

24. And how is this man for Conformity, by which they subscribe assent to the certain salvation of Infants, so dying without Confirmation; and ordain that the Lords Supper be not Administred to any till they are ready to be Confirmed, by learning the Catechism, and recognizing the Covenant? &c.

25. Doth he not make the chief Bishops and Reformers of the Church of *England*, to be the promoters of the Doctrine which he accounteth so damnable, when Dr. *Stillington* in his *Irenicon* recites the words of *Cranmer*, and others of them, at a Consultation, down-right against not only the necessity of his uninterrupted succession, but also even of Episcopal Ordination it self? And I have elsewhere cited about Fourteen of them, for the validity of Ordination without Bishops: And Dr. *Stillington*, Bishop *Edw. Reignolds*, and many more, held that no Form of Government was of Divine determination. Did all these plead for damning Schism, against all title to salvation?

26. And what could more directly contradict the main tenor of the Gospel, which tells us of the saving power of the Word Preached, how it converteth souls, and promiseth salvation to all that truly believe and repent? Inasmuch that *Paul* thanks God that he baptized few of the *Corinthians*, because God sent him not to baptize, but to Preach the Gospel?

27. But his Doctrine feigneth, that God will damn them that truly believe, repent, love God, forsake sin, for want of the Sacrament: or else that the Word converteth none, but only Sacraments convert men.

28. And then it will follow, that none but unbelievers, impenitent wicked men should be first admitted to the Sacrament; for if that only converteth, then it is only the unconverted that must first be received to it.

29. When all's done, he doth but contradict his end; for it's hard to find a National Episcopacy on earth, which imposeth no unlawful thing on Ministers or people: And with all such he speaketh not for our Communion.

30. Either Ordination, and Collation of Church-power, must be given by Superiors, or by Equals: if by Equals, why may not Presbyters make Presbyters? If by Superiors, then who shall give the Pope his Power? Or if you think any other be the highest, who makes them such? Who giveth the Archbishop of *Canterbury* his Power?

31. In short, as far as I can understand, these men deny all Covenant-right to salvation to all men living, and all true Sacraments and Church-Communion, or at least, all knowledg of any such thing; seeing, as it is certain, that in most Churches such Ordination as they describe, hath not had an uninterrupted succession, so no man is sure that any one Church or man hath had such. And they that silence us for not subscribing, declaring and swearing obedience to our Diocesans, and other Ordinaries, are bold men, if they dare swear themselves, that they are true Bishops, and have any Authority to rule and command us, by an uninterrupted succession of a Canonical Episcopal Ordination down from the Apostles.

But I have already in my Book of Concord, Part 3. Chap. 9. opened so many palpable, and pernicious absurdities, and ill consequences of Mr. Dodwell's Doctrine, which he dare not undertake to answer, but sily passeth by, that I must expect the Reader will there peruse them, who will judg uprightly between him and me; and therefore will hear what both have said. And those that will judg falsly upon partial trust, to save themselves the labour of tryal, are out of the reach of ordinary means to be saved from deceivers.

CHAP. IV.

My words of Gods Collation of Ministerial Authority, Vindicated from the forgeries and fallacies of Mr. Dodwell.

§. 1. CHRIST hath taught me to judg of Prophets, or Teachers, by their *fruits* more than by their *cloathing*, Mat. 7. And the fruits which are of God, are those which express the Divine Nature and Image, viz. holy Light and Truth, holy Love, and holy Life and Practice, and the promoting of these in the world.

And Christ hath taught me, that the Devil is, 1. Against holy Light and Truth, the Prince of Darkness, and a Lyar, and the Father of Lyes. 2. Against holy Love, accusing, slandering, and

and rendring as odious the servants and ways of Christ. 3. Against holy, righteous, and sober *living*; and an opposer of it, and a persecutor and murderer of the Saints.

And those that are likest Satan in these three parts of his Image, and whose works are more certainly the works of these three Diabolical Principles, I am taught by Christ to judg of by their fruits. So much as there is in Mr. *Dodwell's* labours, of holy *Truth*, holy *Love*, and helps to *holy living*, so much sure is of God. But so much as there is in his, or any of his Parties cause, of *deceit and falshood*, and defence of *ignorance*, so much as there is of *Malignity*, *Calumny*, or *making odious* the servants of Christ; so much as there is of *cruelty and destruction*, and *silencing faithful Ministers*, and *promoting ungodliness*, by upholding its defences, I am obliged to resist, as being from him, against whom in my baptismal Covenant I was engaged.

