

as well as he, and therefore had power to Ordain.

Sect. 29. If it be Objected that *they had no power to Ordain without a Bishop*: I answer, 1. Nor a Bishop *quoad exercitium*, without them, according to our Laws and Customs, at least usually. 2. Ordaining *with a Bishop* proveth them to be *Ordainers*; and that it is a work that belongeth to the order or office of a Presbyter: or else he might not do it at all, any more then Deacons, or Chancellors, &c. may. And if it be but the work of a Presbyters office, it is not a *Nullity*, if Presbyters do it without a Prelate, if you could prove it an irregularity.

Sect. 30. Argument 11. If the Ordination of the *English Prelates be valid*, then much more is the Ordination of Presbyters, (as in *England* and other Reformed Churches is in use.) But the Ordination of English Prelates is valid, (I am sure in the judgement of them that we dispute against:) therefore so is the Ordination of English Presbyters much more.

Sect. 31. The reason of the Consequence is, because the English Prelates are more unlike the Bishops that were fixed by Apostolical Institution or Ordination, then the English Presbyters are, as I have shewed at large in the former Disputation: the Scripture Bishops were the single Pastors of single Churches, personally guiding them in the worship of God, and governing them in presence, and teaching them by their own mouths, visiting their sick, administering Sacraments, &c. And such are the English Presbyters: But such are not the late English Prelates that were the Governors of an hundred Churches, and did not personally teach them, guide them in worship, govern them in presence, and deliver them the Sacraments, but were absent from them all save one Congregation. These were unliker to the Scripture fixed Bishops, described by Dr. H. A. then our Presbyters are: therefore if they may derive from them a Power of Ordination, or from the Law that instituted them; then Presbyters may do so much more.

Sect. 32. Argument 12. If the Ordination of Papist Bishops be valid, much more is the Ordination of English Presbyters so: but the Antecedent is true, in the judgement of those against whom we dispute: therefore the Consequent must be granted by them on that supposition.

Sect. 33. The reason of the Consequence is, because the Popish Bishop



Bishops are more unlike to the Scripture Bishops, and more incapable of ordaining, then the Presbyters of the Reformed Churches are. For 1. The Papist Prelates profess to receive their Power from a Vice-christ, at least *quoad exercitium*, & *media consecranda*, which Protestant Presbyters do not. 2. The Papist Bishops profess themselves Pastors of a new Catholick Church, which is headed by the Papacy as an essential part; and which Christ will not own (as such :) But so do not the Protestant Presbyters. 3. The Papist Prelates Ordain men to the false Office of turning Bread into the Body of Christ by the way of Transubstantiation, in their Consecration, and offering it as a Sacrifice for the quick and dead, and delivering this as the very Body of Christ, and not Bread to the Communicants, and perswading them that it is such, and holding and carrying it to be Worshipped by them with Divine Worship, and the like : But the Protestant Presbyters are Ordained, and do Ordain others, to that true Office of a Presbyter or Pastor, or Bishop which Christ hath instituted. 4. The Papist Prelates have abundance of false doctrines, and practices in Worship, which the Protestant Presbyters have not. 5. And they have no more to shew for a Power of Ordination, then our Presbyters have : so that these, with many the like considerations, will prove, that if the Papists Ordination be Valid, that of the Protestant Churches by Presbyters is so much more. And doubtless, they that plead for a succession from the Papist Prelates, do hold their Ordination Valid.

Sect. 34. Argument 13. If the Protestant Churches that have no Prelates be true Churches ( in a Political sense, ) and the Ordinances among them valid, and to be owned and received, then are the Pastors of those Churches true Pastors, though they have no Ordination but by Presbyters. But the Antecedent is true : therefore so is the Consequent. The reason of the Consequence is clear, and granted by them that we have now to do with : Because the Pastors are essential to the Church as Political, and the said Ordinances of Publike worship, ( as the Lords Supper, ) and Government, cannot be allowable without them, nor such as the people should submit to or receive. This therefore we may take as granted.

Sect. 35. And for the Minor, that the Protestant Churches  
are



are true Churches that have no Prelates. 1. There are so few of them that have Prelates, that he that will unchurch all the rest, I suppose (when he plays his game above board) would take it for an injury, to be accounted a Protestant himself. 2. If the Churches of the West called Papists, and the Churches of *Africa, Asia, and America*, be true Churches of Christ, and have true administrations, then (much more confidently may we affirm that) the Protestants are so too. But the Antecedent is maintained by those that we now dispute against, (excepting the Papists, who yet maintain it as of their own Church) therefore, &c.

SECT 36. The reason of the Consequence is, because the Papists, *Greeks, Armenians, Georgians, Syrians, Egyptians, Abasines, &c.* have much more to be said against them then we have: And if the lesser (or supposed) imperfection of the Protestant Churches do unchurch them, (for wanting Prelates,) then the many great, and real defects of the other Churches will unchurch them much more. Especially this holds as to the Church of *Rome*, which yet is taken by the Dissenters to be a true Church, and by some of them, at least, denied to be the seat of Antichrist. Their Vicechrist and usurping head, and all the Ministry that hold by him, afford us other kind of Arguments against their Church, then want of Prelates can afford them or others against our Churches.

