

## The Contents.

- Civil or Ecclesiastical over the whole Church, and therefore none to make Laws obligatory to the whole, p.448.*
- Chap. 10. *If it be not our Lawful Governors that command us, but usurpers, we are not formally bound to obey them, though the things be lawful which they command, p.452.*
- Chap. 11. *The Commands of lawful Governors about lawful Ceremonies, must be understood and obeyed with such exceptions as do secure the End: and not to the subverting of it, p.458.*
- Chap. 12. *It may be very sinful to command some Ceremonies, when yet it may be the subjects duty to use them when they are commanded, p.460.*
- Chap. 13. *The Constant use of things indifferent should not be commanded ordinarily ( see the exceptions ) but they should be sometimes used, sometimes not, p.464.*
- Chap. 14. *Thirty Reasons against the imposing of our late Controverted Mystical Ceremonies, as Crossing, Surplice, &c. p.467.*
- Chap. 15. *Reasons perswading to Obedience in Lawful things, p.483.*

ERRATA.



# ERRATA.

Page 10. l. 4. r. had not been by themselves. p. 24. l. 23. for Philetas, r. Alexander. p. 30. l. penult. for Perfect, r. President. p. 33. l. 34, 35. r. the 2000th. or 3000th. person. p. 37. l. 34. for it, r. is. p. 41. l. 9. r. Presbyterie. p. 72. l. ult. for that, r. the. p. 77. l. 24. r. occasioning. p. 78. l. 16. r. had in it. p. 81. l. 1. blot out any. l. 28. for at all, r. all. l. 29. blot out the. p. 87. l. 17. for had r. have. Marg. l. 5. r. *καθίστατον*. p. 88. l. 17. for Prelacy, r. Policarpe. l. 37. for there that, r. that there. p. 89. l. 2. r. *ἐκχυσεν*. p. 93. l. 3. r. he was, and l. 34. for ad, r. at. p. 94. l. 29. r. we well. p. 95. Marg. l. 3. r. Blondel, and l. 33. for yet, r. and. p. 96. l. 9. r. Churches. p. 97. l. 5. for Scholarum, r. Scotorum. p. 100. Marg. l. 13. for no, r. on. p. 104. l. 8. for I mean, r. I wave. p. 106. l. 4. for that, r. the. Disp. 2. Pref. p. 117. l. 16. for pass, r. pass. p. 118. l. 30. blot out and. p. 121. l. 14. r. Bishop. p. 124. l. 17. r. Jansenius. p. 137. l. 5. r. Members. p. 139. l. 5. for men, r. run. p. 157. l. 3. & 4. r. pleasure & Pastors, & l. 34. r. and. p. 160. l. 2. r. will. p. 163. l. 11. for Proctors, r. Doctors. p. 166. l. 14. r. sin in the. p. 169. l. 6. blot out upon. p. 181. l. 26. r. owed. p. 182. l. 11. r. And yet. p. 187. l. ult. for as, r. at. p. 184. l. 3. for Art. 11. r. Act. 11. p. 191. l. 29. for he, r. the, & l. 37. for decafe, r. depose. p. 194. l. 29. for and, r. & c. p. 199. l. 13. for Art. 11. r. Act. 11. p. 219. l. 1. r. Arrianus. p. 229. l. 32. for three and four, r. third & fourth. p. 241. l. 22. for name, r. main. p. 245. l. 14. for Davenant, r. Davenport. p. 253. l. 18. blot out do. p. 265. l. 12. blot out to. p. 277. l. 2. r. one & the. & l. 12. r. works. p. 291. l. 18. for the, r. that. p. 316. l. 16. r. as their. p. 317. l. 1. 3. for Overseers, r. Others. p. 328. l. 21. r. Behmenists. p. 339. l. 16. r. had no other. p. 340. l. 9. r. the least. p. 367. l. 9. r. add to. p. 372. l. 21. for he, r. the. p. 409. l. 34. r. but what was. p. 420. l. 16. r. of the will. p. 421. l. 26. for them, r. than. p. 430. l. 28. r. Law.



An Advertisement to prevent misunderstanding.