¶ 2. He giveth his Reader the sum of my doctrine in this point, p. 29, &c. a chain of forgeries, or putid falshoods. Either he knew that he wrote falsely, or he did not; if yea, then it seems he thinks that God or his Church needed his lyes: if not, how unfit is he to write against what he understandeth not? But what made him devise a frame of his own words of above six pages, to express my words by, if he meant not to deceive those that would believe his writing without reading mine?

¶ 3. And whether it be from the Lord of love, or the enemy of love, that he goeth so far to the unchurching and damning of so many of the Reformed Churches, besides the Churches of the Southern and Eastern parts of the world (if not of all Churches on earth) let the sons of Love consider.

¶ 4. And whether his endeavours to persuade all the *Nonconformists* to give over preaching Christs Gospel, and all publick Worship of God, till they can conscionably conform, and his reasonings for that frame that hath long excluded true discipline, and sheltered ignorance and ungodliness, be of God, and all his copious discourses to that end, are to save souls, or to starve and murder them, I leave to mens impartial trial.

¶ 5. I so often and fully repeated my judgment of the Calling of the Ministry, as leaveth his Forgeries inexcusable. The sum is this.

1. There is no power but of God. 2. Gods universal Laws are the prime Laws, and the only universal Laws of the Church or world.

3. In

3. In his Laws God hath established or instituted the work and the *species* of that Ecclesiastical Ministry which he will have to teach and guide his Church to the end of the world. And there- in signified his owning of them as sent by him, and promised them his help and blessing. 4. In that Law he hath told us what men they are that he will thus own and bless, and described the *Essentials* and the *Integrals* of their *Receptive* disposition or qualificati- ons. 5. He hath in that Law told us who shall be the tryers and judgers of the personal qualifications; and that *ordinis gratia*, or- dinarily their approbation, choice, or consent, shall be a relative part of their Receptive qualification. 6. God himself giveth all the personal qualifications. 7. He is ready to help the appro- vers and chusers to discern all these, and to judg aright of them. 8. The person being thus made a capable Recipient by personal qualifications and relative (due Approbation, Election and Con- sent) God's Donation or Law doth give him *Right*, and *oblige* him to the office-work. And the Electors, Approvers, and Contenters, are none of the proper efficient Donors or causes of this *right* and *obligation*, but only efficient causes of his relative receptive capaci- ty. 9. That therefore the *right* and *obligation* is immediately from Gods Law by resultancy, as the established medium of Gods con- veyance; but not immediately without any means of his recep- tively, to make him *materiam dispositam*. 10. That all this is true both of Sovereign Civil Power, and of Church-power in Bishops and Pastors. 11. That yet besides Approbation and Election, God hath for the publick notice and order of the Church, appointed a Regular Ministerial Investiture, by which the Approved shall be solemnly put into possession (as Kings are crowned, and Ministers instituted): and *Ordination* usually containeth both the approba- tion, part of the election, and the investiture. 12. But this Inve- stiture being but a Ministerial delivery of possesion, proveth not the Investor to be any Donor of the Power to the *King*, or to the Bishop or Pastor. 13. Nor is it necessary save *ordinis gratia*, and *in foro ecclesie*, to avoid intrusion and confusion; but not when it is set against the end, or the end may and must be sought without it. 14. Who it is that hath the power of this Ordination (Ap- probation and Investiture) is much of the controversie of these times: some say it is the Magistrate: but those that say it is the bishops, are not agreed what species of bishops it is; whether the chief Pastors of each particular Parish true Church, or only a Dio- cesan

cesan that is the sole bishop of many parishes that are no true Churches; or only Diocefans that are Archbishops over many true Parish-churches and bishops. 15. But the *Fundamentum juris* being Christs Statute-Law or Grant, and all that is left to man being but *qualitatively* or *relatively* to make the person an immediately capable Recipient, and ministerially invest him; therefore it follows, that if at *Alexandria, Antioch, Jerusalem, Cesarea, Constantinople, London*, all the old bishops were dead or hereticks, a just title may be restored without the ordination of one that had successive canonical ordination; because there needeth no efficient donor but Christ and his Law, and the receptive capacity may be without such ordination where it is not to be had (as among Papists that will not ordain one on lawful terms, &c.) for Order itself is but for the *thing ordered*, and not against it: And *I will have mercy and not sacrifice* (morals before rituals); and *all power is to edification*, &c. are certain rules. And God never made men judges *in partem utram libet*, whether there shall be Churches, and Pastors, and Worship, or none; or whether there shall be Civil Government or none; no, nor of what the *species* the Church-Offices shall be. 16. I use to explain this by many expository, similitudes. 1. If the Laws of God authorize Sovereignty, and the Constitution of the Kingdom say it shall be Monarchy; were it Elective, the Electors are not Efficient of power, but determiners of the Recipient: And if it be Hereditary or Elective, the Investors by coronation, are no efficient of the power; but Ministerial deliverers of possession, and that but necessary *ad ordinem*, and not *ad esse potestatis*.

