

A

Edman

1733

DEFENCE

OF

Presbyterian Ordination,

In ANSWER to a Pamphlet, entitled, A MODEST PROOF, OF THE Order and Government settled by Christ, in the CHURCH.

By *Jonathan Dickinson, M. A.*

Minister of the Gospel at *Elizabeth-Town, New Jersey.*

I Cor. III. 5. Who then is Paul, and who is Apollos, but Ministers, by whom ye believed?

Eph. IV. 14. That we henceforth be no more Children, tossed to and fro, and carried with every wind of Doctrine, by the slight of Men, and cunning craftiness, whereby they lie in wait to deceive.



1733

BOSTON: Printed for *Daniel Henchman, a*
sold at his Shop, over-against the Brick M



Mr. *Dickinson's*

D E F E N C E

O F

Presbyterian Ordination.



PREFACE.

THOUGH the preaching of the Cross, be to them that perish foolishness; and the Ministry of the Gospel, is by the World esteem'd a mean and contemptible Thing: Yet Infinite Wisdom has contriv'd, and Infinite Grace improv'd this Engine, for the beating down the strong holds of Sin and Satan, in the Hearts of Men, for the rescue of Sins miserable Captives, for the advancing the Kingdom of Grace, and erecting Trophies, on the Ruines of Satan's Interest in the World: This it is, that has dissipated that Darknes of Heathenism, which heretofore cover'd the face of the Earth: This, that has demolished the Temples, laid waste the Altars, and extirpated the Votaries of the Heathen Gods; and sent the Gentile Worship packing to Hell: This, that notwithstanding its Original mean Appearance, has conquer'd and baffled all the proud Philosophy of Greece and Rome: This, that so stoutly withstood, and finally triumph'd over the fiercest Opposition of the haughty Monarchs and Potentates of the Earth: By this, are Christ's Ways made known in the Earth, and his saving Health among the Nations: And in a Word, By this, are the Eyes of

poor perishing Sinners open'd, and they turned from Darkness unto Light, and from the power of Satan unto God, that they may have an Inheritance among them that are sanctified.

AND *as this sacred Institution, is of last Importance to the Souls of Men; so it is of no less Concernment, that they that take this Office upon 'em, are called of God, as was Aaron. For, as on the one Hand, it has pleased God, by the foolishness of preaching, to save them that believe; so is it an awful Truth on the other Hand, That who-soever entreth not by the Door, into the Sheep-fold; but climbeth up some other way, the same is a Thief, and a Robber. He that appointed the Ministry of Reconciliation, as the ordinary Means of Salvation, That we cannot believe in him, of whom we have not heard, nor hear without a Preacher; has also hedged in this weighty Trust, from the Intrusion of vain Pretenders, that none may Preach, except they be sent.*

HENCE *it appears a most daring Usurpation, for any to assume the Character of Christ's Ambassadors, that have not their Mission from him. And it would therefore be a commendable Zeal, in the High Church Party, to depreciate our Ministry, and to declaim against our Invasion of the sacred Function; if their Arguments were answerable to their Confidence. But for such a small upstart Sect, gravely to attempt, by Arguments a hundred times baffled, to Unchurch all the Protestant World, but themselves; and to nullify all their Ordinan-*

ces; Rather exposes their Bigottry to Contempt, than their Zeal and Charity, to the envy of any thinking Person.

I have no Sollicitude, to find out more of the Author of the Discourse herein impugned, than is discover'd p. 5. by his Jacobite Principles, of Passive Obedience, and Non-resistance: nor should I have esteem'd his Arguments worthy of Notice, were it not for the malign Influence; they may have upon the Laity, for whose Use they were calculated, and into whose Hands, they are so carefully put. But for their sakes, an Antidote was thought Needful.

AN Apology may be justly expected from me, for undertaking a Task, that should have been left to some abler Hand: But I have none but this to make, That I could hear of no other, like to appear in the Cause; and therefore thought it necessary, to hold up the Shield.

IF some Arguments occur in this Dissertation, that have been used before, in the same Controversy, it must be remembred, that Truth is always the same; and that the same Thing must be repeated, to those that are dull of hearing.

I know that this Discourse must stand or fall, by the Reader's Censure; and therefore shall say nothing about it, but that I hope, it won't be wholly Unuseful.



A
D E F E N C E.
O F

Presbyterian Ordination.

THERE is nothing more necessary, in the right managing of Controversy, than a fair stating the Debate; that Men fight not with their own Shadows, nor combat in the Dark: But of this, our Author had especial Reason to be cautious, since he design'd his Discourse for the Use of the *Laitie*, who are not to be startled with such Questions, lest they stumble at the Threshold.

BUT though his Province was to *Harrangue*, and not to *Argue*, on which score, he may be excused from once mentioning the Question in debate; yet it may be of some Service to the clear understanding of this choice Discourse, to know the state of the Controversy. I shall therefore briefly, and fairly state the Case, in these two Propositions.

I. WHETHER *Bishops* are by *Divine Right*, superior to *Presbyters*, and have by vertue of that Superiority, the sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction

II. WHETHER the English *Diocesan Bishops*, that have some scores, and even hundreds of Congregations under their Inspection; with their *lordly Dignity*, and *secular Power*, are the only Scripture *Bishops*, on whom our *ministerial Authority*, and *sacred Administrations*, do necessarily depend.

BOTH of these, should have been most clearly, and fully prov'd in the Affirmative, before our Author had erected his *Trophies*, and concluded his Pamphlet, with such confident Boasting, and pathetic Admonitions.

IT's my present Business to examine his Performance, and if in the Conclusion it appears, that he cannot find one Word in the Bible, to support this *Prelacy*; nor adduce any *Commission* from the King of the Church, for this extensive *Dominion*, or *lordly Dignity*; I hope *Presbyters* may yet deserve, a more favourable Character in the World, than *Intruders into the sacred Function*, or *Invaders of the sacred Service*; as the *Prefacer* of this Discourse, modestly stiles them.

THE first Thing that offers to our Consideration, (after some Account of the noble Views of this Author) is a remarkable piece of *History*, which take in his own Words. p. 2. 'Now the Church, however harassed and disquieted, with a great variety of Disputes and Debates, about Points of Doctrine and Discipline; yet heard little or no Noise made, for above 1400 Years, about this Point of Church Government. One *Aerius* started a Debate, but had so few to second him, that it died with himself, and left his Name on Record among Hereticks. This deserves particular Consideration; for he would doubtless hereby insinuate, that *Diocesan Episcopacy*, universally obtain'd in the Church, for the first fourteen hundred Years; and met with no Opposition, but by *Aerius*, who got nothing by his upstart Opi-

nion, but the infamous Character of *Heretick*. But

1. WOULD it not have been more to his Purpose, to have proved, that *Diocesan Episcopacy* of the modern Stamp, was ever known in the Church for the first three hundred Years, or ever once asserted by any Author of Note, within that Time? This would have been an acceptable Performance; such I dare say, as the World was never yet blessed with. But what occasion of Proof? He no doubt concluded, that the *Laity* were obliged to take his Word.

2. WAS there no Noise about this Point of Church Government, for fourteen hundred Years? Can he have the Front, to publish such a Story to the World! I'm sure, he is not exceedingly well qualified to write upon this Subject, if ignorant, that *Jerom*, one of the most learned, and judicious of all the *Fathers*; did as expressly assert, and vindicate the co-ordinacy of *Bishops* and *Presbyters*, as ever *Acrius* did. Does he not in his Epistle to *Evagrius*, expressly tell us, that the *Apostle* clearly teaches, that *Presbyters* are the same with *Bishops*; and that afterwards, One was elected, and put before the Rest, for the remedy of *Schism*?— And does he not in his Commentary on *Titus*, largely prove the Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*, by the very same Arguments, that are used by the *Presbyterians* now? and plainly affirms, that a *Presbyter* is the same with a *Bishop*; and before that by the *Devil's Instinct*, there were Parties in Religion, and it was said among the People, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, and I of Cephas; the Churches were govern'd, by the common Council of *Presbyters*, &c. And was *Jerom* the only Person among the Ancients, who maintain'd this Doctrine? Don't our Adversaries themselves acknowledge, * That *St. Ambrose*, *Augustine*,

* Dr. Morton's Apol. Cath. Lib. 1. p 118, 119, 120. Dr. Bedel's Letter to *Wadsworth*, in Dr. Burnet's Life of *Bedel*. *Stillingfleet* &c

gustine, Sedulius, Primatius, Crystostom, Theodoret Oecumenius and *Theophilact*, all of 'em asserted the parity of Bishops and Presbyters? Don't the World know, that the *Waldenses*; and *Wicklef* in England, with his Followers, were persecuted for this very Doctrine, before the Period he speaks of? Hear *Medina* the *Jesuite*, on the whole, as cited by *Bellermine* †: ' *Michael Medina* affirms, that *St. Jerom*, was altogether of ' the same Opinion with the *Aerians*, and that *Jerom* ' was not alone in that Heresy; but also *Ambrose, Augustin, Sedulius, Primasius, Crystostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius*, and *Theophilact*: And though these were otherwise very holy Men, and most studious of the ' holy Scriptures, yet the Church condemned their ' Opinion, first in *Aerius*, then in the *Waldenses*, and ' lastly in *John Wicklef*.