SECT 37. And if any will deny the Antecedent so far as to unchurch all the Churches in the world, that are more defective then the Protestants, he will blot out of his Creed the Article of the Catholick Church, and being a Seeker or next one to day, is like to be an Infidel ere long, as I shall further shew, when I speak of the sinfulness of such.

SECT. 38. Argument 14. If the Administrations of a Usurping Presbyter to an innocent people are Valid (and not Nullities,) then the Ordination of an Usurping Ordainer to an Innocent expectant, is Valid: (and consequently the Ordination of Presbyters is Valid, if they were Usurpers, as they are unjustly said to be.) But the administrations of usurping Presbyters to an Innocent people are Valid: therefore, &c.

SECT. 39. The Antecedent is granted by *Bellarmino* himself (in the place before cited) who saith that no more is required to oblige the people to obey him, and submit, then that he be re-



puted a Pastor : And all must say so, 1. That will not rob the Innocent of the Benefit of Gods Ordinances, because of an usurpers fault. 2. And that will not leave the people, almost commonly, in an utter uncertainty, whom they should take for a Pastor and obey; and when the Ordinances are Valid for their good.

Sect. 40. The Consequence is made good by the Parity of Reason that is in the two cases. If usurpation cause not a Nullity, invalidity or unprofitableness in one case, to the innocent receiver, no nor make it his sin to receive, no more will it in the other : For there is no Reason for any such difference. Nay if it be a duty to submit to an unknown usurper, in several cases, in receiving the Sacraments, hearing, praying, &c. so is it a duty in such cases to receive Ordination.

Sect. 41. Object. *But the usurping Presbyter doth nothing but what belongeth to the office of a Presbyter : but the usurping Ordainer doth that which belongs not to the office of a Presbyter : and therefore his action is a Nullity, as being extra proprium forum.*

Sect. 42. *Ans.* 1. It is proved before to belong to the office of a Presbyter to Ordain : 2. But suppose it were not; yet the objection is vain : because it is the office of a Bishop that the Ordaining Presbyter doth pretend to, and which you imagine that he doth usurp. They say that subject Presbyters (*quoad ordinem vel Officium*) are no creatures of Gods appointment ; and therefore they renounce that Office ; and claim that office which you call Episcopacy, and hath the Power of Ordination. The quarrel between us is not about meer Bishops (such as Dr. H. H. describeth as aforesaid) These are not denied: but the Parish Ministers profess themselves such Bishops: But it is about the other sort of Presbyters, subject to Bishops, that the quarrel is : For they say, that the Church should have none such, and Dr. H. H. saith *there is no Evidence that any such were instituted in Scripture times.* Now as a pretended Presbyters administrations are Valid to the innocent receiver of the Sacrament, so a pretended Bishops administration in Ordination is as Valid to the innocent, *ceteris paribus.*

Sect. 43. Argument 15. They that have the *Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*, have the power of Ordination : But Parochial Pastors called Presbyters have the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven:



Heaven: therefore they have the power of Ordination.

Sect. 44. The Minor is granted commonly by Papists and Protestants, as to *some* of the Keyes, but it is by many denyed as to other. They say that every Pastor hath the Key of doctrine and of Order, but not the Key of Jurisdiction. But 1. Christ gave the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven together and never divided them. Therefore they are not to be divided. He did not give one Key to one, and another to another, but all to the same men: And what God hath joyned together, let no man put asunder. 2. The Apostles in delivering these Keyes to others, are never found to have separated them. For Subject Presbyters were not instituted in Scripture-times: Therefore all that were then Ordained Presbyters had all the Keyes together, and so that of *jurisdiction* (as it is called) with the rest. 3. That Presbyters had the Key of Order, will prove that they may Ordain, as is aforesaid. 4. But that English Presbyters had the Key of *jurisdiction* is proved, 1. In that they were with the Bishops to Ordain by Imposition of hands. 2. In that they were by the Book of Ordination charged to administer Discipline: though this was refused, and the Prelates frustrated their power.

Sect. 45. I shall recite the words of Reverend *Usher* for the proof of this, Reduction of Episcopacy, &c. [By Order of the Church of England all Presbyters are charged (in the Book of Ordination) to administer the Doctrine of Sacraments and the Discipline of Christ, as the Lord hath commanded, and as this Realm hath received the same; and that they might the better understand what the Lord hath commanded therein, the exhortation of St. Paul to the Elders of the Church of Ephesus is appointed to be read unto them at the time of their Ordination, Take heed unto your selves and to all the flock, among whom the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to Rule the Congregation of God which he hath purchased with his blood. Of the many Elders who thus in common ruled the Church of Ephesus, there was one President, whom our Saviour in his

sed & cum plebe in sa. universa: How big was the Diocess then, and how much the Bishop ruled alone, may be hence conjectured; and whether Presbyters had any hand in ruling. Why doth *Ignatius* and *Tertullian* command them to be subject to the Presbyters as to the Apostles of Christ, if they had not the Key of Government?