2. If the King by a Charter to the University, state the power of the Chancellor, Vicechancellor, Proctors, and all the Masters of Colledges, and then tell them who shall be capable, and how chosen, and how invested; here his power is immediately from the Kings Charter, as the efficient Instrument; and all that others do is but to determine of the Recipient, and invest him.

3. So it is as to the power of the Lord Mayor of *London*, and the Mayors and Bailiffs of all Corporations.

4. So it is in the essential power of the Husband over the Wife; the woman chuseth who shall have it; and the Parson that marrieth them, investeth him in it; but God only is the efficient donor of his Law.

17. Therefore it is not in the power of the Electors, Approvers, or Investors, to alter any of the Power established by God. If both the woman and the Priest say, that the man shall be her Husband, but shall have no government of her, it is a nullity; Gods Law shall stand. If the City and the Recorder say, You shall be Lord Mayor, but not have all the power given by the Kings Charter, its vain, and he shall have all that the Charter giveth him. If the *A Bp.* crown the King, and say, You shall be King, but not have all the power stated by the *Constitution* on the King, this depriveth not the King of his power, (unless he give away that which God hath not stated on him, but men) so if an Ordaining Prelate, Patron, or Parish say, *This is a true Parish Church, and we choose, and Ordain you the true Pastor of it, but you shall have but part of the true Pastoral Power stablished on the office by God,* it's null: Gods Institution shall be the measure of his power.

18. But I confess, that if God had left Church-Officers as much to the will of men as he hath done the Civil, the case had been otherwise; for Monarchy, Aristocracy, and Democracy, are all lawful: And the King, or other supreme power may make new *Species* of Judges, and Magistrates, and Officers, and alter them as they see cause. And it would have been so in the Church, if as the *Italians* at *Trent* would have carried it, Christ had immediately Instituted only the Papacy, and left it to the Pope to make Bishops, and to Bishops to make Priests: And yet I would not wrong the worst. I cannot say, that they would have empowered the Pope to change the *Species* of Priests or Bishops. But God hath fixed the *Species*, by making a settled Law for all the work, and all the *Authority* to do it, though Accidentals may be altered in work and Office.

§. 6. This is the clear state of my assertions, which how grossly Mr. *Dodwell* hath falsified in his forged description, I will not stay to open.

But it is a great stress and fabrick that he layeth on the contrary supposition, that his *Species* of Bishops are the givers of the Powers, and so we can have no other, or more than they are willing to give us: And let him that thinks he spoke a sentence of truth and sense, to prove it, enjoy his error. I would quickly prove the contrary to him, if I knew what he denieth.

§. 7. I. If he deny that God hath Instituted the Office of the sacred Ministry, and Pastorship in his Law, 1. The Scripture will shame him to all that believe, and understand it. 2. And if it be not divinely established, men may alter it; and what is all this stir about, to keep up their Domination?

§. 8. II. If he think that God hath only Instituted Teachers, or Rectors, *in genere*, but not in *Specie*, then I give him the same answer as before. Scripture will shame him, and men may make new *Species* of Church-Pastors, and unmake, or alter them; and how many, or how oft, who knows? And who be the men that have this Office-changing-power, that we may know whether, and how far, and how long we are bound to obey them?

§. 9. III. If he think that Gods Law hath not described the Essential Qualifications of the Recipient, then Prelates may make Pastors of *Infidels*, *Mahometans*, *Bedlams*, or *Blasphemers*, if not of *Horses* or *Dogs*.

§. 10. IV. If he think that Gods Law hath determined of no way of *Election*, *Approbation*, or *judging* who is capable, then every man may make himself a Bishop or Priest, and the *Turk* may make Bishops for Christians, or a company of Lay-enemies and persecutors may do it; and then the Bishops Judgment and Ordination will have no Divine Authority.

