



DUKE  
UNIVERSITY  
LIBRARY

*Treasure Room*



1000 1000  
37 (1000, 14), 228 1/2

T H E  
Divine Right  
O F  
EPISCOPACY  
A S S E R T E D.

Wherein is Proved,  
That EPISCOPACY is of Divine, and  
Apostolical INSTITUTION: And that it  
was the Government of the Christian  
Church during the Three first Ages of  
it; and was design'd to be Perpetual in  
it to the End of the World.

W I T H  
An Account of the Distinction of the Three  
Orders of *Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon.*

To Reconcile the Dissenting Parties to that  
Form of Church-Government.

---

*By a Presbyter of the Church of England.*

---

With a PREFACE, by *George Hickes, D.D.*

---

*Χαίρει Θεὸς ἐπὶ ὁ εἰμι, 1 Cor. xv. 10.*

*Per Convitia, & Laudes, 2 Cor. vi. 8.*

---

L O N D O N,  
Printed by *W. B.* for RICHARD SARE at  
*Grays-Inn-Gate in Holborn, 1708.*





been implicitly defended by no vulgar Pen among the dignified Clergy upon Principles, which, were they true, would justify the abolishing of it not only among the *English*, as well as the *Scots*, but in all the Episcopal Churches of the World. Evil Practices maintain'd by as ill Principles in such an Age, and Place of *Latitude*, as *England* now is, must needs have a great, and dangerous Influence upon the Church, which some good and learned Men considering, have written in defence of Episcopacy upon the strict, true, and Catholick Principles of Antiquity, to check, and stop, as much as in them lies, the progress of those new, loose, and false Principles, which may serve at all times to encourage any Secular Powers, that are inclined to do so great a Wickedness, to abolish not only the Order of Bishops, but that of Priests in all the Christian States, and Kingdoms of the World. For as a most learned, and judicious \* Author long since observed, the very same Arguments, that the *Presbyterians* urged against the necessity of the Episcopal Order; Ministry, and Power of Ordination, which are the foundation of Church-Government, the Sects, which sprang up un-

---

\* The Author of the Book entitled, *A Brief Account of Ancient Church Government, with a Reflection on several Modern Writings of the Presbyterians; as the Assembly of Divines, Jus Divinum Ministerii Anglicani, D. Bender's Apologia pro Sententia Hieronymi, and Others.* The Second Edition. London, printed for Ben. Tooke at the Shop in St. Paul's Church-yard, 1685.

## The PREFACE.

v

der them, used against *the Necessity of their Order, Ministry, and assumed Power of Ordination*; asserting, that if any Ordination were necessary, a Company of Believers associated together may ordain without a Priest of either Order, and that Imposition of Hands may be performed by some of the Brethren appointed thereunto by the Church: Which is the very Principle asserted in opposition to Priests and Priesthood, by the Penman of the Book of Rights.

I have taken occasion to mention the Book of *Ancient Church-Government*, to invite all true Friends, and Sons of the Church of England to read it, especially the younger Clergy, who may please to take notice, that by *Others* in the Title-Page, the Author principally meant Dr. *Stillingfleet* in his *Irenicum*. The chief of whose Arguments against the Unalterable Divine Right of Episcopacy he hath fully answered without Naming the Learned Author. The Reader indeed will find by some Expressions in the Book, that the Author was of the Roman Communion; but as learned Men of that Church have written most excellently in defence of many Articles of the Faith: So hath he written with no less Learning, Judgment, and Strength of Reasoning in defence of the Government of the Catholic Church.

But to return to the new Occasions, that are given to write now in defence of the Episcopal Order, and Government, as a per-

petual, and unalterable Divine Institution, I think I may justly take notice of a late *French* Book entituled: *Entretiens sur la Correspondance fraternelle de l'Eglise Anglicane, avec les autres Eglises Reformées*; Printed, as I believe, at *London*, under the Name of *Amsterdam*, MDCCVII. In this Book are collected the Testimonies of many learned Men of the Episcopal Communion, who of their great Charity, and Compassion to the foreign Reformed Churches, have spoken more, or less in favour of them; as certainly every good Man ought to do, as far as is consistent with the Divine Authority of the Sacerdotal Mission, and the Authority, and Honour of the Christian Priesthood, as founded in the Person, and Office of the *Messias*, the great Apostle, and High Priest of our Profession, who sent his Apostles, as the Father had before sent Him, to execute the same Apostolical, Episcopal, Pastoral Office, which was to continue in them, and their Successors unto the end of the World. But in that Collection there are some Sayings of good, and great Men, which are not reconcileable to this Doctrine, which I think is as fundamental, and essential to Christianity as a *Society*, as the Articles of Faith are to it, as a *Seç*; and which, if carried on to all their Consequences, would indanger, if not subvert the Divine Constitution of the Catholick Church.

It was to maintain the Church upon this fundamental Doctrine, that I suppose Dr. *Welles* of late took the pains to write so many excellent Letters, full of Learning, and Reason, to defend the Government, and Orders of the Church of *England*, and shew the Novelty, and Invalidity of the Presbyterian Model, and Mission; and that the Reverend Dr. *Samuel Bradford* in his excellent Sermon preached in *Lambeth-Chapel* at the late Consecration, hath very seasonably in this Age of Latitude told the World: † *That though there were no express Testimonies to be found in sacred Writ, yet the plain and certain account, which we have of the distinction of Bishops, and Presbyters, as superiour, and inferiour Officers in the several Churches planted by the Apostles, of which we have any History, even down successively from their Times, is of it self a Testimony so very clear, that it is hard to conceive how any, that are not Slaves to an Hypothesis, should withstand the force of it, so as ever to bring that matter into farther debate.* In another place he asserts to the same purpose, \* *that the principal Pastors, the Bishops, were settled by the Apostles before they left the World in the Churches, which they had planted to succeed them in presiding over all others.* And then speaking of Christ, saith he, *It was our Lord, who gave the Pastors, and Teachers, (spoken of in his Text) as a*

† Pag. 7. Octavo Edition.

\* P. 8.

settled, and standing Ministry, by virtue of the Authority, and Power, which he ascended into Heaven to exercise. He himself is the chief Pastor, and Bishop of Souls, and these are given by him to officiate in his Name, and by his Authority. As the Church of Christ is not such a Voluntary Society, as that the Members of it lie under no Obligation to associate, and to hold communion with each other: So neither are those, who minister to our Lord in his Church, subject to the arbitrary appointment of the People, either to be set up, or deposed at their pleasure.----- † All therefore that I intend to assert is, what is very evident both from sacred Writ, and the constant Practice of the most pure and primitive Ages of Christianity, that the Authority, by which the Officers of the Christian Church exercise their respective Functions in that Body, was neither at first given, nor can be taken away by the arbitrary Will, and Pleasure of Men; but that as it was derived from our Lord: So it is to be continued, and exercised in his Name.--- || From this account, it will be easie to infer the true Boundaries between that Authority, and Power, which truly belong to the Church, and that which the State of right challengeth, and to shew that there is no interfering between them; no such Imperium in Imperio, as can be charged with limiting, and endangering the just Authority of the Civil Magistrate, as is all along falsely, and very mali-

*ciouſly inſinuated by a late\* Author.—† This I take to be the Sum of the Spiritual Authority, which is conferr'd upon the Miniſters of Chriſt's Church, and belongs to them only, and this whether the Civil State be Chriſtian, or Pagan. For the Conversion of a Nation to Chriſtianity doth not at all alter the Caſe. The Church is ſtill a diſtinct, though not a ſeparate Society from the Chriſtian Nation. It hath its proper Officers, and they their proper Work, which appertains not to the Civil Magiſtrate, but is ſtill peculiar to them, as it was before. To the ſame purpoſe, We of this Church had indeed the ſpecial Privilege, and Happineſs in our Reformation from the Corruptions of Popery, that the Civil Power was forward, and zealous in the Work; and whatſoever was done in it, was with its full conſent. Had it been otherwiſe, it had been nevertheleſs the Duty of our Church to have broken off from the Roman Communion, and to have reformed it ſelf; and in that caſe the diſtinction of the Two Societies, Civil and Eccleſiaſtical, would have very plainly appeared. But ſince it did reform with the approbation; and by the aſſiſtance of the Civil Powers, the diſtinction is no leſs real, however leſs viſible it may be to ſome ſort of Men.*

I muſt confeſs it is with great Satisfaction that I read ſuch things publiſhed by any of the Clergy. For I have obſerved for Forty Years together that Latitude of Opinion, as

---

\* Rights of the Chriſtian Church.

† P. 11.

to the *Faith*, hath grown up with Latitude of Opinion, as to the *Polity, and Government* of the Church; and if the Ministry of the Church of *England* desire that the People should strictly adhere to the *divine Revelations*, they must teach them to adhere strictly to the *divine Institutions* once delivered to the Saints, and to contend for these, as well as those. I take this occasion farther to declare, that to the best of my observation, Men who are loose, as to the Principles of Church-Government, are also for the generality loose, as to the Doctrines of *Faith*, especially, as to the Consubstantial Doctrine, the coequality of three Persons in the Holy, and Blessed Trinity, and the Union of the Godhead, and Manhood in Christ, not to mention other Doctrines. And I very well remember how these *Latitudinarians* among the Clergy were formerly courted, and cry'd up by the open, and secret *Arians*, and *Socinians* of the Town, as well as the *Dissenters*; and about Six and twenty Years ago, when several of the Ministers of *London* had agreed together to preach up the true Principles of Church-Government, and the divine Original of it, together with the Authority of the Clergy over the People, and thereby to let them know what kind of Society the Church was, their design was broken by one of those, who objected, That it was not then seasonable, and that it would look, as he

said

said, like preaching up our Selves. But O blessed God! Did not thy Son, our Saviour Jesus, preach up the Authority, and Mission, which thou gavest him? And did not his Apostles preach up the Mission, and Authority he gave them? And did not their Successors preach up the Authority of their Mission from them? And did they not all preach it up, without preaching up themselves? Did not St. *Ignatius* thy holy Martyr preach up the Authority of the Clergy over the People, and the great Authority of the Bishop, over both, about Sixteen Hundred Years since, without preaching up himself? And did not thy Holy Martyr *Thomas Cranmer* preach up the same Authority, in his Sermon of *the Authority of the Keys*, One Hundred and Sixty Years since, without preaching up himself? And must not thy Ministers of both the Orders, which thou hast ordained in the Church, be severely answerable to Thee, as Traditors of their Trust, for not preaching up that Mission, and the Authority thou hast given them by it, if through their neglect to preach it, thy People come to despise both it, and them, and Sovereign States, and Princes, and their People happen through their Silence, to think it no Sacrilege, but lawful for them to invade the Kingdom of thy Son, and depose his chief Officers in that very Kingdom of Heaven, and Hierarchy upon Earth, of which the greatest Monarchs are made

Members

Members by Baptism, in no other manner, than the meanest of their Subjects are.

Wherefore let all the Clergy, whether Bishops, or Priests, who by Preaching, or Printing instruct the World in the divine Institution of Church-Government, the divine Nature of their own Mission, and the Superiority, and Authority they have by it, as God's Ministers over their Flocks, take Comfort in what they do, and as good and faithful Servants to their Trust, expect their Reward from their Master at the Great Day.

This Learned Author, who is not known to me, so much, as by Name, hath done his part in this excellent Work; Wherein he hath maintained the Divine Right of Episcopacy from its first Original, and shew'd from the best Monuments of Antiquity, how it was received in the Three first Centuries, as the perpetual, unalterable Government of the Church. This he hath done with great Modesty, and as great Respect to the Reformed foreign Churches, and their Reformers, \* only bewailing their casting off the Episcopal Order, and Form of Government, and devising a new Form of their own, to the Prejudice, and let me add to the Scandal, of the Reformation, and hindring of the Benefits of an entire Catholick Union, and Communion of ours with other Reformed Churches; † and though he is willing to believe any thing that may be

---

\* P. 201.

† P. 193.

said in favour, or excuse of the first Reformers of them, from the Circumstance of Time, and State of Affairs, when they began to reform, and to look upon them with all the Compassion, and Allowances, that are due to good Men; yet he doth not think, *he saith*, that any thing alledged in their excuse can strictly justifie their casting off Episcopacy, or the perseverance of their Churches in the abdication of it, because they have been long free from those Difficulties, and Necessities, which are pleaded in their behalf.

In truth I can scarce here forbear to answer all the Pleas that are made for their Justification from *Necessity*, and all the other Arguments for them; as *that Episcopacy is not an Article of Faith*; that *they are only imperfect, and defective Churches*; and the rest that are collected in the *French Book* mentioned above, or mentioned in the Defence of the Bishop of *Sarum's* Exposition of the XXIII. of the XXXIX. Articles, or in the History of the *English and Scotch Presbytery*, said to be written in *French* by an eminent Divine of the Reformed Church, and translated into *English*, and printed in a Second Edition corrected and enlarged in *VILLA FRANCA*, an ominous Name for *London*, 1660. As I am as much as any Priest of the Church of *England* for *fraternal Correspondence* with the foreign Reformed Churches: So I think the best use that can be made of it,

it, is to shew the Insufficiency of those Arguments, which either their Ministers, or some of our Clergy have used in behalf of their Reformation, and Mission; and to beseech, and obtest them in the Spirit of Meekness to put the latter out of all question, and doubt; by returning to that Form of Ecclesiastical Polity, which Christ Jesus appointed by himself, and by the direction of his Holy Spirit for the standing unalienable Government of his Church. I think this much more becoming the Charity of any Christian Bishop, or Priest, than to sooth them up in their Error, and devise Shifts of Arguments against the Authority, and Practice of the Catholick Church, to harden both their Magistrates, and Ministers in the continuance of a sinful Exorbitance, which they ought to redress. But I am confined within the limits of a Preface to another Author's Book, and therefore shall conclude this Paragraph, which I fear will be ungrateful to some, with the Words of my Lord Chancellor *Clarendon*, of honourable and famous Memory, which I have transcribed out of an imperfect Letter, written by him a little before his Death at *Rouen* in *France*. *I cannot, saith he, but observe, without taking delight in the Observation, how great Pains grave Divines of the Church of England take, to have our Church thought to be of the same Religion with the other, whilest their Pastors superciliously look upon themselves as having no need of their access, or countenance: We seem*

*to desire to be thought like them, when they do not in the least degree appear willing to be thought like us; and when in the Usurpation of Cromwell, and the Desolation to which our poor Church was reduced, they made no scruple to declare it Antichristian, they are now reduced to so much good manners, as to believe us in a state of Salvation, without so much as lamenting their own Defects, which the greatest Men that have been of their Communion had the Modesty heretofore to do, and seem'd to grieve that it was not in their power to make their Reformation, as ours was. If the difference that is now in our Temper proceeds from our Christian Meekness and Charity, let us before we think too well of the Soil, stay till we see those Virtues transplanted, and prosper there, and produce the same Inclination in them, which Men would persuade us to have. I am sure I have no Authority to condemn them, because my Mother the Church hath not directly condemn'd them; but I am not sure that every private Man is at liberty to choose a Communion for himself, because his Church hath not taken upon it, to condemn it. It will become every true Son of the Church of England, to have that Reverence for it, as not to prostitute his Dignity to a compliance with a less perfect Communion, when he is not necessitated to it. It was no light Reproach that Tully charged upon a great part of the Roman Senate, Qui spem Catilinæ mollibus Sententiis aluerunt, conjurationemque nascentem, non credendo corroboraverunt.*

verunt. It had been very happy for the Church, if it had suffer'd only by her Enemies, and those who hated her, who were never numerous enough to have destroyed her; its ruine proceeded from those, who wished her no harm, but thought by little Compliances to have satiated the Desires of many Men, who appear'd more moderate than the rest.

The Letter out of which I have transcribed this Passage, is written in his Lordship's own Hand, and it is an Answer to some Friend, who had written a Letter full of Interrogatories to him, whereof the first was, *Why he had not been seen in so long time at Quevelly, the Huguenots Temple?* Which his Friend told him was taken notice of, and the more, because he had heretofore been sometimes present at the same Devotions at Montpellier. And because *l'Auteur des Entretiens* above-cited takes so much pains to prove, that this great Man was seen at the Temple in MONTPELLIER, I will give him a farther proof of it, and of the Reasons, why he went, I suppose once or twice to each Temple there, but would not go to the Temple at Quevelly. I dare not tell you, saith he, that my having been already in these Congregations at Montpellier, and observed all that is done there, is rather an Argument, why I should not go to Quevelly, than why I should. For when a Man hath sufficiently satisfied his Curiosity, which a Man may lawfully do, and informed his Judgment, which in a manner he is bound to do, when he hath

hath opportunity to examine any Customary Forms in the Exercises of Religion, in what Classes soever: He ought afterwards to frequent that Communion, which he best approves of, and which most advances the Practice of Christian Duties; and therefore, as the Desire of being taken notice of, is a very corrupt End of going to Church: So the being taken notice of for not being there, is an Argument of no more weight to carry me thither, than the like taking notice would be to carry me to the Mass. But to give you an answer, that will be more satisfactory, and which cannot but satisfy your first Question, I tell you that I have a \* Chaplain in my own House, by whose Administration I perform my Devotions in a better manner, I think, than I can do in repairing to any of the Temples.

I suppose the Proof I have brought of his Lordship's going to the Temples at Montpellier may supersede that Author's pains of bringing any other Proofs, because I have given him the Reason, why he went thither. To which I will add another Passage, which intimates the Reason why his Lordship would not go to Quercy, saith he, *If the Pastors of those Congregations are not well, or sufficiently Ordained, (which I say again, no particular Man hath the Authority, nor ought to have the Presumption to determine) I wish they were. There are amongst them Men of very eminent Learn-*

---

\* Dr. Lever late Dean of Bristol, and Principal of Magd. Hall, Oxon.

ing, and unquestionable Virtue: I wish them all such. But that their being irreconcilable Enemies to the Papists, should be an Obligation to me, or any other Man to communicate with them, I cannot admit. To communicate Counsels with them, may possibly be at sometimes convenient, and lawful; but to communicate in the Sacrament, that was instituted for the Reconciliation of Mankind, with them, who are, and because they are irreconcilable to another great Body of Christ, seems to be an Argument drawn rather from the Principles of Machiavel, than from the Precepts of the Gospel. To this, for his Lordship's Honour, let me add what he saith in answer to another Question: You ask me, whether I do not think, that my Condition hath need of many Friends, and that my Compliance in this particular would reconcile many good Men to me. Whereas the contrary doth provoke them. Which is a Question pertinent indeed, but can never be stretched into an Argument, to reconcile a Man, who loves himself no better than I do, and who fears new Misfortunes no more than I do. I have always had a Reverence for old Eleazer, who would not be persuaded by those who loved him, to provide, and bring with him his own Meat, and to make, as if he did eat of the Flesh taken from the Sacrifice; but chose rather to suffer Death, with all the Circumstances of Torment, than to be guilty of such odious Dissimulation. For it becometh not our Age, said he, in any wise to dissemble, whereby many

*young Parsons might think, that Eleazer being Fourscore Years old, and Ten, was now gone to a strange Religion; and so through my Hypocrisie should be deceived by me, and I get a stain in my Old Age, and make it abominable,* 2 Maccab. vi. 24, 25.

I must also acquaint that Author, that my Lord in his Answer to his Friend, plainly tells him, *He would not speak all he thought, but answer him warily, that he might not be injured by his captious Questions. The Substance of two, or three of which, saith he, is contained in one short Question: Whether I do not believe that the Pastors of that Church are sufficiently qualified to be God's Ministers in the Preaching of his Word, and the Administration of his Sacraments. To which, saith he, I frankly answer you, I will not tell you what I think in that particular, since I am not qualified to deliver my Opinion in that point; when the Church, of which I am a Member, doth not, I thank God, take upon her to censure any other Church.*

But to return to the judicious Author of this Book, he is always as tender, as the nature of his Undertaking will allow him to be, of the Reputation of the Ministers, and Members of the foreign Reformed Churches, particularly in Page 7. after a gentle Reflection upon our Presbyterians, saith he, *I except from this Censure those modest, and learned Men of foreign Churches, who though they submit to another Form, yet speak ho-*  
a
nourably,

nourably of the Episcopal, and when occasion is given, subscribe freely to it, blaming their Brethren who have written against it. This he hath said with great Judgment. For it was necessary to make a distinction among the Learned Men of foreign Churches, as to their Inclinations to the Church of *England*. Witness Archbishop *Whitgift's* Letter to *Beza* in the 40<sup>th</sup> Page, and XV<sup>th</sup> Number of the Appendix to the second Edition of Mr. *Somner's* Antiquities of *Canterbury*; the Writings of *D. Blondel*, and *Claud. Salmasius* against the Episcopal Order, of which *Dr. Hammond* had reason to complain in his Epistle *Ad Virum Integerrimum*, before his Answer to *Blondel*, *Dallee's* Spiteful, but vain Attack, upon the Epistles of *St. Ignatius* MDCLXVI. *Basnage's* late Church-History; but above all the *Hague-Sermon*, with the *French* Ministers Approbation, which since it was taken notice of, I hear hath been suppressed.

But to proceed, The Author of this Book observes with great Judgment in the 9<sup>th</sup> and 115<sup>th</sup> Pages, that the Apostles in the Infancy of the Church, had only the *Fundamental Principles of Ecclesiastical Government, and Discipline*, in the Subordination of the Ministry to the Apostolical Preheminence, and Authority, which is the Foundation of the Episcopal Superiority in all Churches, and was so at first in the Churches over which they always set one Pastor over all the rest. In other Circumstantial Respects the Church in her  
 Infant-

Infant-State might differ from the more regular Form, which she afterwards had, and was settled in by the Apostles. For that State was her *Prophetical* Period, in which on all Occasions, and in all Exigences the Vicegerent, and Deputy of our Lord, I mean the *Holy Ghost*, directed what should be done. Then she had Prophetical, and some of them Temporary Teachers by immediate Inspiration; then she had Pastors, and Governors appointed by immediate Direction from the Holy Ghost, who upon some Emergencies gave Men, not yet ordained to the Priestly Office, authority to perform Sacerdotal Acts. Then the Holy Ghost, as I may say, sat in Council with the Apostles, and directed them, and others what to say, and do at such, and such times; as it is written, *He that hath an Ear, let him hear, what the Spirit, that is, what Christ by his Spirit, saith unto the Churches.* The Spirit then more immediately presided over the Churches, and the Governors of it, directing them in all Doubts, and supplying all their Wants, and teaching them to call upon God by the Title of *Father*, and how to pray in their Assemblies, when they knew not what to ask, or how to pray. Thus the Churches were governed, and administered during the Scripture-period, before they were settled under the regular Form, and Constitution of Bishops, Priests, and Deacons in orderly Subordination. Of which we have a most clear account in *St. Ignatius's*

Epistles, who was St. *John's* Disciple, in which he exhorts the People to be subject to the Clergy, and among the Clergy, the Deacons to be subject to the Presbyters, the Presbyters to the Bishop, as the Bishop is subject to Christ. This was the Beautiful, and Harmonical Frame, and Order in the first settled Churches, which hath ever since continued, and ought to continue till the Second Coming of Christ. This is the Constitution of the Catholick Church, as it is a Society, by Divine Appointment. The Root, and Foundation of which is, as I said, the Apostolical Superiority, and Power in the Bishop, to whom both Clergy, and Laity are to be subject; 'tis the Phrase of St. *Ignatius*, as to the *Power of God*, and chief Minister over his Church next under Christ.

In the next place, The Learned Author I hope will pardon me, if I take notice of one Omission, of which I my self have often been guilty, and I think most of the Divines of our Church, at least, those, who have written of late Years. \* That Omission is this: That when we speak of the Nature of the Priesthood, and what belongs to the Priests Office, we speak of it, as if it wholly consisted in *Preaching the Word, and Administering the Holy Sacraments*, without mentioning *the Power of the Keys*, which is as Essential to the Priesthood, and as much

---

\* Pag. 9.

the Glory of it, as either of the other two. One would wonder how Priests of the Church of *England* should be guilty of such an Omission, when in the Form of Ordination the † Power of loosing, and binding, or of absolving, and retaining Sins, is the very first thing which is mentioned, as belonging to the Office of a Priest; and in the Absolution after the general Confession in Morning, and Evening Prayer, it is said, That God hath given Power, and Commandment to his Priests to declare, and pronounce to his People being penitent the Absolution, and Remission of their Sins. And in the Office for the Visitation of the Sick, it is expressly affirmed, That God hath left Power to his Church, that is to the Priests of the Church, to absolve all Sinners, who truly repent, and believe in him; and therefore directs the Confessary to absolve the confessing Penitent of all his Sins, in the Name, &c.

Wherefore that my taking notice of this Omission may make deeper Impression upon the Minds of my Brethren of the Clergy, and that I may encourage them by so great an Example, when they speak or write of the Christian Priesthood, always to speak, and write expressly of the Power of binding, and loosing Sinners, commonly called the

---

† *Whose Sins thou dost forgive, they are forgiven, and whose Sins thou dost retain, they are retained; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the Word of God, and of his Holy Sacraments, in the Name, &c.*

*Power of the Keys*, as belonging to the Priests Office: I here present them with Archbishop *Cranmer's* Sermon upon that Subject, with this Title: **A Sermon of the Authority of the Keyes.** This excellent Sermon is in fol. ccxxvi. of his Book entituled *CATECHISMUS, That is to say a short Instruction into Christian Religion, &c.* by the most Reverend Father in God, **Thomas Archbishop of Canterbury, Primate of all England, and Metropolitane.** *Gualterus Lynne excudebat, 1548.* This Book is dedicated by the Archbishop to King *Edward VI.* and in his *Epistle Dedicatory* he tells his Majesty, he wrote it with a design to instruct the Youth of the Realm, thereby to help forward the Reformation; and in his *Preface* he declares, he designed it for a short uniform Instruction of Children, and young Men, to prevent sundry, and different Forms of Instruction; which otherwise would happen, if every several Pastor were left to devise a Form for his own Flock.

## A sermon of the authoritie of the Keyes.



He holpe Apostle saint Paul good children, in the tenth chapter of his epistle to the Romanes, wryteth on this fashion. Who so ever shall call vpon the name of the lord, shall be saued. But how shall they call on hym, on whom they beleue not? How shall they beleue on him of whome they haue not hearde? How shall they heare without a preacher? How shall they preach, except they be sente? By the which wourdes saynt Paul doeth evidently declare vnto vs, two lessons.

The fyrst is, that it is necessary to our saluation, to haue preachers and ministers of Goddes mooste holy worde, to instructe us in the true fapth and knowlege of God.

The seconde is that preachers must not runne to this hyghe honore, befoze they be called thereto, but they muste be ordeyned and appointed to this office, and sent to vs by God. For it is not possible to be sated, or to please God, without fapth, and no man can truly beleue in God by his own wyse, (for of oure selves we knowe not what we shoulde beleue) but we must needs heare Gods woorde, taught vs by other.

Agayne, the teachers, except they be called and sent, can not frutfully teache. For the seede of Goddes woorde, doeth neuer byynge forth frupt, unless the woorde of the barnest do geue increale,

1 Cor. iii.  
John vi.  
Act. ii.

and by his holpe spirite do worke with the  
fower. But God doth not worke with the  
preacher, whom he hath not sente as saynt  
Paule sayeth.

Rom. x.

Holve shall they preache, if they be  
not sent. Wherefoze it is requisite,  
that preachers should be called and sent of God,  
and they must preache according to the autho-  
zitie and commission of God, graunted vnto  
them, whereby they may strengthen mennes  
belefe, and assure their consciences, that God  
hath commaunded them to preache after this  
oz that fashion. For els euerie manne should  
styll be in doubt, and thinke after this sort.  
Who knoweth whether thys be true, whiche I  
heare the preacher say? who can tell whether  
God hath commaunded him to preach these  
thynges oz no? And in case he teacheth no  
thyng but truth, yet I am not sure that God  
wyl worke with me as the preacher promy-  
seth? Perchaunce these promises pertain to  
other, and not to me? These doubttes, in the  
tyme of temptation, might trouble mens  
myndes, if we were not assured, that our  
Lorde Iesus Christ himselte hath both orde-  
ned and appointed ministers and preachers to  
teache vs his holpe worde, and to minister  
his sacraments, and also hath appoynted  
them, what they shall teache in his name,  
and what they shall do vnto vs. Therfoze he  
called them and sent them, and gave them in-  
structions, what they should do, and speake to  
vs, in his name, to the intente that we shoulde  
gve sure credence vnto theyr wordes, and  
beleue that God wyl worke with us accordyng  
to his wordes by them spoken. And he hath  
promised therefore, that what so-  
ever they shoulde bynd vpon earth,  
shoulde

Mat. xvi.

shoulde be bounde in heauen, and whatsoeuer they shuld lose vpon earth shuld be losed in heauen also. Wherefoze good children, to the intente you may stedfastly beleue, all thinges which God by his ministers doeth teache, and promise vnto you, and so be saued by your fayth, learn diligently I pray you, by what wordes our lord Iesus Christ, gaue this commission and commaundement to his ministers, and reherse them here, worde for word that so you may print them in your memories, and recite them the better when you come home.

The wordes of Christ be these.

¶ Our Lorde Iesus brythed John xx.  
on his Apostles, and sayd.

Receave the holye golt, whose synnes ye forgiue, they are forgyben vnto them. And whose synnes you reserue, they are reserued.

Now good children, you shal employ your selles, not onely to reherse these wordes without booke, but also to vnderstande, what our Lord Iesus Christ ment by them, that when you shall be asked any question herein, you maye make a dyrect answer, and that also in tyme to come you maye be able to instruct your children in the same. For what greater shame can ther be, either in the sight of God or of man, then to professe thi selfe to be a Christen man, and yet to be ignorant in what place of scripture and by what wordes, Christ commaunded faith, and forgyuenes of synns, to be preached. Seing that a Christen man ought to beleue nothynge, as an article of his faith, except he be assured, that eyther it is Gods commaundement, or his word. Now good children, that you maye the better vnderstande these

these wordes, of our sauour Christe, you shall knowe, that our Lorde Iesus Christ when he beganne to preache, he did cal and chole his twelue Apostles, and afterwarde helpe des those twelue, he sent forth thre scoze and tenne dysciples, and gave them authozitie to preach the gospel. And a little before his death and passion, he made his prayer to his heauenly father for them, and for all those that shoulde beleue thozow their preaching. As it is declared in the gospel of saint John. Now it is not to be doubted, but that Christes praier was heard, of his heauenly father, wherfore it foloweth, that as mani as beleued the preaching of Christes dysciples, were as surely saued, as if they had heard and beleued Christ himselte. And after Christes assention, the Apostelles gave authozitie to other godly and holpe men, to minyster Gods worde, and chiefely in those places, wher ther wer Chylten men alredy, whiche lacked preachers, and the Apostles them selues could not longer abide with them. For the Apostles dyd walke abrod into diuerse partes of the worlde, and did stude to plant the gospel in many places. Wherfore wher they founde godly men, and mete to preache Gods worde, they layed their handes vpon them, and gaue them the holy gost, as they them selues receaued of Christ the same holy gost, to execute this office.

And they that were so ordeyned, were in dede, and also were called, the ministers of God as the Apostles them selues were, as Paule, sayeth vnto Tymothy. And so the ministracion of Gods worde (which our Lorde Iesus Christ hymselfe dyd first institute) was derpued

deriued from the Apostles vnto other after them, by imposition of handes, and gpyng the holy ghost, from the Apostles tyme to our dayes. And this was the consecration, ordres and vntion of the Apostles, wherby they, at the begynnynge, made Bishopes and p pastres, and this shall continue in the churche, euen to the worldes ende. And what soeuer rite or ceremonye, hath ben added moze than this commeth of mannes ordinaunce and policie, and is not commaunded by Goddes worde.

Wherefoze good childzen, you shal gyue due reuerence and honour to the ministers of the churche, and shal not meanely or lychtly esteeme them in the execution of their office, but you shall take them for Gods ministers, and the messengers of our Lorde Iesus Chyrlte. For Chyrlt himselfe saieyth in the gospel.

He that heareth you, heareth me. Luke x.

And he that dyspysleth you, dyspysleth me. Wherefoze good childzen, you shall stedfastly beleue al those thinges, whiche suche ministers shall speake vnto you, from the mouth, and by the commaundement of our Lorde Iesus Chyrlt. And what soeuer they do to you, as when they baptise you, when they gyve you absolution, and dy tribute to you the bodie and bloude of our Lord Iesus Chyrlte, these you shall so esteeme, as if Chyrlte himselfe in his awne person, dyd speake, and minister vnto you. For Chyrlte hath commaunded his ministers to do this vnto you, and he himselfe, (althoughe you see him not with your bodily eyes) is present with his ministers, and worketh by the holy ghost in thadministration of his sacramentes. And on the other syde, you shall take good hede, and beware, of falsse and pryue preachers; whiche

whiche pꝑuilly crepe into cities, and pꝑeache in corners, habvng none authozitie, noꝝ being called to this office. Foꝝ Chꝑilte is not pꝑesent with such pꝑeachers, and therefore dothe not the holy gost woꝝke by their pꝑeching, but their woꝝde is withoute fruite oꝝ pꝑofyt, and they do great hurte in commen welthes. Foꝝ suche as be not called of God, they no doubte of it do erre, and sow abꝑode herelꝑe and naughtꝑ doctrine. And yet you shall not thinke good childꝑen, that pꝑeachers whiche be lawfully called, haue authozitie to do oꝝ teache what soeuer shall please them. But our Loꝝd Iesus Chꝑilte, hath gꝑuen them playne insꝑtꝑutions, what they ought to teache and do. And ꝑf they teache oꝝ do any other thꝑnge, then is contepned in their commission, then it is of no foꝝce, noꝝ we ought not to regarde it. And foꝝ this cause our sauioꝝre Chꝑilte dꝑd bꝑeath into hꝑs discꝑples, and gaue them the holy gost. Foꝝ where the holy gost is, ther he so woꝝketh, that he causeth vs to do those thꝑnges whiche Chꝑilte hath commaunded. And whan that is not done, then the holy ghoꝝt is not there. Wherefoꝝe all thꝑnges whiche we shall so speake oꝝ do, can take none effecte. Now the summe of the commission whiche Chꝑilte gaue to his dꝑscꝑples, was this, that they shoulde pꝑeache repentance, and foꝝgꝑuenes of synne, in his name. And he added therto, bothe a pꝑomise and a thꝑreatꝑng, sayng. He that wil beleue, and be baptised, shall be saued. But he that wil not beleue, shall be damned. Wherefoꝝe all thinges whiche the ministers of the chꝑrche do saye oꝝ do to vs, ought to be directed to this ende, that they maꝑe lowse vs, and declare vnto us, the foꝝgꝑuenes of our synnes, when we truly repent,  
and

and beleue in Christ. But when we do not repent us of our synne, and forsake the same, or do not beleue the gospel, then they ought to bind or reserue sinne, and to declare vnto vs, that yf we styl continue in sinne, we shal be damned for euer. And when the ministers do thus execute their commission, then they obey God, and whose synnes soeuer they forgiue in earth, their synnes be forgiuen in heauen also. And contrarpe wyse, whome soeuer they binde in earth, their sinnes be bounde also in heauen. But yf the ministers wolde interpret to do contrary to their commission, that is to say, to forgiue synnes to vnrrepentaunte synners and vnbelaueers, or to bynde their synnes and denye them absolution, that be repentaunte and truste in the mercye of God, then they shoulde not do wel, nor their arte shoulde be of any force, but they shoulde decrease themselves, and other also. And than shoulde that be true, that Christ speaketh in the gospel. When the blinde leadeth the blinde, both fall into the ditch. But when the ministers do trulye execute their office, you oughte good childzen to take great comfote, and to confirme your faithe therby, that you maye stedfastlye beleue, and in all temptations answer your aduersarpe the deuell after this maner. God hath sente to me one of hys ministers, he in the name and place of God, hath declared to me the forgiuenes of my synnes, and hath baptised me in the assurance of the same.

Wherefore I doubt not but that my synnes be forgiuen, and that I am made the sonne and heire of God. Thus good childzen, you ought generally in all temptations, to fortifie your faith, and to comfort your selves, with  
the

the authoritie of Goddes word, but specially you shall learne this also, that onre Lorde Iesus Christe, dyd entende, by this authoritie of the keyes, to comfozte the troubled consciences of them, that after their baptisme, do fall in to hapnous offences.

Foz it is not so easie a thynge, to rise agayn from synn, as the mad and blynde worlde doeth thynke, but when the deuel and oure faith shall skirmishe together, then in those straites, and troubles of conscience, we haue nede of the helpe of some trewe minister of the churche, whych (as it were in our swongage) maye lyft vs vp wyth the wourde of God, comfozte and retreshe vs. As the wyse kyng Salomon doth declare by thys sentence. Wo to that man, whych is alone, foz when he falleth, he hath no man to lyft hym vp agayn. And oure Lord Iesus Christe, doth speake so often tymes in the gospel of the authoritie of the keyes, and hathe added so great promyses to the same, that it may wel appere by the earnestnes of Chyistes wourdes, how careful he was foz troubled consciences, and how fatherly an effectiō he had to comfozte the same. Whereof it vndoutedly foloweth, that we haue great nede of this comfozte, and that it is moche to be esteemed and set by. Foz first of al our sauour Christ, before he gaue these keyes indede, he promysed to Peter that he would gyue them, sayng. I wyl  
 Mat. xiii. gyue to the, the keyes of the kyngdome of heauen. What so euer thou shalt bynde vpon earth, shal be bounde in heauen, and what so euer thou shalt louse vpon earth, shal be also loused in heauen. Secundarelye, Christ doeth teache vs, howe we shall vse these keyes, both in open and in secrete

secrete synnes. Of the vse of the keyes in o-  
 pen synnes, Christ speaketh these  
 wourdes. If thy brother trespass Mat. xviii.  
 agaynst the, go and tell hym his  
 faulte betwene him and the alone. If he hear  
 the, thou hast wonne thy brother. But if he  
 heare the not, then take yet wyth the one or  
 two, that vpon the mouthe of two or thre wyt-  
 nesses, euery wordé may stande. If he heare  
 not them, tell it vnto the congregacion. If he  
 heare not the congregacion, let hym be vn-  
 to the, as an hethen and publican. Verely  
 I say vnto you, what so euer ye hynde on  
 earth, shal be bounde in heauen. And what  
 so euer ye lose on earth, shall be loused in hea-  
 uen. And of the vse of the keyes, in pryue  
 and secrete synnes, our sauour Christ hath  
 taught vs by his alone wordé and example.  
 For the man, that was borne of the pallye,  
 Christ said thus. Sonne conceale  
 a stedfast fayth, thy synnes be for- Mark ii.  
 gnen the. And as touching  
 bynding of synnes, he sayd to the hard hearted  
 and stubborne Iewes. If you  
 were blinde, you shulde haue no Luke v.  
 synne. But now because you John ix.  
 saye, you see, your synne abydeth  
 styll, that is to saye, it is not forgiven.  
 Christe, our Sauoure Christe after his re-  
 surrection, gaue the keyes to his apostles  
 (as before he had promysed) breathyng vpon  
 them, and sayyng. Receaue the holy gost,  
 whose synnes ye shall forgive, they are for-  
 gnen. Nowe forasmuche as our sauour  
 Christe, in gyaunge the keyes, did promise  
 vs so great comfote, and so diligentely  
 teache the vse of them, and vnd so saythfully,  
 and louyngly ordeyne and commende them  
 and

and put them (as it were) into the handes of his apostles and their successors, we ought in no wyse to dyspyle this greate authoritie, whiche God hath gūen vnto men, but thankfully to vse it. For knowe this for a suertye good childzen, that it is a very great offence against God, lytle to care for hys great gyftes and benefites. Therefore when we fal agayne to great synnes, after that we are ones baptyzed, we oughte not to walke in a certen rechelesnes, thynkyng that our synnes be forgyuen vs onely because God is merciful (For this opinion or wauering imagination, is moze weake and feble, then that in the feare and battaile of the conscience, it is able to stand against the violent force and craftye assaultes of the deuel) But in this fight betwene our conscience and the deuel, our great trust and comfort is the sure worde and worke of God, whiche maye asserteyne vs that our synnes are forgyuen, that is to say, whan we obteyne forgyuenes of oure synnes and absolution, of the ministers of the churche, to whome Christ hath deliuered the keyes, and hath promysed laping. Whose synnes ye shall forgyue in carthe, their synnes be forgyuen in heauen also.

