

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 Characterè 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*,

at Consecratio Presbyterorum & Diaconorum.] It is the Canons that forbid Presbyters to Ordain, and not the Scriptures that never knew a *Presbyter without the power to Ordain*.

Sect. 82. Were there no Ordainers to do that office, or none but such as would oblige us to sin, it were Gods regular way to enter by the Peoples choice and the Magistrates authority without them, this being in such case the open door: therefore it is more evidently Gods Regular way, when we have both these and the best Ministerial Ordination besides, that is on good terms to be had. I do not only here plead that such a Ministry is not Null (as I did before) but that the entrance in such a case is not sinfull.

Sect. 83. There being nothing left to men herein, but the due designation of the person (before the reception of his power from God) the Peoples Election it self may serve for that designation, where Ministerial Approbation is not to be had. But the ordinary course, where Necessity doth not prohibit us, is that all three concur, *viz.* The Consent of the people, because we cannot Teach and Rule them against their wills: 2. The Approbation of the Ministry, because they are best able to judge of mens abilities. 3. The Allowance of the Magistrate, for the orderly and advantagious exercise of our office. But the first is of the greatest necessity of the three.

Sect. 84. That the people have power of Election, when just authority (Civil or Ecclesiastical) doth not suspend it or limit it, is so easily proved that it is commonly confessed. Its well known that for many hundred years the people had in most or many Churches the Choice of their Bishops or Pastors, or joyned with the Presbyterie and Ordainers in the choice. *Blondellus, Voetius* and many more have sufficiently proved this and other parts of the peoples interest, by unanswerable evidence.

Sect. 85. *Cyprian* saith that this is by *Divine Ordination*. *Cyrian Epist. 11. Plebi—*
Epist. 68. (edit Goulartii) p. 201. [Propter quod plebs obsequens praeceptis Dominicis, & Deum metuens, a peccatore patrum meum, praeposito separare se debet, nec se ad Sacrilegi Sacerdotis sacrificia miscere, quando ipsa maxime habeat potestatem vel eligendi immo contra suffragium vestrum & dignos Sacerdotes, vel indignos recusandi: Quod & ipsum videmus Dei iudicium, de Divina auctoritate descendere, ut Sacerdos plebe praesente, &c.]

* This is not the way of our Prelates Ordination. And this sheweth that the Churches in Cyprians days were not Dioceſan, conſiſting of many particular Churches: eſe all the people could not have been preſent, be- holders and conſenters, at the Ordination of the Biſhops.

† Still this ſhews, that the Churches of Biſhops were then no greater then that all might be perſonally preſent, and fore-acquainted with his life.

Yea that it was the peoples duty not only to elect, but to reject, there's more then Cyprian affirm: *Eusebins Hiſt.*

Ecc. l. 5. c. 18. out of *Apollonius* telleth us that *Alexander* a Montaniſt, being a thief, the Congregation of which he was Paſtor (for that was his Dioceſs) would not admit him. *Cypr. Epiſt. 11.* Plebi — *Secundum vestrā Divina ſuffragia Conjurati & Scelerati de Ecclesia ſponte ſe pellerent.*

*ſub omnium * oculis deligatur, & dignus atq; idoneus publico judicio ac testimonio comprobetur — Coram omni Synagoga. jubet Deus constitui Sacerdotem, id est, instruit & ostendit Ordinationes Sacerdotales non nisi sub populi aſſiſtentis conſcientia fieri oportere, ut plebe preſente vel detegantur malorum crimina, vel bonorum merita predicentur: & ſit Ordinatio juſta & legitima, quæ omnium ſuffragio & judicio fuerit examinata. Quod poſtea ſecundum Divina Magiſteria obſervatur in Actis Apoſtolorum quando de Ordinando in locum Judæ Episcopo Petrus ad plebem loquitur, surrexit inquit Petrus in medio diſcentium; ſuit autem turba in ano: Nec hoc in Episcoporum tantum & Sacerdotum, ſed in Diaconorum Ordinationibus obſervaffe Apoſtolos animadvertimus, de quo & ipſo in Actis eorum ſcriptum eſt: Et convocaverunt, inquit illi duodecim totam plebem diſcipulorum — Quod utique idcirco tam diligenter & cante convoata plebe tota gerebatur, nequis ad altaris Miniſterium, vel ad Sacerdotalem locum indignus obreperet. Ordinari enim nonnunquam indignos non ſecundum Dei voluntatem, ſed ſecundum humanam præſumptionem, & hæc Deo diſplicere, quæ non veniant ex legitima & juſta Ordinatione, Deus ipſe manifeſtat per Olee Prophetam dicens, ſibi ipſi ſi conſtituerunt Regem, & non per me. Propter quod diligenter de traditione Divina & Apoſtolica obſervatione obſervandum eſt & tenendum, quod apud nos quoq; & ſere Provincias univerſas teneatur, ut ad Ordinationes rite celebrandas, ad eam plebem cui præpoſitus ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem provincia proximi quiq; conveniant, & Episcopus deligatur plebe præſente, quæ ſingulorum vitam pleniffime noſcit, & uniufcujuſq; actum de ejus converſatione perſpexit. † Quod & apud vos factum videmus in Sabini collegeſt. noſtri ordinatione, ut de univerſe fraternitatis ſuffragio & de Episcoporum qui in præſentia convenerant, quiq; de eo ad vos literas fecerant judicio, Episcopatus ei deferretur, & manus ei in locum Baſilidis imponeretur.] And ſo he goes on to ſhew that even the Biſhop of Rome, reſtoring of Baſilides, was not valid to reſcind the foreſaid Ordination of Sabinus, which was thus made by the Biſhops on the peoples ſuffrages. And yet our Dioceſans*