§. 11. V. If when the Recipient is duly qualified, and chosen, and capable, he does not think that Gods Law, or Grant, is a sufficient signification of his Donative will, and a *fundamentum juris*, and an *obliging* instrument, 1. He must deny the very nature and force of Gods Law, and Grant. And 2. He maketh it less effective than the Laws, Charters, and Donations of men are; For which he cannot have the least shew of true reason.

§. 12. VI.

§. 12. VI. Can he devise any other sort of power in the Ordainers, than I have named? What is it? If he say, that *they give the Office-power*; I ask, Is the controversie about the word [*Give*] or the Act? If that which I have named be called *giving*, let him use his liberty, and call it how he will. 1. But as to the *Thing*, what is it more than I have described? It is God, and not man that made the Office *in genere & specie*. Did our Bishops make the universal Law, which stablisheth the Office in the world? 2. And the Bishop never *had* that power, and therefore cannot give that which he had not: It's Dr. *Hammond's* reason against Presbyters ordaining, *Nemo dat quod non habet*. The word *Office* or *Power* and *Duty*, signifieth an *Accident*, which cannot *transfire a subjecto in subjectum*. The Ordainers have their *own power*, but they have not another mans. 3. Do they give it as Masters and Owners, or only as the Donors Ministers? No doubt they will say, as his Ministers. And do I need to prove to Mr. *Dodwell*, that servants are not the Donors, and *give not their own*, but *deliver their Masters*? Stewards themselves are but entrusted with the performance of their Masters will, in delivering his Goods as he requireth them.

§. 13. And this is so evident a truth, that the Papists themselves, who would fain have all power flow from the Pope, are yet forced to plead for it, (as you may see in *W. Johnson's*, alias *Terret's* answer to my first) because else they cannot defend the Papal Power. For the Pope hath been sometimes chosen by the *Roman* people, sometime by the *Roman* Presbyters, sometimes by people and Presbyters, sometime by the *Italian* Bishops, sometimes by Emperors, and now by Cardinals; and none of all these were Popes, nor had Papal power; and if they were the givers, must give what they never had: Whereupon the Papists are forc't to grant that the Electors do but determine who shall be the Recipient, but that the power floweth to him immediately from Gods Law or Institution.

§. 14. And the Prelatists must needs say the same, or else grant, that Inferiours, that never had Superior power, may yet give it others; for how else shall the supreme Ecclesiastical power, in every National Church, be given? If it be in a Primate, or a

Synod, those that have not the supreme power must give it; for there is none above them, or equal to do it: And so Archbishops are chosen, and Councils called.

§. 15. And thus almost all Societies, by contract, are formed. *e. g.* The King giveth Commission to several men to List voluntary Souldiers, and be their Captains, and command them: Every Souldier chooseth his own Captain, and thereby subjecteth himself to him; but it is not by *giving* him his power, for that *floweth* immediately from the Kings Commission; but by making himself a subject to it, and so making the Captain Relatively, a Recipient of power from God, and the King, over this particular man; for the Soldiers have no governing-power to give, nor are superiors to their Captain.

§. 16. And thus Servants improperly only make men their Masters, not by giving them a Domestick Ruling-power (which they never had themselves), but by making themselves the Correlate Subjects, and so putting their Masters into the Relation, to which Gods Law immediately giveth the Ruling-power. All the power is from God: and God doth not first give it the Servant, Souldier, &c. to give the Master, or Captain, but the *Servants*, or *Souldiers consent* is, a *Causa sine qua non*, *dispositiva Recipientis*, to make the Receiver capable of it from God.

§. 17. And indeed all Kings and Sovereigns thus hold their Sovereignty from God. Though God hath not made the form, *in Specie*, necessary; all power is of God, and the Sovereignty from him, by no mediate Efficient below his Law: It's a fallshood in politicks to say, that the people, as such, efficiently give the Sovereign his power, and that he is *universis minor* in Authority, though he is not *universis melior*; and therefore their *common good* is more than his, the *finis regiminis*. Nor is it true, that *Richard Hooker* saith; that in defect of Heirs it escheateth to the people; but only that it belongeth to the people to choose a new Recipient, to whom the power shall flow from Gods Law, and not from them. I do not think that the King of *France*, *Spain*, or *England*, will believe that their power is given efficiently by, and floweth from their People, Parliaments, or the

the Prelate that Crowneth them. And the case is evidently the same as to the Ministry.