Cyprian Ep.  
28. p 64.  
ad Clerum d.  
Gaio.—  
Disiderasti ut  
de Philomeno  
& Fortunato  
hypodiaconis,  
& Favorino  
acoluthore  
scribam, cui  
rev non potui  
me solum ju-  
dicem dare,  
cum multi ad-  
huc de clero  
absentes sin-  
t, nec locum  
sum vel sero  
repetendum  
putaverint, &  
hec singulo-  
rum tractanda  
sit, & liman-  
da plenius  
ratio; non  
tantum cum  
collegis meis



Epistle unto this Church in a peculiar manner stileth the Angel of the Church of Ephesus. And Ignatius in another Epistle written about twelve years after unto the same Church, calleth the Bishop thereof. Betwixt the Bishop and the Presbyterie of that Church, what an harmonious consent there was in the ordering of the Church Government, the same Ignatius doth fully there declare, by the Presbyterie with St. Paul, understanding the Community of the rest of the Presbyters or Elders who then had a hand not only in the delivery of the Doctrine and Sacraments, but also in the Administration of the Discipline of Christ: For further proof of which we have that known Testimony of Tertullian in his General Apology for Christians: In the Church are used exhortations, chastisements and divine censure, for judgement is given with great advice as among those who are certain they are in the sight of God; and it is the chiefest foreshewing of the Judgement which is to come, if any man have so offended that he be banished from the Community of Prayer, and of the Assembly, and of all holy fellowship. The Presidents that bear rule therein are certain approved Elders, who have obtained this honour not by Reward, but by good report, who were no other (as he himself intimates) elsewhere, but those from whose hands they used to receive the Sacrament of the Eucharist.

For with the Bishop who was the chief President, (and therefore stiled by the same Tertullian in another place, summus Sacerdos for distinction sake) the rest of the dispensers of the Word and Sacraments joyned in the common Government of the Church; and therefore where in matters of Ecclesiastical judicature, Cornelius Bishop of Rome used the received form of gathering together the Presbyterie, of what persons that did consist, Cyprian sufficiently declareth, when he willeth him to read his Letters to the flourishing Clergy which there did preside or rule with him. The presence of the Clergy being thought so requisite in matters of Episcopal audience, that in the fourth Council of Carthage it was concluded, That the Bishop might hear no mans cause without the presence of the Clergy; and that otherwise the Bishops sentence should be void, unless it were confirmed by the presence of the Clergy: which



which we find also to be inserted into the Canons of Egbert, who was Archbishop of York in the Saxon times, and afterwards into the body of the Canon-Law it self.

True it is that in our Church this kind of Presbyterial Government hath been long disused, yet seeing it still professeth that every Pastor hath a right to rule the Church (from whence the name of Rector also was given at first unto him) and to administer the Discipline of Christ, as well as to dispence the Doctrine and Sacraments, and the restraint of the exercise of that right proceedeth only from the custom now received in this Realm; no man can doubt but by another Law of the Land, this hinderance may be well removed.

Sect. 46. And indeed the stream of Antiquity, and the Authors that are principally rested on for Episcopacy, are full against them that deny the Government of the people to the Presbyters; And it is the principal mischief of the English Prelacy, thus to degrade (or quoad exercitium to suspend at least) all the Presbyters from their office: Not as it is a denying them any part of their honour (thats not to be much regarded;) but as it is a discharging them of their work and burden, and consequently leaving the Churches ungoverned. And for the Government of Presbyters themselves, in Cyprians dayes the Bishop did not, could not, Ordain, or censure any Presbyter without his Clergy, and Councils have decreed that so it should be. Yea and the *plebs universa* also was consulted with by Cyprian.

Sect. 47. And now I cometo the Major of my Arrgument, which I prove thus. Either Ordination is an act of the exercise of the power of the Keyes, or of some other power: But of no other power: therefore of the Keyes. If it be the exercise of any other power, it is either of a secular power, or an Ecclesiastick: but neither of these, therefore of no other. Not of another Ecclesiastick power: for there is no Ecclesiastical power, (at least which Ordination can be pretended to belong to) but the power of the Keyes; not of a secular power; for that belongeth not to Ministers, nor is it here pretended.

Sect. 48. And I think it will appear that the power of Baptizing, and judging who shall be taken for Christians, and who not, and the power of administering the Eucharist and Eucharistical actions in the Church, is as great as this of Ordination,

especially



especially supposing that a Presbyterie must concur in this, and a single Pesbyter may do the other. And therefore the one being granted them, the other cannot be denied.

Sect. 49. Argument 16. If the administrations of the Priests and Teachers in Christs dayes among the Jews was Valid to the people, then the Ordination of our Presbyteries, and the administrations of our Presbyters so ordained are Valid to the people and receivers now: But the Antecedent is true: therefore so is the Consequent. This Argument is managed so frequently and copiously by our Ministers heretofore against the Separatists, that I shall need to say but little of it.

Sect. 50. The Antecedent is proved easily from Scripture. *Acts 13. 27. & 15. 21.* shew that *Moses* and the Prophets were read in the Synagogues every Sabbath day, and *Luke 16. 29.* shew that it was the peoples duty to hear them, *Mat. 23. 1, 2, 3.* Then spake Jesus to the Multitude and to his Disciples, saying, *The Scribes and the Pharises sit in Moses seat: all therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do: but do not ye after their works: for they say and do not.* ] *Mat. 8. 4.* *Mark 1. 44.* *Luke 16. 29.* But go thy way, shew thy self to the Priest, and offer for thy cleansing those things which *Moses* commanded, &c. So that it was the peoples duty to hear, and submit to the Teachers and the Priests.