And this also is to be repproued, that some men, whiche continue in mannyfest and open synn, and go not about to amende their lyfes, yet they wil be counted christen men, and interpyle to receaue the same sacramentes, that other do, to come to the churche, to worship God, and to praye with other. Suche muste be warned of their fautes, and if they refuse to heare and amende, then they ought to be excommunicate and put out of the christen congregation, until they repente and amende their

their lifes. Lest by suche manifest sinne and euell examples, other men might be prouoked to do the lyke and so at length many might be infected, and the Chyristen religion dispypled and euell spoken of, as thoughte it wer the worst religion, foralynuche as Christian men shoulde than leade a shamelful and vngodly lyfe. And so by this meanes, the name of God, and God himselte, might be blasphemed amonge the heathen people. And althoughe those canons, ordynances and rites, whiche be agreable to the gospel, (and were ordyned in tyme past, to punyshe suche open transgressors and malefactorz) are nowe in oure tyme almost vtterly abolished and taken awaye, yet for this cause we ought not to dispyle or cast awaye, the authoritpe and vse of the keyes. For they which presumptuously do cast awaye all yokes of ecclesiasticall discipline or chasticement, and do let, that such kynde of correction, whiche is agreable to the gospel, maye not be restored againe, shall haue without doubtte God for their iudge.

But let vs praye our Lord Iesus Chyrist, that as it hath pleased him to restore vnto vs his moste blessed worde, and the true vnderstandyng of the same, so also he wyll beche- saue to rendre and sende agayne to vs, these and suche lyke good and holisome ordynances, agreable to his worde.

Now when a man after baptysme hath greuouly sinned, and doubteth in his conscience, whether he be in the founour of God or no (as oftentymes it happeneth) then it is harde for hym to trust to his awn bare imaginations, thinking on this fashon. I know that I haue sinned, but yet I am in this opinion, that God is not so cruel a reuenger. But

that he hath forgyuen me. For suche an opinion without Goddes worde, is not a trewe faith, nor is able to stande in the daungerous skirmishes of temptation. But trewe faith must euer be stayed vpon the certen worde and wourke of God. Now God dothe not speake to vs, with a voyce soundynge out of heauen. But he hath giuen the keyes of the kingdom of heauen, and the authozitie to forgyue synne, to the ministers of the churche. Wherefore let him that is a sinner, go to one of theim let him knowlege and confesse his synne, and praye him, that accoꝝdyng to Gods commaundemente, he will gyue him absolution and comfoꝝte him with the worde of grace and forgyuenes of his synnes.

And when the minister dothe so, then I ought stedfastly to beleue, that my synnes are truly forgyuen me in heauen. And suche a faythe, is able to stande stronge, in all skynnynges, and assautes of our mortal enemy the deucl, forasmuche as it is buylde vpon a sure rocke, that is to say, vpon the certen word and wourke of God. For he that is absolved, knoweth for a suretye, that his synnes be forgyuen him by the minister. And he knoweth assuredly also, that the minister hath authozitie from God himselfe so to do. And thirdey he knoweth that God hath made this promise to his ministers, and sayed to them. To whom ye forgyue synnes vpon earth, to him also they shall be forgyuen in heauen. Wherefore good childzen, gyue good eare to this doctrine, and when your synnes do make you afrayed and sadde, then seke and desyer absolution and forgyuenes of your synnes of the ministers, whiche haue receaued a commission and commaundement from Christ  
hym-

hymselfe, to forgyue men their synnes, and then poure consciences shal haue peace, tranquillitie and quietnes. But he that dothe not obey this counsell, but beyng ether blynd or proude, doth dyspyle the same, he shall not fynde forgyuenes of his synnes, neither in hys awne good wourkes, nor yet in painefull chastyementes of his bodye, or any other thynge, whereto God hath not promysed remission of synnes, Wherfore dyspyle not absolution, for it is the commaundemente and ordinance of God, and the holy spirit of God is present, and cauleth these thinges to take effect in us, and to worke our saluation. And this is the meaning and playne vnderstandynge, of these wordes of Christe, which you hearde heretofore reherfed, whiche are wryten to thentent that we shoulde beleue, that whatsoeuer Goddes ministers do to vs by Gods commaundement, are as muche auailable, as yt God hymselfe shoulde do the same. For whether the minystrers do excommunicate open malefactors and unrepentant persons or do gyue absolution to those, which be truly repentant for their synnes, and amende their lyues, these actes of the ministers, haue as great power and authoritie, and be confirmed and ratified in heauen, as though the ourde Lorde Iesus Christ hymselfe had done the same. Wherfore good children, learne these thinges diligentlie. And when you be asked how vnderstande you the wordes before reherfed? ye shall answer. I do beleue, that whatsoeuer the ministers of Christ do to us by Gods commaundement, either in excommunicatinge open and unrepentante synners, or in absolvinge repentant persons, all these their actes, be of as greate authoritie, and as surely confirmed

firmed in heauen, as of Chyiste shoulde speake the wordes out of heauen.

So ye haue good childzen, the begynnynge and foundation, of the ministers of Gods worde, and of the authoritie of the keyes, as our lord Iesus Chyist did first ordeyne and institute the same. The whiche our sauour Chyist did institute and appointe for this purpose, that our consciences myghte thereby be comforted, and assured of the forgyuenes of synnes, and to haue the inestimable thzasures of the gospel, as often as we haue nede thereof. That we thereby being made stronge in oure faith, might so continewe to thende of our life. And he that continueth to the ende, shall be saued. The which graunt vs the most merciful God Amen.

I Have made this Sermon publick again, because I think the Doctrines set forth in it are as beneficial for the Church now, as when they were published One Hundred and Sixty Years ago. I say *the Doctrines*, for in order to explain the *Power of the Keys*, he hath treated of the *Sacerdotal Mission* of God's Ministers, to whom the Power of the Keys is committed, and delivered his Doctrine about in several Propositions, as, I. That it is necessary to have Preachers, or Ministers of God's most holy Word. II. That they must not aspire to that high Office, before they are called, ordained, and appointed to it, and sent to us by God. III. That except they be so called, and sent, they cannot fruitfully

fully teach, because God doth not work with the Preacher, whom he hath not sent. These doubts, *saith he*, might trouble Mens Minds, if we were not assured, that our Lord Jesus Christ himself hath both ordained, and appointed Ministers to teach us his holy Word. *Then after setting down the Words, which Christ after his Resurrection spake to his Apostles, John xx. 22, 23. Receive ye the Holy Ghost; whose sins ye forgive, &c. he tells us*, that as many as believed their Preaching were as surely saved, as if they had believed Christ himself. After whose Ascension, *saith he*, the Apostles gave authority to other holy Men to minister God's Word, by laying their Hands upon them, and giving them the Holy Ghost, as they themselves received the same Holy Ghost of Christ to execute the Priestly Office. These so ordained, *he saith*, were indeed, and were also called *Ministers of God*, as the Apostles themselves were. And so the Ministration of God's Word, which our Lord Jesus Christ himself did first institute, was derived from the Apostles unto others after them by Imposition of Hands, and giving the Holy Ghost from the Apostles time to our Days. And that this was the *Consecration, Orders, and Unction*, whereby they at the beginning made *Bishops, and Priests*, and that this shall continue in the Church even to the World's end. And whatsoever Rite, or Ceremony hath been added more than this cometh of

Man's Ordinance, and Policy, and is not commanded by God's Word.

*After thus deriving the Orders and Mission of Bishops, and Priests from Christ to the Apostles, and from them to others, and from them again successively to others, unto the Worlds end; he then proceeds to speak of the respect, which is due to them as God's Ministers, and what Comfort, and Satisfaction the People ought to have in their Ministration, or Execution of their Office.* Wherefore (saith he) you shall give due Reverence, and Honour to the Ministers of the Church, and shall not meanly, or lightly esteem them in the Execution of their Office, but you shall take them for God's Ministers, and the Messengers of our Lord Jesus Christ. For Christ saith in the Gospel, *He that beareth you, beareth me, &c.* And whatsoever they do to you, as when they Baptise you, when they give you Absolution, and distribute to you the Body, and Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, *these you shall so esteem as if Christ himself in his own Person did speak, and minister unto you.* When the Ministers do truly execute their Office, you ought to take great Comfort, and to confirm your Faith thereby, and in all Temptations answer your Adversary the Devil after this manner. God hath sent to me one of his Ministers, he in the Name, and Place of God, hath declared to me the Forgiveness of my Sins, and hath baptised me in the assurance of the same. Forasmuch as our Sa-  
viour

viour Christ in giving the Keys, did so faithfully, and lovingly put them, as it were, into the hands of his *Apostles, and their Successors*, we ought in no wise to despise this great authority, which *God hath given unto Men*. Whatsoever God's Ministers do to us by God's Commandment are as much available, as if God himself should do the same. These Acts of the Ministers [Excommunication, and Absolution] have as great Power, and Authority, and be confirmed, and ratified in Heaven, as much, as though our Lord Jesus Christ himself had done the same.----- All these Acts be of as great Authority, and as surely confirmed in Heaven, as if Christ should speak the Words out of Heaven. So in his Sermon of the Instruction of Baptism. By these Three [*Baptism, Absolution, and the Lord's Supper*] God's Ministers do work with us in the *Name, and Place* of God, yea God worketh with us to confirm us in our Faith. Our Lord Jesus Christ saith: Go, and teach all Nations, and baptise them in the Name of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This God commanded his Disciples to do. Wherefore by the virtue of this Commandment, Baptism doth work in us, as the Work of God. For when we be baptized in the Name of God, that is as much as to say, *as God himself should baptise us.*

I have set all this in the Reader's view for the honour of Archbishop *Cranmer's* Me-

mory, to shew that when he wrote this Book, he could not be of the Opinion, that *the Form of Church-Government is mutable*, that *there is no distinction between a Bishop, and a Priest*, and that *a Man appointed to be a Bishop, or a Priest, needs no Consecration by the Scripture: Election, or Appointment being sufficient thereunto*, as is said of him with great Triumph in the 178<sup>th</sup> Page of the Book of the *Rights*.

These loose Opinions, which are so apparently contrary to what the Archbishop published in this Sermon, that fraudulent Writer took from a Manuscript as cited by Dr. *Stillingsfleet* in the VIII<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the Second Book of his *Irenicum*; tho' Dr. *Durell*, who saw the Manuscript afterwards, told the World how it was manifest from it, that the Archbishop changed his Opinion, and came over to that of Dr. *Leyghton*\* , who in answer to the Eleventh Question asserted, that *a Bishop hath authority from God in Scripture as his Minister to make a Priest, and that he had not read, that any other Man had authority to make a Priest by Scripture, or knew any Example thereof*. † And in answer to the Twelfth he said: *I suppose, that there is a Consecration required, as by Imposition of Hands: For so we be taught by the Ensamble of the Apostles*. Who, in answer to the Tenth Que-

---

\* Collection of Records in the Third Book of the Bishop of Sarum's *History of the Reformation*, p. 227.

† *Ibid.* p. 230.

tion †, he had said, *were made Bishops, and Priests by Christ*, and that *after them the Seventy Two Disciples were made Priests*. This account of the Archbishop's changing his Opinion as to the point of Church-Government, \* *Dr. Durel* afterwards Dean of *Wind-  
sor* gave from the Manuscript it self, wherein it appeared, that *Th. Cantuariensis* was written with the Archbishop's own Hand underneath *Leighton's* Opinion, to signify his Approbation of it, and his Sermon, which I have here reprinted, shews that it was his final Opinion, and that he thought the People were to be instructed in it, as part of the Erudition of a Christian Man. *Dr. Stillingfleet* afterwards Bishop of *Worcester* never wrote, or that I heard, said any thing to contradict *Dr. Durel's* account of his Manuscript all his Life long. And the Bishop of *Sarum* also acknowledges, that the Archbishop did retract his Opinion, though he printed his Manuscript in another order, and method, than the Original is written in, contrary to the advice of *Dr. Stillingfleet*, as *Dr. Grove* told the World in his shuffling Answer to *Dr. Lowth's* Letter to *Dr. Stillingfleet*. Which was a Fancy, or rather a Liberty in his Lordship, which perhaps he would censure in another Historian: I am sure it cannot be justified in any, and

---

† *ibid.* p. 225.

\* *Vindicia Ecclesie Anglicanæ, &c.* cap. 28. p. 326, 327, 328.

in matters of Law, it would be called Altering a Record. I must also observe, that Archbishop *Cranmer's* Book must be written in 1547, or some time before, because it was printed in 1548. Which also farther shews the great mistake of Bishop *Stillingsfleet*, when he wrote his *Irenicum*, in dating the birth of his Manuscript from the first Settlement of King *Edward VI.* as a Paper containing the Principles upon which the Reformation proceeded in 1547. to the great dishonour of our Reformers, and the disgrace of our Reformation, and giving our Adversaries of *Rome* great occasion to misrepresent our Church to be *Erastian* in its foundation, as giving the Prince the Power of the Apostles, and other unconsecrat Laymen, authority to ordain Bishops, and Priests, and to excommunicate, and administer the Sacraments, if the Law of any Kingdom alloweth thereunto.

But to conclude, the Apostolical Government of the Church by Bishops was either ordained by Christ, for a perpetual standing Institution, as this Learned Author hath shewn, or as the *Men of Latitude*, now under the Name of *Moderation*, would make the World believe, though it was ordained by him, yet it was not ordained, as an unalterable Institution, and with an intention to bind all Ages, and Nations at all times to it, as an indispensable Command. If this latter Opinion be true, then I know no reason, why  
it

it should be kept up any longer in the Church of *England*, where, if it is not necessary by the nature of its divine Institution, there are so many plausible Humane Reasons, why it should be taken away, whether we respect the State of Religion at home, or abroad. At home it hath been matter of great Contention for above a Hundred Years, and it hath occasioned much Bloodshed, and cost many Lives to maintain it, especially that of the *Royal Martyr*, and vast Numbers are still uneasie under it, in all the Dominions of the *British* Empire, and still endeavour to pull it down. Besides it is an hindrance to a more perfect Union, and Coalition of the two Monarchies into one, it being very desirable to that great end, that as both Nations are become one Kingdom: So they should both become one Church. Nay I will be bold to say, that the Nation, as things are now, is never like to be easie under it, and therefore could I believe it was not a binding indispensable Constitution ordained by God, I should be for sacrificing of it to so many Worldly Advantages, and Reasons. Besides, like all other Commands, and Institutions of God, it hath often by the Iniquity of Men been an accidental Cause of many Troubles in the World; and therefore were it not for the sake of him, who ordained it, and reverence to it, as his perpetual Institution, I should be for deposing the whole Order at once for that very reason, which one was

falsely

falsely said to have given in the House of Lords, for his being against the Bishops, because Bishops had troubled the World ever since the time of the Apostles. And then again, if we look abroad among the foreign Reformed Churches, which are almost all *Presbyterian*, and some I fear of *Lay-original*, and will not (or as some to excuse them falsely say cannot) come up to us, why should not we condescend, and go down to them, for the great advantages we should have against the common Adversary in a perfect Union, and Harmony in Government, and Discipline, as well as Doctrine, and in all other things relating to Christianity, as a *Society*, as well as a *Sect*? If their Government, and Ministry is as agreeable to God's Word, as *ours*, which retains the Apostolical Superiority; and their *Mission*, as valid as *ours* by Succession from the Apostles, as is set forth in this excellent Book, and in the Archbishop's Sermon; Why should we not resolve into an Uniformity with them for so great benefits, if it be lawful for us so to do. It is in vain for those, who think their Church-Government lawful, to object, that our Form is not lightly to be alter'd, because it is the most ancient, and was instituted by the Apostles. For can that be said to be lightly alter'd, which is alter'd for such good Reasons? Against which neither the Antiquity, nor Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy will be of any moment, unless it was ordained for the perpetual,

petual, and unalterable Government of the Church. In vain they also say, that our Form hath many Advantages above that of foreign Churches, which yet many of their Writers will not grant. But not to dispute that in the Argument I am now maintaining, who, were it lawful, would not be willing to part with a few private advantages for so great, and publick a Blessing, as perfect Union with our half Sister-Churches would be, if as we have one Faith: So we had one Form of Government, one Mission, one Baptism, one Altar, and one Heart, as all the Churches wheresoever dispersed throughout the World had in the pure primitive Times. Neither would it be sufficient to object, that their Churches are *irregularly formed under great defects in their Constitution*. For as one may live safely, and conveniently in an irregular, and defective House, when it is substantially good, and sound; and would chuse to do so, rather than in a finished, and regular Building, for Reasons, which would justify his Choice: So for the great Reasons above-mentioned, I think, we ought to change our more regular, and perfect, for their irregular, and defective Constitution; if indeed it is safe, sound, and good in all its Parts, and Materials, as in its Polity, Mission, and Ministry, and all that depends thereupon. For my own part, I speak with all the Seriousness of a Christian, did I think the Episcopal Form of Church-Government mutable, the  
Con-

Considerations I have mentioned would make me zealous for the changing of it; nor can I imagine any reason, why those, who think it alterable, should be for continuing of it, unless it be, that they are fondly affected, as many are apt to be, to old Forms, and Customs, or perhaps share, or hope to share in the Dignities, and Revenues, which attend it in our Church.

But if the Apostolical, or Episcopal Form was ordained by Christ, for the perpetual, and unalterable Polity of his Church, as all Christianity in all Ages believed for Fifteen Hundred Years: Then let all the Clergy write for it, as this worthy Author hath done, expecting the Protection of their great Lord here, and their Reward from him hereafter, when they must give an account of their Stewardship, and the Authority he hath committed to them for the Government of his People. It is their Duty to teach their Flocks this fundamental Doctrine of Church-Government, and those which depend upon it, let the Consequences of them fall upon what Persons, or Churches soever; and therefore let them teach them without fearing to be reproached, as High-flyers, and Men of rigid Principles, who have no Charity, but are for Damning all but themselves. These are Slanders, and Persecutions, which those, who will preach the Truths, or Commandments of God, must be content to bear from those, who cannot endure sound Principles,

ciples, because they make themselves obnoxious to the Consequences of them; and then say, that they who preach them, preach Damnation to the greatest part of Mankind, and to Christians as good as themselves. But I would ask those, who are wont to talk after this loose manner, if I must not preach up the Being, and Providence of God, because *Atheists*, and *Epicureans*, who now are no small Number, involve themselves in the Consequences of a Doctrine, which concludes them all under damning Unbelief? Must I not assert the Authority of the Scriptures, and the Certainty of Revealed Religion, because it falls heavy upon the vast Number of *Deists*, and *Scepticks* among us, and puts them all in a state of Damnation? Must I not preach up the Union of the Divine, and Humane Nature in the Person of Christ, because the Consequences of it are severe upon so many *Arians*, *Socinians*, and other *Unitarians*? Or, not to mention the *moral* Doctrines of Christianity, must I not preach up the perpetual Institution of the Lord's Day, or of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, because so many neglect, or despise, and reject the Use of them, to their own Destruction? In like manner let me ask these Men, if the Clergy must not preach up the Episcopal Form of Church-Government, as a perpetual Ordinance of Christ, and the necessity of an Episcopal Mission, and Ministry, without respect to Persons, or Churches, be they never so many which have rejected the

the

the divine Institution, and still wilfully continue in the want of it, and thereby involve themselves in Consequences, which too many Learned, and Worthy Men, under the pretence of Charity, have too much endeavour'd to palliate, and soften, or evade for them; whereas it is much greater, and truer Charity to let those Consequences fall in their full weight upon them, that they may see their Error, and the danger of it by those Consequences, and be thereupon effectually moved to reunite themselves to the Catholick Church, from whose Doctrines they have departed in every thing, that relates to it, as a Society of Christ's framing, and thereby justly brought their Call, and Mission into question, giving as good, and learned Men, as any are in the World, occasion to doubt of their Mission, whether it is valid, or no; and by consequence, whether their Ministers are truly God's Ministers, and Messengers, such Ministers as the Archbishop speaks of in his Sermon, who have the true Sacerdotal Mission, and Authority from God to minister his Word, and Sacraments to the People in Christ's place, and the Acts of whose Ministry are as valid, as if Christ himself should minister unto them; as being made so by the same Consecration, Orders, and Unction, by which Bishops, and Priests were made at the beginning, and are to be made God's Ministers by his appointment unto the end of the World. It grieves me always, when  
I consider

I consider to what difficulty the Ministers of the *Presbyterian* Churches abroad have been put, to answer the Questions about their Mission; and what Shifts and Evasions their Defenders among us have also been put to in their attempts to defend it. And therefore I must say it again, the greatest, and truest Charity to the Reformed Churches, and the whole Reformation, is to exhort them to take the same Mission, that we have retained, as the only true, and indisputable Mission of the Holy Catholick Church. I think the Nature of Christian Charity obliges us upon Catholick Principles to write them up to our Church, and not as the manner of some hath been, to write our Church down to them; and whoever would write such a *Paranesis* to them in the common Language, and Christian Spirit of Meekness, I think, he would do a most charitable Work; for which if they did not think themselves oblig'd to him, God would certainly reward him, and all good Men would praise him for ever. What I have said here, I call God to witness, I speak not out of Ill-will, but out of pure Love, and Good-will for the foreign Reformed Protestants, for whose Preservation, if I can judge of my self, I could lay down my Life, and of whom I say with my whole Heart, as *St. Paul* said to King *Agrippa*, *I would to God*, for his Church's sake, that *they were not only almost, but altogether, as we of the Church of England are.*

Wherefore let the Clergy, without any regard to Human Politicks, or serving Times, or fearing the Arm of Flesh, instruct the People in the true Nature, and Original of Church-Government. Let them teach their Flocks from whom Bishops have their Authority over Priests, and both Bishops and Priests their Authority over the People, and in whose Name, and Place they absolve them, and preach, and minister Sacraments to them, and that they are Christ's Messengers, Christ's Embassadors, Christ's Ministers, and Christ's Spiritual Governors to them, and over them in his Kingdom upon Earth. Let them remember what *St. Paul*, *St. Ignatius*, *St. Cyprian*, not to mention *Hosius*, *Athanasius*, *Greg. Nazianzen*, *Chrysostom*, and *Ambrose*, taught the Christian World upon this Subject, and let them preach, and teach the same Principles with primitive Boldness before the greatest of Men; the same Principles, which Archbishop *Cranmer* taught King *Edward VI.* in his Sermon of the *Power of the Keys*; and which, as it is evident from that Sermon worthy of his great Name, as a Bishop, a Reformer, and a Martyr, were not only his Principles, but as is also evident from the Preface of the Reformers before our old *Ordinal*, the Principles of the Reformation, upon which it began, and proceeded, and upon which I trust, it will ever continue, and subsist; though now it hath more, and more powerful Enemies in number and kind,

than

than ever it had before. Wherefore as it is the Duty of the Clergy to defend the Principles upon which Church-Government, and their own Mission, and Authority is truly founded, as well as the true Faith, and to instruct the People in them: So is it more especially necessary they should do it now, when Men take the liberty to speak, and write with the Spite of Devils against Priests, and Priesthood, and take delight without Truth, Wit, or good Manners, and what is more, without fear of Punishment, to revile and ridicule both. Let them assure themselves God will assist them, if they will be unanimous, and labour in so good a Work. He will contend *with them* against their Enemies, in defence of them, and his own Institutions, but he will not contend without them. He will most assuredly be their Second, but he will not be their Champion to fight alone for them. Nor must they expect that he will work Miracles for them, when they'll do nothing for themselves. He will not support them, and the Church with them, if they will not do their own part to support both. Wherefore let them hold fast what they have, and laying aside all Animosities, Strife, and Contentions, and Names of Parties, agree as one Man to maintain their Sacerdotal Orders, and Authority against those who are confederate with the Powers of Hell against it: Not only against the Sensualists of Flesh, and Blood, but against

Principalities, and Powers, and the Rulers of the Darknes of this World, and wicked Spirits in *High Places*. To that end let not the Rich among them despise the Poor, nor the High the Low, nor those who are in greater Stations, those who are in less, or perhaps in none at all; let no Party among them be stiff, supercilious, or untractable, or refuse to offer, or receive Proposals of Agreement from the others *as impracticable*; but let them unite against the common Enemies of the Church, and Priesthood, as formerly the *Homoousians* of opposite Parties heartily did against the common Enemies of the Faith. To that end also, if any among them have favour'd Principles in any degree destructive, or hurtful to the Apostolical Government of the Church, as perhaps Archbishop *Cr.* once did, let them follow the great Example of his Humility in retracting their Error, and coming over, as he did, to those Principles on which the Churches of Christ were first formed, and ours reformed upon the Prophets, and Apostles, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-Stone. It is high time to joyn Hands to this good Work, and God, and good Men expect it from us; and he that hath the Key of *David*, and holdeth the Stars of the Firmament of the Church in his right Hand, looks on to see what they will do, and will in Judgment bring an Eclipse upon them, or perhaps let them fall first into the uttermost Contempt, and then into utter Ruine, if trusting to Hu-

mane

mane Policies, and *leaning on Reeds, which will at last go into their Hands, and pierce them*, they shall neglect so good, so needful, and so seasonable a Work. Let them remember, what no vulgar Person once said, *What hath been, may be*; and let all good Christians of the Church of *England*, and the Clergy more especially, remember the Admonitions which the Spirit gave by *St. John* unto Seven once glorious Churches, which with many more, as firm and famous, as the Church of *England*, he hath let go into Captivity, Affliction, and Servitude, and remov'd their Candlesticks out of their places, because they were Luke-warm, or suffer'd false Doctrines, and false Prophets among them, or conniv'd at Blasphe-mers, or neglected Discipline, or in some respects or other would not do their first Works.

While I was speaking of that great, and most worthy Peer, *Edward Earl of Clarendon*, and his imperfect Letter, which I mentioned, as written in his own Hand, I should have acquainted the Reader, that his two Right Honourable Sons, *Henry Earl of Clarendon*, and *Lawrence Earl of Rochester* will attest the Letter to have been found among the Papers, which he left behind him, and to be an Original of his Writing. And I cannot but wish for the sake of the Church of *England*, to which he was so great an Ornament, and in whose Communion he lived, and died upon the Principles laid down in this Book,

and in Archbishop Cranmer's Sermon, that his Lordship had lived to finish it. And to what I have already published of it, I believe, it will not be unacceptable to any true Son of the Church to present the Publick with the last Periods of it, where it breaks of: *Having now, saith he, answer'd your whole Letter, at least as fully, as you could expect it, it is not in my power to abstain from asking you, how it comes to pass, that you, and many other grave, and learned Men, who have not yet outgrown the Scars, and deeper Marks, which you received from the Presbyterians, in the time of their Domination, without the least Instance of Brotherly Compassion, or Humanity, but were consider'd by them, as Victims given into their Hands by the immediate Bounty of God himself, to be offered in Sacrifice for the expiation of the Offences of the Episcopal Party in their former* — Here the great Man was going to give an account of the Presbyterians Moderation, and it may be of their Principles; but God was pleased not to let him proceed farther, but to deliver him from all his Pains, and translate him from this World, which was a place of Labour, Sufferings, and Persecutions to him, to the Bosom, or Bay of Abraham, which secures the Faithful to righteous Causes from the Storms, and Tempests, which evil Spirits, and unrighteous Men raise against them, in Everlasting Rest, and Bliss. I wish my Pen were able to give as true, and just a Character of him,

him, as his hath given of many others in his immortal History of the *Rebellion*, and *Civil Wars* in *England*, and then, I am sure, it would be as bright, and glorious, as those of the best, and greatest Men, that this Church, or Nation ever bred. But it must be a very masterly Hand, that can make a Picture truly worthy of him, and therefore I will not presume so much as to attempt it; but only say, that as I am one of those, who have a Veneration for his Memory to the highest degree; So I cannot but wish for the Honour, and Happiness of the Church, and State, that the Peerage of our Country may always abound with Nobles of his great Abilities; and Courage to serve, and defend both.

From the Extract I have given out of his Lordship's Letter, it is plain, that it was not for By-Ends, or Worldly Prospects, or Politick Reasons of State; but out of pure Conscience, that after he had been at the Temples of *Montpellier* to satisfy his Curiosity, he refus'd, when at *Rouen* to go to the Temple at *Quevilly*. For it is plain from the hints he gave his Friend, to whom he thought fit to write with much Caution, and Reserve, that he was not satisfied with the *Mission* of the Ministers of the *French* Reformed Churches: Of which it cannot be said that it was only imperfect, and defective, because a *Mission*, or *Commission*, be it from God, or from Men, who have Power to give it, must

be perfect, or none all. He doubted whether their Ministers were God's Ministers, that is Ministers *sent* by God to act in his Name, and to administer the *Power of the Keys*, the *Preaching of the Word*, and the *Holy Sacraments* by his Authority, and in his stead, according to Archbishop *Cranmer's* Doctrine, though he assigned other Reasons less invidious, yet it is evident this was the true Reason, for which he refused to go to the Temple at *Quevilly*, and for which, or the Suspicion of which, I may presume it was, that the famous Monsieur *Claude* invey'd so severely against him, as I have || elsewhere declared.

Let me farther observe, that as to Archbishop *Cranmer's* Sermon, the Reader will find the Doctrines therein contained agreeable to the Answers he return'd to several Questions with other Learned Men in the *Cottonian MS. Cleopatra E. 5.* printed by Mr. *John Strype* in his *Appendix* to the Memorials of Archbishop *Cranmer*, Num. XXVIII. p. 52. Of which I I thought fit to take notice; and if in this *Preface* I have done any Service to the Memory of that great Man, and Reformer, who lived in very difficult, and trying times, especially in vindicating of him from those unjust Imputations, by which he hath been misrepresented, as to the Principles, upon which he proceeded in the Reformation, I shall think my Pains well bestow'd.

*George Hickes.*

---

---

T H E

# CONTENTS.

CHAP. I. **T**HE Causes why the Hierarchy is not  
Universally Received. Page 1

CHAP. II. Observations upon the State of the Que-  
stion. p. 12

CHAP. III. A General Proof, that the Hierarchy is  
of Divine, and Apostolical Institution. p. 19

CHAP. IV. General Proofs of the Hierarchy, and of  
the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry, in  
the Person of the Apostles. p. 31

CHAP. V. Divers Proofs, that in the time of the  
Apostles there were Bishops, distinguish'd from the  
other Ministers, and establish'd by them. p. 41

CHAP. VI. A particular Proof of the Apostolical In-  
stitution of Episcopacy in the Person of St. James  
Bishop of Jerusalem. p. 46

CHAP. VII. A particular Proof of the Apostolical In-  
stitution of Episcopacy, and its Succession, in the  
Person of St. Simeon Bishop of Jerusalem. p. 56

CHAP. VIII. A particular Proof of the Apostolical  
Institution of Episcopacy, in the Person of St. Ti-  
mothy Bishop of Ephesus. p. 65

CHAP.

## The CONTENTS.

- CHAP. IX. *A particular Proof of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, in the Person of St. Titus Bishop of Crete.* p. 77
- CHAP. X. *An Explication of some Passages of the New Testament, and the Fathers, which are perverted to overthrow the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry.* p. 87
- CHAP. XI. *Remarks upon some Passages of St. Jerome, which seem to be contrary to the Hierarchy.* p. 98
- CHAP. XII. *The Testimonies of the Apostolical Fathers concerning the Hierarchy.* p. 116
- CHAP. XIII. *Divers Proofs of the Continuation of the Hierarchy in the Church; and that there was no Innovation made in the Distinction of the Degrees, in the time of Hyginus Bishop of Rome.* p. 129
- CHAP. XIV. *A Proof of the Establishment of Episcopacy in the Church of Rome, and that it was in Use there during the first Century.* p. 143
- CHAP. XV. *Proofs of the Establishment of Episcopacy by the Apostles in the other Churches; and that they had the same Government with that of Rome, and Jerusalem, during the first Century.* p. 153
- CHAP. XVI. *Wherein is proved, that the Hierarchical Government continued the same in the Second Century, as in the First.* p. 161

# The CONTENTS.

CHAP. XVII. *Wherein is proved, that the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry continued the same in the second Century as in the first.*  
p. 180

CHAP. XVIII. *Wherein is proved, that the Hierarchical Government continued the same in the third Century, as in the first, and second.*  
p. 192

CHAP. XIX. *Wherein the same Proof is continued, concerning the Hierarchy, and the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry, in the third Century.*  
p. 204

CHAP. XX. *The Conclusion.*  
p. 218

---

ERRATA.

---

## ERRATA.

**P**Age 4: line 24. dele *an.* l. 36. dele 2<sup>d</sup> *the.* P. 52. l. 19. read *Nicephorus Callistus.* P. 66. l. 7. r. *reside.* P. 67. l. 18. r. *to them.* P. 98. l. 34. r. *unto.* P. 107. l. 26. dele *in.* P. 113. l. 1. r. *Bucolus.* P. 184. l. 1. instead of *not.* r. *out.* P. 189. l. 10. r. *a Preacher.* l. 13. dele *For.* P. 190. marg. l. 3. r. *Idem.* P. 203. l. 6. put *a*; after *Episcopal.* P. 205. marg. l. 3. r. *Lat.* P. 207. l. 6. r. *Factionous.* P. 212. l. 14. put an \* to *writes.* P. 218. l. 2. r. *nodo.* P. 224. l. 6. instead of *great,* r. *some.*

---

THE

---

THE  
 Divine Right  
 OF  
 EPISCOPACY  
 ASSERTED.

---

C H A P. I.

*The Causes why the Hierarchy is not  
 Universally Received.*

**I** Propose to my self, with God's Assistance, to explain, and determine in this Treatise a Question; which, though it be of the greatest Necessity and Consequence, yet is not so Relishing to all Protestants, either at home or abroad: Some looking upon the Hierarchy in the Church as a Mark of the Beast, and a piece of Antichristianism. As we are all by the Reformation come out of *Rome*, which at the time of that glorious Work appeared, as to her outside, like a Triumphant Queen upon Earth; whatever has the Air of her displeases and scandalizes these Men. They are against all Ecclesiastical Superiority, without considering the Original Constitution of the  
 B Church,

Church, and to whom our Saviour committed the Government of it. It may be truly affirmed, that the Republican Spirit is the predominant Principle in almost all the Protestant States; where every one would fain live according to his Fancy, and where the Clergy is allow'd to bear little or no Authority. This Democratical Genius is the cause of so many Sects and Congregations; which at this Day divide, and tear in pieces all the Reformed Churches in *Europe*. For if Episcopacy was again universally Establish'd, it would be no very difficult matter to bring Men back to the Unity of the Spirit; to reduce the Sectaries, and other Refractory Persons to Obedience; and by the exercise of Discipline, to hinder the Tares from mixing with the good Grain. The People would of course naturally and freely comply with the inferiour Clergy; and these being restrained by a superiour Authority, would beware of raising Sects, or making Innovations in the Doctrine of the Church, now miserably corrupted with damnable Heresies, for fear of being cast out by ignominious Excommunications. But the Iniquity of the Times causing Men to look upon the Hierarchy as a formidable Power, it must be confess'd, that Libertinism prevails upon the Minds of most; who would rather have a Popular Government, or to speak more properly, a Shadow of Government, than be under an Episcopal Discipline, which should keep every one within the bounds of his Duty, and make the Inferiours submit to their Superiours, according to that Precept of *St. Paul*, Heb. xiii. 17. *Obey them that have the rule over you, and submit your selves.*

*Four Causes  
of the Non-re-  
ceiving the Hie-  
rarchy.*

But to discourse more distinctly of the Causes, why the Hierarchy is not universally received: I observe these Four general ones, *viz.* 1. The Prejudice of Birth, and early Education.

2. The

2. The Spirit of Independency and Latitude. 3. The Passion of Ambition. 4. The little Acquaintance Men have with the History of the Primitive Church; by means whereof some are wholly Ignorant of the Constitution of the Christian Church, and others take up with a very imperfect and false Notion of it, for want of applying themselves to the Study of the ancient Ecclesiastical Writers.

The first Cause, which is the Prejudice of Birth and Education, is so prevalent in this, as in all other things, that it draws the Mind after it whithersoever it pleases. We are so led by this, as generally to believe, that any Church which has not the same Form of Government and Worship with that we profess, and to which we have been brought up from our Infancy, cannot be a true Church. A Bishop at the Head of a Clergy, is a Monster to those who have not seen such a sight in their own Country, or who have been prejudiced against it by Education. It is even a Crime with some Men to call the Body of Ministers a *Clergy*. If we should change the Term of *Convocation*, or *Synod*, into that of *Council*, we should not be understood by the common People. To Preach with the Head uncover'd, is, if some may be believed, not to deliver the Word of God like a Minister, and an Ambassador of Christ. And if a certain Method is enjoined in the Confession of Sins, in the Reading of Scripture, and in the manner of Praying; or a fix'd Liturgy is prescrib'd, it is a strange Service, some cry out, or a stinting of the Spirit. Because the Church has retained some decent Ornaments and Ceremonies in her publick Ministrations; as the Surplice, the Cross in Baptism, Kneeling at the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and the like, which resemble such Usages in the *Romish* Communion; the Dissenters are

1. *Cause.*  
The Prejudice  
of Birth and  
Education.

4      *The* DIVINE RIGHT *of*

taught from their Childhood to exclaim against them, as Popish, Superstitious, and Idolatrous; and therein they are sure to follow the Prejudice of their Education. But if Men are thus offended at things of little moment, what Convulsions would they feel in their Souls, if they were to renounce the holy Discipline, which they consider as their Foster-Sister, to embrace another! We sometimes stretch things to such a degree of Folly by this means, that in changing our outward method of Worship, we think we change our whole Religion. “ All Ministers are Equal in *Holland, Switzerland, Geneva,* and some other Reformed Countries; “ they were so lately amongst the Protestants in “ *France*; and continue so amongst those that se- “ parate from the Episcopal Church in this King- “ dom: Say our Dissenting Adversaries. It is pe- “ culiar to the Papists to have Bishops at the “ head of their Clergy. I would not part with “ the Discipline, wherein I was bred and born, “ for the World: And I would venture my Life, “ rather than submit to a new Form of Govern- “ ment in the Church. Thus do Men talk, when they are prepossess’d by the influence of an Educa- tion; which keeps them from Reasoning justly, and discerning Truth from Falshood: They are incapat- ble of believing that to be good, which they have not seen and experienced. Unhappy Principle! which holds them fast to their Rock, like the Wretch in the Fable, and deprives them of the nat- ural Use of their Reason, which was given them to distinguish between Good and Evil, Truth and Falshood. How many, by this fatal Prepossession, fall into Error and Destruction! Let them there- fore put off this Prejudice, and fairly examine, whether the Hierarchy be good or evil, and the Episcopacy ancient or modern in the Christian Church. Truth is not ty’d to a particular Coun- try

try or Congregation, but is found out every where by them that search after it sincerely. In the mean time, let it not be thought so great a Wonder, that those who have suck'd in the Errors and Superstitions of *Rome* from their Birth, are wedded to the Opinions they have first imbib'd: Since such as know the Truth, suffer themselves to be corrupted, and led away by this Prejudice. It is as a second Nature, and cannot be put off without great Violence.

