

stry, then no man can know that he is truly a Minister of Christ. But the Consequent is false, and intolerable; therefore so is the Antecedent.

Sect. 5. The truth of the Minor is apparent thus. 1. If we could not be sure that we are true Ministers, then no man could with comfort seek the Ministry, nor enter into upon it. For who can have encouragement to enter a calling when he knows not whether indeed he enter upon it or not? and whether he engage not himself in a course of sin, and be not guilty as *Uzza* of meddling with the Ark unlawfully? especially in so great and tender a case where God is so exceeding jealous.

Sect. 6. And 2. who can go on in the Calling of the Ministry, and comfortably do the work, and bear the burden, that cannot know through all his life, or in any administration, whether he be a Minister or a Usurper? What a damp must it cast upon our spirits, in Prayer, Praise, administration of the Eucharist and all publick worship, (which should be performed with the greatest alacrity and delight) when we remember that we are uncertain whether God have sent us, or whether we are usurpers, that must one day hear, [*Who sent you? Whence had you your Power? and who required this at your hands?*]

Sect. 7. And the Consequence of the Major (that we are all uncertain of our Call and office, both Papists and Protestants) is most clear (in case of the Necessity of such successive Ordination) For 1. No man ever did, to this day demonstrate such a succession, for the Proof of his Ministry. Nor can all our importunity prevail with Papists (Italians or French) to give us such a proof. 2. It is a thing impossible for any man now alive, to prove the Regular Ordination of all his Predecessors, to the Apostles daies, yea or any Ordination at all. How can you tell that he that ordained you, did not counterfeit himself to be Ordained? Or at least that he was not ordained by an unordained man? or that his Predecessors were not so? It is a meer impossibility for us to know any such thing; we have no Evidence to prove it:

Sect. 8. Object. *But it is probable though not certain: for the Church proceedeth by such Rules, and taketh the matter to be*

of so great weight, that there is no probability that they would suffer any to go for Pastors or Bishops that are unordained, in so great a case.

Ans. 1. All this is no certainty : and therefore no proof : and no satisfaction to the mind of a Minister, in the fore-mentioned doubts. 2. Yea we have so great reason to be suspicious in the case that we cannot conclude that we have so much as a probability.

Sect. 9. For, 1. We know that there is so much selfishness and corruption in man as is like enough to draw them to deceit. Ordainers may be bribed to consecrate or ordain the incapable, and the Ordained or Consecrated may be tempted to seek it in their incapacity ; and many may be drawn to pretend that they were Ordained or Consecrated when it was no such matter. And so there is not so much a Probability.

Sect. 10. 2. And we know that there were so many heresies abroad, and still have been, and so much faction and Schism in the Church ; that we cannot be sure that these might not interrupt the succession, or that they drew not our predecessors to counterfeit a Consecration or Ordination when they had none, or none that was regular.

Sect. 11. 3. And we know our selves that the thing hath been too usual. When I was young, I lived in a village that had but about twenty houses. And among these there were five that went out into the Ministry. One was an Old Reader whose Original we could not reach. Another was his son, whose self Ordination was much suspected : The other three had Letters of Orders, two of them suspected to be drawn up and forged by him, and one that was suspected to Ordain himself. One of them, or two at last were proved to have counterfeit Orders, when they had continued many years in the Ministry. So that this is no rare thing.

Sect. 12. Among so many temptations that in so many ages since the Apostles dayes, have befallen so many men, as our predecessors in the Ministry, or the Bishops predecessors have been, it were a wonder if all of them should scape the snare : So that we have reason to take it for a thing improbable, that the succession hath not been interrupted.

Sect. 13. And we know that in several ages of the Church the
Prelates

Prelates and Priests have been so vile, that in reason we could expect no better from men so vicious, then forgery and abuse; he that reads what *Gildas* and others say of the Brittainish, and what even *Baronius*, much more *Espencans*, *Cornelius Mus.* and others say of the Romanists; yea he that knows but what state the Bishops and Priests have been in and yet continue in, in our own dayes, will never think it an improbable thing that some of our predecessors should be guilty either of Simony or other vice that made them uncapable, or should be meer usurpers under the name of Bishops and Ministers of Christ.

SECT. 14. Argument 2. If uninterrupted Regular Ordination of all our Predecessors be Necessary to the Being of the Ministry, then can no Bishop or Pastor whatsoever comfortably Ordain: For who dare lay his hand on the head of another, and pretend to deliver him authority, in the name of Christ, that hath no assurance (nor probability neither) that he hath any Commission from Christ to do it? But the Consequent will be disowned by those that dispute against us? therefore so should the Antecedent be also.

SECT. 15. Argument 3. If there be a Necessity of an uninterrupted succession of true Regular Ordination, then no man can know of the Church that he is a member of, or of any other Church on earth, that it is a true Church. (By a Church I mean not a Community, but a Society: not a company of private Christians living together as Christians neighbours, but a Politick Church consisting of Pastor and people associated for the use of publick Ordinances and Communion therein.) But the consequent is false; ——— &c.

