

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



whether they may put down the Preaching part, the Praying part, the Sacraments, or which of them? And whether this be the power that hath put out the Sacramental Cup, and made all the changes that are made in the Church. To tell us of these ordinary Governours *changing-power*, is a hard word to us, that took Christs Laws, delivered by his Spirit, to be perfect, and unchangeable; However, some circumstances are changed, which were noted to be but occasional.

§. 31. To return his Consequence, p. 40. *Since it is certain, that the power of Ordaining others, was not given to, nor for some hundred years exercised by that species of Diocesans, who were neither the Bishops of single Churches, associated for personal present Communion, nor were the Overseers of such Bishops, but the Bishops of Diocesses, that have many score, or hundred unbishoped stated worshipping Assemblies, it will follow by his arguing, that these never had their Office from the Apostles, and much less a continued succession of it.*

§. 32. He next pleadeth the Nullity of the Presbyterians Ordination. 1. Because if they had Ordaining power, it is only in Assemblies where Bishops are Presidents, and Edict them. 2. And because they carry it not by Plurality of Voices. But I am a weary with answering such trifling things, and the later part is a known mistake. I never heard of one contradicting Voice against the Ordination of any that was Ordained in our Synods.

§. 33. And he hath half disabled me to answer him from p. 30. forwards, where he feigneth me to maintain, that *Authority must necessarily result from true qualifications*: For it is taken for uncivil to give his words their proper name. But if the Reader will pardon the Repetition, I may remind him, how probable it is, that Mr. Dodwell trusted that his Reader would believe his words without perusing what I wrote; where he might have seen, 1. That I say, that the *Authority resulteth not from the qualifications*, but from Christs Law, Grant, or Charter. 2. That *personal qualifications* (of gifts, or grace) are but part of the necessary *Dispositio Recipientis*; but that moreover there is needful, 1. Opportunity. 2. And need of his Office. 3. And



3. And to a Bishop the flock's consent, if not election. And *ordinis gratia*, (where moral necessity dispenseth not with order) the Ordainers approbation and consent. 5. And to regular possession, where it may be had, a due Investiture; so that there is a *Relative part* as well as a *Qualitative* of the Receptive disposition necessary. And all the following leaves in which he disputeth against me, as maintaining a power resulting from *meer qualities*, are so unbeseeming a Divine, and a Christian, that I will not foul my paper with their due confutation. But they are suitable to that man who thinks himself wise, good and fit enough to Unchurch and condemn so much as he doth of the Christian world, on pretence of pleading for obedience to the Diocesan.

§. 34. And where he adds, p. 50. [Or that it so depends on them (Qualifications) as that where the persons ordained may want any of them, there the whole Ordination must be null, because of the incapacity of the matter.] This also he denieth.

Ans. 1. I still distinguish between the *Qualifications* necessary *ad esse*, and those only *ad bene esse*, or integral. If he would persuade the Reader that I null Ordination for want of the latter, his weakness, or designed ill intent is such as warneth his Readers to take heed of believing him. If he mean it only of the former, as I speak, I have before confuted him that dare say that no qualification is necessary *ad esse*. Then a Pope *Joan*, or woman-Priest or Prelate, or a professed enemy of God or Christ may be a Priest. And he may be a Pastor of a Church to feed them by the Word, who never heard or knew what was the Word or Church. Cannot the best believer go to Heaven, if all your Priests will but deny him the Sacrament? and yet may a man be validly a Bishop, and the Key-keeper of Heaven that believeth not that there is a God, a Christ or Heaven, and so professeth? This maketh me remember the old *Roman* Canons, how no Bishop must be deposed for lying with his own Sister, unless a great multitude of Witnesses testify it; and the Councils that decreed no Layman shall witness against a Clergyman, &c.

But Election, consent, the Ordainers approbation (ordinarily) are part of my Qualifications. And if these be unnecessary, what doth the man plead for? And is a false approbation of a man that wanteth Essentials, more necessary than having them? How contrary is this to the Doctrine of the Council of *Carthage* in the Epi-



file in *Cyprian*, of *Martial* and *Basilides*; and to many honest Councils?