The Spirit of Independency and Latitude, which is the second Cause mentioned, is no less an Enemy to the Hierarchy. And the Reason of it is plain, *viz.* Because it is directly opposite to it. For this admits of little or no Superiority; which yet is a necessary Ingredient, and included in the very Notion of Episcopacy in the Church, whereby the Government is vested in a Superiour: Whereas Independency and Latitude require Equality every where. As this Spirit is Natural to Man since the Fall, so it is likewise Domineering, and cannot brook a Superiour without Regret and Impatience. I may say farther, that the Christian OEconomy, being an OEconomy of Liberty, it gives occasion to depraved Men to turn good things into bad, and to change the happiest Freedom into the most shameful Licentiousness. There is no Religion in the World, under which the People are more Masters of their Wills, than the Protestant. And though perhaps they are so but too much, it looks at this time as if they intended to use their utmost Efforts to cast off all Ecclesiastical Yoke. Since then this seems to be the Natural Genius of Protestants, who are not under the Hierarchy, it is no wonder if Episcopacy is so strongly opposed, which would have every one keep to his Station in the Church, and the Inferiour

2. Cause.  
*The Spirit of  
Independency  
and Latitude.*

## 6 The DIVINE RIGHT of

riour depend upon, and be led by his Superiour. But who does not see, that this Independent and Latitudinarian Spirit is vicious, and that it tends to run things into Confusion; and that if the People are animated with it, it is because they do not care to be governed by a Superiour Power? Independency and Latitude then is one of the Causes why Episcopacy, which requires a Dependency, is not generally received by Protestants; and that because there is no Religion in the World, under which the People would be so absolute in their Ways.

3. Cause. *Ambition.* The Passion of Ambition is the third Cause which sets Men against the Hierarchy, and endeavours to persuade them to reject it. But it proceeds in this Design with Cunning; shifting that upon another, which is proper to it self; and condemning Episcopacy by that which condemns it self. It will not admit of eminent Degrees in the Church, for fear the Ministers should climb up too high, and Lord it over God's Heritage. That is the Foundation, or rather the Pretence of our Adversaries Clamouring. *Episcopacy*, say they, *is attended with Ambition and Vanity, which is the Plague of the Ministry.* But I affirm on the contrary, that that pretended Humility, which they make a shew of, in asserting, *that the Ministers should be equal*, is Ambition it self; and that the Equality for which they contend, arises but from a Spirit puff'd up with Pride and Insolence. For what is the reason, why they will not bear with an eminent Pastor above them? It is because they would equally share the Government with him: If there is a Bishop in a Church, what is most splendid in the Administration, is in his hands, and they would willingly partake with him. This is a pure Effect of Ambition: As if all Men in Orders

ders were equally qualify'd to sit at the Helm, and had the same Talents to feed, govern, and protect the Flock! And yet, in their Judgment, a Bishop ought to have no more Authority than they; and their Understanding, for ought they know, may go as far as his. This Conceit proceeds from an ill-grounded Presumption in them. And therefore it is not the People, as we distinguish them from the Clergy, who are the most opposite to Episcopacy; they would soon come off of this Prejudice against it, if the Ministers, as they are vulgarly call'd, did not foment it: They do not much trouble their Heads about the Government of the Church: Provided they have Teachers according to their own Hearts, who Preach well, all is right. They are then the Ministers themselves, who are the greatest Enemies of the Hierarchy; because, being egg'd on by a Principle of Ambition, they would have an equal share in the Rights and Privileges of it; and that no other should have more Authority than they. Which is the Reason why they proclaim it every where, *That the Ministers ought to be Equal; and that Superiority amongst them, is downright Tyranny and Usurpation:* After this manner, making the Pretence of an humble and popular Parity serve to their own Ends. I except from this Censure those Modest, and Learned Men of the foreign Churches, who tho' they submit to another Form, yet speak honourably of the *Episcopal*, and when Occasion is given, subscribe freely to it, blaming their Brethren, who have written against it. For in short it is evident, that the Body of the Ministers, whose Judgment it is, that the Government of the Church belongs to all equally, are direct Enemies of Episcopacy; and that more by a motive of Ambition and Presumption, than any Knowledge they have of the Discipline of the Apostles, and Primitive Christians who follow'd it.

### 3 The DIVINE RIGHT of

4. Cause.  
*The little Acquaintance Men have with the History of the Prim. Church.*

And indeed the Fourth Cause is, that they do not apply themselves, as they should, to the Study of the Ecclesiastical History of the Apostles times, and those that immediately succeeded. They believe, or at least the Laity does, that the Christian Church has had always the same Face, which they now behold with their Eyes; and that whatever their Discipline is, it is perfectly consonant with the Apostolical. Then frame to themselves an Idea of the Government of the Primitive Church, conformable to what they are born in; and that is enough to determine the Point: As if that ancient Constitution were naturally imprinted in all our Minds, and we had no need to consult carefully the Historians of those Times, to know what they say of it. It is true, the *New Testament* is the only Authentick Record we have to justify the true Government of the Church, as to its Original. But since all are not agreed, as to what it delivers concerning this Article; the one maintaining, that it Establishes it; and the others, that it Overthrows it; whence can we borrow more Light of what was done in this respect, than from the Accounts of those first Ages? For there we may see, by the Practice of the Church, what kind of Government Jesus Christ directed, and the Apostles settled in it; and what was the Form of the Discipline they left to it, and would have continued after their Decease. It would be too wild an Assertion to say, that by the Writings of the *New Testament* we can perfectly understand the whole System of the Apostolical Administration, and what Power they exercised in all the Churches they founded upon all occasions. How many things are there which they did, but which we are ignorant of? And what different measures did they take in the Management

ment of their Affairs, to compass their ends, whereof we have no account in their Acts, or elsewhere? *They were made all things to all Men*, as says St. Paul of himself, 1 Cor. ix. 22. (and the same may be applied to the rest) *that they might by all means save some.* We even see, that in some Churches they injoy the Observation of certain Ceremonies of the Law, which they forbid in others: An evident sign of a Discipline not yet fix'd, and which was to be order'd according to the Exigency of the Times. What do we know, whether every Christian Church had the same Form of Government in all respects? For my part, I am apt to believe, that there was a diversity in this. Only the Apostles had Fundamental Principles, and General Maxims of Ecclesiastical Government, which they held fast, and according to which they ruled the whole Christian Church. And they are those Fundamental Principles, and General Maxims, which we have laid down in the *New Testament*, and which the Apostles have deliver'd to be the Model for the Ages to come. So then the *New Testament* contains in it the Substance and Constitution of the Ecclesiastical Government, *viz.* its Bases and Foundations; but not all its Formalities and Observances, which were in greater Number, even in the time of the Apostles, and before their Death, than we find them in their Books. Jesus Christ then, and the Apostles, having laid down the Fundamentals of the Church-Government and Discipline; since we are not agreed upon the Nature of those Fundamentals, what can we do better, in order to discover the Truth, than to instruct our selves by the Sense, and Practice of the Primitive Church? I must confess, if another Form of Ecclesiastical Government was prescribed in Scripture, the Example of the Church ought not to persuade us to a thing which we see

to be contrary to the Divine Revelation. But so it is not, nor now so much as pretended by our Adversaries. In a Controverted Point, as this is, let the Scripture be plain or obscure about Episcopacy; since we are not agreed upon it, we must seek out the Sense of the Precept in the Practice, and justify the Laws Jesus Christ, and the Apostles have left, by the Obedience their Disciples and immediate Successors have paid them. For to go about to overthrow what the Apostles, and their Successors after them, by a constant Imitation, have done, upon the Allegation of some Passage which we understand not, or distort according to our Imagination; is plainly to deceive our selves, and do violence to the Truth. Let those therefore that are puzzled, or prepossess'd about this matter, enquire into the former Ages; let them turn over the Records of the ancient Times; let them meditate upon what the Primitive Fathers have written; and let them make Christian Antiquity familiar to them. And then, having their Eyes open and found, they will clearly perceive, that the Hierarchy is contained in the *New Testament*; and that Episcopacy was in use in the Christian Church during the three first Centuries, wherein the Bishop was always distinguish'd from the rest of the Clergy, as being their Superiour: Which is my chief Design in this Treatise to prove.

---

C H A P. II.

*Observations upon the State of the Question.*

TO put this matter in its full Light, it will be necessary to make some general Observations, and lay down some Principles concerning the State of this Question; whereby it may appear, what is in Controversie, and what is not; and whether the Point be well proved, or not.

The first part of this Question, relating to the Institution of the Hierarchy, or to speak more intelligibly, Episcopacy: First, I affirm, that Episcopacy is of Divine and Apostolical Institution. For the clearing of which Assertion, I must explain what I mean by *Divine Institution*, and in what sense *Episcopacy* may be said to be of Divine and Apostolical Institution. A thing then may be said to be of Divine Institution three ways, or in three Senses.

1. Inasmuch as God appoints, and ordains it with his own Mouth. Such are the Doctrines of Morality and Religion, which God has revealed, and enjoined Mankind to embrace, by his Son our Lord Jesus Christ. 2. Inasmuch as it is set forth and delivered by Men, who are Divinely Inspired; as are those several Precepts and Ordinances, which the Prophets, and Apostles have declared to Men from God, and by his Inspiration; what they have received from him, and thereupon delivered, is of Divine Institution; because it is he himself that has immediately commanded it. 3. Inasmuch as it

*1. Observation.  
That Episcopacy  
is of Divine and  
Apostolical In-  
stitution.*

*Three Senses of  
Divine Institu-  
tion; as God  
appoints a thing  
himself; as it  
is set forth by  
Men divinely  
inspired; as it  
is grounded on  
a Divine Com-  
mission.*

it is grounded upon a Divine Commission; as the Authority of Preaching the Word, and Administering the Sacraments, the Power of the Keys or Spiritual Jurisdiction, and the like. I say then, that Episcopacy is of Divine Institution in these three Senses, at least in the two last; if there is any cause to dispute the first, which I do not believe. For if Jesus Christ has appointed it in his Gospel to be the Government of the Church, as I doubt not to make it appear; it is past Controversie, that it is of Divine Institution; since it is the Son of God himself that is the Author of it. But admitting we should not meet with the formal and positive Establishment of it by him, as having not ordain'd it there with his own Mouth: If the Apostles have set it forth, as Men Divinely Inspired, it must be confessed, that it is of Divine Institution; since they have not done it of their own Heads, but at the Command of their Master; who doubtless delivered several things to them, as *St. Luke* takes particular notice, *Acts* i. 3. *pertaining to the Kingdom of God*, in the Conversations he had with them from the time of his Resurrection to that of his Ascension into Heaven; and by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost. And lastly, If the Apostles, by virtue of their Commission from Jesus Christ, have founded such a Form of Government in the Christian Church; it must be likewise, if not immediately, yet at least mediately, by the same Right, as being grounded upon a Divine Authority: In which lowest Sense, Episcopacy may be said to be of Apostolical Institution.

2. *Observation.*  
*The Question not*  
*about the Ex-*  
*tent and Domi-*  
*nion of Episcopa-*  
*cy.*

The second Observation I am to make, relating to the State of the Question, and which will be of great use towards the Understanding and Explaining of it; and the removing of several Objections, which do not concern

concern the matter in Dispute, is, that the Point is not, whether in the very time of the Apostles, *i. e.* in its Origine, Episcopacy was as extended, and had as much outward Grandeur, as at this Day? This is insinuated into the Minds of the People, to possess them with an Opinion of the Tyranny of the Hierarchical Government. I should be in the wrong to make a Controverſie of this. It muſt be confeſſed, that in the following Ages it has obtained by degrees a greater Extent, by the Conversion of Nations, and particular Places; and that it has arrived to a larger Dominion, by the Circumſtances of the Church requiring it ſo. A thouſand Differences, which have fallen out within its Preſcincts, have given occaſion to ſeveral Regulations; and the Biſhops have been obliged, in the Councils which have been held by them, to make ſeveral Conſtitutions, Laws, and Canons, to keep up a good Order in the Church. In proportion as the Body of the myſtical Kingdom of *Iſrael* has increaſed in Strength, it has been neceſſary to increaſe the Power of its Spiritual Judges, to reſtrain it within its Bounds. The Government of Colonies, which from time to time are planted here and there, does not at firſt come nigh to that of thoſe populous and ancient States, which ſend them. And it would be ridiculous to imagine, that when *St. Paul* founded a Church at *Athens*, and appointed *Dionyſius* the *Areopagite* Biſhop thereof; *Dionyſius* had the ſame extent of Jurisdiction; or lived in the ſame State of Grandeur amongſt his ſlender Clergy, and his inconfiderable Laity, as the Biſhops of *London*, *Durham*, or *Wincheſter*, may have, or live in, in their large and wealthy Dioceſes. Or that when the Goſpel was firſt preach'd here in *England*, and Biſhops ſettled in this part of the Kingdom; they equall'd in Authority and Grandeur thoſe who now enjoy

enjoy their Bishopricks. It is sufficient, that there be an Essential Conformity, and that the Change be not in Fundamentals, to affirm, that it is the same Government. The more or the less, does not vary the Species. The present State of the Church requires, that Episcopacy should carry some Lustre with it; and that there should be more Formalities in the Ecclesiastical Administration, than were at first, when it began but to take root. And I will venture to say, that if there had been no more Regulations made about Discipline, than those which were used in the time of the Apostles, it would have been impossible to prevent a Confusion in the Church; since within that very Period, there happen'd Dissentions concerning the Government, which with much difficulty were allayed: And the Adversaries of Episcopacy themselves would have it, that the Church being no longer able to subsist by the Apostolical Discipline, it made that Innovation, as they pretended, in the second Century. *Ut inter Christi servos ordo aliquis esset, &c.* says an \*Author of Reputation amongst them. But what would not have fallen out in process of Time, if when the Church was spread throughout the World, Episcopacy had not had a larger Extent of Jurisdiction, than it enjoyed in the Days of the Apostles? The Head must be able to govern the Body, in proportion to the strength of the Members: For therein consists the Justness of the Temperament, which without it must be in the utmost Disorder.

But what is the Question then?

*But the Nature.*

Why, whether in the time of the Apostles, and in the first Ages of Christianity, there was in each principal Church an eminent Pastor, who had a De-

---

\* Cat. Test. Ver. Lib. 2. de Eccl. Gub.

gree above the rest, and was called the *Bishop, Antistes*, or Πρεσβυς of it: Whilst the other Clergymen were either Bishops simply, or Presbyters, or Deacons? And whether that Pastor was the Bishop of the Church, because to him did of Right belong the Government of it, and the others did but assist him in his Administration; and because being invested with the Apostolical Succession, he had the Sovereign Right there of ordaining and admitting Men to the Offices in the holy Ministry, and exercising Spiritual Jurisdiction: Which Right entitled him to the Primacy within his District, and raised him above the rest of his Clergy, as being the Head of them? If this be so, we may conclude hence, that there has been a Subordination in the Ministry from the very Days of the Apostles; and that it is thence Episcopacy, which is since become vastly extended, according to the State of the Church, has derived its Origine; its Administration being conformable to the Nature of that, whence it arose. It is true, something of Vigour and Lustre has been added to it in its Manhood, which it had not in its Infancy: But still it resembles it in its Institution, Form, and Pre-eminency; which consists in an Hierarchical Discipline.

My third Observation concerns the Episcopal Primacy, what is to be understood by it. Those, who are not for it, cry out against it, as downright Tyranny: As if a Man could not be set in an higher, and more eminent Station than another, but he must presently become a Tyrant. By this Primacy then we ought not to understand such a high degree of Authority, whereby a Man may presume to have a Right of saying, *Sic volo, sic jubeo*; such is my Pleasure, and such is my Command. Such a Despo-

3. Observation.  
What Episcopal  
Primacy is?

a Despotical Power Jesus Christ calls  
 Marth. xx. 25. *a Dominion*, in the evil sense, and  
 condemns it in those, to whom he  
 has committed the care of his Church; as does  
 likewise *St. Peter*, styling it *a Lord-*  
 1 Pet. v. 3. *ing it over God's Heritage*. But the  
 Nature of the sacred Ministry does  
 not hinder, but our Lord may have entrusted cer-  
 tain Persons with the Guidance of his Flock; and  
 they ought to govern it, according to the Post  
 wherein Providence has placed them. I must own,  
 if a Bishop should be so rash, under the colour of  
 his Primacy, as to go about to do every thing af-  
 ter his own Head and Fancy, as if the whole Pru-  
 dence of the Ecclesiastical Administration were  
 lodged in himself, he would grossly abuse his Au-  
 thority. But besides that he has the Scripture,  
 and the Canons of the Church, to direct his  
 Conduct, and limit his Power: He is not with-  
 out Counsellors. By his Primacy, he is not all,  
 and his Clergy nothing. It is not to be doubted,  
 but the Bishops in the Primitive Times conferr'd  
 with their Clergy, as with their Brethren, upon  
 matters of moment; and ask'd the Advice of their  
 wisest and learned'st Presbyters, and even com-  
 ply'd with them when there was occasion. And  
 it would be an Affront to Protestant Bishops, to  
 charge them with having no regard for the Coun-  
 sel of their Clergy, or with determining of Church-  
 Affairs, without imparting them to them. It is  
 well known, how *St. Polycarp*, *St. Irenæus*, *St. Cy-*  
*prian*, and other holy Bishops, behaved themselves  
 herein towards their Clergy; thinking it no Dis-  
 honour to their Character, to take their Consent  
 and Names to their Epistles. And if Men are ig-  
 norant, that the modern Bishops have their Coun-  
 sellors, their Chapters, their Chancellors, their Arch-  
 deacons, and the like; and that in their Synods  
 they

they enact nothing without the Advice of their Clergy; it is because they will be ignorant. Their Power is so far from being absolute, that it is restrained to Bounds; and those so very straight, that they have sometimes much to do to reduce the Scandalous with the Laws of their Discipline. The Episcopal Primacy then is such a degree of Honour and Authority, as sets the Bishop above the Body of his Clergy; and gives him the principal Administration of the Church, with the Right of Ordaining to the Ministry. By which it is evident, that this Primacy is neither a Tyranny, nor an usurped Dignity; though it raises the Bishop above the level of the simple Presbyters.

This gives me occasion to enquire here into the true Sense of that vulgar Saying, that *the Præses* of the Primitive Times, whom we call the Bishop, was *Primus inter Pares*; which our Adversaries apply to their presiding Pastor, or Moderator, in their Ecclesiastical Assemblies, to express after their way the Equality of the whole Clergy. Now it may be very safely affirmed, that a Bishop has a Primacy above his Clergy; and yet that they are his Equals: But not according to the Meaning of the Enemies of the Hierarchy, who, with a manifest Contradiction, would prove, by the Primacy amongst Equals, an Equality amongst all Ministers; so that one should not be Superior to the other. But does not Equality destroy Priority; and *vice versa*? And has not he that is first something as such, which sets him above the others, whom they would have to be his Equals? The Bishop then, as such, is *Primus*; because in that respect he is above the second, and third Order of Ministers: His Primacy sets him in another Station, and gives him another Right, than the others have, *viz.* to govern the Chair in chief, and admit

*How the Bishop is Primus inter Pares.*

mit into the Ministry; which the Apostles have left him by Succession. But the Presbyters are *Pares*, as to the Priesthood; because upon that Score he has nothing more than they: They share equally the Functions of that Office, which are to Preach the Word, and Administer the Sacraments. Which is the true Ground, why the Bishops call the Presbyters *Brethren*, *Sympresbyters*, and *Symmystas*, as possessing nothing in that respect, but what is common to both. But whosoever should conclude from thence, that the Bishop, as invested with the Episcopal Dignity, is not above the Presbyters, who are not honoured with that Office, would certainly Reason ill. It would be the same thing, as if he should infer, that a Gentleman is not above a Plebeian, or the Magistrate above the People; because, as Men, they are all Equal. The Bishop by his Primacy has a Degree, which raises him above those, whom the Priesthood makes Equal to him: And the Apostolical Chair, which he acquires by Succession, gives him a new Title, and a new Dignity, which the others have not. These are the Principles upon which I will build what I have to say in behalf of Episcopacy, and for promoting its Interest: Considering it, as I have described it in these three Observations, *viz.* As being of Divine Institution, Conformable in its Essentials to that which was establish'd by the Apostles, And as a superior Degree to the Presbyterat. Which I shall endeavour to prove, by shewing that it has been believed, and exercised as such during the three first Centuries; and that the Ecclesiastical State, from the time of the Apostles, has been composed of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, as of three distinct Orders for the Work of the Ministry; whereof the two last were always subordinate to the first.

C H A P. III.

*A General Proof, that the Hierarchy is of Divine and Apostolical Institution.*

HAVING thus stated the Question, and particularly explained the Sense and Meaning of Divine and Apostolical Institution, as it may be used in this Controversie: I come now to apply it, and to prove here in general, that the Hierarchy, or the Episcopal Government, is of Divine and Apostolical Institution, in the Senses I have delivered, and explained.

*Episcopacy of Divine Institution.*

As to the first Sense then, of Divine Institution; the Point being now to prove, that Jesus Christ has appointed an Hierarchical Order in the Christian Church, two things are observable. 1. That Jesus Christ having not spoken in his Gospel against that Form of Government, which then obtained in the true Church, *viz.* the Jewish, nor any way discountenanced it; but only reproved the false Glosses, and Traditions of the Doctors of the Law; he has thereby tacitly approved it, and judged it proper to be perpetuated in the Christian: According to that known Maxim, *Qui tacet, consentire videtur.* Now it is certain, that the Discipline of the *Mosaical* Religion, in the time of our Saviour, was Hierarchical; there being a Subordination in the Degrees of the Ministry. Our Lord then having not destroy'd it in his new *Œconomy*, he has ratify'd it. And moreover, he has fram'd upon that Model the Discipline, and Subordination of the Evangelical Ministry: Excepting however what

*In the first Sense.*

was Ceremonial, and Typical in the first; in which respect he fulfilled in his own Person the Form of that ancient Ministry, which consisted chiefly in Sacrificing. 2. The second thing to be observed is, that Jesus Christ has declared himself expressly upon the establishing of the Hierarchy in the Christian Church. It cannot be deny'd, but there was a Subordination of Degrees between the twelve Apostles, the Prophets of the New Testament, and the Evangelists; as it will appear there was between the standing Pastors, and those who served the Church in their time. To affirm, that they shared equally the Ministerial Function, and that the Apostles were not above the rest; is to set forth a Proposition, which is purely false: Each one observed his Station, and the Inferiors obey'd their Superiors. Now it was Jesus Christ, who appointed those different Orders amongst them. For *St. Paul*, speaking of the Institution of the Gospel-Ministry, tells us, *Ephes. iv. 11, 12. That he that ascended up on high*, viz. the Son of God, being willing to provide for the Building up of his Church, *He gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors and Teachers; for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ.* If it was he himself gave these divers sorts of Offices, Ministries, or Gifts; if it was he himself made this Subordination; he has not only expressed himself plainly upon the Form of the Ecclesiastical Government, but he has likewise settled himself such a Discipline: And consequently it is of Divine Institution, in the first Sense. And it cannot be pretended, with any colour of Reason, that the Church-Government, which was in use in the Days of the Apostles, was not Hierarchical.

Against this is to no purpose the Distinction which is commonly brought in, of Ministers Ordinary, and Extraordinary; of Ministers for a Time, and such as were to be Perpetual by Succession in the Church. For since Jesus Christ had appointed both the one, and the other, in the time of the Apostles; *For the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, and for the edifying of his Body*: It is plain, there was a Subordination between them, by his own Institution. And it signifies as little to alledge, that that Subordination was to be but for a Season: It was then for that Season. But it has lasted beyond the Time, wherein our Adversaries pretend, that the Hierarchy of the Ordinary, and Permanent Ministers began: Since in the second Century †, at least in the middle of it, there were Prophets, and Evangelists. So that by the very Concession of those who oppose the Hierarchy, there was then, *viz.* in the Age of the Apostles (as it will appear there has been all along) a Subordination amongst the Ministers in the Christian Church.

What is farther alledged against this plain Passage, that there is no mention made in it of *Bishops*; and consequently, that their Superiority above the Presbyters, and the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, cannot be fairly deduced from it, is to as little purpose: If we impartially consider the Terms of *Pastors*, and *Teachers*, or *Doctors*, in the Text; which are equivalent to that of *Bishops* in other places. But before I shew that, it is material to observe, that though there are two words put here, *Pastors*, and *Teachers*, which may seem to denote two distinct sorts of Officers in the Church; yet they signify but one, and the same. For the Apostle, distinguishing the others by, first,

---

† Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. c. 3. Ibid. lib. 3. c. 37.

*Apostles*; secondly, *Prophets*; thirdly, *Evangelists*; but joining *Pastors* and *Teachers* together, by a *Conjunction copulative*, as the *Grammarians* speak, Ποιμνῆες ἔτι Διδάσκαλοι; is a clear Intimation, that he meant them so; if the Sense of them did not require it, as we are going to shew.

Ποιμνῆες then, or *Pastors*, is a Word borrow'd from *Husbandry*, and *Pasturage*; and transferr'd from a Natural and Proper Use, to an Instituted and Figurative, both Civil, and Ecclesiastical. And therefore in *Homer*, when it is put with *People*, it signifies a *King*, Ποιμνὴ Δαῖς. And it is said, *Matth. ii. 6.* out of *Mic. 5. 2.* *That out of Bethlehem shall come a Governour, ὅστις ποιμνηεῖ τὸ Λαόν μου τὸ Ἰσραήλ; that shall rule or feed my People Israel.* In several places of the New Testament, it is apply'd to *Jesus Christ*; and joined with that of *Bishop*, as importing the same thing, *1 Pet. ii. 25.* *You are now returned unto the Shepherd, or Pastor, and Bishop of your Souls.* As likewise in effect to the same *St. Peter*, by *Jesus Christ* himself three several times, *John xxi. 15, 16, 17.* where he commands him to feed his *Lambs, and Sheep.* And to the *Elders of Ephesus* by *St. Paul*, who calls them in the same manner *Bishops*, *Acts xx. 28.* *Take heed, says he, unto your selves, and to all the Flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, or Bishops, Ἐπισκόπους, to feed the Church of God, which he has purchased with his own Blood.* As does also *St. Peter* those of the *Strangers scatter'd throughout Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bitynia*, *1 Pet. v. 1, 2.* *The Elders which are among you, tells he them, I exhort; Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the Oversight thereof, Ἐπισκοπέητε.* But if we will take the Comment of *St. Chrysostom*, and the *Scholiasts* upon the places, it puts this matter out of Controversie, that by *Pastors* here we ought to understand *Bishops*: "The Apo-  
" file

“ He speaks of those, to whom Churches were  
 “ committed, namely, of *Bishops*; such as were  
 “ *Timothy, Titus*, and the like.

As to the *Teachers, Doctors*, or *Διδασκαλοι*; which are here joined together by an Exegetical, or Explanatory Particle: When that Term is used, as the former of *Pastors*, to denote a peculiar Function in the Church, they can be no others, than *Bishops*. So even amongst our own Writers, where \* *Bede* says, that *Austin* summon'd a Council of *Bishops* and *Doctors*; we can hardly understand by that double Appellation, any others, than the former: The Words signifying the two parts of the same Office, or the same Officers in two different respects. And as the *Teachers* are distinguish'd from the *Prophets*, and *Apostles*, 1 Cor. xii. 28. by first, *Apostles*; secondarily, *Prophets*; thirdly, *Teachers*; after that, *Miracles*; then *Gifts of Healing, Helps, Governments, diversities of Tongues*: Much after the same manner, as the *Pastors* and *Teachers* are here from the others: So is there a Distinction to be made, if we will speak strictly, between *Prophet* and *Evangelist*, and *Evangelist* and *Teacher*. This Function of a *Gospel-Prophet* was properly to declare more at large the Doctrine of Faith, to those who had already receiv'd it from the *Apostles*, or *Evangelists*; and to confirm it out of *Moses*, and the ancient *Prophets*. Of an *Evangelist*, to Preach the Word to such as had not yet heard it. And of a *Teacher*, as to that part, much the same with a *Prophet's*; but so, according to the Greek Fathers, that this spoke all from the Spirit; but the other, as they express it, from himself too.

I must add a Word or two here concerning the *Ἡγούμενοι*, which we translate in our New Testament, *those that have the Rule*, the Governours:

---

\* *Bed. Hist. Eccles. lib. 11. cap. 2.*

Because they are sometimes mentioned there, particularly, *Heb. xiii. 7. Remember them which have the Rule over you, who have spoken unto you the Word of God. whose Faith follow, considering the end of their Conversation.* And *Verf. 17. Obey them that have the Rule over you, and submit your selves:* And in the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, which I shall have occasion to quote. That they were Bishops, besides other Arguments that might be produced, we have the Judgment of *St. Chrysoftom*, and others: *He speaks of Bishops*, says the Father upon the place. And who were *those that had the Rule over them*, i. e. the *Hebrews*; the Greek Commentators upon that Epistle tell us, *They were the singular Præfets of Jerusalem, and of all the Cities in Palestina.* So that I presume, no more need be said here concerning this Point.

As to the second Sense of Divine Institution; it is evident, that Episcopacy is of Divine, and also of Apostolical Right, in the Sense I have explained: Since the Apostles have set it forth, and convey'd it to the Church by the Direction of Jesus Christ, and the Inspiration of the Holy Spirit. *St. Paul*, in his first Epistle to *Timothy*, Chap. iii. and in that to *Titus*, Chap. i. supposing the Office of a Bishop to be a standing one in the Church, and calling it a good Work; describes his Character in full. And not only so, but he gives those two Bishops, throughout those Epistles, several important Instructions, how they ought to behave themselves in the House of God, as Bishops. Moreover, in his Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. xiii. Ver. 17. he charges them, *To Obey them that have the Rule over them, and to submit themselves.* And in his first to the *Thessalonians*, Chap. v. Ver. 12, 13. he exhorts them, *To know them which labour among them, and are over them*

*them in the Lord, and admonish them; and to esteem them highly in Love for their Works sake.* But when he was at *Miletus*, in his way to *Jerusalem*, he not only sent for the Elders of the Church to come to him at *Ephesus*, and resigned up to them his Care of the Flock; but he also put them in mind, *That the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers, or Bishops over it, to feed the Church of God,* (the word in the Original implies, *to instruct, and govern*) *which he hath purchased with his own Blood,* Acts xx. 28. So that I am bold to say, none can deny Episcopacy to be of Divine and Apostolical Institution, in this Sense, but such as reject the Authority of the Scriptures. For supposing these things to have been done, and said by the Apostle. It must have been in Obedience to the Commands Jesus Christ gave, concerning the Government of the Church, in the space between our Lord's Resurrection and Ascension, which they might impart to him after his calling to the Apostleship: And in compliance with the Inspirations of the Holy Ghost, who acted immediately in him, and by him. And therefore these things are attributed to the Spirit, 1 Cor. xii. 28. and he is said there to have set the several Ministeries in the Church. It was He that directed the Lot for *Matthias*, Acts i. 26. And that said, Chap. xiii. 2. *Separate now unto me Barnabas and Saul, for the Work whereunto I have called them:* And that in the beginning pointed out the very Persons for the Ministry, either by Inspiration, or some remarkable Gifts. The Apostles then did but declare, and execute the Orders of Jesus Christ, and his Spirit; who were the Principles of their Words, and Actions: They were but the Instruments those Divine Persons made use of, to set forth their Intentions, and the Plan they had made of the Government of the Church. But the Effect

ought

ought to be attributed to the principal Cause. And therefore if Jesus Christ, and the Holy Ghost, have given such Directions to the Apostles, and enjoyned them to publish them to the World; they ought to be look'd upon as Divine: And what is so deliver'd, is of Divine, and Apostolical Institution. Which will farther appear in the course of this Treatise.

As to the third Sense of Divine  
*In the third* Institution; it is pretty plain, that  
*Sense.* Episcopacy is of Divine, and Apostolical Right, in that lowest Sense: Since if the Apostles themselves have exercised such a kind of Government in the Church, and transmitted the same to others, as I doubt not to make it appear in the Series of this Tract; they have done it pursuant to the Commission they had received from Jesus Christ, and according to the Pattern he had set them. Besides the secret Conferences he had with them after his Resurrection; before he left the World, and them, he gave them a formal Commission, *Matth. xxviii. 19, 20. To go, and teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things which he had commanded them: And lo, he would be with them to the end of the World:* That is, to gather and constitute the Christian Church. This he had promised them before, in some measure, in the Power of the Keys, when he told *St. Peter, Matth. xvi. 18, 19. Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against it. And I will give unto thee the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt bind on Earth, shall be bound in Heaven; and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth, shall be loosed in Heaven.* But that none may pretend, this Promise was only made to *St. Peter*, it is expressly

expressly repeated to all the Apostles, after our Lord's Resurrection, and in part made good to them, till the Completion of it upon the Descent of the Holy Ghost, *John xx. 22, 23.* when He *breathed on them, and said unto them, Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whose soever Sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whose soever Sins ye retain, they are retained.* And at the same time, (*all Power being given unto him in Heaven, and in Earth, as he declares in St. Matthew xxviii. 18.*) he Commissions them to their Office, in these words, *As the Father hath sent me, even so send I you,* *John xx. 21.* Now the Father sent his Son Jesus Christ into the World, by his Essential Sovereign Power, to form a new Church, the *Christian* in the room of the *Jewish*. And He, by Virtue of that Authority, whilst he continued here on Earth, preach'd the Gospel; instituted some Rites to be perpetually used amongst the Faithful, *vis.* the two Sacraments; called certain Disciples, whom he governed according to his good Pleasure; to whom he gave Commandments, and whom he employ'd in several Transactions: And in a word, laid the Foundations of his Spiritual State. And having finish'd the Work he came about, as far as it was necessary for him; and being to return to Heaven, which he had left but for a time: To propagate his Kingdom throughout the World, and to provide for the Continuation of it to the Consummation of all things; he thought fit, as he had been authorized himself to begin, so to empower some others to go on with the Project, which God had resolv'd upon from all Eternity, of calling an Universal Church. And thereupon he Commissioned his chief Followers, those who had been the constant Observers of his Doctrine, and Discipline, and whom he judg'd fittest for that Employment, to go and make all the Nations Disciples; initiating

ting them into the Church by Baptism: And he promised them, that in so doing, he would be with them by his Spiritual Presence, even to the Conclusion of the World. If then they went thereupon, and did so; was it not by Virtue of that Divine Authority, and in Conformity with his Instructions, and the Model he had set them, that they settled the Hierarchical Government in the Church? And if this does not make Episcopacy in its full Course throughout the several Ages of Christianity, to be of Divine Institution immediately; does it not mediate, and originally? But what likelihood is there, that the Apostles, of their own Heads, and depending upon their own Prudence, should undertake to establish a Form of Ecclesiastical Government, without Commission, Instructions, or Example? Would they not have been afraid to lay in the very bottom, upon which the Church stands, a Foundation subject to Ruin, and of dangerous Consequence? What! was not the Church liable to be corrupted in its Government, as well as in its Doctrine? And in this respect, would they order any thing, that was to be perpetual, whereof they might not say, We have thus received it of the Lord; and we deliver unto you, what we have received of him? And if God was not satisfied with giving *Moses* on Mount *Sinai* all the Laws, which the *Israelites* were to observe, to keep in his Covenant, until the time of the King, who was to restore all things, and settle a better Oeconomy; but was pleased farther to chalk out, to the least Cord of the Pattern of the Tabernacle, without which *Moses* would not have dared to go about it: could Jesus Christ be contented with delivering to his Apostles on Mount *Sion* the Doctrines of his Law, without the Plan of the Tabernacle of his Church, according to which they should

should build, and maintain it? Or of themselves, without his Commission, Instructions, or Example; would they have ventured upon so great a Work, wherein all things were to be done according to the Weight and Measure of the Sanctuary? This can no way be imagined; unless Men will say, that the Government of the Church is a matter of no moment, and which does not deserve, that God should take any course in it. But can that be thought a thing of no moment, or unworthy the Care of Jesus Christ, which is to establish the Order, Union, and Subsistence of his Church, to the end of the World? And after all, St. Paul tells us expressly, *Heb. v. 4. That no Man taketh this Honour unto himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron; i. e. can come into the Priesthood, but by a Divine Authority. And not only so, but that Jesus Christ himself, as Man, glorified not himself, to be made an High Priest: But he that said unto him, Thou art my Son, to day have I begotten thee, Ver. 5.*

Something must be said here for the Explication of that Expression in the Text, *Even unto the end of the World*, εως τ̄ (ωστελείας τ̄ αἰών)Ⓞ, Even unto the Consummation or Conclusion of the Age: Because it has been lately misapply'd, to restrain our Saviour's Promise to a very short space of Time, the End of the Jewish State, which happen'd soon after. And against the Perpetuity of his Commission to his Apostles, and their Successors. And the Government of the Christian Church grounded upon it. The Word 'Αἰών then, as it is translated by *Ævum*, *Age*; which are all the same, with the Terminations in their respective Languages, signifies properly a Duration of an Hundred Years. But the *Hebrews*, whose Style the holy Penmen of the *New Testament* commonly follow, use it in general for a longer space, than  
a Man's

a Man's Life; or at least, that which is unknown to them. And therefore, in a Figurative Sense, they imploy it to denote the *World*, whose Duration is measured by Time, but such as is hidden from us. For which Reason our Translators usually render it, both in the Singular, and Plural Number, by *the World*, or *the Worlds*. So that, by *the End of the World* here, we may understand the End of the Age, or of the World: Which comes to the same thing in this place. For it is observable, that our Lord does not express himself of the End of *this Age*, or *this World*; as if he had meant it of the then present Time, in the Jews Sense: But of his own, the Period of the Messias; which began upon his Resurrection, and was to be the last, according to them, and to continue to the end of this visible World. But if we consider what he joins with it there, as an Explication of his Meaning, *I am with you alway, all the Days*, *πάντα τὰς ἡμέρας*; after he had commanded them to *Go and Teach all Nations*; that Passage is capable of no other Interpretation, without the greatest Absurdities.

