ 14. Yet may one Accident take off the Indifference, and make the action Good or Evil. And though the Governours themselves should well weigh Accidents, and prefer the chief, and lay no more upon them then they deserve: yea because the Accidents are oft distant, and unseen, and the Ruler is the Judge of them, therefore the people should ordinarily obey, when they see them not themselves.

§ 15. Objet. But in case the Genus is commanded by God, and the Species are equal, may not the Governour limit us to one of the two? Especially in case the people are divided about them,
them, or else will do nothing, because they cannot resolve which way to do it. For instance: if sitting, standing and kneeling be equally convenient at the singing of Gods Praises, if the people be in a doubt which to use, or at least if they fall into contention about it, may not the Governours interpose, and limit them to one? If you be the conductor of Travailers or Souldiers, and they come to a place where the way divideth, though both ways are equally good and near, yet you must command them one way, and choose for them, because else they will go no way at all.

§. 16. AnsE. I. In this case you are not to choose one Gesture or one Way rather then another, unless they make it necessary by Accident. But tell them of the Indifferency and Equality, and drive them on to Action. And so you only choose and cause them to choose Action before Cessation, but not this way before that. 2. If this will not serve, but they will do nothing, unless you determine of their Gesture or Way, you must then command one rather then another, because they can use but one, and some one they must use. But in this doing, your comparing, taking This rather then the other, is not to be done by Election, not be a humane act, there being no more Reason (thats supposed) for one then for the other. But though you name them one Way or Gesture only (when they necessitate it,) you do it but as choosing their Action before their cessation; this therefore is all that is Moral in your Act: and that you Determine them to Action by Naming This way and not the other, is good (for the Determination for Duty sake was eligible:) but that it was rather to This then the other, was Indifferent, and not Moral: For of that you had no Reason: and where there is no Reason, there is no Morality.

§. 17. All this considered, I leave it to the consideration of common Reason, and of men that have any pity for the Church or their own souls, whether it be a Prudent or Christian course to make Laws for the Church about things Indifferent, that have nothing in the Nature of them to induce them hereunto: and then to cast out Ministers and other Christians for not obeying them, and deprive men of the greatest blessings, on the account of things indifferent.

§. 18.
§ 18. If God have left us at Liberty by not commanding or forbidding, then man should not take that Liberty from us without great cause, and without some Accidental good that is like to come by depriving us of that liberty, and the Good must be greater than the Accidental evill. Why should any man on earth deprive the Church of Liberty in that thing where God thought not meet to deprive him of it, unless he can prove that time, or place, or some special accident hath altered the case? In any case which standeth with us just as it did in Scripture times, we must no more be deprived of our freedom by man, then we are by God: Had it been best for us, God would have done it.

CHAP. VII.

Prop. 7. Some things may be lawfully and profitably commanded at one Time and Place, and to one sort of people, that may not at or to another; no nor obeyed, if commanded.

§ 1. The case is so plain in point of Commanding, that it is past all doubt. Many Accidents may make that destructive at one Time and place, that would be profitable at another. Pauls precepts and practice in becoming all things to all men, do manifest this.
§ 2. *The Papists themselves are convinced of this: and therefore sometime granted the Bohemians the use of the cup for the Luity in the Lords Supper: and profefs, that it is in the Power of the Pope and Council to do the same by other places. Yea when they burn men for the Protestant Religion in one Countrey, they tolerate it in another, for fear of a greater evil. And when they torment men in one age and place for using a Bible in the vulgar tongue, in another place or time, they themselves transliterate.

§ 3. It is therefore a very great sin in Governours, unneces-
sarily to make such things the matter of a common standing Law which is so variable, yea and must be varied according to di-
ersity of times and places: These things shou'd be left to the Prudence of the Governours that are on the place. No wise General will take a Commission for the Command of an Ar-
my, if he must be tied up before hand, when to march, and when to stand still, and which way to go, and how to fight in all the va-
riable Circumstances. Shall Governours pretend to be so much wiser then God, as to make a standing Law for that which God thought best to leave at liberty, to be varied as occasions vary?

§ 4. The English Church Laws do tie the Ministers to a particular habit, and to the particular Chapters of Scripture that we must read: and if the Law-givers had pleased, they might as well have tied us to that particular Text which they will have us preach on, and forbid us to choose a Text as a Chap-
ter: And they might have as well tyed us to particular Psalms in singling, as in Reading. But all this is against the nature of our office, and the good of the Church: And therefore it is not fit matter for a Law. If I know my hearers to be most ad-
dicted to Drunkenness, must I be tyed up from Reading or Preaching against that sin, and tyed to Read and Preach only against Covetousness or the like, because it seemeth meet to Governours to tye me to a constant course? If I have a tra-
flable people, it may do them no harm to limit them to this or that gesture, vesture, &c. But what if they be prejudiced against a thing that in it self is lawfull, and take it to be a sin, and re-
solve that they will rather forbear Gods Ordinances then use a thing that their Consciences are against, must I needs exercise or press
press a Gesture, vesture or such Ceremonie, when I see it tendeth to the destruction of my flock? Must I needs deny the Lords Supper to all my flock, if they dare not receive it in this or that gesture (let it be sitting or kneeling,) and all because I am commanded to do so?

§ 5. Suppose it here granted that the thing being lawfull, it is the peoples sinful weakness that causeth them to refuse it; and that the power commanding me no otherwise to deliver it, is such as in things lawful I am bound to obey; yet is it not a thing lawfull to punish the peoples infirmity in a circumstance so severely as with an excommunication, or a denying them the communion of the Church in the Lords supper. In such a case my first duty is, to tell the Magistrate that such a Law is sinfully cruel and destructive to the Churches peace. If that will not prevail with him to repeal or suspend such an unrighteous law, my next duty is, yet to persuade the people to obey him: (for we suppose the gesture or ceremony commanded now to be lawfull;) But if I can neither prevail with the Magistrate to forbear his imposition, nor with the people to obey him; my next duty is to forbear the execution of his unrighteous penalty: I dare not be his executioner, in excluding all Chrifts servants from his house or holy Communion, that dare not do every circumstantial action that is imposed on them: For the penalty is flat contrary to the Commands of Chrift. Yet would I not refuse the Magistrate, but lay down my office, if the Churches necessity did not forbid me to lay it down: but if it did, I would do my office, and suffer what the Magistrate should inflict upon me.

§ 6. And indeed, I might else be obliged by a Magistrate to excommunicate or deny Communion to all Christians within my reach: For all Christians are imperfect; and there is not one but is liable to error in a greater matter then a gesture or circumstance, such as we have now before us: no nor one but doth actually err in as great a matter: and therefore one as well as another, on this account may be cast out: But Chrif would not have this dealing in his Church.

§ 7. How tender are his own expressions, his practice and his laws towards those that are infirm! He came to preach the Gospel to the poor, and heal the broken-hearted, and lay upon them an easier yoke and lighter burden. He will not break the bruised
bruised Reed, nor quench the smoaking flax: he carryeth the Lambs in his arms, and gently driveth those with young: The little ones that believe in him must not be offended: It were better for him that offendeth one of them (by injurious persecution) that a milestone were hangered about his neck, and that he were cast into the sea: Him that is weak (even) in the Faith, we must receive (and therefore must not cast him out that doubteth of a ceremony.) And they that are strong must bear with the infirmities of the weak, and not to please our selves, but every one to please his neighbour for his good to edification. No man should put a stumbling block, or occasion to fall in his brothers way. If we grieve our brother by our meats (or other indifferent things) we walk uncharitably: we must not for such things destroy them that are the work of God, and for whom Christ died. It is good neither to eat flesh, nor to drink wine, or any thing whereby he stumblcth or is offended, or is made weak. He that doubteth is condemned if he eat, because he eateth not of faith. And we must not be too forward in harming men for a morsel of bread, or a garment, or a garment.

§ 8. Moreover, the Ministry hath a certain end, to which all our administrations are Means: even the saving of our flock, and the Pleasing of God thereby: And if Magistrates will command us to order but a lawful Circumstance so as shall not only cross, but destroy these ends, we must as soon leave our Ministry as obey him: Our Power is given us to Edification and not to Destruction: Not only those things that of themselves destroy, but those that are like to be the occasions of such an event, through the infirmity of the people, must be by us avoided. To command us a way of Ministry that shall (though but accidentally) damn men, and that unnecessarily, is to destroy our office, by destroying the end, which is mens salvation. If men will destroy themselves by the only means of salvation (Christ and the Gospel) this will not excuse us from preaching that Gospel: but if men will destroy themselves by a Ceremony, or unnecessary circumstance, I will take it out of their way if I can. It is a Lawfull thing for all sick people in England to eat of one particular dish of meat, as well as on others: But if the Lawgivers command that all Physicians shall give no man Physick that
that will not be tyed only to such or such a dish, I would not be a Physician, if I must obey that command; what if my Patient have a weak stomack and cannot eat of that dish, or be peevish, and will not? must I therefore be guilty of his death by denying him my necessary help, because the Magistrate forbiddeth me? He may as well forbid us all to visit the sick, or relieve the poor, or cloath the naked, if he can but find the least infirmity that they are guilty of. And I think that Christ will not take it for an excuse in judgement if any man say [Lord, I would have relieved them, cloathed them, healed them, but that the Magistrate forbade me; and I thought it the part of a seditious rebell not to obey my governors.] Yet I should much less desire to be in that Ministers case (whose labours are necessary to the Church) that had no better an excuse for his denying to preach the Gospel, or to admit the servants of Christ to holy Communion, then that the Magistrate forbade him: Our Ministration is a work of Charity, to be exercised upon voluntary receivers: And if a Magistrate have power to forbid us to preach or grant the Sacraments and Communion of the Church to any that wear not black or blew, or white or red, or that kneel not at the Sacrament, or such like, then may he as well or much better forbid us to give alms to any that wear not a horn on their backs, and an iron ring about their arms as Bedlams do: No Magistrate can dispence with Charity, especially in so great a case as mens salvation: no more then the Pope can dispence with Oaths and Covenants.

§. 9. We have therefore the use of our Reason left us to weigh the tendency of a Magistrates commands, even where the act commanded is in it self indifferent: For the Magistrates Power, and the Ministers, are from one Fountain, and are but Means to one and the same end: And neither of them hath any power to destroy that end: And therefore if by accident, through the weakness of my flock, the observation of a trivial circumstance would undo them, I would not use it, no not in obedience to the Magistrate: but would resolve with Paul never to eat flesh while I live rather then to offend or destroy my brother. But if I find by the weighing of all accidents, that my obedience will do no such hurt to the Church and Souls of men, but as much good as my not obeying; then (in such indifferent cases) I would readily
readily obey: But otherwise I would appeal to God, and bear the Magistrates persecution. No means can be justly pleaded against the end (and least of all, a bare ceremony.) For it is no Means when it destroyeth the end.

§ 10. On this account it is that it hath alwaies by wise men been reckoned a tyrannical unreasonable thing, to impose all the same ceremonies and circumstances upon all places as upon some; and it hath been judged necessary that every Church have their liberty to differ in such indifferent things, and that it hath been taken for a wise mans duty, to conform his practice in such indifferent circumstances, to the several Churches with which he shall have communion, as Ambrose professeth he would do, and would have others do the same.