§ 35. P. 90. At the end of this insinuated false accusation, he asketh, [*Where do we find that God ever gave Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, (though he gave Apostles, Pastors and Teachers) ? those extraordinary Offices indeed seem to have been made neither of man, nor by man, but by God immediately, &c.*]

*Ans.* 1. Hath he said a word to prove that *Pastors and Teachers* are not ordinary Officers, contrary to the common judgment of the Church in all ages? 2. Whether he mean [*Bishops*] in the Dative Case, or the Accusative, I know not. If the later, let him speak out and say, *God gave not Bishops*. But how proveth he that *Presbyters* (and *Bishops*) are not *Pastors* or *Teachers*? 3. The Text tells you, *Ephes. 4. 14, 15, 16.* that these offices were given for the continued stated use of the Church: *For the perfecting of the Saints, the work of the Ministry, for the edifying the body of Christ, till we all come in the unity of the faith, and the knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect man, &c.* Was this temporary? 4. It seems he disclaimeth *Bishops* being made, in making *Apostles*. 5. Christ by his Spirit in the *Apostles* ordered the Churches.

§ 36. P. 65. he saith, [*They never find any of those Officers to whom succession is at present pretended, made immediately by God, but by the intervention of men, &c.*]

*Ans.* Still deceiving confusion: 1. *Intervention* is a word of fraud, and may signifie only that act which determineth of, and qualifyeth the receiver; and it may signifie the *Donation*, or making of the office. It is this that we speak of. 2. The Intervention of infallibly inspired men, commissioned to deliver and record Christs own will, hath an efficiency instrumental in making the office, in that the Spirit in them doth it, and they do make instrumentally the Charter or Law which giveth the power; and Christ doth what they did by his Commission and Spirit. If you can prove that our *Diocesans* have this Commission, spirit and power, if they write new Sacred Scriptures, or make new Sacraments, and Church-forms, and offices, we will obey them. But prove it well.

3. Did any man but Christ send forth the Seventy? Yet most Prelatists hold, that those were the predecessors of the *Presbyters*.

4. By



4. By this it seems he again denieth, that Christ himself instituted the Order of Bishops, by making Apostles. And if so, he will sorely shake his standing; for then they must prove all their power from the Apostles (or following persons) institutions; and not make them successors of the Apostles own Office (for they made not their own Office). And Dr. *Stillingfleet* thinks there were *no Bishops*, or few made in the Apostles times, as Dr. *Hammond* thinks of subject-Presbyters. And if Christs Spirit in the Apostles made not these Offices (who made the Scripture, which is Gods Law), I despair of seeing it proved, that any since them were authorized to make them. And if men only made the Episcopal and Presbyters Office, men may unmake them.

§. 37. A case put to me within this hour, remindeth me, how much these men prefer Ordination, not only in it self, but in this circumstance of Prelatical uninterrupted succession, before Baptism, which is our Christning. There are some godly young men that have Communicated in the Lords Supper, that were the children of Quakers and Anabaptists; some were never baptized, and some know not whether they were, or not; and being born near Two hundred Miles hence, cannot learn or come to any certainty. The question is, Whether these that have Communicated, should yet be baptized? which is to make Christians of Christians? Or whether the higher Sacrament do not eminently contain the lower, as making a man a Bishop, containeth making him a Presbyter, and that containeth eminently his Deaconship (as some say)? If they must be baptized, yet, it implieth the Nullity of their Sacramental Communion before: And if so, Mr. *Dodwell* must confess, that Priestly exhibition, or investiture is null to an incapable Subject. But I think most will say, that he should not be baptized, it being done interpretatively. And if so, is his Prelatical mode of Ordination more necessary than actual Baptism? Besides, that (as is said) they make Lay-mens or womens baptizing sufficient *ad esse*. And yet the Church of *England* professeth, that only the Two Sacramens, Baptism and the Lords Supper, are generally necessary to salvation.



§. 38. Pag. 67, 68. He would persuade us that the *Imposition of hands in Ordination* signifieth what he asserteth. But he giveth us not one word of proof of it. Was it the *Holy Ghost which was in the imposing Apostle or Prelate* that was given by him, and out of him into the Ordained? No, he was never in Scripture said to be the *Ownor, Donor, or efficient conveyer* of the Holy Ghost. But Gods will made the Imposition of the Apostles hand, a conditional act to qualifie the recipient to receive the Holy Ghost immediately from God, as the Texts before cited, and many more prove. What if it be once said that [*Διὰ τῆς ἐνδ' οὗ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν ἀποστόλων διδόται τὸ Πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον,*] when many other Texts expound it? It's well known that *διὰ* signifieth many other causes, medium, conditions, as well as efficient conveying causes. Is it like to signifie more here than in the Doctrine of Justification, when it is so oft said, that we are *justified by faith*? And yet faith there, is no efficient instrument conveying or giving us pardon and relative Justification, but only a necessary qualification of the Recipient (called by Dr. Twisse, *Causa dispositiva*, which is part of the *Materialis*) upon which Gods Covenant immediately pardoneth and justifieth the believer; so both there and here it is *by or through* the Act of man, as a moral qualification of the Recipient, made a condition by God.