---

## C H A P. IV.

*General Proofs of the Hierarchy, and of the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry, in the Person of the Apostles.*

WHAT I have now said concerning the Divine, and Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, brings me orderly into the other Article of the Controversie, and a main Point in this Debate, *viz.* Whether Episcopacy has been in use in the Church from the very Time of the Apostles, as a distinct Government from Presbytery; and that from that Period, *viz.* from the first Age of Christianity, there has been a Subordination in the Ministry? Now to begin with the Apostles themselves: We meet in them with a pregnant Instance of the Episcopat's being distinguish'd from the Presbyterat. For though in the Quality of Presbyters, they were not above the Ministers of the same Order, who as such are all Equal; the Priesthood admitting of no Degrees, and being all in all; upon this account, that every one of them has a Right of Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments, in which consists the very Essence of the Office: Yet it cannot be deny'd, that they had some Authority above the others, in respect of the Government of the Church, which was committed to them. It is uncontroverted, that besides the Power of the Priesthood, they had a general Inspection over the Flock: And that the Clergy of each Church, which they had founded, held of them; and considered them as those who had the Conduct of the Sheepfold of our Lord,

and

and to whose Directions they were to conform, as being under their Jurisdiction. And they cannot be charged with having abused that Right of Inspection, and Superintendency; or to have changed it into that Dominion, which is condemned in the Gospel. For to exercise a Degree of Superiority, does not imply a Tyrannical Dominion: Otherwise all that are raised in Authority above others in this World, whose Beauty consists in that very Diversity of Degrees, and Offices, would be Tyrants; which I suppose none will affirm.

I expect, that it will be objected, That that Privilege of Governing the Churches, which I pretend the Apostles had above other Pastors, was an Appendix of their Apostleship, grounded upon their having gathered them. But if there be not, by a Divine Institution, divers Degrees of Dignity, and Authority in the Church; why will Men ascribe one to the Apostles, upon any account whatsoever? Our Adversaries must declare, according to their Principles, that all Ministers being Equal, the Apostles themselves had no more Right to govern the Churches in chief, than any Presbyters; and that what would be sinful in others, could not be innocent in them. Perhaps they will repeat again, That their Apostleship gave them that Authority. But that is what I contend for. *viz.* That they were thereby made Bishops; and consequently that Episcopacy had its Source in the Apostleship; since the Apostles, as such, had a Right of Inspecting, and Governing the Churches, above all other Pastors, in their several Districts. Moreover, call this distinguish'd Dignity, *Apostleship*, or *Episcopacy*, as you please; it will be but a change of the Name: The Thing in the bottom will be still the same, *viz.* That the Apostles enjoyed a Pre-eminency, and had a Superiority above the other Ministers, whom they had settled in  
their

their respective Churches; wherein consists properly the Office of a Bishop. Now that they had such a Power in the Church, superior to that of the other Pastors, (whether Bishops, or Presbyters) who were Equal to them in other respects; is, I think, very clear: If we will judge of it by their Practice, and their own Testimony. *St. Paul* tells us expressly, *2 Cor. xi. 28. That he had the Care of all the Churches.* It was his Business then to build them up; and to cause the Order, which he had establish'd in them, to be well observed. And hereof he gives us a particular Instance, as to the Church of *Ephesus*, *Acts xx.* which I have before mentioned to another purpose. Going bound in the Spirit unto *Jerusalem*, and being apprehensive they should see his Face no more; he sends from *Miletus* to *Ephesus*, and calls for the Elders of the Church; who being come to him, as owning him for their general Governor; he delivers to them the Instructions, which he thought necessary, to keep up the Body in a sound State, by a pure Doctrine, and a good Discipline; *Acts xx. 28. Take heed therefore,* says he to them, *unto your selves, and to all the Flock, over the which the Holy Ghost hath made you Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he hath purchased with his own Blood.* I mean not by all this, that the Apostles had no more than the Bishops, their Successors; for their infallible Spirit, their extraordinary Gifts, and their unlimited Commission, must make a great difference: But that they were alike in the standing part of their Administration, and the Essentials of Episcopacy.

But to set this Matter in its due Light; the Episcopal Dignity of the Apostles, appears chiefly in Four things.

*The Episcopal Dignity of the Apostles appear in Four Things.*

I. In their  
Writing to the  
Churches.

I. In that they assumed to themselves the Authority of Writing their Doctrine, and Discipline to the Churches, which they had founded, as their Directors in both. Thus St. Paul writ his Epistles to the *Romans*, *Corinthians*, *Galatians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, *Colossians*, *Thessalonians*, and *Hebrews*: And even to the Bishops, whom he had Ordained, and left to supply his absence; as *Timothy*, and *Titus*: As likewise to private Persons; as *Philemon*, *Apphia*, and to *Archippus*, of the Clerical Order. Thus did St. James write a General Epistle to the *twelve Tribes*, which were scatter'd abroad. Thus did also St. Peter two General ones, to the *Strangers* scatter'd throughout *Pontus*, *Galatia*, *Cappadocia*, *Asia*, and *Bithynia*. Thus did St. Jude a General one to them that were sanctified by God the Father, and preserved in Christ Jesus, and called. And thus did St. John one General, and two Particular ones, to the Elect Lady, and her Children, (probably the Church of *Jerusalem*;) and to *Gaius*, a Layman; besides his *Revelation* to the seven Churches in *Asia*. Now to what end did they write these Epistles, which are found in the very Body of the *New Testament*, to those Churches which they had founded, or which they had reserved to themselves to govern; or which, by virtue of their general Commission, as Apostles, of edifying the Church of Christ, they had a Right to direct above their particular Pastors? To what end, I say, did they do this, but to maintain a sound Doctrine, and a good Order in them? Was it not for these two Ends, that they took upon them to write; and that both Ministers, and People should follow their Instructions? Certainly they would not have pretended to such an Authority, if they had not believed, that those they writ to, were bound to submit

submit to their Constitutions; and to conform to their Discipline, as well as to their Doctrine. For those Writings contain Rules of Discipline, for the well ordering of the Church; no less than Doctrines of Faith, to instruct its Belief.

2. The Episcopal Dignity of the Apostles appears in their Visiting the Churches, to see how Matters went there; and to take a course in them for the future, if there was occasion. Those holy Men were not content with sending them their Instructions in their Epistles, when they were oblig'd to be absent; that a good Order might be kept up in them: But they were careful, as their chief Governors, to Visit them in Person, to know if they continued sound in Doctrine, and Discipline. For in those Visitations, they not only Preached the Gospel, but they ordained what both Pastors, and Flocks were to do: They corrected what was amiss, they abrogated what was inconvenient, they supplied what was wanting, and they appointed what was necessary for a good Government. Hereof St. Paul gives us a plain Evidence in himself, declaring to the *Corinthians*, 1 Cor. iv. 19, 21. *That he would come to them shortly*; to redress the Schism, which some false Apostles were fomenting amongst them; and to correct their Contentions with the *Rod of Discipline*, by Excommunicating the Delinquents. And he tells them, 2 Cor. xiii. 2. *That if he came again, he would not spare*, viz. those who disturbed the Church by their Divisions, and other Disorders. If he had not had some Authority in the Government of the Flock, and a superior Degree to the other Pastors; would he have threatned them with such a Visitation? Would not those, who troubled the Church, have answered him, We have no occasion for your Coming; we are all Equal; we will Govern our selves, as

2. *In their Visiting them.*

we understand it: And as for the Flock, we can take care of it without you; we dread not the Thunderbolts; you would frighten us, by bringing your Rod with you? Those who had a mind to destroy the Reputation of the Apostle at *Corinth*, would not have lost this opportunity; nor failed to censure, and exaggerate this superior Authority, which he assumed to himself over the Clergy; and likewise over the Laity, which was committed to them, as well as to him. The Apostles undertook those Visitations, in the Churches they had founded, not only to maintain there a good Discipline; but also to ordain the Pastors, (if there was not sufficient Provision made) who were necessary for their Edification. For without such an Ordination, they could neither Preach the Word, nor Administer the Sacraments, nor perform the Functions of Ministers in any respect. This Fact is proved by their Practice at their Visitations. And when they could not attend it themselves, (as indeed they could not often) by reason of the distance of the Places they were at, or their being taken up with more pressing Affairs of the Church; they deputed in their room some of the most excellent Pastors about them, whom they invested with their Authority, by ordaining them Bishops; and giving them a Commission to regulate the Concerns of those Churches, and confer Orders there, by the Imposition of their Hands on such as they should judge worthy to be admitted into them. Thus were Ordained, and Deputed *Apollos*, *Timothy*, *Titus*, *Mark*, &c. And say not, that it was so done through Necessity, because there were no Pastors whither they went to perform that Office. For those Churches were already planted: And it is most certain, they had in them a Clergy, which consisted of several Ministers; as is evident in those of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, *Theſſalonica*, &c. And consequently

consequently if all the Ministers were Equal, and had a Right of Ordaining, they might have done it themselves, without putting the Apostles to the trouble, and hazard of long Journeys, and dangerous Voyages; or for that purpose, obliging them to depute Bishops. Notwithstanding, we do not find, that in the time of the Apostles, any one was admitted into the Ministry, but by them, or by those to whom they had given such a Commission. The Power of Ordaining was in the Hands of those who possessed a distinguish'd Authority: Otherwise there would have been no need, that the Apostles, or their Commissioners, should cross Countries, and Seas, to institute Ministers into Churches, which had a numerous Clergy, if these might have done it without them. It was for these Reasons, that *St. John*, who was Bishop of *Ephesus*, returned to that Church, as soon as he was discharged from his Banishment into the Isle of *Pathmos*. For, according to the Testimonies of *Ireneus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, which \* *Eusebius* reports: *Domitian* being dead, *St. John* the Apostle and Evangelist, came and dwelt in *Asia*, where he resumed the Government of all the Churches, which belonged to the Province of *Ephesus*, as their common Bishop, and Inspector; appointing Bishops where there should be any, Admitting the Clergy, and providing for the good Order of those Churches. "Whereof, says † *Ireneus*, "all the Presbyters are Witneses, who "have seen *John*, and must have known, that he "did all these things. And again, || "The Church "which is at *Ephesus*, was founded by *St. Paul*, and "governed by *St. John*, who dwelt there till the

---

\* *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 23. Clem. Alex. de Divit. Salv. Num. 42.*

† *Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 2. cap. 3.*

|| *Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 3.*

“ time of *Trajan*. Who was there but *St. John*, that was Pastor of all the Churches in that District? In the very Days of *St. Paul*, as appears from the Place before cited, *Acts xx.* they were already many: And doubtless they were yet more numerous in the Reign of *Nerva*, and *Trajan*. But *St. John* was the first of them, and the chief Bishop of that Province. And therefore, as soon as he obtained his Liberty, he returned to his Flock; and exercised the Office of Bishop amongst them unto the Day of his Death.

3. *In the Churches submitting to their Directions.*

3. The Episcopal Dignity of the Apostles appears in the Deference the Churches paid them, by submitting to their Directions. It was the constant Custom of the Christians, when there was any Question about the Government, and the Rule which was to be observed by the Flock of Christ, to give notice of it immediately to their respective Apostles; to the end they might have their Sense upon it, and might know how to behave themselves, when a Disorder was gotten in among them. This the Church of *Corinth* Religiously kept towards *St. Paul*. And therefore never failed to acquaint him with the Contentions, which from time to time disturbed its Body; with the Incest of one of its Members; with the Law Suits, which several of them brought in against their Brethren, before the Tribunal of the Unbelievers; with divers Cases concerning Marriage; with the Points concerning Meats offered unto Idols, and indifferent things; with several Disorders in its Religious Assemblies, how their Men Prayed, and Prophefied with their Heads covered, and the Women uncovered; and some spake in an unknown Tongue; and with their prophaning the Lord's Supper. And likewise desired his Counsel concerning the Maintenance of  
the

the Ministry, and the Collections for the Saints. And all this, that the old Leaven should be purged out; and that he might give the *Corinthians* his Directions upon these Points, and restore the Church to a good Order. Which the Apostle took special care of; as appears from the several Answers he returned them upon all these Points, which concern the Government of the Church; wherein he instructs them, what they ought to do, in his Judgment, upon these Emergencies. If these Proceedings, and Transactions between the Church of *Corinth* and *St. Paul*, and *St. Paul* and the Church of *Corinth*, do not shew plainly, that its Clergy owned some Superiority in him, as to its Government; since both Pastors, and Flock desired his Instructions, as of one who had the Inspection over them: And if after this, Men will pretend, that all the Ministers of that Church were Equal with the Apostle, and that they equally shared with him the Authority in it; I do not see, but they may wrangle to the World's end about the clearest Matters of Fact. The turbulent Pastors, who sought, by their Interest amongst the People, to make the Church of *Corinth* say, *I am of such an one, and I am of such an one*, would undoubtedly have hissed at all those Regulations of *St. Paul*; and would not have failed to clamour openly, *What has he to do to meddle with our Flock?* But they were too sensible, that the Church would own his Authority, and submit to his Directions. And *St. Paul* knew full-well, that such a Deference was due to him, as being the Superior, under whom the Clergy of *Corinth* administered the Government. For which reason he performs the Duty of Bishop in it; and they acquiesce in his Authority over them. If it comes to this at last, that our Adversaries, being forc'd by the Evidence of Truth, will acknowledge upon the whole matter, that the

Apostles were general Superintendents in the Church; and that they had a superior Power in their Judgments and Determinations, in respect of Discipline, as well as Doctrine, from which there lay no Appeal; as indeed it cannot well now be denied: I have as much as I desire. For it does follow from thence, that they had an Authority, which the other Pastors had not. Whether they had it as Apostles, or Bishops, is not very material: It is enough for me to prove, that from the Apostolical time, *inclusivè*, there have been Pastors in the Churches, who had a superior Authority above the others; which is the Foundation of the Episcopal Dignity. Whether it was *quatenus Apostoli*, or *quatenus Episcopi*; the Name does not change the Thing: The Distinction of Degrees remains between the Ministers, and their Equality is destroyed, as to the Point in dispute.

4. In the  
Apostles casting  
Men out of the  
Church.

4. The Episcopal Dignity of the Apostles appears in their Power of casting Men out of the Church. When the Apostles had a just cause to proceed to that Extremity with any one, they were used to pronounce an Excommunication against him, and to signify it to the Faithful; who approved, and executed it. I shall not instance here only in the case of the Incestuous Person at *Corinth*, against whom that Church would not pass to an *Anathema*, without the Advice of *St. Paul*: He was obliged to deliver the Sentence himself, and to send it to the Clergy, to be put in Execution. It is remarkable, that he writes to *Timothy*, to the end the Church should take notice of it; that of his own Authority he had delivered unto Satan *Hymeneus*, and *Alexander*, 1 *Tim.* i. 20. It is probable he did no less by *Phygellus*, and *Hermogenes*, 2 *Tim.* i. 15. *Demas*, and *Alexander* the Coppersmith, *Chap.* iv. 10, 14.

For

For to what purpose does he Characterize them in that manner, but that all the Faithful may know, that they were cast out of the Church; and that they were not to Communicate with them; nor even, as it is express'd, 2 *John* 10. *to bid them, God speed?* And as the Apostles took upon them to Excommunicate Men, so did they likewise to Restore them to the Church. Witness the Excommunicated Person, 2 *Cor.* ii. whom, upon his Repentance, *St. Paul* forgave, and of himself reconciled to the Peace of the Church. From which several Instances, it is evident, that the Apostles had a Right of themselves to Excommunicate Delinquents, without giving a Reason to the other Pastors of their Proceedings therein; or to call the Clergy together for that purpose. As likewise that they had a paramount Authority; and that in that, no more than in many other things, the other Pastors were not Equal with them.

---

C H A P. V.

*Divers Proofs, that in the Time of the Apostles there were Bishops, distinguish'd from the other Ministers, and establish'd by them.*

W<sup>H</sup>at I have delivered above, relates particularly to the Apostles. But in respect of the Ministers in general, this Question may be put here, *viz.* Whether in the time of the Apostles there were Bishops, *i. e.* Pastors, who answered to those that are now at the Head of the Clergy; and

and are distinguish'd from the rest by their Power of Ordaining, and because the chief Government of the Church of their District belongs to them? To which I answer :

1. That admitting, for Argument-sake, that there were not; that would not abate any thing of the Antiquity of Episcopacy, which I have carry'd up to the Apostolical Period: Because the Apostles themselves were Bishops of the Universal Church, and distinguish'd from the other Pastors; besides that its Government was in their Hands, and they dispens'd it as they judg'd fit. They were general Superintendents, upon whom depended the Conduct of all the Faithful; and from whom is derived the Office of Bishop, as from its Spring: So that they alone might be sufficient, at that time, to be the Governors of the Christian Church.

2. That it is certain in Fact, that the Apostles in their Life-time communicated to some Persons the Office of Bishops; as is evident in *St. James*, and *St. Simeon*, Bishops of *Jerusalem*; and particularly in *St. Timothy*, and *St. Titus*; the former whereof was ordained the first Bishop of the Church of the *Ephesians*, and the latter of the *Cretans*; as we have it specified in the Subscriptions of the Epistles to them; which, though no part of Canonical Scripture, are yet of good Antiquity. For a farther Proof of which, *St. Paul* enjoins *Timothy*, 1 Tim. iv. 22. *To lay Hands suddenly on no Man*; and Chap. iii. 6. to admit *no Novice*, i. e. one newly come to the Faith, into the Episcopal Order: And gives him several Instructions relating to the Exercise of his Jurisdiction. And the same Apostle tells *Titus*, Chap. i. 5. *That for this cause he had left him in Crete, that he should ordain Elders in every City; as he had appointed him*: And sends him several Directions for the Governing of that Church. Besides that it is well known, that they

they both actually performed the Office of Bishops, whilst they continued in those Districts. And not only so, but if those Bishops happen'd to die before them, the Apostles constituted others in their room, that the Succession might not fail; as appears, besides *St. Simcon*, in several of the *Asiatick* Bishops in the time of *St. John*.

3. That it was the Custom of the Apostles, when they perceived a Church well settled, and the Divine Providence called them to plant the Gospel in another place; and they thought they should see the Face of that Flock no more; to leave there some one of their ablest, and most zealous Disciples; and to appoint him to be Bishop in their room; to preside over the Clergy, and have the chief Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs. Whereof we meet with a fair Example in *St. John* the Apostle and Evangelist. The Inspection of the *Asiatick* Churches had been committed to him, and he had governed them a long time; as we have intimated before, in Person. But the Emperor *Domitian* condemned him to Banishment: Or, as some suggest, foreseeing what would befall him, he withdrew into the Island of *Pathmos* in the *Archipelagus*; and left *Timothy*, or his Successor, to supply his Place at *Ephesus*. Now it is generally agreed amongst the Church-Historians, that one of them two was Bishop of that District, whilst the Apostle was under Confinement in that Island. What! was it because there was no other Pastor in the Province of *Ephesus*, that laboured in it? Nothing less; but he is particularly taken notice of amongst the rest, by reason he filled the Chair in *St. John's* absence, as the first Minister of that Church, which he had left to him to govern in chief, as he had done; and whom he found there, when he returned to it from *Pathmos*, to resume the Functions of his Apostleship; whereby  
he

he was made as it were a Transcendent, and Universal Bishop of the Churches in that Province. Which is the ground why the Spirit, who revealed to the Apostle what passed there, and what would befall his Substitute, if he did not so and so; styles him *the Angel of the Church of Ephesus*, Rev. ii. 1.

4. That not only St. *John*, but also the other Apostles, used that Custom; settling towards the end of their Course, or when they were called to remote Parts, or were likely to be hindered from their Function by any Accident; some one or more of their chief Disciples, if there was occasion, as Bishops in their Churches; being the most proper for that Work, as having learned from them, how they were to Govern the Church of Christ; and been Eye-witnesses of their Conduct, and Hearers of their Discipline. And for an irrefragable Proof of this, we see that being so appointed by the Apostles, they filled the first Places in their respective Churches; appearing at the Head of their Clergy, and administering Affairs in chief. Witness, besides those before mentioned, St. *Clemens* at *Rome*, St. *Ignatius* at *Antioch*, St. *Polycarp* at *Smyrna*, and his contemporary Bishops in *Asia*, who all took upon them the Title of *Bishops*; and distinguish'd themselves Personally from the rest of the Clergy, as being the principal Governours of the Churches of their Districts. And if those Successors of the Apostles enjoyed a Degree of Pre-eminency above the other Ministers, with whom they edified their Churches; and if all Primitive Antiquity has look'd upon them as Bishops, whilst it gives but the Name of Presbyters, or Deacons, to those who were associated with them in the Work of the Ministry; (which is a matter of Fact, that cannot be contested, without contradicting the Writings of the Fathers of the first Ages of Christianity;

Christianity;

Christianity; as I shall have occasion hereafter to shew;) what likelihood is there, that they would assume to themselves the Quality of Bishops, and cause themselves to be thus distinguish'd from their Clergy, if they had not learned this Distinction from their Masters? Would they conspire unanimously together, to overthrow the establish'd Government of the Church? Or could they make all at once, and in the very first Generation, such a notable Change in the Discipline? Is not this, in effect, to offer the highest Violence and Injustice to those Apostolical Men, to accuse them of such an Innovation? Would not some one or other, at least, have stood up against it? And would not this Distinction of Bishop, from Presbyter, and Deacon, which the former had introduced to build their Superiority and Dignity upon, have occasioned a Noise in the Church? Yet all these things pass quietly and peaceably, and go on in their ordinary course: *Antioch* has its Bishop, *Ephesus* has its Bishop, *Smyrna*, *Magnesia*, *Tralles*, and *Philadelphia*: And the other Ministers, who serve with them in those Churches, are simply Presbyters, or Deacons. What can be concluded from all this, but that the Apostles taught their Successors such a Form of Government? And that, lest there should be a Schism occasioned in the Churches, by that cursed Ambition, which too naturally sets each Pastor upon appropriating one to himself; they had taken care betimes to appoint one, who should be the principal Rector of it: To the end, by that means, the other Ministers might be kept within Bounds, and not divide the Body of Christ. In following therefore the Hierarchical Form, the Successors of the Apostles did but follow their Precept, and Example: So far from innovating any thing in the Ecclesiastical Government! Which could not have been done

done without great Heats; whereof some Footsteps would appear in the History of those Times. But since, on the contrary, we see nothing but an unanimous Consent amongst all those holy Men, as to the chusing of a Pastor, who should be the Chief in his Church; and should be acknowledged for the Bishop thereof, in Contradistinction to the rest of the Clergy; and that they themselves were willing to be so specified: It is evident, they continued such a Succession by an Apostolical Tradition; and that they therein did but tread in the Paths of their Forerunners and Founders.

---

## C H A P. VI.

### *A Particular Proof of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, in the Person of St. James Bishop of Jerusalem.*

THE preceding Argument makes out, I presume, that the Successors of the Apostles continued the Episcopal Government in the Church, by a Tradition which they had received from them. Which is very true; but is not all the ground they went upon. They did not so only by that Principle, which yet might have been sufficient; but they were moreover induced thereunto by the very Practice of the Apostles, who themselves had put it in Execution. And to come to particular, and distinct Proofs of this; I shall give here a very plain Instance, which will shew us, that Episcopacy is of Apostolical Institution; and that the Distinction of Ministers in the Church, was settled by them  
in

in the very beginning; *viz.* That of *St. James*, the Son of *Joseph* or *Alpheus*, and of his first Wife *Salome*; commonly called the *Just*, and the *Less*. This Man, out of a particular respect to our Lord's Family, was constituted the first Bishop of *Jerusalem* by the Apostles themselves, in Contradistinction to the other Pastors, who served with him in that Church; and to themselves likewise, who were never stiled Bishops of *Jerusalem*; that Character being peculiar to *St. James* during his Life. Now that that Apostle (for he was a secondary one, though none of the Twelve) was chosen to be Bishop there, and that he was the first settled in that See, in that Quality, by the Apostles; we have the Testimony of three Faithful Writers, *viz. Hegesippus, Clemens Alexandrinus, and Eusebius*. They all agree in it\*: But the second speaks thus of it; "That though *Peter, James, and John*, after our Saviour's Ascension, " were by our Lord raised to the highest Dignity: " Yet they did not contend among themselves " about that Honour; but chose *James the Just* " Bishop of *Jerusalem*. What is the Meaning of these Words? Why, certainly *Clemens*, and after him *Eusebius*, would acquaint us; that though *Peter, James, and John*, were more eminent than the other Apostles, after the Ascension of our Lord, upon the account of their greater Gifts; which makes *Clemens* say there, † " That our Lord, after " his Resurrection, gave the Gift of Knowledge " to *James the Just*, and to *John*, and to *Peter*; " and they to the rest: Yet these two last would not take upon them the Primacy of *Jerusalem*, out of respect to the Family of the other. And that having, with the other Apostles, establish'd

---

\* *Hegesip. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 23.*  
 † *Clem. Alex. Ibid. lib. 2. cap. 1.*

*James* the *Less* Bishop of that See; they consider'd him, even whilst they were actually with him, as Bishop of the whole Body of that Church; to whom appertained *the Throne* of it, as \* *Eusebius* expresses it. This must be the natural Sense of these two Authors, and no other. Which shews us plainly, that Episcopacy was a distinguish'd Dignity in the very time of the Apostles; and that they yielded the Primacy to him, to whom the See of *Jerusalem* did belong, viz. *St. James*, surnamed the *Just*; who was thereunto chiefly promoted, because he was our Lord's next Kinsman. There is no Man can reflect upon these Passages, but he must allow this to be the true Meaning of them. Otherwise let any one explain to me, what *Hegeſippus* has understood, when he said, † "That *James* received the Administration " of that Church from the Apostles. And to the same effect *Clemens*, and *Eusebius*, || "That the Apostles chose, or constituted him Bishop of *Jerusalem*. Doubtless the Apostles thereby conferr'd on him a Primacy, which they would by no means encroach upon; well knowing it could belong but to one, if a good Order was observed. For if they were all to share equally the Primacy, and Episcopacy in that Church; what had they a mind to bestow upon him, when they made him Bishop of *Jerusalem*; and refused to contend with him about that Office there? Certainly their plain Intention was, to give him in that respect a Degree of Eminency above them; and as long as they remain with him there, they will look upon him in that Church as their Bishop, and Primate. This is what *Hegeſippus*, *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Eusebius* relate concerning *St. James* the *Just*, and the

\* *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. c. 23.*† *Ibid.*|| *Suprà.*

*Lefs*; writing the History of the Establishment and Government of the Christian Church in its Birth, and under the Eyes of the Apostles. And it is to be observed, that they report this Fact, as having happen'd *after our Blessed Saviour's Ascension into Heaven*, viz. Soon after he had instituted the Evangelical Ministry, and the Pastors began to exercise their several Functions.

But because we have to do with Men, who will scarce allow the Accounts of the Primitive Fathers, the common Credit of Faithful Relations; I shall argue in this case from the History of the *New Testament*, and what we meet with there concerning this matter. I say then, that the Book of the *Acts* of the *Apostles* obliges us to consider St. *James*, as Bishop of the Church of *Jerusalem*, in two several places, (Chap. xv. and xxi.) In the former, the Apostles, and Elders meet in Council at *Jerusalem*, to compose a great Dissention which was risen at *Antioch*, about observing the Law of *Moses*; particularly as to Circumcision, which some insisted upon. Wherein two things are very remarkable, in the Proceedings of that famous Assembly: Whereof one is, that St. *Peter* speaks the first, to open the way to their Consultations about the Question proposed; and the other, that St. *James* does it the last, to collect their Deliberations, and deliver the decretory Sentence of the Council. St. *Peter*, because he was one of the eldest Ministers of the Gospel; and one of the Apostles, who had the greatest Talents: For St. *Peter*, St. *James*, and St. *John*, (as I intimated before) passed for the most Excellent amongst them. As therefore they were upon a Point of great Nicety at that time, wherein the Minds of the Jews, and of the Christians were to be discreetly dealt with; and *the Synagogue was to be honourably buried*; as St. *Austin* somewhere elegantly expresses it;

and yet the Assembly was not to appear an Enemy to the Constitutions of that ancient Oeconomy: *St. Peter* thought it proper for him, to endeavour to influence the Opinions of the others by his own. But *St. James* speaks the last; because that Council was held in his Church; and it belonged to him of course, as Primate, and President, to gather the Votes; and declare his Judgment, and what is determined. This Conciliary way of *St. James*, as it is related in that xv<sup>th</sup> Chapter of the *Acts*, shews evidently, that he acted then as the Bishop, who presided in the matters which were treated of in his Church: Wherein that Assembly being held, he has had the honour of having been the Head of the first, the most holy, and the most perfect of all the Councils in the Christian World. In the latter place, Chap. xxi. *St. Paul* is represented as going in unto *St. James*; at whose House *all the Elders*, it is said, *were present*: By whom he is exhorted to *purifie himself*, upon a Complaint made to them, *That he taught all the Jews, who were among the Gentiles, to forsake Moses; and that they were not to Circumcise their Children, neither to walk after their Customs.* What he does the next Day, to comply with the Advice of that Assembly. Upon which I make the following Reflections. 1. That *St. James* is therein distinguish'd from the Elders of the Church; for *St. Paul* goes in unto him, and all the Elders are present at his House: Which is not put in there without ground. 2. That it was doubtless *St. James*, that summon'd these latter to him; and presided in that Assembly. 3. That *St. Paul* shews himself willing to comply with what is determined amongst them, in a Point which grates upon his Mind, and wherein the very Doctrine of the Gospel is concerned. All this implies the Pre-eminency of *St. James*; and carries something with it of the Authority and Functions

of Episcopacy. The sacred Historian makes a plain Distinction between *St. James*, and the Elders of the Church of *Jerusalem*; (whether they were Bishops, or single Presbyters, or some of both, is not material here) and sets him at the Head of them; giving him the Power to call them together; or they coming of course, out of respect to his Character, to meet with him at his House, and to receive *St. Paul* there. Why did not some other convene them, and do what is here related? And why is no other Name particularly mentioned, but *St. James's*? Can any Man believe, that *St. Paul*, who was not a whit behind the very chief Apostles, 2 Cor. xi. 5. should obediently submit in such a matter, to the Advice of the Clergy of *Jerusalem*; he who was so much above them, by his Office, Parts, and Success in the Gospel? If he had not seen at their Head a Person of such an eminent Dignity, and such a powerful Authority by his Episcopacy, and Primacy, as was *St. James*: He would never certainly have yielded to purifie himself, according to the *Mosaical Law*, to comply with the Clamours of the Jews, of whom the Church of *Jerusalem* did then consist; he who had already Preach'd its Abrogation; if he had not considered *St. James*, who with the rest advis'd him to it, as in a distinguish'd, and superior Station there. Whether he was in the right, to pay that Deference to his, and the Assembly's Determination, as to the Point in Question? This is not the place to inquire. But still it is certain, that it was the Character *St. James* bore in that first Christian Church; which was founded soon after the glorious Ascension of our Lord into Heaven; and wherein the Apostles held their first Council; that prevailed upon him to do what he did: And what probably he would not have done, if only the rest of the Clergy had so opin'd, and advis'd. But a

Bishop in his See, and as *Clemens*, and *Eusebius* speak, the Bishop of *Jerusalem*; declaring to him, that he judged it fit, for the quieting the Minds of the weak Jews; who would otherwise be much scandalized, if they saw him thus despise the Ordinances of *Moses*; that he should yet comply with those Institutions: He yielded to the Judgment of so eminent a Person, he purified himself.

But after all, what likelihood is there, that both *Hegefippus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and *Eusebius*, and likewise the other Historians, who have had occasion to mention it in the following Centuries; should all agree, without the Publick's contradicting it, or any one Writer in those Ages, that I know of; to call *St. James* the first Bishop of *Jerusalem*; and to assure us, that the Apostles constituted him in that Dignity? For so do *Sophronius*, *Bede*, *Nicephorus*, *Callist.* &c. Is Episcopacy a new Office, which they have devised in their Minds, to ascribe it to *St. James*? Or who taught them to speak in that Stile, to so little purpose, if it was not true? What Reason could they have, to give him the Title of *Bishop* of the Church of *Jerusalem*; and to tell the World, that he was the first that filled that Chair; if he had nothing above the other Pastors, who served with him there? Had they a mind to cross the Usage of those Times, wherein it is pretended, that all the Ministers were Equal; or that the Bishop, and the Presbyter were the same; or that all the Presbyters were Bishops? We must give the Lye to all Ecclesiastical Antiquity; and accuse its several Writers with having been ignorant of the Affairs of the Apostolical Times, and their own; or to have disguised them willingly, on purpose to favour a Novelty. And we must say in particular, that *Eusebius* suffer'd himself to be imposed upon by false Memoirs;

moirs; if it be not true, that St. *James* the *Just*, or the *Less*, held an eminent Dignity in the Church of *Jerusalem*. Certainly all those good Men would never have affirmed it, if they had not had some ground for it; or they would have been very shy to have spoken it; if such a Distinction had not been used, and well known in their respective Times. Now this particular Fact was so clear, and so publickly averr'd in those first Ages of the Church; that our Historian, in his *Ecclesiastical History*, does not mark indeed the very Year, in which St. *James* was instituted Bishop of *Jerusalem* by the Apostles; and how long he held that See. But what is as much; treating of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*, from the Ascension of our Lord, to the Reign of the Emperor *Adrian*\*; he gives us a Catalogue, or List of them, to the Number of Fifteen: Whereof he relates the Names, and Extraction; and puts at the head of them St. *James*, as he who first came into that See. If he had deliver'd such a thing out of his own Fancy; what would he have pass'd for in the Opinion of the World, to lay down a Matter of Fact so untrue; and so contrary, as we are told, to the Christian Discipline! But that no Man may doubt of his Fidelity therein, he declares positively, That he had gather'd that Catalogue out of the Records of the Ancients; though he could not find there the precise Time, or Duration of their Episcopats. Notwithstanding, he assures us, that there were Fifteen of them within that Period; all *Hebrews* by Descent, and Men of Merit: Whereof he gives us the Names one after another. The Fathers therefore of the first Ages of Christianity prove, or at least undeniably confirm, what the *New Testament* lets us understand, *viz.* That in that very time

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. c. 5.

there were Bishops, distinguish'd from the other Pastors in the Church. And they would never have spoken of a Degree of Eminency, in respect of *St. James*; if it had been perfectly unknown to them, and quite out of use in their Days.

It will perhaps be alledged by our Adversaries, forc'd thereunto by the prevailing Evidence of the Testimony of the Fathers; that *Eusebius* utter'd himself according to the Style of his Time, where-in Episcopacy was already Establish'd in the Christian Church; and a Distinction made between *Bishop*, and *Presbyter*: And that so all that can be infer'd from his Expression is, that *St. James* was the first Pastor of the Church of *Jerusalem*; and what they name *Primus inter Pares*; i. e. that he called him *Bishop*, who in the Days of the Apostles was only the first Minister in Order, or Precedency; but that that kind of Primacy gave him no Pre-eminency, Superiority, or Authority, above the other Presbyters, who were Equal with him in Degree. But besides that they allow thereby, that in the time of *Eusebius*, which was in the beginning of the fourth Century, viz. Two Ages, and somewhat more, after the Death of the Apostles; the term of *Bishop* signified a peculiar Dignity: He cites the very words of some, who followed them pretty near; as *Hegeffippus*, and *Clemens Alexandrinus*, who both stiled him that held the See of *Jerusalem*, Bishop thereof. From that Period then, i. e. from the Age of the Apostles Disciples, or their immediate Successors; the Name of *Bishop* was used to denote an eminent Dignity in the Church. And that Dignity could not be of Order, or Precedency; but of Degree: For such a one may change its Subject; and he that is to day *Primus inter Pares*, may not be so to morrow, according to the Pleasure of those that are his  
 Equale.

Equals. Whereas that of *Bishop*, which is ascribed to the Primates of *Jerusalem*; did not change its Subject, but by Death: And nothing but that; or a collective superior Authority, upon the account of Heresie, Schism, or grievous Scandal; could deprive him of it, who was invested with that Character; according to that received Maxim, *Superior ab Inferiori non potest judicari*. Moreover, I desire them, that they would shew me, when the Term of *Bishop* changed its usual Signification; and when Episcopacy began, between the time of the Apostles, and *Eusebius*, to denote a Degree of Eminency? I doubt, they will find it very difficult, if not altogether impossible, to point at it. But if they could do that; and they should shew me likewise, when the Name and Thing commenced to be appropriated to the Primate of a Church, exclusively to all the other Ministers; or even that in the Apostolical Times the Presbyters were called *Bishops*, and *vice versa*: What would that be to the Question? It will indeed thereby appear, that the words may have changed their Signification, but the Thing remained; *viz.* the Primacy. For call him *Bishop*, or *Primate*, or *Presbyter*, if you will; who by Right of Ordination, Institution, or Succession, is at the Head of his Clergy for Life: Provided he has the Power to perform what *St. James*, and his Successors in the See of *Jerusalem* did, in relation to the Government of his Church; I have all I desire. For a Bishop is nothing else, but he who by a Lawful Call, and like that of *St. James*, and his Successors, is seated for his Life in the Chair of Primate, to perpetuate the Ministry in his Church, and to edifie it as its principal Pastor, by a pure Doctrine, and a godly Discipline. Which is the Idea we ought to have of *St. James*, and of all those who in the Quality of first Ministers of the Church, hold an Episcopal

See. For in short, we must overthrow the Testimony of Antiquity, to say nothing of Scripture, if we do not allow St. *James* a Degree of Pre-eminency, by virtue of his Primacy in the Church of *Jerusalem*, in which he was settled by a particular Appointment of the Apostles.

---

## C H A P. VII.

*A Particular Proof of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, and its Succession, in the Person of St. Simeon Bishop of Jerusalem.*

**I**F the Installation of St. *James*, as I may term it, in the Chair of *Jerusalem* by the Apostles, be a Demonstration of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy: The Promotion of St. *Simeon* to that See, is a good Evidence of their Intention to have it continued in the Christian Church; since they themselves appointed him Bishop there, after the Death of his Predecessor. It is a remarkable Fact, which I think proper to relate after the foregoing, as ushering in the Method of filling up a vacant See in the time of the Apostles, and after their Death, in the first Ages of Christianity. And we have it Recorded (besides † *Hegesippus*; *Simeon's* almost Contemporary) by the Ecclesiastical Historian \* *Eusebius*, with some Enlargement. “It is reported, says he, that the Apostles, and the

---

† *Hegesip.* apud *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 22.*

\* *Ibid.* lib. 3. cap. 11.

“ Disciples of our Lord, who were yet living,  
 “ with his Kinsmen according to the Flesh; had  
 “ a Consultation, who was fit to succeed *St. James*;  
 “ and that they unanimously pitch’d upon *Simeon*  
 “ for that Chair, as being our Saviour’s Kins-  
 “ man.

*St. James* had been constituted Bishop of *Jerusalem*, as we have seen before: And he govern’d that Church till the Day of his Martyrdom in that Quality. For though the Apostles assembled together often there, before they separated themselves, to go and plant the Gospel throughout the World; they had appropriated it to him, as the chief Pastor of it. But soon after his Decease, came on the Ruin of that Noble City, by the *Roman* Armies, under the Command of *Titus*, the Son of *Vespasianus*. As there was in it a famous Church, which was honoured with the Presence of the Apostles, and of the Councils, that from time to time met there, to treat of the Affairs of Religion; it received a terrible Blow by that fatal War: But it was not wholly extinguish’d in the general Desolation; the Divine Providence providing for its Preservation in a wonderful manner. For there remained in the Places about the City a good Number of Christians, who had escaped the Fury of the *Romans*. Which was the Reason that the Apostles, and the Disciples of Jesus Christ, who were then alive; considering amongst themselves, that the See of that Mother-Church was vacant by the Death of *St. James*; repaired thither, with the Kinsmen of our Lord, according to the Flesh, to fill it up with a fit Successor; and unanimously agreed to establish Bishop there *Simeon*, the Son of *Cleophas*; as they actually did. Thus *Eusebius*. But it seems more probable, that *Simeon* was Bishop of *Jerusalem* before its Destruction, *viz.* immediately upon the Death of *St. James*,  
 which

which happen'd some Years before; and that the Christians withdrew to *Pella*.