§ 11. If any think (as too many do) that such a diversity of circumstances is a disorder and confusion, and not to be endured, I shall further tell these men anon, that their opinion for an hypocritical unity and uniformity, is the true bane of Christian unity and uniformity, and that which hath brought the confusion and bloody wars into the Christian world, and that our eyes have seen, and our ears have heard of: And it were as wise an objection for them, if they should charge us in Britanie with Confusion, and drive us to a separation or division, because the Scots wear blew caps, and the English hats: or because some English wear white hats and some black; and so of other circumstances.

§ 12. Did I live in France or other Popish Countries, or had lived in England at the abolition of Popery, I should have thought it my duty in many indifferent circumstances to accommodate myself to the good of those with whom I did converse; which yet in another Countrey, or at another time, when those things were as offensive as then they were esteemed, I durst not have so done. And therefore our Common Prayer-Book itself with its Ceremonies might be then commendable, in many particulars, which now are reforrnable. And so in Ethiopia, Greece, or Spain, those things would be very laudable, that are now in England deservedly vituperable. And several Ceremonies in the primitive times had such occasions and concomitants, that made them tolerable that now seem less tolerable: The case is not the same, though the Materials be the same.
CHAP. VIII.

Prop. 8. Those orders may be profitable for the Peace of the Churches in one Nation, that are not necessary to the Peace of the Churches in many Nations.

§. 1. I mention this 1. Because the Romanists are so peremptory for the Necessity of their ceremonies through all the world: as if the unity, peace, or well being of the Church, at least, did hang on these. And yet sometimes they could dispense with the different rites of the Greeks, if they could but have got them under their power by it.

§. 2. Also 2. Because the Protestants called Lutherans, stick so rigidly on their ceremonies (as Private Confeffion, Exorcism, Images, Vestments, &c.) as if these had been necessary to the unity of the Churches. And the Pacifiers find a difficulty in reconciling the Churches of several nations, because they expect an uniformity in ceremonies.

§. 3. And so necessary doth it seem in the judgement of some deluded souls, that all Churches be one in a visible Policy, and uniformity of Rites, that upon this very account they forsake the Protestant Churches and turn Papists. As if Christ were not a sufficient Head and Center for Catholick union, and his Laws and waies sufficient for our terms of uniformity, unless we are all
all of a mind and practice in every custome or variable circumstance that God hath left indifferent.

§. 4. I need no other Instance then 1. what Grotius hath given of himself * (in his Discurs. Apologet. Rive.) who professeth that he turned off upon that account, because the Protestants had no such unity: And 2. What he said before of others (by whom he took no warning, but did imitate them) in his Epist. to Mr. Durry (cited by Mr. Barksdale in his Memorials of Grotius life) where he saith [Many do every day forsake the Protestants, and joyn with the Romanists, for no other Reason but because they are not one Body, but distracted parties, separated Congregations, having every one a peculiar Communion and rites—] And they that will turn Papists on such an inducement, deserve to take what they get by their folly.

§. 5. Did not these men know that the Church hath alwaies allowed diversity of Rites? Did not the Churches differ till the Nicene Council about Easter day, and one half went one way, and another half the other way? and yet Polycarp and the Bishop of Rome held communion for all their differences? and Irenaeus pleads this against Victor's temerity in excommunicating the Asian Churches? Did they not know that the Greek, and Armenian, and Roman Churches differ in many Rites, that yet may be parts of the Catholic Church notwithstanding such differences? Yea, the Romanists themselves would have allowed the Greeks, and Abassines, and other Churches a difference of ceremonies and customs, so they could but have subjugated them to the Pope.

§. 6. Yea more, the severall orders of Fryers and other Religious men among the Papists themselves are allowed their differences in Rites and Ceremonies; and the exercise of this allowed Difference doth make no great breach among them, because they have the liberty for this variety from one Pope in whom they are all united. What abundance of observations do the Jesuites, Franciscans, Dominicans, Benedictines, Carthusians, and others differ in? And must men needs turn Papists because of the different Rites of Protestants, when they must find more variety among them that they turn to? The matter's well amend-ed with them, when among us, one countrey useth three or four Ceremonies which others do disuse: and among the Papists,
Papists, one order of Fryars useth twice as many different from the rest; yea in habit, and diet, and other observances they many waies differ. What hypocritie is this, to judge this tolerable, yea laudable in them, and much les to intolerable in us, as that it must remove them from our Communion?

§. 7. And how sad a case is it that the Reconciliation between the Lutherans and other Protestants should in any measure stick at such Ceremonies? what if one countrey will have Images to adorn their Temples, and will have exorcism, and other Ceremonies, which others do disallow and desire to be freed from? may we not yet give each other the right hand of fellowship? and take each other for the Churches of Christ? and maintain brotherly Charity, and such a correspondence, as may conduce to our mutual preservation and edification?

§. 8. Yea in the same Nation, why may not several congreations have the liberty of differing in a few indifferent ceremonies? If one part think them lawfull, and the other think that God forbids them, must we be forced to go against our Consciencs, for a thing of no necessity? If we profess our Resolution to live peaceably with them that use them, and only desire a toleration ourselves, because we dare not wilfully sin against our light, will charity deny us this? If men forbear a thing (suppose) indifferent for fear of Gods displeasure and damnation, and profes that were it not for this they would conform to the wills of others, are those Christians or men that will come behind them and drive them into hell without compassion, and that for things indifferent?
Prop. 9. There is no meer Humane Universal Sovereign, Civil or Ecclesiastical, over the whole Church, and therefore none to make Laws Obligatory to the whole.

ADD this, because of the specious pretences of some, that say we are bound to an uniformity in Ceremonies by the Church: and call all Schismaticks, and such as separate from the Catholic Church, that disown and diffuse such Ceremonies as on these pretences they obtrude. And by the Church that thus obligeth us, they mean, either some Universal Sovereign Power: or else an universal Consent of the Church essential (as they call it.) And that Sovereign must be the Pope or a General Council.

§. 2. If it be Universal Consent of all Believers, that they suppose to be the obliging power, I shall answer them, I. That Believers are not Governours and Law-givers to the Universal Church, no nor to a particular Church. If that point of the Separatists be so odious that affurseth the multitude of Believers to be the Governours of a particular Church, and to have the power of the Keyes: what then shall we think of them that give them, (even to such as they call the Laity themselves)
the Government, yea in the highest point even Legislation, over the Universal Church itself.

§. 3. And 2. I add, that the Dissent of those Churches that refuse your Ceremonies, doth prove that there is no Universal consent: If all must consent, we must consent ourselves before we be obliged. We are as free as others, we gave none power to oblige us by their consent. If we had, it had been Null: because we had no authority so to do, and could not have obliged our selves, by a universal Law, or perpetual contract. Or if we had, we had also power, on just occasion to reverse a self-obligation. But no such thing de facto can be pretended against us.

§. 4. And if such an obligation by consent should be pretended, 3. I would know whether it was by this or by some former generation? Not by this as is certain. Nor by any former: For former ages had no power to bind all their successors in Ceremonies about the worship of God. Shew whence they had such a power, and prove it, if you can: we are born as free men, as our ancestors were in this.

§. 5. And 4. I would be satisfied, whether every man's consent in the world be necessary to the Universality, or not? If it be; then there are no Dissenters: or no obligation because no Universal consent. If not; then how many must consent before we are obliged? you have nothing to say, but [a Major part] where you can, with any shew of reason, rest: And 1. How shall we know in every Parish in England, what mind the Major part of the Christians through the world are of, in point of such or such a Ceremony? 2. Yea by this rule, we have reason to think that both Papists and Protestants must change their Ceremonies, because the greater part of Christians (in East and South, and some in the West) are against very many of them.

§. 6. But if it be the Authority of a Soveraign Head that is pleaded as obliging the universal Church to an uniformity in Rites and Ceremonies, we must know who that Soveraign is. None that we know, pretend to it but the Pope and a General Council. And for the Pope we have by many volumes proved him an Usurper, and no authorized Head of the Church Universal.
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The pretended Vice-Christ, is a false Christ. The first usurpers pretended but to a Soveraignty in the Roman world, but had never any shew of Government over the Churches in Ethiopia, India, and the many Churches that were without the verge of the Roman Empire.

§. 7. And as for General Councils, 1. They are no more the Visible Head and Soveraign of the Church than the Pope is. This I have proved in another Disputation by it self. 2. There neither is nor can be any Council truly universal, as I have there also shewed. Its but a delusory name. 3. There never was any such in the world, since the Church (which before was confined to a narrow room) was spread over the world. Even at Nice, there was no proper representative of almost any but the Churches under the Roman Emperours power: Few out of the World, even in the Empire: and none out of almost any of the Churches without the Empire: (For what one Bishop of Persia, or such another of another Countrey, and perhaps those prove the Roman subjects too, that are so called?) If there was but one from Spain, and only two Presbyters of Rome from Italy, and one from France (if any) and none from many another Countrey in the Empire, no wonder if there was none from England, Scotland, or Ireland, &c. And therefore there can be no universal obligation on this account.

§. 8. Councils are for Concord by Consultation and consent, and not a Soveraign or superior sort of Governing power. And therefore we that consented not are not obliged: and if we had consented, we might on weighty reasons have withdrawn our consent.

§. 9. The Orders established by General Councils have been laid aside by almost all, and that without the repeal of a Council: Yea such Orders are seemed to presuppose the custom of the Universal Church, if not Apostolical Tradition, to have been their ground.

§. 10. Among many others, let us instance only in the last Canon of the Nicene Council, that forbidding Kneeling, commanded all to pray only standing on the Lords Dayes, &c. And this was the common use of the Church before, as Tertullian and others shew, and was afterwards confirmed again in a General Council: And yet even the Church of Rome hath cast
it off; much more the Protestant Churches. No General Council hath been of more authority then this of Nice: No Ceremony of more common use then this standing in prayer on the Lord's days: So that it might as much as any, be called the constitution and custom of the Catholic Church. And yet we suppose not these now to bind us to it: but have call'd it off without the repeal of any other General Council. And why are we more bound then by the same authority to other Ceremonies then to this? And if to any, then to which, and to how many, and where shall our consciences find rest?

§ 11. Even the Jesuites themselves say that the General disuse of a practice established by Pope and Council, is equal to an abrogation, without any other repeal, so it be not by the said powers contradicted. And certainly all such disuse began with a few, and proceeded further: we are allowed then to disuse such things.

§ 12. It would grieve a man that loves the Church to hear the name of the Church abused by many dark, though confident disputers, when they are pleading for their Ceremonies, and Holy days, and laying about them with the names of Schismaticks against all that will not do as they do [O (say they,)] These men will separate from the Catholic Church, and how then can they be the Children of the Church?] And 1. Which is it that is called by them the Catholic Church? Little do I know, nor am able to conjecture. Did the Catholic Church make the English Common-Prayer Book? what! were the then Bishops in England that consented in that work, the whole Church of Christ on earth? God forbid. Or did ever any General Council authorize it? I think not. And if they would tell us what General Council commanded Christmas Day, or Kneeling at the Sacrament, &c. they would do us a pleasure: but I think they will not.