have, alas, too commonly thrust on the people against their consent, such unworthy persons, as of whom we may say as Cyprian (*ibid.*) of these, [*Cumq; alia multa sint & gravia delicta quibus Basilides & Martialis implicati tenemur; frustra tales Episcopatum sibi usurpare conantur, cum manifestum sit ejusmodi homines nec Ecclesia Christi posse praeisse, nec Deo sacrificia offerre debere.*] I have cited these words at large, because they are full and plain to shew us the practice of those times, and are the words of an African Synod, and not of Cyprian alone, and shew that then the People had the chiefest hand in the Election or designation of the person, which is it that I have now to prove.

SECT. 86. Pamelinus himself while he seeks to hide the shame of their Prelates Ordination, from the light of these passages of Cyprian, doth yet confess and say, [*Non negamus vetitrem Electionis Episcoporum ritum, quo plebe presente, immo & suffragiis plebis eligi solent. Nam in Africa illam observatum constat ex electione Eradii Successoris D. Augustini, de quo extat Epistola ejus 120. In Gratia atate Chrysost. ex lib. 3. de Sacer. In Hispaniis ex hoc Cypriani loco, & Isidor. lib. de Officiis. In Galliis, ex Epist. Celestin. Pap. 2. Roma, ex iis qua supradiximus, Epist. ad Anton. Ubique; etiam alibi ex Epist. Leonis 87, Et perdurasse eam consuetudinem ad Gregor. 1. usq; ex ejus Epistolis: immo & ad tempora usq; Caroli & Ludovici Imperatorum, ex 1. lib. Capitulorum eorundem satis constat.*] This full confession from the mouth of an adversary, may save me the labour of many more allegations concerning the judgement and practice of the ancients.

SECT. 87. He that would see more may find enough in Voetius de Desparata causa Papae lib. 2. c. 12. SECT. 2. & passim. And in Blondel. de jure plebis: & Goulartius on the foresaid notes of Pamelinus on Cyprian, p. 205. Among others he there citeth those known Canons of the Carthage Councils, three and four out of Gratian [*Nullus ordinetur clericus nisi probatus, vel examine Episcoporum, vel populi testimonio*] Et [*Episcopus sine concilio clericorum suorum clericos non ordinet; ita ut civium conventum & testimonium querat*] (What and where is that Clergy without whose Council our Prelates Ordain not; and that people whose suffrages they require?) And saith Goulartius, Ob-
servanda est Caroli ut & Ludovici Constitutio [*Sacrorum Ca-*
nunum.

Constantine in his Epistle to the people of Antioch tells them that [in the election of their Bishops all men should freely deliver their opinion, and the general suffrage of all should be equally considered; because Ecclesiastical Honours should be obtained and conferred without trouble and discord —] Euseb. de vita Const. l. 3. c. 58.

*nonum non ignari, ut Dei nomine sacrosancta Ecclesia suo liberius
potiatur honore, assensum Ordini Ecclesiastico prabemus, ut Epis-
copi per Electionem Cleri & populi, secundum statuta Canonum
eligantur.*] Its certain then that the people were sometime the
sole choosers, and the Pastors the approvers; and sometime the
People and the Pastors joynt Electors; and sometime the Pastors
chose, but forced none on the people, against or without their
Consent (as *Pamelius* confesseth) till Popular tumults, divi-
sions, and other reasons occasioned the change of this ancient
Custom. And therefore it is most certain, that an Election by
the people may be a valid determination of the person.

Sect. 88. And the person being once sufficiently determined
of, the power and obligation doth fall upon him immediately
from God; so that were it not that the Pastors Approbation is
part of the Determination, there would be nothing left for
Ordination, but the solemnizing of their entrance by Investi-
ture, which is not essential to the Ministerial Office, but *ad bene
esse*, makes to a compleat and orderly possession, where it may
be had; and where it cannot, Election may suffice.