§. 39. After all this, the man cometh himself pag. 72. to distinguish of *Qualifications necessary to the being of the office, and to the well-being*; yea, and hath the face to say, that I should have distinguished them; as if I had not ever done it. Is it not an unprofitable toil to dispute with such men that will pretend that a case by me constantly stated was not stated, and then will long dispute himself for the unqualified without distinction, and after all distinguish in the sag-end? This becometh not any man that will pretend to plead for truth.

But yet he will not be over-liberal to us; he saith p. 13. *All the skill that is requisite essentially, is only in general to know the benefits to be performed on Gods part, and the duties to be promised on mans, and the nature and obligation of Covenants in general; and the particular solemnities of Ecclesiastical Covenanting. And of this how can any one be incapable, that is but capable of understanding the common dealings of the world?*

*Ans.*



*Ans.* 1. And yet must we have Universities? and must the Holy Ghost be given by the Bishops for this? And is there any need to open the Bible to know it? and must so much riches and honour maintain this much? and all be damned Schismatics that turn to better?

2. Set this qualified Ministry and his great zeal to persuade the *Nonconformists* to cease Preaching, and his Unchurching the Reformed Churches altogether; and it's easie to see what this humble diligent man is labouring for.

3. Do not many millions *understand the common dealings of the world*, that understand not the Gospel? The natural man receiveth not the things that be of God, for they are spiritually discerned.

4. Is not this a plain design to set up a carnal Kingdom of ignorant, vicious Clergy-men, such as *St. Paul* saith, *Rom. 8.* neither are nor can be subject to Gods Law, instead of a holy Catholick Church and Communion of Saints? and to make *Mahometans* think that they are Saints in comparison of us, and that Christians are an unholy sort of men?

5. Either he includeth all that is *necessary* to the things named by him, or not. If not, then *his Priest must know the benefits of Gods Covenant, without knowing what God is, or that Christ is the Purchaser, Covenantor, &c.* If yea, (which I doubt not he will say) then, *O what an excellent body of Theology is included in these few general words!* Then he must know all those Attributes of God and his Relations to man, by which he is said to be *our God*. He must know all the necessary articles of faith, about the Person of Christ, as God and man in two Natures and one Person, his Incarnation, Birth, Life, Sufferings, Death, Burial! his Doctrine, his Merits, his Resurrection, Ascension, Glory, Intercession, Kingly and Prophetical office, and last Judgment, and Glorious Kingdom. He must know what Covenant God formerly made, and man broke; and what sin, original and actual, and what curse and condemnation followed on mankind. And Oh how many great and mysterious things are contained in Gods Covenant-benefits! Our Union with Christ, Reconciliation, Justification, Adoption, Sanctification; The Doctrine of the Holy Ghost as the Third person in the Trinity, and as the Inspirer of Prophets and Apostles, and Inditer and confirmer of the Scriptures, and the Witness of Christ, and the Sanctifier and Comforter of the Elect, besides Resurrection, Glorification, &c. And what a deal is contained in mans necessary qua-



ification (Faith, Repentance), and promised duty? And the true nature and use of the Sacraments themselves? And is all this such a small or easie matter as he seems to intimate?

6. But hath he yet proved that a true Minister of Christ hath no necessary work but thus to administer Sacraments? I will yet believe, *2 Tim. 4. 1, 2.* that he must preach the Word in season, out of season, reprove, rebuke, exhort, partly to convert the unconverted, partly to confirm and guide believers; and that the people should ask the Law at his mouth as being the messenger of the Lord of Hosts. And that the very essence of his office is to be a Minister under the *Teaching, Priestly* and *Ruling* office of Christ.

