

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 gainsayers, 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

other Censures and Absolution alone.

2. But if they could prove that Church Government containeth only Censures and Absolution, yet we shall easily prove it Impossible for the late English Episcopacy to do that. For, 3. It is known to our sorrow that in most Parishes there are many persons, and in some greater Parishes very many, that have lived, common open swearers, or drunkards, and some whoremongers, common scorers of a godly life, and in many more of those offences, for which Scripture and the ancient Canons of the Church do excommunicate men, and we are commanded with such no not to eat. And its too well known what numbers of Hereticks and Seducers there are, that would draw men from the faith, whom the Church-Governours must after the first and second admonition reject. 4. And then its known what a deal of work is Necessary with any one of these, in hearing accusations, examining Witnesses, hearing the defendants, searching into the whole cause, admonishing, waiting, re-admonishing, &c. 5. And then its known of how great Necessity, and moment all these are to the honour of the Gospel, the souls of the offenders, to the Church, to the weak, to them without, &c. So that if it be neglected, or unfaithfully mananged, much mischief will ensue. Thus in part we see what the Government is.

Next let us see what the English Episcopacy is. And 1. For the extent of it, a Diocess contained many score or hundred Parishes, and so many thousands of such souls to be thus Governed. Perhaps some Diocesses may have five hundred thousand souls, and it may be *London* Diocess nearer a million. And how many thousand of these may fall under some of the forementioned acts of Government, by our sad experience we may conjecture.

2. Moreover the Bishop resideth, if not at *London* (as many of them did) yet in his own dwelling, many miles, perhaps twenty or thirty from a great part of his Diocess, so that most certainly he doth not so much as know by face, name, or report the hundredth, perhaps the thousandth, or perhaps the second or third thousandth person in his Diocess. Is it Possible then for him to watch over them, or to understand the quality of the person and fact? In Church Cases the quality of the person is of so much moment, that without some knowledge of it, the bare knowledge of the fact sometimes will not serve.

* I know
 Bishop *Usher*
 in his papers
 to the King,
 doth say that
 by the Order
 of the Church
 of *England*, all
 Presbyters are
 charged (in
 the form of
 Ordering of
 Priests) to
 administer the
 Discipline of
 Christ : But
 the Bishops
 understood
 that only of
 their publish-
 ing their
 Censures. For
 no such Ad-
 ministration
 was known
 among us, or
 allowed: Nor
 would they
 suffer men to
 suspend them
 from the Sa-
 crament, as the
 Rubrick in
 the Common
 Prayer Book
 requireth.

* 3. And then it is known that the English Episcopacy denyeth to the Presbyters all power of Excommunication and Absolution, unless to pronounce it as from the Bishop when he hath past it: And they deny him also all power so much as of calling a sinner to open Repentance, which they called Imposing penance: and also they denied all power of denying the Lords Supper to any without the Bishops censure, except in a sudden case, and then they must prosecute it after at the Bishops Court; and there render the Reason of that suspension: So that the trouble, danger, labour, time would be so great that would be spent in it, that scarce one Minister of a hundred did venture on it once in seven and seven years, except only to deny the Sacrament to a man that would not kneel, and that they might do easily and safely.

4. And then Consider further, that if the Minister should be one of an hundred, and so diligent as to accuse and prosecute all the open scandalous offenders of his Parish, before the Bishops Court, that so he might procure that act of Government from them, which he may not perform himself, it would take up all his time, and perhaps all would not serve for half the work, considering how far he must ride, how frequently he must attend, &c. And then all the rest, or most of the Pastoral work must be neglected, to the danger of the whole Congregation.

5. It is a great penalty to an innocent man to travail so far to the trial of his Cause. But the special thing that I note is this, that it is Naturally Impossible, for the Bishop to hear, try and judge all these causes, yea or the fifth or hundredth of them, or in some places one of five hundred. Can one man hear so many hundred as in a day must be before him, if this discipline be faithfully executed? By that time that he hath heard two or three Causes, and examined Witnesses, and fully debated all, the rest can have no hearing; and thus unavoidably the work must be undone. It is as if you set a Schoolmaster to teach ten or twenty thousand Schollars? Must they not be needs untaught? Or as if you set one Shepherd to look to two or three hundred several flocks of Sheep, that are every one of them three or four miles asunder, and some of them forty miles from some of the rest. Is it any wonder then if many of them be lost?