§. 18. And the *French* Papists (by some called Protestants), who are for the Ecclesiastical Sovereignty of General Councils above the Pope, do not believe that the Pope giveth them their power, though he may call them: But whoever calleth them, or chooseth them, they suppose that God only giveth them their power.

§. 19. And in all these cases, it is notorious, that an interruption of due Election and Investiture, hindereth not the restoration of interrupted power. If the Law say, *whoever is thus and thus chosen to be Lord Chancellor, Lord Chief Justice, Lord Admiral, &c. shall have such, and such power, and be thus, and thus invested in the place*, if there were an intercession of an hundred years, the next person, so chosen, will from the Law immediately receive his power. And the Investiture is but for publick Order, and the Investors regular succession (no nor the act it self), never necessary, *ad esse*, where it cannot be had, as I proved against Mr. D. in my Book of *Concord*. The Archbishops succession that Crowneth him, is not necessary to the power of the King.

§. 20. And *obligation* to the Office-work, is as essential to the *Officer*, as is the power to do it: And it is only the Governours that lay on another an *obligation to duty* (except what by contract a man layeth on himself): and none are the obliging Governours of the highest Powers, Civil or Ecclesiastical, but God; therefore theirs must flow only from God. Therefore the thing is not unusual. And if Bishops were as much superior to Parish-Pastors, as the Lord Chancellor is to a Constable, yet they were but Governours of them, *in tantum quoad exercitum*, and not Donors of their power: The Constables power is immediately from the Sovereigns Law, and so is the Ministers from Christ; for he is the only universal Sovereign.

§. 21. Mr. Dodwell saith, *These are bare similes.*

Ans. These are plain explications of the conveyance of power from the Sovereign of all.

He saith, *That the power is not properly given by the Ordainer; is but begged by me.*

Ans. A begging affirmer may easily write Books at that rate.

But saith he, *They cannot give an instance from humane Charters, where the acts of men, not invested, are valid in Law.*

Ans. 1. Will you tell the King so to his face, that before his Coronation no act is valid that he doth? 2. No doubt but (as publick Matrimony after secret Marriage is necessary, *in foro civili ordinis gratia*, where it may be had, and yet when it was done by a Justice, without a Priest; yea, or by the persons publick contract only, it was no nullity, no, nor *coram Deo* before, so) to regular order, the most orderly Investiture is needful, but not *ad esse*, much less that all the Investors circumstances also, and all his predecessors, have been regular. 3. Investing here, is the act of a servant only, solemnizing the entrance, or delivery of possession: But such a servant is not the Owner, and Donor of the power. 4. The Papiests and Protestants confess that the power of Investing is so humane and mutable, that it cannot be necessary, *ad esse potestatis*. I told you how oft the power of choosing and investing Popes hath been changed. And the old Canons make the Act of three Bishops necessary to Invest, or consecrate one. But did God determine of three? Or can you prove one Bishops Ordination a Nullity? 5. In the Civil State some Officers are made without any Investiture (as Constables, Headboroughs, Church Wardens and others), and some the Charter imposeth Investiture on: But whether if Records, Stewards, Town Clerks, that by Charter are to Invest, be dead, or refuse their Act, the Mayor, Bayliff, or other Officers be therefore none, and the Government be dead, let Lawyers tell you. 6. Sure I am that *Hen. 4.* and the rest of the *Germanic* Emperors, who fought, and strove so long against *Hildebrand*, and his Adherents, for the Investing-power, were no Bishops; and all the Councils of Bishops, who stood for the Emperors, never took them for Bishops; and therefore thought not that Investing was an Act proper to Episcopal-power. 7. I have before proved, that ancient Writers, and Papiests, and many Protestants agree, that Baptism is valid administered