Sect. 89. *Voetius, de Desperata causa Papatus, lib. 2. sect. 2.
cap. 20.* doth by seven Arguments prove against *Jansenius*,
*Electionem tribuere Ministerium: & esse proprie ejus fundamen-
tum.* The first Argument is from the Definition of Election:
the second from the Canon Law, which giveth a Bishop his
power before Consecration, and gives the Pope a power of go-
verning the Church before he is enthroned or Consecrated.
The third is *à similibus*, in *Oeconomie* and *Policie*: the founda-
tion of marriage-union is mutual Consent, and not Solemniza-
tion. Coronation (saith he) doth not make a King (he
means, *not fundamentally*, but compleatively,) but hereditary
Succession or Election. He may well be a King without Coro-
nation, as (saith he) the custom is in *Castile, Portugal, &c.*
The King of *France* dependeth not *pro jure regni* on the Arch-
bishop of *Rhemes*, but saith *Barclay*, hath the right and honour
of a King before his Coronation. An elect Emperour govern-
eth before his Coronation. *Quoad potestatem administrandi regni
(Gallici) unctio & Coronatio nihil addunt inquit Commentator
sanctionis pragmat. fol. 4.* His fourth Argument is from the na-
ture of all Relations; *qua posito fundamento & termino, in sub-
jecto*

jecto dicuntur existere : atqui Solemnizatio, seu Consecratio, seu Ordinatio, seu Investitura (*ἐξουσιοδότης* vocant patres Greci) illa externa quam nos confirmationem dicimus, neque est fundamentum, neque terminus Ministerii, aut Ministerii ; sed legitima electio & *ἐκλογή* Ecclesia est fundamentum Ministerii, & ista vel illa particularis Ecclesia est terminus, in quo est correlatum Oves seu discipuli, ad quod refertur relatum Doctoris seu Pastoris. (Though some of this need explication and limitation, yet its worthy consideration.) His fifth Argument is from the Confessions of the Adversaries, citing Sylvest. Prieras, Immanuel Sa, Onuphrius, Navarrus, yea Bellarmine and Pope Nicolas, who maintain that [*In summo Pontifice post Electionem nulla alia requiritur confirmatio ; quia statim ut electus est suscipit administrationem.* And to this agreeth their Practice, who at the Council of Trent had many Bishops merely Elect, and Elect Cardinals are admitted to Elect a Pope. His sixth Argument is, [*Quod Consecratio seu Investitura potest abesse aliquo in Casu: Electio autem nunquam : ergo fundamentum Ministerii seu potestatis Ecclesiastica est Electio & non Consecratio ;* which he endeavours to confirm. My opinion of the *fundamentum potestatis*, I have expressed in my *Christian Concord* otherwise : but yet I consent, as is there expressed, to the Necessity of the peoples Consent to our Office.

Sect. 90. Argument 20. If those in the Reformed Churches that are Ordained by Presbyters, have as good a call to the Ministerial Office, as the Princes of the Nations (yea any one of them) have to their Sovereignty or Power, then are they true Ministers of Christ, and their administrations valid to the Churches, and their Ministry to be received. But the Antecedent is true : therefore so is the Consequent. And I prove them both.

Sect. 91. The Secular power will be granted, as to the most (at least) of Christian Princes and other Sovereigns : when the Holy Ghost commandeth subjection to the Higher Powers, even when they are Heathen, and come in as Nero did, *Rom. 13.* we may well take it for granted that Christian Magistrates, that have no better title then he, are such as we must be subject to : even those that have not so lawful an entrance, as may justify their possession, or free them from the guilt of flat Usurpation, before

before God, may yet be such while they are in possession, as we must be subject to for Conscience sake : and all their administrations are as valid to the innocent subjects, as if they had as good a title as the best. They that deny this, must overthrow almost all the Common-wealth's on Earth, and turn Subjection into Rebellion.

Sect. 92. The Consequence then is proved from the parity of Reason, in both cases. The title of such Princes is so far good, as that subjection is due to them, and their Government valid : our title to the Ministry is at least as good as theirs : therefore submission or obedience is due to us, and our administrations valid to the Church. And that our title is as good as theirs, will appear by a due comparison.

Sect. 93. 1. God is equally the Author of our Office, and of theirs. He that appointed the Magistrate to Rule by force, appointed the Ministry to Teach, and Guide, and Worship publicly before the Church. There is no Power but of God : even Magistrates could have none, unless it were given them from above. 2. Usurpation therefore is a sin in Magistrates as well as Ministers. And there is the same reason, why it should invalidate their actions, as ours, if we were guilty of it. 3. The Dissenters rule [*Nemo dat quod non habet*] concerneth the Magistrate as much as the Minister, and somewhat more. A man may do more in works of service to others without a special Office, than in Magisterial Government. Magistracy is a Relation that must have a foundation or efficient cause, as well as Ministry. If a *Giver* that himself hath the Power given, is necessary to make Ministers, then also to make Magistrate (which yet is false in both, if you speak of humane Donation to the Sovereign) The effect can no more be without a cause in them than in us. 4. If the Election or Consent of the people be enough to make a Magistrate, or to be the foundation or donation (as they suppose) of his authority, then much more may the election or consent of the people, with the approbation and investiture by Presbyters, and allowance of the Magistrate, prove those in question to be true Ministers. 5. No Prince on earth that ever heard of, can prove any thing like an uninterrupted succession of legitimate Princes from a Predecessor immediately authorized by God. If Hereditary Princes that are the Successors

sors of Usurpers are not to be obeyed, it will be hard to find an Hereditary Prince that is to be obeyed: so that their case is worse then the case of Ministers.