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

SECT. I. Pag. 89. There is somewhat that requireth correction of the pen, and somewhat that requireth explanation. In translating that passage of Ignatius, [Unus panis qui pro omnibus fractus est] must be written next [effusus est] before [& unus Calix.] And for the following objection, though it was made by a discreet person, yet I know no ground for it: unless H. Vossius his Edition leave out [πρὸς τὴν ἐκκλῆσιαν] (which I have not now at hand, but is likelyest) I know not of any Greek copy that leaves it out. Indeed Bishop Ushers Latine doth, and the Vulgar Latine leaves out the translation of the next words before it [τοῖς ὅλοις διατεμένῳ ἐν δυσωστῆριον] of which saith Bishop Usher [Ex interpretatione hac excidisse videantur.] And noting the corruption of the Vulgar Translation in this very place, I there premised to my Answer,

(g)

that



that it might occasion a change in the Text : that it hath done so in many places, I think is easie to prove ; but that it hath done so here, there is no probability, (if any Greek Copy be as is objected : ) and the Reasons of my conjecture of the possibility, are so litile for a probability, that as I express them not, so I think them not worth the expressing, but rather bid you take that as non dictum. Though of the general I find Bishop Usher himself saying, both of his Latine Version [Ex eâ solâ integritati suæ restitui posse Ignatium, polliceri non ausim,] and of the first Greek Edition [Hanc reliqui sequuti sunt editores ; non ex Græco aliquo codice alio, sed partim ex ingenio, partim ex vetere Vulgato Latino Interprete, non paucis in locis eandem corrigentes] Epist. ad Lect. ante Annot. & pag. 26. Dissert.

Seçt. 2. I must intreat the Reader to observe that my drift in this writing is not so much to oppose any form of Government meerly as contrary to the Institution or Apostolical Rule, as to plead against that which I take to be destructive to the Ends of Government : Not that I desire not a careful adhering to the sacred Rule, but 1. Because I suppose that many circumstantials of Discipline undetermined in the Word are feigned by some to be substantial necessary things : and that many matters are indifferent that some lay the Peace if not the being of the Church upon. 2. Because I so far hate contention, that if any Government contrary to my Judgement were set up, that did not apparently in the nature of it wrong the Church, I would silently live under it in peace and quietness : and accordingly would be now loth to enter a quarrel with any Writers that differ from us in tolerable things : But if I know that their judgement reduced to practice is like to be the undoing of many souls, and to cast Discipline almost wholly out of the Church, I think it better to displease them,



them, then let them undo the Church without contradiction. The best is, the serious Christians of this age have experience to help them to understand the case, and I suppose my Disputation to be unto them as if I Disputed before a man that is restored from want, or banishment or sickness, whether he should be reduced to the Condition from which he is restored?

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

SECT. 4. Quest. [Whether the Order of subject Presbyters might lawfully be created by Bishops or any humane Power? and whether the Order of Bishops might lawfully be created for the avoiding of Schism by the consent of Presbyters? or Metropolitans by Bishops?]



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

Sect. 5. When I do in these Papers plead that the Order of Subject Presbyters was not instituted in Scripture times, and consequently that it is not of Divine Institution, I mean as aforesaid, that as a distinct Office, or Species of Church ministers, as to the power from God, it is not of Divine Institution, nor a lawful Institution of man; but that among men, in the same Office, some might Prudentially be chosen to an eminency of degree as to the exercise; and that according to the difference of their advantages there might be a disparity in the use of their authority and gifts. I think was done in Scripture times, and might have been after, if it had not then. And my judgement is, that ordinarily every particular Church

(such

(such a  
but not  
Elders  
dicious  
the same  
fit for  
in the  
preaching  
them for  
true Ep  
mistake  
of these  
in speci  
is above  
and that  
other of  
led now  
to Gover  
Admini  
cal on or  
the other  
then con  
of what  
refers to,  
(same.) W  
the chief  
led Jupit  
fice shoul  
their Ag  
should be  
is usual.  
preaching  
oversight  
monitoring