by

by Lay-men, that I say not women. 8. Mr. *Dodwell*, self-condemningly saith, that a presumptuous Ordination of the Priest serves to the validity of Sacraments, though indeed he were not Ordained; and that God is bound to make such Acts to the people good. 9. Mr. *D.* must beg belief instead of proving it, if he tell us, that the stated teaching of Gods Word to a Church, is not as truly the work of the Pastor, as is the Admistering the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lords Supper. It is one of the principal of the Jesuits jugglings, to make the people think, that till they can prove their Teachers the rightly Ordained Ministers of Christ, they are not bound to hear them, or believe them. Our Parents (mostly) were never Ordained Bishops, or Priests: Must not Children therefore hear them, and believe them (*sic humana*)? And hath not that God, who appointed Parents to teach his Law to their children, lying down, and rising up, and to educate them in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, thereby signified, that Parents instruction is the first ordinary means appointed by God for the conveying of saving knowledg, and faith? And if the help of Parents, though unordained, be Gods ordinary means of the first saving faith, shall We say with such men as Mr. *Dodwell*, that we have no Covenant right to salvation, till we have the Sacrament from the hand of a Minister that had a regular Ordination, uninterruptedly down from the Apostles? 10. Did the Three hundred, *Act. 2.* and the Eunuch, *Act. 8.* refuse Baptism till they were satisfied by proof, that the Baptizers were rightly called Ministers? *Paul* tells those that questioned his Apostolick power, that *he was an Apostle to them, whatever he was to others*; and that they should know first, whether Christ were in them, and so whether he were not a true Minister; and not begin at the trying of the Ministry, 2 *Cor. 13. 14.* 5; 6, 7. *Gal. 3. 1, 2, 3, 4. &c.* 11. The Acts of the Parliament, called irregularly by General *Monk*, were they that restored King *Charles the 2d.* and were confirmed by him as valid, through the defect of a Regular Summons, and by necessity. 12. I have fully proved in my Treatise of Episcopacy, that the Species of Bishops, which Mr. *Dodwell* pleaded for, is not the same which the Churches had for 200. or 300. years. And then where is his regular succession from the Apostles?

§ 22. He saith also, p. 37. *They cannot give an Instance (of any power settled by Charter), whereupon the Acts of any persons, lawfully Invested, though confessedly less qualified, are not thought valid: A plain sign that their Investiture doth properly confer such power.*

Ans. Words fitted to deceive. 1. *He that is unqualified is not lawfully Invested, and yet the Act of the Investor may be right, had the Recipient been lawful.*

2. *He saith, Less qualified; when he knew that our question is of the unqualified.*

3. *Investiture giveth it, as the Act of the Power and Donor, by a servant delivering orderly possession, but doth not make, or prove the Investing Minister the Owner, or Donor, no more than he was that from the Emperor Henry delivered the Bishops the Staff and Ring; or the Priest that Marrieth the persons.*

4. *Burroughs and Cities choose, and return Burgessees for Parliament by Charter; yet if they are unqualified when they come thither, the choice is judged null. If a City choose, and Invest a proclaimed Rebel for Mayor, I will believe it null, or invalid, though Mr. D. will not: And if he write Forty Books with such streams of confident words, to prove, that the Election, and Investiture of the declared Heretick Bishops at Alexandria, Antioch, Constantinople, and most of the Empire in many Ages (Arrians, Eutichians, &c.) were yet judged valid by the Councils of the Orthodox, no man that ever read the Councils will believe him.*

5. *Nor will I believe him, that any Bishops Ordination can make a true Bishop, or Priest, of a Woman, an Infant, or a professed Heathen, Infidel, or proper Heretick, or any uncappable person, any more than he can make a Woman to be a Husband, or a dumb man the University Orator.*

§ 23. He saith, *They cannot give an Instance of any Power settled by Charter, whereupon a failure of all who are by the Charter empowered to dispose of Offices, the power must devolve to those who are not by the Charter empowered to dispose of them, and where such a Charter is not thought in Law to fail, by becoming unpracticable, till the suprem power interpose, &c.*

Ans.

Ans. Still the same fraud: *If all empowered to dispose of Offices*, is an ambiguous word. The Prince disposeth of them, by giving the Power, and the Electors by choosing the Receivers, and the Minister by delivering the *Insignia*: If Electors, and all die indeed, there are none to determine of the Receiver: And yet if the Plague kill most of the Electors at Age, and leave not a due number, when the rest left come to Age, and choose, the Charter will renew the Office-power. 2. But if it be only the Ministerial Investor that faileth, the sense of the Lawgiver must be judged of by the words, and by other notices, and the light of common Reason. *e. g.* Whether it be the meaning of the Charter which saith, that the Recorder shall give the Oath, or the former Mayor shall deliver the *Insignia*, that if the Recorder, or Mayor be dead, or sick, or mad, or wilfully refuse, the City shall have no Mayor; or if no Priest will Marry folks, all *England* must live unmarried; or if the Archbishops and Bishops will Ordain none but Hereticks, all the Churches must have no other Ministers. And here Nature and Christ teach us, that the Means is only for the End, and Order for the thing ordered; and God will have us understand his own Laws so, as that Rituals give place to Morals: *I will have mercy, and not sacrifice.* And sure if the King of Spains Charter, for the making of Governours at the *West-Indies*, should not expresse, or reasonably imply a Remedy, in case of the failure of circumstances of meer Order, his Countrey might be lost before they could send to *Spain* for a new Charter or new power.