I could besides, bring him sufficient *Documents*, from Authors much more Ancient than any of these, to disprove this Assertion: But he not putting the Debate upon this Issue, I shall not spend Time to heap up Authorities; but only enquire, whether *Prelacy* when it did obtain in the Church, was so very grateful, that there was no Noise made about it. Hear *Gregory Nazienzen*, on that Point. ' Would to God, (says ' he) there were no *Prelacy*, no Prerogative of Place, ' no Tyranical Privileges, that by Vertue alone we ' might be discern'd. Now this right and left Hand, ' and middle Rank, these higher and lower Dignities, and this state like Precedence, have caused many

† De Cler. Cap. 15. *Michael Medina* affirmat, Sanctum Hieronymum, idem omnino cum *Aerianis* sensisse, neque solum *Hieronymum* in ea Heresi fuisse; sed etiam *Ambrosium, Augustinum, Sedulium, Primasium, Crystostomum, Theodoretum, Oecumenium, et Theophilactum*, atque ita (inquit *Medina*) isti viri, alioqui Sanctissimi, et sacra Scripturarum consultissimi, quorum tamen Sententiam, ut in *Aerio* deinde in *Waldensibus* nostram in *Salvato Wicklefo*.

my fruitless Conflicts and Bruises, have cast many into the Pit; and carried away Multitudes to the Place of the Goats. And just Cause there was for this Complaint; for does not every one, that has the least Acquaintance with *Ecclesiastical History* know, what dreadful Convulsions, the primitive Churches were thrown into, by the Pride and Emulation of the Clergy, after this *prelatick* Power and Superiority had obtain'd among them: And what tumultuary Uproars, and bloody Massacres, those who would be deem'd the *Ambassadors of the Princes of Peace*, have occasion'd, by their ambitious Pursuit of *Ecclesiastical Dignities*.

AND now let the Reader judge, how agreeable, is the Title of *A modest Proof*, to a Pamphlet which begins, with so bold and notable an Escape.

THUS I'm come to consider the Character of *Aerius*; whose Name, he tells us, is left on Record among Hereticks, for his Opposition to *Prelacy*. But who has recorded him among Hereticks? It was *Epiphanius*, Bishop of *Constantia* in *Cyprus*; a bright Instance of the Pride, Emulation, and Ambition of the Clergy, at that Time; as appears from his haughty and malicious Conduct, towards *Crysoptom*, Bishop of *Constaurinople*;* and a most pitiful, weak, trifling Author: That he *spake Nonsense, on the Subject before us*; † and that he was of acknowledged *Injudiciousness, and Unaccuracy* ||.

BUT was it only for his Opposition to *Prelacy*, that *Aerius* was left on Record among Hereticks? Were there not greater Articles against him than this? *viz.* His condemning of *Lent*, of *Prayers and Sacrifices for the Dead*; and the like Superstitions, then receiv-

* Vid. *Socrat. Eccles. Hist. Lib. 6. Cap. 9. 11.*

† *Reynolds Letter to Sir Francis Knolls*

received in the Church: which *Epiphanius* attempts to justify against him; and thereby proves him more *Orthodox*, than himself.

I should now take my leave of this *Historical Introduction*, were it not for a pleasant Continuation, (or rather Contradiction) of this Story, in the very next Word: 'The goodly Order, (says he) and Government instituted by Christ, stood firm for many Ages, and under it the Church flourished, and the Christian Religion mightily prevail'd, notwithstanding the violent Persecutions of those Times: But at length it was invaded and suppressed, by the Usurpation and Tyranny of the *Roman Papacy*, a secular Power and Dominion was set up, &c. Was there no Noise for fourteen hundred Years, about this Point of Church Government, and yet this Government invaded and suppressed, by the *Usurpation and Tyranny* of the *Roman Papacy*; and a secular Power and Dominion erected upon its Ruines? These Consequences do then, most naturally follow.

1. THAT the Church Government he contends for, is the same with the *Papal Hierarchy*, according to the Pattern of the Church of *Rome*, before the Year of Christ 1400. For until that Period, there was no Noise about this Point of Church Government; nor was it suppressed by the *Roman Papacy*.

2. THAT the *Usurpation and Tyranny of the Roman Papacy*, did not commence till the fifteenth Century. For by this, the Government he propugns, was suppressed, and a secular Power and Dominion set up.

BUT it's time I dismiss this *History*, and consider nother, no less Remarkable; which I find in p. 3. where after a just Lamentation of the unhappy Differences, which the Church at the *Reformation*,

was disturb'd, and the common Enemy diverted; he proceeds to tell us, that 'among other Differences, 'this was one, that while the greatest and most considerable Part of the reformed Church, retain'd the 'ancient Order and Government; and vindicated it 'from the Usurpations, and Encroachments of the 'Papacy; others, (upon what Considerations I shall 'not enquire) were pleas'd to set up a new Form, 'and Model of Policy.

HAVE I quite mistaken this Author all this while, and supposed him pleading for *Prelacy*, whilst it's the Antiquity of the *Presbyterian Government*, which he asserts? Truly this Paragraph, That *the greatest and most considerable Part of the reformed Church, retain'd the ancient Order and Government*, would tempt me to think so; had it been reconcileable to the rest of his Discourse. For does not every Body know, that the *Divine Right of Prelacy*, was a *Doctrine* unknown in all the foreign Churches, at the Time of the *Reformation*? and that they universally maintain'd the Identity of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*? And han't the bitterest of our Adversaries, acknowledged this? Hear one of them, * who after he had propos'd *Calvin*, as the first Founder of the *Presbyterian* Principles, proceeds, 'Thus *Geneva* Lake 'swallowed up the *Episcopal See*; and Church Lands 'were made Secular, which was the White they levelled at. This *Geneva* Bird flew thence to *France*, 'and hatch'd the *Huguenots*, which make about a tenth 'Part of that People, it took Wing also to *Bohemia*, 'and *Germany* High and Low, as the *Palatinate*, the 'Land of *Hesse*, and the confederate Provinces of the 'States of *Holland*, &c. I would therefore advise this Author to read the *Smalcaldick, French, Dutch, Scotch, Helvetian, &c. Confessions of Faith*; with all their Au-

thors of Note upon this Subject, whether Systematical, or Polemical. And he'll find, that he has once (whether willingly or not) spoken Truth; That *the greatest and most considerable Part of the reformed Church, retain'd the ancient, (that is the Presbyterian) Order and Government.* Some of the foreign Churches, did indeed early set up *Superintendents*; but never once dream'd of their Superiority by *Divine Right*, over their Brethren. But even these (as Dr. *Stillingfleet* testifies, *) *stiffly maintain Jerom's Opinion, of the primitive Equality of Gospel Ministers.* And in *Sweden, Denmark, and Norway*, they have nominal *Bishops*. But as for those of *Denmark*, they have their Succession from *Bugenbagius*, who was but a *Presbyter*, and therefore, according to our Authors Scheme, are so far from *Diocesan Bishops*, that they are not so much as *Gospel Ministers*. And they of *Sweden and Norway*, will no better serve his Purpose; for the *Lutheran Religion*, has deprived those of Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction; and these are but *primi inter pares*, says the Author of the *Present State of Europe*, for the Year 1705. p. 134, and 147.

THUS we see, that the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, was not known in the primitive Church; nor once profess'd by any of the foreign Reformers; and I may add, as little believed by the *Church of England* her self, in the beginning of the Reformation.

AND now, since we find our Authors *Confidence*, thus far outgoing his *Modesty* in this; we'll see how he acquits himself, in his following Essays.— And the next thing that offers, worthy of particular Consideration, is his Account of *the Order and Government, instituted by Christ and his Apostles, in the Christian Church.* Which being cast into four Heads, I shall consider them each distinctly.

The

The First HEAD consider'd.

HE first undertakes, *To shew what sacred Offices were instituted by Christ and his Apostles, in the Church.* And the Sum of what he offers on this Head is, That these Offices were threefold: (1.) *The Twelve Apostles, whose Commission (he tells us) we have at large, Mat. X. (2.) The Seventy Disciples, sent forth with the same Commission, and the same Power: But though their Commission was much the same, with what was given to the Apostles, (who had not as yet receiv'd their full Commission) yet it is most certain, that they were two distinct Orders of Gospel Ministers. (3.) Deacons, who were invested with some share of the Apostolick Office, particularly of Preaching and Baptizing, as well as managing the publick Stock of the Church.*

I shall first take Notice of his Instance of the *Twelve Apostles*, and the *Seventy Disciples*. Is it most certain, that they were two distinct Orders of Gospel Ministers? How does this appear? 'The *Twelve* (says 'he, p. 10) were particularly honour'd with the Title of APOSTLES; but the *Seventy*, though they were sent forth immediately by Christ, are no where so called. But what is the meaning of the Word APOSTLE? Does it not signify a *Messenger*, or one Sent? And was it not because they were sent forth, that our Lord gave to the *Twelve*, the Title of APOSTLES? And were not the *Seventy* also said to be APOSTELEIN, Sent. Luk. X. 1, 3? which every Body that understands any Greek, knows to be the Word, from whence APOSTLE is deriv'd. And does not the *Evangelist*, with Allusion to the Mission of the *Twelve*, tell us, fore-cited Luk. X. 1. That after these things, the Lord appointed other *Seventy* also, and SENT them? - Other *Seventy* what? Not Disciples

he did not appoint 'em such now, they were so before: But other *Seventy Apostles*, or *Messengers*, which is the same thing. These indeed, were not sent out as the *Twelve*, to Gospelize the Nations after Christ's Resurrection. And therefore, were never APOSTLES, in the Gospel Dispensation: But for this Temporary Mission, had the same Commission, the same Powers, and the same Denomination with the *Twelve*. If they were not expressly called *Messengers*, they are said to be SENT, which implies it.