6. But what need we further witness then the sad experience of the Church of late? Are we not sure that discipline lay unexercised, and our Congregations defiled, and Gods Laws and the old Canons were dead letters, while the Bishops keep up the lame and empty name of Governours? How many drunkards, swearers, whoremongers, raylers, Extortioners, scornerers at a godly life did swarm in almost every Town and Parish? and they never heard of discipline, except it were one Adulterer or fornicator once in seven years within twenty miles compass (where I was acquainted) that stood in a white sheet in the Church: We know that there was no such Matter as Church Government exercised to any purpose, but all left undone, unless it were to undoe a poor Disciplinary (as they therefore scornfully called them) that blamed them for neglect of Discipline. For my part, the Lord my Judge knows, that I desire to make the matter rather better then it was, then worse then it was; and I solemnly profess that for the Peace of the Church, I should submit to almost any body that would but do the work that is to be done. Here is striving between the Episcopal, Presbyterian and Independent, who it is that shall Govern. I would make no great stirr against any of them all that would but do it effectually. Let it be done, and its not so much matter by whom it is done, as it is to have it lie undone. But I can never be for that party that neither did the work, when they might, nor possibly can do it. To be for them, is to consent that all should be undone; and that Drunkards and Railers and all wicked persons shall continue so still, or continue members of our Churches in all their oblinacy: and that there shall be nothing but the name of Government and Censure without the thing. Its hard making men of Conscience believe the contrary that have had the trial that we have had: If where good men were Bishops thus it was, what hope of better by that way? We cannot shut our eyes against so great experience. And certainly those Learned men among us that think so much Discipline may serve turn to all the Congregations in the whole Diocess, as the Bishop can perform or have a Negative Vote in, do too manifestly shew that they * are less friends to real godliness, and greater friends to sin, teach, or are themselves such as they describe, or really would promote a holy life; especially when Scornerers at a godly life were favoured more then the practisers of it.

* Its an easie matter to preach or write a strict Lesson; but they that would practically when they have done open a gap to licentiousness, and overthrow all Discipline almost, will hardly persuade men that they mean as they

and care too little for the matter it self while they contend about the manner or agent, then serious Christians should do. If men once plainly shew themselves meer formalists, and would set up a scarecrow, and pull down all true Discipline, by setting up one man to do the work of five hundred, and making the exercise of it impossible, what serious Christian will ever take their part? Not I while I breath: Who can choose but see that such do seek their dignity, and Lordships, and worldly Mammon more then the Kingdom of Christ. I know they will be angry with me for this language; but so are most impenitent persons with reproofs. I would advise all of them that survive to lay to heart before the Lord, what they did in undertaking such an impossible task, and leaving so many souls and Congregations without Christs remedy, and suffering the Churches to be so foul, while they had the Beesom in their hands.

This being so manifest that it is impossible for an English Bishop to Govern as they undertook so many Congegations, I may well next argue from the mischiefs that follow.

Argum. 2. **T**hat Government which gratifieth the Devils and wicked men, is not to be restored under any pretence of the Order or Peace of the Church: But such was the English Episcopacy; therefore, &c.

The Major is undeniable, supposing that it do not this by an avoidable accident, but by natural Necessity, as I have proved. I confesse some of the Men were so Learned and Good men, that I think few men honour their names more then my self. But it is the way of Government that I have spoke of.

And for the Minor, it is as plain from experience, and the argument before used. If it necessarily exclude the exercise of Christs Discipline from most Congregations, then doth it gratifie Satan: But, &c.

And if it keep wicked obstinate sinners from the power of discipline, then doth it gratifie sinners in their Sins, and consequently please Satan. But this it doth: therefore, &c.

Who knows not (for it cannot be denied) that the generality of the rabble of ignorant persons, worldlings, drunkards, haters of Godliness, &c. are very zealous for Episcopacy, whilst multitudes

tudes of truly conscientious people have been against it? And who knows not that they both fetcht their chief Motives from experience? The ungodly found that Bishops let them keep their sins, and troubled them not with this preciseness, but rather drove away the precise preachers and people whom they abhorred. And the godly people that disliked Episcopacy, did it principally on the same experience, observing that they befriended the wicked, at least by preserving them from the due rod of discipline; but exercised their zeal against them that scrupled or questioned at least their own standing or assumed power, or the abuse of it. And then further,

Argum. 3. **T**hat Government which unavoidably causeth separations and divisions in the Church, is not to be restored under any pretence of its Order and Peace? But such is the English Episcopacy? therefore: &c.

I know the clean contrary is strongly pretended, and they tell us that we may see how Episcopacy kept men in Unity, by the many Sects that since are risen. But let it be observed, 1. That these Sects were hatched in the separation which was caused by themselves. 2. That the increase hath been since there was no Government at all. 3. It was not Episcopacy, but the Magistrates Sword whose terror did attend it, that kept under heresies in that measure that they were: Had Episcopacy stood on its own legs, without the support of secular force, so that it might have workt only on the conscience, then you should have seen more Sects then now. Do you think that if Episcopacy were in *Scotland* in the Case as Presbytery is now, without the Sword to enforce it, that it would keep so much Unity in Religion as is there? Its known in *France* and other places that Presbytery hath kept more Unity, and more kept out Heresies and Schisms, even without the Sword, then Episcopacy hath done with it. 4. But the thing that I speak of is undeniable; that it was the pollution of our Churches that caused the Separatists in the Bishops dayes to withdraw. This was their common cry against us, Your Churches bear with Drunkards, Whoremongers, Railers, open Scorners at Godliness, with whom the Scripture bids us not eat, And we could not deny it: for the Bishops did keep

See my Preface to Mr. Pierce of Gro-tius Religion. Were Prelacy now tolerated only as Presbyterie and the Congregational way are, doth any man think it would cast out Heresies?