SECT. 16. The Major, or consequence is certain: For no man can know that the Church is a true Political Organized Church, that knows not that the Pastor of it is a true Minister of Christ. Because the Pastor is an Essential constitutive part of the Church in this acceptation. And I have proved already that the truth of the Ministry cannot be known upon the Opponents terms. And for the Minor, I think almost all Church members will grant it me. For though they are ready enough to accuse others, yet they all take their own Churches for true, and will be offended with any that question or deny it.

SECT. 17. Argument 4. If there be a Necessity of an un-

interrupted

errupted succession of true Ordination, then cannot the Church or any Christian in it, know whether they have any true Ministerial administrations, whether in Sacraments or other Ordinances. For he that cannot know that he hath a Minister, cannot know that he hath the administration of a Minister.) But the consequent is untrue, and against the comfort of all Christians, and the honour of Christ, and is indeed the very doctrine of the *Infidels and Papists*, that call themselves *Seekers* among us.

Sect. 18. Argument 5. If the Churches and each member of them are bound to submit to the Ministry of their Pastors without knowing that they are regularly ordained, or that they have an uninterrupted succession of such Ordination, then are they *quoad Ecclesiam*, true Pastors to them, and their administrations valid, though without Ordination or such a succession. But the Antecedent is true, and granted by all that now we have to deal with. Though they will not grant a *known* unordained man is to be taken for a Minister, or one whose succession had a known intercision; Yet they will grant that if the Nullity be unknown, it freeth not the people from the obligation to their Pastors.

Sect. 19. Bellarmine (*lib 3. de Eccles. c. 10.*) was so flailed with these difficulties that he leaves it as a thing that we cannot be resolved of; that our Pastors have indeed [*Potestatem Ordinis & Jurisdictionis*] that is, that they are *true Pastors*. And he saith that [*Non habemus certitudinem nisi Moralem, quod illi sint vere Episcopi.*] But when he should prove it to us that there is a *Moral Certainty*, he leaves us to seek and gives us not so much as a ground to conjecture at any probability.

Sect. 20. But he saith that we may know that [*some Pastors at least are true: or else God had forsaken his Church.*] *A. sw.* But what the better are we for this, if we know not, *which they are* that are the true Pastors, nor cannot possibly come to know it?

Sect. 21. But he saith that [*Quo Christi locum tenent, & quod debemus illi obedientiam*] may be known: and thereupon he saith that [*Certe sumus certitudine infallibili quod isti quos videmus sint veri Episcopi & Pastores nostri: Nam ad hoc non requiritur, nec fides nec Character Ordinis, nec legitima Electio, sed solum ut*

habeantur pro talibus ab Ecclesia.] From all this you may note
 1. That they are *veri Episcopi & Pastores nostri*, that were never
 ordained, if they are but reputed *such* by the Church, 2. That
 we may know this by *infallible Certainty*, 3. And that we owe
 them obedience as *such*. So that as to the Church they are
 true Pastors without Ordination, and consequently to the Church
 a succession is unnecessary.

Sect. 22. Yet of such Usurpers he saith [*Eos quidem non esse
 in se veros Episcopos, tamen donec pro talibus habeantur ab Ec-
 clesia, deberi illis obedientiam, cum conscientia etiam erronea
 obliget.*] So that they are not *veri Episcopi in se*: and yet they
 are *veri Episcopi & Pastores nostri*, if Bellarmine say true;
 And the words have some truth in them, understood according
 to the distinction which I before gave, Chap. 1. Sect. 5, 6. He
 hath no such Call as will save himself from the penalty of usur-
 pation (if he knowingly be an usurper) but he hath such a Call
 as shall oblige the Church to obey him as their Bishop or
 Pastor.

Sect. 23 But his reason (*Cum conscientia etiam erronea obliget*)
 is a deceit; and neither the only, nor the chief reason, nor any
 reason. Not the *only* nor *chief* reason; because the obligation
 ariseth from God, and that is the greatest. Not *any* reason;
 1. Because indeed it is *not an Erroneous Conscience*, that tells ma-
 ny people that their usurping Bishops or Pastors are to be obey-
 ed as true Ministers: For as it is terminated on the Pastors act
 or state, it is no act of Conscience at all; and therefore no er-
 ror of conscience. For conscience is the knowledge of our own
 affairs. And as it is terminated on our own Duty of obeying
 them, it is not *Erroneous*; but right; For it is the will of God,
 that for order sake we obey both Magistrates and Pastors that
 are settled in Possession, if they rule us according to the Laws of
 Christ; at least, if we do not know the Nullity of their call.
 2. And its false that an *Erroneous Conscience bindeth*, that is, *makes
 us a Duty*; For at the same instant it is *itself a sin* and we are
 bound to depose it, and change it, and renounce the error.
 It doth but intangle a man in a Necessity of sinning till it be laid
 by. But it is God only that can make our duty, and cause such
 an obligation.