BUT there's one invincible Argument yet to be consider'd; and that is, 'When a Vacancy falls in the College of *Apostles*, by the Apostacy of *Judas*, what a solemn Work was there, at the translation of one from the Number of Disciples, (of the *Seventy* I suppose he means) that he might be reckon'd and numbred with the Eleven. But who told him, that *Matthias* was one of the *Seventy*? Is it possible to prove this? If not, it is not put beyond all Question, as he vainly boasts: But on the contrary, it's beyond all Question with me, that instead of being two distinct Orders of *Gospel Ministers*, they were neither of them *Gospel Ministers* at all, by vertue of the Commission he speaks of. For how could they be *Gospel Ministers*, before there was any *Gospel Church*? Certain it is, that they were then under the *Jewish Oeconomy*; and that the Christian Church was founded on Christ's Resurrection, & therefore, could not have *Officers*, before it had a Being. But what need I insist? These Dotages are effectually answer'd, beyond all possibility of Reply, by two of his own Party. Hear what they say.

WHEREAS (saith Dr. *Whitby* *) some compare the *Bishops* to the *Apostles*, the *Seventy* to the *Presbyters*

'ters of the Church; and thence conclude, that
 ' divers Orders in the Ministry, were instituted by
 ' Christ himself. It must be granted, that the An-
 ' cients did believe these two to be divers Orders;
 ' and that those of the *Seventy*, were inferior to the
 ' Order of the *Apostles*; and sometimes they make
 ' the Comparison here mentioned: But then it must
 ' also be granted, that the Comparison will not
 ' strictly hold. For the *Seventy* receiv'd not their
 ' Mission, as *Presbyters* do from *Bishops*; but immedi-
 ' ately from the Lord Christ, as well as the *Apostles*;
 ' and in their first Mission, were plainly sent on the
 ' same Errand, and with the same Power. Thus
 he.

And

Mr. Sage* has more plainly and fully clear'd the
 Cause. ' It is obviously observable (says he) in the
 ' Evangelical Records, that the Christian Church
 ' was not, could not be founded, till our Saviour was
 ' risen; seeing it was to be founded on his Resur-
 ' rection. Our Martyr *Cyprian*, as appears from his
 ' Reasonings on divers Occasions, seems very well to
 ' have known, and very distinctly to have observed,
 ' that the *Apostles* themselves, got not their *Commis-
 ' sion* to be Governours of the Christian Church, till
 ' after the Resurrection; and no Wonder, for this
 ' their Commission is most observably recorded Joh.
 ' XX, 21, 22, 23. No such thing any where recorded,
 ' concerning the *Seventy*. Nothing more certain, than
 ' that *that* Commission which is recorded Luk. X. did
 ' constitute them only *Temporary* Missionaries, and
 ' that for an Errand, that could not possibly be more
 ' than *Temporary*. That *Commission* contains in its
 ' own Bowels, clear Evidences, that it did not In-
 ' stall them, in any standing Office at all, much less,

‘ in any standing Office in the Christian Church ;
 ‘ which was not yet in being when they got it. Could
 ‘ that *Commission* which is recorded Luke X. any
 ‘ more constitute the *Seventy*, standing Officers in the
 ‘ Christian Church, than the like *Commission* recorded
 ‘ Mat. X. could constitute the *Twelve*, Governours
 ‘ of the Christian Church ? But it’s manifest, that the
 ‘ *Commission* recorded Mat. X. did not constitute the
 ‘ *Twelve*, Governours of the Christian Church ; other-
 ‘ wise, what need of a new *Commission* to that pur-
 ‘ pose, after the Resurrection ?

NOW let the Reader judge, whether the disparity of the *Twelve* and *Seventy*, ben’t a very tottering Foundation, to build their *Episcopacy* upon.

BUT it’s Time I take notice of his Third sort of Officers ; and consider whether *Deacons* were invested with some share of the *Apostolick Office*, particularly of *preaching* and *baptizing*. The only way to know what was their Office, and what their Power, is to have recourse to their Original Institution ; we find it in Acts VI. 2, 3. *It is not reason, that we should leave the Word of God, and serve Tables ; therefore Brethren look you out, seven Men of honest Report, full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom, whom we may appoint over this Business.* Is here the least shadow of Authority, for their *preaching* and *baptizing* ? Is not it propos’d as the whole of their Work, to *serve Tables* ? And is it not plainly insinuated, that they had no Authority to *preach* or *baptize*, in that the care of the Church Stock, was committed unto them on purpose, to disentangle those from secular Encumbrances, whose Business this was ; that they might not be forc’d to *leave the Word of God* ? I would therefore, with respect to these *Deacons*, remind this Author of the Apostles Challenge, Rom. X. 15. *How shall they preach, except they be sent ?*

BUT he tells us, p. 12. That *Philip by his preaching, converted Samaria, and initiated the Converts there, into the Christian Profession, by Baptism.* To which it's sufficient Answer, that *Philip was an Evangelist.* Acts XXI. 8. and in that Capacity, *preach'd and baptized.* He insinuates indeed, that he was dignified with that honourable Title, on account of his *preaching and baptizing*: But I'm sure he can't find the least hint in the Bible, to countenance such an Insinuation. But were it granted, that *Deacons* as such, may be *Evangelists*; they must then have Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction: For *the Work of an Evangelist* (saith Dr. Whitby from *Eusebius*) *was this, to lay the Foundations of the Faith in barbarous Nations, to constitute them Pastors, &c.* and so at length, according to his own Scheme, *Deacons* are become superiour to *Presbyters*, and even co-ordinate with the *Apostles* themselves.

THUS we see, that there is not such a difference as he pretends p. 12. *between these Gospel Deacons, and those so named under the Presbyterian Model.* If any of these want *Ordination*, it is in those Congregations, where there is no Church Stock to commit to their Care. And I confess, we are not very fond of ordaining Men to a Work, that we know 'em not furnished to discharge.

HAVING thus undermin'd his Foundation, his Fabrick must necessarily fall. I'll however take the Pains to pull it to pieces, and see what Materials it's made of.

REMARKS on the Second HEAD.

HIS next Business, he tells us p. 13. is, *to make it appear how these Offices were distinguished, and to demonstrate an Imparity among them.* This he essays, by such a tedious and impertinent Harrangue; that dis-

facilius est invenire, quam vincere. It's much more difficult to know what he would be at, than to answer his Arguments, if there be any thing under this Head, which deserves that Name.

BUT that I may make way for a distinct Consideration of what he ought to have prov'd, under this Head, I'll state the Case, particularly.

THE Office of *Apostles*, was either *Extraordinary* and *Temporary*, or *Ordinary* and *Perpetual*. 'Twas by virtue of their *extraordinary* Office, that they were denominated APOSTLES. Which appears from this, that this Title was given them, on Account of their being sent abroad, of their unfixed Charge, and itinerary Circumstances; and therefore, none but these thus *extraordinarily* sent forth, are any where in Scripture, distinguish'd by that Appellation. But even they themselves, as ordinary Officers in the Church, are stiled *Presbyters*. 1 *Ret. V. 1.* and 2 *Job. v. 1.* and 3 *Job. v. 1.*

THAT the *Apostles* were *extraordinary* Officers, he himself grants; and tells us, p. 33. (as such) what their Powers and Gifts were, which take in his own Words. 'Tis acknowledged, that some Things peculiar to the first *Apostles*, were *Extraordinary* and *Temporary*, and expired with their Persons: such as, their having been Eye and Ear Witnesses of Christ's Life, Doctrine, Miracles, Suffering, Resurrection, and Ascension; their having received their Commission immediately from Christ, their being infallible Guides, in delivering the Doctrines of the Gospel, their unlimited Commission to all the World, and Jurisdiction over all Churches, their Power to confer miraculous Gifts on others, to discern Spirits, and to back their Censures with corporal Punishments, as on *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, and *Elimas*. Thus for their *extraordinary* Power. But besides this,

they

they had *ordinary* Functions, common to other *Ministers* of the Gospel; such as Preaching, dispensing the Sacraments, ordaining others to the Work of the Ministry; and governing the Church. These things premised, I come now to consider the Question, which should have been,

WHETHER the *Apostles* in the exercise of their ordinary Function were *Bishops*, superior to *Presbyters*. This he ought to have demonstrated, if he would have done any thing to the Purpose: But what his Performance is, we shall see by the Sequel.

THE first Method he proposes for clearing the Cause, is indeed the only right one, and if duly prosecuted, will infallibly answer. It is to consider their *Commissions*. Let us then consider them.

AS for the first *Commission* he speaks of, I've already shewn, all Discourse upon that Subject to be meer trifling. But true it is, that *when Christ was to leave the Earth, having finished the Work of our Redemption, he gave the Apostles their Commission, and put 'em into the actual Exercise of their Apostolick Power and Office.* Mat. XXVIII. 18, 19, 20. and Joh. XX. 21. Upon this he makes a long *Common-place*, in which he dextrously acquits himself. But it's to be observ'd, that he all along considers the *Apostles*, as acting by virtue of this *Commission*, in the exercise of their *extraordinary* and temporary Power; and therefore, (as we heard before) spends his Breath to no Purpose. Wherefore, since I have no Controversy with him, about their *extraordinary* Power, I shall not waste Time, in animadverting on the Imperfections of his Discourse, on that Subject: But immediately consider, whether he finds any distinct *Commission* for *Presbyters*, whereby their Authority appears subordinate to that of the *Apostles*, in their ordinary Function. He promises p. 18. To consider the *Commission*, given to the other

‘ Order of Church-Officers instituted by Christ, the
 ‘ *Seventy Disciples*, in whom the Order of *Presbyters*,
 ‘ and ordinary *Pastors* and *Teachers*, is suppos’d to be
 ‘ founded. And why does he not produce it? If
 there were any such *Commission*, it is easy to tell us
 where we may find it. But the plain Truth is, had
 he search’d till *Dooms-day* for a *Commission* for *Presbyters*
 distinct from what was given to the *Apostles*, he must
 have return’d with a *Non est inventus*. And *where it*
is not to be had, the King must lose his Right.