§ 13. And 2. What if these things had all been commanded by a General Council? May not a man disuse them without separating from the Church? I think, as good as you are, you do some things your selves that God himself hath forbidden you to do; and yet will be loth to be therefore taken for men that separate either from the Church or God. And when you read the Books of Heathen Philosophers; when you adore
not toward the East, or when you pray & receive the Sacrament, Kneeling on the Lords Dayes, would you be taken to separate from the Catholick Church, for crossing its ancient customs, or Canons? But these perverse and factious reasonings we must hear to the dishonour of Christianity and Reason it self, and that from men that scorn the supposed meanness of others; yea and see poor souls seduced into separation by such empty words! And this is one of the present judgements on this land.

CHAP. X.

Prop. 10. If it be not our Lawfull Governours that command us, but usurpers, we are not formally bound to obey them, though the things be lawfull which they command.

§. 1. E may be bound by some other Obligation perhaps, to do the thing which they command us, but we are not formally (though sometime Materially) bound to obey them: For it is not formally obedience unless it be done eo nomine because commanded, or for the Authority of the Commander. If the Pope or any usurper should command me to pray or to give alms, I will do it, but not because he commandeth me, but because God commandeth me: and therefore I will not obey him but God: But if a Parent or Magistrate or Pastor command it me, I will do it both because it is commanded me, by God and them, and
and so I will obey both God and them. If an usurper command me to do a thing in itself indifferent, I will not do it because he commandeth it: but yet if accidentally it become my duty, by conducing to another's good, or avoiding their offence or hurt, or any other accident, I will use it for these ends, though not for his command.

§. 2. The Pope 1. As the Vice-christ or universal Head, is an usurper; and therefore hath no authority to command me or any man (in that relation) the smallest Ceremony. 2. The Pope as Patriarch of the West, is an humane creature, and not of Divine institution, and was indeed a sinful institution from the first of his creation; but if it had been otherwise, yet since is that Patriarchship become unwarrantable, since he hath forfeited it, and the world hath found the mischiefs of it. So that no man is therefore bound to use one lawful Ceremony because the Pope as Patriarch of the West commanded it. 3. If this were not so, yet Britain and Ireland were from the beginning none of his Patriarchate, nor did at Nice consent to it: and therefore have the least appearance of any obligation.

§. 3. The Authority of General Councils cannot be pretended as obliging men in Conscience to the English Ceremonies. 1. Because indeed General Councils are not a superiour Power for proper Government of the Church having authority to command particular Bishops, or Synods, as their subjects; but they are only necessary for Union and Communion of Churches and mutual assistance thereby: and so their Canons bind but by virtue of the General commands that require us to maintain the Unity and Communion of the Churches.

§. 4. And 2. If it were otherwise, there is few, if any of these Ceremonies that are commanded by any true General Council. They that can prove any such thing, let them do it: but till we see it, we will not be forward to believe it. Yea 3. Some of them, General Councils have made Canons against; as I before shewed in the Case of Kneeling at the Sacrament on the Lords days. And therefore the neglecters of our Ceremonies sin not against a General Council.

§. 5. The Common plea is, that we are bound to use these Ceremonies in obedience to the Church of England; and that we are not true sons of this Church if we refuse it. But what is
it that is called by them [The Church of England]. In a Political sense, I know no such thing as a Church of England, or of any Nation on earth; that is, There is no one Society united in any one Ecclesiastical Soveraign, that can truly be called [the Church of England] or of any other Nation. The whole Catholic Church is One, as united in Christ the Head: And every particular Church, associated for personal Communion in Gods Worship, is one; being a part of the Catholic Church, and united in, and individuated by their relation to their several Pastors. But a National Church under one chief Ecclesiastical Government, I find no mention of in Scripture; but contrarily, [the Churches of Judæa, Galatia, &c.] or any other Country where there were many, are always mentioned in the Plural number; and never called one Church.

§. 6. Yet will we quarrel with no men about meet names or words. If by [a National Church] be meant any of these following, we acknowledge that there is such a thing. 1. If all the particular Churches in a Nation do Associate, for Communion and mutuall assistance, and so use to meet by their officers in one National Assembly; I confess the Association useful, if not necessary, and the Assemblies to be maintained, and for unity fake obeyed in things lawfull: And though Scripture call not such National Associations by the name of [a Church] in the singular number, yet we shall leave men to their Liberty in such names. If all the Schoolmasters in England should hold General Assemblies, to agree what Books to read in their Schools, &c. if any man would therefore call all the Schools in England in the singular number, by the name of [the School of England,] I would not differ with him for a word. 2. Or if the Churches are all called One that are under one Christian Magistrate, I will confess the thing to be true that is pretended to be the reason of the name: All the Churches do owe obedience to the Magistrate. But he is no Essentail part or Ecclesiastical Head of the Church: and therefore it is very improperly denominated from him; or called [One] on that account: No more then all the Schools are one because he is their Soveraign. It is the Common-wealth that is specified and individuated by the Magistrate as the Soveraign Power; and not the Churches.
But yet it is but an improper word, to call all the Churches one Church on that account, which we contend not about.

§. 7. But it is the Thing that we stick more at then the name. A General Head doth properly specific and individuate the Body. Prove either, 1. That the Archbishop of Canterbury or any other. 2. Or an Assembly of Bishops or Presbyters, is properly an Ecclesiastical Head, having Authority from Jesus Christ to be the chief Ruler of all the Churches in the Land and then I will confess that we have properly and strictly a National Church. But no such thing can be proved.

§. 8. As for an Assembly, I have already shewed (which Bishop Ether asserted to me) that they are not superior Governors, nor instituted gratia Regiminis, but gratia unitatis; having no more Rule over particular Bishops, then a Convention of Schoolmasters over a particular Schoolmaster. If they say that Kings and Parliaments give Power to Convocations, I answer, that can be but such as they have themselves: which we shall speak of anon, and is nothing to this place.

§. 9. And as for a Primate or Archbishop (of Canterbury, e. g.) 1. It will be a hard task to prove Archbishops, as such, to be of Divine Institution. 2. And it will be harder, even Impossible, to prove Archbishops of the English species, as such, to be of Divine Institution. 3. And certainly Christ hath nowhere told us, that every Nation shall have such a Head, nor every Province, nor every County: nor told us whether there shall be one over ten Nations, or ten over one: Their limits are not to be found in Scripture (supposing there were such an office there known.) 4. Nor is it anywhere determined, that such a City shall have the preeminence, and Canterbury, e. g. be Ruler of all the rest. All these are of meer humane institution: And therefore that which the imposters of Ceremonies call [the Church of England] is a meer humane thing, which therefore can bind us no further than the Magistrate can authorize them to do.

§. 10. But the stronger pretence will be, that the particular Bishops of England were severally officers of Christ, authorized to Govern their several flocks, and therefore a Convocation of these Bishops binds us in conscience gratia unitatis. The People they oblige as their Rulers: and the several Presbyters also.
also as their Rulers, and the several Bishops, gratia unitatis, for avoiding of schism.

§. 11. Ans. This also is an insufficient evidence to prove our Consciences obliged to their Ceremonies, eo nomine, because of their Canons or commands. For though we acknowledge a sort of Episcopacy to be warrantable, yet that this sort that made the Canons in question, is not warrantable, I have proved at large in the former Disputation on that question. Such Pastors of a Dioces as our Bishops were, have no word of God to shew for their office (further then as they are Presbyters,) but we have shewed already, that their office is unlawful. And therefore though their actions as Presbyters may be valid, yet their actions are Null which were done by pretence of this unlawful sort of office, (they being no other way enabled thereto,) On this ground therefore we are not bound.

§. 12. If it could be pretended that at least as Presbyters the Convocation represented the Presbyters of England, and therefore their Canons binds us to the use of ceremonies; Common prayer, &c. I should answer, that 1. Even Synods of Presbyters or the Lawfull sort of Bishops, oblige but gratia unitatis. 2. That the late Synod at Westminster was as truly a Representative of the Presbyters of England, as the Convocation; where such consent, if any were given, was retracted. 3. By actual dislike signified by disuse, the Presbyters of England, for the most part, have retracted their Consent. 4. Yea, most that are now Ministers never gave such Consent. 5. Even all particular Pastors and Churches are free, and may on just reason deny consent to such impositions.

§. 13. There remains nothing then, that with any shew of strength can be pretended, as continuing our obligation to Ceremonies, from Authority, but that of the Civil Power that commanded them. But to that I say, 1. So much as was lawful, we confess that we were bound to use, while we had the command of the Civil power: But nothing unlawful could be made our duty by them. 2. the Civil Power hath repealed those laws that bound us to these ceremonies. The Parliament repealed them: the late King consented, at least, for the ease of tender Consciences (as he spoke) that men should have liberty to forbear them. And the present Rulers are against them, whom we see even the ceremonial observante in other matters.

§. 14. Let
§ 14. Let those then that would subjugate our Consciences to their ceremonies, make good their foundation, even the Authority by which they suppose us to be obliged, or they do nothing: if all their impositions were proved things indifferent and lawful, that's nothing to prove that we must use them, till they prove that lawful authority commandeth them. The Civil Powers do not command them: And the Ecclesiastics that command them, prove not their authority over us. In the matters of God, we will yield to any man that bids us do that which God hath bidden us do already: But if they will exercise their power by commanding us more than God commands us, and that unnecessarily, we must crave a sight of their commission.

§ 15. And if men that have no Authority over us, shall pretend Authority from God, and go about to exercise it by Ceremonious impositions, we have the more reason to scruple obeying them, even in things indifferent, lest we be guilty of establishing their usurpation, and pretended office in the Church, and so draw on more evils then we foresee, or can remove.
Prop. 11. The Commands of Lawfull Governors about Lawfull Ceremonies, must be understood and obeyed with such exceptions as do secure the End; and not to the subverting of it.

§. 1. HE proof of this is obvious. These humane Ceremonies are appointed but as means to a further end. But that which would cross and overthrow the end, doth cease to be a Means; and cannot be used sub ratione mediæ.

§. 2. Order, and Decency are the pretended ends of the Imposed Ceremonies; and the right worshiping of God, and the good of mens souls are said to be the greater and remoter ends, and the glory of God the ultimate end. If then I have good assurance that I cannot use such or such a ceremony but it will prove the subversion of Order, or Edification, (though it should be by accident, through the infirmity of men,) I know no reason I have to use them, when such a mischief would follow, unless they can shew me some greater good that also will follow, which may recompense it.

§. 3. Therefore the commanding of unnecessary ceremonies, on such Penalty, as was done in England, and Scotland, to
the silencing of the Preachers, and dissipating of the flocks, and casting out that worship, or hindring that Edification that was pretended to be their end, was preposterous both in the commanders and obeyers; and proved not convenient means to the ends pretended.

§. 4. If I be enjoyned by the Magistrates (whom I mention as of more undoubted authority then our Bishops,) to read such and such chapters, and preach on such and such texts through the year; I am in reason to interpret their commands with this exception [when it doth not apparently cross the main end.] So that if in my course I should be commanded to read and preach of an alien subject, when my hearers are running into schism, sedition, heresie, &c. I will suppose that if the Magistrate were present, he would allow me to read or preach according to the matter of present necessity. And if I were commanded to read the Common prayer in a Surplice and other formalities, I hope if the Church were all in an uproar, and the fools flying about my ears, as the women at Edinburgh used the Bishop, I might think it would not tend in that Congregation to order or Edification, to use such Ceremonies. Were they things of Gods institution, they would not edifie the people till they were prepared to receive them; and therefore that preparation should go first.