SECT. 94. For, though 1. No Pastors on Earth can prove an uninterrupted Succession of persons *lawfully* Ordained. 2. Nor is it necessary to prove a Local succession; because God hath not tyed his Church to Towns or Countries, and a Church and Pastor that are banished into another Land, may there be the same Church and Pastor, though in and of another place: yet 1. We have a succession of possession in the Office itself. 2. And a succession of actual Ordination in great probability: no man can prove against us that we receive our Ministrie from any that were not actually Ordained. Yet this much is not Necessary to our Office.

SECT. 95. Object. *But Christ hath tyed the Office of the Ministry to a legitimate Ordination; but he hath not tyed the Magistracy to a lawful Title.* Answ. Here are two falshoods barely affirmed, or implied. One is that a just Title is less necessary to the Magistrate then the Minister; when the Reason of both is the same. Title is the foundation of Right. Magistracie is a Right of Governing. No Relation can be without its Foundation. The other is, that God hath tyed the Office of the Ministrie to a *legitimate Ordination*. This is unproved, and I have proved the contrary before. It is *our Duty* to enter by *Legitimate Ordination* where it may be had; and thus we do. But if any of our Predecessors (perhaps a thousand or five hundred years ago) did enter otherwise, that doth not invalidate our Ordination or Ministrie, nor is it any of our sin.

SECT. 96. As Ministers were at first Ordained by Imposition of hands, so Kings were chosen by God, and (in the Church) anointed by a Prophet, or special Officer of God; and sometime by the people (that is, by their suffrages appointing it, or consenting to it) as appeareth, 1 Sam. 10. 1. & 15. 17. & 16. 13. & 24. 6. 2 Sam. 2. 4, 7. & 5. 3. & 12. 7. & 19. 10. 1 King. 1. 45. & 5. 1. 2 King. 11. 12. & 23. 30. 2 Chron. 22. 7. so that there is as much in Scripture for this manner of their investiture, as there is for Ministers Ordination by imposition of hands; yet may they be Kings that have no such Investiture; much less all their predecessors. We then that *have a due Investiture*, may

prove our Ministry, whatever our predecessors had.

Sect. 97. I come now to the Arguments of the adversaries of our Ministry, which I need not stand long on, because they are few and scarce considerable, and sufficiently answered in what is said. And first its said by a Learned man (*Dissertat. de Episcop. contra Blondel. Praemonit. ad Lector. sect. 4. 13.*) [*Nos illud in hac disceptatione pro concessio positum censebimus, Neminem recte dare quod non habet: eumque aut eas qui hac potestate induti nunquam fuerint, sine violatione aut sacrilegio quodam sibi arrogare aut assumere aut aliis aequè à Deo non vocatis, aut missis communicare nequitiam posse.*] *[Illud hic nobis unicum meminisse sufficiet, innumquemque in Anglicana Ecclesia ab Episcopis ordinatum Presbyterum, nulla ordinandi alios facultate (aut per se, aut quò quolibet comparium catu munitum) praeclitum esse, nec igitur eam sibi rectius arrogare posse, quam si Diaconum, immo Laicorum unus, aut plures, tali potestate nullatenus induti, idem ausuri sint.]* The sum is: Presbyters have not this power: therefore they cannot give it.

Sect. 98. Ans. If the Argument run thus [*No man can give that which he hath not: Presbyters have not the Office of a Presbyter: therefore they cannot give it.*] I then deny the Minor: They are not Presbyters, if they have not the Office of a Presbyter: that therefore which they have (to speak in the Dissenters language) they may give.

Sect. 99. But if the Argument be this [*No man can give that which he hath not: Presbyters have not a power of Ordaining: therefore they cannot give a power of Ordaining*] I answer as followeth. 1. We receive not our Office by the Gift of man, whether Presbyters or Prelates. The Power is immediately from Christ, and men do but open us the door, or determine of the person that shall from Christ receive the power, and then put him solemnly into possession. It is the first Error of the adversaries, to hold that this power is given by men as first having it themselves. In the Popes case Bellarmine himself will grant us this (*Respons. ad 7 Theolog. Vener. p. 246. 232.*) [*Sæpe (inquit) jam dictum est, Electionem Cardinalium non conferre potestatem, sed designare tantummodo personam, cui Deus potestatem tribuit.*] And yet that [*In summo Pontifice post electionem nulla alia requiritur confirmatio, quia statim ut electus est, suscipit administrationem,*

strationem, ut declarat Nicol. Papa Can. in nomine, dis. 23.]
 pag. 175. And of the Power of Princes, the Dissenters will grant
 it (for we have it in their writings) that the Power is from God
 immediately, though the people may elect the person. You will
 thrust out all Princes of the world by this Argument, and say,
 [*No man giveth that which he hath not: the people have not a*
Power of Government: therefore they cannot give it.] I would
 answer you as here: *God hath the Power, and he giveth it: but*
the people that have it not, may design the person that shall receive
it from God: as the Burgeffes of a Corporation may choose a
Major or Bayliff to receive that power from the Sovereign (by
the Instrumentality of a Law or Charter) which they had not
themselves to use or give. And so a Presbyterie (and sometime
the people alone) may design the person that shall receive the
Office of the Ministrie from God, though they had it not them-
selves to use or give.