(Such as our Parish Churches are) had more Elders then One, but not such store of men of eminent gifts as that all these Elders could be such. But as if half a dozen of the most judicious persons of this Parish were Ordained to be Elders, of the same Office with my self, but because they are not equally fit for publick preaching, should most imploy themselves in the rest of the Oversight, consenting that the publick preaching lie most upon me, and that I be the Moderator of them for Order in Circumstantial: This I think was the true Episcopacy and Presbytery of the first times. From the mistake of which, two contrary Errors have arisen: The one of those that think this Moderator was of another Office in specie, having certain work assigned him by God, which is above the reach of the Office of Presbyters to perform; and that he had many fixed Churches for his charge. The other of them that think these Elders were such as are called now Lay-elders, that is, Unordained men, authorized to Govern, without Authority to Preach, Baptize, or Administer the Lords Supper. And so both the Prelatical on one side, and the Presbyterians and Independents on the other side, run out, and mistake the ancient form, and then contend against each other. (This was the substance of what I wrote to Mr. Vines, which his subjoynd Letter refers to, where he signifieth that his judgement was the same.) When Paul and Barnabas were together, Paul was the chief speaker, and yet Barnabas by the Idolaters called Jupiter. Nature teacheth us that men in the same Office should yet have the preheminence that's due to them by their Age, and Parts, and Interests, &c. and that Order should be kept among them, as in Colledges and all Societies is usual. The most excellent part of our work is publick preaching, but the most of it for quantity is the rest of the Oversight of the Church (in Instructing personally, admonishing, reprovng, enquiring into the truth of accusa-



tions, comforting, visting the sick, stablishing the weak, looking to the poor, absolving, answering doubts, excommunicating, and much more.) And therefore as there is a necessity (as the experienced know) of many Elders in a particular Church of any great number, so it is fit that most hands should be most employed about the said works of Oversight, yet so as that they may preach as need and occasion requireth (and administer Sacraments) and that the eminent Speakers be most employed in publick preaching, yet so as to do their part of the rest as occasion requireth: And so the former Elders that Rule well shall be worthy of double honour, but especially these that labour in the Word and Doctrine, by more ordinary publick preaching: And such kind of seldom-preaching Ministers as the former, were in the first times, and should be in most Churches yet that are numerous.

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

Sect. 7. Specially remember that by [Bishops] in that dispute, I mean, according to the Modern use, one that is no Archbishop, and yet no meer Presbyter, but one supposed to be between both, that is, a Superior to meer Presbyters in Order or Office, and not only in degree or modifi-



carlon of the exercise; but below Archbishops (whether in Order or Degree:) These are they that I dispute against; excluding Metropolitans, or Archbishops from the question, and that for many Reasons.

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

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



think they abuse or are abused in, is displeasing and unprofitable.

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



loco only (as of the kiss of love, hair, covering, eating things strangled, and blood, &c.) I take it not for a proof that this is an universal standing Law. One or two of these exceptions wil shake off the proofs that some count strong for the universal obligation of the Church to Diocesans or Metropolitans.

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

Se<sup>ct</sup>. 12. And as to them that confidently teach that the Apostles suited the Ecclesiastical Government to the Politick, and that as by a Law, for the church universally to obey: All the confutation at present that I will trouble them with, shall be to tell them, that I never saw any thing like a proof of it, to my understanding, among all the words that are brought to that purpose: and to tell them, 1. That if Paul chose Ephesus, Corinth, and other the most populous places to preach in, it was but a prudential circumstantiating of his work, according to that General Law of doing all to Edification: and not an obli-



gation on all the Pastors or Preachers of the Gospel to do the same where the case is not the same. 2. And if Paul having converted many in these Cities do there plant Churches (and no other can be proved in Scripture times) it follows not that we may plant no Churches but in Cities. 3. And if the greatest Cities had then the most numerous Churches, and the most eminent Pastors fitted to them, and therefore are named with some note of excellency above the rest, it followeth not that the rest about them were under them by subjection. 4. Yea if the Bishops of the chief Cities for order sake were to call Provincial Assemblies, and the meetings to be in their Cities, and they were to be the Presidents of the rest in Synods, with such like circumstantial difference, it followeth not that they were proper Governours of the rest, and the rest to obey them in the Government of their proper charges. Nor that they had power to place and displace them. 5. Much less will it prove that these Metropolitans, taking the name of Diocesans, might put down all the Bishops of two hundred Churches under them, and set up none but Presbyters (in order distinct from Bishops) over the flocks, besides themselves; and so the Archbishops having extinguished all the first Order of Bishops of single Churches, to take the sole Government of so many Churches, even people as well as Presbyters into their own hands. 6. And I do not think that they can prove that the Apostles did institute as many sorts of Church-Government then, as there were of civil Policy in the world. All the world had not the Roman form of Government: Nor had lesser Cities the same dependence upon greater, in all other Countreys. 7. Was it in one degree of subordination of Officers only, or in all, that the Apostles suited the Ecclesiasticall Government to the Civil? If in One, how is it proved that they intended it in that one, and not in the rest? If in all, then we must have