Two things are observable from this Promotion, and Election of *Simeon* to be Bishop of *Jerusalem*. The first is, That in the very time of the Apostles, when an Episcopal See became vacant by the Death of its Primate; one of the Clergy was appointed to be his Successor; who was called the *Bishop* of that Church. For to imagine, that in the Days of *St. James*, and *Simeon*, there were no other Pastors in the Church of *Jerusalem*; is what no Man of Reason ever can; or has been affirmed of such a Body by any of our Divines. There was then one chosen amongst that Clergy, to be the Bishop of that See. The first was *St. James*, and the second *Simeon*, who was raised to that Dignity by a Council, made up of the Apostles, and the Disciples of our Lord that were then alive, with his Kinsmen according to the Flesh; and who with one accord seated him in the Episcopal Chair.

The second thing to be observed is, That in the time of the Apostles, when an Episcopal See was vacant; they first, and in chief, with the Disciples of our Lord, used to assemble together, to chuse, and admit the Pastor, whom they judged fit for that Dignity: At least it happen'd so in this Case. It was the superior Clergy, who had the Right, and Authority so to do; such as were the Apostles first, and in chief, with those whom the Gospel names the *Disciples of our Lord*; and his Kinsmen according to the Flesh, particularly mentioned here *honoris causâ*. Neither the Church in a Body, nor the Presbyters, and Deacons; nor, in a word, the inferior Clergy, in those Days, had the Power to appoint, or ordain a Bishop. For if they had had it; what necessity was there, when the Episcopal See of *Jerusalem*, *ex. gr.* became vacant,

cant; that the Apostles who remained, and the Disciples of our Lord, with his Kinsmen according to the Flesh; should meet so solemnly together for that end? The Church in a Body; or the Pastors, and ordinary Ministers, might have done it themselves; and their Proceedings therein would have been Regular, and in Form, according to the Hypothesis of our Adversaries. Notwithstanding, it is transacted here otherwise: A Council of Apostles, and Disciples resort together, to establish *Simeon* Bishop of *Jerusalem*.

But let us return to the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, and its Succession in the Person of *Simeon*. If only *St. James* had governed the Church of *Jerusalem* in chief; it might be said, that it was a peculiar Prerogative, which the Apostles conferr'd on him, upon the account of his eminent Station amongst them: And that this particular Instance does not prove, that this Institution was to pass to Posterity. But here is *Simeon*, who succeeds him in all his Rights, Pre-eminencies, and Authorities, and that by the Appointment of the same Persons. And to institute him into this high Office, the Apostles use the same Formalities, as they did in the Intallation of *St. James*. For this Man being dead; they, with the Disciples, who remained alive after the sacking of *Jerusalem*, and our Lord's Kinsmen according to the Flesh, assembled from divers parts thither: And having found *Simeon* worthy to fill the Chair, they chose him, and ordained him to be the Bishop, Primate, and chief Pastor of that Church, in the room of his Predecessor of glorious Memory. This I have said, is the Account *Eusebius* gives of it in his *Ecclesiastical History*; as he had Read it in the Records of the second, and third Centuries of the Church. Whereby it appears, that *Simeon* was admitted by the same Power, in the same Manner,  
and

and with the same Formalities, as *St. James* had been. Not by all the Pastors, and Ministers, who were in *Judea*, and elsewhere: But only by the Apostles first, and in chief, with the Disciples of our Lord, and his Kinsmen according to the Flesh; to whom alone, it seems, appertained then the Right of so doing. It was they that authorized, and confirmed by such a Proceeding the Episcopal Succession in that Church: That there might be continued in after-Ages one Pastor amongst the rest, who should be at the Head of his Clergy; and should be the Bishop, Primate, and chief Rector of the See, unto which he was appointed. We may gather likewise, from the same Account, That *Simeon* held the See of *Jerusalem* about forty three Years; *i. e.* till his Death: An evident sign, that Episcopacy was an Office for Life; and not a Primacy of Order, or Precedency, which might be changed the very next Day. 'Twas a permanent Dignity, wherewith a Man was invested for as long as he lived, by those who had a Right to confer it. If our Adversaries deny it, they must be wilfully Blind, and believe nothing of what is read in the Ecclesiastical Historians, wherein that Fact is as clear as the Light. But if *Eusebius* ascribes to him so long a Possession of the Chair of *Jerusalem*, in such troublesome Times, and wherein the Persecution raged so furiously against the Christians; \* *Hegesippus*, who flourish'd about that time, gives him the longest Life of all the Bishops: For he makes him live a hundred and twenty Years, and die in the tenth Year of *Trajan's* Reign. Which we may see likewise in the † *Chronicle* of the same Author: And consequently he held out till the beginning of the second Century,

---

\* *Hegesip. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 32.*

† *Euseb. Chron. Ann. 107.*

*viz.* till about an hundred and seventeen Years after the Birth of our Redeemer.

I will now explain, as being an Illustration of the matter I am now upon, the Method how the Apostles, and their Successors after them, filled up a vacant See, in the first Ages of Christianity; and how they Consecrated a Bishop. For this is a thing fit to be handled here, as proving collaterally, that Episcopacy bears Date with the Apostolical, and Primitive Times: The Manner of the Institution, is a plain Evidence of the Institution it self, and of the Distinction of the Degrees in the holy Ministry. When a See then was vacant, and a Bishop was to be Consecrated; the Apostles, and the Disciples of our Lord, in the beginning; and afterwards the Successors of the Apostles, *viz.* the Bishops, were wont to meet together, from the Neighbouring Districts, to chuse a fit Person; and to perform the Ceremony of his Consecration, and Institution. To which end, besides the Clergy, they convened the People, to know their Opinion, and have their Approbation of his Character. And when they saw, that he was well reported of, and was acceptable to the Church in general: Having the necessary Qualifications to hold that See, as Talents; Piety, Zeal; the first Ministers amongst them Consecrated him to that Office, by the Imposition of their Hands. Which Formalities being duly observed, he was look'd upon as Establish'd in that Church, to Govern it as its principal Pastor: And the rest of the Clergy, with the People, were to be obedient to him; as to whom belonged the Right of the Chair. It is true, the Gospel does not give us a particular Account of all the Circumstances of such a Transaction. But besides that we are bound in Reason to believe, that every one

*How a Bishop was Consecrated, and Establish'd in the Primitive Times.*

one acted therein according to his Station: It lets us know enough to make us understand, that it was the Apostles that called the Church together; that the lower Clergy were only Assistants at their Devotions; that the People gave simply their Opinion, and Approbation of the Person; and that it was they (the Apostles) lastly, that Instituted him into that sacred Function, by the Right they solely had of Consecrating him, and laying their Hands upon him.

The same thing is to be said, of the Consecrations, which after the Death of the Apostles, were performed by their Successors, in the following Ages of Christianity. This is evident in some measure, not only as to the Bishops, in the Person of *Matthias*, who was chosen by the Apostles into the place of the Traitor *Judas*, *Acts* i. and consequently to be an Apostle, and a Bishop at large: But also as to the Deacons themselves; whereof we have a remarkable Instance, *Acts* vi. Upon the murmuring of the *Grecians* against the *Hebrews*, that their Widows were neglected in the daily *Ministration*; the Apostles directed the Brethren, to look out among them seven Men for that Employment. But though they were chosen by the People, and presented by them, at the Direction of the Apostles; yet because those Deacons were to be Assistants in the Ministry, in Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments; it was necessary, that to admit them to that Office, the Apostles should lay their Hands on them; as being a Right which belonged to them, in that Quality, or as Bishops. Now that there might be no doubt raised, that they must be Bishops, who were to confer the Order upon him that was to be so; and that that Point of Discipline should be Religiously observed throughout the Christian Church in after-Ages: The Apostles did not only propose their own

own Practice; but they made likewise a Canon, to regulate the Formalities of that sacred Ceremony. It is that which is to be found amongst the true Apostolical Canons\*, extracted out of the ancient Catholick Books. I know what is justly thought of a Compilation, which goes under that Name. It is believed, and that with good reason, that they were not all composed by those holy Men: For it is not very difficult to point at the Date of some of them in the Ages after them; and to shew the falsity of others, that are contrary to the true ones, which they have left us in their Writings, and by Tradition. But if they have not made them all, it does not follow, but they may have made some; amongst which is this, which has been acknowledged for Apostolical in the first Ages of the Church. Unless we will disbelieve, without any colour of Reason, what St. Cyprian says of it; who lived in the beginning of the third Century; *i. e.* a little more than a hundred Years after the Death of the Apostles. For he lays it down positively, and expressly, that the Apostles enacted such a Canon concerning the Ordination of a Bishop in the Church, that it is of Divine Tradition, and Apostolical Observation; and that it has been generally observed from Father to Son. These are his very words, † *De Traditione Divinâ, & Apostolicâ Observatione.* To which he adds, that it is a Rule to be kept, and held, as of Divine Ordinance, and Apostolical Practice; ‖ *Diligenter servandum est, & tenendum; viz. Ut ad Ordinationes ritè celebrandas, ad eam Plebem cui Præpositus Ordinatur, Episcopi ejusdem Provinciæ proximi quique convenient, & Episcopus deligatur.* And to shew moreover, that it was observed in his time, as coming from the Apostles;

\* Can. Apost. 1.

† Cyp. Epist. 63.

‖ Ibid.

and that that was the constant Custom of the Church; he commends the Bishops, who had settled *Sabinus* in the place of *Basilides*, that had been deposed upon the account of his Crimes; in that they had followed the Canon in all its Points; having all of that Province resorted to the Church, which was destitute of a chief Pastor; and called the People together, to have their Approbation of the Person, and consecrated *Sabinus*; and after they had laid their Hands on him, had committed to him the vacant See of *Basilides*. All which Proceedings he confirms with his whole Clergy, as conformable to the Divine Ordinance, and the Apostolical Practice.

In that Synodical Letter of *St. Cyprian* appears, as clear as the Light of the Sun, the Distinction between a Bishop, and a Presbyter. It is plainly seen there, that from the Apostles to the Days of that famous Primate of *Carthage*, it was the Bishops that consecrated the Bishops, for the Churches in which they were to Officiate. For I think, these two Truths may be fairly concluded from the Words of that Letter. 1. That if the Presbyters, and the Deacons, with the Body of the People, could have constituted a Bishop; the Apostolical Canon would not have obliged the Bishops of the Province to resort to the place, to consecrate the Person. And if they had done it; *St. Cyprian's* Account tells us, that from the time of the Apostles to him, the Bishops were to confer the Order; and that that was the constant Custom of the Church, grounded upon a Divine, and Apostolical Tradition. 2. That it being indisputable, that in the Days of that Primate, the Episcopat was a distinct Office from the Presbyterat, and the Diaconat: When he speaks of the Promotion of *Sabinus* to the Episcopat, he understands it of a Degree distinguish'd from that of a Presbyter,  
or

or a Deacon. For *Sabinus* was a Deacon, and a Presbyter, when he was made a Bishop, upon the Deprivation of *Basilides*. And indeed it was a general Rule in the Church, that a Man was to be first ordained Deacon, and then Presbyter; before he could ascend to the Episcopal Dignity.

---

C H A P. VIII.

*A Particular Proof of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, in the Person of St. Timothy Bishop of Ephesus.*

HAVING touch'd above but slightly the Instances of *St. Timothy*, and *St. Titus*; whereof the former was ordained by *St. Paul*, Bishop of the *Ephesians*, and the latter of the *Cretans*; and those giving us a great Light into this matter of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, and of its Distinction from the Presbyterat, and the Diaconat; besides that the account of them is to be found chiefly in the Canonical Books of the New Testament: I presume, it will not contribute a little to my purpose, if I consider them now more narrowly, and apart.

As to *Timothy*; his Dignity in general appears in this, that *St. Paul* chose him to be his Companion, and Fellow-worker, in his Travels, and Labours for the Propagation of the Gospel, and the Edifying of the Body of Christ: And the several Commissions he employ'd him in, in respect of some principal Churches; sometimes appointing him to look to them in his absence; sometimes

resigning

resigning them up to his Care; sometimes ordering him to govern those which he had already founded; sometimes to settle new ones; now to provide them with Pastors, then to direct them in the discharge of their Office; to stay at *Berea*, to go to *Thessalonica*, *Macedonia*; but particularly to preside at *Ephesus*. Upon which score the Ancients generally assure us, that *Timothy* was the first appointed Bishop of *Ephesus*.

The Author of the *Martyrdom of Timothy*, in *Photius's Bibliotheca*, tells us, <sup>a</sup> "That the Apostle (for so he is sometimes called) "*Timothy* was ordained, and enthroned (or Installed), as it is there expressed, "*Bishop of the Metropolis of the Ephesians* by the great *St. Paul*: And that he did first act as Bishop of *Ephesus*. *Eusebius* says, <sup>b</sup> "That *Timothy* is storied to have been the first Bishop of the Province or Diocese of *Ephesus*. In the *Apostolical Constitutions*, we are expressly told, <sup>c</sup> "That he was ordained Bishop of it by *St. Paul*. And the Fathers of the Council of *Chalcedon* <sup>d</sup>, including *Timothy* in the Number, reckon twenty seven Bishops of *Ephesus* to their Time. *St. Chrysostom* affirms, <sup>e</sup> "That it is manifest, that *Timothy* was entrusted with a Church, or rather with a whole Nation, that of *Asia*. And to him, says *Theodoret*, <sup>f</sup> "Divine *St. Paul* committed the Care and Charge of *Asia*. Many other Testimonies might be produced to the same effect; but, I presume, these are sufficient.

The Truth is, his Quality of Evangelist did not hinder, but he might be one of those Bishops at large, who went up and down the World, to help

<sup>a</sup> Apud Phot. Biblioth. Num. 254.

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. lib. 3. c. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Const. Apost. lib. 7. c. 47.

<sup>d</sup> Conc. Chalced. Act. 11.

<sup>e</sup> Chrysost. Hom. 15. in 1 Tim. 5. 19.

<sup>f</sup> Theodor. Arg. in 1 Tim.

out the Apostles in their Work; to Preach the Gospel, and to Ordain, when duly Commissioned thereunto, such Ministers in the Churches which were already gathered, as they judged necessary and proper for the edifying of them. For without such an Ordination, none could come into the Ministry, or perform holy Offices. Which may be allowed, besides their assisting in publishing the Word, to have been the ground, if not of the first Institution of the Evangelists, yet of their being sent by the Apostles to Churches already planted; supposing it was so done. For according to the Word *Ἐυαγγελισμοῦ*, with the Notion of \* *Eusebium*; "The Work of an Evangelist was, as of an Apostle, "To lay the Foundations of the Faith in  
 " remote, and Barbarous Countries; to constitute  
 " them Pastors in their room: And after they had  
 " committed them to the Care of those new Plan-  
 " tations, to pass on to other Nations. As then the Ministerial Function was to be derived from the Apostles, and they could not go every where; they pitch'd upon the most Pious, Eloquent, and Excellent Persons amongst the Faithful; whom, after they had Consecrated them, they Commissioned to Preach the Gospel, and to settle Pastors from City to City. So that the Apostolical Succession being in part to be conveyed through them into the Church; they communicated it, with the sacred Orders, as they saw occasion. And consequently none could pretend to a lawful Mission, or to partake of that Succession, but by the Hands of the Apostles, or those their Deputies, and the Bishops: Notwithstanding, this is no hinderance, but *Timothy* may have been a Bishop, appropriated to the Church of *Ephesus*; no more than the Apostleship of *St. James*, was an Obstacle to his Appro-

\* *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 37.*

priation to the Episcopal See of *Jerusalem*. From whence it is evident, that *Timothy* was both an Evangelist, and a Bishop, properly so called. He had then, in these respects, some Degree of Eminency, which set him above the other Ministers; who, we cannot say, were Equal with him, without being sensible, that we speak too hastily, and somewhat out of the way.

But to discourse a little more distinctly: The Episcopal Dignity of *Timothy* is palpable in these three things, *viz.* 1. In that *St. Paul* had ordained him to it, by the Imposition of his Hands on him. 2. In that he gave him the Power of Ordaining Ministers himself. And 3. In that he had a Jurisdiction committed to him over them. Which three Truths are grounded chiefly upon these three Passages: *Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my Hands, 2 Tim. i. 6. Lay Hands suddenly on no Man, 1 Tim. v. 22. Against an Elder receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses, 1 Tim. v. 19.* If we consider these Passages but superficially, they seem to give no great matter of Prerogative to *Timothy*. But if we make a Judicious Reflection upon them, we shall soon perceive, that they contain Much in Little, mighty Things in few Words. For what a Divine Gift, what an Extraordinary Spirit was bestowed upon *Timothy* at his Ordination, by the Imposition of the Hands of *St. Paul*? Could he confer on him a higher Honour in the Church, than to impart to him the Right of Communicating the sacred Orders? And in Commissioning him to proceed as a Judge, in the Accusations which should be brought before his Tribunal against the Elders; does he not invest him with a powerful Jurisdiction over them, which made him much their Superior? These several Pre-eminencies

eminencies stamp upon him a truly Episcopal Character; which consists in his deriving his Call from the Apostles by Consecration, his Right of Ordaining Ministers himself, and his Power of Jurisdiction over them. To which may be added, what *Irenæus* says, \* “ That the Bishops, who succeeded the Apostles, with their Succession into their Bishopricks, received a certain Gift of Truth, according to the good pleasure of the Father: What may pass for a Comment upon these Passages.

I say, first, That *Timothy* was by *St. Paul* ordained a Bishop, as will farther appear from what is to follow; and that by the Imposition of his Hands on him for that purpose: For he himself tells him, *Wherefore I put thee in remembrance, that thou stir up the Gift of God which is in thee, by the putting on of my Hands, in the forecited place.* To which I must add, and Bishop of *Ephesus* too. For the Apostle tells him likewise, *1 Tim. i. 3.* That he besought him to abide still at *Ephesus*, Περσμεῖναι ἐν Ἐφέσῳ, in the Original; which signifies to reside, or fix in *Ephesus*. So that I presume, the former part of the Proposition will scarce be denied here by our Adversaries.

*Object.* But methinks I hear them start up an Objection, to invalidate this pretended Episcopal Dignity of *Timothy*, which I seem to ground upon the Imposition of the Hands of *St. Paul* alone. Is it not written, say they, *1 Tim. iv. 14.* Neglect not the Gift that is in thee, which was given thee by Propheſie, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery; Elders, i. e. or Presbyters: Μετὰ ἐπιθεσίῳ τῶν χειρῶν τῶν πρεσβυτέρων. Whence they infer, that it was no more *St. Paul*, than the other Presbyters, that ordained *Timothy*; and that then

\* *Iren. adv. Har. lib. 4. cap. 43.*

the Presbyters had a Right of Ordaining, as well as the Bishops, or Apostles : Which they alledge, has been since taken away from them by Usurpation, against the Form of the first Institution ; seeing the Company of the Presbyters laid their Hands on *Timothy*, with *St. Paul*, and not he alone.

*Solut.* How pitiful, and false are such Inferences ; if we consider the force of the Passage it self, and the Custom of the Bishops in Ordinations ! The Objection overlooks, *by Prophecy* ; which implies a Divine Designation of *Timothy* to his Office. But admitting for this time their Sense of the Presbytery, and the Presbyters, (though it is pretty evident, that *Timothy* was ordained by Apostles, or Apostolical Men :) I say, that by *the laying on of the Hands of St. Paul, and the Presbytery on him* ; we are to understand his Ordination to the Function of Bishop ; which was performed with such a Ceremony : And that in Conformity to the Tradition of the Jewish Church, wherein it was used, with Prayer, when a Person was to be admitted into an holy Office. Whence it is, that *laying Hands on one, and Ordaining him*, are Reciprocal Terms amongst the Rabbies. I will allow, (though contrary to the after-Customs of the Church, in the Consecration of Bishops) that some Presbyters might lay their Hands on *Timothy*, at his Ordination, with *St. Paul* : But then our Adversaries must own, that the Apostle acted therein, as he that Ordained him ; and consequently, that without him, the Imposition of the Hands of the others, would have been to no purpose. It was he alone that laid his Hands on him, as he that had the Right to institute him into the Episcopat, and to confer on him the Office of Bishop : And the Presbyters joined with him, but as Assistants, who by that Action approved what he did.

The

The whole Virtue, and Efficacy of the Ordination proceeded from *St. Paul*, who alone had the Power to convey to *Timothy* the Apostolical Succession: Which the others could not do, by the Imposition of their own Hands. As *Joshua* could not succeed to *Moses*, unless this laid his Hands on him; after which he was invested with the Spirit of Wisdom, and the *Israelites* obeyed him: So it was absolutely necessary, that *Timothy* should receive from an Apostle, or an Apostolical Man, the Right of Succession, by the Imposition of his own Hands; otherwise the Christian Church would not have owned him for a lawful Successor, *i. e.* a Bishop. The Presbyters then, in the time of the Apostles, might assist at the Ordinations; they might even lay their own Hands with them on the Persons, whom they were admitting into the holy Ministry, in the Sense I have explained, tho' probably never practised in the case of Bishops; but they could not do it without them: For if they had done it, it would have been a downright Usurpation, and a vain Ceremony, which would have render'd the Call of the Minister unrighteous, and null to all Intents and Purposes. It was of indispensable necessity, that the Ordination should come from him, who had the Right to convey the Apostolical Succession. And the same Custom is observed in the Reformed Episcopal Churches of *Europe* at this Day; though it is affirmed, contrary to Truth, that the Protestant Bishops, as well as the Popish, have taken away from the Presbyters, by a manifest Violence, the Right of laying on their Hands, at the Ordinations. The Bishops do no more therein, than *St. Paul* did. They indeed assume to themselves the chief Power of Ordaining; and they maintain, that none without them can lay their Hands on any Person, to institute him into Holy Orders: But they do not deny, that others

may do it with them; and they do not bar the Presbyters from enjoying their share in that Ceremony, on certain occasions. These do lay their Hands with them, at the Ordination of Presbyters; both by way of Approbation, and by way of Association: Which is all they can justly claim. So then the Presbyters lay their Hands with the Bishops, when he pronounces the Words, *Receive thou the Holy Ghost*; but not without him: And the chief Virtue, and Efficacy of the Ordination depends upon his Action; who alone, having the Apostolical Succession in his Character, can impart it to others, and continue the Ministry in the Church. Which is evident, in some measure, in the Case of *Timothy*. For therein *St. Paul* attributes to himself, to have bestowed on him the Gift he possessed; by the laying on of his Hands, when he Ordained him. But he declares likewise, that it was done *with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*; viz. in Company of the Presbyters, whom he had called to join with him in the Performance of so solemn a Ceremony. There cannot be, I think, a fairer Explication of those two seeming contrariant Passages; admitting our Adversaries Sense of the Presbytery. And in truth, who can imagine, that simple Presbyters, or what we call the Lower Clergy, could confer on *Timothy* the Dignity of a Bishop? They could not give to another a Degree, which they had not themselves: *Nihil dat, quod in se non habet*. And if they had it; how is it, that they did not shew it; when those Officers were scarce in the Church; and none but the Apostles, or those whom they had raised to the first Stations, could communicate it? *Timothy* could never have been invested with such a Prerogative, Pre-eminency, and Authority; if *St. Paul*, or some other like him, had not intervened in it. The inferior Ministers could not place  
 a Man

a Man in a superior Office in the Church: That was, in reason, above their reach. None but the Imposition of the Hands of *St. Paul*, could set *Timothy* in so high a Station in the Hierarchy.

It is not therefore to be doubted, after those eminent Functions, which I have asserted to *Timothy*, and which he actually exercised without Contradiction; but he enjoyed a high Dignity in the Church. But what I have said, secondly, That *St. Paul* conferr'd on him, by his Consecration of him to be a Bishop, the Power of Ordaining Ministers himself, by the laying on of his own Hands on them; is no mean, or wrong Argument of it: That being an Essential of the Episcopal Office, as I have shewed already. I speak of that Ordination, or laying on of the Hands, which gives the Person so Ordained; if a Bishop, the Right of Governing his Church in Chief, and continuing the Evangelical Ministry in it; if a Presbyter, of Preaching the Word, and Administring both the Sacraments, in his Congregation; and if a Deacon, the same, with Restriction to Baptism, and in Subserviency. None but he, who has the Apostolical Succession duly in him, can transmit it to others. Now they are the Bishops only, that have the Title to sit in the Apostles Chair; and to whom these have entrusted the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, as their direct Successors. And if the lower Clergy have any share in the Ordination of Ministers, as I have explained it before, it is by way of Association, Approbation, and Assistance in the Solemnity: But the Essential Operation, which makes it Regular, and Apostolical, proceeds primarily from him who has the dispensing of the Succession. Wherefore we do not find in the Books of the New Testament, or any where in the History of the first Ages of the Church, that ever any  
simple

simple Presbyters ordained a Minister, without a Bishop. In the time of the Apostles, it was always they themselves, or their Deputies, and Commissioners, that did it: And afterwards, it was the Bishops in their respective Sees. Since then *St. Paul* conferred upon *Timothy* the Right of laying his Hands upon such as were to be admitted into Holy Orders; and that we have no ground to doubt, but he exercised it on several within his District; and that Prerogative belonged but to those, who held an eminent Rank in the Church: We ought to conclude, that he was more than a secondary Presbyter, *i. e.* that he was a Bishop; as is implied in the second Passage produced, *Lay Hands suddenly on no Man.* To which I shall annex here, as spoken to the same purpose, that in *2 Tim. ii. 2.* *The things that thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.*

I have said, thirdly, That *St. Paul* committed to him a Jurisdiction over his Clergy; grounding that upon the other Passage, *Against an Elder receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses:* Which is another Argument of his Episcopal Dignity, and Superiority. And indeed that is a peculiar Prerogative, which is there given to *Timothy*, exclusively to the other Ministers, to receive the Accusations which are brought before him against the Elders: And consequently to inflict upon them a condign Censure, if they are found Guilty. If he is to receive the Accusations brought before him against the Elders; then they are his Inferiors, and he has a Jurisdiction over them; since if they are faulty, he may proceed against them Judicially: Otherwise to what purpose has he a Power to receive those Accusations? I know very well what is pretended, to elude the  
force

force of that Passage, wherein the Authority of *Timothy* over his Clergy, is so clearly laid down; *viz.* that the Apostle gives him a Right of receiving such Accusations, not to judge of them alone; but to carry them before the Senate of the Presbyters, that they may be debated before the Body, and the whole Presbytery determine them with him. I must confess, there ought to be an Order observed in those Proceedings; and the Bishops must not look upon themselves to be so absolute, and wise, as to be dispensed from taking the Advice of their Clergy. And when *St. Paul* instructed *Timothy*, not to receive slightly an Accusation against an Elder; but before, or under two or three Witnesses; I am persuaded, neither the one, nor the other understood thereby, that a Bishop might act despotically. I am apt to believe, that he would have proceeded therein, as the other did in the Case of the *Incestuous Corinthian*. But this is stiled *torquere Questionem*; for such Facts are not denied: The Point is, Whether the Authority *St. Paul* commits to *Timothy*, of receiving an Accusation against an Elder, when it is well grounded, and well proved, does not give him a Jurisdiction over the Elders, and sets him in a Seat of Superiority? Let him call, or not call his Clergy to it; that no way increases, or diminishes the Power he has. Now I argue, that it can be no otherwise conceived. For, 1. The Apostle directs his Discourse to him alone; and it is to him in particular, that he gives that Instruction. Why then will Men join his Clergy with him; *i. e.* his Presbyters in their Sense: That is an addition to the Text, and no way deducible from it? 2. If *St. Paul* had meant, that the Jurisdiction should be in common betwixt *Timothy*, and his Presbyters; he would undoubtedly have express'd himself in this manner, or to this effect.

*Against*

*Against an Elder, thou, and the Presbytery, receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses.* 3. Admitting that they were to share the Jurisdiction with him; in the terms that the Apostle delivers himself, he makes him still superior to the Body of the Presbyters; in that he is to receive the Accusation, and proceed Judicially upon it. To him belongs the Judgment-Seat. 4. He that is judged by another, must be inferior to him in that respect. But the Elder is to be judged by *Timothy*, before whom the Accusation is to be brought, and examined: This is therefore superior to the other; and he is entitled to an Office, upon which the Presbytery is dependent. It will perhaps be replied; That the Elder, who is Equal to him in Degree, becomes his Inferior, by falling into a Crime. But if the Accusation is false, and he is innocent; wherein is he inferior to him? And by what Right is he subjected to the Judgment of his Equal? It is alledged indeed, That *Timothy* was to bring the Accusation before the Presbytery, who were superior in a Body to any Elder: But that is *gratis dictum*, upon a shift, without any manner of Proof made of it. For put the case, that *Timothy* had been accused before his Clergy; would he have appeared before them? And would he thereupon have become their Inferior? Certainly the Higher cannot be judged by the Lower. *St. Paul* never intended to tell *Timothy*, When thy Presbyters, and thy Deacons shall accuse thee, and go about to depose thee, submit thy self to their Judgment. He would have him indeed, *not receive an Accusation against an Elder, but before two or three Witnesses.* But he never understood, that his Clergy should receive one against him, to proceed on it in a Judicial way. Supposing therefore, that he should have render'd himself worthy of Deposition; there must have

have been found out a superior Power, to judge him. They could have no Authority over him, as he had over them. The Case quite alters here. None but they who were above him, and from whom he derived his Ministry; or who shared it with him, in a Body, for want of another Power, could proceed to Ecclesiastical Censures against him. Which shews the Eminency of his Degree, in which none but the superior Clergy could touch him; as being placed himself in one of the highest Stations in the Church, which laid the Presbyters, and the Deacons under his Jurisdiction. And it is very probable, that *Timothy* was constituted by *St. Paul*, Metropolitan, and Archbishop of the whole Province of *Ephesus*.

---

C H A P. IX.

*A Particular Proof of the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy, in the Person of St. Titus Bishop of Crete.*

THE Case of *St. Timothy*, and *St. Titus*, is so parallel, and is so much grounded upon the like Authorities; that having discours'd pretty largely upon the former, I might very well be dispensed with from proceeding on the latter: If they did not mutually give Light to one another, and into the Matter I have in hand, the Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy; and the Practice of it in the Apostles time, and by them.

*Titus* then, as well as *Timothy*, was a Bishop; and that of *Crete*, or *Candia*, as it is now called; if

we will give any Credit to the Writings of the Primitive Fathers, and the faithful Relations of the Ecclesiastical Historians, in the earlier, and the latter Ages likewise of Christianity. *Eusebius* acquaints us, <sup>a</sup> " That *Titus* was the first Bishop of " the Churches in *Crete*. " The Apostle (*St. Paul*) " consecrated him, says *St. Ambrose*, <sup>b</sup> Bishop of it. And so *St. Chrysostom*, <sup>c</sup> " That without doubt, *Ti-* " *tus* was an approved Person, to whom was com- " mitted ὀλόκληρη ἡ νῆσος, an entire Island; and " the Power, and Jurisdiction over so many Bi- " shops, τῶν ἑπισκόπων κρείσις. And likewise *Theodoret*, <sup>d</sup> " That he was by *St. Paul* ordained " Bishop of *Crete*, though a very large Island, to " ordain Bishops under him. To which may be added that of *St. Jerom*, <sup>e</sup> " That *Titus* was Bi- " shop of *Crete*: And in it, and the adjacent " Islands, he Preached the Gospel of Christ. And also the Testimonies <sup>f</sup> of *Theophylact*, *Oecumenius*, and many others, to the same effect.

It is true, that *Titus* was likewise an Evangelist: For though it is no where so said of him in the New Testament, *ipsissimis terminis*, as it is of *Timothy*, *2 Tim.* iv. 5. *Watch thou in all things, endure Afflictions, do the Work of an Evangelist, make full proof of thy Ministry*; yet it appears so from several Particulars. It is plain, *Gal.* ii. 1. that he accompanied *St. Paul* to the Council of *Jerusalem*; and in his Travels through *Syria*, and *Cilicia*, to Preach the Gospel, and to gather Churches; and that he was sent by him upon the same account to some places, and sent for to others. He was with the Apostle at *Philippi*, when he writ his second Epistle to the *Corinthians*: For it is ex-

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. c. 4.

<sup>c</sup> Chrysost. Hom. 1. in Tit. 1.

<sup>e</sup> Hierom. Cat.

<sup>f</sup> In Tit.

<sup>b</sup> Ambros. Præf. in Tit.

<sup>d</sup> Theod. Arg. in Tit.

pressed in the Date of it, that it was written thence; and that he sent it to them by him, and *St. Luke*. And when he was at *Corinth*, whither he was deputed by him about Church-Affairs, particularly a Contribution for the poor Saints at *Jerusalem*, 2 Cor. viii. 23. as his Partner, and Fellow-helper concerning the *Corinthians*; as he himself declares it: He was received by them with suitable Reverence, and Kindness. The Apostle acquaints *Timothy*, That *Titus* was departed unto *Dalmatia*, 2 Tim. iv. 10. Not as *Demas*, who had forsaken him, having loved this present World; but by his Direction, to plant the Gospel there. And he orders *Titus* himself, when he should give him notice of it, to be diligent to come unto him to *Nicopolis*, Tit. iii. 12. where he had determined to winter. But notwithstanding this Office of Evangelist, (supposing he did these things as such) which did not in its Nature necessarily include that of a Bishop; he might be ordained a Bishop at large, and continue his assistance to *St. Paul*; and yet have a particular District appropriated to him, as *Timothy* had. And that was *Crete*; as I have proved by the foregoing Authorities: Of which Island he was, it seems, Metropolitan or Archbishop.

Now to shew a little more distinctly, that this was so; and that *Titus* was ordained Bishop of *Crete*, and had a Power there of Ordaining Ministers himself, and a Jurisdiction committed to him by *St. Paul*. I shall mention the Passages I chiefly ground this Assertion upon. And they are these three: For this cause left I thee in *Crete*, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain Elders in every City, as I had appointed thee, Tit. i. 5. These things speak and exhort, and rebuke with all Authority. Let no Man despise thee, Tit. ii. 15. A Man that is an Heretick,  
after

*after the first and second Admonition, reject,* Tit. iii. 10. The two first Passages are so very clear, or have been so fully examined, as to the Sense of them, in the preceding Chapter, that I think, I need say nothing concerning them in this: But I must a little explain the last, the second falling in with it.

The Person *Titus* is here directed to proceed against, the Manner in which he is to do it, and the Punishment he is to inflict upon him; are every one of them such a Proof, as shew him to have a superior Jurisdiction in the Church, and to be properly a Bishop. As to the *Person*; it is an *Heretick*: Which being derived from ἀιρεσιζω, to take or receive others to one's self, signifies one, according to *Hesychius's* Definition, who chusing to have some other Opinion or Doctrine, besides or in opposition, or preferring it before the Truth; is a Leader of a Faction, and a Separatist from the Orthodox Congregation. Which being a Crime of a Spiritual nature, belongs properly to the Cognizance of the Ecclesiastical Judge. As to the Manner in which he is to proceed against him; it is *after a first and second Admonition*. Wherein it differs from the Method prescribed by our Saviour to private Men, in the case of Offenders, *Mat. xviii. 15, &c.* who are there to be first admonish'd privately, and then in the presence of one or two Witnesses, before they are complained of to the Church. But here the Person spoken to, being a publick Magistrate; his first Admonition is reputed equal to the other two; and his second to the third there: So that upon the Criminal's neglecting to hear him, he may go on to Ecclesiastical Censures against him. As to the Punishment, which he is to inflict upon an Heretick; it is *rejecting of him, απαριτẽ*. Thus *St. Paul*, *2 Cor. xiii. 1.* having admonished the Offenders amongst the *Corinthians*  
the

the first time; he proceeds, *Verf. 2. I told you before, and foretel you, as if I were present the second time; and being absent now I write to them which heretofore have sinned, and to all other, that if I come again, I will not spare.* And *Verf. 10.* he tells them, that this second Admonition is, *That he may not use sharpness, according to the power which the Lord had given him to Edification, and not to Destruction:* Which is in the Original, *Kataigēsis, taking away;* the Term commonly used in the Canons for *Excommunication.* From all which it is evident, that *Titus* had a Jurisdiction committed to him; and that he was a Bishop, properly so called. Well therefore might *St. Paul* direct him, *to rebuke with all Authority;* and to advise him to take care, *that no Man should despise him.*

Having proceeded thus far in this matter of the Hierarchy; I think, it will not be improper in this place, before I go farther, that I Answer that grand Objection, which is usually made against Episcopacy, *viz.* That if it were by Divine, or Apostolical Right; the Institution of it would appear in the New Testament. You cannot shew us, say our Adversaries, in any of the Writings of that Holy Book, that ever Jesus Christ, or his Apostles, appointed Bishops above the other Clergy: Or that *St. James the Less,* or *Simeon the Son of Cleophas,* were so at *Ferusalem,* or *Timothy* at *Ephesus,* or *Titus* in *Crete.*

*Objection,*  
That Episcopacy  
does not appear  
in the New Te-  
stament.

To which I answer, 1. That it was not necessary, that the New Testament should tell us, Word for Word, that there must be a Hierarchy in the Christian Church. It was already settled in the Jewish: And it is enough, as I have intimated before, that our Lord did not

*Solution.*

contradict it, or any way oppose the Establishment of it, to shew that he approved it. If he had had a mind to change the Form of it, as to its Substance; he would have express'd himself plainly somewhere to this effect: Let all such as serve at the Altar, or minister about Holy Things, be look'd upon henceforward as Equal; there shall be no more any Subordination between them, as has been hitherto used: The ancient Polity must be now abolish'd, and a new Discipline introduced instead of it; that which has been hitherto observed, is out of Date from this Day forward. But he having not done so; it is but natural for us to conclude, that the Subordination in the Ministry was acceptable to him; and that it was his pleasure it should be continued in the Church under the Gospel, as it was under the Law. For the Ecclesiastical State consisted then of an High Priest, who was above all the other Priests, and Levites: And though there were several Orders of Officers in each principal Synagogue; yet was there one amongst them, who being in an eminent Station, was called the Chief, or Master of it, *the Rabbi*. Besides that it is sufficient, that the Gospel should deliver to us, as it does, the general Maxims of the Government of the Church: Which may admit of some Alteration, as to the Exercise of it, according to the Prudence of those that Govern; provided the Form, as to its Substance, be preserved entire, and a good Order be observed; what is convenient at one time, being liable to be otherwise at another. I would not hereby insinuate, that that Form has been changed, as to the Substance of it: I only say, that if the Gospel has not given us particular Rules about the Exercise of it; it is because it was not thought fit to fix that to a Point, which was left free to be altered; if the Prudence of the future Governors judged it  
proper,

proper, into whose hands the Ecclesiastical Discipline was to be transmitted. For it is not with the Government of the Church, as with the Doctrines of Faith. The Apostles must have declared themselves particularly upon these latter; and have laid down unshaken Principles, and which ought never to be altered; because they are unchangeable. But as to the former; it was enough, that they kept to what they found already in use in the Church: And that they recommended, as they did, 1 Cor. xiv. 40. *That all things should be done decently, and in Order;* καὶ ταξίω, according to the Establish'd Order.