Sect. 100. Resp. 2. By this Argument and its supposition,
 none are true Ministers that are Ordained by *Prelates*: for they
 have not the Power of the Ministrie to Give, but only to Use:
 no Ordination is a Giving of the Power, save only by way of
 Investiture, which supposeth a Title and Right before, and is
 not of absolute necessity to the Possession: for in several cases it
 may be without it.

Sect. 101. Respons. 3. A man may *Instrumentally* give or
 deliver both Right and Investiture in that which he *hath not him-*
self, nor ever had. Your servant may by your appointment,
 deliver a Lease, a Deed of Gift, a Key, or twig and turf, for
 Possession of house and lands, though he never had house or
 lands or possession himself. It is sufficient that the Donor have
 it, that sends him.

Sect. 102. Resp. 4. Presbyters have the Power of Presby-
 ters, or the Ministerial Office: and if they can give that (which
 certainly they have,) then they can give a Power of *Ordaining*
 other Presbyters. For to Ordain others, is no more then they do
 themselves in giving the Power or Office which they have: there-
 fore if they may do it, those that they give their Power to may
 do it; that is, may also give others that power which they
 have.

Sect. 103. But as to our case in hand, it sufficeth that we

prove, that Presbyters may give others the Office of Presbyters ; whether this Office contain a Power of Ordaining, is another Question, but soon dispatcht, if this be granted : because (as is said) to Ordain is nothing else but to invest others with the Office or Power which we have our selves.

Se^{ct}. 104. Resp. 5. The Argument maketh more against the Prelates Ordination, on another account ; because that (as is proved already) that *Species* of Prelacie that was exercised in *England* (the sole Governours of an hundred or two hundred Churches) is so far contrary to the Word of God, that we may boldly conclude, that as such, they have no power to *use or give* : their very Office is humane, and destructive of the true Pastoral Office : and therefore as such, they have less pretence of Divine Authoritie, then Presbyters, whose Office is of God. Yet do I not make their Ordination Null, because they were Presbyters as well as Prelates, and also were in Possession of the place of Ordainers, and had the Magistrates authority.

Se^{ct}. 105. Resp. 6. Presbyters have a Power of Ordaining : it is already proved. And to your confirmation (where you say that the Bishops gave them no such Power : therefore they have it not :) I answer : 1. I deny the Consequence. God gave it them : therefore they have it without the Bishops gift. 2. If by [*Giving*] you mean but an accidental Causation, or the action of a *Causa sine qua non*, or a designation of the Person that shall receive it, then I deny the Antecedent. The Prelates (and Electors) designed the person, and also invested him solemnly in the Office, which containeth this Power of Ordination which you deny them.

Se^{ct}. 106. Obj. *The Prelates expressed no such thing in their Ordination.* Ans. 1. It being not the Prelates but Christ that makes the Office, we must not go to the words of the Prelates, but of Christ to know *what the Office is*, though we may go to the Prelates (while the work was in their hands) to know *who the person is*. If a Prelate Consecrate a Prelate, and yet mention not particularly the works that are pretended to belong to a Prelate, you will not think him thereby restrained or disabled to those works. He that Crowneth a King, and they that choose him, though they name not the works of his Office and Power, do thereby choose him to all those works that belong to a King.
God

God hath set down in his Word, that the Husband shall be the Head or Governor of his Wife: if now the woman shall choose a certain person to be her Husband, and the Minister or Magistrate solemnize their Marriage, without any mention of such Governing Power, the Power doth nevertheless belong to the man; because God hath specified by his Law the Power of that Relation, and the man is Lawfully put in the Relation that by the Law of God hath such a Power: so is it in the case in hand.

Se^ct. 107. But yet 2. I add, that the Prelates and the Laws of England gave to Presbyters a Power of Ordination. For in all their Ordinations, the Presbyters were to lay on hands with the Prelate (and did, in all Ordinations that I have seen.) And if they actually imposed hands and so Ordained, it was an actual profession to all that they were supposed to have the power of Ordination, which they exercised.

Se^ct. 108. Obj. *But they had no Power given them to do it without a Prelate.* Answ. 1. By Christ they had. 2. You may as well say, that Bishops have no Power to Ordain, because they were not (ordinarily at least) to do it without the Presbyters.