have many degrees of Officers, more then yet we have: Inferiors very many, and Superiors some of all conscience too high: then we must have some to answer the Correctors, the Consular Presidents, and the Vicars, and Lieutenants, the Pro-consuls and Prefects, and the Emperor himself: Even one to be Universal in the Empire (thats yet some Limit to the Pope, and will hazzard the removing of the Supremacy to Constantinople, by the Rule that the Apostles are supposed to go by.) And great variety must there be in the several Diocesses of the Empire (which Blondell hath punctually described de primatu in Eccles. pag. 511. to 519. shewing the causes of the inequality of Bishopricks and Churches.) 8. According to this Opinion the form of Church must alter as oft as Emperours will change their Policy, or Wars shall change them: And upon every change of the Priviledges of a City, the Churches Preheminence must change, and so we shall be in a mutable frame: Which if Basil and Anthymius had understood, might have quicklier decided their controversie. Yea according to this opinion, Princes may quite take down Metropolitans at pleasure, by equalling the priviledges of their Cities. The best is then, that it is in the power of our Civil Governours to dissolve our obligation to Metropolitans, yea and to all Bishops too, if Cities must be their only residence, as I have shewed.

Sec. 13. As for them that pretend humane Laws for their form of Government, that is, the decrees of General Councils; I answer, 1. I disown and deny all humane Laws as obligatory to the Church Universal: It is the prerogative of God, yea the greatest point of the exercise of his Sovereignty to be the Law-giver to his Universal Church. There can be no Universal Laws without an Universal Law-giver: and there is no Universal Law-giver under Christ in the world. 2. And for General Councils (since



Scripture times at least) there have been no such things nor anything like them, unless the Roman Empire, yea a piece of it, be the whole world. I know therefore no humane Universal Laws, whether it be for forms of Government, Liturgies, Holy dayes, or any thing else.

SECT. 14. But the principal matter that tends to end our difference, is, the right understanding of the Nature of that Government that is properly Ecclesiastical: What is it that we must have Diocesans and Metropolitans to do? (besides what I have granted to Apostolical Bishops in the third Dispute?) Is it to Teach or Rule the people of the particular Churches? They cannot do it at so great distance, not knowing them nor conversing with them; at least so well as they that are on the place, as the ancient Bishops were. Is it to Rule the Presbyters only? Why then hath not every Church a Bishop to Rule the flock, but a Presbyter that is forbidden to Rule them (in all that which they call Jurisdiction themselves)? And how is it that Presbyters shall be Ruled by Diocesans, and the Diocesans by Provincials? not by force: For the Pastors have no coercive power by violence, or touching mens bodies or estates. Is it by bare commanding? Why what will that do on dissenters that disobey? shall they depose the Bishops or Presbyters that disobey them? But how? Not by any force, but command, or exhortation, or Excommunication. They can do no more that I know of. And what if they excommunicate a Pastor! Let the case be supposed as now it is among us: What if a Bishop with the few that adhere to him, excommunicated all the Pastors in the County that are not satisfied of the Divine Right of Diocesans, or of the lawfulness of all his imposed Ceremonies and Forms? The people will take it to be their duty (most generally where the Ministry hath been savingly effectual) to own their Pastors notwithstanding such an Excommunication, and the Pastors will take it to be



be their duty to go on with their work: and the excommunication will do no good (unless perhaps to make some Division, and make both parties the scorn of the ungodly, or procure the rabble to rail more bitterly at their Pastors, and hate all their advice, be a desirable good.) And as when the Pope excommunicated them, some Bishops again excommunicated the Pope; so some of these Pastors its like would excommunicate their Metropolitans: And why a Bishop, or at least a Synod of Bishops may not cast a wicked Metropolitan out of their communion, is past my understanding to conceive.