2. I reply, That our Adversaries alledge a thing which is not granted, *viz.* That we cannot prove by the New Testament, that there was instituted a Distinction of Degrees in the Evangelical Ministry; and that some were raised above others in Dignity, and Power, in Quality of Bishops. Methinks (without repeating others) one cannot read that celebrated Passage, *Ephes. iv. 11, 12.* which I had before occasion to mention; *When Jesus Christ ascended up on high, he gave some, Apostles; and some, Prophets; and some, Evangelists; and some, Pastors, and Teachers; For the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for the edifying of the Body of Christ.* I say, One cannot read that Passage, without observing a plain Subordination between those Ministers; some appearing higher than others in those very Stations. As for *St. James, Simeon, Timothy, and Titus;* I presume, I have fully demonstrated above, that they were Bishops in their respective Sees. It is true, it is here pretended, that some of these Men were a kind of Bishops at large, by virtue of their Character of Evangelists: And that it was upon that account, that *St. Paul* sent them into remote Places, and beyond the Seas, to ordain Ministers, where

they were wanted, in the Churches which he had founded. But besides that it cannot be proved, that the Office of a Bishop was included in that of an Evangelist; it is thereby confess'd, in some measure, that none but those who had the Apostles Commission, or were sent by them, could ordain Ministers in the Church. For indeed if others might have done it; why did they not leave it to them? And why did they engage those their Deputies in troublesome Journeys, and perilous Voyages; if the other Pastors, who were present in those Churches, could admit Men into the Service of the Church, by the Imposition of their own Hands on them? Certainly those Evangelists had a Power, which the other Ministers had not; and which could not be conferr'd on them, but by the Apostles, who ordained them to it. The truth is, we do not find, that in those Days any but the Apostles, the Evangelists Commissioned thereunto by them, and the Apostles Successors; *i. e.* the Bishops; took upon them to lay their Hands on Men, to institute them into the Ministerial Function: That Work was left to them, as who had the Right to perform it. And call those Deputies, or Successors of the Apostles, *Bishops*, or not; it is sufficient to my purpose, that they had a Dignity, and an Authority, which the other Ministers had not. But what can our Adversaries return to the Instances of *Simeon*; and that before-mentioned of *Timothy's* Successor, or whoever was at that time Bishop of *Ephesus*; to which I might add those of *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*, of *Antipas* Bishop of *Pergamos*, of the Bishop of *Thyatira*; and the other three Bishops of the Churches of *Asia*, who are written to by *St. John*, at the Direction of Jesus Christ, *Rev. ii.* and *iii.* and which are not liable to the Evasion of these Persons being Evangelists? To confine my self at present to the

the first of these seven *Asiatick* Bishops, though the same thing is observable of them all: I perceive in him a distinct Character from the rest of his Clergy; and I consider him as he, who was appointed by the Holy Ghost to impart to his Flock that important Instruction, which was to make their Happiness, or Misery. He is stiled there an *Angel*, upon the account of his Office, Merit, and the Authority he had to speak to his Church, as from God, and as his Ambassador: And therefore to him alone is that Commission, and that Instruction directed. From all which it is evident, that both the Institution, so far as was necessary; and the Practice of Episcopacy, with the Distinction of Degrees in the Ministry, appears by the New Testament. To which I may annex, that Jesus Christ is represented in the beginning of this second Chapter, and in the preceding, as holding seven Stars in his right Hand, *viz.* these seven Bishops: Which cannot imply less, than his Approbation, and Protection of this Form of Church-Government.

Now because it may fall out, that some reflecting upon the Answer I have given to the Objection against Episcopacy, taken from hence, that its Institution is no where to be found in the New Testament; no Footsteps of it being seen in the Writings of the Evangelists, or Apostles, as the Anti-Episcopal Men pretend; because it may so fall out, I say, that some will infer, that according to a part of that Answer, there must be a Pope in the Christian Church: I think it will not be amiss here, that I take off that Illusion. If it be true, they will urge, that Jesus Christ fashioned the Evangelical Ministry, or of the New Church, upon the Model of the Old; *i. e.* if he has not changed the Form of the Ecclesiastical Government, except as to what was Typical, and Ceremonial in it; but

has transmitted to his Apostles the Idea of the Subordination between the Ministers, without touching that Point; (that they, and their Successors might let it run on, as that which had always been, and was always to be in use in Religion) there ought to be in the Christian Church a Sovereign Pontif, upon whom all may depend, in whatever Station they are; and that can be no other at this Day, than the Pope of *Rome*. It cannot be denied, but this follows from what I have asserted: But then this Sovereign Pontif, or High Priest, is not the Pope, but Jesus Christ himself; who is stiled, *I Pet. ii. 25. The Shepherd, and Bishop of our Souls;* and in several places of the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. iv, v, vii, &c. *our High Priest*. And who being the Head of the Church, has appointed some to one Work, and others to another, in a due Subordination, according to his manifold Wisdom. So that there is none but He, that can justly pretend to the supreme Seat in the Christian Church. And conformable to this, as the High Priest under the Law was the Type of Jesus Christ; so the Diversity of Offices amongst the Ministers of the Jewish Synagogue, whereof some were superior to others; was the Pattern of the different Degrees; and of the Subordination of the Officers under the Gospel, who serve in the Christian Church, under Jesus Christ their Head, according to their proper Stations.

## C H A P. X.

*An Explication of some Passages of the New Testament, and the Fathers, which are perverted to Overthrow the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry.*

**N**Otwithstanding what I have hitherto said, and proved out of the New Testament, and the Fathers; I am so sensible of the Tenaciousness of our Adversaries, that I doubt, they will not easily quit their Hold: And the more, because they think their Opinion grounded in the same Book, and Writers, as well as ours. They pretend, that there are several Passages in the New Testament, (which it would be too long to repeat here) wherein the Terms of *Bishop*, and *Presbyter*, signifie the same Officer; that those that are called there *Bishops*, were likewise *Presbyters*; and that those that are called there *Presbyters*, were likewise *Bishops*: That there were several Bishops, or Presbyters, in one and the same Church; and that the Apostles themselves, who were likewise Bishops at large, stiled themselves *Presbyters*; and the like. And to shew farther, say they, that there was an Equality between all those several Pastors; they look'd upon one another as Brethren: And considered themselves as Fellow-Labourers, and Fellow-Soldiers. To which they add some Quotations out of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, and other Fathers; which speak after the same manner. And likewise the Title, which some Bishops of the second, and third Centuries, give themselves some-

times, of Sym-Presbyters. But I shall endeavour now, by the following Reflections, to overthrow this Argument of theirs; and shew, by a general Explication of those Passages, that they misunderstand the Sense and Spirit of the New Testament, and those Fathers; and pervert the Apostolical, and Primitive Form of Church-Government, to serve their own Purposes.

To solve all these Difficulties, I presume, I need lay down but this one Principle; *viz.* That the Terms of *Bishop*, of *Presbyter*, or *Elder*, and even of *Deacon*, both in the New Testament, and in the Writings of some of the earliest Fathers, may be sometimes used Appellatively, and sometimes Properly. In the former Acceptation, according to its primary Signification, the Term of *Bishop* denotes an *Overseer*; that of *Presbyter*, or *Elder*, as it relates not to *Age*, but an *Office*, and has been transferr'd from the State to the Church, imports an *Ecclesiastical Officer* with *Præfecture*; and that of *Deacon*, a *Servant*. In the latter; the Word *Bishop* signifies one, who has the chief oversight of a *See*; who has the Right of Ordaining Ministers in it; and the Authority of exercising Jurisdiction over his Clergy, and the Faithful within his *Diocese*, in Spiritual Matters. That of *Presbyter* one, who has a special Power of Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments, in the Congregation committed to his Care. And that of *Deacon* one, who besides serving Tables in the Scripture-pharse, and distributing the Charities to the Poor; is admitted likewise into the Ministry, to Preach the Word, and Administer the Sacrament of *Baptism*, in Subserviency to the Bishop. This Distinction of Terms, and Offices, being well minded, will, I doubt not, easily remove the Exceptions that are here started.

And

And therefore, 1. It is not to be wonder'd at, if the *Bishops* are called *Presbyters*, or *Elders*, in the New Testament; or the *Presbyters Bishops*, in the Sense of our Adversaries: (Which I only admit for Disputing-sake, it being pretty difficult to shew it in any Passage of that Book) And if some of the Primitive Fathers, as is alledged, have spoken in that Stile. For taking those words Appellatively, the *Bishop*, and the *Presbyter* might very well pass for the same thing; and the Name be promiscuously applied to either of them in that Meaning. The *Bishops* are called *Presbyters*, or *Elders*, it is confess'd; as having a *Præfecture* in the Church, and the highest too ordinarily; and so might the Apostles themselves. And who denies, that *Presbyters* having Cure of Souls, are *Bishops* in the primary Acceptation of the Word; and have an Inspection over the Flock committed to them? Upon which account St. Paul titles all the Elders of the District of *Ephesus*, Acts xx. 28. both *Bishops*, and *Presbyters*; (supposing there were any of this latter Order in that Assembly; for *Ireneus*, who lived pretty near that time, tells us, \* "That those Elders were called together " from *Ephesus*, and the other Cities; taking them for the Bishops of that Province;) *Overseers*, or *Bishops*: And exhorted them, to take heed unto themselves, and to all the Flock; and to feed the Church of God, which he had purchased with his own Blood. This was their common Duty, and a thing Essential to their respective Functions. But because there were several Elders in the Church of *Ephesus*; and because St. Paul makes of those several Elders, or *Presbyters*, so many *Overseers*, or *Bishops*: It does not follow from thence, that there was not one Pastor amongst them, who

---

\* Iren. adv. Har. lib. 3. cap. 14.

was above all the others; and whose peculiar Business it was to Govern it in chief, to confer holy Orders, and exercise Spiritual Jurisdiction. The Holy Ghost had appointed all the Elders of that District, to be Bishops; in as much as he would have them take the Oversight of the Flock, and feed it. But then it was as the Ministers of the Jewish Church, who were Inspectors of the *Mosaic* Service, and the Temple of *Jerusalem*; and yet had a High Priest at their Head, who had the chief Care, and Government of it. So that he that was the *Antistes* of a Christian See, and presided over that Body, as its Head, and had the principal Inspection of it; was called the *Bishop*, by way of Eminency: Because the other Pastors depended upon him, and acted but under him. These were like the Subordinate Officers in a State, who administer Affairs under the Sovereign. Not that I could compare the Church to a Temporal Kingdom, in all respects: But I presume, an Ecclesiastical Government may be chalk'd out by the Pattern of a Civil one.

Neither 2. ought we to be surpris'd, that the Terms of *Bishop*, and *Presbyter* or *Elder*, are thus promiscuously used; and that the one is called by the Name of the other, though not according to our Adversaries Meaning. The very Apostles, as they truly alledge, stile themselves *Elders*, or *Presbyters*, and even *Sympresbyters*, as it is in the Original: So St. Peter, 1 Pet. v. 1. *The Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder, and a Witness of the Sufferings of Christ, and also a Partaker of the Glory that shall be revealed.* So St. John, Epist. 2. 1. *The Elder under the elect Lady, and her Children, whom I love in the Truth: And not I only, but also all they that have known the Truth.* And Epist. 3. 1. *The Elder unto the well-beloved Gaius, whom I love in the Truth.* And they

they call themselves likewise *Deacons*, *Διακονοι*, 1 *Cor.* iii. 5. As their *Ministry* is termed *Διακονια*, 2 *Deaconship*, *Acts* i. 25. But then these several Titles are used Appellatively, and upon the account of some common Functions. This promiscuous Use of the Words *Bishop*, *Presbyter*, or *Deacon*, does not take away the true Distinction of these three Orders. It is allowed on all hands, that the *Presbyterat*, and the *Diaconat*, are two Offices, formally distinguish'd in the Writings of those Men, who are by every one acknowledged to have been Divinely-Inspired; and even so far distinguish'd, that our Adversaries will not grant the *Deacons* to have been sacred Officers, as the *Presbyters*. And yet they are sometimes confounded in the New Testament, and the Fathers, as to their Functions; and consequently might have been so, as to their Names: Those who were *Deacons*, being likewise *Presbyters*; and those who were *Presbyters*, being likewise *Deacons*, in some common respect. But such a Confusion of Terms, and Offices, could not make of those two things one; nor blend absolutely the two different Degrees of the *Presbyterat*, and the *Diaconat* together. Now that this is so, is what may be verified by those very Men, who were first instituted *Deacons* by the Apostles themselves; whereof the greatest part, if not all, were ordained *Presbyters*, in one Sense; by the Imposition of their Hands, to exercise part of that Function. At least amongst those seven, it cannot well be denied of *Stephen*, and *Philip*. They were appointed to be *Deacons*, and yet they perform the Office of *Presbyters*; they are called *Deacons*, and yet they acted as *Presbyters*: They are both *Deacons*, and *Presbyters*. Were not the *Presbyterat*, and the *Diaconat*, two distinct Degrees in the Ministry; Because those who are called *Deacons* by the Fathers, were also *Presbyters*, in one

one respect? That *Stephen*, and *Philip* were Deacons, appears from their Ordination, recorded *Acts* vi. wherein we are positively told, that the Apostles laid their Hands on seven Men for that Office; who are there particularly named, and amongst them these two first. And that both of them might be called *Presbyters* likewise, is evident from hence, that they Preached the Gospel, and Administred the holy Sacraments, at least that of Baptism: What none can do, but in that Quality, and being thereunto Authorized. For these are the two Essential parts of the Evangelical Priesthood; as the Reading and Expounding of the Law, and the Offering the Incense, and Sacrifices, were of the Legal. And none can pretend to exercise any Office in the Ministry, unless he be duly Ordained thereunto. Those very seven Persons, who were first set apart to serve Tables, would have committed a kind of Sacrilege, if they had taken upon them to Preach the Word, and Administer the Sacraments, without a lawful Commission. As for *Stephen*, he Preach'd the Gospel so powerfully, that the Jewish Doctors *were not able to resist the Wisdom, and the Spirit by which he spake*, as we have it in *Acts* vi. 10. And as for *Philip*; it does not only appear, that he was an effectual Preacher, having thereby converted a great part of the City of *Samaria* (*Sebaste*) to the Faith; But also that, besides that, he administer'd the Sacrament of Baptism to the Eunuch of *Candace* Queen of the *Ethiopians*; as it is related in that Book, Chap. viii. If then there were Deacons Presbyters, upon one account; and Presbyters might be called Deacons, upon another, because of some common Functions; and that Confusion of Names could not prejudice the real Distinction, which lies between the different Degrees of the Presbyterat, and the Diaconat: Why, by the same reason, should not the Presbyter be

be Bishop, and the Bishop be stiled Presbyter; and this Indistinction of Words not destroy the Diversity of Orders between them? There is much more ground in this latter case, than in the former, for the promiscuous Use of the Terms. The Priesthood is the most Essential, and the most intrinsically honourable Office of the Evangelical Ministry: It is in a manner the whole of the Minister of the Gospel, without which the rest is but little in comparison. Episcopacy is indeed a noble Dignity in the Church, which clothes the Priesthood with a fine Robe: But as it relates peculiarly to the Government, and external State of the Body; if it be not grounded upon the other, it signifies not much. The Glory of the Ministry consists in Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments; which in a special manner constitutes the Priesthood, though eminently in, and derived from the Episcopat. The Bishop would be little more than a bare Inspector, and not a very profitable Servant in the House of God, if he did not perform the Duty of a Priest; which is the most excellent Work a Man can desire upon Earth. The chief Glory then of the Ministry, and its most Essential part consisting in the Priestly Office; what wonder is it, if the Bishops are called Presbyters in the New Testament, or the Fathers; since it is that which makes them intrinsically Ministers of the Gospel, and without which their Dignity would be but inconsiderable? This is the true Reason, why the Bishops, and even the Apostles themselves, are sometimes stiled Presbyters. It is in respect of these Functions chiefly, not excluding the *Presecture*, that they are so named. And when they are termed *Bishops*, it is upon the account of a new Dignity, that they have obtained in the Church; which gives them a particular Right, and Authority, in order to perpetuate the Ministerial

sterial Succession. But we ought not to conclude Illogically, that because they take upon them the Titles of *Bishops*, and *Presbyters*; the Orders of the Episcopat, and the Presbyterat, are not different: As I have observed of this latter, and the Diaconat; which are two distinct Degrees, though a Presbyter may be called Deacon, and *vice versa*, as to some common respect.

3. Admitting, that in the time of the Apostles there were several Bishops in one Church; it does not follow from thence, that there was not one at their Head, who governed the See in chief, and instituted Men into the Ministry. I put here-upon this Question to our Adversaries: Whether those Bishops enjoyed an eminent Degree above the simple Presbyters, or not? If they answer, No; and that they were not Ordained to a superior Authority in the Church: Then the Presbyters were Equal with them, and they possessed no more than these. But in that case, I must reply, That they were Bishops but by their Inspection; *i. e.* that they were all Inspectors of the Flock in common, and appellatively: Which makes nothing against the Dignity of the proper Bishops. If they say, Yea; and that they had received a superior, or a new Order; I have what I ask: And that Bishops consequently in the time of the Apostles were seated in a higher Station in the Church than the Presbyters; and all the Presbyters were not Bishops, properly so called. It can hardly be denied, I must confess, that the Apostles, or those Commissioned by them, Ordained several Bishops for the Service of one principal Church: I mean not for all, but for those which were most populous. And this, I humbly conceive, is so far from Invalidating the Unity of Episcopacy, that it contributes much to Illustrate it. But then I affirm, that they were either in the Nature of Coadjutors,

to supply the Place of the proper Bishop, in case of Age, Infirmities, and Accidents; or in the Congregations which used a different Language, or observed particular Rites within his District: Or they were a kind of Titular Bishops, without any Flocks appropriated to them, but ready at hand to undertake the Care of such as should be afterwards gathered into one Diocese; μελλοντων πιστευειν, as should afterwards believe, as *St. Clement* expresses \* it. The principal Churches were a kind of Colleges, as the holy Father seems to intimate in that place; whence Bishops were taken out to fill up the room of the Deceased, or were sent to Govern other Churches, which were newly planted, and wanted a Primate. For if there had been but one Bishop in one chief Church, as indeed but one could do the Office at one time, without destroying the Unity of Episcopacy; I say, if there had been but one Bishop there, and none of those Coadjutors, or those Titular Bishops: When that Incumbent died, who should have Consecrated one for the vacant See, or the other Occasions that might happen? The Lower Clergy could not, as I have already shewn: It was then necessary, that there should be some one, or more Bishops in the Church, or nigh to it, to answer such Accidents. It is true, that in *St. Paul's* time, when Bishops were scarce, and the Harvest grew plenteous; he sent *Timothy*, and *Titus*, with Commissions to ordain Elders in various Countries; and made them cross the Seas for that purpose. But to prevent such Inconveniencies for the future; it is not improbable, that the Apostles left more than one Bishop in certain Churches: To the end, that when they, or their Neighbours should want any, they might be speedily supplied; and the Mini-

\* Clem. Epist. 1. ad Cor. Sect. 42.

sterial Succession not be interrupted; and there should be always Men in the Church, having a Right to admit others into its Service. This is the account that may be given, how there were several Bishops in one Church, in the very time of the Apostles; if the Matter of Fact be true, and they were not rather Diocesans under a Metropolitan in a Province, which is the most likely.

But, 4. Nothing seems to me worse infer'd, for the pretended Equality between all the Ministers in the Church, than the Conclusion our Adversaries would make, that because the Apostles, in the New Testament, call themselves *Presbyters*, and likewise *Fellow-Soldiers*, and *Fellow-Labourers in the Work of the Lord*; and some Bishops of the second, and third Centuries, (which we do not deny) gave themselves sometimes the Title of *Sympresbyters*: They were therefore the same, without Distinction, or Subordination. The truth is, if the Apostles were not superior to the rest of the Clergy; it must be own'd, that they were all Equal. But who can believe, that the Apostles, upon whom the Christian Church was founded, Jesus Christ himself being the Head Corner-Stone; were not placed in a higher Station, than the ordinary Ministers of it? Or that any of these in their time would have disputed Precedency with them; and pretended, that their Authority, and Votes were as good as theirs? Besides that there seems to me to be some Rashness, in insinuating, that the Deacons, as such; if they are a part in one respect, and an Order of the Clergy, as we say they are; have an equal share in the Administration of the Church with the Presbyters. Doubtless there is as much Subordination between these, with relation to their Power, as to their Office. But admit, that all the Pastors, of what Denomi-  
nation

nation soever they be, are *Sympresbyters*; and that *St. Peter* was so to all those he spake to, as he says it himself; and the Bishops of the second, and third Centuries were so: Does it follow from thence, that they are all Equal, as to their Rights, Pre-eminencies, and Authorities? It is true, that they have this in common between them; that they are Presbyters, to Preach the Word, and Administer the Sacraments. And I likewise allow, that in that they are *Brethren, Fellow-Soldiers, and Fellow-Labourers*, jointly in the Work of the Lord. But will any Man infer from thence, that they labour in the same Rank; and that the one are not Subordinate to the others, that the Work may be done with Order? It is indisputable, that the Apostleship had something Sublimier in it, than the ordinary Ministry: And none can be so silly, as to Equal a simple Presbyter with *St. Peter*. His Intention was not therefore to put his Office in the Scales with that of the other Ministers, in calling himself an *Elder, or Presbyter*: In what Sense, is not material here to inquire. But if as an Apostle, *St. Peter* possessed a Dignity above the other Pastors; why not as well, as being a Bishop? If a Bishop does not enjoy a higher Degree in the Church, than a simple Presbyter, because he is a *Sympresbyter*; I must say, by the same Reason, that *St. Peter* did not, because he called himself so expressly. And by that means, in speaking so, he will have declared, that the Apostleship has nothing in it above the common Ministry: Which is a thing directly contrary to Truth, and his own Judgment. But what is it then that he would signify, by reckoning himself amongst the Elders, or Presbyters? Why, that the other Pastors, to whom God has committed the feeding of his Flock, share with him the Office of Preaching the Word, and Administering the Sacraments;

and that he is their Sympresbyter, and Fellow-worker, in Edifying the Body of Christ. What an Absurdity is it therefore, to conclude from thence, that the other Ministers were Equal with *St. Peter*; and that he was not set in a higher Station in the Church than they? Is it so, that by that Association of the Eldership, and Apostleship, all the Presbyters were Apostles; or that the Apostle was no more than a simple Elder, or Minister? But if the Sym-presbyterism, as I may word it, of *St. Peter*, did not hinder him from holding a distinguish'd Degree in the Body of the Clergy: Why should it swallow up the Episcopal Dignity? And if that Term implies an Equality between all the Ministers, the Apostle was no more above the secondary Presbyter, than the Bishop; and *St. Peter* will have thereby null'd the Glory of the Apostleship, or made it common: What, I suppose, he never intended.

---

## C H A P. XI.

*Remarks upon some Passages of St. Jerom, which seem to be contrary to the Hierarchy.*

**T**HE before-cited Texts of Scripture, and Examples given of Bishops in the time of the Apostles, prove, at least in general, and in the main, that the Institution of Episcopacy, and the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry, were in the very beginning of Christianity. But before I descend to other Particulars, and follow step by step the

the

the three first Centuries, to make the Reader discern therein the constant course of the Hierarchy; I think it will not be amiss, that I examine some Passages of *St. Jerom*; which seem to imply, that the Episcopal Government was not instituted by Christ, or his Apostles; that in the Days of these latter, the Bishop, and the Presbyter were the same Officer, without any Distinction; and that the Hierarchical Form was not establish'd in the Church till long after them, and that by a kind of Necessity, lest it should be torn to pieces by Schisms; which would soon have overwhelmed it, if the Primitive, and Apostolical Discipline had not been changed. I shall insist a little upon the Explication of those Passages, because there are few Anti-episcopal Men but alledge them, when this Question comes into Debate: As if the Testimony of one single Father, and he a latter one, were to prevail over the whole current of the rest. Besides that it may be said, that *St. Jerom* has spoken therein like a Presbyter; who being not a Bishop, and thinking he deserved to be one, as well as many others of his time; was grown peevish at Episcopacy: And thereupon would Equalize the Presbyterat with it, as to their beginning, wherein the Presbyters were in some respects as much as the Bishops. But let us come to the Passages, in as few words as possible; to avoid Tedioufness, without taking off any thing from the force of them. *St. Jerom* then, in his Comment upon the *Epistle to Titus*, after he had urged an Argument for it, as he does some others elsewhere; which it is not necessary to recite here, being answered by the whole Tenor of this Discourse; concludes thus, \* *Idem est ergo Presbyter, qui & Episcopus: & antequam Diaboli instinctu, studia in Religione fierent,*

---

\* Hieronym. in Tit.

*Et diceretur in Populis, Ego sum Pauli, ego Apollo, ego autem Cepha, communi Presbyterorum consilio Ecclesie gubernabantur. Postquam verò unusquisque eos quos Baptizaverat; suos putavit esse, non Christi, in toto Orbe decretum est, ut unus de Presbyteris electus superponeretur ceteris, ad quem omnis Ecclesie cura pertineret; Et Schismatum semina tollerentur.—Sicut ergo Presbyteri sciunt se ex Ecclesie consuetudine, ei qui sibi prapositus fuerit, esse subjectos; ita Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominice veritate Presbyteris esse majores; Et in commune debere Ecclesiam regere: Imitantes Moysen, qui cum haberet Solus præesse Populo Israël, septuaginta elegit, cum quibus Populum judicaret. In his Epistle to Oceanus the Presbyter, he tells him, † Apud veteres iidem Episcopi atque Presbyteri fuerunt; quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc atatis. In his Epistle to Evagrius, he speaks much to the same purpose: To which he adds, \* Quid enim facit excepta Ordinatione Episcopus, quod Presbyter non facit?—Et ut sciamus Traditiones Apostolicas sumptas de veteri Testamento; quod Aaron, Et Filii ejus, atque Levite in Templo fuerunt; hoc sibi Episcopi, Et Presbyteri, atque Diaconi vendicent in Ecclesia.*

Now to enter upon the Explication of these Passages: I affirm, 1. That *Jerom* did believe the Subordination in the Ministry, and the Superiority of the Bishops above the Presbyters; as appears from these very places, and some others. For he says here expressly, “ That it was an Apostolical Tradition, taken out of the Old Testament, that what *Aaron*, and his Sons, and the Levites were in the Temple; the same were the Bishops, and Presbyters, and Deacons in the Church. Upon

---

† Epist. ad Ocean.

\* Epist. ad Evagr.

which account he exhorts *Nepotianus* thus, || *Esto subiectus Pontifici tuo, & quasi animæ parentem suscipe: quod Aaron, & Filios ejus; hoc Episcopum, & Presbyteros esse noverimus.* Now we are all agreed, that there was a Subordination between *Aaron*, and his Sons, and the Levites; he being the High-Priest, and their Superior; and they of an Inferior Order. And again, in the forecited Passage to *Evagrius*, having told him how at *Alexandria*, from *Mark* the Evangelist to *Hercles* and *Dionysius* the Bishops, the Presbyters always chusing one of themselves, and placing him in a higher Degree, did call him the Bishop: He subjoyns, *Quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat, aut Diaconi eligant de se quem industrium noverint, & Archidiaconum vocent.* Where he owns all those Bishops to have been placed in a higher Degree above the Presbyters, in the same manner as a General is above his Army. And indeed he titles the Bishops, *Princes of the Church*; as in the same Comment upon *Titus*, *Ecclesiæ Principem formans*, speaking of a singular Bishop, or the Presbyter there to be Ordained. What he extends to all the Christian World, in his Comment upon *Psalms* xlv. and that by Christ's Appointment: *Constituit Christus—in omnibus finibus Mundi Principes Ecclesiæ, scil. Episcopos.* For which he gives a very good Reason, in his *Dialogue* against *Lucifer*: † *Ecclesiæ Salus*, says he, *in summi Sacerdotis dignitate pendet, cui si non exors quedam, & ab omnibus eminens detur potestas; tot in Ecclesiis efficiuntur Schismata, quot Sacerdotes.*

But, 2. I say, that the Institution, and Antiquity of Episcopacy, or of the Distinction of Orders; is proved by those Authorities of *Jerom*, which our Adversaries chiefly urge against it here. For tho'

|| Ad Nepot. Epist. 2.

† Dial. adv. Lucifer.

in those Passages there are some Expressions, which are a little too harsh; and the Equality, and Identity he puts between the Bishop, and the Presbyter, amongst the Ancients, *i. e.* in the Days of the Apostles; seems to overthrow their Distinction: Yet they shew pretty plainly the Antiquity of Episcopacy, and the Subordination of the Presbyterial Office to the Episcopal. “ Before that, says he, “ by the Instigation of the Devil, there were “ Parties made in Religion; and it was said amongst the People, I am of *Paul*, I am of *Apollos*, and I am of *Cephas*; the Churches were “ governed by the common Counsel of the Presbyters. But after every one reckoned them his “ own, whom he had Baptized, not Christ’s: It “ was decreed in all the World, that one chosen “ out of the Presbyters, should be set over the “ rest, and should have the Care of the whole “ Church; that by that means the Seeds of Schisms “ should be taken away. That is the Translation, and Sense of *St. Jerom’s* Words. Now it was in the time of the Apostles, and at *Corinth*, that the People said, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, and I of him that has baptized me*, 1 Cor. i. 12, 13. Which caused Contentions, and sowed a Schism in that Church. It was then in those Days, that to remedy that, it was judged necessary amongst the Apostles, and the other Pastors of the Flock; that throughout the World, where there were Christian Churches planted, there should be a Bishop chosen in each Clergy, who should be the chief Rector, and Guardian of the Church, over which he was appointed. There is therefore, by the very Testimony of *St. Jerom*, Episcopacy establish’d in the time of the Apostles; to remedy the Schism of those that said, *I am of Paul, and I of Apollo, and I of Cephas, and I of him that has baptized me*. Which gave occasion to that Settlement,

ment, as he says. There is the *Epoch*, according to him, of its Antiquity, and of the Distinction of the Christian Priesthood; which I put with him within the Period of the Apostles: And which has always continu'd in the Church, without ever being brought under Deliberation in any Council, whether it should be altered.

But if I must explain particularly the Passages of *St. Jerom*; I do not find in them the Sense our Adversaries would affix to them: And though there be some Ambiguity, and Equivocation in them; yet they may be true, if their Meaning be rightly understood. He tells us, "That the Bishops, and  
" the Presbyters were the same amongst the An-  
" cients; because the former is a Name of Dig-  
" nity, and the latter of Age: Seeming to imply,  
they denoted one and the same Office. Does he mean by that, that all the Bishops were Presbyters, and all the Presbyters were Bishops? If he did so; he would contradict himself, and the Truth. He would have the Presbyter to be called Bishop, upon the account of his Dignity, and Office; which is to watch over the Flock: And the same Person, who is a Bishop for that reason, to be likewise called Presbyter, because he is old in Age. But this is not true in Fact, as to all the Pastors of the Church; who could not be all called Presbyters, and Bishops, in both these respects: There having been some Bishops, who were not ancient in Age; and consequently could not be called Presbyters upon that score. Whereof *St. Paul* himself is an evident proof; having been constituted an Apostle, or Bishop, (which I have shewn in some respects to have been the same thing in effect) when he was yet very young, not being above twenty five Years of Age, as it is supposed. But *Timothy*, whom he had Ordained a Bishop, is an Instance past all Controversie; since the Apostle intimates

it plainly, 1 *Tim.* iii. 12. when he gives him in charge, *That he should let no Man despise his Youth.* Neither *St. Paul* then, nor *Timothy*, in respect of the Name, were Presbyters; though they were Bishops: And consequently upon the account of that Name, as it denotes Ancientness of Age, all Bishops were not Presbyters. And by the same Reason, all those that were called Presbyters upon the score of their Age, might not be called Bishops in respect of the Name, as it implies Watching: Since, though they had some Right of Watching over the Flock, they were not therefore the chief Overseers of it, nor enjoyed their Dignity, and Office. So that all that *St. Jerom* would say in those Passages, which we are now Explaining, is only this; that ordinarily the Pastors of the Church bore those two Names of *Bishop*, and *Presbyter*, by reason of the different Qualities they had. They were called *Presbyters*, because they were commonly Ancient, when they were instituted into the Ministry: And they were named *Bishops*, because it was their proper part to Watch over the Flock. Which is the true Account, how those two Titles were confounded in one and the same Person: The same Pastor was called by those two different Names; or to speak in the Words of *St. Jerom* to *Oceanus* the Presbyter, \**Apud veteres iidem Episcopi atque Presbyteri fuerunt; quia illud nomen dignitatis est, hoc ætatis.* But it cannot be inferr'd from thence, that all the Bishops were Presbyters, according to the proper Signification of the Word: Or that all the Pastors, who might be called Presbyters, and Bishops, in that respect; were the principal Presbyters, and Bishops of their Churches in Dignity. For that is the Point in Question; *vis.* Whether, though the Pastors might be called Presbyters, and

---

\* *Suprà Epist. ad Ocean,*

Bishops, by reason of their Age, and Office too; which made St. *Jerom* conclude on that account, † *Idem ergo est Presbyter, qui & Episcopus*; there was not one amongst them, who as the Head was stiled the Bishop of the Church, and was the chief Governor of it? This the Father does not deny in those Passages. And I make no doubt, but he believed it; as I hope it will appear by the Reasons I shall now offer for it, besides those I have already given.

St. *Jerom* then is so far from being of a contrary Opinion, as our Adversaries pretend, that he seems to me to confute it plainly; and to have provided the Christians of the following Ages with Arguments to destroy it, when he says there, that *inter plures equaliter Ecclesie cura dividitur\**; and that the Bishops, and the Presbyters *debent regere Ecclesiam in commune*; and that the Bishops are greater than the Presbyters, *magis Ecclesie consuetudine, quam Dispositionis Dominice veritate*. I must confess, these Expressions are somewhat harsh; and strictly taken, not to be defended. But what likelihood is there, that St. *Jerom* would undermine the good Order of the Church; and speak against a Government universally establish'd at that time, *in toto Orbe*, as he expresses it; or against the Hypothesis, which he proceeds upon in other places; as we have seen? Inquire we therefore into the Sense, and Meaning of his Words. According to the manner in which he delivers himself, it must be agreed, that he had not in his Mind the way after which the Church was governed *apud veteres* only, in the earliest Ages of Christianity; but that he utters himself here likewise concerning the Administration of it, as it stood in his time: *Sicut Presbyteri sciunt, &c.* A Man

† Suprà in Tit.

\* Ibid.

must have but little Knowledge in Ecclesiastical Antiquity, or be very impudent to deny, that in the Days of *St. Jerom*, the Degree of Bishop was distinguish'd from that of Presbyter; or that the chief Care of the Church did, belong to him who was Bishop thereof. And yet our Author tells us, that then, *viz.* towards the end of the fourth Century, *Ecclesie cura inter plures equaliter dividitur*; and that the Bishops, and Presbyters *debent regere Ecclesiam in commune*. What appearance is there, that he would lay down a Fact, which was notoriously false; *viz.* the Equality of the Pastors, and of their Degree, and Care in the Church: Since the chief Government of it was appropriated to the Bishops? Would he not have render'd himself ridiculous to the Clergy, and the World, if he had thereby pretended, that the Government of the Church ought to be changed, which had been settled in it for some Ages: And if he had understood by those Words, that the Bishop had no more Authority there, than the meanest Minister? We must therefore find out a more Reasonable Meaning, more Consistent with, and more Worthy *St. Jerom*, in those Expressions of *Æqualiter*, and *in Commune*: Since he spake conformably to the Usage of his Time, wherein an Equality in the Ministry, and in the Discipline was not imparted to each Pastor; but the principal Government and Care of the Flock belonged to him, who had been appointed Bishop above the rest of the Clergy. He would say then, that although the Bishops be above the other Ministers of the Church by their Dignity; yet they ought not to presume so far upon their Authority, as to exclude the Body of the inferior Clergy from their Care of the Flock, in which they have their share, according to the Station wherein God has placed them: That though they are the Governors; yet Jesus Christ has assigned them

Counsellors,

Counsellors, whose Advice they ought to take; and therefore to confer with them, as with Men who may give them Light in the Management of Church-Affairs, that they be not done inconsiderately, or arbitrarily; and that they, and their Clergy, compose a kind of Senate, for the building up of the Body of Christ. And moreover, that they are all jointly, and separately concerned in the Work of the Ministry; in Preaching the Word, Administring the Sacraments, and Watching over the Flock. This seems to me to be the true Sense of those Words *Æqualiter*, and *in Commune*. But St. *Jerom* would not have us, and we ought not to conclude thence; that all the Pastors, or all those that make up the Body of the Clergy, are Equal; and that there is no Distinction to be put between them. What he means by *Ecclesiæ consuetudo*, & *Dominicæ dispositionis veritas*; is not so easily understood: But if it implies, that Episcopacy is not of Divine Institution; that is Explained, and Answer'd throughout this Tract.

To illustrate this matter by one, or two Examples in this Church of *England*: It would be a wrong Conclusion, that because the Clergy of the Province of *Canterbury*, assembled in Convocation, do consult, and deliberate together, in *Æqualiter*, and *in Commune*, as St. *Jerom* speaks, about the Affairs of the Church; all the Members were Equal with the Archbishop, who presides there: Or that the Presbyters in the lower House, had the same Authority with the Bishops in the upper; particularly in things of Judicature, or such as immediately concern the Government of the Church, and the Execution of the Ecclesiastical Laws. The same is to be said of the Diocese of *London*, or *Winchester*; wherein the Bishop, and his Presbyters do *regere Ecclesiam in Commune*; & *Ecclesiæ cura inter plures æqualiter dividitur*. Because he

confers with them about the Government, and well-ordering of his Flock; and they work with him in directing it; in Preaching the Word, and Administring the Sacraments: It does not follow from thence, that he is not their Head; or that they have an Equal Power with him in all things, *exceptâ Ordinatione*. He has his Ecclesiastical Courts; his Chancellor, Archdeacons, Commissaries, Surrogates, and other Officers, for the Exercise of his Jurisdiction. They indeed share with him the Care of the Congregations, which are committed to them: And some of them are called *Rectors*, others *Vicars*; and generally all *Curates*, upon that account; because *Ecclesiæ cura ipsis competit, æquè ac Episcopo*: They even bear a part in the Spiritual Administration, being empowered to suspend Men from the Communion: Executing the Bishop's Censures, and Mandates, which are sent to them. But it cannot be denied, that he is raised above them in Dignity, and Authority. Whence it is evident, that by the Establishment of this Church, though the Government, and Care of the Flock belongs to all the Pastors, in their respective Capacities; yet each Diocese, in this part of the Kingdom, has a Bishop, who excels his Clergy in Office, Pre-eminency, and Power. A plain Proof, that the Distribution of Cares amongst the Ministers, does not make them all Equal; nor destroys the Superiority of the Bishop above the Presbyters. Which must be very well known to the Latin Church in *St. Jerom's* time, since it enjoyed the same Government, as to its Essentials, with ours; the Ecclesiastical State consisting then of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; between whom there was a noted Subordination. And he would have passed for a Fool, and a Lyar; if by those words *Æqualiter*, and *in Commune*, he had meant, that in those Days all the Pastors were

Equal;

Equal; and that the Bishops were not distinguish'd from the other Ministers. But since such a Sense would be notoriously False, and Scandalous; we must say, that he intended only, that the Care, and Direction of the Church belonged to the Presbyters, as well as to the Bishops. Every one is to act in his Business, according to his Post, and the Station wherein God has placed him, working jointly, and severally for the Perfecting of the Saints, and the Edifying of the Body of Christ.