7. And if he had proved that a sorry Priest hath all that is essential to his office, that proveth not that I must take him for my Pastor, no not though the Diocesan command me. Souls are more worth than to be wilfully made the Priests and Prelates merchandize. If a man have all essential to a Physician, and no more, I will not trust my life to his skill, which is less than my soul, though the Bishop bid me. If a woman have all that's essential to a woman, he is a fool that will take her for his wife, because the Bishop bids him, if she have no more. The Priests that the Pope sent from *Italy* into *England* that could speak no *English*, knew what you mention perhaps. But it's necessary also that the Pastor teach all this knowledge to all the flock, which is not done with saying a few words. This man minds me of the saying of an Atheistical Physician, *What needs there all this Preaching and stir? I can tell them all in three words, it is but think well, and say well.* Dr. Saywell, and Mr. Dodwell that are so much for our silence, seem to be too near to this mans mind. But saith St. Paul, *Who is sufficient for these things!*

8. Yet this sort of men that can accept of so little of God in the Priests, so be it they will but be ruled by the Prelate (who I suppose need *ad esse* be no wiser or better himself in their opinion) are the rigidest silencers and excommunicators of others the wisest and holiest Pastors and Christians, as Schismatics, or Hereticks, if they obey not the Diocesan in every indifferent thing, or be not of their mind in what they decree; such odds is in their demands for God, and for the Prelates.

He that doth but *understand the common dealings of the world*, is capable of saying over the Liturgy of the Sacrament; and a little know-



knowledg, and no honesty or piety, may serve *ad esse*. But if the Councils of Prelates, yea or his single Diocesan command him never so many things as indifferent, which the poor Priest feareth are perjury, lying, false worship, or other heinous sins, he is to be Excommunicated from Christian society, and cast out of the Ministry, and as a Schismatick not only to be silenced, but to be damned, if such as Mr. Saywell and Mr. Dodwell, and their Masters be to be believed.

§. 40. But saith he, *P. 74. How can they prove that Preaching is at all any essential part of the Office? &c.*

*Ans.* 1. From Christs own practice, and his command to those whom he called and sent, and from their practice, and the Holy Ghosts determination by them, *Mat. 4. 17. & 10. 7. & 11. 1. Mar. 1. 4, 38. & 3. 14. Luk. 4. 18, 19, 43. & 9. 2, 60. Act. 5. 42. & 10. 42. Rom. 10. 8, 10, 14, 15. Mat. 28. 19. Mar. 16. 16, 20. Act. 30. 20. & 8. 5, 23, 40 & 9. 20. & 13. 5, 42. & 20. 7, 20, to the end. Phil. 1. 17, 18. 1 Tim. 3. 16. 2 Tim. 3. 16. 2 Tim. 4. 1, 2. 1 Cor. 1. 21. 2 Tim. 2. 2, 24 Tit. 2. 3.* Where do you find that ever any one in the New Testament was ordained a Mass Priest, or Sacrament Priest, and not a Teacher?

2. When did you prove that actual giving the Sacrament was essential to a Bishop or Presbyter? not only; *Paul* baptiz'd few, but many Parish-Priests leave that work to their Curates, and some Bishops leave both the Sacraments to their Chaplains or Priests. I suppose you know that in the ancient Churches one Assembly had usually a Bishop with many Presbyters and Deacons; and usually the Bishop did both preach and celebrate the Eucharist? Can you prove that the rest did any oftner celebrate than preach?

3. But if you are willing, you may easily know that we take *Preaching* to have more modes than making a set Sermon in the Pulpit. The Presbyters of old were all Preachers; Sometimes in the Pulpit when the Bishop or chief speaker was absent, sick or required it; Sometimes to smaller parties in Houses or Chappels, or lesser meetings; sometime by conference, as *Christ* preached to the Woman, *Joh. 4.* And if you think otherwise, yet I am confident by experience, that it is an easier thing, and requireth less skill to make a Pulpit studied Sermon, than to deal convincingly in conference with particular persons that need our teaching. And a man may learn to say Mass or Liturgies, that hath no tolerable fitness to teach.



