

as *Pastors*, are *Directly* acts of Government : but as *Assembled Pastors*, and also as to the Canons by which they bind each other, they act but by consent or contract in order to concord and communion, and not by a superiour Ruling power. So that Synods as Synods are *Directly* only *Gratiâ Unitatis & Communio- nis*, and not *Gratia Regiminis*; but *Indirectly* and by consequence from the first use, they are *after a sort Regimental*.

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

So a Schoolmaster may make orders for the right circumstan- tiating of matters in his School (supposing one Grammer en- joyed by superiour Authority,) and he may order what Au- thors shall be read, and at what hours, and how much at a time, and dispose of the seats and orders of his Schollars : But yet if

he be a Teacher of the Adult, according to our case, he cannot corporally punish those that either refuse to be his Schollars, or to learn of him or obey him ; but the utmost that he can do is to put some disgrace upon them while they abide in his School, and at last to shut them out. And then all the Schoolmasters in the Countrey may well agree upon one Method of Teaching, and that they will not receive those without satisfaction into one School, who are for obstinacy and abuse cast out of another. But such Agreements or Meetings to that end do not make either one Physitian or Schoolmaster to be the Governour of the rest, or above another, nor yet to have the charge of all the Schollars or Patients of all the rest ; so is it in the case of Ecclesiastical Assemblies.

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

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

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

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

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

4. A fourth sort are the *sole Pastors of such a particular Church that have many Ministers under them as their Curates*, who are properly to be Ruled by them alone ; so that the Pastor is the sole Ruler of that Church, and the Curates do only teach and otherwise officiate in obedience to him : Which is the case of

divers

divers Ministers of great Parishes, that keep one Curate at their Parish Church, and others at their Chappels. Yet its one thing to be the sole Ruler of the Parish, and another to Rule the rest of the Elders.

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. The eleventh sort are *unfixed general Pastors*, called *Am-bulatory*.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I. Such

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

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

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

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

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

8. As to the eighth sort of Bishops, *viz.* [*The Diocesan who assumeth the sole Government of many Parish Churches both Presbyters and People*] as ten, or twelve, or twenty or more, as they used to do, even a whole Diocess, I take them to be intolerable, and

and destructive to the Peace and happiness of the Church, and therefore not to be admitted under pretence of Order or Peace, if we can hinder them. But of these we must speak more when we come to the main Question.

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

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

11. As for the eleventh sort of Bishops, that is [*such as succeed the Apostles in the office of Preaching and Governing, to wit as unlimited universal Officers*] it is a great doubt among many whether any such should be? For though it be certain that such were, yet we are in doubt whether they have any successors. For my own part, I confess my self satisfied in this, that the Apostles have Successors, though not in their extraordinary Immediate man-

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

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

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

So that I am satisfied of this, that the Apostles as General Preachers and Governours have successors. But then I must confess my self not fully satisfied, what Governing Power it was that the Apostles had over the Pastors of the Church. I find that when *Saravia*, and after him, the Disputants in the Isle of *Wight*, do insist on this Argument from the way of Church Government by the Apostles, that their Antagonists do presently grant the Minor [*that The Government of the Church at first was by men authorized to Rule the Presbyters and their Churches.*] but they deny the Major, that [*the Government which was then in the Church should continue till now,*] because it was by Apostles, whose Office they think ceaseth. Whereas I must confess I am unavoidably forced to yield the Major, that we must have the same kind of Government that was at first instituted, unless we had better proof of a change: For the stablishment of particular Churches and Presbyters was no change of the Apostles power, seeing they gave not away their power to the Presbyters nor

nor ceased to have the same Apostolical power which they had before. Only the Apostles extraordinary Mission, Gifts and Priviledges, I confess are ceased. But then I conceive that the Minor which is so easily granted, *viz.* [that the Apostles had the Government of the particular Presbyters] will hold more dispute, at least as to the nature and degree of their power: and were I as fully satisfied about the Minor as I am of the Major, I must by this one Argument be forced to be for the *Jus Divinum* of Episcopacy. What at present seems truth to me, I shall lay down in these Propositions.