But besides that the Passages we have been Examining, are capable of a favourable Construction, we must consider a little what he says to *Jovinian*: \* *Dicis*, replies he to himself in the Person of *Jovinian*, *super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia; licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat; & cuncti clavis regni Cælorum accipiant, & ex æquo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur, ut Capite constituto, Schismatis tollatur occasio.* This Passage explains clearly the Father's Mind; and is the true Commentary, which sets in the Light the Sense of those before alledged. He lays down therein, " That all the Apostles have received the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven; that the Church is founded on each of them, and that its Strength is consolidated, and confirmed upon all of them equally. There is an Equality lodged in the College of the Apostles; *Inter eos Ecclesiæ cura equaliter dividitur*; i. e. the Apostles share equally the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven, and the Foundation of the Christian Church; and support it in common: *Regunt in commune*; that is the Office of their Apostleship. Notwithstanding this Community, or Equality of Office, he would have one amongst the twelve to be chosen; " That a

---

\* Hieron. Lib. 1. adv. Jov.

“ Head being establish’d, the occasion of Schism  
 “ may be taken away. There is then, in the Judgment of *St. Jerom*, a Chief set to the Apostles; a President of the sacred Senate, a Bishop of the first Christian Clergy; and one of the Apostles chosen, and establish’d in Dignity above the others. But the Reason he gives to justify that Pre-eminency, and the Distinction of one amongst the Apostles, is very considerable: It was, says he, *Ut Capite constituto*, &c. The Meaning of this is, that the ground of such a Government was, that good Order might be kept, and Unity maintained in the Christian Church. For if they had not chosen a Head amongst them, Schism would soon have gotten in: And as Humane Nature is prone to usurp Dominion, every one would have appropriated to himself the Church of Christ, and Lorded it over it: Which would have caused a terrible Division, and Confusion therein. To prevent therefore such a Scandal, which would have sprouted out from the very time of the Apostles; they judged it necessary, to establish a Chief amongst them; looking upon that Form of Government to be the best, not only as to its Original Institution, but to obviate a Spirit of Schism, and Contention, from corrupting the Church. Is not this then to say, that there was in those Days a Subordination, and a Degree of Pre-eminency between the Pastors; amongst whom there was one, who was distinguish’d from the others by the Title of *Head*, or *Chief*? And that for the most important Reason that could be; *viz.* lest the Church should be torn to pieces by Schisms; which would infallibly have seized upon the Members, if such a Government had not been settled in the Body? There was therefore such a Distinction made then, that the Christian Church might not fall into Ruin: And the Apostles themselves laid the Foundation of the  
 Episcopal

Episcopal Government, by constituting a Head amongst them, to keep up the Peace, and the Unity of the Spirit. By which we see, that though the Care of the Church belongs in common to all the Ministers; yet that does not hinder, but there may be a Subordination between them; and one may be raised in Dignity above the rest: And that that Order is as ancient as the Apostles, who thus observed it from the beginning, to prevent the Evils which a Government of Parity would have caused in the Church; and to teach their Successors how they ought to behave themselves, and to maintain a good Order in the Government of the Body of Christ.

If *St. Jerom*, out of a Design to bring down the Deacons, whom he makes but *Ministers of Tables, and Widows*, in the fore-cited Epistle to *Evagrius*; has herein overshot the Mark, as our Adversaries will scarce deny, by setting up a Head amongst the Apostles, and consequently a kind of a Pope in the Christian Church: Let them justify him, who think the Diaconat to be no sacred Office, and urge his Authority for the Parity of all the Pastors; it is none of my Business.

The truth is, this Distinction of Offices in the Ministry, and the Superiority of the Bishops above the Presbyters, has been all along in use in the Christian Church. And to carry up the Point to the time of the Apostles; though the Care of the Church was distributed amongst many, it was necessary, for Order's sake, that between the several Ministers, there should be Superiors, and Inferiors; and that in each District there should be one, who should appear as the Head of the Body, and should be the principal Director of it. This thing is so sensible, that it is plain from the several Evidences I have already produced, and the more particular Proof I shall make of it; that the Episcopal Government

vernment was formally establish'd in the very Days of the Apostles, and thence immediately continued down through the three first Centuries. For tho' there were divers Ministers in one Church; as, *ex. gr.* at *Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth, &c.* yet we are informed from Scripture, and Ecclesiastical History, that there was one appointed amongst the Clergy to be at their Head, as their Leader. Against that Man therefore did the Heathens chiefly direct their Spite, to make him suffer Martyrdom. Which caused several, out of Humility, or a Sense of their Weakness, to hide themselves, and to decline the first Dignity in the Church; or to weep bitterly at their accepting of it, when they could not get themselves excused. In this Station stood *St. Clements, St. Ignatius, St. Polycarp, &c.* They had indeed several Ministers with them, in their respective Churches: But they had been settled Bishops there by the Apostles; and were the Presidents, and Chiefs in them.

And to give a Scripture Example of this Truth, within the unquestioned Period of the Apostles; in the Church of *Ephesus*, whereof I have already taken some notice, from *Acts xx.* in the Days of *St. Paul*, there were divers Pastors, whom he calls *Elders*, and even *Bishops*, upon the account of their Office of being *Overseers over the Flock*. But yet we see, that in that sacred Body there was one, whom *St. John* considered above the rest, and whom he directs his Discourse to in his Letter, stiling him *the Angel of the Church of Ephesus*, *Rev. ii. 1.* It was doubtless he, who was at the Head of the Clergy in that District; and had been ordained their Bishop, or Archbishop, to preside over them, and to exercise a greater Authority over that Church, than the others had a Right to: Though they all had the Care of it, according to their different Stations. Can we imagine, that *Evodius* at *Antioch*, *Linus* at *Rome*, *Polycrates* at *Ephesus*,

*Ephesus, Bucolas at Smyrna, Dionysius at Corinth, Publius at Athens, Anianus at Alexandria, Philippus in Crete, and Irenæus at Lyons;* were not look'd upon as in a higher Degree, than their Fellow-workers in the Gospel? And it is not to be conceived, as is maliciously suggested, that all those holy Men should set themselves in their several Times, and Places, at the Head of the Clergy, and the Church; and that by a Spirit of Ambition, and Innovation: Especially when there was nothing to be got by it but Trouble, and perhaps Martyrdom. They must have believed the thing good, and even necessary; and have seen that Order already establish'd in the Person of their Predecessors in the Faith. What appearance is there, that all those Disciples, and Successors of the Apostles, who had tasted of their Doctrine, and Discipline at the very spring; should unanimously conspire together to change a Government, which they, whom they immediately succeeded, had settled in the Church? Would there not have been some Opposition made to them upon so material a Point: And would not some of the other Ministers have said, Why against the Precept, and Custom of the Apostles, which put no such Subordination, or Distinction between the Pastors; do you endeavour to introduce the contrary, by imposing one in each Church, to be the Chief, and Superior? Certainly such a change could not but be very sensible in the Christian Church, especially at its first sprouting up; and must have occasioned a great deal of Noise, and many Disorders amongst the Clergy. Besides that after so much Contention, the Truth would have overcome: And God would not have suffered, that his Church should wade through so many Ages, under a Government, which was contrary to that establish'd in the beginning. But the Practice of the first Disciples of the Apostles, who appeared

at the Head of their Clergy; shews plainly enough, what they had been taught by their Masters upon that Point. And I think, with Submission, that what I have now urged upon this matter, amounts to an Argument; that there has been a Subordination in the Ministry from the Apostolical Times, *viz.* that there has been a Degree distinguish'd from the others in the Church, and a Dignity lying above them, *i. e.* the Episcopal. As for *St. Jerom*, I may venture to say, he never was of another Opinion, for any thing that appears to the contrary.

I do not mean by this, that Episcopacy in the Days of the Apostles had attained its full Form. Things were then but in their Birth, and their tender Infancy; there was need of Time to lick them out, and to bring them to their Perfection. It would be ridiculous to expect, that the Ecclesiastical Discipline should be carry'd up to the pitch we now see it at, at a season when there could scarce be any establish'd. It is enough, that the Foundations of it were laid, and the Seeds sown, and the Principles delivered; which were to arrive at their Maturity, and appear in their Splendor, at the Meridian of the Church. The Family of Jesus Christ was yet but small, a few Ministers were sufficient for it: But it has been found necessary, in process of Time, to increase their Number, and to invest them with a larger Authority to govern it, as it has extended it self far and wide in the World. In proportion as that People, which was in its Origine but a House, is waxen a great Kingdom; it has been requisite to raise its Officers, and to set out their Charge. Which is the reason, why that Order, which was at first but in Embryo, as it were, has appeared afterwards in a very different, and more Manly State. The Foundation then of the Episcopal Go-

vernment was laid by the Apostles, in the Choice they made (according to the Opinion of *St. Jerom* himself) of a Chief, whom they gave a distinguish'd Pre-eminency to amongst the other Pastors; in the Church, I presume, which was committed to his Care: Which is what I contend for. And what is sufficient to ground that Government upon, and to carry up the Date thereof to their Time: Since they settled it by their Practice, as an effectual Order to destroy Schism, and to preserve the Unity of the Spirit; which could not be done, without a Subordination in the Ministry; and conferring an eminent Authority to one Pastor beyond the rest of his Clergy in his District, to be the Head of it. Though I allow, that Episcopacy had not in the Infancy of Christianity, all the Form, and all the Extent, which it has acquired in its Manhood. The difference of these two States made the thing in a manner impossible; the Figure of the Body augmenting, and diminishing, according to the Time. The Family of *Jacob* was far otherwise Governed by *Moses* in the Wilderness; and by *David*, and *Solomon*, in the Land of *Canaan*, than whilst it continued at home with its Father, before their going down all into *Egypt*. The more the Church has multiplied, the more has it been necessary to multiply its Leaders, and to diversify their Employments: As is done in great Houses, where the Officers are more numerous; and a stricter Subordination is observed, than in small; though the Government be the same, exercised under one Head, upon whom all depends. For these Oeconomies differ only as to more, or fewer Persons, and in the small, the Head is sufficient to govern; whereas in the great, there must be divers Classes of Officers, invested with Authority, to direct their Inferiors; and keep every one to his proper Business. This Example

shews us, in some measure, how the Church of Christ, which was but a scanty Family in the time of the Apostles, might be contented with some Primacy in the Pastors, who were most capable to govern; and who, as the Heads, were to maintain a good Order in it; until getting Strength, and growing up by degrees, that sacred Body required to be ruled by a greater, and stronger Power. So that the more the Season of the Spring, and Harvest, made the Field of the Church fruitful; the more the Seeds, and Principles of the Episcopal Primacy, and Authority, which were at first but weak, and as it were in the Bud, broke forth, and acquired Vigour, and Splendor. Such was, in my Opinion, the rise, and progress of the Episcopal Government; and of the Distinction between the Bishop, and the Presbyters: Which was here to be Explained.

---

## C H A P. XII.

### *The Testimonies of the Apostolical Fathers concerning the Hierarchy.*

**I** Have intimated in the first Chapter of this Treatise, that the History of the first Ages of Christianity, which is no where to be found, but in the Writings of the ancient Fathers of the Church; gives us much Light into the true Apostolical Discipline. For it is certain, that as they lived nigh the Spring, they might better judge, than we at this distance, how pure the Waters were that flowed thence: And which cannot but have

have contracted a great deal of Mud and Filth, by passing through the Dregs of the Times. We must lay a great Weight upon their Testimonies; and prefer what they tell us to have seen, or heard concerning the Affairs of the Church, to what we think of them under our Prejudices. For besides that they were Contemporary to the things they relate, living in the very Days of the Apostles, or soon after; they were Men of an extraordinary Piety, and Probity: And so not to be suspected of any Prevarication. Let us consider then what they have said of their Predecessors, and their Discipline: And let us examine, whether Episcopacy was a Government unknown to them; and whether they did not look upon the three sacred Offices in the Ministry of the Church, as three distinct Degrees? For it is evident, that if they have spoken of them, or mentioned them as such; they were in use amongst them; and they received them from their Forefathers.

But this being an Argument I shall have occasion to pursue, through the several Centuries I am to write of: For better Method's sake, I shall confine my self here to those Apostolical Fathers of the First, whereof we have any genuine Writings now extant. And indeed their Testimony deserves a particular Consideration: For besides the Advantages they have in common with other Primitive Fathers, in point of Credibility; they were not only instructed by the Apostles, but were endued with a large Portion of the Holy Spirit; and their Writings were approved by the Church, which at that time enjoyed extraordinary Gifts, for the discerning of Prophecies.

To begin then by *St. Clement*, of whom *St. Paul* gives this noble Character, *Philip. iv. 3. That his Name was written in the Book of Life*; calling him his *Fellow Labourer in the Gospel*: We meet

with several Passages to our present purpose in his first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, which was used to be read publickly with the Scripture in the Congregation, as if it had been Canonical. But these, and the other Quotations out of the Writings of the Apostolical Fathers; I shall deliver, with a little Variation, from the excellent Translation of a Learned Doctor \* of our own Church: It being out of my reach to mend it. *St. Clement* then, in that Epistle, Sect. 42. has these Words; which shew the Institution of the Hierarchy in the Christian Church to be Divine, and Apostolical, and grounded upon a Divine Commission: “ The Apostles have Preached to us from our Lord Jesus, “ Jesus Christ from God. Christ therefore was sent “ by God, the Apostles by Christ: So both their “ Offices were orderly fulfilled by God. For having received their Command, and being fully assured by the Resurrection of our Lord Jesus Christ; “ and convinced by the Word of God, and the “ Evidence of the Holy Spirit; they went abroad, “ publishing, That the Kingdom of God was at “ hand. And thus Preaching through Countries, “ and Cities; and proving by the Spirit, the First- “ fruits of their Conversions, they appointed out “ of them Bishops, and Deacons, over such as “ should afterwards believe. And in the next Section, setting forth, how this was done after the Example of *Moses* in the Jewish Church; he applies it thus in the following, (Sect. 44.) where he extends it to the Succession in the Christian Ministry: “ So likewise our Apostles knew by our Lord Jesus Christ, that there should Contentions arise “ upon the account of the Episcopat. And therefore having a perfect Foreknowledge of this, “ they appointed Persons, as we have before said;

---

\* *Dr. Wake*, now Bishop of *Lincoln*.

“ and then gave Direction, how, when they should  
 “ die, other chosen and approved Men should suc-  
 “ ceed in their Ministry.——Blessed are those  
 “ Presbyters, who having finished their Course be-  
 “ fore these times, have obtained a fruitful and  
 “ perfect Dissolution: For they have no fear, lest  
 “ any one should turn them out of the place in  
 “ which they are now establish’d! To which I  
 may add, *Sect. 1.* “ You walked according to the  
 “ Laws of God; being subject to those who had  
 “ the Rule over you, and giving the Honour that  
 “ was fitting, to such as were the Presbyters  
 “ among you. *Sect. 21.* “ Let us Honour those  
 “ who are set over us; let us respect the Pres-  
 “ byters that are amongst us; and let us instruct  
 “ the younger Men in the Discipline and Fear of  
 “ the Lord. And to conclude with him, *Sect. 57.*  
 “ Do you therefore, who laid the first Foundation  
 “ of this Sedition, submit your selves to your Pres-  
 “ byters; and be instructed unto Repentance. In  
 which Passages, it is pretty plain, that by Presby-  
 ters he means Bishops.

I proceed next to *St. Polycarp*, (to conform my  
 self to the Order, in which the Learned have  
 placed the Apostolical Writings; though he be not  
 the next in time) *The Angel of the Church in Smyr-  
 na*, as *St. John* styles him, *Rev. ii. 8.* whose Epistle  
 to the *Philippians*, which was likewise used to be  
 read publicly as the former, affords us several  
 material Passages, very Particular upon this Point.  
 It is worth our Observation, that the very Inscrip-  
 tion of it bears, that it comes from him, *and the  
 Presbyters that were with him.* But *Sect. 5.* de-  
 scending to give Instructions to the Ministers of  
 the Church, he speaks thus concerning the Dea-  
 cons: “ Also the Deacons must be Blameless be-  
 “ fore God, [or his Righteousness] as the Mini-  
 “ sters of God in Christ, and not of Men. Not  
 false

" false Accusers ; not Double-Tongued ; not Lo-  
 " vers of Money : But Moderate in all things,  
 " Compassionate, Careful ; walking according to  
 " the Truth of the Lord, who was the Servant of  
 " all. And he commands the younger Men, " to  
 " be subject to the Presbyters, and Deacons, as  
 " unto God, and Christ. And *Señ. 6.* concerning  
 the Presbyters: " And let the Elders [or Presbyters]  
 says he, " be Compassionate, and Merciful towards  
 " all ; turning them from their Errors ; seeking  
 " out those that are Weak ; not forgetting the  
 " Widows, the Fatherless, and the Poor : But al-  
 " ways providing what is good, both in the sight  
 " of God and Man, *Rom. xii. 17.* Abstaining from  
 " all Wrath, Respect of Persons, and Unrighteous  
 " Judgment. And especially being free from all  
 " Covetousness. Not easie to believe any thing  
 " against any ; not severe in Judgment. A pretty  
 plain Description of a Scripture-Presbyter, or Bi-  
 shop. But *Señ. 11.* he names particularly *Valens*, as  
 having been a Presbyter in the Church of *Philippi* ;  
 " I am greatly afflicted, says he, for *Valens*, who  
 " was once a Presbyter among you ; that he should  
 " so little understand the Place that was given to  
 " him in the Church. I shall shut up this with  
 a Testimony of the Church of *Smyrna*, in their  
 Epistle concerning the Martyrdom of *St. Polycarp*,  
*Señ. 16.* " He was, says it, in our Times, a truly  
 " Apostolical, and Prophetical Teacher ; and Bi-  
 " shop of the Catholick Church which is at  
 " *Smyrna*.

It is scarce consistent, I must confess, with the  
 intended Shortness of this Tract, to repeat here all  
 the Passages we meet with in the Inscriptions of  
*Ignatius's* Epistles concerning this matter ; or to  
 rehearse all the particular Names of the Bishops,  
 Presbyters, and Deacons, therein mentioned. But  
 he having been in his Generation, as he calls him-  
 self,

self, *Theophorus*, one who carry'd God in his Breast; and having this Character given him in the Relation of his Martyrdom, *Señ. 1.* "That he was a  
 " Man in all things like unto the Apostles. And moreover, those Pieces having pass'd the Approbation of the Church in those Times; and being the fullest upon this Point, that the Divine Providence has preserved for our Information: Some compendious way must be found out, to lay before the Reader what they contain of this matter. But I can think of none better, than by reducing it under several Heads; as it is already done to my hands by the accurate Pen of *Dr. Hammond* †: Adding the respective Passages to them.

The State of this Matter then lies thus, according to *Ignatius*. 1. That a singular or one Bishop, the Presbytery or Senate of Presbyters, and the Deacons, were or made three distinct Degrees or Orders in the Church. For in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*, *Señ. 1.* having made an honourable mention of *Onesimus* their Bishop, he congratulates them, "That God had granted them to enjoy  
 " such an excellent Bishop. *Señ. 2.* speaking of *Burrhus* their Deacon, *in things pertaining to God*;  
 " I intreat you, says he, that he may tarry longer,  
 " both for yours, and your Bishop's Honour. And in the same place he exhorts them all, "That  
 " being subject to their Bishop, and his Presby-  
 " tery, they be wholly and thoroughly sanctified. *Señ. 4.* "It will become you, says he, to run to-  
 " gether according to the Will of your Bishop, as  
 " also you do. For your famous Presbytery, wor-  
 " thy of God, is fitted as exactly to its Bishop,  
 " as the Strings are to their Harp. *Señ. 5.* having laid down, "That whoever is not within the Al-  
 " tar, he is deprived of the Bread of God: Who

---

† Hamm. de Epif. Jur. Diff. 2. Cap. 26.

that is, he presently explains, *viz.* he that does not pray with the Bishop, and the Church: Whereupon he concludes, "Let us take heed therefore, that we do not set our selves against the Bishop, that we may be the Servants of God. *Seet. 6.*" The more any one sees his Bishop silent, the more let him Reverence him. For whomsoever the Master of the House sends unto his own Household, we ought in like manner to receive him, as we would do him that sent him. It is therefore evident, says he, that we ought to look upon the Bishop, even as we would do upon the Lord Jesus. *Seet. 20.* he admonishes them again, "That they should obey their Bishop, and the Presbytery, with an entire Affection."

In his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, *Seet. 2.* he beginneth the thing thus: "Seeing I have been judged worthy to see you, by *Damas* your most excellent Bishop, and by your very worthy Presbyters *Bassus* and *Apollonius*, and by my Fellow-Servant *Sotio* your Deacon; in whom I rejoyce, forasmuch as he is subject unto his Bishop, as to the Grace of God; and to the Presbytery, as to the Law of Jesus Christ; I determined to write unto you. *Seet. 3.* He thinks it proper to caution them in this manner, "Wherefore it will become you also, not to take advantage of the Youth of your Bishop, but to yield all Reverence to him, according to the Power of God the Father (the Authority given him by God); as also I perceive that your holy Presbyters do: Not considering his Age, which indeed to appearance is young; but as becomes those who are Prudent in God, submitting to him, or rather not to him, but to the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Bishop of us all. It will therefore behove you, with all Sincerity, to obey your Bishop, in Honour of him, whose Pleasure

" it

“ it is, that you should do so. Because he that  
 “ does so, deceives not the Bishop, whom he sees;  
 “ but affronts him that is Invisible. For whatso-  
 “ ever of this kind is done, it reflects not upon  
 “ Man, but upon God, who knows the Secrets of  
 “ our Hearts. *Sect.* 4. It is therefore fitting, says  
 he, “ that we should not only be called Christians,  
 “ but be so. As some call indeed their Governor,  
 “ *Bishop*; but yet do all things without him. But  
 “ I can never think, that such as these have a good  
 “ Conscience, seeing they are not gathered toge-  
 “ ther according to God’s Commandment. *Sect.* 6.  
 “ I exhort you, that you study to do all things in  
 “ a Divine Concord: Your Bishop presiding in the  
 “ place of God; your Presbyters in the place of  
 “ the Council of the Apostles; and your Deacons  
 “ being intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ.  
*Sect.* 7. Having premised, “ Be you united to your  
 “ Bishop, and those who preside over you, to be  
 “ your Pattern and Direction in the way to Im-  
 “ mortality; he goes on in Exhorting them, “ As  
 “ therefore the Lord did nothing without the Fa-  
 “ ther, being united to him, neither by himself,  
 “ nor yet by his Apostles: So neither do you any  
 “ thing without your Bishop, and Presbyters. Nei-  
 “ ther endeavour to let any thing appear Rational  
 “ to your selves apart; but being come together  
 “ into the same place, have one Common Prayer.  
*Sect.* 13. After mention made of “ their most wor-  
 “ thy Bishop, and the well-wrought Spiritual  
 “ Crown of their Presbytery, (as he expresses it)  
 “ and their Deacons, who are according to God:  
 He admonishes them again, “ Be subject to your  
 “ Bishop, and to one another, (*i. e.* the Deacons  
 to the Presbyters, and all other Inferiors to their  
 Superiors) “ as Jesus Christ to the Father accord-  
 “ ing to the Flesh; and the Apostles both to  
 “ Christ, and to the Father, and to the Holy Ghost;  
 “ that

“ that so you may be united both in Body, and  
 “ Spirit. And lastly, *Seet. 15.* “ The *Ephesians*  
 “ from *Smyrna*, says he, salute you, (those were  
 they whom the Churches of the *Smyrneans*, and  
*Ephesians* had sent with him) “ together with *Po-*  
 “ *lycarpus* the Bishop of the *Smyrneans*.

In his Epistle to the *Trallians*, *Seet. 1.* we meet  
 with the Name of their Bishop, *viz. Polybius.*  
*Seet. 2.* Amongst those things wherein they shewed  
 themselves the Followers of God, he takes notice  
 of this, “ That they were subject to their Bishop,  
 “ as to Jesus Christ. And in the same place he  
 tells them, “ It is necessary, that as you do; so  
 “ without your Bishop, you should do nothing.  
 “ Also be you subject to your Presbyters, as to  
 “ the Apostles of Jesus Christ. *Seet. 3.* “ In like  
 “ manner, says he, let all Reverence the Deacons,  
 “ as Jesus Christ; and the Bishops, as the Father;  
 “ and the Presbyters, as the Sanhedrim of God,  
 “ and College of the Apostles. Without these  
 “ there is no Church. *Seet. 7.* Advising them to  
 guard themselves against the Poison of Hereticks;  
 “ And that you will do, says he, if you are not  
 “ puffed up; but continue inseparable from Jesus  
 “ Christ our God; and from your Bishop; and  
 “ from the Commands of the Apostles. He that  
 “ is within the Altar, is pure: But he that is  
 “ without; *i. e.* does any thing without the Bi-  
 “ shop, and the Presbyters, and Deacons; is not  
 “ pure in his Conscience. *Seet. 12.* Having ex-  
 horted them “ to continue in Concord among them-  
 “ selves, and in Prayer with one another; he sub-  
 joins, “ It becomes every one of you, especially  
 “ the Presbyters, to refresh your Bishop to the  
 “ Honour of the Father, of Jesus Christ, and of  
 “ the Apostles. And lastly, *Seet. 14.* “ Fare you  
 “ well, says he, in Jesus Christ; being subject to  
 “ your

“ your Bishop, as to the Command of God ; and  
 “ so likewise to the Presbytery.

In his Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, in the very  
 Inscription, “ He salutes them in the Blood of Je-  
 “ sus Christ; especially if they are at Unity with  
 “ the Bishop, and Presbyters who are with him,  
 “ and the Deacons appointed according to the  
 “ Mind of Jesus Christ. *Señ. 3.* Having commend-  
 ed their Bishop, he lays down this, “ As many as  
 “ are of Jesus Christ, are also with their Bishop.  
*Señ. 4.* “ Let it be your endeavour, says he, to  
 “ partake all of the same holy Eucharist. After  
 which follows, “ For there is one Altar ; as also  
 “ there is one Bishop, together with his Presby-  
 “ tery, and the Deacons : That so whatsoever you  
 “ do, you may do it according to the Will of God.  
*Señ. 7.* “ Attend to the Bishop, and to the Pres-  
 “ bytery, and to the Deacons. *Señ. 8.* Speaking  
 of the Repentance of Hereticks, and Seducers ;  
 “ The Lord forgives all that repent, if they re-  
 “ turn to the Unity of God, and to the Council  
 “ of the Bishop. *Señ. 10.* Advising them to de-  
 pute some Deacon, to congratulate the Church of  
*Antioch* upon its Settlement in Peace ; he tells  
 them, “ That the other Neighbouring Churches  
 “ had sent them some, Bishops ; some, Presbyters ;  
 “ and some, Deacons.

In his Epistle to the *Smyrneans*, *Señ. 8.* he ex-  
 horts them thus, “ Follow your Bishop, as Jesus  
 “ Christ, the Father ; and the Presbytery, as the  
 “ Apostles. As for the Deacons, Reverence them,  
 “ as the Command of God. Let no Man do any  
 “ thing, of what belongs to the Church, without  
 “ the Bishop. Let the Eucharist be look'd upon  
 “ as firm and just, which is either offer'd by the  
 “ Bishop, or by him to whom the Bishop has  
 “ given his consent. Wheresoever the Bishop shall  
 “ appear, there let the People also be : As where  
 “ Jesus

“ Jesus Christ is, there is the Catholick Church.  
 “ It is not lawful without the Bishop, neither to  
 “ Baptise, nor to celebrate the Holy Communion:  
 “ But whatsoever he shall approve of, that is also  
 “ pleasing unto God; that so whatever is done,  
 “ may be secure, and well done. And a little af-  
 ter, “ It is a good thing, to have a due Regard both  
 “ to God, and to the Bishop. He that Honours  
 “ the Bishop, shall be Honoured of God. But he  
 “ that does any thing without his Knowledge,  
 “ ministers unto the Devil. And *Señ. 12.* “ I fa-  
 “ lute, says he, your very worthy Bishop, and  
 “ your venerable Presbytery; and your Deacons,  
 “ my Fellow-Servants.

In his Epistle to *Polycarp*, the Inscription runs  
 thus: “ *Ignatius*, who is also called *Theophorus*,  
 “ to *Polycarp* Bishop of the Church which is at  
 “ *Smyrna.* - *Señ. 4.* He bespeaks *Polycarp* in this  
 manner, “ Let not the Widows be neglected: Be  
 “ thou after God, their Guardian. Let nothing  
 “ be done, but with thy Knowledge and Consent.  
*Señ. 5.* “ If any one thinks, says he, that he knows  
 “ more than the Bishop, he is ruined. But it be-  
 “ comes all such as are Marry’d, whether Men or  
 “ Women, to come together with the Consent of  
 “ the Bishop. *Señ. 6.* “ Harken unto the Bishop,  
 “ that God also may hearken unto you. My Soul  
 “ be Security for them, that submit to their Bi-  
 “ shop, with their Presbyters, and Deacons. And  
 in the same place, bespeaking together the Bishops,  
 Presbyters, and Deacons; “ Labour with one ano-  
 “ ther, says he, as the Stewards (so he calls the  
 Bishops) “ and Assessors (so the Presbyters) and  
 “ Ministers (so the Deacons) of God.

2. That those singular Bishops, by Christ’s In-  
 stitution, were appointed every where throughout  
 the World, where-ever the Christian Religion was  
 planted. For in his Epistle to the *Ephesians*,  
*Señ. 3.*

*Sect.* 3. he tells them, "That Jesus Christ is the Mind of the Father; as the Bishops appointed even unto the utmost Bounds of the Earth, are the Mind of Jesus Christ.

3. That to those singular Bishops, Honour, Subjection, or Obedience was due by all in the Church, even by the Presbyteries, in the same manner as it was paid either to God the Father by Christ, or to Christ by the Apostles, or to the Apostles by the rest. See before, *Ad Ephes.* *Sect.* 2, 4, 5, 6, 20. *Ad Smyrn.* *Sect.* 8. *Ad Polyc.* *Sect.* 6. *Ad Magn.* *Sect.* 2, 3, 6, 13. *Ad Trall.* *Sect.* 2, 3, 12, 13. *Ad Philadelph.* *Sect.* 7.

4. That Union with the Bishop was so necessary to be kept, by all the Members of the Church, that whoever separated himself from his Bishop, was reputed thereby to be cut off from the Church itself. See *Ad Ephes.* *Sect.* 5. *Ad Magn.* *Sect.* 6, 7, 13. *Ad Trall.* *Sect.* 3, 7. *Ad Philadelph.* *Inscript.* *Sect.* 3, 4, 8.

5. That without the Bishop's License, nothing ought to be done in the Church. For which see *Ad Magn.* *Sect.* 4, 6, 7. *Ad Trall.* *Sect.* 2, 7. *Ad Philadelph.* *Sect.* 4. which he concludes, "That so whatsoever you do, you may do it according to the Will of God. And *Sect.* 7. "The Spirit, says he, "spake, saying on this wise, Do nothing without the Bishop. *Ad Smyrn.* *Sect.* 8. *Ad Polyc.* *Sect.* 4, 5.

6. That after the Bishop, Honour and Obedience was likewise due to the Presbyters, and the Deacons. For which see *Ad Ephes.* *Sect.* 2, 20. *Ad Magn.* *Sect.* 2, 6, 7, 13. *Ad Trall.* *Sect.* 2. To which he adds, "The Deacons are not the Ministers of Meat and Drink, but of the Church of God. *Sect.* 3, 7, 13. *Ad Philadelph.* *Sect.* 7, 10. *Ad Smyrn.* *Sect.* 8, 12. *Ad Polyc.* *Sect.* 6.

That we may have the Testimonies of all the Apostolical Fathers, whereof any thing remains to us, relating to this Subject; I shall add two or three Quotations out of *St. Hermas's* Shepherd; which notwithstanding his Allegorical way of Writing, are pretty plain to my purpose. It is highly probable, that the Author of that Book was that *Hermas*, whom *St. Paul* mentions, *Rom. xvi. 14.* as one of his Acquaintance in the Church of *Rome*. In his Book of *Visions* he has then these words; \* “ And thou shalt write two Books; and send one “ to *Clement*, and one to *Grapté*. For *Clement* shall “ send it to the foreign Cities, because it is permit- “ ted him so to do. But *Grapté* shall admonish “ the Widows and Orphans. But thou shalt read “ it to the Elders that are over the Church. Here is a clear Distinction made between *St. Clement* and the Elders of the Church: Whether he was the Metropolitan, and they his Suffragans; or he the Bishop, and they the Presbyters of the second Order, is not material here. And again, † “ The “ square and white Stones, which agree exactly “ in their Joints; are the Apostles, and Bishops, “ and Doctors, and Ministers, who through the “ Mercy of God are come in, and exercised Epif- “ copacy, and taught, and ministred holily and “ modestly to the Elect of God, both that are “ fallen asleep, and which yet remain, and have “ always agreed with them, and have had Peace “ within themselves, and with each other. In his Book of *Similitudes*, || “ These are such as have “ believed, and some of them been Bishops, *i. e.* “ Governors of the Churches; then such as have “ been set over inferior Ministries.

---

\* *Herm. Sheph. Lib. 1. Vis. 2. Sect. 5.* † *Ibid. Vis. 3. Sect. 5.*  
 || *Lib. 3. Sim. 9. Sect. 27.*

And so you have an account of the Institution of the Hierarchy, and the first State of it, according to the Apostolical Fathers, particularly St. Ignatius Bishop of *Antioch*.

---

C H A P. XIII.

*Divers Proofs of the Continuation of the Hierarchy in the Church; and that there was no Innovation made in the Distinction of the Degrees, in the Time of Hyginus Bishop of Rome.*

**I**T being a thing very difficult, if not absolutely impossible, as I have intimated before, to assign the Time, wherein the pretended Change of Discipline was made, and when the Bishops began to be distinguish'd from the Presbyters, as two different Orders in the Church; and that yet it must have happen'd a little while after the Apostles; because it cannot be denied, that that Distinction is visible about the middle of the second Century, which was not above fifty Years after the Death of them all: The Adversaries of the Hierarchy do their utmost to find out the Time of that Change. And indeed it imports them very much to labour towards it: For the Truth of the Matter is thereby discovered; it being certain, that if the Discipline was not changed in the second Century; but the Government of the Church continued like that which has been in use ever since; Episcopacy was always an Order distinguish'd from Presbytery.

And that, on the contrary, if there was a Change made, it could not be brought about secretly; but the Clergy must be consenting to it; without which there would have been a great Disturbance in the Church: So that the thing must be very sensible. To unty which Knot, which is pretty hard ty'd; they fix that Time to the Year of our Lord 140. or thereabouts (for they are not sure of it) under *Hyginus* Bishop of Rome: And thus they tell their Story. *Telesphorus* Bishop of that See, dying in the Year 139. *Hyginus* succeeded him in the Episcopal Chair; which he held but four Years. This Man, say they, to signalize himself; or, as it is commonly express'd by them, to introduce *the Mystery of Iniquity* into the Church, and lay the Foundation of *Antichristianism*; (though by the way he was an excellent Bishop, who sacrificed his Life for Jesus Christ; and whose Piety, Zeal, and extraordinary Gifts we ought to celebrate) this Man, to signalize himself, as they suggest, changed the Form of the Ecclesiastical Government: And whereas there were but two Orders of Ministers in the Church, *viz.* Presbyters or Bishops, and Deacons; he made of them three, dividing that of the Presbyterat or Episcopat into two, which from the time of the Apostles had been but one and the same thing. And this they prove chiefly out of the *Pontifical of Damasus*, which says, that *Hyginus composuit Clerum, & primus distribuit Gradus*. Thitherto, they tell us, there were several Bishops in one Church, and the Bishops were not above the Presbyters: But yet they own, that all the Presbyters were not chosen Bishops before. And as to him who was so, and was appointed to be the *Præses* of the Church; they pretend, that he thereby acquired no new Dignity, or Office; and that he was not superior to the others: And likewise that it was the oldest

in Age, or in the Ministry, *i. e.* he who was the first, as to the Date of his Admission, that succeeded to the Chair. But *Hyginus* observing, that that Custom, which yet according to them was Apostolical; was subject to many ill Consequences, and to several Accidents which might be prejudicial to the Church; and that, for the most part, the ancientest Presbyters were not so capable to fill the Chair, nor so couragious to defend it, as some of their Brethren; and so it was necessary, that the Honour of the Clergy should be kept up, and asserted by a Pastor, who was qualified to edifie the Church by his Talents, and the strength of his Piety, and Zeal; and even to seal the Truth with his Blood, if there was occasion: He ordained, that the ancient Form should be altered. And whereas the Nomination of the Primate was used to be made, but according to the Date of his Admission into the Ministry, which gave him a Title to the Chair; and not by a free Election of the Clergy, who were ty'd to chuse the oldest Presbyter upon the Death of the President: The same *Hyginus* instituted, that the Choice should fall upon every one equally, and indifferently, according to the Plurality of Votes he might have, without regard to his Age, or Admission; and so the Election should be no longer limited to the ancientest, but be extended to whom it should be thought fit, according to Capacity, and Merit. Such was the new Constitution, as we are told, of *Hyginus* Bishop of *Rome*.

Which was taken up, as they would make us believe, upon the same Reasons, by the Church of *Ferusalem*: Which having no more Presbyters of the Jewish Nation, capable to fill up the Episcopal Chair; the Persecution having carry'd off most of them, or there being others more worthy; conformed to the Practice of *Rome*; which insinuated

it self into all the other Christian Churches, where-  
 in Episcopacy was made a new Degree. For my  
 part, I think, the Design of *Hyginus* was very  
 commendable; to abrogate a Custom, which gave  
 the Government of the Church to Age, rather  
 than to Merit, and the Capacity of the Person.  
 And the Institution of the Apostles, which limited  
 the Episcopal Dignity to the ancientest Presbyter,  
 whatever his Endowments were, appears to me ill-  
 conceived (supposing that to have been their Pra-  
 ctice): Which I must therefore deny. What In-  
 conveniencies would not happen at this Day to  
 the Church, if that Method were to be pursued?  
 Nothing would require more to be reformed.  
 But since it was found to be so ill an Order in  
 the time of *Hyginus*, that he judged it fit to be  
 abrogated, lest the Church should suffer Prejudice  
 thereby; it is a plain sign to me, that it was not  
 the Custom, or Practice of the Apostles, as it is  
 pretended. And that in what that Bishop did  
 therein, he trod in the steps of his Predecessors;  
 and only confirmed amongst his Clergy, a Disci-  
 pline, which he had received by an uninterrupted  
 Tradition: So far from changing the Form of the  
 Ecclesiastical Government, or dividing what the  
 Apostles had joined together, and making a new  
 Office!

I shall therefore now, that I may not interrupt  
 the account I intend to give of the course of the  
 Hierarchy, by any Digression, endeavour to confute  
 that pretended Discovery, upon which  
 our Adversaries lay such a stress. And  
 to that end I shall make several Re-  
 flections, whereby it will appear, that  
 there has been no change attempted  
 in the Apostolical Discipline, in the  
 time of *Hyginus*; but rather a Confirmation of it:  
 And that the Fact, placed in that Age, *viz.* that  
 † Episcopacy

*No Innovati-  
 on made in the  
 Apostolical Dis-  
 cipline, in Hy-  
 ginus's time.*

Episcopacy then began to be a superior Degree to Presbytery; is ill-grounded, imaginary, and full of palpable Inconsistencies.