it so, by keeping out all effectual Discipline. Only we told them, that it was the Prelates sin, and not theirs that could not help it, and that a polluted Church might be a true Church. And so the Disciplinarian Non-Conformists were fain by many painful writings to suppress the spirit of separation, or else it had been like to have overwhelmed all; Mr. *John Paget*, Mr. *Bradshaw*, Mr. *Arthur Hildersham*, Mr. *John Ball*, Mr. *Brightman*, Mr. *Paul Bains*, Mr. *Dod*, Mr. *Parker*, Dr. *Ames*, and many other such, were fain to make it a great part of their business, to quench the fire of separation, which even their persecutors kindled by the exclusion of Discipline. And yet the sense of the Churches uncleanness was so deep in mens minds, that it had bred such abundance of discontented humors, that they easily broke out, and turned into this disorderly swarm which we have seen, as soon as the wars had but given them liberty.

And even to this day it is the uncleanness of our Churches, (wherein I would the Pastors were wholly innocent) which maintaineth much of the separation, among many sober godly men. For the Churches were left so polluted by the Bishops, that in most places the Presbyters dare scarce go roundly about the cure, unless they had the help of the sword, wherein yet for my part I think them deeply sinful.

Argum. 4. **T**hat Episcopacy which degradeth all the Presbyters in the Dioceſs, or causeth them to suspend the exercise of an Essential part of their Office, is not to be restored under any pretence of right order, or peace. But such was the late English Episcopacy: therefore.

I confels this is the second inconvenience which followeth it, which I think utterly intolerable, where there is any possibility of a remedy. The Major I suppose will be granted. For though an Office may be unexercised for a time on some special reason, yet if it be staledly suspended, and that suspension established by Law or Custom, during the life of the Minister, this is plainly a destroying or nulling of the Office it self, and not to be endured.

And that it is not to be endured appeareth thus; 1. Because the Office of the Presbyter is of Divine Institution, and therefore

fore not to be nulled by man. I never yet read or heard of any more but one Divine of any reputation who denyed that Presbyters as now called are appointed in the Scriptures, and I think, that one hath destroyed his cause by it, of which more anon.

2. Because the Church cannot with any safety spare the Office of the Presbyters, because they are many, perhaps many hundred to one Prelate: and if so many of Christs Officers be laid by, it is easie to see what loss the vineyard and harvest may sustain.

The Minor I prove thus. That Episcopacy which taketh from the Presbyters the power of Church-Government, and alloweth them only the power of preaching and administring Sacraments, and those other parts of the work which they distinguish from Government, do thereby destroy the very Office of the Presbyters (and so degrade or suspend them) But the late English Episcopacy taketh from the Presbyters the power of Church-Governing; &c. therefore.

The Antecedent is well known by those that know their Canons, claim and constant practice in *England*, till the time of their exclusion. That the Consequence is currant appeareth thus. Church-Government is as real and as essential a part of the Presbyters work and office as any other whatsoever. Therefore they that take this from him, do destroy his Office.

The Antecedent is proved thus: if those Texts of Scripture which mention the Office of Presbyters, *Acts 20.* and *14. 23.* and many other places do speak of Presbyters as now understood, and not of Prelates, then Ruling is as much essential to their office as Preaching. This is proved, 1. From the expresse words of the several Texts, which make them Overseers of the flock, *Acts 20. 28.* and to be over the people in the Lord, to whom they are to submit, *1 Thes. 5. 12, 13.* and Rulers of them, whom they must obey, as well as Preachers to them, *Heb 13. 7, 17, 24. 1 Tm. 3. 4. 5.* 2. Its proved from common Consent. For,

1. Those that think these Texts speak of Presbyters as now understood, do most commonly confesse this sense of the Text, viz. that it makes them Rulers; only some of them add, that themselves must be Ruled by the Bishops. 2. He that denyeth these Texts to speak of such Presbyters, doth confesse that those of whom it doth speak, are certainly Rulers of the Church.

And then I assume: But the general vote of almost all Expo-

Functiones in Ecclesia perpetua sunt duae; Presbyterorum & Diaconorum: Presbyteros voco cum omnibus in Ecclesia veteribus eos, qui Ecclesiam pascunt verbis praedicationis, Sacramentis & Clavibus; quae Jure Divino sunt individua: (he meaneth inseparable) so that its inseparable from a Presbyter to have the Power of the Keyes. Grot. de Imperio, pag. 267. c. 22.

posers

Pastorum ergo est Ordinare Pastores: neque id officium eis competit qua hujus aut illius Ecclesie Pastores sunt, sed qua ministri Ecclesie Catholicae.

Grotius ibid.