Sect. 51. The reason of the Consequence is, because these Priests and Teachers had not so good a Call as our Presbyters, to their Office, but were lyable to far more exceptions. The Priests were not of the line that God had by his Law appointed to succeed in the Priethood: the succession had long failed, as to the just title of the Successors. The Priesthood was bought for money of the Civil Powers: and instead of being the Priest for life, he was oft changed every year: chosen by a Pagan Prince, and by him displaced: and most think there were two at once. The Scribes and Pharises had abominably corrupted the Law by their traditions and false expositions; and their Calling was much more defective then ours: so that if they must pass yet for Ministers of God, and their administrations be valid, then so must Presbyters and their administrations be esteemed much more. I know we need not this odious comparison of our Ministry with the Priests or Pharises, but to shew the advantages



tries the odiousness of their accusations, and grossness of their inferences.

Sect. 52. Argument 17. If Presbyters may make a Bishop, then they may make a Presbyter. But they may make a Bishop : therefore they may make ( or ordain ) a Presbyter. The Consequence of the Major is proved thus. 1. They that may confer the *higher* Degree, may confer the *lower* : the place of a Bishop is supposed the higher Degree, and the place of a Presbyter the lower. 2. The Bishops themselves require more power in or to the Consecration of a Bishop, then to the Ordination of a Minister, called a Presbyter. The later may be done, according to their Canons, by one Bishop ( with assisting Presbyters, ) but the former must have three Bishops at the least.

Sect. 53. To this it is commonly answered, that *Præcise* the Ordination of a Presbyter, is a greater work then the making of a Bishop ; and therefore the Major is denied. To which I reply. 1. I speak not of a *Greater* work, because the word *greater* is ambiguous, and may signify the greater change in regard of the *Terminus a quo*, which is not it that I intend. But the addition of an *higher* degree of power, may require more power to the effecting it, then the giving of the Lower degree, though the lower be *præcise* the greater change : for the higher is the greater change as to the *terminus ad quem* ; and as Episcopacy comprehendeth or supposeth Presbyterie, so the power of making a Bishop comprehendeth or supposeth the power of Ordaining Presbyters. It may be *præcise*, ( or *cum præcisione*, as the Schoolmen speak ) it may be a greater work to make a beggar to be the chief Prince next to the King in a Kingdom : and yet *sine præcisione* and in regard of the *terminus ad quem* it is a greater work to make him afterward a King ; and doubtless the addition of this Power requireth the Greater power to effect it.

Sect. 54. Otherwise, if the Dissenters will stand to their answer, we shall from their own grounds infallibly overthrow their cause thus. It is a greater work to Baptize then to Ordain or Confirm : therefore he that may Baptize, may Ordain and Confirm. Just as making a Presbyter is *cum præcisione*, and in respect to the *terminus a quo*, a greater work then Consecrating or making a Bishop ; so Baptizing is *cum præcisione* and in respect to the *terminus a quo*, a far greater work then Ordination ;  
the



the one making a Christian, and the other a Minister of a Christian. See *Aquil. in Scotel. in 4. sent. d. 7. q. 2. pag. 816. of Confirmation.*

Se<sup>c</sup>t. 55. It is only the Minor therefore that will hold dispute, which I prove from the well known words of *Hierom* to *Eugrins* ( which Bishop *Usher* told me he alleadged to King *Charls* at the Isle of *Wight* to this end, when he was asked by him for an instance of Presbyters Ordaining ) [ *Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui ceteris preponeretur, in schismatis remedium factum est, ne unusquisque ad se trahens Christi Ecclesiam rumpere. Nam & Alexandria à Marco Evangelista usque ad Heraclum & Dionysium, Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum, in excelsiori gradu collocatum, Episcopum nominabant: quomodo si exercitus Imperatorem faciat: aut Diaconi eligant de se, quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent. ]* Presbyters then made the first Bishops at *Alexandria*.

Se<sup>c</sup>t. 56. To this it is answered, that it was only Election of Bishops that *Hierom* ascribeth to the *Alexandrian* Presbyters, and not Ordination of them; for that was done by some other Bishops: and that it is Ordination that makes a man a Bishop.

Se<sup>c</sup>t. 57. To this I reply: 1. *Hierom* here undertakes to tell us, how Bishops were made at *Alexandria*; but maketh not the least mention of other Ordination or Consecration, then these words express as done by the Presbyters: And therefore till they prove it, we must take the affirmation of another Ordination to be but the groundless presumption of the Assertors. 2. *Hierom* doth purposely bring this as an argument, to prove the identity first, and the nearness afterward, of Bishops and Presbyters, that [ *Presbyters made Bishops:* ] which would have been no argument, if it was not Presbyters but Prelates that made them, and if the Presbyters only chose them; for, 3. The people may choose a Bishop, as well as the Presbyters, and ordinarily did it: and yet this proveth not that the people were near the Bishop in degree; that which the people themselves may do, and frequently did, is not the only thing that *Hierom* here ascribeth to the Presbyters: but such is the Election of a Bishop: therefore, &c. 4. It is the Original or first making of Prelates at *Alexandria* that *Hierom* here speaks of; which he shews was from the Presbyters consent. This appeareth plainly in his words