Se^ct. 109. Obj. Saith the foresaid Learned Author (*Disser. Praemonit. sect. 10. 11.*) [*Unum illud habens interrogare, an Hieronymus, dum hic esset, & Presbyteratu secundario fungeretur partiaria tantum indutus potestate, praesente, sed spreto & insuper habito Episcopo, Diaconum aut Presbyterum ordinare (aut Presbytero uni aut alteri adjunctus) recte potuerit? si affirmetur, dicatur sodes, qua demum ratione ab eo dictum sit, Episcopum sola ordinatione (& ergo ordinatione) à Presbytero determinatum esse] sin negetur, quomodo igitur Presbytero Anglicano, cui nullam, qua non Hieronymo potestatem, &c. —]*

Answ. 1. This is none of our case in England: we Ordain not, praesente sed spreto Episcopo: but most Countreys know of no Bishop that they have, but Presbyters. 2. Hierom might have Ordained with his fellow-presbyters, according to the Laws of Christ, but not according to the Ecclesiastical Canons, that then obtained, or bore sway. 3. Hierom plainly tells you, that it is by Ecclesiastical appointment for the prevention of schisme, that Bishops were set up so far as to have this power more then

Presbyters, in the point of Ordination. 4. The English Presbyters are Parochial Bishops, and have an Office of Christs making, and not of the Prelates; and are not under those Ecclesiastical Canons that restrained *Hierom* from the exercise of this power. And therefore whereas it is added by this Learned Author [*Quid huic dilemmati reponi, aut opponi possit, fateor equidem me non adeo Lynceum esse ut perspiciam*] he may see that he could scarce have set us an easier task then to answer his dilemma.

Sect. 110. The second and their principal objection is, that *We have no precept or example in the Church for Presbyters Ordaining without Prelates: therefore it is not to be done.* *Ans.* 1. I told you before how Bishop *Usher* told me he answered this Objection to King *Charls.* viz. from the example of the Church of *Alexandria* where Presbyters made Bishops, which is more.

Sect. 111. But 2. I answer, you have no example in Scripture or long after that ever Prelates of the English sort, did ordain, nor any precept for it, nor was such a Prelacy then known, as is proved; and therefore their Ordination hath less warrant then that by Presbyters.

Sect. 112. And 3. I have told you before of Scripture warrant for Ordination by a Presbyterie, and also by the Teachers and other Officers of a single Church, as was the Church of *Antioch*. Prove that there was any Bishop.

Sect. 113. Lastly, it is confessed by the Dissenters that such Presbyters or Bishops as are mentioned, *Act. 20. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1, &c.* had power of Ordination: But according to the judgement of most of the Fathers (that ever I saw or heard of that interpret those texts) it is Presbyters that are meant in all or some of those texts. It is granted us also by the Dissenters that the chief or sole Pastors of single Churches in Scripture-times did ordain, and had the power of Ordination: But the Presbyters of *England*, and other Protestant Churches are the chief or sole Pastors of single Churches; therefore, &c.

Sect. 114. Object. 3. *But the English Presbyters have brook their Oaths of Canonical obedience, and therefore at least are schismatical.* *Ans.* 1. Many never took any such oath, to my knowledge: For my part I did not. 2. The particular persons that

that are guilty must be accused : and neither must they be judged before they speak for themselves , nor yet must others be condemned for their sakes. In these parts, there is not one Presbyter I think of ten, who differs from the Prelates about Ordination, that ever took that oath. And therefore it is few that can be called Schismaticks on that account. Yea 3. And those few that did take that Oath, have few of them that I know of, done any thing against the Prelates.

Sect. 115. Object. 4. *The English Presbyters have pull'd down the Prelates, and rebelled against them, and therefore at least are guilty of Schism.* Answ. 1. The guilty must be named and heard: their case is nothing to the rest. It is not one of ten I think, perhaps of twenty, that can be proved guilty. 2. It was not the Scripture Bishops that they Covenanted against or opposed : but only the irregular English Prelacy before described : And the endeavour of reforming this corrupted Prelacy, and reducing it to the Primitive frame, is in it self no schism.

Sect. 116. Object. 5. *Ignatius commandeth them to obey the Bishops and do nothing without them.* Answ. 1. Ignatius also commandeth them to obey the Presbyters as the Apostles of Christ, and to do nothing without them. 2. The Bishops that Ignatius mentioneth were such as our Parish Bishops or Presbyters are, that have a Presbyterie to assist them : They were the chief Pastors of a single Church, as is before proved out of Ignatius, and not the Pastors of hundreds of Churches.

Sect. 117. I shall trouble the Reader with no more of their objections, seeing by what is said already, he may be furnished to answer them all : but I shall now leave it to his impartial sober consideration, whether I have not proved the truth of our Ministry and of the Reformed Churches, and the Validity of our administrations, and of our Ordination it self ?

CHAP.



CHAP. VIII.

The greatness of their sin that are now labouring to perswade the People of the Nullity of our Ministry, Churches and administrations.