§. 5. Indeed it is the Pastors office to be the guide of his flock in the worship of God, and therefore to judge pro re nata, what subject to speak on to them, and what circumstances to choose, that may be most suitable to time, and place, and persons, to promote his ends, even the good of souls: And therefore no Magistrates should take the work or power of Pastors from them; though they may oversee them in the use of it.
Prop. 12. It may be very sinfull to command some ceremonies, when yet it may be the subjects Duty to use them when they are commanded.

§. 1. Add this Proposition as necessary both for Rulers and for Subjects: For Rulers, that they may not think that all may be lawfully Commanded which may be lawfully done when it is commanded. And for Subjects, lest they think that all things are unlawfull to be done, which are sinfully commanded.

§. 2. Some Governors think, that the Sermons and Arguments that charge the people with sin for disobeying them, do all justify them for making the Laws, which others should obey: And all the words that are spent in aggravating the sin of the disobedient, they think are spoken in justification of their commands. And on the contrary, many people think that all that is said against the laws or penalties, is said in justification of their disobedience. And they are so lamentably weak that they cannot discern, how that can lawfully be obeyed, that is sinfully commanded: when yet the case is very plain.

§. 3. If a thing be simply unlawfull, as being forbidden by God himself, there no command of man can make it lawfull. But if it be but inconvenient or evil only by some accident or circumstance, it is possible for the commands of Governors to take off the accidental evil, and make it become a duty. For example,
It is not lawful for me to travail one mile in vain: nor is it lawful for a Prince to command me to travail a mile in vain: And yet if he send me such a command, to appear before him at such a place, (yea though it be many miles) it may become my duty to obey him. Otherwise subjects should not be bound to appear before any judicature, till they were satisfied of the cause, which is absurd. A Prince command his officers to execute some unjust sentences, if they know it not, at least, it may be no sin of theirs, (in many cases) though it be his. Every war that is unlawfully undertaken by the Prince, is not unlawful in all his Souldiers: Some of them that have not opportunity to know the evil of his undertaking, may be bound to obey (the case of others I determine not.)

§. 4. So if a Pastor call the Assembly at an inconvenient hour, or to an inconvenient place, though it be his sin to do so, yet is it their Duty to obey. If in the manner of Prayer he (tolerably) miscarry, they may not therefore refuse to join with him. If of two Translations of Scripture, or two versions of the Psalms, he use the worser, (so it be tolerable) they must obey.

§. 5. Yet if the miscarriage be so great in the ordering even of these circumstances, or in the Manner of Duties, as shall overthrow the Duty it self, and be inconsistent with the ends, or bring greater evils upon the Church, then our refusing to obey the Pastors (in those cases) can do; then (as I have before shewed) we are not bound to follow him in such a case: But otherwise we are.

§. 6. The Reasons of this are obvious and clear. Even because it is the office of the Governours to determine of such Circumstances: It is the Pastor's office to guide and oversee the flock. And so the determining of Time and Place of worship, (that's undetermined) belongeth to his office: and the choice of the subject on which he shall preach, the leading them in prayer, and praise, and choice of verses, translations, and other ordinary helps in his work. And therefore when he determineth these, he is but in his own way, and doth but his own work: and therefore he is therein the judge, if the case be controvertible. If none shall obey a Magistrate or Pastor in the works of their own office, as long as they think he did them not.
the best way, all Government then would be presently over-thrown, and obedience denied. We are sure that God hath commanded us to obey them that are over us in the Lord, (1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 7, 17, c.) And therefore a Certain duty may not be forborn upon uncertain conjectures, or upon every mistake or in them that we owe it to. This would unchurch all Churches (as they are Political Societies) For if Pastors be taken down, and the work of Pastors, the Church is taken down: And if Government and obedience be taken down, then Pastors and their work is taken down; Which will be the fruit of this disorder.

§. 7. And the things in which the Pastor is now supposed to err, are not of themselves unlawful; but only by such an accident, as being over-weighed by another accident, shall cease to make them unlawful. For instance: If the Pastor appoint a more imperfect version of the Psalms to be sung in the Church (as is commonly done in England,) the obeying of him in the use of this, will not bring so much hurt to the Church as the disobeying on that account would do: For besides the sin of disobedience itself, the Church would be in a confusion, if they forbear the conduct that preserves the union; and some will be for this, and some for that, and so the worship itself will be overthrown. But if the Pastor would command a version so corrupt as would overthrow the duty itself, or be as bad as non-performance, the Church is then to seek redress, and not obey him. So if he command a Time inconvenient, but tolerable, (as to meet at sun rising or sun setting) it were better obey than dissolve the Church (if we cannot be otherwise relieved) But if he appoint a Time that is intolerably unfit (as at midnight) I would not obey (except in such necessity, as leaves to that time or none) the same I spoke before of other circumstances.

§. 8. On the other side, if Magistrates or Pastors shall think their Imposition lawful, because the people may lawfully obey them, they are as much mistaken. Even many of those Divines that wrote for conformity to the late Ceremonies, did take it to be the sin of those that imposed them, as they were imposed, and would have written as much against the Imposition, if they had but had liberty; I mean such writers as Mr. Sprint, Mr.
Mr. Paybody, Dr. John Burges's (who told the King of Pollio's glasses that were broken by Caesar, that no more anger and danger of men's lives should follow; and would have had him so to have used our Ceremonies.) So Zanchy that judged the Ceremonies such as might lawfully be used, did write to the Queen to take them down, and not leave them as snares to entice out the Ministers, and at the same time he wrote to the Ministers to use them, in case the Queen would not be persuaded to forbear the imposing and urging of them.

§ 9. If I be bound to obey a Governor if he set me to pick straws, or to hunt a feather, it followeth not that he may lawfully command it. I have heard many pleading for Ceremonies say, that if the Magistrate commanded them, and would not otherwise permit them to preach the Gospel, they would preach in a fool's Coat, and a fool's Cap with a feather, rather than forbear. But I do not think that any of them would justify that Ruler that would make such a Law, that no man should preach or celebrate the Sacraments, but in a fool's Coat and Cap: such might expect to be judged by Christ, as the scorners of him and his Ordinances.
Prop. 13. The Constant use of things indifferent should not be (ordinarily) commanded; but they should be sometimes used, and sometimes disused.

§ 1. WILL say but little of this, because I have opened it before in the Disputation about Liturgies. The Reasons of it are plain. 1. Indifferent things should be used as indifferent things, and therefore with some indifferency.

§ 2. And 2. The people else will be brought to think them Necessary, if they be constantly used, and custom will grow to a Law: And no contradicting this by doctrine will serve turn to rectifie the mistake: For we cannot be alway nor oft preaching on such things: And if we were, yet practice is much more observed by them then doctrine; which commonly they understand not, or forget.

§ 3. And 3. Hereupon their minds will receive a false impression about the nature of their Religion, and they will be brought to worship they know not how, and to set a high value on that which is not to be valued; and consequently it will kindle a false zeal in their affections, and corrupt all their devotions.

§ 4. And 4. It will make them disobedient against Magistrates or Parents that would take them off from their false apprehensions, and misguided practices: and if they live in a place where
where the Governours are against their customs, they will disobey them on pretence of duty to God, and think that they do him service in it.

§. 5. Yea 5. They will be uncharitably censorious against their Brethren that are not of their mind, and look on them as men that are self-conceited or irreligious, as the Papists do by all that do no entertain every opinion which they annumerate with the Articles of their faith, and every practice which they place their Religion in.

§. 6. We see all this by sad experience among our selves. The imposers of our Ceremonies and the maintainers of them, did still profess that they were no parts, but Accidents of worhip; and they pleaded for them but as things indifferent. And yet now the Magistrate, and their lawfull acknowledged Pastors, would bring the people in some of these Ceremonies to change their customs; they will not do it, in many places, but make conscience (as they profess) of Gestures, and forms and Days, and such like, as if they had been of Divine Institution. If they be things Indifferent, why may not they disuse an Holy day one year as they use it another or disuse a form of Prayer one day, as they use it another, or receive the Lords Supper one time sitting, as they do another time kneeling? But this they will not endure to yield to; so that you see that constant uninterrupted use, hath made custome a Law with them, and given the Lie to the Doctrine of the Bishops themselves, that called them but indifferent things; and caused the people to place Gods worship in them.

§. 7. And on the other side a constant purposed disuse of convenient Modes and Circumstances of worship, may draw people to think them things unlawfull, and to rise up against them as innovations, and strange things, when they are imposed.

§. 8. Yet here we must distinguish of indifferent things. Some are so convenient, that we cannot frequently vary, but with great inconveniency and wrong to the Church (as a due hour for Assembling, and a convenient place, and the best Translations, and versions of the Psalms, the fittest Utensils for worship, &c.) In all these cases it were giddiness to vary frequently and without need; and yet worse to tie men up from varying
varying when they find need. Other things are of ordinary inconvenience, which therefore ordinarily should be allowed; other things depend upon the will of men, and there is no great difference in point of convenience between the using and disuse of them, but what the will of man doth cause. (As in our vestures, our gestures in some of the Ordinances, as in bearing,任职, praying, Psalms, and in abundance of Ceremonies or Circumstances, this is the case.) These are they that I say should be used, but unconfantly, unconfantly.
CHAP. X. IV.

Reasons against the Imposing of our late Controverted Mystical Ceremonies, as Crossing, Surplice, &c.

§. 1. OW far Ceremonies are lawfull or un-lawfull to the users, I have shewed sufficiently already: and therefore may omit the fourteenth Proposition as discussed before: But so eager are the minds of men to be exalting themselves over the whole world, and putting yokes on their Brethrens necks, even in the matters of God, and setting up their own wills to be the Idols and Law-givers to all others, that I take it for the principal part of my task, to give in my Reasons against this distemper, and to try if it be possible to take men off from Imposing or desiring, the Imposition of unnecessary things. I durst not desire the Imposing of our Mystical Ceremonies, but had rather they were abolished, or left indifferent, for these followings Reasons.

§. 2. Reas. 1. To impose new Symbolical Rites upon the Church which Christ hath not imposed, doth seem to me to be an usurpation of his Soveraign power. It belongeth to him to be the Law giver of his Church. No man hath Power to make him a new worship. Officers are but to see his Laws executed: and to determine only of such circumstances, as are needfull for the well executing them. To make new Symbols or instituted signs
signs to teach and excite Devotion, is to make new humane Ordinances: whereas it belongs to us only to use well such as he hath made: and to make no Laws but such as are thus needful for the executing of his Laws. But of all this I have more largely spoken already.

§. 3. Reaf. 2. The imposing of these Mystical Rites doth seem to accuse Christ of ignorance or negligence, in that he hath not himself imposed them, when he hath taken upon him that Royall office to which such Legislation doth belong. If Christ would have such Rites imposed on the Churches, he could better have done it himself, then have left it to man. For these being not mutable circumstances, but the matter of standing Laws, are equally necessary or unnecessary to this age of the Church as to that in which Christ lived upon earth, and to those Countreys in which he conversed as to these. If Images, Crofting, significant garments, &c. be needful to be imposed in England, why not in Judea, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, &c.