Sect. 24. From the adversaries Concessions then an uninter-
 rupted

rupted succession, or present true Ordination is not of Necessity to the being of the Ministry, Church or Ordinances *quoad Ecclesiam*: for the Church is bound to obey the usurpers, and that as long as they are taken for true Pastors. Which is as much as most Churches will desire in the case.

Se&. 25. And the consequence is easily proved: For where God obligeth his Churches to the obedience of Pastors (though usurpers) and to the use of Ordinances and their Ministration, there will he bless the Ministry and those Ordinances (to the innocents, that are not guilty of his usurpation) and that obey God herein. And consequently the Ordinances shall not be Nullities to them. God would never set his servants upon the use of a means which is but a Nullity; nor will he command them to a duty, which he will blast to them when he hath done without their fault. Its none of the Churches fault that the Bishop or Pastor is an usurper, while they cannot know it, and that any of his Predecessors were usurpers since the Apostles dayes. And therefore where God imposeth duty on the Church and prescribeth means, (as Baptism, Prayer, the Lords Supper, Church-Government, &c.) it is certain that he will not blast it, but bless it to the obedient, nor punish the Church so for the secret sin of I know not who, committed I know not where nor when, perhaps a thousand years ago.

Se&. 26. Argument 6. As other actions of usurpers are not Nullities to the innocent Church, so neither is their Ordination: and consequently, those that are Ordained by usurpers, may be true Ministers. If their Baptizing, Preaching, Praises, Consecration and administration of the Eucharist, binding and loosing, be not Nullities, it follows undenyably on the same account, that their Ordinations are not Nullities: and consequently, that they are true Ministers whom they ordain; and succession of a more regular Ordination is not of Necessity, to the Ministry, Church or Ordinances.

Se&. 27. Argument 7. If such uninterrupted succession be not Necessary to be *Known*, then is it not Necessary to the *Being* of the Ministry or Validity of Ordinances administered; But such a succession is not Necessary to be *known*: therefore ——— The Consequence of the Major is plain, because

cause the Being or Nullity of Office and administrations, had never been treated off by God to men, nor had it been revealed, or a thing regardable, but that we may know it : Nor doth it otherwise attain its ends. And that it is not necessary to be known, I further prove.

Sect. 28. If this succession must be known, then either to the Pastor, or to the Church, or both : but none of these : therefore — 1. If it must be known only to the Pastor, then it is not Necessary as to the Church. And yet it is not Necessary to be known to the Pastor himself neither. For (as is shewed) its impossible for him to know it, so much as by a Moral Certainty. His Predecessors and their Ordinations were strange to him. 2. Not to the Church. For it is not possible for them to know it : Nor likely that they should know as much as the true Ordination of their present Pastor according to the Prelatical way, when it is done so far out of their sight.

Sect. 29. If the foresaid uninterrupted succession be necessary to the being of our Ministry, or Churches or Ordinances, then is it incumbent on all that will prove the truth of their Ministry, Churches or Ordinances, to prove the said succession. But that is not true ; for then none (as is aforesaid) could prove any of them. Either it is meet that we be able to Prove the truth of our Ministry, Churches and administrations, or not. If not, then why do the adversaries call us to it? If yea: then no man among the Churches in *Europe* (on their grounds) hath any proof ; and therefore must not pretend to the Ministry, Churches or Ordinances, but we must all turn Seekers to day, and Infidels to morrow, by this device.

Sect. 30. Argument 8. The Ministry of the Priests and Levities before the incarnation of Christ, and in his time, was not Null, though they wanted as much or more then such a succession of right Ordination : therefore it is so still with the Gospel Ministry. The Antecedent I shall more fully manifest neerer to the end : Only now observe, that when *Abiathar* was put out by *Solomon* ; and when such as were not of the line or Genealogie of the Priests, were put as polluted persons from the Priesthood (*Neh. 7. 64, 65. and 13. 29, 30. Ezra 2. 62.*) yet

yet were not any of their administrations taken to have been Null.

Sect. 31. Argument 9. If the Ministration or Governing acts of *Usurping Princes* may be Valid, and there need no proof of an uninterrupted succession to prove the validity, then is it so also in the Ministry: But the Antecedent is certain; therefore, &c. The Validity of the consequence from the parity of Reason I shall manifest anon.

Sect. 32. Argument 10. If an uninterrupted Succession of Canonical or true Ordination be Necessary to the Being of the Church, Ministry and Ordinances, then *Rome* and *England* have lost their Ministry, Churches, and Ordinances. But the Consequent will be denyed by the adversaries; therefore so also must the Antecedent, if they regard their standing.