Even those Protestant Churches that have Superintendents are unchurched by them too, for want of a true Ordination: For their Superintendents were commonly ordained by meer Presbyters, or settled only by the Princes power. So in Denmark, when their

Sect. 1.



mine intent to make them odious, or cast disgrace upon them (for I do with great reluctancy obey my Conscience in the performance of this task:) but my intent is, if it be the will of God to give success so far to these endeavours, 1. To humble them for their great and hainous sin and save them from it; 2. And to save the Church from the divisions and disturbances that is already caused by them and their opinion; 3. However

Aving laid so fair a ground for my application, I think it my duty to take the freedom to tell those Reverend persons that oppose usin this point, the Reasons why I dare not joyn with them, and the guilt that I am perswaded they heap upon their own souls; Wherein I protest it is not

seven Bishops were deposed, seven Presbyters were Ordained Superintendents by *Johan Bugenhagenius Pomeranus* a Presbyter of *Wutenberge* in the Presence of the King and Senate at the chief Church in *Uassnia*: See *Vit. Bugenagii in Melch. Adam. vii. Germ. Theolog. page 315.*

to discharge my Conscience and tell them plainly, what frightneth me from their way.

Se^{ct}. 2. And 1. It seems to me (upon the grounds before expressed) that those men that would Nullifie all the Protestant Ministry, Churches and administrations, that have not Prelates; are guilty of schism, and are plain Separatists. They depart from truly Catholick principles. That man hath not the just Principles and Spirit of a Catholick, that can on such a pretence as this degrade or nullifie so many Learned, Godly Ministers, and unchurch so many excellent Churches of Christ; they make a plain Schism, and separate from us on as weak grounds as the ancient Separatists did, whom yet they account an odious generation. And the writings of *Paget, Ball, Bradshaw, Hilderham, Bernard*, and the rest that defend our Ministry and Churches against the old Separatists, will serve in the main to defend them against these new ones, which therefore I refer the Reader to peruse. Many of the same Arguments are as forcible against this adversary.

Se^{ct}. 3. 2. And by this means they condemn themselves that have spoken so much against the Separatists, calling them Brownists, Schismatics, and the like; and now take up the cause (in the name) that in them they so condemned. Will they turn Schismatics that have spoken against Schismatics so much?

Se^{ct}. 4. 3. By this means also they exceedingly wrong the Lord Jesus Christ, by seeking to rob him of his inheritance: by telling him that his Churches are none of his Churches, and his Ministers are none of his Ministers, and his Ordinances are not his Ordinances indeed. Let them first prove that Christ hath renounced these Ministers, or unchurched or denied these Churches, or given them a bill of divorce: and then let them speak their pleasure. But till then they were best take heed what they do, lest they have not the thanks from Christ which they expect.

Se^{ct}. 5. 4. They go against the plain commands of Christ, and examples of his servants: Christ himself bid concerning such as cast out Devils in his name, but followed him not [*Forbid him not; for there is no man that shall do a Miracle in my name that can lightly speak evil of me: for he that is not against us is on our part, Mark 9. 37, 38, 39.* He liked not their humour

that would have the *substance* of so good a work forbidden, for want of a due circumstance, mode, or accident. He commandeth us to *Pray the Lord of the Harvest to send Labourers into his Harvest, because the Harvest is great, and the Labourers are few*: And these men would have multitudes of Labourers thrust out, in the Necessity of the Churches. *Paul* rejoiced that *Christ was Preached*, even by them that did it in *strife and envy*, thinking to add affliction to his bonds. But these men would silence them that preach in sincere compassion of mens souls. *Moses* would not forbid *Edlad* and *Medad* prophecying, but wish that all the Lords people were Prophets. While men do good and not harm, or more good then harm in the Church, I should see very good grounds, yea and Necessity for it, before I should silence them, or be guilty of silencing them.

Sect. 6. 5. They manifest a great deal of *selfishness* and *pride*, that dare thus consent to the injury of *Christ*, and the Church and souls of men; because they may not bear that Rule which is according to their principles and spirits. Self-denial would do much to cure this.

Sect. 7. 6. And yet they do as self-seekers commonly do, even seek after misery and destruction to themselves. While they look (its like) at the honour, and forget the work, they plead for such a load and burden, as is enough to break the backs of many, even for the doing of a work that is so far beyond their strength, that its a meer impossibility: How can one man do the works which Scripture layeth on a Bishop, for a hundred or two hundred Churches? and for thousands that he never sees or hears of?

Sect. 8. 7. And above all, I admire how the heart of a considerate Christian, can be guilty of so great cruelty to the souls of men, as these men would be, if they had their will, in the practice of their principles? What if all the Churches that have no Prelates were unchurched? the Ministers cast out as no true Ministers, or the people all prevailed with to forsake them, what would be done for the thousands of the poor ignorant careless souls that are among us? when all that all of us can do is too little, what would be done if so many and such were laid aside? How many thousands were like to be damned, for want of the means,

means, that according to the ordinary way of God, might have procured their conversion and Salvation?

SECT. 9. If they say, that *others as good as they should possess the places*: I answer, they speak not to men of another world, but to their neighbours, that well know that there are few to be had of tolerable worth to possess one place of very many, if all that they oppose were cast out or forsaken. Do we not know who and what men they are that you have to supply the room with?

SECT. 10. If they say that *more obedient men would soon spring up, or many of these would change their minds, if they were forced to it*; I answer, 1. So many would be unchanged as would be a greater loss to the Church (if it were deprived of them) then ever Prelacy was like to repair. 2. And what should become of poor souls the while your young ones are a training up? 3. And in all ages after, the Church must lose all those that should dissent from your opinion.