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

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

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

Prop. 4. It is most certain that they who had the extraordinary privilege of being eye-witnesses of Christs Miracles and Life, and ear-witnesses of his Doctrine, and had the extraordinary power of working Miracles for a Confirmation of their Doctrine, must needs have greater * *Authority in mens Consciences* than other men, upon that very account, if there were no other. So that even their Gifts and Priviledges may be (and doubtless were) one ground at least of that higher degree of Authority, which they had above others. For in such a Ratio-

* Authority is, 1. Rational and of meer Interest upon Consenters.
2. Imperial, over Dissenters also.

nal perswasive Authority which worketh only on the Conscience, the case is much different from the secular power of Magistrates. For in the former, even Gifts may be a ground of a greater measure of Power, in binding mens minds. And here is the greatest part of the difficulty that riseth in our way, to hinder us from improving the example of the Apostles, in that it is so hard to discern how much of their power over other Presbyters or Bishops was from their supereminency of Office and Imperial Authority, and how much was meerly from the excellency of their Gifts and Priviledges.

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

Prop. 6. Yet had the Apostles a power of Miraculous Castigation of the very bodies of the Offenders, at least sometimes: which *Peter* exercised upon *Ananias* and *Sapphira*, and *Paul* upon *Elymas*, and some think upon *Hymenæus* and *Philetas*, and those other that were said to be delivered up to Satan: certainly *Paul* [*had in readiness to revenge all disobedience*] 2 Cor. 10. 6. which its like extendeth somewhat farther than to meer censures. But its most certain that the Apostle used not this power of hurting mens bodies ordinarily, but sparingly as they did other Miracles; perhaps not according to their own wills, but the Holy Ghosts. So that this did not corrupt their Government neither, and destroy the Spirituality of it. Yet this makes it somewhat more difficult to us to improve the Apostles example, because we know not how much of their power upon mens Consciences might be from such penal Miracles.

Prop. 7. The Apostles had power to Ordain and send others to the work of the Ministry. But this only by the consent of the ordained, and of the people (before they could be compleat fixed Pastors) for they forced not any to go, or any people to entertain them. And it seemeth they did not Ordain singly, but many

many together, *Acts 14.23.* * *Timothy had his Gift by the laying on of Pauls hands and of the hands of the Presbyterie, 1 Tim. 4.14. and 2 Tim. 1.6.*

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

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

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

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

Prop. 12. It was therefore by the General Commission of Apostleship that they Governed particular Churches *pro tempore* while they were among or neer them, and not by any special Commission or Office of being the Diocesan or Metropolitan of this or that place. 1. It was below them, and a diminution of their honor to be so affixed, and take the charge of any particular Churches. 2. We find not that ever they did it. 3. If they had, then all the disorders and ungovernedness of those Churches would be imputable to them, and therefore they must be still with them as fixed Bishops are, seeing they cannot govern them at such a distance as makes them incapable. 4. When

* If one were not meant of Confirmation or giving the Holy Ghost, and the other of Ordination, which I rather incline to think,

Peter drew Barnabas and many more to dissimulation, and almost to betray the liberties of the Gentiles, Paul doth not say, This is my Diocese, and I must be the Ruler here: nor doth Peter plead this against him, when Paul and Barnabas fell out, whether Mark should be taken with them or not; neither of them did plead a Ruling Authority, nor say, This is my Diocese, or I am the superior Ruler, but they produced their reasons, and when they could not agree concerning the validity of each others reasons, they separated and took their several companions and waies.