P. 273.

Pastores tales (ubi nulli sunt Episcopi) esse Presbyteris id commune habent quod alius non presunt; habent tamen illud Episcopale, quod nemini Pastori subsunt; atque ad hoc dubium est, Episcopisne, an meris Presbyteris rectius amoverentur. Idem pag. 320.

sitors old and new, Episcopal and others from the Apostles daies till now, as far as we can know by their writings, did take these Texts, at least many of them, to speak of such Presbyters: and I think the new exposition of one man, is not to be taken against the Exposition of the whole stream of Expositors in all ages, without better reason to evince them to have erred, then any I have yet seen produced. At least, all the Episcopal Divines except that one man, and those that now follow his new Exposition, must yield to what I say, upon the authority of these Texts.

But if this Divine were in the right, and none of these Texts be spoken of Presbyters, yet I make good my Antecedent thus.

For 1. If Presbyters be of humane Institution, then neither Preaching or Ruling is any Essential part of their Office by Divine Institution; because they have none such: and therefore I may say one is as essential as the other: that is, neither is so. But yet of their humanly instituted Office, it is as essential a part still: for if it be true, that there were no Presbyters in the Church till about *Ignatius* his daies, yet its certain that when they were instituted (whether by God or man) they were as truly made Rulers as Preachers. And therefore we find their *Ignatius* still calling on the people to obey the Presbyters as well as the Bishops. And *Hierom* tells us, (*Epist. ad Evagr.*) how long the Presbyters governed the Churches *Communi Consilio*, by Common Counsel or Consent, and how themselves at *Alexandria* chose out one and made him their Bishop: and *Cyprian* tells us enough of the Presbyters ruling in Council or Consistory with the Bishop in his time: so that he would do nothing without the Presbyters. Much more proof may easily be brought of this, but that I find it now acknowledged, and so it is needless. I will not go far, but only note a few Canons, especially of the fourth Council of *Carthage*. Can. 23. is, *Ut Episcopus nullius causam audiat absque presentia Clericorum suorum; alioquin irrita erit sententia Episcopi, nisi Clericorum presentia confirmetur.*

Can. 22. *Episcopus sine Consilio Clericorum suorum Clericos non ordinet; ita ut Civium assensum, & conviventiam, & testimonium querat.*

Can. 29. *Episcopus si Clerico vel laico crimen imposuerit, debeat ad probationem in Synodum.*

Can.

Can. 32. Irrita erit donatio Episcoporum, vel venditio, vel commutatio rei Ecclesiastica, absq; conviuentia & subscriptione clericorum.

Can. 34. Ut Episcopus in quolibet loco sedens stare Presbyterum non patiatur.

Can. 35. Ut Episcopus in Ecclesia in consensu Presbyterorum sublimior sedeat: Intra domum verò collegam se Presbyterorum esse cognoscat.

Can. 36. Presbyter qui per dioceses Ecclesias regunt, non à quibuslibet, &c.

Can. 37. Diaconus ita se Presbyteri ut Episcopi Ministrum esse cognoscat.

Here you see that Bishops may not Ordain, hear any cause, accuse a Clergy man or Lay-man, not give, sell, or Change any Church goods, without the Presbyters: and that he is their Collegue, and must not let them stand if he sit, and that they Rule the Churches through the Diocesses, and that the Deacons are Servants as well to them as to the Bishop. *Aurelius* and *Augustine* were in this Council.

If they that think it uncertain whether Presbyters be mentioned in the New Testament, and that think they began about *Ignatius* his time, do mean that yet they were of Divine Apostolical Institution, then they strike in with the Papists in making the Scriptures to be but part of Gods word, and insufficient to reveal all Divine institutions about his Church Government, and Worship, and so we must look for the rest in uncertain Tradition. Nay I know not of any Papist to my best remembrance that ever reckoned up the Office of Presbyters under their meer unwritten Traditions.

If they say that they are of Ecclesiastical Episcopal Institution, not by inspired Apostles, but by Ordinary Bishops, then 1. They make all Presbyters to be *jure Episcopali*, and Bishops only and their Superiours to be *jure Divino*, as the Italians in the Council of *Trent* would have had all Bishops to depend upon the Pope: But in this they go far beyond them; for the Italian

and *Chrysost.*) may do all that a Bishop; and he addeth, *Quid obstat quo minus id ita interpretemur ut Presbyteri neminem potuerint ordinare contempto Episcopo?*

And pag. 359. He shews that where Bishops are not, Presbyters do rightly ordain,

See the beginning of Bishop *ushers* Reduction of Episcopal Government.

Communi Presbyterorum Concilio gubernabantur, *Saith Hier.*

See *Grotius ubi sup. p. 354 & 355. 356. 357.* proving that Prelacy is not of Divine precept, and that of old many Cites had many Churches and Bishops in each: and that Presbyters, except ordination (as *Hier.*

Papists themselves thought *Presbyterie jure Divino*. 2. Either they may be changed by Bishops who set them up, or not: If they may be taken down again by man, then the Church may be ruined by man; and so the Bishops will imitate the Pope; Either they will Reign, or Christ shall not Reign, if they can hinder it: Either they will lead the Church in their way, or Christ shall have no Church: If man cannot take them down, then 1. It seems man did not Institute them; for why may they not alter their own institutions? 2. And then it seems the Church hath universal standing, unchangeable Institutions, Offices and binding Laws of the Bishops making: And if so, are not the Bishops equal to the Apostles in Law making, and Church Ordering? and are not their Laws to us as the word of God, and that word insufficient? and every Bishop would be to his Diocess, and all to the whole Church, what the Pope would be to the whole.