4. But if Preaching and Teaching be all one with you as they are with me, is it not a strange question to ask, *How we prove that Preaching, that is, Teaching, is at all essential to their Office?* As if you should ask, How we prove that *Teaching is essential to a Schoolmaster or Tutor?* or that to Rule is essential to a Ruler; or to give Physick essential to a Physician? What can you take the Office to be that includeth not Teaching? Neither Christs Apostles, nor the ancient Church ever ordained any to give Sacraments without Teaching, (however *Papists* make the essence of the Priesthood to be in the power of making the body and blood of God.) Nay, how can they celebrate the Sacraments without Preaching or Teaching? Can they justly baptize the adult, and not teach them the great Articles of the Creed which they must profess? and the great and many duties to be done? and the great and many benefits to be received? And doth he think it such a small and easie matter to teach men all the Articles of the Creed, the sense of the Lords prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the nature of the Sacrament of Baptism, and the Lords-supper? It may be he will say, that it is some other Preaching that he meaneth. But he speaketh to me, who (in the hearing of Dr. *Warmstrie*, and of Mr. *Th. Baldwin*, who is yet living) did offer Bishop *Morley* when he forbad me to preach in his Diocess, to promise him to preach only the Catechism-Doctrine, on Baptism, the Creed, the Lords-prayer, the Ten Commandments, and the Lords-supper. Archbishop *Usher* in his Sermon before King *James*, on *Ephes* 4. 3. boldly affirmeth, That let the learnedst of them all try it when they will, they shall find that it requireth greater skill to open to the ignorant intelligibly these Catechism common truths, than to handle points of controverted School-Divinity.

§. 41. It may be objected, 1 Cor. 12. *Are all Teachers?* and Rom. 12. *He that teacheth on teaching,*

*Ans.* It's evicent that Teachers or Doctors are there put for some eminently gifted above others in opening and defending sound Doctrine, and not for all Teachers in general. For *Exhortation* is distinguished from it, which yet is the greatest part of most Sermons. *Paul* was the chief Speaker, yet *Barnabas* was a Teacher. We are more than he is, for many Ministers in each Church, where the chief Speaker shall usually preach; but the other as assistants in their time and place, and not to be meer Sacramenters.

§. 42. His



§. 42. His next recollections run all upon such intimated or expressed untruths merely forged by him contrary to my copious Explications, and against the rules of common honesty, that I will not lose my own and the Readers time in particular answers to them. He would perswade the Readers that I affirm that *power immediately results from gifts*, who never had such a thought, but say it neither resulteth from them, mediately nor immediately. This dealing is so grossly false, that it is neither credit to his cause nor him. Would he make men think that I take him to have most authority or power, that hath the best gifts? As if the wisest and best man had right to the Crown or Church-power? If copious discourses to the contrary will not hinder such busy disputers from such inhumane slanders, are they meet to be disputed with? I have over and over said that, 1. Gifts, or the best abilities. 2. And due *election* or *approbation* of the Ordainers. 3. And the peoples election and consent, all set together, do but make up the Qualification or Receptive disposition of the Recipient. 4. Yea, and his consent conjoined; and that where all these in the necessary degree concur, the power resulteth to that capable person from none of them all, but immediately from Gods Law, which is his instrument giving power to persons so qualified. And that besides all these, Ministerial Investiture for Orders sake, when it may be had, should introduce him into possession; yea, and the Magistrate must be judg whom he will countenance, protect or tolerate. But the case of Ordination and Investiture are necessary only where they may be had lawfully, and without crossing their end, as *sacrifice was compared with mercy*, and the Rest of the Sabbath compared to works of charity and necessity.

§. 43. And as it is the trick of such dealers, p. 81. he must have Governours to do his work; and therefore must not leave out that which may make us odious to them; but tells men, that our *Hypothesis is unreconcilable with government in this life*, in that it permits persons to assume Authority, and to extend it as far as they think fit, by appealing to Writings against the sense of all the visible authority of this life.

Ans. 1. But if this *Hypothesis* be none of his Adversaries, but come out of the Meal-Tub, or forge of Inventers, what shall such men be called?

2. We



2. We permit no person to *assume Authority*. But *Writings* are not so contemptible to us in comparison of that which you take to be *all the visible Authority of the Church*. It is your *Richard Hooker* that saith, that the *Law maketh the King, and giveth and measureth his power*, and that it's *usurpation which obligeth no mans Conscience*, when power is taken, and used which the Law never gave. What I think of this, I have elsewhere shewed. The *Statutes* are not so contemptible in this case, but the great Lawyers think they may be appealed to from *visible Rulers* in several cases. And you must talk at other rates than you have done in your tedious fallacious Vagaries, before wise Christians will believe that we may not appeal from Prelates to the written Word of God, when the power used by them is justly questioned. If not, how came the Reformed Churches to justify their Reformation? Was it not by appealing to Scripture against the visible Church Rulers, that were commonly against them? Were not Popes, Councils, Prelates, and Priests against them, for the far greatest part? Did it overthrow all Government of the world to appeal from these to the Scripture? I hereby undertake to prove, that neither Popes, Prelates, or Priests, have any Church-Authority, but what God hath given them by his Word. And is it not then necessary to try it by that Word? Must we take their own words for all that Popes, or Prelates claim? And it will put the Pope and Council hard to it, to prove any Authority from God, if the Scripture do not give it them: And if it give it them, it may give it others.