words ( though some can make the plainest words to signifie what they would have them ) For 1. He begins with a [ *Presbyteris, id est Episcopis,* ] and 2. proceedeth from many scripture passages, to prove them in scripture times the same : and that not only *quoad nomen*, but *officium* ; for 3. When he had done with the Testimonies of Saint John in his two Epistles, he immediately addeth [ *Quod autem postea unus electus est, qui ceteris preponeretur &c.* ] where note, both that [ *unus qui ceteris preponeretur* ] is more then the bare name : and also that [ *Postea* ] referreth to the date of Johns Epistles, and therefore he plainly averreth, that it was after Johns Epistles, that [ *one was chosen to be before the rest.* ] 5. And to the Answer I further reply, that here is all that was done, and all that was needfull to be done, ascribed to the Presbyters : For 1. They elected one. 2. They did *in excelsiori gradu electum collocare*, place him in an higher degree, and 3. *Episcopum nominabant* : they named him the Bishop ( by way of excellency. ) And if Election and placing him in the Degree, and giving him peculiarly the name, be not Ordination, then Ordination is but some Ceremony ; for these contain the substance. 6. And Hierom expressly resembleth this action of the Presbyters to an Armies making an Emperour or General ; as if he had said, As the Army makes an Emperour ( *Imperatorem faciat* ) so Presbyters made the Bishop : but the Army so made the Emperour, that they left it not to another power to make him ( and to them only. ) So that it is both [ *Making a Bishop* ] that is here ascribed to the Presbyters, and [ *such a making* ] as leaveth him not unmade, to the making of another. 7. And he resembleth it to the making of an Arch-deacon, supposing that the Deacons do 1. Elect. 2. Judge of the person ( *quem industrium noverint.* ) 3. And give him the name ( & *Archi diaconum vocent.* ) 8. And he affirmeth this to be ( *semper* ) the constant custom of the Alexandrian Presbyters, till the dayes of Heraclas and Dionysius : intimating that then the custom changed : but what custom was then changed ? Not the Election of a Bishop by the Presbyters, ( with the people ) for that continued long after : and therefore it must be the Constitution, which afterward was done by Neighbour Bishops in Consecration, but till then by the Election, Collocation, and nomination of the Presbyters of that City-Church.

Alphonsus à Castro doth maintain that Hieroms opinion was indeed the same that from his plain and frequent expressions we averr it to be, and rebuketh them that pretend the contrary.

Hector Boethius ( before cited ) saith ( See.

Histor. l. 7. fol. 128. b. ) that Ante Palladium Populi suffragis ex Monachis & Culdaeis pontifices assumerebantur. No Bishop then ordained them but Presbyters.

And Balans ( Centur. 1. 4. c. 6. ) saith [ *Habebant antea Scoti suos Episcopos ac Ministros ex verbi Divini Ministerio plebium suffragis electos, prout Africanorum more fieri apud Britannos videbant.* ]



9. Having shewed thus, that Bishops and Presbyters were the same, and in the beginning called them by the same name, he affirms that [*Omnes Apostolorum successores sunt*] that is, *All these Bishops.* 10. And he plainly affirms that the difference is made by Riches and Poverty: *He is the greater that is the richer, and he is the inferiour that is the poorer.* [*Potentia divitiarum & paupertatis humilitas, vel sublimiorem, vel inferiorem Episcopum facit.*] Let any impartial Reader peruse the Epistle it self, and confide of these ten passages, and then believe if he can, either that Hierom did imply that other Bishops made these Alexandrian Bishops, and not the Presbyters, or that these Presbyters altered but the name, and gave not the Bishop his new degree, or that this was not a thing that was now *de novo in remedium schismatis* contrived or performed by them. There is evidence enough against these conceits.

SECT. 58. And further, for them that think it was but the name that was now changed, I would ask them these few Questions, (supposing them to be of their mind, that tell us that Inferiour Presbyters were not instituted in Scripture-times, and that it was only Prelates that are called Bishops and Presbyters in Scripture.) 1. Is it not strange, that when *after* Scripture-times, a New Office was made, it should not have a new Name also; but should have the same name with the old superiour office? 2. And is it not strange that both names of the superior Office (Bishop and Presbyter) should be commonly given to the new inferior Office, at the first? 3. And strange that the Church must afterward be put to change the names, and retrench or recall the name of a Bishop from the new sort of Presbyters, and confine it to the old, leaving (as old) the name of a Presbyter to the new inferior Office. 4. And if in Scripture-times (in the dayes when John wrote his Epistles and Revelation) the names of Bishop and Presbyter were both appropriated to Prelates, there being no Inferiour Presbyters then instituted; and yet from Mark the Evangelist, the Alexandrian Presbyters brought back the name of a Bishop to the Prelates, retaining the name Presbyter themselves, *Quæro* How long time was there *after the Institution of Inferiour Presbyters, till the regulating of their names, from the dayes of Mark?* About thirty four years backward. Mark dyed in the eighth year of Nero, and the Presbyters



Presbyters made *Arianus* Bishop after his death, who continued twenty two years, even from the eighth of *Nero*, to the fourth of *Domitian*, as *Eusebins in Histor. Eccles. l. 2. cap. 23. & lib. 3. cap. 12. & in Chronic. & Hieronym. in Catalog. & ex illis Usher Annal. Vol. 2. ad an. Dom. 67. pag. 677.* And *Helvicus* and others are near the same time. And saith *Helvicus*, *John* wrote the Revelations about the fourteenth year of *Domitian*, and wrote his Gospel about the first year of his Successor *Nerva*. So that *Mark* dyed about thirty six years (or thirty four at least) before *John* wrote his Gospel; so that here you have your choice, whether you will believe, that subject Presbyters did regulate the names of themselves and Bishops, and did elect (or make, Bishops thirty six years before they were instituted themselves; or whether you will believe, that yet at the death of *Mark* there were no inferior Presbyters at *Alexandria*, and so no superior Bishops, for all this that *Hierom* doth report.