3. Moreover, how do they prove that ever the Apostles gave power to the Bishops to institute the order of *Presbyterie*? I know of no text of Scripture by which they can prove it. And for Tradition, we will not take every mans word that saith he hath tradition for his conceits, but we require the proof. The Papists that are the pretended keepers of Tradition, do bring forth none as meerly unwritten, but for their *ordines inferiores*, and many of them, for Bishops as distinct from the Presbyters; but not for Presbyters themselves. And Scripture they can plead none; For if they mention such texts where *Paul* bids *Titus* ordain Elders in every City, &c. they deny this to be meant of Elders as now, but of Prelates whom *Titus* as the Primate or Metropolitan was to ordain: And if it be meant of Elders, then they are found in Scripture, and of Divine Apostolical Institution.

4. If they were Instituted by Bishops after the Scripture was written, was it by one Bishop, or by many? If by one, then how came that one to have Authority to impose a new Institution on the universal Church? If by many, either out of Council, or in; if out of Council, it was by an accidental falling into one mind and way, and then they are but as single men to the Church: and therefore still we ask, how do they bind us? If by many in Council, 1. Then let them tell us what Council it was that

that Instituted Presbyterie, when and where gathered, and where we may find their Canons, that we may know our order, and what Authors mention that Council. 2. And what authority had that Council to bind all the Christian world, to all ages? If they say it bound but their own Churches, and that age; then it seems the Bishops of *England* might for all that have null'd the Order of Presbyters there. But O miserable *England* and miserable world, if Presbyters had done no more for it, then Prelates have done!

I conclude therefore that the English Prelacy either degraded the Presbyters, or else suspended totally an essential part of their office: for themselves called them *Rectors*, and in ordaining them said, [*Receive the Holy Ghost: Whose sins thou dost remit they are remitted, whose sins thou dost retain they are retained.*] And therefore they delivered to them the Power of the *Keys* of opening and shutting the Kingdom of Heaven; which themselves make to be the opening and shutting of the Church, and the Governing of the Church by Excommunication and Ablolution: And therefore they are not fit men to ask the Presbyters; *By what authority they Rule the Church, by binding and loosing*, when themselves did expressly as much as in them lay, confer the Power on them: And we do no more then what they bid us do in our Ordination; Yea they thereby make it the very work of our office. For the same mouth, at the same time that bid us [*take authority to preach the word of God*] did also tell us that *whose sins we remit or retain they are remitted or retained*: and therefore if one be an Essential, or true integral part at least of our office, the other is so too. From all which it is evident, that if there were nothing against the English Prelacy, but only this that they thus suspend or degrade all the Presbyters in *England*, as to one half of their office, it is enough to prove that they should not be restored under any pretence whatsoever of Order or Unity.

Argum. 5. **T**hat Episcopacy which giveth the Government of the Church, and management of the Keys of Excommunication and Absolution into the hands of a few Lay-men, while they take them from the Presbyters, is not to be restored under any pretence of Unity or Peace: But such was the English Prelacy: therefore, &c.

I have, it and can produce it under the Kings own hand and seal, whereia he forbids that any Church man or Priest in holy orders should be a Chancellor: And this was the occasion of all the corruptions, &c. They must for their own advantage and profit have instruments accordingly: So the Registers, Protectors, Apparators, were *pestimum genus hominum*: G. Goodman, Bishop of Glouc. in the Preface to his Two Mysteries, &c.

The Major is plain: because it is not Lay-men that are to be Church Governours, as to Ecclesiastical Government: This is beyond Question with all save the Congregational, and they would not have two or three Lay men chosen, but the whole Congregation to manage this business.

The Minor is known by common experience, that it was the Chancelor in his Court, with his assistants and the Register, and such other meer Lay-men, that managed this work. If it be said, that they did it as the Bishops Agents and Substitutes, and therefore it was he that did it by them; I answer, 1. The Law put it in the Chancellors, and the Bishops could not hinder it. 2. If the Bishops may delegate others to do their work, then it seems Preaching and Ruling, Excommunicating and Absolving may as well be done by Lay-men as Clergy men: Then they may commission them also to administer the Sacraments: And so the Ministry is not necessary for any of these works, but only a Bishop to depute Lay-men to do them; which is false and confusive.

Argum. 6. **T**hat Episcopacy which necessarily overwhelmeth the souls of the Bishops with the most hainous guilt, of neglecting the many thousand souls whose charge they undertake, is not to be restored for Order or Peace. (For men are not to be overwhelmed with such hainous sin on such pretences) But such is the English Prelacy: and that not accidentally, through the badness of the men only, but unavoidably through the greatness of their charge, and the Natural Impossibility of their undertaken work. How grievous a thing it is to have the blood of so many thousands charged on them, may soon appear. And that man that undertakes himself the Government of two or three

three, or five hundred thousand souls that he never seeth or knoweth, nor can possibly so Govern, but must needs leave it undone (except the shadow of a Government which is committed to a Lay Chancellor,) doth willfully draw this fearful Guilt upon himself.