THIS Consideration, of the Unity of the *Commis-*
ssion, furnishes me with an Argument, unto which I
 challenge the whole Tribe of the *Prelatists*, to give a
 Rational Answer. It is this.

THEY that are authorized by the same *Commission*,
 have the same Office and Authority.

BUT all the Ministers of the Gospel, (the Apostles
 themselves, in their ordinary Capacity not excepted)
 are authorized by the same *Commission*.

THEREFORE, it necessarily follows, that they have
 all the same Office and Authority.

THE Major of this Argument is self evident; and
 the *Minor* must stand good, until our Adversaries can
 produce two *Commissions*, by which Gospel Ministers
 are authorized to the discharge of their Trust.

ENOUGH has been said already, about the Suc-
 cession of ordinary *Pastors* and *Teachers* to the *Seventy*;
 that there needs no more Words about it.

BUT he has one old thread-bare Argument, to
 prove the Imparity he pleads for, which has been so
 often exploded by those of his own Party, and so of-
 ten refuted by the *Presbyterians*; that the mention-
 ing it at this time of Day, is perfectly ridiculous.
 However, let’s hear what he has to say. ‘ From the
 ‘ Account we have (says he, p. 19, 20.) of them, and
 ‘ their Ministry, in the Sacred History; we can’t

' frame a more just and true Notion of this second
 ' Order of Church Officers, than that they were in-
 ' stituted to be Assistants and Helpers to the Apostles
 ' in the Work of the Gospel. And I know nothing
 ' which will give us a better Reason for this Notion,
 ' than this Consideration; that as it is the same *Lord*
 ' and *Lawgiver*, the same *Master-builder*, who had
 ' framed the Civil and Ecclesiastical Policy among
 ' the Jews, under the Legal Dispensation, who does
 ' erect this new Fabrick of the Gospel Church; so
 ' it's reasonable to expect as great Symmetry and
 ' proportion between the one and the other, as the
 ' Difference of the two Dispensations will allow, &c.
 Unto which he adds Instances of *Aaron* and his Sons,
 install'd in the Priests Office, and the *Levites* subor-
 dinate unto them; and *Moses* in the State, and the
Seventy Elders subordinate unto him.

THIS Argument, (as indeed most others, adduced
 by the Party) was consecrated in the *Jesuits* School*.
 And the *Romanists* have more Reason to be fond of
 it, than our *Episcopalians*; unless they also, are for an
Universal Papacy. For as the *High Priest* in the Jewish
 Church, and *Moses* in the State, were but one; with
 the other Orders under them, so should there be (by
 this Argument) but one *Bishop* (the *Pope*) in the Chri-
 stian Church; to whom all others should be sub-
 jected.

BUT let the Cause be duly weigh'd, and I think
 neither of these can get much by it.

1. THEN, has not our Lord dissolv'd the Jewish
 Polity, chang'd their Priesthood, and erected another
 Constitution? Hear the *Apostle* on this Head, Heb.
 VII. 12. *For the Priesthood being changed, there is made*
of necessity, a change also of the Law.

D

2. THE

2. THE Jewish High Priest was appointed for a particular Function, which no Officer in the Gospel Church, has any Concern with. He was daily (saith the Apostle) to offer up Sacrifices, first for his own Sins, and then for the People. Heb. VII. 27. and to enter into the Tabernacle alone, once every Year, not without Blood; which he offer'd for himself, and the Errors of the People. Heb. IX. 7. Whence it necessarily follows, that the Occasion of the Office ceasing, the Order must be abolished.

3. THE whole Aaronick Priesthood was Typical, and had its full Accomplishment in Christ the Anti-type; it cannot therefore, have any Continuance under the Gospel. The Apostle call's this Legal Priesthood, with all its Appendages, a Shadow of good things to come. Heb. X. 1. And when the Substance is come, the Shadows are done away. But after all,

4. I'm willing to grant, that the same Lord and Law-giver, (to use this Authors Words) and the same Master Builder, who appointed his Worship and publick Adoration in the Jewish Synagogue, has translated the same into the Christian Church; and thereby has maintain'd a great Symmetry and Proportion, between the one and the other. But this is so far from being any Service to the impleaded Hierarchy, that it utterly destroys it. Let us hear what two of the most learned and judicious Divines the Church of England could ever boast of; say on this Subject.

THE first is Dr. Burnet *. Among the Jews, (saith he) he who was the chief of the Synagogue, was called CHAZAN HAKENESETH, The Bishop of the Congregation, and SHELIACH TSIBBOR, The Angel of the Church. And the Christian Church being model'd, as near the Form of the Synagogue, as

as they could be; as they retain'd many of the Rites, so the Form of the Government was continued, and the Names remain'd the same. And again †, 'In the *Synagogues*, there was first one, who was called the *Bishop of the Congregation*; next the three Orderers and Judges of every thing about the *Synagogue*; who were called TSEKENIM, and by the Greeks *Presbuteroi*, or *Gerontes*, that is *Elders*; These order'd and determin'd every thing that concerned the *Synagogue*, or the Persons in it. Next them, were the three PARNASSIN, or *Deacons*, whose Charge was to gather the Collections of the Rich, and distribute them to the Poor. Thus he, than which, nothing can be a more exact Description of the *Presbyterian* Form of Government.

THE second is Dr. *Stillingfleet* *, 'What shew of Reason (says he) can be given, why the Apostles should slight the Constitution of the Jewish Synagogue, which had no dependance on the Jewish Hierarchy, and subsisted not by any Command of the Ceremonial Law? The Work of the Synagogue not belonging to the Priests as such, but as Persons qualified for instructing others. And again ||, 'We are to take Notice, that the Rulers of the Church under the Gospel, do not properly succeed to the Priests and Levites under the Law; whose Office was Ceremonial, and who were not admitted by any solemn Ordination, unto their Function. Thus he, with much more to the same Purpose. By which we see, that if our Author *knows nothing that will give us a better Reason of his Notion*, of the Imparity of Gospel Ministers, than the different Orders in the Jewish Priesthood, (as he tells us p. 19. he does not) we are not like to be much distress'd with his Arguments.

D 2

Thus

† Observat. on the 2 Canon p. 83.

* Iren. p. 257. || ibid. p. 261.

THUS having done with the Consideration of the *Commissions* given to the *Apostles*, and those of a distinct Office and Order, he promises p. 23. ' To shew next, the *Apostles* Authority over other *Pastors* and *Teachers* in the Church, from several Instances of their exercising it, in several Respects and Ways, as is recorded in the sacred History. And he gravely undertakes for eight Pages together, to exemplify this. But what need of this Pains? since it's what was never yet called in Question; nor ever like to be, unless his weak trifling Reasons on the Subject, give occasion for it. But has he brought one single Instance to prove, that the *Apostles* as *Bishops*, in the Exercise of their ordinary Office, were superior to other *Pastors* and *Teachers*? Not one Syllable to this Purpose! But on the contrary, we find him p. 25. mentioning *Timothy*, (a *Bishop*, as he afterwards tells us) as an Instance to prove, that those inferior *Pastors* serv'd with the *Apostles* in the Work of the Gospel, as *Sons* with their *Fathers*. And also bringing in the *Rulers* of the Church among these inferior Orders, p. 29. And what then becomes of the Succession in the *Apostolate*, if his *Bishop Timothy* was inferior to the *Apostles*? Or what becomes of his *Diocesan Episcopacy*, if *Presbyters* were *Rulers* in the Church?

THERE's no need I should longer attend upon his impertinent Discourse on this Subject; I will therefore hasten to some

ANIMADVERSIONS on the third HEAD.

WHICH is to examine, whether any of these Offices were Extraordinary and Temporary; and to prove that they were not: But design'd to be perpetual, and standing in the Church. And this he tells us p. 32. is ' The Hinge, on which the whole Controversy depends;

yea, all the Authority and Obligation of Christ's Institution, as to the present Church. One would think, that we are now in a fair way for compromising all the Controversy between the *Prelatists* and the *Presbyterians*; and of procuring general Releases from both Parties; for he acknowledges, *That the Apostles extraordinary Powers* (as we have heard him before describe them) *are ceased*; and *that it was only the ordinary Power and Authority of the Apostles, which was to serve the Edification, good Order and Government, of the constituted Church in all succeeding Ages*; which he pleads for. And if the perpetual Permanence of the *Apostles ordinary Office*, will satisfy; I'll be Security for all the *Presbyterians* in the Realm, that they shall heartily acknowledge it: And demand no other Terms in order to their Conformity, than this very reasonable one; that the *Episcopalians* shall plead for no other Powers, as belonging to the *Apostles ordinary Function*, but what they can prove from Scripture. But it's well, if this don't prove a Bone of Contention at last; for I find this Author, without the least Shadow of Proof, p. 34. asserting it to be part of their ordinary Office, 'To superintend both Pastors and People, to settle good Constitutions, agreeable to the Word of God, for the orderly and decent Performance of all the Ordinances of Religion, publick Worship, and other Affairs of Discipline, as the Exigence of the Church should require, &c. And if these things be not granted him, all his fine Scheme will come to nothing, and his *elaborate Treatise* may be even used for waste Paper. And yet the *Presbyterians* can by no Means be brought into these Concessions.