And Mr. D. saith, *Which is the very case impugned by me of the Nonconformists*: And so judg whether he must not turn a Seeker, and say, that all *Ministry, Churches, and Sacraments cease, till a new Commission comes from Heaven*, upon the failure of every such circumstance; yea, when almost all the Churches charge each other with failures and intercessions, and the very *Species of the Ordainers* is so much altered.

If the King send his Army into the *Indies* (or his *Navies*), and mention no power but the Generals, as chief, or no way of choosing a new General, but by the Field-Officers choice, and giving him an Oath by the Secretary, &c. yet no man doubteth but it was his meaning, that if the General die, or turn Rebel, yea, and the major part of the Field-Officers; or the

Sec

Secretary, the Army should choose another General, rather than perish, and the Kings service miscarry.

§. 24. He addeth, *They cannot give an Instance of any humane Charter, that ever allows any person empowered, to extend his own power by a private exposition of the Charter, against the sense of all the visible supreme powers of the Society.*

Ans. This opens the Core of the Aposthume.

1. We deny, as confidently as any *French*, or *Italians* affirm, that there is any such thing at a supreme *visible* power over the universal Church, under *Jesus Christ*; and therefore none such is disobeyed, or contradicted.

2. And we maintain, That by Divine appointment there is no visible National supreme Church-power, but that of the Civil Christian Sovereign; and therefore none such disobeyed.

3. And we hold, that no man can extend his own power further than *Christs* own Law extendeth it. False expositions give no power.

4. And therefore we prove by your own Rule, that (*Christ* being the only supreme universal Ruler, and having described and specified the Office of a Pastor, and order of a Church) no Bishops can by their private exposition, turn a single Church into a Diocesan, or a Presbyter of *Christs* description into an half Presbyter of their own making: But if they make a man a Pastor, his power and work shall be what *Christ* saith, and not what the Ordainer will. Investing-Ministers Acts are null, if they contradict the Order of the Donor: If the King give you a Parsonage of 300. *l.* a year, and the Instituter say, you shall have but 100. *l.* out of it, it's vain; he instituteth you but as the Donors instrument in the same Benefice, and power given by him.

§ 25. He addeth, p. 38. *Where can they find such a Charter for the power of Presbyters in Scripture as they speak of?*

Ans. Nay, then we are far from agreeing, if you think that the very Species of a Pastors Office is not found in Scripture, as of *Christs* institution. Then it seems, the Bishops make the very Species: The *Italian* Bishops at *Trent* scarce gave so much to the Pope. Then why may not the Bishops put down Presbyters, if they make the Species, or make as many Species as they

they please? Indeed Dr. *Hammond* thought that there was no evidence of the Order of Subject Presbyters in Scripture-times. And if God instituted none, let us have none. But I have told you before, and often, where in Scripture the true Pastors Office is described.

§. 26. He adds, *They may find some actual practices; but will they call that a Charter?*

Ans. This is indeed to strike at our foundation. If we prove not Christ to be King, and Lawgiver, and that his Laws, or Governing-precepts, were partly given by himself, and partly by his Spirit, in his Commissioned Apostles, and these Recorded, Sealed, and Delivered in Scripture: If we prove not, that these, as the authorized Agents of Christ, delivered his Will by words and practice, in settling, and describing the Pastors of his Churches, then take the Ministry, and spare not for mans invention. I cited you before, the Texts that are our proof.

But if the Office, which you call *Priestly*, be of mans making *in specie*, I doubt the Diocesans will prove so much more; for many Papists doubt of the Divine right of Prelacy, that doubt not of the Divine unalterable right of the Priestly, or Presbyter-power and work. And will this cure men of Schism, to tell them, that God hath not so much as made, and specified the Parish-Pastors Office, and it is but a humane invention which you forsake?