Argum. 7. **T**hat *Episcopacy which is the product of Proud Ambition and Arrogancy, contrary to the expresse command of Christ, is not to be restored for Order or Peace. But such is the late English Prelacy: therefore, &c.*

The Major is undoubted. The Minor is proved thus. Were it not for proud Ambition men would not strive to have the doing of more work then an hundred times as many are able to do, and the answering before God for as many souls: But the English Prelates did strive to have the work and account of many hundreds: therefore, &c.

The Minor is proved and known by experience. And the Major is proved thus. 1. From the common avernesse that all men have to labour, excessive oppressing labour, and that spiritual too. 2. From the self-love that is naturally in all: No man can naturally and rationally desire that which would tire him, oppress him, and finally damn him, without great repentance, and the speciall mercy of God, unless by the power of some lust that draweth him to it. 3. And common prudence will teach men not to thrust themselves into impossible undertakings. If we see a man desirous to have the Rule of a whole County under the Prince, and that there should be no Justice of Peace, or other Magistrate to Rule there but he, though he know that he must answer it upon his life, if the County be not well Ruled, as to the punishing of all the known drunkards, swearers, adulterers, &c. in the County; may not any man see that Ambition makes this man in a manner besides himself, or else he would never set so light by his own life, as certainly and willfully to cast it away, by undertaking a work which he knoweth many men are unable to perform: And Ambition it must needs be, because Honour and Preheminence is the bait and thing contended for, and there is nothing else to do it. And how expressly doth Christ forbid this to his Apostles, telling them, [*Wish you it shall*

not be so: but he that will be the greatest shall be the servant of all] Luke 22. 26. As the old Rimer hath it [*Christus dixit quodam loco; Vos non sic, nec dixit joco: dixit suis ergo isti Cujus sunt? non certè Christi*] Speaking of the Prelates. I own not the Censure, but I own Christs prohibition. Certainly the Honour is but the appendix for the work sake, and the work is the first thing and the main of the office. And I would know whether they would strive thus for the work and the terrible account, without the honour and worldly gain. Nay do they not destroy the work, while they quarrel for the doing of it, for the honor sake? If it were the Churches good and the work that they so much minded, they would contend that so many should have the doing of it as are necessary thereto, and not that none should do it but they. He that would turn all the labourers out of the Harvest saving himself, in all this County, that he may maintain his own priviledge, I should think doth not much mind the good of the owner, or the well doing of the work, or his own safety, if he were to answer for all upon his life.

Argum. 8. **T**hat Episcopacy which so far gratifieth lazy Ministers as to ease them of the most painful, troublesome and hazardous part of their work, is not to be restored for order or unity: but such was the late English Prelacy: therefore, &c.

The Major is undoubted. The Minor is before proved as to the work it self. And as to the quality and consequents, experience putteth it past all doubt, that the work of Government and Oversight, is incomparably more troublesome then the preaching of a Sermon, Baptizing, administering the Lords Supper, and praying with them. When we come to touch men by personal reproof, and make that publike, and that for disgraceful sins, and suspend or excommunicate them if they be obstinate, usually we do not only turn their hearts against us, but they rage against us, and could even be revenged on us with the cruellest revenge. We find that all the Preaching in the world doth not so much exasperate and enrage men, as this Discipline. I can Preach the most cutting and convincing truths, in as close a manner as I am able, to notorious wicked livers, and they will bear it patiently, and say it was a good Sermon, and some of them say that

that they care not for hearing a man that will not tell them of their sins. And yet call them to an open confession of these sins in the Congregation, or proceed to censure them, and they will rage against us as if we were their mortal enemies. The Bishops let all these men (almost) alone; and therefore never exasperated them: and so now they rage the more against us, and love the Bishops the better, because they were never so troubled by them.

And here I cannot but note, how groundless that accusation is of some Prelatical men against the Conscionable adversaries of their way, when they say, the Presbyters would fain have the Reins of Government in their own hand: which may be true of the unconscionable, that know not what it is that they undertake: but for others, it is all one as to say, They would fain have all the trouble, hatred and danger to themselves. These Objecters shew their own minds, and what it is that they look at most themselves: and therefore think others do so: its dear bought honour that is purchased at such rates of labour and danger. I here solemnly profess for my own part, that if I know my heart, I am so far from thinking it a desirable thing to Rule, much less to Rule a Diocess, that if I might so far gratifie my carnal desires, and were not under the bond of Gods Commands, and so were it not for fear of sinning and wronging mens souls that are committed to my charge, I would give, if I had it, many thousand pounds, that I might but Preach, Pray, Read, Baptize, administer the Lords Supper, though I did more then I do in them, and be wholly freed from the care and trouble of oversight and government of this one Congregation, which is further required. © how quiet would my mind be, were I but sure that God required none of this at my hands, nor would call me to any account for the neglect of it! And that this is not my case only, but the common case to find Discipline so troublesom, is apparent in this; that the whole body of the Nation (for the generality) have contended against it these many years, and in almost every Congregation in *England*, the greater part do either separate from the Ministers, and forbear the Lords Supper, or some way oppose it and withdraw, that they may avoid it. And most of the Ministers in *England*, even godly men, do much, if not altogether neglect it. So that some through a Carnal indulging of
their