I. THEY can't allow, that the *Apostles* as ordinary Officers, were to *superintend both Pastors and People*; because there is not one lisp in the Bible, of

such a *Superintendency* belonging to any ordinary Officer. But on the contrary, the whole Government is committed to *Presbyters*, without any to *superintend* them. See 1 Pet. V. 1, 2. *The Elders who are among you I exhort, who are also an Elder, &c. Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the Oversight (Episcopantes) thereof.* Whence I argue,

IF Presbyters are not only to Feed the Flock of God; but to take the Oversight thereof, or to discharge the Bishops Office over it, as the Original Word signifies. They are under the Superintendency of no ordinary Officer in the Church.

BUT the former is the Words of the Text; and therefore the latter true.

2. NOR can the *Presbyterians* grant, that Christ has left it with any ordinary Officers, to settle any *Constitutions* in his Church. Because (as our Author himself truly tells us p. 39.) *We know what a dreadful Curse is pronounced against them, who either add to, or take away from, the Institutions of Jesus Christ, in the 18 and 19 Verses of the XXII Chap. of the Revelations of St. John.*

BUT if the *Presbyterians* are so incredulous, as not to take his bare Word in this Case, though given with the most positive Air; yet they have such Sparks of good Nature left, as to agree with him in this Conclusion; That *there is nothing more evident, upon the slightest Examination; than that Christ in instituting these Orders and Offices (in their ordinary Exercise) design'd, that they should be standing and unalterable Constitutions in his Church, to continue to the end of the World.* And we will allow him too, the unalterableness of the *Apostolick Office*; if he intends no more, (as he tells us p. 34. he does not) than *their ordinary Power and*

Authority, which was to serve the Edification, good Order and Government of the constituted Church, in all succeeding Ages. But if he means, as it seems he does, that the *Apostolate* (properly speaking) is a standing Order in the Church; here we must part ways, and he must bring very good Arguments to prove it, before he can make me his Profelyte. And whether he has such to offer, I'll now particularly consider.

HIS first Argument is taken from their *Commission*, and the Promise subjoyn'd, *Lo I am with you alway, to the end of the World!* But how could that be, (says he) if their Office was to expire with themselves? How indeed? We must therefore (as he says) understand it as a Promise not to them only; but to their Successors also. But the Question is, What is this Succession, unto which the Promise is made? Is it a Succession in the *Apostolate* only? If so, there is then no *Commission* given, nor Promise made, to any but *Apostles*, and so consequently, there is but one Order of Gospel Ministers in the Church; none but *Apostles*, to discharge any Ministerial Function. But I hope he will allow us enough of these, to *Disciple all Nations, to Baptize and to Teach 'em, whatsoever Christ has commanded.* And I'm sure, the *Presbyterians* will be no loosers by that Bargain, let these *Parochial Apostles* be called *Bishops, Presbyters*, or what else our Author pleases. In a Word, this Argument is so far from establishing an Imparity among the Ministers of the Gospel, that it plainly proves, that there is but one Order in the Church, since the *Commission* is but one; and the Succession to the *Apostles* by vertue of that *Commission*, but one. If *Bishops* be the *Apostles* Successors; there are no *Presbyters* inferior to them. If *Presbyters* be the *Apostles* Successors, there are no *Bishops* superior to them. Let which will be assum'd, the Consequence is the same. Thus we are prepar'd to attend his second Argument

WHICH is taken from 1 Cor. XII. 28. *God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers, after that Miracles, then Gifts of Healing, Helps, Governments, diversities of Tongues.* Whence he triumphs, 'God hath Set,—— even he who settled the Ordinances of Heaven, which none can alter, hath fixed these different Orders in the Church. If this be so, that these Orders are fixed in the Church, these Consequences must necessarily follow.

1. THAT there are not only *Apostles* and *Teachers*; but also *Prophets* distinct from both, fixed in the Church: For these are not only named with the others; but sorted into a Class, distinct from them both. First *Apostles*, SECONDARILY *Prophets*, thirdly *Teachers*. And thus, he who the last Page, would allow us but *One Order of Ministers*, has now furnish'd us with *Three*, and by both spoil'd his own Scheme.

2. IT will also follow, that *Miracles, Gifts of Healing, and diversities of Tongues*, are fixt in the Church, and of perpetual Permanence. This Consequence cannot be evaded, by saying, that *they are not distinct Offices from these, but extraordinary Gifts confer'd on them.* For (to use his own Words) *God hath Set, even he who settled the Ordinances of Heaven, which none can alter, hath as well set Miracles, Gifts of Healing, and diversities of Tongues, as Apostles, Prophets and Teachers.* To say that these are *Extraordinary*, the others not, is to quite destroy his Argument, from God's having SET those in the Church. For the Text assures us, that he hath SET these there also.

HIS third Argument, is taken from Eph. IV. 11, 12, 13. *He gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, some Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, for the edifying the Body of Christ; till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, &c.* Where it is plain, (says he) these Offices were

to continue till the Church should be perfected, fully brought in, and fully advanced; and till it should be beyond all hazard of being seduced; that is to say, until the end of the World. This Text is very agreeable to the former, and the Answer may be the same; that if these Offices are to continue to the end of the World, they are all of 'em to continue so long, and then we shall have four Orders of Church-Officers, besides *Deacons*, when he pleads for but three in all. And were that absurd, and even ridiculous Assertion of his p. 38, granted him, That *these different Designations, dont import different Offices, but different Exercises of the same Office*; yet the Text makes these as permanent as the other. His *Apostles* therefore, must (according to that Notion) be *Prophets*, and *Evangelists*, to the end of the World, as well as *Bishops*. And when we find these fixed *Diocesan Bishops*, whilst such, not only endowed with the Gift of *Prophecy*, but travailing through the World, to *Evangelize* the Nations; we'll allow 'em to be the *Apostles* Successors.

BUT the plain Truth of the Business is, that the *Apostolate* was a Temporary Office, calculated only for the infant State of the Church; and as such, treated of in both these Texts. And the ordinary Office of *Pastor* and *Teacher* only, to continue until we all come in the unity of the Faith. That the *Apostolick* Office was *Extraordinary*, and admitted of no Succession, I thus prove.

I. THE *Apostles* had an extraordinary Call to their Office; and were never brought into it, in an ordinary Way, and therefore when a Successor was appointed to *Judas*, Act. I. they chose him by *Lot*, that the Affair might be left wholly to God's Decision; and did not presume to separate him to the Work, by *Ordination*. Nor indeed, did the *Apostles* ever ordain any, to their own Office and Order. I

lunge the World to produce one Instance of such an Ordination. But on the contrary, it is essential to the Apostolical Character, that they be *Apostles, not of Men, nor by Men; but by Jesus Christ, and God the Father, who raised him from the Dead, Gal. I. 1.*

2. THERE were extraordinary Qualifications necessary to the Apostolick Office. We have them particularly mentioned, when a Successor was to be chosen to *Judas, Acts I. 21, 22. Wherefore of these Men which have companied us, all the time that the Lord Jesus went in and out among us, beginning from the Baptism of John, unto that same Day, that he was taken up from us; must one be ordain'd, to be a Witneß with us, of his Resurrection.* Whence it plainly appears, that none could be admitted into the *Apostolate*, but such as had seen Jesus, both before his Death, and after his Resurrection.

3. THE *Apostles* had an universal and unlimited Commission; and were sent to the remotest Kingdoms, to Gospelize the Infidel Nations. On which account especially, they are distinguish'd by the Title of *APOSTLES*, as we heard before. It is therefore but Nonsense, to talk of *Diocesan Bishops* succeeding them, whose Power is limited.

4. THERE were extraordinary Gifts confer'd on the *Apostles*, to qualify them for the Exercise of their extraordinary Power and Commission; such as the Gifts of Miracles, of Tongues, infallibility of Doctrine, transcendent Efficacy and Energy in Preaching, &c. And as *Spanhemius* truly affirms*, *Every one that was endued with a proper Apostolick Power, had, and could give visible Proof, and ocular Demonstration of these Gifts.* I'll therefore conclude this Argument, with his Challenge to the Pope, with but little Variation. *Let the Bishops*

Bishops w^d did the *Apostles*, declare, that they have the Gifts of *Tongues* divinely infused; let them bring visibly the Gifts of the *Holy Ghost* from Heaven, let 'em work like the *Apostles*, such illustrious Miracles, and then we shall yield, that they have *Apostolick* Authority.

THUS having seen, what Cause of Triumph our Author has on this Subject. I'll leave him to clap his Wings, and crow over the poor baffled *Schismatics*, and proceed to some

REMARKS on his Fourth HEAD.

Which is to shew, who succeed in these Offices, and rightly execute them to this Day.

HE tells us p. 41. That he need but do it, of the Successors to the *Apostles*; for when that is done, the other come in of course. But I enquire, how do they come in? Do they come in at the Door, or climb over the Fold? I'm sure, except they are Successors to the *Apostles*, in their ordinary Office, he can find no Commission in the Bible, to bring them in. However, let us follow him in his own Path.

AFTER a triumphant Narrative of the Feats he has perform'd, under the former Heads; (which I think I have sufficiently animadverted upon already) he proceeds to this Argument:

'EITHER *Bishops* must be the true Successors to the *Apostles*, or else they have no Successors at all; and the *Apostolick* Order and Office is quite extinct; and the Church is totally depriv'd of the prime and chiefest Office, instituted by Christ, for its Edification, good Order, and Government.