And if they are needful now, why not then? No man can give a rational cause of difference, as to this necessity. If therefore Christ did neither by himself nor by his Apostles, (who formed the first Churches, and delivered us his mind by the Spirit) institute and impose these Rites, then either the imposing of them is needless, and consequently noxious: or else you must say that Christ hath omitted a needful part of his Law and worship, which implies that he was either ignorant what to do, or careless and negligent of his own affairs, which are not to be imagined.

Moses left nothing out of the Law that he delivered, that was to be the standing matter of the Law: nor omitted he anything that God required in the instituting of the Legal worship. But Christ was faithful to him that appointed him as Moses was in all his house, Heb. 3. 2, 3. therefore certainly Christ hath omitted nothing that was to be a standing Gospel Law and Worship nor done his work imperfectly.

§. 4. Reaf. 3. And as this Imposition of Mystical Rites doth imply an accusation of Christ, so doth it imply an accusation of his Laws, and of the holy Scriptures, as if they were insufficient. For if it belong to Scripture sufficiency to be the full revelation of the will of God concerning Ordinances of worship and duties of universal or stated Necessity, then must we not imagine
imagine that any such are left out. If Scripture be God's Law, it is a perfect law: And if it belong to it as a Law to impose one stated Symbol, Ordinance, or matter of worship, then so it doth to impose the rest of the same nature that are fit to be imposed. If we will do more of the same that Scripture was given for to do, we accuse it, while we seem to amend it.

§ 5. Reaf. 4. And by this means we shall be brought to a loss for the Rule of our Religion. For if once we leave the holy Scriptures, we shall not know where to fix. If God have not instituted all the Ordinances of Worship (such as Sacramental, or Mystical Rites, &c.) that are meet to be statedly imposed on the Churches, then we are uncertain who is to be the institutor of them. The Pope will claim it: and General Councils will claim it: and Provincial Councils, and particular Bishops will claim it: and Princes will claim it: and we shall be at a loss for our Religion.

§ 6. Reaf. 5. But whoever it be that will be the master of our Religion they will certainly be men, and so it will become a humane thing. Whereas Divine worship supposeth a Divine institution: and it is an act of obedience to God, and therefore supposeth a Law of God: For without a Divine Law there cannot be obedience to God.

§ 7. Reaf. 6. These impositions seem to be plain violations of those prohibitions of God, in which we are forbidden to add to his worship, or diminish from it. As Deut. 12. 32. [What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.] Objeft. But we add nothing to the Work of God, though we impose such Mystical Rites as he imposed not. Ans. The text doth not say Thou shalt not add to my Command: but [Thou shalt not add to the thing that I command thee.] It is the Work, Worship, or Ordinances that you are forbidden to add to, or diminish from, and not the Word or Law itself only.

§ 8. Reaf. 7. It seemeth to be a very great height of Pride that is manifested in these impositions. 1. When men dare think themselves wise enough to amend the work of Christ and his Apostles, and wise enough to amend the holy Scriptures: is not this exceeding Pride? How can man more arrogantly lift up himself....
himself, then by pretending himself to be wiser then his Maker and Redeemer? Is it not bad enough to equalize your selves with him, unless you exalt your selves above him? If you do not so, what mean you by coming after him to correct his Laws, or mend his work, and make better laws and ordinances for his Church then he himself hath done? 2. And I think it is no better then Pride for men so far to exalt themselves above the Church of God, as to institute new signs and ordinances, and say, \[ I command you all to worship God according to these my Institution and inventions: and he that will not thus worship him, shall not have liberty to worship him at all, nor to live in the Communion of Christians. \] What's Pride and arrogancy, if this be not?

§. 9. Reaf. 8. None knoweth the mind of God concerning his worship, but by his own Revelation: If therefore he have not Revealed it to man, that he would be served by such mystical Rites, and Ceremonies, then no man can know that it will please him. And if it Please him not, it will be loft labour and worse: and we may expect to hear \[ who requireth this at your hands? \] How do you know that it pleaseth him to be served by Images, Exorcisms, Crosslings, and many pompous Ceremonies? He hath nowhere told you so. And your will is no proof of the will of God.

§. 10. Reaf. 9. God would not have taken down the Legal Ceremonies, and delivered us from them as a burden, and commanded us to stand fast in the Liberty with which Christ hath made us free, and not again to be entangled with the yoak of bondage Gal. 5.1. If he would have given men leave to have imposed the like burdensome observances at their pleasure. If you say, that these present Ceremonies are not burdensome; I ask, why then were those of God's institution burdensome? That yoak was strict and burden heavy; and Christ hath called us to take upon us his yoak that is easy, and his burden that is light. Matt. 11.28. It was not only the threatenings conjunct against the disobedient, that made the Jewish Ceremonies to be a burden, which they were not able to bear, Acts 15. not yet because they were but Types (for to be Types of Christ, was the highest honour: ) But also because they were numerous, and required labour and time, and were unnecessary (when Christ was come) and so against the liberty of the Church, as
Col. 2. 16. &c. And is it a likely thing that God would take down his own institutions when they became unnecessary, and at the same time give commission to the Pastors of the Church to set up unnecessary Ceremonies of their own? Yea or give them leave to do it, without his commission? If it be such a mercy to be delivered from Divine Ceremonies, when they grew needless, and a liberty which we are commanded to stand fast in, I know not: why men should impose on us unnecessary Ceremonies of their own, and rob us of our Mercies.

§. 11. Reaf. 10. The imposition of unnecessary Ceremonies, is a certain means for the Division of Christians, and therefore is but an engine of the Devil, the great divider. As the Papists set up a Vicar-christ and false Center of union, under pretence of the unity of Christians, when nothing is so great a cause of their division; so usually the Imposers of Ceremonies pretend the Unity and Peace of Christians to be their end, when they are most effectually dividing them. They are preserving the house by casting fire into the thatch. There is no more effectual means of Division, then to set up impossible terms of unity, and tell men, that they must Agree upon these or none. All Christians will unite in Christ, and Agree in all the essentials of Christianity, and all that is the known word of God: But no wise man will expect that all Christians should ever Unite and Agree about the Mystical signs and Ceremonies of mans invention and imposition. Come to a Congregation that walke in unity and holy order in the simplicity of faith and Scripture ordinances, and make Laws to this Church, that no man shall joyne in the worship of God that will not Cross himself, and be sprinkled with holy water, and bow toward the Altar, and wear a sword and helmet, to signify the spiritual warfare, and such like, and try whether this course will not divide the Congregation; Men are likely to agree in few things then in many; in Certain truths, then in uncertain Controversies; in Divine ordinances, then in Humane inventions. Undoubtedly if you impose such Ceremonies, multitudes of honest Christians will dissent: And if they dissent, what will you do with them? If you leave them to their liberty, then your Ceremonies are not imposed. If you do not, you will drive them to a separation, and break all in pieces.
pieces by your violence, and exasperation of mens minds.

§. 12. Reaf. 11. And by this means you will be led, and also lead others into the haynous guilt of persectuting the members of Christ. For when you have made Laws for your Ceremonies, you will expect obedience, and take all for schismatics or disobedient that refuse them; and its like your laws will be buckt with penalties; you will not be content to have the liberty of using these Ceremonies themselves, and to leave all other to their liberties. We hear (and formerly heard it more) how impatient almost all of this way are of diversity in Circumstances and Ceremonies. They take it to be intolerable confusion to have diversity in these things: what say they? shall one use one gesture, and another use another? what confusion will this be? or if a few of the wiser sort have more wit, yet custome will bring the multitude to this pass. We see now, they will not endure to joyn with those that sit at the Lords Supper, though they may kneel themselves. If they see but two or three shops in a Town open on Christmas day, they throw stones at them and break their windows, where they dare, and are ready to rise up against such as enemies in war. Besides you will take it as a contempt of your Laws, if men do not conform to them: And if you use the Ceremonies, and others disuse them, you will think they censure your practice by their forbearance. And its like they will be forced to give some reasons of their forbearance: And those Reasons must needs be against your way, and consequently seem to disparage you, so that I may take it for granted, that those that would have Ceremonies, would have them forced on the Church, and so would raise a persectution to maintain them.

§. 13. And then this persecution when its once begun, its never like to stay till it reach to the height of Cruelty. For 1. When you have begun, you will think that you are engaged in honour to carry it on, and not to suffer every poor man or woman to disdain you, and disparage your wisdom. 2. And if you lay but a gentle penalty on dissenters, it will do no good on them (but perhaps excite them to the more opposition.) When Conscience is engaged against you, it is not small multas nor imprisonment neither that will alter the judgements of the wates of such. And therefore you must either proceed to blood
blood or banishment, or you miss your ends, and will but be opposed with greater animosity.

§. 14. Reaf. 12. And then this will raise an odium upon your Government, and make men look upon you as tyrants: For naturally men pity the suffering party, especially when it is for the cause of God, or Profession of more then ordinary exactness in the obeying of God’s commands: And then mens minds will by this be tempted to disloyal jealousies, and censures, if not to the opposition of the Rulers.

§. 15. Reaf. 13. And it were an evil which your Ceremonies will never countervail, if it were but the uncharitableness that will certainly be raised by them. When you will persecute men, and force them against their Consciences in such indifferent things (as you call them) you will occasion them to judge you persecutors, and cruel, and then they will censure you as ungodly, yea as enemies to the Church: And then you will censure them for schismatical, and self-conceited, and refractory disobedient people. And so Christian love, and the offices of love will be extinguished, and you will be mutually engaged in a daily course of hainous sin.

§. 16. Reaf. 14. And it will be the worse, in that your persecution will oft fall on the most conscientious persons. Hypocrites and temporizers dare do anything; and therefore will follow the stronger side, and obey him for their worldly ends. But the upright Christian dare not do that which is displeasing to God, for a world: He is the man that will be imprisoned, or banished, or rackt, or slain, rather then he will go against his Conscience. And is it not a horrid thing to make such Laws, that the most conscionable are likest to fall under, and to perish by? May it not make you tremble, to read that God himself doth call such his Jewels (Mal. 3. 16, 17.) and faith, he that toucheth them, toucheth the apple of his eye, and that it were better for him be cast into the depth of the sea with a Millstone about his neck, that offendeth one of these little ones? Away with the Ceremonies that are unnecessary, and yet have such effects, and bring you into such danger.

§. 17. Reaf. 15. And then a more grievous evil will follow: the Ceremony will devour the substance, and shut out the preachers, and consequently the word and worship of the Lord.
For you will never give men Liberty to forbear them. And when godly Ministers will not be conformable to your will, you must silence them, lest they draw the people from you. And so the ignorant must be left in their ignorance, and the profligate in their profligacies, and the godly in their sorrows for want of their faithful Teachers, and the ordinances of grace.