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

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

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

Prop. 15. It seems utterly untrue that Christ did deliver the Keyes only to the twelve Apostles as such, and so only to their Successors, and not the seventy Disciples or any Presbyters. For 1. The seventy also were General unfixed Officers, and not like fixed Presbyters or Bishops: and therefore having a larger Commission must have equal power. 2. The Apostles were not single Bishops as now they are differenced from others: but they were such as had more extensive Commissions, then those now called Arch-Bishops or Patriarchs. If therefore the Keyes were given them as Apostles, or General Officers, then they were never given to Bishops. For Bishops as fixed Bishops of
this

this or that Diocess are not Successors of the Apostles, who were General unfixed Officers. 3. It is granted commonly by Papists and Protestants, that Presbyters have the power of the Keyes, though many of them think that they are limited to exercise them under the Bishops, and by their Direction and Consent, (of which many School-men have wrote at large) 4. The Key of Excommunication is but a Ministerial Authoritative Declaration, that such or such a known Offendor is to be avoided, and to charge the Church to avoid Communion with him, and him to avoid or keep away from the Priviledges of the Church; and this a meer Presbyter may do: he may authoritatively Declare such a man to be one that is to be avoided, and charge the Church and him to do accordingly. The like I may say of Absolution: if they belong to every authorized Pastor, Preacher and Church guide, as such, then not to a Bishop only, but to a Presbyter also. And that these Keyes belong to more then the Apostles and their Successors, is plain, in that these are insufficient Naturally to use them to their Ends. An Apostle in *Antioch* cannot look to the censuring of all persons that are to be Censured at *Athens, Paris, London, &c.* so that the most of the work would be totally neglected, if only they and their supposed Successors had the doing of it. I conclude therefore that the Keyes belong not only to Apostles and their Successors in that General Office, no nor only to Diocessan Bishops: for then Presbyters could not so much as exercise them with the Bishops in Consistory, which themselves of late allow.

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

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

safety, as *Paul* did by *Peter*, *Galatians* 2. 1.

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

Prop. 19. It is not easie to manifest, whether every Presbyter in *prima instantia* be not an Officer to the Church Universal, before he be affixed to a particular Church; and whether he may not go up and down over the world to exercise that office, where ever he hath admittance. And if so, what then could an Apostle have done by vertue of his meer office, without the advantage of his extraordinary abilities, and priviledges, which the Presbyter may not do? May an Apostle charge the people where he comes to avoid this or that seducer or heretick? so may any Preacher that shall come among them, and that by authority. May an Apostle Excommunicate the very Pastor of the place, and deprive him? why what is that but to perswade the people, and Authoritatively require them, to avoid and withdraw from such a Pastor, if the Cause be manifest? And so may any Pastor or Preacher that comes among them. For if (as *Cyprian* saith) it chiefly belong to the people even of themselves to reject and withdraw from such a Pastor, then a Preacher may by Authority perswade and require them to do their own duty. Yet I shall acknowledge, that though both may do the

the same duty, and both by Authority, yet possibly not both by equal Authority, but an Apostle *Majore autoritate*, and so may lay a stronger obligation on men to the same duty; but the rest I determine not, but leave to enquiry.

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

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

TO draw some of this which I have said into a narrower room, I shall briefly tell you what I could heartily wish both Magistrates and Ministers would speedily accomplish for the order and Peace of the Church in these matters.

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

2. I could wish that every Parish Church may have one Eldership (where they may be had) or some Elders and Deacons, with one Constant Fixed, Perfect for Order and Unity.

3. I could wish that Ordination and Constitutions for Unity and Communion may be done only in Synods, less or greater: and that of many Presbyteries there may consist a *Classis*, as commonly called, and of many of those a Province: And that the Classial meeting may be frequent, and that some one, the fittest man, may be standing President of that *Classis* during life, except he deserve removal.

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

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

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

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

AND now at last after these (not needless) preparations, I come to the main Question it self, *Whether it be Necessary or Profitable for the right Order or Peace of the Churches, to restore the extruded Episcopacy?* And this I deny, and having said

Essentiale fuit, quod ex Dei ordinatione perpetua; necessesse fuit, est & erit in Presbyterio quispiam & loco & dignitate primus actioni gubernandae praesit, cum eo quod ipsi divinitus attributum est jure. Beza de Ministr. Evang. Grad. cap. 23.

so much already for explication, shall presently give you the Reasons of my denial; in which the rest of the necessary explication will be contained.

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

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

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

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