§. 44. And when all's done, we are far from granting, that we have less to shew for our succession from the Apostles, than Popes or Diocesans have.

1. We are sure that we have the same Baptism, Eucharist, Creed, Lords Prayer, Decalogue, and Scripture, delivered down from the Apostles. 2. We are sure that we have a Ministry of the same *species* which Christ and his Spirit in the Apostles instituted. 3. We know that our Churches, and Worship, and Doctrine, are the same that are described, and settled by the Apostles. 4. We know that our present Ministers are qualified as the Apostles required. 5. And that they are Elected, or consented to by the Flocks, as the Apostles required. 6. And that



that they have as good an Ordination, and Investiture, as the Apostles ever made necessary to the Ministry: That is,

1. They have the Approbation of *senior* Pastors, and many of them of *Diocesans*. All that were put into any places by the Parliament, when the Bishops were down, were to have the *Westminster* Assemblies Approbation under their hands. And that Assembly, as called, consisted of many *Diocesans*, with many score grave Eminent Divines, though the *Diocesans* were not actually present. And a signed Approbation, and Allowance, hath the Essence of all that is of absolute necessity in Ordination.

2. They were Ordained by true Bishops. 1. All true Presbyters are *Episcopi gregis*, and joyn in Ordination here in *England*. 2. The chief Pastors of City-Churches, having Curates under them, are *Episcopi Eminentes vel Praesides*, such as Ordained for above Two hundred years after the Apostles. And 3. The chosen Presidents of Synods were such Bishops. But all these concurred in the Nonconformists Ordinations when the *Diocesans* were down. They were Ordained at, and by a Synod of Presbyters in some great Town, or City, where the Moderator, and the chief City-Pastors were part.

3. Many of them were Ordained by *Diocesans*.

4. Many Ordained, as aforesaid, were after approved by *Diocesans*, some by Imposition of Hands, and all by Word, or Writing; for Archbishop *Usher* did in my hearing by Word and in Writing more publicly declare his opinion of such Presbyters Ordination as valid (though he excused not such as deposed the *Diocesans* from the guilt of Schism); and so did the many other Bishops, whom I formerly cited; yea, even *Ban-croft* himself. And surely all this hath all that is essential to Ordination.

5. And we know that such a Ministry hath continued to propagate the Church and Gospel in the world since the Apostles days.

But we confess, 1. That we cannot prove, that such Ministers have still succeeded in the same Towns. 2. Nor that no one, from whom their Ordination came down from the Apostles, did pretend to have Orders, or Authority when he had none. 3. Or that no one of them in 1660 years was an Heretick, or a Schismatick, or a Papist. 4. Or that no one Ordained



dained in wrong words. 5. Or that no one Ordained contrary to the Canons, out of his own limits, or without three Bishops, or without the Presbyters. 6. Or that no Competitors were Ordained by several Bishops. Mr. *Dodwell* is a great Historian; when he hath proved all this of all, or any of his Clergy-friends, he hath done something more than multiply words.

§. 45. But on the other side, we can easily prove, and have proved, 1. That our Diocesans are not of the same *species* with those of old. 2. That the Apostles did not make them. I think Mr. *Dodwell* will say, that the Presbyters first made them by consent (the Children begot the Fathers). 3. And Dr. *Hammond* will defend it, that there is no certainty, that any Subject Presbyters were made by the Apostles in Scripture-times. So that the very *species* of their Clergy hath no such succession, as distinct from ours. 4. And he that will read the Church-History, and Councils, declaring the multitude of doleful intercessions in East and West by Heresies, the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, *Jerusalem* and *Rome*, and most of the chief Seats of Bishops, having been judged Hereticks, Simoniacks, or no Bishops by General Councils; yea, *Roman* Bishops judged some of them Infidels, and Diabolical by the Councils of *Constance*, *Basil*, &c. I say, he that knoweth this History, must know, that the Diocesans that from these derive their succession, have certainly had frequent and notorious intercessions.