SECT. 11. If you say that, *It is not your desire to silence all these Preachers that you disown*: I answer, How can that stand with your doctrine or your practice? Your Doctrine is, that they are Lay-men, and no true Ministers, nor to be heard and submitted to as Ministers, nor Sacraments to be received from them. And would you not have them then cast out? 2. Your practice is to dissuade the people (especially the Gentry that are near you) to separate and disown them accordingly; and it is done in many places. And would you not cast them out, whom you would have forsaken?

SECT. 12. If you say, *It is your desire that they should forsake their error and obey you, and so be continued and not cast out*: I answer, 1. But that is not in your power to accomplish, nor have you reason to expect it. They are willing to know the mind of God as well as you, and perhaps search as diligently, and pray as hard as you; and yet they think that its you that are in the wrong; you see that for many years the Reformed Churches have continued in this mind: And it appears that if they will not turn to your opinion, you would have them all cast out or forsaken. Christ shall have no servants, nor the Church any Pastors that will not be in this of your Opinion.

SECT. 13. 8. Hereby also you would run into the guilt of a

more grievous persecution, when you have read so much in Scripture against persecutors, and when you have heard of and seen the judgements of God let out upon them. It is an easie matter for any Persecutor to call him that he would cast out, a Schismatick, or Heretick, but it is not so easie to answer him that hath said, *He that offendeth one of these little ones, it were better for him, &c.* God will not take up with fair pretences or false accusations against his servants, to justify your persecution.

Sect. 14. 9. Yea you would involve the people of the Land, and of other Nations, in the guilt of your persecution; drawing them to joyn with you, in casting out the faithful labourers from the Vineyard of the Lord. This is the good you would do the people, to involve their Souls into so deplorable a state of guilt.

Sect. 15. If you say, *It is you that are persecuted*, as I read some of you do: I answer. 1. If it be so, you are the more unexcusable before God and man, that even under your persecution, will cherish, defend and propagate such a doctrine of persecution, as strikes at no less then the necks of all the Reformed Ministers, and Churches that are not Prelatical, at one blow. 2. For my part, I have oft protested against any that shall hinder an able Godly Minister from the service of Christ and the Church, if he be but one that is likely to do more good then harm. But I never took it to be persecution to cast out Drunkards, scandalous, negligent, insufficient men, where better may be had to supply the place: no more then it is persecution to suppress an abusive Alehouse, or restrain a thief from making thievery his trade. 3. The present Governors do profess their readiness to approve and encourage in the Ministry any Godly, able, diligent men that will but live peaceably towards the Commonwealth. And I am acquainted with none (as far as I remember) of this quality, that have not liberty to preach and exercise the Ministerial Office. 4. But if you think you are persecuted, because you may not Rule your Brethren, and persecute others, and take upon you the sole Government of all the Churches in a County, or more, we had rather bear your accusations, then poor souls should bear the pains of Hell, by your neglect and persecution: if you are persecuted when your hands are held from striking; what are your Brethren, that cannot by
your

your good will have leave laboriously to serve God in a low estate, as the servants of all, and the Lords of none?

Sect. 16. 10. By this means also you shew your selves impenitent in regard of all the former persecutions that some of you and your predecessors have been guilty of. Abundance of most Learned Godly men have been silenced, suspended, and some of them persecuted to banishment, and some to death. The world hath had too few such men for exemplary abilities, diligence and holiness, as *Hildersham, Bradshaw, Bayn, Nicols, Brightman, Dod, Ball, Paget, Hering, Langley, Parker, Sandford, Cartwright, Bates, Ames, Rogers*, and abundance more, that some suffered unto death, and some were silenced, some imprisoned, &c. for not conforming to the Ceremonies: besides *Eliot, Hooker, Cotton, Norton, Cobbes, Davenant, Parker, Noyes*, and all the rest that were driven to *New England*; and besides *Ward* and all that were driven into *Holland*: and besides the thousands of private Christians that were driven away with them: And besides all the later more extensive persecution of such as were called Conformable Puritans, for not reading the Book for dauncing on the Lords day, and for not ceasing to preach Lectures, or on the Evening of the Lords day, and such like: All this I call to your mind, as the sin that should be lamented, and heavily lamented, and not be owned, and drawn or continued on your own heads by impenitencie; and how do you repent, that would do the like, and take your selves to be persecuted, if your hands are tyed that you may not do it? For my own part, I must profess, I had rather be a Gally-slave, or Chimney-sweeper, yea or the basest vermine, than be a Bishop with all this guilt upon my soul, (to continue,) how light soever many make of it, and how impenitently soever they justifie themselves.

Sect. 17. 11. Yea more, after all the warnings you have had, in the waies and ends of your predecessors, it seems that you would yet incomparably outstrip the most of them in persecution, if you had your way. For few of them did attempt, or make any motion, for degrading or denying most of the Protestant Ministers in *Europe*, or such a number as in *England* and *Scotland* are not Ordained by Prelates, and to unchurch all their Churches. This is far higher then these before you.