Sect. 59. As for the Episcopal Divines that dissent from the Principle of the forecited Learned Author (who saith that there is no evidence that any of the second sort of Presbyters were instituted in Scripture times) I need not deal with them in this Disputation: for all of them that ever I yet met with, do grant the validity of Presbyters Ordination, and the truth of the Reformed Churches and their Ministry, and Ordinances: otherwise it were easie enough to vindicate all these from them also, if they denied them.

Sect. 60. Argument 18. *Ad hominem.* If the late English Prelates had a lawful call to their Prelacy, then much more have Ministers Ordained by Presbyters a lawfull call to their Ministry. But the Prelates say that they had a lawfull Call to their Prelacy: therefore, &c. The reason of the Consequence (which only will be denied) is, 1. Because the Presbyters are Ordained to an Office that is of Christs Institution; but the Prelates are Consecrated to an Office that is not of Christs Institution, but against it, and against the light of Nature (in taking on them the impossible Government of an hundred, or many hundred Churches) as was shewed in the former Disputation. 2. Because the Prelates hold an uninterrupted Succession of Legitimate Ordination necessary to the Being of their Prelacie (I mean, such as now we dispute against, hold this) but so do not the



the Presbyters. The said dissenting Prelates are still upon their *Nemo dat quod non habet*; which therefore we may urge upon them. And 1. They cannot prove an uninterrupted Succession themselves, on whom it is incumbent, according to their principles, if they will prove their Call. 2. We can prove that they are the successors of such as claimed all their Power from the Roman Vicechrist, and professed to receive it from him, and hold it of him as the Catholick Head, and so that their Ordination comes from a seat that hath had many interruptions, and so had no power of Ordination, by their Rule: For when the succession was so oft and long interrupted, *Nemo dat quod non habet*: and therefore all that followed must be usurpers and no Popes: and those that received their Offices from them must be no Officers: But the Presbyters that Ordain will give a better proof of their Call then this.

Sect. 61. Argument 19. Where the Office is of Gods Institution, and the persons are endued with Ministerial abilities, and are Orderly and duly designed and separated to the Office of the sacred Ministry, there are true Ministers, and Valid administrations. But all these are found in the Reformed Churches that have Ordination without Prelates: therefore, &c. The Major is undeniable, as containing a sufficient enumeration of all things necessary to the Being of the Ministry.

Sect. 62. The Minor is proved by parts. 1. That the Office of a *Presbyter* is of divine institution, is confessed by most: And I suppose those that deny it to be of Scripture institution, will yet have it to be Divine: But if they deny that, yet it sufficeth us, that it is the same officer that they call a Bishop, and we a Presbyter; that is, the chief Pastor of a particular Church.

Sect. 63. 2. And that the persons are *duly or competently qualified* for the Ministry, nothing but Ignorance, Faction and Malice, that ever I heard of, do deny. (Supposing the humane frailties, that make us all insufficient gradually for these things) The Ignorant that know not what the Ministerial qualifications are, do judge as carnal interest leadeth them. The Factionous rail at all that be not of their mind. *Grotius* thought the opinions of the Calvinists made them unfit materials for the Catholick Edifice that by his Pacification he was about to frame. So do most other Sects, reject those as unworthy that suit not with their



their minds. And malice ( whether animated by Heresie, Prophanes or Carnal interest ) will easily find faults, and unweariedly slander and reproach : But besides such I meet with none that dare deny the competent abilities of these Ministers.

Sect. 64. And 3. That the persons are *Orderly and duly separated to the work of the Ministry* is thus proved. Where there is a separation to the Ministry by *mutual Consent* of the person and the flock, and by the *Magistrates authority*, and by the *Approbation and Investiture* of the *fittest Ecclesiastical officers that are to be had*, there is an orderly and due separation to the Ministry ; But all this is to be found in the Ordination used in *England* and other Reformed Churches, without Prelates : therefore &c. This proves not only the Validity of their Ordination, but the full Regularity.

Sect. 65. *God himself* ( as hath been shewed ) doth by his Law appoint the *Office* of the Ministry, imposing the duty upon the person that shall be called, and giving him his power, by that Law. And then there is nothing to be done, but to *determine of the person* that is to receive this power and solemnly to put him in *Possession* by *Investiture*. Now the principal part of the former work is done also by God himself: by his Qualifying the person with his eminent Gifts, and giving him opportunities and advantages for the Work. So that the people and Ordainers have no more to do, but to find out the man that God hath thus qualified, and to elect, approve and invest him ; and usually he is easily found out, as a candle in the night. So that the two great acts by which God maketh Ministers, is his *Instituting Law* that makes the office, and his *Spiritual and Natural Endowments* given to the person ; which the Church is but to find out, and call into use and exercise. And therefore we may still truly say, that the Holy Ghost maketh Pastors or Overseers of the Church, as well as formerly he did ( *Act. 20. 28.* ) because he giveth them their Gifts, though not such Miraculous Gifts as some then had ; By his common Gifts of Knowledge and Utterance, and his special Gifts of Grace, it is the Spirit that still makes Ministers, and still Christ giveth Pastors to the Church.