§. 46. And this leads me to another part of Mr. *Dodwell's* work: viz. his proof that *Aidan* and *Finan* were Bishops. As if this had been a great part of his Cause. Such diverting noise is a great part of the art of deceiving. Because I had said, that *Aidan* and *Finan* were not Bishops, but Presbyters, that is, when they came out of *Scotland* into *Northumberland*, I apprehended that some men of his genius and design, would be willing to mistake me, and therefore Printed an Explication of the Words in the end of my first Answer to Dr. *Stillingfleet*. But Mr. *D* would have men think that I said, that they were never made and called Bishops at all; and that I read not *Beda*, from whom alone (near Five and Thirty years ago) I took almost all that I assert concerning them. Let the

Rea-



Reader see my foresaid Explication. If Mr. *Dodwell* will give us more than noise and mist about this matter :

1. Let him prove that it was Diocesan Bishops that Ordained these *Scots* before they came into *England*, when *Beda* saith they were sent from those Monasteries that were ruled by Presbyters, and which would not so much as eat or communicate with the *Roman* Bishops.

2. Let him prove that any Bishops in *England* Consecrated him, or made them Bishops here, when *Beda* tells us that they were the first in the North, and therefore had none here to Ordain them.

3. Let him prove that they were here made true Diocesan Bishops of our species : When, 1. they had no Presbyters at first under them, and therefore ruled none, and had but one Congregation; for one man can be but in one place at once. 2. Their Church in *Lindisfarne* was not made of stone, but of wood, covered or thatcht with reeds, and they are not said to have any other Church under them. 3. They went indeed to preach all over the Country, but not as to a Church, but as to Heathens to convert them.

4. Let him prove that ever they took themselves to be of a distinct order from Presbyters. 5. At a Synod (*Bed. c. 25.*) we find no more but the King and his Son, and *Hilda* a woman-Abbeſs, and three or four of this sort of Bishops, (far below our Ordaining City-Presbyters and their Synods.)

But unlearned men that value Books by interest and preconceived opinions, may think that by such talk Mr. *Dodwell* hath done some great matter.

§. 47. But (saith he, p. 81, 82.) *Our Hypothesis obliging inferior Governours to prove their title to their office, and the extent of it, from the intention of their supream Governours, does oblige all to a strict dependance on the supreme visible power, so as to leave no place for appeal concerning the practice of such Government (which as it lasts only for this life, so it ought not to admit of disputes more lasting than its practice), &c.*

*Ans.* Alas for the poor world and Church that will be cheated at so gross a rate !

1. Did you not know that the grand error that Protestants charge Papists with, is the asserting of any such thing as a *supreme visible power over the Church universal besides Christ*. And did you think that your roteing over the name to them that deny the thing,



would make a wise man change his Religion?

2. By your Hypothesis then no man can prove his title to his Office, who either believeth not that there is any such universal Supreme, or that knoweth not who it is (I know no Competitors but the Pope, and General Councils, unless the Patriarch of *Constantinople* be one.)

3. And he that knoweth not the *intention* of this Supreme power, is still unable to prove his office.

4. And he that knoweth the intention of the Ordaining Diocesan, is never the better if he know not the intention of the Supreme. And what if the intention of the Supreme, and of the Diocesan are contrary?

5. But by your *Hypothesis* the Governours may alter the very *species* of the Priesthood as they please; and what ever God saith of it in his Institution or Law, it must be to us no other in kind or extent, than the Governours intend. If they say, *I ordain thee to baptize, but not to teach*; or to do both, but not to celebrate the Lords-Supper; or to do that, but not to pray or praise God; or not to use the Keys of the Church, our power is limited accordingly; Then if the Prelates make Mass-Priests, their intention is the measure of their power. Answer the *Papists* then that ask, Was it ever the intention of the Pope and his Prelates, that the *English* Bishops should disclaim the Pope, or the Mass, or reform without them as they did?

6. Seeing the *English* Bishops, by you, derive their succession from *Willfred*, and *Augustine*, and *Rome*, is not the Church of *Rome* the fittest Judge of the extent of their power, as knowing their own intentions? Nay, if they were so blind as to intend them power to pull down themselves, may they not recall it?

7. Did ever Protestant preach this Doctrine, *That there is no appeal from the supreme Prelates, to God*? O dreadful! what may men come to? and what error so great that a former may not introduce? Disgrace not the Church of *England* so much as thus to intimate, that they set up themselves so as that there is no appeal to Scripture, or God himself from them? God hath commanded Preaching, Praying, Praises, Baptism, the Lords-Supper, holy assemblies, &c. if the supreme Prelates interdict and forbid all these, is there no appeal to God? I have told you how much *Robert Grossthead* abhor'd this Doctrine, and so told Pope *Innocent* the 4th. What absolute blind obedience to Prelates is this!