§. 27. And I would crave of this confident man to consider, whether he teach not high, and horrid Sacriledg, if he make the Investor to be first the *Owner*, and then the *Donor*? Did we devote our selves to *Patrons* in our Ministry, or to Diocesans, or immediately to God? If we covenanted only to be Gods Ministers, for the Churches good, then let them take heed that claim propriety in us as Priests. And if Tythes and Glebes were devoted to God, and not to Princes, or Patrons, I doubt he that maketh Patrons the Proprietaries, and proper Donors, will prove Sacrilegious, and be convinced at last, that he should only have taken Princes and Pastors for such Trustees as determine of the *Receiver*, but give not the things.

¶ 28. If it be otherwise, Princes, Patrons, and Prelates, are greater and richer than I ever thought them. 1. Then, all the Bishopricks in *England* are the King's, till he give them. 2. Then all the Tythes, Glebes, and Temples in *England*, are the Patrons, till they give them; or else the Bishops, or Chancellors, who investeth men in them by institution and induction. And the Patron and Bishop may have a hard suit to determine which is the Proprietor. 3. And then a Bishop that Ordaineth a thousand Priests, was the *Owner* of all their Relations before; and so as they that are for the pre-existence of souls, dispute, whether they pre-existed individually, or only in *animâ universali*; so these that are for the pre-existence of Priesthoods in the Diocesans, must dispute, whether they were in the Prelate a thousand individual Priesthoods before, or but one common Priesthood, that fell into individuals by Ordination. If they say, that they were but *virtually* in the Prelate, that kills their Cause; for then they did not pre-exist (for *existere est esse extra causas*). And this only saith, that the Prelate had an effective vertue that could make them. But the *species* was made before; and so was the obliging, and Donative Law; therefore the Prelate had not power to do what God had done before.

¶ 29. I take it for granted (because I know him), that all this is nothing to Mr. *Dodwell*; but to me it is moreover something. 1. That the highest esteemers of Diocesans Ordination, make it but a Sacrament. 2. And that the Investing Minister is not the Owner and Donor of the Relation and Gift in any of their Seven Sacraments.

1. In Baptism God only giveth the Right and Relation, which the Minister by Investiture solemnizeth, but giveth it not as his own: Else every Lay-man and woman by their judgment, should have multitudes of Christendoms of their own to bestow.

2. In Confirmation the Priest never pretendeth to be the giver of the Spirit, but by his act to fit the person to receive it: The Holy Ghost is said to *fall on them that heard the word* (before Baptism), *Act. 10. 44, 45* and they were after baptized: He fell on them, *Act. 11. 15*. And *Peter* and *John* prayed.

ed for the Samaritans, that they might receive the Holy Ghost, *Act. 8. 15.* and they laid hands on them, and they received the Holy Ghost, *v. 17.* but not that they gave the Holy Ghost, though by the laying on of their hands, and their prayers, he was given, as he was on them without, *Act. 2.*

3. And in Matrimony it's confessed, that the Priest is not the Owner and Donor of the Husbands power, but a Ministerial Investor.

4. And in the Eucharist, even they that think the bread is made God, take not the Priest as the efficient cause, but a disposing instrument; nor that he giveth God to the Receiver, as the Owner, or Donor, but delivereth him as a Minister.

5. The same is true of Penance, Extreme Unction, and therefore must be so also in Ordination.

If the King send a thousand Commissions to Captains, Judges, Justices, &c. the Messenger is not the Owner, or Donor of them all; nor may make any alteration of them: yea, if he intrust the Chancellor to name all the Justices, he doth thereby but determine of the person that shall receive the Commission, but altereth nothing of the Office, nor is the Donor of it. All this is plain to us, but not to Mr. Dodwell.

§. 30. Saith he, p. 39. *Are not many actual practices grounded on circumstances? Are not many of those circumstances obnoxious to great mutability? Are not ordinary Governours the competent Judges of their actual change?*

Ans. 1. And did not Christ promise his Spirit to his Apostles, for the performance of their Commissions? And were not those Commissions to gather, and settle his Churches, and teach them all that he commanded them? And did not Christ by that Spirit make Pastors and Teachers, as is before proved? And did not the Apostles faithfully perform their trust?

2. And doth he not see, that by this he also subverteth his foundation of Prelatical power also, as having no better institution than the Priesthood? And then who are those Governours of the Church that he talks of, that must judg? And how prove they their judging-power?

3. And it were a kindness, if he would tell us what change it is that the Diocesans may make in the Priestly Office and work, and tell us the bounds of their power, if it have any? And