THIS Argument I acknowledge, is invincible; and therefore, I must yield the Cause, that *Bishops* are the *Apostles* true Successors; and that none but they have any Powers from the Commission, or any Claim to the

Promise given to the *Apostles*. But then, the Question is, who these *Bishops* are, whether the *Arch-Bishop* of *Canterbury*, and the *Bishop* of *London*, who superintend many hundred Congregations; and none but such: Or whether it be the *Pastor* of each particular Congregation. If the latter be granted, we have no Quarrel with him on this Subject. If the former be supposed, he would have done well to have offered some Proof upon that Head. For though the *Presbyterians* do allow the Succession of *Bishops*, to the *Apostles*; they are not so good humour'd as to grant, what he insinuates p. 44. without the least shadow of Proof; that these *Bishops* are superior to ordinary *Pastors* and *Teachers*; or that they properly succeed to the *Apostolick Office*. But whether we'll allow it or not, he is resolved to stand by the Cause, and defend it if possible. And could he justify what he further offers, as an Argument for his *Episcopal Succession*, he would I confess, bid very fair for it.

IT's evident (says he) also from Scripture, that the *Apostles* in their own Time, did confer on others the *Apostolick Power* and Authority. But how is this evident? He makes it evident to any Man that is resolved to believe it, from the Election of *Matthias* to the *Apostolate*. Their (the *Apostles*) first work (says he p. 45.) was to chuse one to succeed *Judas*; and by the direction of God, *Matthias* is receiv'd into the Number of the *Apostles*. Did the *Apostles* confer on *Matthias*, the *Apostolick Power*? No! it plainly appears that they neither did, nor could do it; in that they so solemnly refer the Cause to God, by a *Lot*, and depend upon his immediate Direction. If they could (as he insinuates) have committed the *Apostolick Office*, into the Hands of other faithful Persons, why did they not ordain *Matthias* to the Charge,

Without referring the Election to God's immediate Decision? or why did they number him among the eleven *Apostles*, without Ordination? The Reason of this plainly is, because this Office was *Extraordinary*, and the Call to it must therefore be so too.

BUT he has more Evidence to produce, well worthy of our most serious Attention! It is this. 'So when *James* the Brother of *John*, is killed by *Herod*, another of that Name, was *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*. And is not this an invincible Argument, to prove, that the *Apostles* (who according to him were all of 'em *Bishops*) did confer upon others, the *Apostolick Power* and Authority, because *James*, who was one of the *Apostles*, was *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*? But he tells us, That this *James*, some will have to be another, than *James* commonly called the less, one of the first *Twelve Apostles*. But who are these some? and why will they have it so? I'm sure no Man living can give a good Reason, why this *James* he speaks of, was not the Son of *Alpheus*, numbred with the *Twelve*. *Mat. X. 3.* And I'm as sure, that there is not one Word in the Bible to support this chimerical Notion, of his *Episcopacy*. And this, I think every body will be convinced of, when they see what is offer'd for the Proof of it. I will therefore give the Reader the Entertainment, of every Word this Author offers, to confirm this Point. And

FIRST he tells us 'Twas he, to whom *St. Peter* (as *Bishop* of *Jerusalem*) notifies, his miraculous Deliverance. *Acts XII. 17.* A most convincing Argument! For we know, *Peter* could not notify his Deliverance, to any but *Bishops*.

HE subjoins, 'Twas he, who presided in the Council of *Jerusalem*. *Acts XV.* But how does that appear? I'm certain, there is not the least lisp of that kind, in the place refer'd to, unless his declaring his Sentence, or Opinion, of the *Affair* debated, be supposed an Evi-

dence of it; and if so, Peter must also be President of that Synod; for he, as well as James, declares his Opinion of the Case before them. But were it granted, that James presided in the Synod at Jerusalem, what will he get by it? Is every Moderator of a Synod a Bishop, in the Sense he pleads for? If so, there are many more Bishops, than he is willing to allow.

THUS we are come to the last Proof, of James's Episcopacy, and that is, *It was He to whom St. Paul made his Address, when he came thither; and he of whom he speaks, in the 19 Verse of the first Chap. of the Epistle to the Galatians, whom he calls an Apostle, and the Lord's Brother.* The Argument stands thus, Paul went in unto James; therefore James was a Bishop. Paul calls him an Apostle, and the Lord's Brother; therefore he was Bishop of Jerusalem. *Risum teneatis amici.* Can Men pretend to found their Faith upon such ridiculous Whimsies, the very mention whereof, is enough to excite Mirth, in the most stigmatick Complexion.

AND now let us see, what more he can offer to make it evident, that the Apostles did in their own time, confer the Apostolick Power on others. Certain it is, (saith he) that Paul and Barnabas, were received in to the Apostolick Office; Paul immediately called thereunto by Christ, at his Conversion; but Barnabas in the ordinary manner, when he received that new Name from the Apostles, which signifies Son of Consolation. I hope he won't pretend, that the Apostles confer'd the Apostolick Power on Paul, since he acknowledges his immediate Call: And the Apostle himself informs us, 1 Cor. XV. 8. That Christ was seen of him, as of one born out of due time. By which it appears, he had that necessary Qualification for the Apostolick Office, a sight of Christ. Though his Vision of Christ, and Commission to his Office, were late, and miraculous, on which account he styles himself an Abor-

Vide. And as to *Barnabas*, does he bring the least hint from Scripture, to prove his *mediate* Separation to the *Apostolate*, though he so confidently asserts it? Did he think, that his bare Word would be taken in this Case, without the least pretence of Proof? Or that it was a sufficient Argument, to prove his *mediate* Call, that he receiv'd a new Name from the Apostles, which signifies Son of Consolation? By a like Argument, this Author may expect to be an *Apostle* himself? he having so famously merited the Name of *Boanerges*, by his Thunder against the Schismatics. But I'm weary of such trifling, and will therefore see, if he can find any thing more to the purpose; when he comes to give Instances of some raised from among the ordinary Pastors, to the *Apostolical*, or *Episcopal* Order.

HIS first Instance is, The most Reverend Father in——, his Grace, *Timothy*, Lord Arch-Bishop of *Ephesus*. Of whom he tells us, p. 47. That Paul actually gave him an *Episcopal* power, over the Church of *Ephesus*, and the *Presbyters* and *Pastors* thereof. To which I Answer:

1. THE Scriptures no where give so much as the Title of *Bishops*, to *Timothy* and *Titus*; and how then came they by that Character? The *Postscripts* do indeed call 'em *Bishops*; but every one conversant in Books, knows, that they are no part of the Canon of Scripture, nor to be found in any ancient Copy of the *New Testament*.

2. *Timothy* was so far from being *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, that it's abundantly evident from Scripture, he never was fixed there at all. Particularly, it's unaccountable, if *Timothy* was there, that *Paul* should make no mention of him, in his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*; as he does in all his other *Epistles* to the Churches, that to the *Galatians* only excepted. It's a sure Evidence, that he was neither *Bishop* there, nor resident there. But let us

take a particular View of his *Peregrinations*, as we find them recorded in the Scriptures; and it will thence plainly appear, that if he was a fixed *Bishop* at any place, he was a pattern of *Nonresidency*. We find him at *Corinth*, when *Paul* wrote from thence, his *Epistle* to the *Romans*. Rom. XVI. 21. He was with *Paul* at *Phillippi*, when he wrote his first *Epistle* to the *Corinthians*. 2 Cor. I. 1. He was with *Paul* at *Rome*, when he wrote his *Epistle* to the *Phillippians* from thence. Phil. II. 19. And also when he wrote his *Epistle* to the *Colossians*. Col. I. 1. He was also his Companion when he wrote both his *Epistles* to the *Thessalonians*; as appears from the first *Verse* of each *Epistle*. We find him likewise invited by the *Apostle* to *Rome*, to be helpful to him in the *Ministry*. 2 Tim. IV. 9, 10, 11. From whence, he intened to take him along with him, to visit the *Churches* of *Judea*. Heb. XIII. 23. To all which I may add, he was a preacher for some considerable time, to the *Corinthians*. 2 Cor. I. 19. And now, would it not make a Man smile, were he never so serious; to hear of a *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, who has the whole World for his *Diocess*; especially, when there is not the least Word in the Scripture, to countenance his having any fixt Charge there. Our *Adversaries* do indeed urge to that purpose, 1 Tim. I. 3. As I besought thee to abide still in *Ephesus*, that thou mightest charge some, that they preach no other *Doctrine*. But the Argument is the quite contrary way. For to what end should the *Apostle* entreat a *Bishop*, to tarry in his own *Diocess*, when he could do no other, without offending God, and neglecting his *Duty*?

3. IT's certain, he was no *Bishop* of *Ephesus*, when the *Apostle Paul* took his last leave of that Church. For then he commits to the *Presbyters* the oversight thereof, and gives 'em a most solemn Charge of the Church, as the proper *Bishop* of it. Acts XX. 17, 28.

And yet this is the last time they ever saw the *Apostle's* Face, as is evident from Verse 25. But it's time I consider, what our Author adduces, to prove this *Episcopacy* of *Timothy*.

HE is instructed (says he) in all the Exercises of the *Episcopal* Power, particularly to command and charge them, (the *Pastors*) that they *preach sound Doctrine*. And han't every *Minister* Authority, as *Christ's Ambassador*, to charge his Brethren as well as others, to be *faithful*?

HE was also (says he) to prescribe *Rules* for publick Worship; particularly that *Prayers* be offered up for all in Authority. That is, he was exhorted, *1 Tim. II. 1, 2. To Supplications, Prayers, and giving of Thanks, for all Men; for Kings, and for all that are in Authority.* Therefore was to prescribe *Rules* for publick Worship. The meaning no doubt is, that he was by his *Episcopal Authority*, to put out a *New Common Prayer Book*; since there is no praying for *Kings, and all in Authority* without.