8. And



8. And what a reason brings he, *That the practice lasteth only for this life, and therefore, &c.* Doth any of our actions here last longer than while they are doing? Praying, Praise, Sacraments, obeying the King, doing good to the poor, &c. and so swearing, cursing, adultery, rebellion, atheism, blasphemy here, last only for this life. Must we therefore obey men without appeal to God, if they forbid us all duty, and command all sin?

9. And what did the man mean when he said, *That it ought not to admit of disputes more lasting than its practice.* Is this the rate of these mens wise disputations? 1. A murderers practice may be disputed at the Assizes when his act is past. 2. Shall not all the actions of men in this world be examined and judged of by Christ hereafter? What? no men judged according to their works, or for any thing done in the body? 3. Or did he mean that God will justify us for any Villany that we shall do in obedience to the Supreme Clergy? 4. Or did he think that by appealing to Gods judgment, we challenge them there to dispute with us? What to make of this mans demonstrations, little do I know.

§. 48. He adds, *P. 82. For how fallible soever they may be conceived to be in expounding Scripture, yet none can deny them to be the most certain, as well as the most competent Judges of their own intentions.*

*Ans.* 1. That's true. And if their intentions may make Doctrine, Worship, and Priesthood, what they please, it much concerneth us that they conceal not their intentions! But I would I knew whose intention this must be; whether the supreme Clergies, or the Ordainers; and what to do if divers mens intentions differ; and what bounds are set to their intentions; and how many hundred sorts of Priests Doctrine or worship they may make.

2. You touch their fallibility tenderly, as a thing that *some may conceive.* But it seems let them never so falsely expound Scripture, their own intentions still shall prevail against all the word of God? I would you would answer *Dr. Stillingfleet's Rational Account*, which confuteth you.

§. 49. He proceeds, *As certainly therefore as God hath made his Church a visible society, and constituted a visible Government in it, so certainly it is to be presumed that their Hypothesis must be false, &c.*

*Ans.* 1. Trifle not at this deceiving rate with plain men that love



love the light. If by a *visible Society with a visible Government*, you mean (as we have great reason to think), *With a visible Government over it besides Christ*, do not thus as Mr. Thorndike and others of you do, go on to beg it, and build vast structures on it, but prove it to us and we will yield; prove to me that the *Universal Church is a Society that must have one visible supreme Government under Christ*, and I here declare to you, that I will turn *Papist* presently, and will not wrangle against any man for calling me a *Papist* (though I may not own all that Popes say and do, as those do that *Grotius* called *Papists*.) I will not talk with Bishop *Gunning* of a *Collegium Pastorum*, governing all the Christian world *per literas formatas*; nor be so moderate as those *French* *Papists* that make an *Universal Council* (which never was, nor ever must be, the supreme Church-power. I will presently be for the Pope, though not *as absolute*. But why answer you not what we have said against it? particularly my Sermon in the Morning-Lectures against Popery.

2. But if by a *visible power in the Church*, you mean not *one over the Church*, the *Independents* deny it not; while every City hath its proper Mayor, (and so every Church its Pastor) it is a *visible power in the Kingdom*, but not *over it* as a Kingdom. All the *Justices of Peace* are *visible powers in the Kingdom*, but not *Supreme*, nor as one *Aristocracy* over the whole.

Seeing all my dissent from Popery, and from you, is founded in my judgment against *any one universal Supreme besides Christ*, (Monarch, Aristocracy, or Democracy, I seriously intreat you to write your strongest arguments on that subject to convince me, and answer what I have said to Mr. *Johnson*, and you may spare all the rest of your labour as to me. This will do all.

§. 50. P. 83. He adds, *How can Subjects preserve their due Subordination to their Superiors if they practice differently? and while they defend their practices, and pretend Divine authority for them?*

*Ans.* 1. As the three Confessors did, *Dan. 3.* and as *Daniel* did, *Dan. 6.* and as the Apostles did, *Act. 2. & 3. & 4.* And as all the Bishops and Churches did for three hundred years. And as the Orthodox did under *Valens*, *Constantine*, *Theodosius junior*, *Anastasius*, *Philippicus*, &c.

2. They may defend it by proving, that there is a God, who is supreme, and that there is no power but of him, and none against him;