§. 18. Reaf. 16. And then it will follow, that ignorant, idle, ungodly Ministers must be taken in to supply their rooms: For if the best disobey you, you will think your selves necessitated to take such as will obey you. And so God shall be dishonoured, his word and work abused, his people grieved, his enemies encouraged, the wicked hardened, and the unworthy Ministers themselves undone and destroyed; and all for a few unnecessary ceremonies of your vain invention.

§. 19. Reaf. 17. And now it were more unexcusable than ever before, to impose such unnecessary burdens on the Churches, when we have so lately seen and felt the sad and miserable effects of such impositions. We are scarce out of the fire, that this straw and rubbish kindled in this land. We are the men that have seen the Churches divided by them, and the preachers cast out for them, and persecution occasioned by them, and the Nation hereupon corrupted with uncharitableness, the Bishops against the people, and the people against the Bishops: and war and misery hence arising. And yet shall we return to the occasion of our misery, and that while we confess it to be a needless thing?

§. 20. Reaf. 18. Yea this course is like to kindle and maintain Divisions between the Churches of several Nations, as well as among those that are under the same government. For either you will have all the Christian world to join with you in your Mystical and unnecessary Ceremonies, or not: All cannot be expected to join with you: For 1. The world will never agree in such humane unnecessary things. 2. There is no universal governor to impose one Law of Ceremonies on all the Churches. Christ only is the universal King and Head: and he hath done his part already. If you will have more universal Laws, you must first have another universal King or Head. And there is none such. Only the Pope and a General Council pretend
pretend to it; and they are both deceived (in this) and would deceive us. They are none of our Lords, as I have elsewhere proved. But if you expect not universal Concord in your Mystical signs and Ceremonies; then 1. Why should you cast out your Preachers and brethren, for those things which other Nations may be so well without; and hold communion with foreigners that avoid them, and deny Communion to neighbors as good, that are of the same mind? And 2. This will make foreign Churches and you to grudge at one another, and the diversity will cause disaffection; especially when you persecute your members for the cause that is theirs. We find now by experience, that the Images, Exorcism, Crossing, &c. of the Lutherans doth exceedingly hinder their Peace with other Churches, while others censure them as superstitious; and they by custom are grown so highly to value their own Ceremonies, as to cen- sure and disdain those that are not of their mind.

§. 21. Reaf. 19. It easily breedeth and cherisheth ignorance and formality in the people. You cannot keep them from placing their Religion in these Ceremonies: and so from deceiving their souls by such a Pharisaical Religiousness, in washings and observances; And so in vain will they worship God, while their worship is but a Conformity to the doctrines, traditions, and inventions of men. Mat. 15.

§. 22. Reaf. 20. To prevent these evils (and yet in vain) your Rites and Signs must bring New doctrines, and new labours into the Church, which will exceedingly hinder the doctrine and work of Christ. The Ministers must teach the people the meaning and use of all these Ceremonies (or else they will be dumb signs, contrary to your intent, and the use of them will be vain.) And if we must spend our time in opening to our people the meaning of every ceremony that you will impose: 1. It will be but an un favoured kind of preaching. 2. It will divert them and us from greater and more needful things. Yea we must teach them, with what Caution, in what manner, to what ends, &c. to use all these Ceremonies; or else they will turn them all to sin; if not to Popish, yea to heathenish formal- ities. And alas, how much ado have we to get our people to understand the Creed, and the Kernel of the Gospel, the essenti- als of Christianity, and the two Sacraments of Christ's institu-
tion, and some short Catechism that containeth these? And when we have done our best in publick and in private, we leave many of them ignorant: what these two Sacraments are, yea or who Christ himself is. And must we put them to so much more labour, as to learn a Rationale or exposition of all the Ceremonies, holy days, &c? We shall but overwhelm them, or divert them from the Essentials.

And here you may see the unhappy issue of humane wisdom and false means. It is to be teachers of the ignorant that men pretend these Signs, Images and Ceremonies to be useful. And yet they are the causes of ignorance, and keep men from necessary knowledge. If you doubt of this, do but open your eyes, and make use of experience: See whether among the common people the most Ceremonious are not commonly the most ignorant? yea and the most ungodly too? It is a truth so notorious, that it cannot be denied. Who more ignorant of the Sacraments, then they that rail at them that sit in the act of receiving? Who more ignorant of the doctrine of the Gospel? who more obstinate enemies of a holy life, more worldly, self-conceited, licentious, prophane, despisers of their faithfull Teachers, then the most zealous persons for all these Ceremonies?

§. 23. Reaf. 21. Moreover these new Laws and services introduce also a new office into the Church. There must be some of pretended Power to impose all these Ceremonies, and see them executed: or else all is vain. And no such office hath Christ appointed. Because men thought it necessary that all the Christian world should have but one way and Order in the Ceremonious worship which was commonly approved, therefore they thought there was a Necessity of one Head to maintain this unity of order: and so came up the Pope, (as to one cause.) And so in a Nation, we must have some one or more Masters of Ceremonies, when Ceremonies are kept afoot. And so whereas Christ hath placed officers in his Church to teach and guide them, and administer his own Ordinances, we must have another sort of officers, to make Laws for Mystical Signs and Ceremonies, and see them executed, and punish the neglecters, and teach the people the meaning and the use of them.

The Primitive Bishops had other kind of work; we find directions,
ions to the Pastors of the Church containing the works of their office (as to Timothy, Titus, &c.) But we no where find that this is made any part of their work, to make new Teaching signs and Ceremonies, and impose them on the Church, nor have they any directions for such a work: which surely they much needed, if it had been their work indeed.

§. 24. Reaf. 22. When we once begin to let in humane Mystical Rites, we shall never know where to stop, or make an end. On the same ground that one Age inventeth three or four, the next think they may add as many, and so it will grow to be a point of devotion, to add a new Ceremony (as at Rome it hath done), till we have more than we well know what to do with.

§. 25. Reaf. 23. And the miserable plight that the Christian world hath lain in many ages by Ceremonies, may warn us to be wise. Augustine complaineth that in his time the Church was burthened with them, and made like the Jewish Synagogue. The most of the Churches in Asia and Africa are drowned too deeply in Ceremonious formality, turning Religion into ignorant shews. The Church of Rome is worse then they; having made God a worship of hisforical actions, and shews and signs and Ceremonies: so that millions of the poor blind people worship they know not whom nor how. And if we abate only of the number, and keep up some of the same kind, (even Symbolical Rites of man's institution, to teach us, and excite our devotion) we shall harden them in their way, and be disabled from confuting them. For a Papift will challenge you to prove just how many such signs are lawfull: And why he may not use threescore as well as you use three, when he faith he is edified by his number, as you say you are with yours?

§. 26. Reaf. 24. It is not inconsiderable that God hath purposely established a spiritual kind of worship in the Gospel, telling us that God is a Spirit, and will be worshipped in spirit and in truth: Such worshippers doth God require and accept: Bodily exercise profiteth little. The kingdom of God is not in meats or in drinks, but in Righteousness, and Peace, and Joy in the Holy Ghost. Neither Circumcision availeth any thing in Christ Jesus, nor uncircumcision, but a new creature, and faith that worketh by Love. God would never have so much called
called men off from Ceremoniousness to Spirituality, if he had delighted in Ceremony.

§. 27. Reaf. 25. The Worship of God without his blessing is to little purpose. No man can have encouragement to use any thing as a Means to reach him and help his devotion, which he hath no ground to believe that God will bless. But there is no ground (that I know of) to believe that God will bless these Instituted Teaching signs of mans inventions to the Edifying of our souls. For God hath no where bid us devise or use such signs; 2. Nor no where promised us a blessing on them (that ever I could find.) And therefore we have no encouragement to use them. If we will make them, and impose them on ourselves, we must undertake to bless them on our selves.

§. 28. Reaf. 26, As vain thoughts and words are forbidden us in Scripture, so no doubt but vain actions are forbidden: but especially in the worship of God: and yet more especially when they are Imposed on the Church by Laws with penalties. But these Mystical Rites of humane institution are vain. You call them your selves but [Things indifferent:] And they are vain as to the use for which they are pretended, that is, to Teach and Edifie, &c. having no promise of a blessing, and being needless imitations of the Sacraments of Christ. Vanity therefore is not to be imposed on the Church. My last Reason will fuller shew them to be vain.

§. 29. Reaf. 27. We are sure the way in which Peter, and Paul, and the Churches of their times did worship God, was allowable and safe: and that Princes and Prelates are wise and righteous overmuch, if they will not only be more wise and righteous than the Apostles in the matters of Gods worship, but also deny their subjects liberty to worship God, and go to heaven in the same way as the Apostles did. If Peter and Paul went to heaven without the use of Images, Surplice, the Cross in Baptism, kneeling in receiving the Lords Supper, and many such Ceremonies, why should not we have leave to live in the Communion of the Church without them? would you have denied the Apostles their liberty herein? Or will you be partial? Must they have one way, and we another? They command us to imitate them: give us leave then to imitate them, at least in all things that your selves confess to be lawfull for us.
§. 30. Reaf. 28. Hath not God purposely already in the Scripture determined the Controversie, supposing your Ceremonies (which is their best) to be indifferent. He hath interposed also for the decision of such doubts. He hath commanded, Rom. 14. 1, 3. that we [Receive him that is weak in the faith, but not to doubtfull disputation] (much less to imprison, or banishment) [Let not him that eateth, despife him that eateth not; and let not him that eateth not, judge him that eateth, for God hath received him] Nay we must not so much as offend or grieve our brother, by indifferent things, Verfe 13. 15. 21. to the end. And fo Chap. 15. 1. We that are strong ought to bear the infirmities of the weak, and not to please our selves. So that the case is decided by the Spirit of God expressly, that he would have weak Christians have liberty in such things as these; and would not have Christians so much as cenfure or despife one another upon such accounts. And therefore Prelates may not silence Ministers, nor excommunicate Christians on this account; nor Magistrates punish them, especially to the injury of the Church.