Sect. 33. Though this be the Argument that I have the greatest advantage to press the adversary with, yet because I have made it good already in two or three other writings (in my Key for Catholics, and my Safe Religion, and Christian Concord) I shall say but little of it now. But briefly this may suffice: 1. For the Church of *Rome*, if either Heresie, Infidelity, Sodomy, Adultery, Murder, Simony, violent intrusion, ignorance, impiety, want of due election, or of due consecration, or plurality of Popes at once, can prove an interruption of their succession, I have shewed them already where its proved; But if none of these prove it, we are safe our selves.

Sect. 34. But *Grotius* (in *Discuf. Apolog. Rivet.*) pleads for them, that if any *intercession* have been made at *Rome*, it hath been made up from other Churches.] *Answ.* 1. That is not proved, but nakedly affirmed. 2. Nor will it serve the Papists turn, that must have all Churches hold from *Rome* and her succession, and *Rome* from none, nor to be patcht up from their succession. 3. *De facto* the contrary is certain: For 1. Those other held their Ministry as from the universal Headship of the Pope; and therefore had themselves their interruptions in the former interruptions of *Rome* (as being but her members:) and therefore were not capable themselves of repairing of her breaches, 2. The successors of the illegitimate Popes (such as *deposed Eugenius*, &c.) and men as bad as they, have continued the succession: And the Bishops that were consecrated by power received from the illegitimate

gitimate Popes, were the only persons that were the repairers of the breach. And yet the Pope will hardly yield that he receiveth his power from any of these. 3 There have been greater defects in the succession than this of Consecration, even of due Election, Capacity, yea of an office it self which Christ will own. The Vicechristship of the Pope is no office of Christs planting.

Sect. 35. And 2 For the English Prelates, as they are unable to prove their uninterrupted succession, so the interruption is proved, in that they derived and held their Power from the Vicechrist of *Rome*, and that *quæ talis*, for so many ages. This was their own profession: and all that they did was as his Ministers by his Authority, which was none.

Sect. 36. Object. *But this nulled not the true Authority which they received from the Pope or Prelates as Prelates.* *Ans.* The Pope was incapable of giving them Authority (and whether the Prelates as such were so too, we shall enquire anon.) And though I grant that (where the person was fit) there was yet a Ministry Valid to the Church (and perhaps to themselves in the main) yet that is because Canonical Ordination is not of Necessity to the Being of the Ministry; (but by other means they might be then Ministers, though this corruption was conjunct, that they received their Power imaginarily from *Rome*.) But that the said Canonical succession was interrupted, by this Papal tenure, and many a delinquency, is nevertheless sure, and sufficient to inforce the Argument as to them that now are our adversaries. But so much shall suffice for the Non-necessity of this succession of a true and Regular Ordination.



CHAP. V.

Ordination by such as the English Prelates, not Necessary to the Being of the Ministry.

Sect. 1.



Have made this work unnecessary by the two former Chapters : For if *no Ordination* be of Necessity to the Being of the Ministry, nor an uninterrupted Succession Necessary, then doubtless an Ordination by these Prelates *in Specie* is not Necessary at present, or as to succession. But yet *ex abundanti* I add.

Sect. 2. Argument 1. *Ad hominem*, I may well argue from the Concession of the English Prelates themselves and their most zealous adherents ; And their judgements were 1. That such a succession as aforesaid of right Ordination was not of Necessity ; And for this they that write against, the Papists do commonly and confidently dispute.

Sect. 3. And 2. They maintained that the Protestant Churches that had no Bishops were true Churches, and their Ministers true Ministers, and so of their administrations. This was so common with them that I do not think a dissenting vote can be found, from the first Reformation, till about the preparations for the Spanish match or little before.

Sect. 4. I have in my *Christian Concord* cited at large the words of many, and the places of the writings of more, as 1. Dr. Field,
2. Bishop

2. Bishop Downham; 3. Bishop Jewel, 4. Saravia, 5. Bishop Alley, 6. Bishop Pilkinton, 7. Bishop Bridges, 8. Bishop Bilson, 9. Alexander Nowel, 10. Grotius (their friend then) 11. Mr. Chyssenhal, 12. The Lord Digby, 13. Bishop Davenant, 14. Bishop Prideaux, 15. Bishop Andrews, 16. Chillingworth, 17. (To which I now add) Bishop Bromball (of Schism) 18. Dr. Fern, 19. Dr. Steward (in his answer to Fountains letter (these of the later, or present sort) 20. And Bishop Usher (whose judgement of it is lately published by Dr. Bernard at his own desire) 21. And Mr. Mason (in a Book of of purpose for justification of the Reformed Churches) hath largely pleaded this cause. 22. And Dr. Bernard saith that Dr. Overall was judged not only to consent to that Book, but to have a hand in it. 23. And no wonder when even Bancroft himself (the violentest of all the enemies of them called Puritans in those times) is said by Spotswood (there recited by Dr. Bernard) to be of the same mind, and to give it as his judgement, that the Scotch Ministers (then to be Consecrated Bishops) were not to be reordained, because the Ordination of Presbyters was valid.