ANOTHER Instance of his *Episcopal* Power, assign'd by this Author, is, That he was to examine and judge, Persons duly qualified for the *sacred Offices* of the Gospel; and give *Imposition of Hands* to, or to *ordain* none, but such as are found duly qualified, &c. And what Inference would he make from hence? But that *Timothy* had the Power of *Ordination*, which he would have had, were he but a common *Presbyter*. If he would insinuate, that because *Timothy* was admonish'd, to lay *Hands* suddenly on no Man; he had the sole Power of *Ordination*; it's just as much to the purpose, as if he should argue, that he had the sole Power of *exhorting and teaching*, because the *Apostle* charges him, to be *instant, in season, and out of season, in preaching the Word.*

A further Argument of this *Episcopal Authority*, he thus proposes. 'He was to guard diligently against false Doctrines, and seducing Spirits, and to put the Brethren in mind, and command them, that they give not heed to such Doctrines and Seducers. And is not this the Duty of every Gospel Minister, without this superior *Episcopal Authority* ?

HE was also (saith this Author) 'To judge, correct, and confute Offenders, even *Presbyters*, after due Examination, and Conviction. But is there a Word of censuring *Presbyters*, in the Text refer'd to ? He is indeed there warned, *not to receive an Accusation* (or give heed to a slanderous Report) *against an Elder, without two or three Witnesses*. And is it the Prerogative of a *Bishop*, to take up an evil Report ? But were it granted, that he had this Authority, and what further is pleaded for, of promoting such *Deacons* to a higher Degree, as were faithful, and diligent. This will nothing distinguish him from other *Presbyters*; who in concert with others of their Order, might exercise all these Powers. After all, if we allow, (what I'm sure can never be prov'd) that he had a Power over other *Presbyters*, solely vested in his own Person, he was an *Evangelist*, 2 Tim. IV. 5. and as such, was desir'd to tarry a while at *Ephesus*, to regulate Affairs in that infant Church, and give a check to those *Wolves*, which the *Apostle* foresaw Acts XX. 29. would enter there, not sparing the Flock; as well as to direct and assist the newly settled *Pastors*, who wanted the influence of such an extraordinary Person. How vain therefore, is all Argument from such an extraordinary, to an ordinary Church-Officer ?

OUR Author foresaw this *Objection*, and attempts the removal of it, by telling us, p. 49. 'Tis altogether groundless; for we find no such Office of an *Evangelist*, instituted, distinct from that of *Apostle*,

¶ *Presbyter, or Deacon*; but that it was a common Designation to all, who were the first Planters of the Gospel, among *Jews* or *Heathens*. What Doctrine is this? Does not the Apostle plainly tell us, Eph. IV. 11. That our ascended Lord gave to his Church, not only *some Apostles, some Prophets, some Pastors and Teachers*; but *some Evangelists* also? And agreeably, the Ancients always esteem'd *Evangelists* to be extraordinary Officers, distinct from other *Pastors*. Hear what *Eusebius* says of them*. 'They obtaining (says he) the first Step of *Apostolick* Succession; and being as divine Disciples of the chief and principal Men, builded the Churches every where, planted by the *Apostles*.—— Next taking their Journey, fulfilled the Work and Office of *Evangelists*; that is, they preached Christ unto them, that had not yet heard of the Doctrine of Faith; and publish'd earnestly the Doctrine of the holy Gospel. These Men, having planted the Faith in sundry new and strange Places, ordain'd there, other *Pastors*, committing unto them the tillage of the new Ground, and the oversight of such as were lately converted unto the Faith; passing themselves, unto other People and Countries, &c.

THUS I've gone through what he has to offer for the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy*. And now let us hear, how he proves *Titus* to be *Bishop* of *Crete*. 'The like Power and Authority (says he) is confer'd on *Titus*, over the Churches of *Crete*, that he should set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain *Elders*, or *Presbyters* in every *City*; and that he should stop the Mouths of the unruly, who taught things which they ought not; and that he should rebuke them sharply, that they may be sound in the Faith. To which I an-

swer, *Crete* being at this time unsettled with Pastors, the very Errand he was left there upon, was to *ordain Elders in every City*; and these *Elders* so ordain'd, were all of 'em *Bishops*, Tit. I. 6, 7. And therefore, there was no need of his continuance with them, under the Character of a *Bishop*; nor did he tarry long with them, as Dr. *Whitby* not only acknowledges, but proves from *Scripture*. 'As for *Titus*, (says he) he 'was only left at *Crete*, to *ordain Elders in every City*, 'and to set in order the things that were wanting; and 'having done that Work, he had done all that was 'assign'd him in that Station; and therefore, St. *Paul* 'sends for him the very next Year, to *Nicopolis*, Tit. 'III. 12. Thus he, to which nothing need be added, since whatever occurs on this Head, has been particularly answer'd already.

THUS having quit our Hands, of the *Episcopacy* of *Timothy* and *Titus*, his *Hierarchy* has but one Refuge more to fly to, and that is the *Apocaliptick Angels*, who I suspect will also fail him, and not prove his Guardians in this Conflict.

'What has been hitherto observ'd, makes it to me 'very evident, (says he) and I think, may make it to 'any other unprejudiced Person, at least highly probable, that the *Angels* of the seven Churches of the 'lesser *Asia*; were Persons of the *Apostolical* and *Episcopal* Order. For since there was such an Order 'of *Apostles* and *Bishops* instituted by Christ in his 'Church—— who else could these *Angels* be, but 'Officers of this higher Order? In answer to which, I'll endeavour to imitate his Brevity, and waving all other Arguments, to disprove this fond conceit; will only offer plain *Demonstration*, that these *Angels* are (as the Word *Anzel* frequently is) taken in a collective Sense, as including not only the *Ministers* of the Churches; but even the whole Churches themselves. Thus

the *Epistles* are directed, unto the Seven CHURCHES in *Asia*, Rev. I. 4, 11. and always concluded with this *Epiphonema*, *He that hath an Ear to hear, let him hear, what the Spirit saith unto the CHURCHES.* And thus in the *Epistle* to the *Angel* of the Church of *Ephesus*, is there such a Commendation for *Labour and Patience*, such a Complaint of the loss of their first Love, such an Exhortation to *Repentance*, and threatening to remove their *Candlestick* out of its place, as are altogether incompatible to a single Person. And what clears this Case, beyond all possibility of Reply, is the plural Expressions, so frequently applied to these *Angels*. For Instance; When the *Angel* of the Church of *Smyrna*, is exhorted to fear none of these things, &c. it is subjoined; *The Devil shall cast some of YOU, into Prison, that YE may be tried, and YE shall have Tribulation, &c.* Chap. II. Verse 10. Was it some of the *Bishop*, that was to be cast into Prison, and a number of him, to be tried, and to have Tribulation? So likewise Verse 13. *Antipas my faithful Martyr, was slain among YOU, where Satan dwelleth.* Was he slain among the *Bishop*, and had the *Bishop* only, such bad Quarters, where *Satans seat* was? And to the same purpose, Verse 24. *But unto YOU I say, and to the rest in Thyatira.* With several other like Passages, which can by no means agree to a single Person. And how then did it become so very evident to this Author, that these *Angels* were of the *Episcopal Order*? I confess, I can't envy him the Satisfaction he obtains from such Evidence, but will leave him to the fruition of it, while I take a short View of the *History*, with which he concludes his Arguments, and see, whether he has been more happy in this, than in that, with which he began his *Dissertation*.

ALL the Records (saith he) we have of the ancient and primitive Church, do harmoniously attest,

' that this *Order*, and these *Offices* instituted by *Christ*,
 ' were inviolably preserv'd for many Ages, and so po-
 ' sitive are they, as to that prime Office of *Apostles*
 ' and *Bishops*, that they give us particular *Catalogues*
 ' of the *Bishops*, who succeeded the *Apostles*, in go-
 ' vernaing the most famous and principal Churches
 ' in the World. It would have been a needless Toil,
 for this Author to have given his Reader any *Docu-*
ments of this, or to have produc'd one of those an-
 cient *Records*, or so much as one of the *Fathers* of the
 Church, to prove this bold Assertion; for he knows
 that the *Laity* are easily put off with Confidence and
 Assurance. And it is also needless for me, to heap
 up contrary Authorities, against bold and blind Affir-
 mation. I shall therefore only propose to his Con-
 sideration, the Answer of their own Dr. *Stillingfleet* *,
 to these frivolous Pretences. Who observing, that
Eusebius makes it a most hard Matter to know, who
 succeeded the *Apostles*, in the Churches they plan-
 ted; adds, ' Say you so, is it so hard a Matter to find
 ' out, who succeeded the *Apostles*, in the Churches
 ' planted by them, unless it be mentioned in the wri-
 ' tings of *Paul*, what becomes then, of our unquesti-
 ' onable Line of Succession, of the *Bishops* of several
 ' Churches, and the large *Diagrams* made of the *Apos-*
 ' *tolick* Churches, with every one's Name set down in
 ' his Order, as if the writer had been *Clarenceau* to
 ' the *Apostles* themselves? Is it come to this at last,
 ' that we have nothing certain, but what we have
 ' in Scripture? And must then the Tradition of the
 ' Church be our Rule, to interpret *Scripture* by?
 ' An excellent way to find out the Truth doubtless,
 ' to bend the Rule to the crooked Stick. And the
 same Author justly observes †, ' That from such Rea-
 ' sonings

sonings of the Fathers, and their mentioning of Successions of *Bishops*, it can never be prov'd, that *Bishops* were of a higher Order, or had any Power over *Presbyters*; nor that in all places, there was so much as any Difference at all between them; nor that they mean'd ought, save a *Succession of Doctrine*. Thus Dr. *Stillingfleet*, unto which nothing need be added.