Sect. 66. It is therefore to be noted that, *Eph. 4. 6, 7, 8, 11.* the way of Christs giving officers to his Church is said to be by [ *giving Gifts to men* ] and the diversity of *Officers* is founded in the



diversity of the *Measure of Grace*, ( or these Gifts ) [ To every one of us is given Grace according to the measure of the gift of Christ. Therefore he saith, *Ascending on high he led captivity captive, and gave Gifts to men* ( *Edwards Dispensary* ) — And he gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers ] So that giving Gifts, and giving Apostles, Prophets, &c. are here made the same work of God: Not that the Trial and Approbation of these gifts is hereby made unnecessary, but that this is Gods principal act by which he giveth Pastors and Teachers to the Church, and by which the Officers are distinguished. For the Church is to discern and submit to those that are thus gifted; and to follow the Spirit, and not either contrariet or lead him. When God hath thus gifted men, the main work is done, for making them Ministers ( it will be he give them opportunities and advantages for the work ) and it is the Churches Duty to Own and Approve these Gifts of God, and to do their parts to introduce the person: And if the Ordainers refuse this, in case of *Necessity*, the gifted person is bound to improve his Gifts without them. I say [ *in case of Necessity* ] using the best Order that is left.

Sect. 67. This being premised, I come to the Argument ( s. 64. ) And the Major is undeniable, because there are all things enumerated, that are Necessary to the determination of the person qualified, that is to receive the power from Christ.

Sect. 68. And the Minor I prove by parts, 1. That our Ministry have usually the peoples consent, is a known case that needs no proof: 2. So is it that they have the Magistrates allowance, and his Authority appointing Approvers for their Introduction, and allowing Ordination and commanding Ministerial Works.

Sect. 69. And doubtless the Magistrate himself hath so much Authority in Ecclesiastical affairs, that if he command a qualified person to preach the Gospel, and command the people to receive him, I see not how either of them can be allowed to disobey him: ( Though yet the party ought also to have recourse to Pastors for Ordination, and people for consent, where it may be done. ) And *Grotius* commendeth the saying of *Musculus*, that would have no Minister question his Call, that being qualified, hath the Christian Magistrates Commission. And though  
this



this assertion need some limitations, yet it is apparent that Magistrates power is great about the Offices of the Church. For Solomon put out *Abiathar* from the Priesthood, and put *Zadeck* in his place, 1 Kings 2. 27, 35. David and the Captains of the host separated to Gods service those of the sons of *Asaph* and of *Heman* and of *Jeduthun* who should Prophecie with Harps, &c. 1 Chron. 16. 4. And so did Solomon, 2 Chron. 8. 14, 15. They were for the service of the house of God, according to the Kings Order, 1 Chron. 25. 1, 6. And methinks those men should acknowledge this, that were wont to stile the King [ *In all causes, and over all persons the supream Head and Governour.* ]

Sect. 70. But 3. We have moreover in the Ordination of the Reformed Churches, *The approbation and solemn Investiture of the fittest Ecclesiastical Officers* that are to be had. And no more is requisite to an orderly Admission. There being nothing for man to do, but to determine of the qualified person, and present him to God to receive the power and obligation from his Law; it is easie to discern, that where all these concur ( the Peoples Election or Consent, the Magistrates Authority, the determination of fit Ecclesiastical Officers, and the qualification and consent of the person himself, ) there needs no more to the designation of the man. Nor hath God tyed the essence of the Church or Ministry, to a certain formality, or to the interest or will of Prelates: nor can any more *ad ordinem* be required, but that a qualified person do enter, by the best and most Orderly way that is open to him in those times and places where he is. And that we have the fittest Approvers and Ordainers, I prove.

Sect. 71. If the most of the Protestant Churches have no other Ecclesiastical Officers to Ordain but Presbyters, then is it the most fit and orderly way to enter into the Ministry in those Churches by their Ordination, and those Presbyters are the fittest that are there to Ordain. But the Antecedent is a known truth. If any in denial of the Consequence say, that the Churches should rather be without Ministers then have Ordination by such, they are confuted by what is said before.

Sect. 72. And if you say, that they should have Bishops, and it is their own fault that they have not; I answer, Suppose that were a granted truth, it can reach but to some that have the

Rule.



Rule: It is not the fault of every Congregation, or expectant of the Ministry: It is not in their power to alter Laws and forms of Government: and therefore they are bound to enter by the fittest way that is open to them:

SECT. 73. Moreover, even in *England*; the Presbyteries are fitter for Ordination than the present Bishops: (as to the Nation in general) therefore the Ordination by Presbyteries is done by the fittest Ecclesiastical officers, and is the most regular and desirable Ordination.