SECT. 5. These Novel Prelatical persons then, that so far dissent from the whole stream of the Ancient Bishops and their adherents, have little reason to expect that we should regard their judgement above the judgement of the English Clergy, and the judgement of all the Reformed Churches. If they can give us such Reasons as should conquer our modestie, and perswade us to condemn the judgement of the Prelates and Clergy of England, & all other Churches of the Protestants, and adhere to a few new men of yesterday, that dare scarcely open the face of their own opinions: we shall bow to their Reasons when we discern them: But they must not expect that their Authority shall so far prevail.

SECT. 6. And indeed I think the most of this cause is carried on in the dark: What Books have they written to prove our Ordination Null? and by what Scripture Reasons do they prove it? The task lieth on them to prove this Nullity, if they would be Regarded in their reproaches of the Churches of Christ. And they are not of such excessive Modesty, and backwardness to divulge their accusations, but sure we might by this time have expected more then one volume from them, to have proved

us, No Ministers and Churchess if they could have done it. And till they do it; their whisperings are not to be credited.

Sect. 7. Argument 2. If that sort of Prelacy that was exercised in *England* was not necessary it self, yea if it were sinfull, and tended to the subversion or exceeding hurt of the Churches; then is there no Necessity of Ordination by such a Prelacy. But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the consequent. The Antecedent hath been proved at large in the foregoing Disputation. Such a Prelacy as consisteth in the undertaking of an impossible task, even for one man to be the only Governour of all the souls in many hundred Parishes, exercising it also by Lay men, and in the needful parts, not exercising it all; a Prelacy not chosen by the Presbyters whom they Govern; yea suspending or degrading the Presbyters of all those Churches, as to the governing part of their office, and guilty of the rest of the evils before mentioned, is not only it self unnecessary, but sinful, and a disease of the Church which all good men should do the best they can to cure. And therefore the effects of this disease can be no more Necessary to our Ministry, then the burning of a seaver, or swelling of a Tympany, is necessary to the body.

Sect. 8. No Bishops are Necessary but such as were in Scripture times: But there were none such as the late English Bishops in Scripture times: Therefore the English Bishops are not necessary. He that denyeth the Major, must go further in denying the sufficiency of Scripture, then I find the Papists ordinarily to do: For they will be loth to affirm that any office is of Necessity to the Being of the Church or of Presbyters, that is not to be found in Scripture, or that was not then in Being: Therefore so far we are secure.

Sect. 9. And for the Minor, I prove it thus. If the English Bishops were neither such as the unfixed General Ministers, nor such as the fixed Bishops of particular Churches, then were they not such as were in Scripture times. But they were neither such as the unfixed General Ministers, nor such as the fixed Bishops of particular Churches: therefore, &c.

Sect. 10. Besides these two sorts of Ministers, there are no more in the New Testament. (And these are diversified but by the exercise of their office, so far as they were ordinary Ministers

sters to continue.) The unfixed Ministers (whether Apostles, Evangelists or Prophets) were such as had no special charge of any one Church as their Diocess, but were to do their best for the Church in general, and follow the direction and call of the Holy Ghost for the exercising of their Ministry. But its known to all that our English Bishops were not such. They were no ambulatory itinerant Preachers : they went not about to plant Churches, and confirm and direct such as they had planted : but were fixed to a City, and had every one their Diocess, which was their proper charge (but Oh how they discharged their undertaking!)

SECT. 11. Object. *The Apostles might agree among themselves to divide their Provinces, and did accordingly, James being Bishop of Jerusalem, Peter of Rome, &c.* Answ. No doubt but common reason would teach them when they were sent to preach the Gospel to all the world, to disperse themselves, and not be preaching all in a place, to the disadvantage of their work: But 1. Its one thing to travail several ways, and so divide themselves as itinerants ; and another thing to divide the Churches among them, as their several Diocesses to which they should be fixed : Which they never did, for ought is proved. 2. And its one thing prudently to disperse themselves for their labour, and another thing to claim a special power over a Circuit or Diocess as their charge, excluding a like charge and power of others. So far as any man, Apostle or other, was the Father of souls by their conversion, they owned him a special honour and love, which the Apostles themselves did sometimes claim : But this was nothing to a peculiar Diocess or Province. For in the same City (as Jerusalem) some might be converted by one Apostle, and some by another. And if a Presbyter convert them, I think the adversaries will not therefore make them his Diocess, not give him there an Episcopal Power, much less above Apostles in that place. Nor was this the Rule that Diocesses could be bounded by, as now they are taken.