their own ease and quiet, and to avoid mens ill will; and some through the great oppositions of the people, or for one such cause or other, do let all alone. In so much, as even here in this County where we have associated and engaged our selves to some execution of Discipline, this work goes on so heavily as we see, and need not mention further: when yet there is not a daies omission of Sermons and other Ordinances: so that its apparent that its it which all lazie, carnal, man-pleasing Ministers may well comply with, as that which suites their Carnal Interests, to be free from the toil and care of Discipline.

If you say, why then do the Bishops desire it, if flesh and blood be against it? I answer; Experience and the impossibility of performance tells us, that it is not the work, but the empty name and honour that they took up: and that indeed the flesh doth much more desire. Had they desired or been willing of the work, as they were of Lordships and Riches, they would have done it.

Argum. 9. **N**O *Episcopacy, (at least which hath so many evils as aforesaid attending it) which is not of Gods Institution, should be admitted into the Church. The late English Prelacy, as to the disapproved properties before mentioned, is not of Gods Institution: therefore it is not to be admitted into the Church.*

The Major is confessed by all that plead for the *Jus Divinum* of *Episcopacy*, or most: and with the qualification, from the ill consequents, will be yielded by all.

The Minor I prove by parts: 1. That the exclusion of Presbyters from Rule, and the putting the Government from them into a Lay-mans hand, with the rest before mentioned, are not of Divine Institution, is proved already, as much as needs. 2. If at the present we yield a superintendency or prebeminence of one Pastor before others, yet the Controversie remaineth, whether a Prelate should be only Parochial, that is, only the President of the Elders of one particular Church, or at the utmost of that with two or three, or a few neighbour small Parishes which he may well oversee, without the neglect of the Discipline. Now I know not how any man of that way can prove
our

out of Scripture, that a Bishop must have more then one Parish, much less more then three or four, or a few. For it is confest by them, for ought I know, that Scripture doth not determine how many Presbyters, or Churches a Bishop must have under him, (only *we* say he must have but one :) for the main thing that they labour to prove is, that a Bishop is above Presbyters as to Ordination and Jurisdiction: and so he may be if he be a Parish-Bishop: for a Parish-Church may have a Curate, and 2 or 3 Chappels with Curates at them, besides Deacons; and according to the old course, perhaps many Presbyters more that did not publicly preach (though they wanted not authority) but oversee the flock. Now one man may have all that most of their Arguments require, if he be but the chief over this Parish Presbytery.

But perhaps they will say, that according to Scripture, every City only must have a Bishop, and therefore all the Country about must be his Diocess, though the number of Churches and Presbyters under him be not determined. To which I answer, that the word *Only*, is not in Scripture: no Text saith that it was *Only* in Cities that Churches or Bishops were to be seated. There is no prohibition of setting them in Villages.

It will be said, that *There is no example of any Bishop but in a City*. To which I answer. 1. Themselves ordinarily tell us in case of Sacrament gesture, and many other things, that examples do not alway bind affirmatively; much less can they prove that they bind negatively; I mean, not to do that which was not done. Can you prove in Scripture that there were any particular Churches or Assemblies for Sacraments and other worship in Villages? If not, then is it lawful now to have any? If not, then all our Parish Churches in the Country are unlawful: If yea, then why may we not have Bishops in the Countreys without Scripture example, as well as Churches? for we shall prove that the reasons why there were none or few Bishops in the Country, was for want of Churches for them to oversee. The Gospel was not then preached, nor any Bishops placed in many Nations of the world: it doth not follow therefore that there must be none since. 2. The reason is evident why Churches and Bishops were first planted in Cities; because there was the greatest Concourse of people: not that God loves a Citizen better then a

Country-man, or that he will have his Churches so limited to soil, or place, or situation: it is the number of persons wherever they live, that must be regarded, that the Church be not too great nor too small: but if there be the same number of people Cohabiting in the Country, as one of the Apostolical Churches did consist of, then there is the same reason to have a Church and Bishop in that Country Village, as was then for having one in a City. 3. Elders should be ordained in every Church, and therefore Bishops (for some of them say that these were Bishops) But Churches may be in Country Villages; therefore Elders and Bishops may be in Country-Villages. 4. I prove from Scripture that there were Bishops in Villages, or out of Cities, thus. Where there was a Church, there was a Bishop. But in a Village there was a Church; therefore. The Major I prove from *Act. 14. 23.* compared with *1 Tim. 3.* They ordained them Elders in every Church, or Church by Church: but these Elders are called Bishops in *1 Tim. 3.* (and by some of that way maintained to be such.)