§. 31. Object. But this is spoken only to private Christians, and not to Magistrates or Prelates. Answ. I. If there had been any Prelate then at Rome, we might have judged it spoken to them with the people. And no doubt but it was spoken to such Pastors as they then had. For it was written to all the Church, of whom the Pastors were a part. And if the Pastors must bear with dissenters in things indifferent, then most certainly the Magistrates must do so. 2. If Magistrates are Christians, then this command extendeth also unto them. God hath sufficiently told us here that he would have us bear with one another in things of such indifferency as these. If God tell private men this truth, that he would have men born with in such cases, it concerns the Magistrate to take notice of it. Either the error is tolerable, or intolerable. If intolerable, private men must not bear with it. If tolerable, Magistrates and Pastors must bear with it. It is as much the duty of Private Christians to reprove an erroneous person, and avoid him, if intolerable and impenitent, as it is the duty of a Magistrate to punish him by the sword, or the Pastor by Church-censures. If therefore it be the duty of Private men to tolerate such as these in question, by
by a forbearance of their rebukes and Censures; then is it the
duty of Magistrates to tolerate them, by a forbearance of penali-
ties; and of Pastors to tolerate them by a forbearance of excom-
munication. Who can believe that God would leave so full a
determination for tolerating such persons, and yet desire that
Prelates should excommunicate them, or Princes imprison, banish
or destroy them. Some English Expositors therefore do but
unreasonably abuse this text, when they tell us that Magis-
trates and Prelates may thus punish these men, whom the rest of
the Church is so straitly commanded to bear with and not offend.
§ 32. So Col. 2. 16. to the end [Let no man judge you in
Meat or Drink, or in respect of an holy day, or of the new Moon, or
of the Sabbaths, &c.] ver. 20. [Wherefore if ye be dead with
Christ from the rudiments of the world, why as though living in
the world are ye subject to Ordinances? (Touch not, taste not,
handle not, which all are to perish with the using,) after the com-
mandments and doctrines of men: which things have indeed a show
of wisdom in will-worship and humility and neglecting of the body,
not in any honour to the satisfying of the flesh.] Here also God
sheweth that it is his will that such Matters should not be made
Laws to the Church, nor be imposed on his servants; but their
freedom should be preserved. Many other texts express the same,
which I need not cite, the case being so plain.
§ 33. Reaf. 29. Moreover, me thinks every Christian should
be sensible, how insufficient we are to perform the great and
many duties that God hath imposed upon us already. And
therefore they should have little mind to be making more
work to the Churches and themselves, till they can better
discharge that which is already imposed on them by God.
Have not your selves and your flocks enough to do to ob-
serve all the precepts of the Decalogue, and understand all the
doctrines of the Gospel, and believe and obey the Gospel of
Christ, but you must be making your selves and others more
work? Have you not sin enough already in breaking the Laws
already made, but you must make more Laws and duties, that
so you may make more sin? If you say, that your precepts are
not guilty of this charge, you speak against reason: The more
duty, the more neglect we shall be guilty of. See how the Lord
Falkland urgeth this Objection on the Papists. And it is con-
siderable
Considerable, that by this means you make your selves unexcusable for all your neglects, and omissions toward God. Cannot you live up to the height of Evangelical Sanity? Why then do you make your selves more work? Sure if you can do more, it may be expected that you first do this that was enjoyned you. If you will needs be Righteous (materially) overmuch, you are unexcusable for your unrighteousness.

§. 34. Reaf. 30. Lastly, consider also, that all your Mystical Teaching Signs, are needless things, and come too late, because the work is done that they pretend to: God hath already given you so perfect a directory for his worship, that there is nothing more that you can reasonably desire. Let us peruse the particulars. 1. What want you in order to the Teaching of our understandings? Hath not God in his word and his works, and his Sacraments provided sufficient means for our instruction, unless you add your Mystical signs? Will your Ceremonies come after and teach us better then all these Means of God will do? We see by the Disciples of Ceremonies, what a Master they have. 2. What want you for the exciting of dull affections, that God hath not provided you already? Have you Ceremonies that can give life, and are more powerful remedies against Corruptions, and more useful all means of Grace then all the institutions of God? Or hath God left any imperfection in his institutions for your Ceremonies to supply? Would you have plain Teaching in season and out of season? This God hath appointed already: and settled the Ministry to that end. Would you have men taught by a Form of words? Why you have a copious Form: The whole Scripture is a form of words, for mens instruction. And yet we deny not but out of this Form you may gather more contracted forms for the instruction of your flocks. Catechizing and publick and private teaching are Gods own Ordinances. Would you have a Directory for Prayer, Confession and Thanksgiving? Scripture is a Directory; and out of it we shall be glad of any direction that you will gather for us. Would you have forms of Words for Prayer and Praise? Scripture hath given you many: the Lords Prayer, the Psalms, and many more. And if you think you can do better, you have liberty to do it your selves. And is not that enough? God hath left it indifferent to us, whether we use a hinted form or not. If
you be not wiser then God, do you leave it indifferent also. Would you have a fasted day for Gospel-worship in Comme- 
oration of the work of our Redemption? Christ and his Apostles 
have taught you to observe one, even the Lord's day to these 
Ends. Would you have exciting mystical instituted signs? Christ 
hath appointed you Baptism and the Lord's Supper, which sig-
ifie the very substance of the Gospel: Can your signs do more? 
Or is a greater number more desirable? Why may not a few 
of Christ's institution, full and clear, that have a promise of his 
blessing, serve turn without the additions of men's froathy wits ? 
Use the Lord's Supper often, and with more preparation, and 
you will need no Sacramental Rites of your own. If Christ's 
signs will not do it, in vain do you hope for it from the deceives 
of men. God's Ordinances have no blemishes and wants that 
need your patches. Do that which Scripture hath cut out for 
you, and I warrant you, you'll find no want of such additions. 
The making of the Law and Rule of Worship is God's work, the 
obeying it is yours. It's a course most perverse when you fail 
and deal falsely in your own work, to fall upon God's work, and 
take on you to mend that. Do your own well, in obeying, and 
judge not the Law, and trouble not the Church with your addi-
tions.

§. 35. Yet still remember, that we allow both Magistrates and 
Pastors to see to the execution of God's laws, and to determine of 
Circumstances in order thereto that are necessary in genere. But 
it is only 1. Such Mystical signs as in genere are not commanded 
us, and left to mans determination, that I speak of. 2. And also 
the needless determination of circumstances, and making Laws 
for such things as should be left to the prudence of every Pastor, 
to be varied as occasion requireth.
CHAP. XV.

Reasons for Obedience in Lawfull things.

§. 1. EST men that are apt to run from one extrem into another, should make an ill use of that which I have before written, I shall here annex some Reasons to perswade men to just obedience, and preserve them from any sinfull nonconformity to the commands of their Governours, and the evill effects that are like to follow thereupon.

§. 2. But first I will lay together some Propositions for decision of the Controversie; How far we are bound to obey mens precepts about Religion? Especially in case we doubt of the lawfulness of obeying them? and so cannot obey them in faith?

§. 3. Briefly: 1. We must obey both Magistrates and Pastors in all things lawfull which belong to their offices to command. 2. It belongs not to their office to make God a new worship; But to command the Mode and Circumstances of worship belongeth to their office: for guiding them wherein God hath given them generall rules. 3. We must not take the Lawfull commands of our Governours to be unlawfull. 4. If we do through weakness or perversenes take Lawfull things to be unlawfull, that will not excuse us in our disobedience. Our error is our sin, and one
fin will not excuse another sin. Even as on the other side, if we judge things unlawful to be lawfull, that will not excuse us for our disobedience to God in obeying men. 5. As I have before shewed, many things that are miscommanded, must be obeyed. 6. As an erroneous judgement will not excuse us from Obedience to our Governours, so much less will a doubtfulness excuse us. 7. As such a doubting, erring judgement cannot obey in (plenary) faith, so much less can he disobey in faith. For it is a known Command of God, that we obey them that have the Rule over us: but they have no word of God against the act of obedience now in question. It is their own erring judgement that intangleth them in a necessity of sinning (till it be changed.) 7. In doubtfull cases, it is our duty to use Gods means for our information: and one means is to consult with our Teachers, and hear their words with teachableness and meekness. 8. If upon advising with them we remain in doubt about the lawfulness of some Circumstance of order, if it be such as may be dispensed with, they should dispense with us: if it may not be dispensed with without a greater injury to the Church or cause of God, then our dispensation will countervail, then is it our duty to obey our Teachers, notwithstanding such doubts: For it being their office to Teach us, it must be our duty to believe them with a humane faith, in cases where we have no Evidences to the contrary: And the Duty of Obeying them being certain, and the sinfulness of the thing commanded being uncertain and unknown, and only suspected, we must go on the surer side. 9. Yet must we in great and doubtfull cases, not take up with the suspected judgement of a single Pastor, but apply our selves to the unanimous Pastors of other Churches. 10. Christians should not be over-busie in prying into the work of their Governours, nor too forward to suspect their determinations: But when they know that it is their Rulers work to guide them by determining of due Circumstances of worship, they should without causeless scruples readily obey, till they see just reason to stop them in their obedience; They must not go out of their own places.
to search into the Actions of another mans office, to trouble themselves without any cause.

§. 4. And now I intreat all humble Christians readily to obey both Magistrates and Pastors in all Lawfull things; and to consider, to that end, of these Reasons following. Reaf. 1. If you will not obey in Lawfull things, you deny authority, or overthrow Government it self, which is a great ordinance of God, established in the fith commandment with promise: And as that commandment respecting Societies and common good, is greater then the following commands, as they respect the private good of our neighbours, or are but particular Means to that Publick good, whose foundation is laid in the fith commandment, fo accordingly the sin against this fith commandment must be greater then that against the rest.

§. 5. Reaf. 2. In disobeying the lawfull commands of our superiors, we disobey Christ, who ruleth by them as his officers. Even as the disobeying a Justice of Peace or Judge is a disobeying of the sovereign Power; yea in some cases when their sentence is unjust. Some of the ancient Doctors thought that the fith commandment was the laft of the first Table of the Decalogue; and that the Honouring of Governors is part of our Honour to God, they being mentioned there as his officers, with whom he himself is honoured or dishonoured, obeyed or disobeyed: For it is Gods Authority that the Magistrate, Parent, and Pastor is endued with, and empowred by to rule those that are put under them.

§. 6. Reaf. 3. What confusion will be brought into the Church if Pastors be not obeyed in things lawfull? For instance: If the Pastors appoint the Congregation to Assemble at one hour, and the people will scruple the time, and say, it is unlawfull, and so will choose some of them one time, and some another, what disorder will here be? and worse, if the Pastors appoint a Place of worship, and any of the people scruple obeying them, and will come to another place, what confusion will here be? People are many, and the Pastors are few: and therefore there may be some unity if the people be Ruled by the Pastors; but there can be none, if the Pastors must be ruled by the people, for the people will not agree among themselves: and therefore if we obey one part of them, we must disobey and dis-
please the rest. And their ignorance makes them unfit to rule.

§. 7. Reaf. 4. Moreover, disobedience in matters of Circumstance, will exclude and overthrow the substance of the worship itself. God commandeth us to pray: If one part of the Church will not joyn with a stinted form of Prayer, and the other part will not joyn without it, both parties cannot be pleased, and so one part must cast off Prayer it self, or separate from the rest. God commandeth the reading, and preaching, and hearing of the Scripture, and the singing of Psalms: but he hath left it to man to make or choose the best Translation of Scripture, or version of the Psalms. Now if the Pastor appoint one version, and Translation, and the Church joyn in the use of it, if any members will scruple joyning in this Translation or version, they must needs forbear the whole duty of Hearing the Scripture, and singing Psalms in that Congregation. If they pretend a scruple against the appointed time or Place of worship, they will thereby cast off the worship it self. For if they avoid our Time or Place, they cannot meet with us, nor worship with us.

§. 8. Reaf. 5. And when they are thus carried to separate from the Congregation, upon such grounds as these, they will be no where fixt, but may be still subdividing, and separating from one another, till they are resolved into individuals, and have left no such thing as a Church among them. For they can have no assurance or probability, that some of themselves will not dissent from the rest in one Circumstance or other, as they did from their Pastors and the Church that they were of before.