SECT. 12. Nor do we find in Scripture the least intimation that the Apostles were fixed Diocesan Bishops, but much to the contrary. 1. In that it was not consistent with the General charge, and work that Christ had laid upon them to go into all the world, and preach the Gospel to every

every creature: How would this stand with fixing in a peculiar Diocess?

Sect. 13. And 2. We find them answering their Commission in their practice, going abroad and preaching and planting Churches, and sometimes visiting them in their passage, but not settling on them as their Diocesses; but going further, if they had opportunity, to do the like for other places. Yea they planted Bishops in the several Cities and Churches which they had gathered to Christ. Though *Paul* staid three years at *Ephesus* and other adjacent parts of *Asia*, yet did not all that abode prove it his peculiar Diocess: (And yes its hard to find again so long an abode of *Paul* or any Apostle in one place.) Elders that were Bishops we find at *Ephesus*, *Acts* 20. and some say *Timothy* was their Bishop, and some say *John* the Apostle was their Bishop: but its clear that it was no peculiar Diocess of *Paul*.

Sect. 14. And 3. We still find that there were more then one of these general itinerant Ministers in a Place, or at least that no one excluded others from having equal power with him in his Province, where ever he came. *Barnabas*, *Silas*, *Titus*, *Timothens*, *Epaphroditus*, and many more were fellow-labourers with *Paul* in the same Diocess or Province, and not as fixed Bishops or Presbyters under him, but as General Ministers as well as he. We never read that he said to any of the false Apostles that sought his contempt [This is my Diocess, what have you to do to play the Bishop in another mans Diocess?] Much less did he ever plead such a Power, against *Peter*, *Barnabas* or any Apostolical Minister: Nor that *James* pleaded any such prerogative at *Jerusalem*.

Sect. 15. And therefore though we reverence *Ensebius* and other Ancients, that tell us of some Apostles Diocesses, we take them not as infallible reporters, and have reason in these points partly to deny them credit from the word of God. The Churches that were planted by any Apostle, or where an Apostle was longest resident, were like enough to reckon the series of their Pastors from him: For the founder of a Church is a Pastor of it, though not a fixed Pastor, taking it as his peculiar charge, but delivering it into the hands of such: And in this sence we have great reason to understand the Catalogues of the Ancients and

and their affirmations that Apostles were Bishops of the Churches. For Pastors they were: but so that they had no peculiar Diocess, but still went on in planting and gathering and confirming Churches: Whereas the Bishops that were settled by them (and are said to succeed them had) their single Churches which were their peculiar charge; They had but one such charge or Church, when the Apostles that lead in the Catalogues had many; & yet none so as to be limited to them. And why have we not the Diocess of *Paul* and *John*, and *Marth* and *Thomas*, and the rest of the twelve, mentioned, as well of *Peter* and *James*? Or if *Paul* had any, it seems he was compartner with *Peter* in the same City (contrary to the Canons that requireth that there be but one Bishop in a City.)

SECT. 16. Its clear then that the English Bishops were not such Apostolical unfixed Bishops as the Itinerants of the first age were. And yet if they were, I shall shew in the next Argument that its nothing to their advantage; because Archbishops are nothing to our question. And that they were not such as the fixed Bishops of Scripture times, I am next to prove.

SECT. 17. The fixed Bishops in the Scripture times had but a single Congregation, or particular Church for their Pastoral Charge: But our English Bishops had many (if not many hundred) such Churches for their charge: therefore our English Bishops were not of the same sort with those in Scripture. The Major I have proved in the former Disputation. The Minor needs no proof, as being known to all that know *England*.

SECT. 18. And 2. The fixed Bishops in the Scripture times had no Presbyters, at least, of other particular Churches under them, (They Governed not any Presbyters that had other associated Congregations for publick Worship.) But the English Bishops had the Presbyters of other Churches under them (perhaps of hundreds:) therefore they are not such as the Scripture Bishops were. There is much difference between a Governour of People, and a Governour of Pastors; *Episcopus gregis*, & *Episcopus Episcoporum*, is not all one. None of us saith, *Cyprian* in *Concil. Carthagin.* calleth himself, or takes himself to be *Episcopum Episcoporum*. No fixed Bishops in Scripture times were the Pastors of Pastors, as least, of other Churches.

SECT.

Sect. 19. This I suppose I may take as granted *de facto* from the Reverend Divine whom I have cited in the foregoing Disputation, that saith (*Annotat. in Art. 11.*) that [*Although this Title of Ἐπίσκοποι Elders, have been also extended to a second order in the Church; and now is only in use for them, under the name of Presbyters; yet in the Scripture-times it belonged principally, if not alone to Bishops; there being no Evidence that any of that second Order were then instituted; though soon after, before the writing of Ignatius Epistles, there were such instituted in all Churches*] So that he granteth that *de facto* there were then no Presbyters but Bishops, and that they were not instituted: and therefore Bishops had no such Presbyters to Govern; nor any Churches but a single Congregation: For one Bishop could guide but one Congregation at once in publick worship; and there could be no Worshipping Congregations (in the sence that now we speak of) without some Presbyter to guide them in performance of the worship.