I will therefore proceed to consider *Calvin's* Authority, whom he brings for his Voucher in this Case, and would no doubt by this, and several other Quotations from him, have his *Lay Reader* suppose he is wholly on his side. He indeed finds him acknowledging, that the Ancients had *Bishops* and *Arch-Bishops*; and he might have added, *Lectors* and *Acolyths*, for *Calvin* mentions these too among the rest, in the place refer'd to. But why did he not tell us, that according to *Calvin*, 'The *Bishop* had no Dominion over his Colleagues, the *Presbyters*; but was among them as the *Consul* in the *Senate*, to propose Matters, to enquire the Votes, to preside in Counsels, Admonitions, and Exhortations; to direct the Affair by his Authority, and to put in Execution, what was decreed by common Council. And that even this is introduced by *Humane Consent*, is confessed by the Ancients themselves. I say, why did he not inform us of this also? The Reason is obvious, it would quite have spoiled his Argument, and who would be an Evidence against himself?

THUS, I've gone through all his Arguments, for the Proof of the *Jus Divinum* of *Prelacy*; and must submit it to the Readers Judgment, whether any of 'em remain unanswer'd.

HIS next Business is, to propose three *Objections*, against the Doctrine he propugns; and he discovers his Prudence and Caution, in proposing 'em as fa-

vourably as possible to his own Cause, that he might find something to answer. But it would have been kindly done of him, to have allow'd the *Presbyterians*, to state their own *Objections*: And I dare say, if he had undertaken to have given any satisfying Answer to the *Reasons* brought by them, against his *Doctrine*; he would have found Work enough for his Life time. I'll take liberty to propose some few of them, which he may consider at his Leisure.

Arg. 1. IF the Scriptures ascribe, not only a *Community of Names*; but also of *Office and Order*, to *Bishops and Presbyters*; they are necessarily co-ordinate.

BUT the Scriptures do ascribe, a *Community both of Names and Office*, to *Bishop and Presbyter*.

1. THEY ascribe a *Community of Names*, Acts XX. 17, 28. Where those called *Presbyters*, in the 17 Verse, are stiled *Bishops* in the 28. And the same thing appears with meridian Lustre, from *Tit. I. 5, 7*. Where those called *Presbyters* in the 5th Verse, are also denominated *Bishops* in the 7th. And

2. THE Scriptures also ascribe, an *Identity of Offices*, to *Bishops and Presbyters*. Thus *1 Pet. V. 1, 3*. *The Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder, &c. Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the Oversight thereof*. I'm sure, the Consequence is inevitable, that if *Presbyters* are to take the Oversight of the Flock, or as the Original Word signifies, to discharge the *Bishops Office* over it; there is a *Community of Order and Office*, as well as of *Name*, between *Bishop and Presbyter*, which was the thing to be proved.

Arg. 2. IF there be no *Gospel Ministers* in a regularly constituted Church, but *Bishops*; then *Bishop and Presbyter*, must be the same *Order and Office*.

BUT, *there are no Gospel Ministers in a regularly constituted Church, but Bishops.* As is abundantly evident, from Phil. I. 1. *Paul and Timotheus the Servants of Jesus Christ, to all the Saints in Christ Jesus, which are at Phillippi, with the Bishops, and Deacons.* From which Text, we not only find *Bishops and Deacons* all the Officers belonging to the Church of Phillippi; but it also appears, that there was a plurality of *Bishops* in that Church; and that they were therefore such *Bishops*, as would make but a very *whiggish Figure*, in our Times.

Arg. 3. *IF Presbyters are the only ordinary Ministers of the Gospel, given unto the Church by our ascended Lord, for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, and for the edifying the Body of Christ; then Bishops and Presbyters are co-ordinate.*

BUT that *Presbyters are the only ordinary Ministers of the Gospel, given unto the Church by our ascended Lord*, appears true, from Eph. IV. 11, 12. Where *Pastors and Teachers* are enumerated, as the only ordinary Gospel Ministers. And therefore the Consequence is undeniable, that there are no *Bishops* given by Christ to the Church, distinct from these *Pastors and Teachers*. Enough has been said already, to satisfy any Man, that won't shut his Eyes against clearest Convictions, that the Offices first enumerated in this Text, were *Extraordinary and Temporary*. I need therefore take no Notice of that *Objection* now.

Arg. 4. *IF Presbyters have power of Ordination; Bishops and Presbyters are co-ordinate.*

BUT that *Presbyters have power of Ordination*, is most undeniably prov'd, from 1 Tim. IV. 14. *Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery.* Our Author raises two mean and trivial *Objections*, against

the pertinency of this Text, to the Purpose for which it's adduced. The first is, that *the Presbytery is not to be understood of the Assembly, or Consistory of Presbyters; but of the Munus, or Office it self.* Very pretty! Then *Timothy was ordain'd by the laying on of the Hands of the Office of a Presbyter.* The first Office I presume, that ever had Hands. His second *Objection* is, that *the Presbytery did but concur and assist, at the Ordination of Timothy, as is evident, from 2 Tim. I. 16. Where the Apostle says, this Gift was confer'd on him, by laying on of his Hands.* But does not the Text expressly say, that he received this Gift by *the imposition of the Hands of the Presbytery?* And I know of no Consequence, that can be drawn from the *Apostle's* joyning in this *Ordination*, but this; that he was himself a *Presbyter*, and therefore not a *Bishop* of the modern Stamp. Which brings me to

Arg. 5. IF *the Apostles themselves, as ordinary Ministers of the Gospel, were Presbyters; then Bishops are not Superior to Presbyters.*

BUT *the Apostles themselves, as ordinary Gospel Ministers, were Presbyters.* Thus 1 Pet. V. 1. *The Elders which are among you, I exhort, who am also an Elder.* 2 Joh. 1. *The Elder, unto the Elect Lady.* And 3 Joh. 1. *The Elder, unto the well beloved Gaius*

Arg. 6. IF *there be no mention of Bishops superior to Presbyters, in the whole Book of God; then Bishops and Presbyters are co-ordinate.*

BUT *I challenge the World to shew any mention, of Bishops Superior to Presbyters, in the Book of God.*

IT *is therefore a just Conclusion, that there is no such thing.* Since it can't be found in the *sacred Records*; especially, since the Word *Bishop* no where occurs in the *New Testament*, but in direct *Opposition to Pre-*

BUT whither do I run? It's high time to consider, that my Province is to be a *Respondent*, and not an *Opponent*; I will therefore only bespeak my Readers Patience, while I just propose two or three *Scruples*, with respect to the *Modern Bishops*, which I can by no means get rid of. Hoping this Author will be so charitable, as to resolve 'em in his next.

1. **THE** first is, How the *Ambassadors* of our *lowly Jesus*, and the Successors of his humble self-denying *Apostles*, came by a *Lordly Dignity*, when expressly discharg'd from being *Lords over Gods Heritage*. 1 Pet. V. 3.

2. **HOW** *Bishops* came by secular Business and Authority, when expressly requir'd to *give themselves wholly to the Work of their Ministry*. 1 Tim. IV. 15.

3. **WHETHER** those *Bishops* that are found so very seldom in the *Pulpit*, are the proper Successors to *Timothy*, who was so strictly charg'd, *To preach the Word, be instant, in Season, and out of Season*. 2 Tim. IV. 2.

CONCLUSION.

AND now, having finish'd my Remarks upon this Pamphlet, I shall only add by way of *Conclusion*, a short *Expostulation* with the *High-Church Party*.

WHOSE Interest Gentlemen, do you think you are driving on; while you are not only *damning* almost all the *Protestant Churches*, for want of a *regular Ministry*; but what in you lies, bringing a *Contempt* upon the Persons, and a *Blast* upon the Labours, of so many of Christs *faithful Servants*? Is it a light thing, to wound the Consciences of the *weak*, to strengthen the Infidelity of the *carnal Libertine*, and so give such matter of Triumph to the *Papists*, by rendring the very *Baptisms*, and all other sacred Institutions in most re-

formed Churches, matter of Question and Debate; and even sapping the Reformation, at the very Root? Would not Modesty oblige you to question your Arguments, since level'd against so considerable a Part of Christ's Mystical Body; so often refuted by the Presbyterians, and all of 'em condemn'd, by some or other of the most eminent of your own Party? Is not the condemning of Presbyterian Ordination, an egregious Reflection upon the Legislature of the Nation, who have establish'd Presbytery in North Britain? Nay, is it not an equal Reflection upon the Fidelity of our Blessed Saviour, that he should leave so great a Part of his Church, without either Ministry or Ordinances? Do you think that our Lord Jesus Christ will disown his faithful Servants, in the Day of his Kingdom, for their want of external State and Grandeur, and for not submitting to a Government, whereof there is not one Word in the Scriptures?

TRULY Gentlemen, some small Allay of Charity in your Principles, would render 'em nothing less amiable, to the Protestant World; who maugre all the Anathema's of Rome, or Imputations of Schism from HIGH-CHURCH, will suppose, that "The Opinion which wants Charity, is not from God, but that the Error is of the damning side".

OUR Comfort is, that we are not to stand or fall, by your Judgment; but can cheerfully go on in our Work, with a refreshing Expectation, that when the chief Shepherd shall appear, we shall receive the promised Crown of Glory, that fadeth not away.

20 JY 63

F I N I S.