SECT. 74. I prove the Antecedent by comparing the Ordination of the Presbyteries and the present Prelates. 1. I have before shewed that the English Prelacy is more unlike the Primitive Episcopacy, than our Parochial Presbytery or Episcopacy is; and therefore hath less reason to appropriate to themselves the Power of Ordaining. 2. The Ordaining Presbyters are Many, and known persons; and the Prelates few, and to the most (and except three or four, to almost all that I am acquainted with) unknown. 3. The Presbyters Ordain Openly where all may be satisfied of the impartiality and Order of their proceedings: But the Prelates Ordain in Private, where the same satisfaction is not given to the Church. 4. Hereupon it is easie for any vagrant to counterfeit the Prelates secret Orders, and say he was Ordained by them, when it is no such matter; and who can disprove him? But the publick Ordination of Presbyters is not so easily pretended by such as have it not, and the pretence is easily discovered. 5. The Prelates for ought I hear, are very few, and therefore few can have access to them for Ordination: But Presbyteries are in most countreyes. 6. The Prelates, as far as I can learn, Ordain Ministers without the peoples consent over whom they are placed, and without giving them any notice of it before hand, that they may put in their exceptions if they dissent: But the Presbyters ordinarily require the consent of the people; or at least will hear the reasons of their dissent. 7. The Presbyteries Ordain with the Magistrates allowance, and the Prelates without and against them. Those therefore that are Ordained by Prelates usually, stand on that foundation alone, and want the consent of People and Magistrates; when those that are Ordained by Presbyteries have all. 8. Ordination by Prelates is now pleaded for on Schismatical grounds, and in submitting



mitting to it, with many of them, we must seem to consent to their Principles ( that all other Ordination is Null, and the Churches are no true Churches that are without it. ) But Presbyteries Ordain not on such dividing terms. 9. We hear not of neer so much care in the Prelates Ordinations in these or former times, as the Presbyteries; I could give some instances even of late of the great difference, which I will not offend them with expressing. 10. Most of them that we hear of, Ordain out of their own Diocesses, which is against the ancient Canons of the Church. 11. Some of them by their Doctrines and their Nullifying all the Reformed Churches and Ministry that have no Prelates, do shew us that if they had their will, they would yet make more lamentable destructive work in the Church then the hottest persecutors of their late predecessors did. For it is plain that they would have all the Ministers disowned or cast out, that are not for the Prelacy. And what a case then would this land (and others) be in? (Of which more anon.) So that we have reason to fear that these are destroyers, and not faithful Pastors. I speak not of all, but only of the guilty: For again I say, we very much Reverence such Learned, Worthy men as Bishop *Morton*, Bishop *Brownrigg*, and some others yet surviving are. 12. The Ordination by Prelates, as things now stand, endangereth mens liberty in the exercise of the Ministry, by some things in the Manner which I shall not mention. Review the rest that I said before in *Cap.* 5. and 6. and then judge, Whether he that in these dayes is Ordained by a Learned Grave Presbytery ( and perhaps where a City Pastor is Moderator or President, and many of the Ordainers are the fixed Presidents or Bishops of a Parochial Church, having a Presbytery where they preside, ) I say, Whether such be not separated to the Ministry in the most orderly way that is now to be found existent? and come not in at the door that God would have them to enter at.

Se<sup>c</sup>t. 75. It is strange that those men ( among the Papists ) that allow of the *Cardinals* choosing a Pope, and exercising so much Government as they do over all the Christian world, and all this under the name of *Presbyters of Rome*, should yet be against Ordination by such Presbyters as are indeed Parochial Bishops, and accuse it to be a Nullity. I see not how these things cohere.



Se& 76. But yet many Papists are more moderate in this, then those at home that we now deal with. That *Erasmus, Richardus Armachanus, Guilel. Durantes*, and many more of them, were on our side in this point, is commonly known, and manifested by abundance of our writers, some of them Bishops, and some Episcopal Divines themselves.

Se& 77. And divers of their Schoolmen do maintain that the [ *Ordo Episcopalis non differt à Caracthere Sacerdotali, nisi sicut forma intensa à se ipsa remissa* ] as *Soncinas* relateth ( in 4. Sent. d. 25. ) the sentence of *Paludanus*, which *Voetius* recites.

And the same *Soncinas*, and *Voetius* after him do cite *Anreolus*, proving that *Gradus Episcopalis & Sacerdotum non sunt distincta potestates, &c. Quia Sacerdos auctoritate Papa potest Sacerdotem instituire. Ergo non differunt potestas Episcopalis & Sacerdotis, nisi sicut potestas impedita & non impedita: que tamen est eadem. Antecedens probatur, quia omnis virtus activa, non impedita, potest transfundere seipsam* ] To the same purpose *Cusanus* and many more.

Se& 78. Hence it is that Presbyters have of old had a place in Councils, yea and a suffrage too: and the Council of *Basil* did decide and practise it: which is allowed by many of the Papists. And hence it is that divers of the Papists do make Episcopal preheminiency to be but of Ecclesiastical Institution.

Se& 79. That the *Chorepiscopi* did ordain, and their Ordination was Valid, though they were not accounted Bishops ( any other wise then our Parochial Bishops are ) is a thing that hath been spoken of so oft, and by so many, even Bishops themselves, that I shall pass it by.

Se& 80. And saith *Voetius*, even among the Papists, the *Abbots* and such regular Prelates that are no Bishops, and the *Chapter of Canons* may Ordain; yea and exercise other acts of Jurisdiction, as excommunicating, &c. It is not therefore proper to the Bishops.

Se& 81. It is therefore as *Hierom* speaks of Confirmation by a Bishop only, in *honorem Sacerdotii*, a matter of Ecclesiastical institution for Order, and not of Divine institution that Presbyters without Prelates should not Ordain: As *Leo* first Bishop of Rome saith ( *Epistol. 86. ad Episcop. Gall. & German.* ) there are *Quedam Sacerdotibus Prohibita per Canones Ecclesiasticos*,