Sect. 20. So saith the same Learned man, *Dissertat. 4. de Episcop.* page 208, 209. [*in quibus plures absq; dubio Episcopi fuerunt, nulliq; adhuc quos hodie dicimus Presbyteri*] And therefore he also concludeth that the Churches were then Governed by Bishops assisted by Deacons without Presbyters, instancing in the case of the Church of Jerusalem, *Act. 6.* and alledging the words of *Clem. Roman.* *Κατὰ χάριν ἡ πλειὸς ἐπισκοπῶν καὶ διακόνων τὰς ἀπορίας αὐτῶν, ἐν ἐπιστολῇ καὶ διακρίσει, &c.* (How Grotius was confident that Clemens was against their Episcopacy, I shewed before) To the same purpose he citeth the words of *Clemens Alexandrinus* in *Euseb. of John the Apostle*, concluding *Ex his ratio constat quare sine Presbyterorum mentione interveniente, Episcopis Diaconi immediate adjiciantur, quia scilicet in singulis Macedonia civitatibus, quamvis Episcopus esset, nondum Presbyteri constituti sunt; Diaconis tantum πρὸς ὑμῶν ubiq; Episcopis adiunctis*] *Dissertat. 4 cap. 10. Sect. 19, 20, 21.* So also *cap. 11. Sect. 2. & alibi passim.*

Sect. 21. Object. But though *de facto* there were no Bishops ruling Presbyters then, nor ruling any more then a single Worshipping Church, yet it was the Intention of the Apostles that they should afterwards enlarge their Diocess, and take the care of many Churches, and that they should ordain that sort of subject Presbyters that were not instituted in Scripture-times. *Ans.* Do you prove the

the secret Intention of the Apostles to be for such a Mutation, and then we shall be satisfied in that. But till then it is enough to us that we have the same Government that *de facto* was set up by the Apostles, and exercised in Scripture times. And that its granted us that the office was not then instituted which we deny: For it is the office of such subject Presbyters having no Power of Ordination that we deny.

Sect. 22. Object. But though in Scripture times there were no Bishops over many Churches and Presbyters, yet there were Archbishops that were over many. Answ. Because this objection contains their strength, I shall answer it the more fully. And 1. If there were no subject Presbyters in those times, then Archbishops could rule none. But there were none such, as is granted: therefore, &c. And what proof is there of Archbishops then?

Sect. 23. Their first proof is from the Apostles: But they will never prove that they were fixed Bishops or Archbishops. I have proved the contrary before. But such an itinerant Episcopacy as the Apostles had (laying by their extraordinaries) for my part I think should be continued to the world and to the Church (of which after.)

Another of their proofs is from *Timothy* and *Titus*, who, they say, were Archbishops. But there is full evidence that *Timothy* and *Titus* were not fixed Bishops or Archbishops, but Itinerant Evangelists, that did as the Apostles did, even plant and settle Churches, and then go further, and do the like. See and consider but the proofs of this in *Prins* unbishoping of *Timothy* and *Titus*. Such Planters and Itinerants were *pro tempore* the Bishops of every Church where they came, (yet so as another might the next week be Bishop of the same Church, and another the next week after him, yea three or four or more at once, as they should come into the place) And therefore many Churches as well as *Ephesus* and *Creet* its like might have begun their Catalogue with *Timothy* and *Titus*: and many a one besides *Rome* might have begun their Catalogue with *Peter* and *Paul*.

Sect. 24. Another of their proofs is of the Angels of the seven Churches which they say were Archbishops. But how do they prove it? Because those Churches or some of them were plant-

ed in chief Cities, and therefore the Bishops were Metropolitans. But how prove they the consequence? By their strong imagination and affirmation. The Orders of the Empire had not then such connection and proportion, and correspondency with the Orders of the Church. Let them give us any Valid proof that the Bishop of a Metropolis had then (in Scripture times) the Bishops of other Cities under him, as the Governor of them, and we shall thank them for such unexpected light. But presumption must not go for proofs. They were much later times that afforded occasion for such contentions as that of *Basl* and *Anthymins*, (Whether the bounds of their Episcopal Jurisdiction should change as the Emperours changed the State of the Provinces?) Let them prove that these *Asian* Angels had the Bishops of other Churches, and the Churches themselves under their jurisdiction, and then they have done something.

Sect. 25. But if there were any preheminance of Metropolitans near these times, it cannot be proved to be any more than an honorary Primacy: to be *Episcopus prima sedis*, but not a Governour of the rest. How else could *Cyprian* truly say (even so long after) as is before alledged, that none of them was a Bishop of Bishops, nor imposed on others, but all were left free to their own consciences, as being accountable only to God?