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

Sect. 15. Much of my Opposition to the English Prelacy dependeth on the supposition, that they took all the people, and not only the Presbyters for the objects of their Government, or for their charge: And I find some of the younger sort that are sprung up since their fall, do doubt of this. But 1. all men in England that knew



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

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



self, in saying the Pastors were degraded or suspended, as to the exercise of so great a part of their work, and yet say here, & Pref. to the Reformed Pastor, that the Power of Discipline was given them? ] *Ans. 1. In their Ordination the Bishops said to them* [Receive the Holy Ghost: whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted; whose sins thou dost retain they are detained.] *And in the Book of Ordination it was asked of them* [Whether they would give their faithful diligence always to administer the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the Discipline of Christ as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Realm hath received the same according to the Commandements of God?] *And the Rubrick of the Common Prayer Book enableth the Curate to admonish open and notorious evil livers by whom the Congregation is offended, and those that have wronged their neighbors, that they come not till they have openly declared that they have repented and amended.] But 1. This doth but serve to leave them unexcusable, that acknowledged Discipline to belong to the Office of a Presbyter, when yet he might not exercise it. The Bishops in the Ordination of Presbyters enabled them to preach the Gospel: And yet they were after that forbidden to preach till they had a License; and it was put into the Visitation Articles, to present those Ministers that preached without License. If they will deny us the exercise of the Power that they first confess belongeth to our Office, we are not answerable for their self-contradictions.*

2. By Discipline I suppose they mean but our Instruction, and our publishing their Orders for Penance, Excommunication, or Absolution. 3. They were the Judges of the sense of the Laws, as far as the execution required: And the Universal Practice of England, with their writings, shewed us, to our cost, their judgement. What good would it do us, if the Law had been on our side, while the Con-

rent



rent Judgement and Practice of the Governors denyed it, and went against it. 4. He that had kept a man from the Sacrament, according to the plain words of the Rubrick, was to have been accountable for it at their Courts, and so likely (if he had been a man of serious piety, and not a persecutor of Puritans) to have been undone by it, and was like to make so little of it, as to the Ends of Discipline (all men being compelled by the Presentments to receive the Sacrament) that I never knew one (to my best remembrance) in 25 years time that I lived under the Bishops, that was kept from the Sacrament, except a Puritan that scrupled to take it kneeling. And what was this to true Church Government?

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

Sect. 18. *Object.* But may not Bishops when they Ordain, Delegate what measure of Ministerial Power they please? and if you never received more, why should you use it? *Answ.* A poor relief to the forsaken Church: Deprive her of Government, and then tell us that



we had no power! Is the Power desirable to us; if the Ordinance were not desirable to the Church? 2. What Power have Bishops, and whence did they receive it, to change the Office of Christs institution, or his Apostles? If so, they may turn the three Orders (which the Papists themselves say the Pope cannot alter) into as many more. Then they may create an Office for Baptizing only, and another for the Lords Supper only, and another for praying only, and so of the rest; which is worse then making Lay-elders, or then taking away the Cup in the Sacrament. Hath Christ by his Spirit instituted Church-offices, and are they now at the Bishops power to transform them? 3. If they had power to distribute the work in the exercise, part to one, and part to another, yet they have no power to deprive the particular Churches of the whole or any part; but one or more must do it, and the Office must be the same, and the power exercised to the edification, and not the confusion and corruption of the Church.

Sect. 19. Object. But the Keys were given only to the Apostles, and not to the seventy Disciples nor to Presbyters.] Answ. 1. If the seventy were only Disciples, and not Church-officers, the Ancients and the English Bishops have been much mistaken, that have so much urged it, that Presbyters succeed them as Bishops do the Apostles: But if they be Officers, then they have the Keys. 2. The Episcopal Divines, even the Papists, commonly confess that part of the Keys are given to the Presbyters: and Christ gave them together. 3. Were they given only to Apostles for themselves, or to convey to others? If to themselves only, then noone hath them now. If to convey to others, then either to Apostles only as their Successors (but there's none such) or to Patriarchs or Trimates, or Metropolitans, or Archbishops only: (but none of this will please the Bishops) or to Bishops only; which I grant, taking Bishops



in the Scripture sense. And I desire to see it proved, that it was not a presumptuous Innovation in them whoſoever they were, that after the days of the Apoſtles Ordained a new ſort of Presbyters in the Church that ſhould have no power of the Keys. 4. They that muſt uſe the Keys, muſt have Power to uſe them. But Pariſh Biſhops muſt uſe them (as the nature and neceſſity of the work doth prove:) Therefore Pariſh Biſhops muſt have the Power. If only one man in a Dioceſs of an hundred or two hundred Churches ſhall have the power of the Keys, we may know after all the talk of Diſcipline, what Diſcipline to expect.

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

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