§. 9. Reaf. 6. By this means the wicked that are disobedient to their Teachers, and reject the worship of God it self, will be hardened in their sin, and taught by professors to defend their ungodliness: For the very same course that you take will serve their turns. They need not deny any Duty in the substance, but deny the circumstance, and so put off the substance of the Duty. If a wicked man will not hear the word preached, he may say [I am not against preaching; but I am unsatisfied of the lawfulness of your Time or Place, I am in judgement]
ment against coming to your Steeple-house, or against the Lords Day.] And so he shall never hear, though he say he is for hearing. If a wicked man will not be personally instructed, or admonished, or be accountable to the Church or Pastors for any scandals of his life, nor submit to any discipline, he may say [I am for discipline, I know it is my duty to be instructed: but I am not satisfied that I am bound to come to you when you send for me, or to appear at such a place as you appoint: the word of God nameth no time or place, and you shall not deprive me of my liberty.] If a wicked man would not hear or read the Scripture, or sing Psalms, he may say that he is for the duty, but he is only against this and that Translation and version: And so while every version is excepted against, the duty is as much evaded as if it were denied itself. By this device it is that the Rebellion of unruly people is defended: They run to the circumstances of the duty, and ask, [Where are they bound to come to a Minister? or to be examined by him in order to a baptism or Lords Supper? or to speak their consent to be Church members, or to subscribe to a Profession, or to read an English Bible, or to hear in a Steeple-house, with many such like.] Thus also it is that they put off family prayer, and ask, [Where are they bound to pray in their family Morning and Evening?] and to keep no constancy in family prayer at all, under pretense of denying only the circumstances.

§ 10. Ref. 7. By this disobedience in things lawfull, the members of the Church will be involved in contentions, and so engaged in bitter uncharitableness, and censures, and persecutions, and reproaches of one another: which scandalous courses will nourish vice, dishonour God, rejoice the enemies, grieve the Godly that are peaceable and judicious, and wound the consciences of the contenders. We see the beginning of such fires are small, but whether they tend, and what will be the end of them, we see not.

§ 11. Ref. 8. By these means also Migrates will be provoked to take men of tender consciences for factious, unruly, and unreasonable men, and to turn their enemies, and use violence against them, to the great injury of the Church: when they see them so self-conceited, and refusing obedience in lawfull circumstances.
§. 12. **Reaf. 9.** By this means also the conversion and establishment of souls will be much hindred, and people possessed with prejudice against the Church and ordinances, when they take us to be but numerous people, and see us in such contentions among our selves. To my knowledge, our late difference about some such lesser things, hath turned off, or hindered abundance of people from liking the holy doctrine and life which we profess.

§. 13. **Reaf. 10.** It will seem to the wisest, to favour of no small measure of Pride, when people on the account of lawfull circumstances, dare set themselves against their Govenors and Teachers, and quarrel with the ordinances of God, and with the Churches: Humble men would sooner suspect themselves, and quarrel with their own distempers, and submit to those that are wiser then themselves, and that are set over them for their guidance by the Lord. There may more dangerous Pride be manifested in these matters, then in Apparel, and such lower trifles.

§. 14. **Reaf. 11.** Consider also what yielding in things lawfull the Scripture recommendeth to us? How far yielded Paul when he circumcised Timothy? Acts 16. 3. And when he [took the man, and purified himself with them in the Temple, to signify the accomplishment of the days of purification, until that an offering should be offered for every one of them ], and this for almost seven dayes, Acts 21. 26, 27. with the foregoing verses.

§. 15. So 1 Cor. 9. 19, 20. [For though I be free from all men, yet have I made my self servant unto all, that I might gain the more: And unto the Jews I became as a Jew, that I might gain the Jews; to them that are under the Law, as under the Law, that I might gain them that are under the Law: To them that are without Law, as without Law (being not without Law to God, but under the Law to Christ) that I might gain them that are without Law. To the weak I became as weak, that I might gain the weak: I am made all things to all men, that I might, by all means save some, and this I do for the Gospels sake, &c.] Study this example.

§. 16.
§. 16. Read also Rom. 14. and 15. Chapters, how much condescension the Apostle requireth even among equals, about meats and days. And 1 Cor. 8. 13. the Apostle would tie up himself from eating any flesh while the world standeth, rather then make a weak brother to offend. Many other passages of Scripture require a condescension in things of this indifferent nature, and shew that the Kingdom of God doth not consist in them.

§. 17. And Matthew 12. 1, 2, to 9. you find that hunger justified the Disciples of Christ for plucking and rubbing the ears of Corn on the Sabbath days. And hunger justified David and those that were with him, for entering into the house of God, and eating the Shew-bread, which was not lawful for him to eat, nor for them which were with him, but only for the Priests: And the Priests in the Temple were blameless for prophaning the Sabbath day. ] Now if things before accidentally evil, may by this much Necessity become lawful and a duty, then may the commands of Magistrates or Pastors, and the Unity of the Church, and the avoiding of contention, and offence, and other evils, be also sufficient to warrant us in obeying, even in inconvenient Circumstantial of the worship of God, that otherwise could not be justified.

§. 18. Ref. 12. Lastly consider, how much God hath expressed himself in his word to be pleased in the Obedience of believers. Not only in their Obedience to Christ immediately, but also to him in his officers, 1 Sam. 15. 22. [Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, &c.] Col. 3. 20, 22. [Children obey your Parents in all things (that is, all lawful things) for this is well-pleasing to the Lord] [Servants Obey in all things your Masters according to the flesh, &c.] And Obedience to Pastors is as much commanded. 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. [We beseech you brethren to know them which labour among you, and are over you in the Lord, and admonish you, and esteem them very highly, &c.] Heb. 13. 17. [Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves, for they watch for your souls as they that must give account, &c.] So Verse 7. & 24. 1 Tim. 5. 17, &c.

§. 19. As the General Commission to a Parent, or Master, or
Magistrate to Govern their inferior relations, doth authorize them to many particular acts belonging to their office, that were never named in their commission: so your general command to obey them, obligeth you to obey them in the said particulars. And so it is also betwixt the Pastors and the flock, in matters belonging to the Office of a Pastor.

§. 20. If a Child shall ask a Parent, [Where doth God's word allow you to command me to Learn this Catechism, or read this Divine's writings, or repeat this Sermon, or write it? &c.] doth not the question deserve to be answered with the rod? The General Commission for parents to Govern their children is sufficient; so if a Schoolmaster command his Schollers to come to such a place to School, and to take their places in such an Order, and to learn such books, and do such exercises, &c. the General Commission that he hath to teach and Govern them, will allow him to do all this. (Though it will not allow him to set his Schollers to any Artifice or Manual Operation alien to his profession.) So if a Minister determine of the variable Circumstances of worship, as what place the people shall come to, and at what time, to be Catechized, examined, instructed, &c. what Translation or Version of Psalms to use, what Utensils to make use of about God's service, or such like, he is warranted for this by his General Commission. And if he miss it in the manner, by choosing inconvenient circumstances, or by unnecessary determination of points that should rather be left undetermined to liberty, though this be his own sin, it will not excuse the people from obedience; unless the error of his directions be so great as would frustrate the Ordinance itself, or do more harm then our disobedience would do; which in Circumstantialis is rarely found.

§. 21. And thus I have finished this discourse of Ceremonies; a Subject that may seem unseemly at such a time when we are disburdened of Ceremonies. But the offence and vehement accusations of the Ceremonious, hath made it seem necessary to me, while they accuse Dissenters of schism.
schism and obstinacy, and reproach them as Puritans; and seem ready to add their second part, in casting out those that be not of their mind, if it were in their power: when yet they call the Ceremonies but things indifferent; and Preachers and Gods Ordinances are not Indifferent things to us.

FINITUR. July 9. 1658.

Satisfaction to certain CALUMNIATORS.

I am informed from London, and several parts of the Land, that some of my Books having lately been sold at excessive rates by the Bookellers, it is somewhat commonly reported that it is caused by my excessive gain, which say they, is at least three or four hundred pounds a year. I thank the Lord that doth not only employ me in his service, but also vouchsafe me the honor and benefit of being evil-spoken of for doing him the best service that I can, Mat. 5.11,12. 1 Pet. 4.11,12.13,15,16. Blessed Augustine was put to vindicate himself by an oath, from the infancy of a covetous design, which was raised by one godly woman, upon a disorderly action of other men, and to that end he wrote his 22d Epistle. I find no call to use his oath; but yet I judge it my duty to imitate him in patience, and in reducing the flandersers from their fin, that they abuse not their souls by uncharitable furnishes, nor their tongues by false reports. To which end I give them this true information: The two first Books I printed, I left to the Bookellers Will; for all the rest, I agreed with them for the fifteenth Book, to give to some few of my friends, hearing that some others agreed for the tenth. Sometimes my fifteenth Book coming not to an hundred, and sometimes but to few more, when of Practical Books I needed sometime 800 to give away. Because I was scarce rich enough to buy so many, I agreed with the Bookseller, (my Neighbour,) to allow 18. d. a Ream (which is not a penny a quart,) but of his own gain towards the buying of Bibles, and some of the practical Books which he printed, for the poor: Covenanting with him, that he should sell my Controversial Writings as cheap, and my Practical Writings somewhat cheaper than Books are ordinarily sold. To this hour I never received for my self one penny of money from them for any of my Writings, to the best of my remembrance: but if it fell out that my part came to more than I gave my friends, I exchanged them for other Books: My accounts and memory tell me not of 5.11. that ever was returned for me on these accounts, which was on literary occasions: so that my many hundreds a year is come to never a penny in all, but as above-said, in some exchange of Books. And the price I let on my Books which I exchanged for theirs at the dearest rates, is as followeth, [Treat. of Conversion, 2.s. Treat. of Crucifying the World, 2.s. Disput. of Justificat. 2.s. 4.d. The Call to the Unconverted, 8.d. Disput. of saving Faith, 5.d. Of the Grotian Religion, 6.d. Directions for sound Conversion, 1.s. 8.d. Disput.of Right to Sacraments, edit. secund. 2.s. 4.d.] These
These are all my bargains and my gains. And I chose the honestest Book-
fellers that I could meet with, according to my small measure of wit and ac-
quaintance; who told me, they still made good their Promises. And now
censuriferous Slanderer, tell me, what thou wouldst have had me to have done
more? If I had got Food and Rayment out of my own hard labors, had it
been unlawful or dishonourable, when Booksellers get so many hundred
pounds by one Book, that never studied nor spent their time and cost for it,
as I have done? And yet dost thou reproach me that receive not a great?
But because I will not oblige my self to the same course for the future, and
that thou mayst know at what rates I serve thee, let me tell thee, that in
these labors early and late my body is wasted, my precious time laid out, and
somewhat of my Estate, and somewhat of the labor of my friends. I can-
not have twenty quire of my writing well transcribed, under fifty pounds.
And who shall pay for this, or maintain me in thy service? I have troubled
a Neighbour-Minister in the tedious work of transcribing my Characters
(for some books) for which, neither he nor I had ever one penny. These
personal matters are unsavory to me, and I take it for a great injury that
thou puttest upon me a necessity of mentioning them. But I have yielded
this once to thy unrighteous importunity, that thou mayest hereafter learn
what to believe and utter, and make more conscience of thy cenfures and
reports. And that thou mayst have the utmost relief that I can procure thee
for the time to come, I shall agree with my Booksellers, to sell all that I
publish at three farthings a sheet, and to print the price of every book at the
bottom of the Title page.

Farewell.

October 11.

1658.

Richard Baxter.