Sect. 26. Yea the Reverend Author above mentioned shews (*Dissertat. de Episcop. 4. cap. 10. Sect. 9, 10, & alibi*) that there were in those times more Bishops than one in a City, though not in *una Ecclesia aut Cœn.* And the like hath *Grotius* oft. So that a City had oft then more Churches than one, and those Churches had their several Bishops: and neither of these Bishops was the Governour of the other, or his Congregation: much less of the remoter Churches and Bishops of other Cities. And this they think to have been the case of *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome*, yea and of their immediate successors there. And so in other places (*Lege Dissert. 5 c. 1.*)

Sect. 27. When the great *Gregory Thaumaturgus* was made Bishop of *Neocæsarea*, he had but seventeen Christians in his City; and when he had increased them by extraordinary successes, yet we find not that he had so much as a Presbyter under him. And if he had, its not likely that *Musonius*, his first and chief entertainer, would have been made but his Deacon, and be the only
man

man to accompany him and comfort him in his retirement in the persecution, and that no Presbyter should be mentioned : which shews that Bishops then were such as they were in Scripture-times (at least in most places) and had not many Churches with their Presbyters subject to them, as Diocesan Bishops have. And when *Comana*, a small place not far off him, received the faith, *Gregory* Ordained *Alexander* (the Colliar) their Bishop, over another single Congregation, and did not keep them under his own Pastoral charge and Government : *Vid. Greg. Nysen in vita Thaumati.*)

SECT. 28. But because that our Diocesan Bishops are such as the Archbishops that first assumed the Government of many Churches, and because we shall hardly drive many from their presumption, that *Timothy* and *Titus* were Archbishops (besides the Apostles,) I shall now let that supposition stand, and make it my next Argument that,

(Argument 3.) Ordination by Archbishops is not necessary to the Being of Ministers or Churches. Our English Bishops were indeed Archbishops : therefore Ordination by them is not Necessary —] It is not the Name, but the office that is pleaded Necessary.

Arg. 3.

SECT. 29. And for the Major, I think it will not be denied. All that I have to do with, Protestants and Papists, do grant the Validity of Ordination by Bishops. And for the Minor, it is easily proved. The Bishops that are the Governours of many Churches and their Bishops, are Archbishops. The Bishops of *England* were the Governours of many Churches with their Bishops : therefore they were Archbishops. The Major will be granted. And for the Minor I prove it by parts : 1. That they were (by undertaking) the Governours of many Churches. 2. And of many Bishops.

SECT. 30. He that is the Governour over many Congregations of Christians associated for the publick worship of God and holy communion and Edification, under their Proper Pastors, is the Governour of many Churches. But such were our English Bishops : therefore, &c. That such Societies as are here defined are true Churches, is a truth so clear, that no enemy of the Churches is able to gainsay with any shew of Scripture or reason, they being such Churches as are described in the Scriptures. And 2. That our Ministers were true Pastors, if any will deny, (as the Papists

and

and Separatists do) I shall have occasion to say more to them anon.

Sect. 31. Argument 4. If Ordination by such as the English Bishops be of Necessity to the Ministry and Churches, then was there no true Ministry and Churches in the Scripture times, nor in many years after: But the consequent is false; therefore so is the Antecedent. The reason of the Consequence is because there were no such Bishops in those times; and this is already proved, they being neither the Itinerant Apostolical sort of Bishops, nor the fixed Pastors of particular Churches; besides which there were no other.

Sect. 32. Argument 5. If Ordination by such as the English Prelates be Necessary to the Being of the Ministry and Churches, then none of the Protestants that have not such Prelates (which is almost all) are true Churches or have true Ministers: But the Consequent is false: therefore so is the Antecedent. Of this I shall say more anon.

Sect. 33. If none of the Protestants Churches that have not such Bishops are true Churches, and have not a true Ministry, then neither *Roman, Greek, Armenian, Ethiopian, &c.* or almost any through the world are true Churches: For they are defective in some greater matters, and chargeable with greater errors than these. But the Consequent is false; therefore so is the Antecedent. He that denyeth all these to be true Churches, denyeth the Catholick Church: And he that denyeth the Catholick Church, is next to the denying of Christ.

Sect. 34. Having thus proved that there is no necessity of Ordination by such as the English Prelates, I have withall proved that men are not therefore ever the less Ministers, because they have not *their* Ordination, nor our Churches or Ordinances ever the more to be disowned.

Sect. 35. Yet where there is no other Ordination to be had, it may be a duty to submit to theirs: Not as they are *Episcopi ex-ortes* (as even *Grosius* calls them) or of this *species*; but as they are Pastors of the Church, notwithstanding such superfluities and usurpations.

Sect. 36. It is not the duty therefore, but the sin, of any man that was Ordained by such Prelates to a lawful office, to disclaim and renounce that Ordination (as some do.) For it is not every irregularity