For the Minor I prove it from *Rom. 16. 1.* where there is mention of the Church at *Cenchrea*: but *Cenchrea* was no City, but as *Grotius* speaks, *Portus Corinthiorum, ut Pirans Atheniensium, viz. ad sinum Saronicum: apparet ibi Ecclesiam fuisse Christianorum.* *Grot.* in *Act. 18. 18.* & in *Rom. 16. 1.* vide et *Downam, Defens.* pag. 105. who out of *Strabo* saith, it was the Port that served most properly for *Asia*. But Bishop *Downam* saith (*ibid.*) that *Cenchrea* was a Parish subordinate to the Church of *Corinth*, having not a Bishop or Presbytery, but a Presbyter assigned to it: so before he saith, by a Church, he means a Company of Christians having a Bishop and Presbytery.] But if he will so define a Church as that the Prelate shall enter the Definition, then he may well prove that every Church had a Prelate. And so a Patriarch may be proved to be Necessary to every Church, if you will say, you mean only such congregations as have a Patriarch. But it was denominated a Church, *Act. 14. 23.* before they had Presbyters ordained to them, and so before fixed Bishops: when the Apostles had converted and congregated them, they were Churches. And the Text saith that they ordained them Elders in every Church, or Church by Church; and therefore *Cenchrea* being a Church, must have such
Elders

Elders ordained to it, according to the Apostles Rule. And that it was a Parish with one Presbyter subject to *Corinth*, is all unproved, and therefore to no purpose.

5. Yet I prove that the English Prelacy on their own grounds, is not *jure Divino* in that it is against the word of God, according to their own interpretation; of which next.

Argum. 10. **T**hat *Episcopacy* which is contrary to the word of God, or *Apostolical Institution*, according to their own interpretation, is not to be restored. But such is the late *English Episcopacy*: therefore, &c.

I prove the Minor (for the Major needeth none:) according to their own interpretation of *Tit. 1. 5.* and other Texts; Every City should have a Bishop, (and if it may be, a Presbytery.) (And so many Councils have determined, only when they grew greater, they except Cities that were too small: but so did not *Paul*.) But the late *Episcopacy* of *England* is contrary to this: for one Bishop only is over many Cities. If therefore they will needs have *Episcopacy*, they should at least have had a Bishop in every City: and though we do not approve of confining them to Cities, yet this would be much better then as they were: for then

1. They would be nearer their charges, and within reach of them.
2. And they would have smaller charges, which they might be more capable of overseeing; for there would be ten or twenty Bishops for one that be now. If they say that except *Bath and Wells, Coventry and Lichfield*, or some few, they have but one City. I answer, its not so. For every Corporation or Burrough-Town is truly *πόλις*; and therefore should have a Bishop. Let them therefore either prove that a Market-Town, a Burrough, a Corporation, is not *πόλις*, or else let every one of these Towns and Burroughs have a Bishop, to govern that Town with the Neighbouring Villages by the consent and help of the Presbyters of these Villages, (according to their own grounds.) And if it were so, they would be no more then *Classical Bishops* at most.

Perhaps they'll say that, while we pretend to take down Bishops, we do but set up more, and would have many for one, while we would have every Corporation or Parish to have a Bishop. To which I answer, its true: but then it is not the same sort of Bishops which we would exclude and which we would multiply.

Object.

Answ.

multiply : we would exclude those Bishops that would undertake two or three hundred mens work themselves, and will rule a whole Diocess alone (or by a Lay Chancellor) when every conscionable man that hath faithfully tryed it, doth feel the oversight of one Congregation to be so great a burden, that it makes him groan and groan again. We would exclude those Bishops that would exclude all others in a whole Diocess, that they may do the work alone, and so leave it undone, while they plead that it belongs to them to do it. If they will come into the Lords Harveſt, and exclude from the work of Government, the Labourers of a whole County or two, we have reason to contradict them. But this is not to bring in more such Bishops as they that will shut out others, but to keep in the necessary labouring Bishops whom they would shut out. Nor do we shut out them themselves as Labourers or Rulers, but as the excluders of the Labourers or Rulers. If we have a Church to build that requireth necessarily two hundred workmen, and some Pillars in it to Erect, of many hundred tun weight, if one of the workmen would say, that it belongs to him to do it all himself, or at least when the materials are brought to the place prepared, to rear and order and place every stone and pillar in the building, I would no otherwise exclude the vain pretender then by introducing necessary help that the work may be done; and I should think him a silly Caviller that would tell me, that while I exclude him, I do but multiply such as he; when his very fault consisted in an hinderance of that necessary multiplication.

Object. 2.

Answer.

I know that some will say, that we feign more work then is to be done; and we would have the sentence of Excommunication pass upon every light offence. I answer; that its a thing that we abhor: we would have none Excommunicated but for obstinacy in hainous sin; when they will not hear the Church after more private admonition. But there's much more of the work of Government to be done on men that are not Excommunicable, to bring them to Repentance, and open confession, for manifestation of that Repentance to the satisfaction of the Church: but what need we plead how great the work is which every man may see before his eyes, and experience putteth beyond dispute?

Furthermore that the English Episcopacy is dissonant from all
Scripture