And 1. If *Hyginus* began by a Spirit of Innovation, contrary to the Practice of the Apostles, and the Custom of the Church, to divide the Orders of Bishop, and Presbyter, which before were but one; then it follows, that he was the first, as is suggested, that made that Distribution of the Degrees. But this is evidently false, as I am going to shew by two or three Instances in that very See. The Bishops of *Rome*, his Predecessors, had done the same thing before him; having distinguish'd the whole Body of the Clergy into three Orders, *viz.* Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. *Telesphorus* himself, whom he immediately succeeded, Ordained in his Life-time eight Deacons, fifteen Presbyters, and thirteen Bishops; as we read it in Authentick History\*. After his Example *Hyginus* Ordained five Deacons, fifteen Presbyters, and six Bishops; as we find it in the same. If that be so; he did but what his Predecessor had done before him: He made therefore no Innovation in the Discipline, which was at that time in use in the Church. And if the Orders of Presbyter, and Bishop, were but one and the same thing before his Days: Why did his Predecessors ordain some to be Presbyters, and others to be Bishops? I can see no reason of this Distinction, but what is grounded in the difference of the Offices. However the Matter of Fact is plain; *viz.* that the Ordination of Bishops, and Presbyters, was observed in the See of *Rome*, before the Constitution of *Hyginus*. And if that does not imply some Difference or Distinction;

---

\* Anast. Bibl. de Vit. Pont. Rom. Plat. & alii, with a little Variation.

then our Adversaries must say, that the Ordination of a Presbyter was the Ordination of a Bishop, and *vice versa*; and that the Bishops who were ordained Bishops, had but the Ordination of Presbyters: For what did they receive more, when they were ordained Bishops, in the Opinion of our Adversaries? But then again, what should induce *Telephorus*, and his Predecessors, to ordain some Presbyters Bishops, and not some Bishops Presbyters; as it is implied in those Accounts? I say, his Predecessors: For *Xistus*, who sat in the Episcopal Chair of *Rome* immediately before him; had likewise distinguish'd the several Ordinations; having conferr'd the Order of the Diaconat, on eleven Persons; of the Presbyterat, on so many; and of the Episcopat, on four; as *Alexander*, his immediate Predecessor, had Ordained three Deacons, five Presbyters, and five Bishops. The Bishops of the other Sees did the same; as might easily be made out here, if it were necessary. All which shews, that *Hyginus* did not alter the ancient Discipline; but that he kept close to it, conformably to the Tradition of his Fathers.

2. What is insinuated above concerning the Church of *Jerusalem*, *viz.* that they left off chusing the oldest Presbyter for Bishop, is not altogether consistent with what our Adversaries would conclude from its Practice; that it struck in with the new Constitution of *Hyginus*: For it was in the Year of our Lord 135, or 136, as appears from Ecclesiastical History †; that other Presbyters than of the Jewish Nation, began to hold that See. The Discipline was then altered in the Church of *Jerusalem*, before it was in that of *Rome*; supposing it ever was so. But I must make a Remark upon this

---

† Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 6. & alibi.

matter, which will set it in its true Light; and serve for an Answer to the Point in hand. And it is this: That from the time of the Apostles, to the Year 136, they were always Clergymen, or Presbyters of Jewish Extraction, who were promoted to the Episcopal See of *Jerusalem*. It was not therefore their Age, or the Date of their Admission into the Ministry, that gave them that Preference; but their advantage of being Jews. For if a Presbyter in that Church was descended from a Gentile, till that time; he was excluded from the Chair: Not because he was younger, as to his Admission; but because he was not a Jew. So that the Jewish Presbyter, admitting that the Greek was ancients in Age, or Time of Institution, step'd before him into the Chair. Which proves almost demonstratively, that the Presbyter did not succeed to the Episcopal See of *Jerusalem*, by the Order of Age. For what likelihood is there, that precisely from the Days of the Apostles to the Year 136. wherein are reckoned no less than fifteen Jewish Bishops; there should not be in that Church a Greek, or a Roman Presbyter, more ancient, as to his Age, or Admission, than those several Jews, who came one after another into the Chair? But the Truth of the Matter is; that at first, either out of respect to our Lord's Family, or that particular Nation, who were God's peculiar People; they were consider'd before others: Or that afterwards continuing to be more numerous than the rest there, where the Converts of that Extraction retained an Affection for the Circumcision, and some other of the Mosaick Rites; it was thought prudent to indulge them in that Privilege. This seems to me to have been the true Reason of the Usage of that Church: Which destroys the Opinion of those who pretend, that the ancientest Presbyter succeeded of course to the

Episcopal Dignity, by a Custom derived from the Practice of the Apostles. That is a pure effect of Imagination, which supposes the thing, without proving it; and even against all appearance, as I have shewn, as being contrary to Reason.

3. If the Reasons I have given, are  
*Respect.* 3. not thought convincing enough; I will offer one Instance in the same Church of *Jerusalem*; which will, I hope, put the thing out of dispute, that it was not the Custom of the Apostles, to prefer the Presbyters to that See, according to their Seniority. Had it been their Intention to settle such an Usage in the Christian Church, by their own Practice, they would doubtless have appointed the Senior to be the Bishop, when an Opportunity presented it self; and particularly when the See of *Jerusalem* was first establish'd, they would have chosen amongst themselves the first, as to his Call, for that Dignity; and that would have been by that means *St. Andrew*, or *St. John*, or *St. Peter*. But they were so far from going by that pretended Rule, in that Case, that they pitch'd upon *James the Less*, who was none of the twelve Apostles: That after-Ages might learn from this Example, that the future Admissions into the Episcopal Order, were not to proceed according to the Ancientness, or Priority of the Call of the Persons; but were left free to the Election of those who had a Right to make it. If then Men will conform themselves to what was practis'd by the Apostles, in the appointing of a Bishop; they must not pretend, that the Choice ought necessarily to fall upon the oldest Presbyter. But I cannot but wonder, how without any Proof, and against so authentick a one as this, taken from the Election of *St. James* unto the See of *Jerusalem*; our Adversaries have the Confidence to maintain, that the Custom of the  
 Church

Church has always been, from the very time of the Apostles to the Year 140. to chuse the oldest Presbyter to be the Bishop: Since the contrary is so evident, even in the beginning of that Establishment! And who has told them, that all the Presbyters that succeeded St. *James* in the See of *Jerusalem*, were ancients Presbyters than their Brethren? This, I think, may very well be look'd upon as a meer Supposition, made on purpose to hammer out the pretended Innovation of *Hyginus* in the Discipline of the Church.

But, 4. Admitting, that that Bishop of *Rome* did really alter the ancient Polity of his Church; what Influence could that have upon the Church of *Jerusalem*? Could the Example of *Hyginus* persuade this Clergy, all on a sudden, to change the Form of their Ecclesiastical Government? The distance of those two Churches did scarce allow of such a Correspondence. And though the Jealousie, which might be between those two Churches of *Jerusalem*, and *Rome*; should not have kept the former, which was as the Mother of all the rest, from conforming to the Regulations of the latter; especially being contrary to those of the Apostles: What likelihood is there, that all the other Christian Churches, whereof several were more famous at that time than the *Roman*, should have said nothing against such an Innovation; but should have blindly embraced it? Would not *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, *Corinth*, *Alexandria*, and many others have murmured, both in *Asia*, *Europe*, and *Africa*; that the Government of the Church was thus altered? Would not each Presbyter, who was the Senior amongst his Sym-Presbyters, and consequently concern'd in this affair; have been highly offended at it: And would he not have turned every Stone, to ward off the Disgrace, of seeing himself

himself deposed, as it were, from his just Pre-eminency? What Noise would not this have caused throughout the World; since the settling only of *Easter-Day*, which some would observe precisely on the 14<sup>th</sup> Day of the Moon of *March*, and others but on a *Sunday*; occasioned so many Divisions, with Excommunications in the Christian Church, that it took up a whole Age to pacifie the contending Parties, about an Article indifferent in it self? And yet our Adversaries would make us believe, that an universal Tradition was unanimously changed, in all the Christian Churches, without any one standing out: Which is inconsistent with common Sense. And we must thence necessarily conclude one of these two things; either that that change of Order, and Discipline, owned to have descended from the Apostles, did not really happen; but that the ancient Establishment was kept up; or that the Christian Churches throughout the World, were not so averse to Episcopacy, as some are in our Days; since they so silently submitted to that pretended Innovation, against which they so openly declare at this time.

5. What is annex'd to the Story  
*Reserv. 5.* of *Hyginus*, that upon the account of his having establish'd a Distinction between the Bishop, and the Presbyter, in the Church of *Rome*, that See continued vacant four whole Years after him; is as unlikely as the rest. For it was by no means the change of Discipline, that occasioned that Vacancy; or that raised a Dispute amongst the Clergy about that Point, which lasted all that time, before the Chair could be filled up by their consent; as it is alledged by our Adversaries, without any manner of Proof, and very wrongfully. It is a great Injury done to the Memory, and Piety of those holy Men, to suggest such a thing, against them; when a juster account  
 may

may be given of it. They laboured perhaps then under a severe Persecution; their late Primate had already laid down his Life in the Cause of the Gospel; and they were at the Hour of doing the same: So that they had other things to mind, than to divide, and quarrel amongst themselves. And what ground is there to think, that whilst their Persecutors were enraged against them to that degree, that to avoid their Fury, they were forc'd to hide themselves with their Flocks; they should go and tear one another to pieces by their Animosities about the Bishoprick? The Station was not then so charming, to be pursued at such a rate. Besides that there being but one, who according to the ancient Discipline, as is pretended, could claim a Right of succeeding to the Chair; *viz.* the eldest Presbyter; and consequently but one, that had an Interest to oppose that Deliberation; supposing that the rest were for practising a new way: The matter would have been soon decided. For the other Presbyters being thereby put into a capacity of aspiring to the Episcopal Dignity, would probably have voted for a free Election, in hope every one of being chosen the first Minister of that See. Ambition would have carry'd it with a high hand; (I speak according to the sense our Adversaries have of such Men) and especially the last Primate they had at their Head, having judged the Order good, and necessary. And where was the ground for a Dispute, which should last four Years? *Hyginus* in his Life-time had ordained six Bishops, as we have taken notice. How easie was it then to take the Senior amongst them, according to the ancient Custom; and to put him into the place of the Deceased! That might have been dispatched presently, and without jarring. Or if the other five Bishops had any Pretension to the See, according to the new Constitution of *Hyginus*;

how

how soon might the thing have been decided by a free Election, which would immediately have carry'd it over that, which restrained it to the Eldest in respect of Admission? There was no need, that Controversie should hold out four full Years. What was then the Cause of that long Vacancy of the Episcopal See of *Rome*? If that could not be discovered, a fair Excuse might be pleaded for it: It is not so obvious, to dive into all the Secrets, and all the Circumstances of ancient History; how many considerable Events of those Times are there unknown to us? But the state of that Church in the second Age of the Gospel, may help us to a sensible account of that Vacancy. The Christian Church in general, lay almost all that while under the Cross; but particularly that of *Rome*, as being most exposed to the Fury of the Emperor; who professing the Pagan Religion, could not brook under his sight, in the Capital of his Empire, a set of Men, who were endeavouring to destroy the establish'd Worship, by bringing in a new one; against which Earth, and Hell seem'd to have conspired together. It is probable, the Clergy was at that time so harass'd, and the Flock so dismayed, that there was no Governing of the Church with any Order. It is possible likewise, that the Pastors were so dispersed, that they could not be got together without the utmost hazard. And as the Thunderbolt of Persecution usually lighted upon him, who sat in the Episcopal Chair, above any other of the Faithful; because the Heathens levelled their Spite directly at him, as being the Head, and chief Director of the Body. (For which reason some absolutely refused that Dignity, when it was offer'd them, in those perillous Times; doubting their Constancy, if they should be called to suffer Martyrdom, which was then in a manner unavoidable.) And

as likewise Charity began to wax cold; the Zeal, and Courage of the Pastors daily abating through the fierceness of the fiery Tryals: There was perhaps not one found, who would undertake *Hyginus's* place, whose Blood was but newly shed; as that of his Predecessor's had been before. Every one feared for his own Life; and declined to appear at the Head of a Church, which was so cruelly persecuted. And thus four Years passed away; and none whatsoever durst take upon him the Quality of Bishop of *Rome*; until *Pius*, more daring than the rest, ventured to leap into the Chair. Which would not have happen'd so, if the eldest Presbyter had been used to succeed to the See, by the Right of his Priority, and the Date of his Admission into the Ministry. He had but to step into the room of his Predecessor; he had no need of an Election: He had but to use his Title, which was as ancient as the Time of the Apostles. And if he would not have accepted of the Episcopal Dignity, he would have been look'd upon with Contempt, as unworthy of his sacred Calling; and another would have been brought over his Head. Impute we then that Vacancy of four Years in the Episcopal See of *Rome*, to the severe Persecution of the Heathens at that time; to the Humane Fearfulness of the Ministers, or some other Accidents; as the true occasion of it: And not to the Division, and Differences of the Clergy about the Person that was to succeed to it.

6. The Ordination which appears here to have been conferr'd upon a Presbyter, when he was called to be a Bishop; is a convincing Argument, that he was thereby consecrated to a new Office. For to what end was he Ordained again; and to what purpose were the Hands of the Bishops laid on him anew; if the  
*Reflect. 6.*  
 Episcopal

Episcopal Function was not distinguish'd from the Presbyterial? He had already received Ordination, and had been admitted into the Ministry, when he was made Presbyter; if not when he was instituted Deacon. If therefore the Orders of Bishop, and Presbyter, are one and the same; there was no need to reiterate the Ordination, and to use a new Form. The eldest Presbyter, without observing any holy Ceremony, upon the Vacancy of a See, had but to take the place of his Predecessor; and to say, that he was Bishop by Right of Succession: And that the Presbyter, and the Bishop being the same Officer; he stood in no need of Imposition of Hands, or Consecration, for his Installation. Why then did the above-mentioned Bishops of *Rome* renew the Formality, when they admitted one into the Episcopal Order; though he had received that of Presbyter, or Deacon before? Whence we ought to conclude, that since before *Hyginus's* time, his Predecessors in that See, by a constant, and universal Practice of the Church, Ordained with a sacred Ceremony the Presbyter, whom they made a Bishop; and that that Promotion to the Episcopate, was consequently a distinct Ordination from the former: He did but confirm the Discipline already establish'd, by an express Constitution, lest it should be afterwards violated. And likewise that the Primitive Church look'd upon that Ordination, as distinguish'd from the other; and as entitling the Person to a new Authority, and a superior Degree.

## C H A P. XIV.

*A Proof of the Establishment of Episcopacy by the Apostles in the Church of Rome, and that it was in Use there during the first Century.*

**I**T is sufficient, one would think, to shew, that there was no Innovation made at *Rome* in the Discipline delivered by the Apostles, about the middle, or towards the beginning of the second Century; that I have laid out the Form of the Ecclesiastical Government, as it was observed under *Xistus*, *Telesphorus*, and *Hyginus*. But because it may be said, that possibly there is a mistake of some Years, as to the Time that That happen'd; and that perhaps it was before those Bishops came to the See; so that the thing may be true notwithstanding: And the more, by reason it is pretended, that there was at first no difference between a Bishop, and a Presbyter. Let us now see, what was the Polity of that Church in the Apostolical Age, and immediately after; and let us examine, whether it did not continue the same from the beginning. The Arguments I have used, and the Examples I have produced, do easily overthrow that Position, that the Episcopat, and the Presbyterat were not two distinct Offices in the time of the Apostles: I humbly conceive, I have fully made appear the contrary. But supposing it imaginable, that such a change of Discipline could be wrought under the Eyes of some of the Apostles, who might be still alive about the beginning of the second Century; and in the sight of those

those Disciples, who had been Auditors of their Doctrine, and that none of them should gainsay such an Innovation; which, as our Adversaries tell us, tended to corrupt Religion, and to raise the Ambition of the Clergy: My business at present is to prove, that in this very Church of *Rome*, where that Change is laid, the Government has been the same from the very Foundation of it.

That *St. Paul* preach'd the Gospel at *Rome*, is agreed on all hands: But whether *St. Peter* was ever there? Who was his immediate Successor? Whether he appointed one, or more Bishops in it, in his Life-time? Whether *Linus* was Bishop of that See before *Clemens*; or this before *Cletus*; or *Anacletus*, if they were two Persons? are intricate Questions in Ecclesiastical History; and not necessary to be discuss'd here. For it is confess'd on each side, that *Linus*, *Clemens*, *Cletus* or *Anacletus*, and *Evarestus*, were Bishops, and the first in the See of *Rome*; whereof the two former by the Appointment of the Apostles; but whether of *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul*, I shall not now determine. These Men, at least two of them, had seen the Apostles, and had been instituted into the Ministry by them; they were their Fellow-Labourers, and ordained Bishops in their time, being their Contemporaries; as appears from some Passages in <sup>a</sup>Scripture. And all <sup>b</sup>Antiquity testifies the same. As for *Linus*, who is the same the Apostle mentions; <sup>c</sup>*Eusebius*, in more than one place, would have him be Bishop of *Rome* after the Martyrdom of *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*; (which must be about the twelfth Year of *Nero's* Reign, and of Christ the 65<sup>th</sup>) <sup>d</sup>and to have held that See twelve Years.

<sup>a</sup> Philip. iv. 2. 2 Tim. iv. 21.

<sup>b</sup> Iren. adv. Har. lib. 3. cap. 3. Hier. Cat.

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 2. <sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 13.

But others make him Bishop there, establish'd by St. Peter, (more probably St. Paul) six Years before their Death; viz. about the Year 59. So that *Linus* having held the See of Rome eighteen Years, he will have died in the Year of our Lord 77. Which is not improbable; it being very likely, that he was one of the Roman Clergy, at the time of St. Paul's being first a Prisoner there; and that he served that Church under him, or St. Peter; and might be left to supply St. Paul's room, upon his departure to plant the Gospel elsewhere. After *Linus* followed *Anacletus*, as <sup>b</sup> *Eusebius* would have it: And <sup>c</sup> he sat in the Chair twelve Years, till about 91.

The *Romish* Writers think, the Historian is in an Error; and that *Cletus* must be inserted between; making two Bishops of Rome of *Cletus*, and *Anacletus*; and supposing that *Cletus* succeeded *Linus*, and *Anacletus* *Cletus*. According to this Account, here are besides St. Peter, and St. Paul, two or three Bishops, who hold the Episcopal Chair of Rome till the Year of God 91. For *Anacletus* was in it till then. After them came *Clemens*, according to <sup>d</sup> *Eusebius*, and he died about the Year 100. Then <sup>e</sup> *Evarestus*, who governed that See till the Year 108. Then *Alexander* <sup>f</sup>, &c. But as for *Clemens*, who was undoubtedly likewise Bishop of Rome; Historians are not agreed where to place him: For some make him St. Peter's immediate Successor; others put him after *Linus*, and others after *Cletus* or *Anacletus*. The ground of this Diversity of Opinions lies here; that <sup>g</sup> *Tertullian*, and several others of

<sup>a</sup> Geo. Sync. Chronogr. a Jac. Goar. edit. p. 341.

<sup>b</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 13. <sup>c</sup> Ibid. cap. 15.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. cap. 34. <sup>e</sup> Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 1.

<sup>f</sup> Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 3. cap. 3.

<sup>g</sup> Tert. de Præscript. Hær. cap. 32.

the Latins; and even the Compiler of the || Apostolical Constitutions, have delivered it in their Writings, that *St. Peter* committed the Episcopal Chair of *Rome* to *Clemens*, to preside in it; and that he did so. And yet, tho' that Commission must be granted him before the Year 65. wherein *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul* suffer'd Martyrdom; it is evident, that he lived till the Year 100. during which Interval there were several Bishops, who governed that Church in chief. But still it may be safely affirmed, that he was Bishop of *Rome* at the same time that *Linus* was; though he survived him, as also *Cletus* or *Anacletus*; and though these held the See before he died. For it is most certain, by the forecited Testimonies; and the *Liber Pontificalis* of *Damasus*, or *Anastasius*, and other *Romish* Writers; that he was appointed Bishop of *Rome* by the Apostles; that he had their Doctrine and Discipline fresh in his Mind; and that *St. Peter* committed his Chair to him: So that the beginning of his Episcopat must be placed with *Linus*, or soon after. It is true, *Eusebius* reckons him after *Anacletus*, and allows him but about nine Years in that See: Which must be understood, when he became sole Bishop of the whole Church. And indeed, if Men would take the Conjecture of two very Learned, and Judicious Persons; it would help very much to extricate most of these Difficulties; viz. † “ That there were two Divisions, or “ Congregations of the Christians at *Rome*; one “ of the Jewish, and the other of the Gentile “ Converts; over the former of which *St. Peter* “ presided, and over the latter *St. Paul*: So that “ one might substitute *Clemens* in his room, and

---

|| Const. Apost. lib. 7. cap. 47.

† Grot. Annot. in Apoc. 11. 3. Hammond. Dissert. 5. c. 1. de Episc. Jur.

“ the other *Linus*. Which seems to have been  
 “ practised at *Antioch, Ephesus, Corinth*; and pro-  
 “ bably in some other Churches, where there was  
 “ the like occasion.

This Account I have thought necessary to give, and to lay out this Plan; that I may draw thence the Evidence of the Proof I intend to offer, to shew what was the Discipline of the Apostles, and their first Successors, in the Church of *Rome*; and that the Subordination in the Ministry was then in use there: There being constantly at the Head of that Clergy a chief Pastor, who had the Superintendency, and Government of that Flock. You may observe in that Abstract, which is indisputable as to the Substance, though there is some diversity in the Circumstances; that *Linus*, and *Clemens* were ordained Ministers in the time of *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*; that *Linus* was made Bishop of *Rome*; that *St. Peter* committed his Chair to *Clemens*: And that *Cletus* or *Anacletus* succeeded to that See; then *Evarestus, Alexander, &c.* In the Days of *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul* then, there were Pastors settled at *Rome*, who were Bishops: *Linus*, and *Clemens* were so. There were probably then in the same City other Ministers, besides them: But yet the Historians do not tell us, that *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul* appointed them Bishops of that Church; they name only *Linus*, and *Clemens*, as such. They do not (I mean the Latin Historians) even give *St. Paul* the Title of *Bishop* of *Rome*. Which turns upon what I intimated before, (if the Conjecture of *Grotius*, and *Hammond* will not be accepted) *viz.* that when a Church was Populous, or like to become so; the Apostles instituted several Bishops for the Service of it, who were as Coadjutors of the proper Primate, to help him out upon several Occasions; and to succeed him after his Death; or only Titu-

lar ones, without any particular Flocks appropriated to them, but ready at hand to take the care of such as should be gathered: As many Presbyters, and Deacons are Ordained at this Day for the Cures, and other Employments, which may require their Ministration, at the Discretion of the Bishop. But that still there was one appointed amongst them, to be the Bishop of the See in chief; to whom the Government of it belonged, and who had the Right to confer Orders in it. In the time of *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*; *Linus*, and *Clemens* were Bishops in the Church of *Rome*: And it is possible, there might be others besides. But till the Death of *St. Peter*, (supposing him to have been the proper Bishop of that See) they were but his Coadjutors, or Titular Bishops; he being the Primate, and chief Rector of it. Yet as he was likewise an Apostle, who had a general Commission to plant the Gospel where ever the Divine Providence opened him a way; it is likely, that his Substitutes exercised the Office of Bishops at *Rome*, whilst he executed his Apostleship elsewhere: As \* *Ruffinus*, a Presbyter of *Aquileia*, has very well observed in the Preface of his Translation of *Clemens's Recognitions*. The meaning of that is, that *St. Peter* being obliged by his Apostolical Function to leave *Rome*, to return to *Pontus*, *Bitynia*, *Babylon*, &c. (whether this is true, or false, I inquire not here) where he had before founded Churches; and to maintain a good Order in them: He had committed to those Bishops, during his absence, the Administration of the Ecclesiastical Affairs of that See. It is even highly probable, that he chose one amongst them, according to the Custom of the other Apostles, to sit in the Episcopal Chair of *Rome*, as its Primate.

---

\* *Ruff. Præf. in Clem. Recogn. Lib.*

Whether it was *Linus*, or *Clemens*, is not material to my present purpose. Yet it is in a manner unquestionable, that it was *Clemens*. For besides the other Authorities out of \* *Tertullian*, and the † Apostolical Constitutions; the Pontifical of *Damasus* is positive in it: These are the very words in the Book; || *Hic*, i.e. *Clemens ex præcepto Beati Petri suscepit Ecclesiam*. Whence it is plain, that the Episcopal Chair of *Rome* was conferr'd on *Clemens* by *St. Peter*; and that *Clemens* was at *Rome* in the Life-time of *St. Peter*. And indeed it was no more than was requisite in Reason, and good Order; that the Apostles having no fix'd Station, but being engaged by their Office to Preach the Gospel throughout the World; they should appoint some one or other, in each principal Church they had planted, to be the standing Pastor, and Governor of it. What *St. Peter* did, as to the Church of *Rome*, by establishing *Clemens* there, as its Bishop. But if any one will have it, that *Clemens* had not the Possession of the Episcopal Chair of *Rome*, till after the Death of *St. Peter*; the Assertion will still remain good, viz. that *St. Peter* chose *Clemens* in his Life-time to hold his place in that See, and to be at the Head of his Clergy, as himself had been. So that during *St. Peter's* absence, *Clemens*, or *Linus*, will have governed the Church of *Rome*, as his Deputies: But after his Death, *Clemens* will have taken the Chair, by virtue of his Appointment; *Clemens ex præcepto*, &c. Though it is most probable, that after the Example of other Apostles, *St. Peter* settled *Clemens* Bishop of *Rome*: And as for himself, that he exercised his Office of

---

\* Suprà Tertull. de Præscr. Hær. cap. 32.

† Suprà Const. Apost. lib. 7. cap. 47.

|| Anaft. Bibl. de Vit. Pont. Rom. Vit. Clem.

Apostle, which was to Superintend all the Churches he had founded.

Here is then *St. Peter*, who begins himself to dispose of the Episcopal Chair of *Rome* to *Clemens*; to the end after Ages may learn thence, what was the Apostolical Institution of Church-Government; and should conform thereunto. And according to this, it is not improbable, (if we will not allow the Supposition of two distinct Congregations) that *Clemens* succeeded *Linus* in it; then *Cletus* or *Anacletus*, *Evarestus*, *Alexander*, &c. Wherein however it is manifest, that the Pattern of *St. Peter* was duly followed. How comes this about? Is it that there were no other Bishops at *Rome* in their time? Nothing of that: The contrary is plain. For *Linus* is said\* to have Ordained eleven Bishops, and eighteen Presbyters; *Clemens* fifteen Bishops, ten Presbyters, and two Deacons; *Cletus* thirty five Presbyters, by the Command of *St. Peter*; *Anacletus* six Bishops, five Presbyters, and three Deacons. But the true Reason is, that amongst all those Bishops, there was but one, who could be reckoned the Bishop of that Church; or perhaps the Metropolitan of that Province: And the other were Diocesan Bishops, or *Chor-episcopi*, if there were any at that time, which it is not likely; or Coadjutors, or bare Titulars. The truth is, as to these last, those Seminaries, or Colleges of Bishops (if there were such, for it is not wholly agreed) might be then of good use in the Church: For they had therein an opportunity of being thoroughly instructed in the Apostolical Doctrine, and Discipline. So that when they were to be sent into other Christian Churches, they were fitly qualified to discharge their Duty, and

---

\* Plat. de Vit. Pont. Rom. & alii, with a little Variation.

to keep up the Unity of the Spirit, in the Bond of Peace; by preaching the same Doctrine, and following the same Discipline, which they had heard, and seen.

From what I have said upon this Head, I think, I may safely deduce the following Inferences, as being evident from thence: 1. That from the very beginning of Christianity, though there might be several Bishops in one principal Church; (I speak not here of those distinct Congregations) yet the Episcopal Chair was committed but to one, to Govern it in Chief. 2. That that one was called the *Bishop, Primate*, and sometimes *Angel* of that Church. 3. That the Orders of Deacon, Presbyter, and Bishop, were then distinguish'd; as appears by the different Ordinations of *Linus, Clemens*, and their immediate Successors; if we may depend upon the Authorities produced. 4. That that Form, establish'd in the beginning, was constantly observed afterwards; one Bishop holding the See, tho' there might be more in the Church. 5. That the proper Business of that Bishop was to confer Orders, and govern the Flock committed to him. It was *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul*, that Ordained *Linus*, and *Clemens*; *Linus* did it to eleven Bishops, *Clemens* to fifteen, *Anacletus* to six, and they and *Cletus* to Presbyters, and Deacons, as I have related of each of them. What is not affirmed of any others, whilst these held the Episcopal Chair of *Rome*. The Reason is, that the Government of that Church belonged to them in chief; and that it was their part to execute the Constitutions of it, whereof the Ordination of Ministers was one of the most sacred Articles. Otherwise it would have been lawful for the least amongst them, to admit into the holy Ministry whom he pleased. But as under the Law, none was permitted to touch the Censer; or even to

uphold the Ark, when it was tottering, as in the case of *Uzzah*; but he only that was duly thereunto called: So under the Gospel, none can enter into any holy Office, but in the regular way, *i. e.* by the Episcopal Conveyance; which none can pretend to bestow, but he who has a Right to the Apostles Chair. And as they acted thus in the Church of *Rome*, in the first Age of Christianity; so did they likewise in that of *Jerusalem*: Which being accounted for in the preceding Chapter, and the appointing of *St. James*, and *St. Simeon*, the two Bishops within that Period; I presume, I need say no more here. From all which I conclude; that there was no Innovation made in the Ecclesiastical Government, by the Bishops of the second Century, either at *Rome*, *Jerusalem*, or elsewhere: But that they trod Religiously in the Steps of the Apostles, and their immediate Successors, who were their Predecessors; conforming themselves punctually to their Tradition, and Custom. I do not mean, that they added no Circumstantials: And that the Church beginning to feel some Agitations within it self, being grown a large Body, and requiring a more particular Management, to preserve its Purity, and keep it from falling into Disorder; they made no positive Regulations, about things which were yet observed but by Custom, and a Tradition from Father to Son. But a Custom confirmed by a Decree, and reduced into a positive Law; is not an Innovation, or a change of Discipline: It is rather the ancient Tradition fortified by the Law; and an exacter Confirmation of what was required to be done before.

## C H A P. XV.

*Proofs of the Establishment of Episcopacy by the Apostles, in the other Churches; and that they had the same Government with that of Rome, and Jerusalem, during the first Century.*

**B**UT to take away all occasion of Cavil from our Adversaries; and that none may imagine, that it was only the Custom of the Church of Rome to have a Bishop to govern it; whom *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul* appointed first; and who afterwards left his Place at his Death to another, with the same Authority that he had: I shall shew now, that it was the general Practice of the Christian Church, during the first Century; there being then none, whereof we have any Monuments extant, but used it so. This appears plainly enough, notwithstanding the Accounts we have of that Time, are but short; and we have but few Contemporary Writers left us, to inform us of these Matters, and set them in a full Light. How many things are we perfectly ignorant of, which fell out within that Period? And how many Events, and particular Transactions, might we learn, if we had the Relations of what the Apostles did amongst the *Barbarians*; how they governed the Churches they had planted there, and in the remotest parts of the World; and what Regulations they made for the well ordering of them: Whereof we know but little, or nothing; and that intermix'd with Legends, and Fables! So that I must confine my  
self

self of necessity to those Churches, whereof we have some Monuments left us. And those will be at present *Antioch*, (besides *Rome*, and *Jerusalem*, which I have already accounted for) *Byzantium* or *Constantinople*, and *Alexandria*; that we may see the Proof of Episcopacy in the five great Apostolical Churches: with some others, which are mentioned in Scripture, and the Succession of whose Bishops is recorded in Authentick History.

To come then to a particular proof of this, that the most famous Churches of the first Age of Christianity had the same Government with that of *Rome*, and *Jerusalem*; let us cast our Eyes first upon the See of *Antioch*: For there the Faithful were first called *Christians*, *Acts* xi. 26. This Church, as it is generally agreed, was founded by *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*; the former probably Preaching to the Jews, and the latter to the Gentiles, upon prudent Considerations, and their being separated on account of their respective Rites. For besides that *St. Peter* was in a peculiar manner the Apostle of the Circumcision, as *St. Paul* was of the Uncircumcision, where those People were intermix'd; as appears from *Gal.* ii. 7. We find *Acts* xv. *St. Peter* disputing for the Jews of *Antioch*, and *St. Paul* for the Gentiles. But let that be as it will; we read in Ecclesiastical History, that *Evodius* was made Bishop of that Church about the Year of Christ 46. and that he held the Chair twenty three Years: And likewise that *Ignatius* succeeded him in the Year 69. It is true, that *Ignatius* was ordained Bishop of that See before, in the Life-time of *Evodius*; as we are assured by *St. Chrysostom*, *Theodoret*, and others. Which things, I must confess, I know of no better way to reconcile, than by saying, according to the Hypothesis of the two Learned Men above-mentioned, That there were two

Divisions

Divisions of Christians at *Antioch*; one of the Jewish, and the other of the Gentile-Converts: And that one Bishop might be appointed by one Apostle, and the other by the other. And this once for all, I must extend here to other Instances of the like nature, that there may be no need to repeat it again. For we cannot suppose, without destroying the Unity of Episcopacy, that there were two Bishops in one and the same Episcopal Chair, at the same time. However it is agreed on all hands, that after the Death of *Evodius*, *Ignatius* held alone the See of *Antioch*; and that to about the Year of our Lord 110. and the Tenth of *Trajan's* Reign; *Syria*, and *Synecius* being Consuls the second time; when he suffered Martyrdom\*. And he was not only Bishop of that See; but he got so much Honour in it, that he was considered as one of the greatest Lights of all the Churches in the East. But here I must advertise the Reader, that I follow *Eusebius's* Chronology, as digested by *Dr. Cave* in his *Dypticha Apostolica*, and Chronological Table; but where I have a particular Reason to the contrary; as the best method I can take.

The next Apostolical Church, whose Government is here to be inquired into, is that of *Byzantium* or *Constantinople*, founded by *St. Andrew*. This Apostle, as we are informed by *Nicephorus Callistus* ||, (having *Scythia*, and the Neighbouring Countries allotted him, in the Distribution which is supposed to have been made of the several Provinces of the World amongst the first Preachers of Christianity, for the better and more orderly planting of it) in his Travels, converted to the Faith a considerable Num-

*Byzantium* or  
*Constantinople.*

\* *Aët. Ignar. Wake's Apost. Epist. Præf. p. 71. Ann. 116.*

|| *Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 39.*

ber of Men in that City, and erected a Church at *Argyropolis*. And the same Author tells us \*, that he appointed *Stachys* the first Bishop thereof; whom *St. Paul* calls his *beloved Stachys*; and that he held that See sixteen Years. But if this Authority is not thought sufficient; *Nicephorus* Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who flourish'd in the Year of Christ 806. and who may be allow'd to know the History of his own Church, and the Succession of his Predecessors, says expressly, † “ That *Andrew* the Apostle, when he Preached at *Byzantium*, built an Oratory at *Argyropolis*, on the “ other side the Water; and ordained Bishop of “ that City *Stachys*, whom *Paul* mentions in his “ Epistle to the *Romans*: And assigns him the same Term of holding that See. And doubtless such a Person is spoken of by *St. Paul*, *Rom. xvi. 9*. Him succeeded in that See *Onesimus*, who held fourteen Years; then *Polycarpus*, who held seventeen Years: Which brings the Succession of the *Constantinopolitan* Bishops towards the second Century, where it will be farther accounted for.

If we consider the Church of *Alexandria*, which deserves well to be taken notice of here; we shall find, that *St. Mark* was the first Founder, and Bishop of it †. I place it amongst the Apostolical Churches; because, though he was not, strictly speaking, an Apostle; yet being one at large, and Commissioned by *St. Peter*, whose constant Attendant he had been; it is reckoned in the Number of them. He then appointed <sup>a</sup> *Anianus*, or according to some, *Ananias*, to hold the Chair, the Eighth, or Tenth Year

---

\* *Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. lib. 8. cap. 6.*

† *Niceph. C. P. Chronogr. p. 412.*

‡ *Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 16.*

<sup>a</sup> *Ibid. cap. 24. j*

of the Emperor *Nero*, and of Christ the 63<sup>d</sup>; and he did it twenty two Years: \* “He was, says the Historian, “a Man beloved of God, and admirable “in all things. After him came † *Avilius*, in the Fourth Year of *Domitian*, and of Christ 85; who governed that Church twelve, or thirteen Years. || *Cerdo* then, about the First Year of *Trajan*, who was Bishop of it till the Year of Christ 109. What! was there but one Pastor in *Alexandria* at one time? That can hardly be imagined: It was a considerable Church; and had doubtless a proportionable Clergy in it. But there was but one that bore the Title of *Bishop* of it; because he alone possessed the Episcopal Chair of *Alexandria*, conformably to the Custom establish’d by the Apostles.

As for the other Churches; that of *Athens*; for the Situation of the City, and the great Concourse of People resorting thither, upon the account of its being a famous Martplace, and having an University in it, could not but be one of the most numerous, and flourishing in *Greece*: And therefore *St. Paul* settled the same Order in it, as he had done in the others he had planted. And to that end he committed the Chair to *Dionysius* the *Areopagite*, whom he had converted to the Faith; as it is testified by another *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, who flourish’d in the Year of Christ 170. Which is recorded by *Eusebius*<sup>a</sup>, *Lib. 3. Cap. 4.* The same Historian acquaints us<sup>b</sup>, *Lib. 4. Cap. 23.* that *Dionysius* having suffered Martyrdom under *Domitian* the Emperor, as it is probably conjectured<sup>c</sup>; he was succeeded in that See by *Publius*, about the Year 90. in the time of the second Persecution. Which

---

\* Euseb. Ibid. † Ibid. lib. 3. cap. 14. || Ibid. c. 21. ]  
<sup>a</sup> Ibid. lib. 3. c. 4.      <sup>b</sup> Ibid. lib. 4. c. 23.  
<sup>c</sup> *Cav.* Life of *Dionys.* the *Areop.* brings

brings the Episcopal Succession towards the beginning of the Second Century. But we read of no other Bishops of that Church in the First.

I proceed therefore to the Church of *Corinth*; which was one of the first planted, and which had the happiness to be instructed, and governed by the Apostles, and several eminent Men, in its Infancy. But whether it was founded by *St. Peter*, or *St. Paul*; and whether *Apollos*, or another, was the first Bishop of it: And whether there were two Divisions of Converts in it? I shall not now inquire. This is but too plain concerning it, *viz.* That before the Government was fully established in one Bishop, it began to be miserably divided, *one saying, I am of Paul; and another, of Apollos; and another of Cephas; and another, of Christ;* as the Apostle complains, *1 Cor. i. 12.* In short, it was torn to pieces within it self; or rather, to speak more particularly, the Ring-leaders tore it to pieces with their Schisms, and Animosities: Corrupting the Christian Doctrine, and Discipline; and using all their Eloquence to gain Profelytes to their several Parties. To suppress therefore this Spirit of Ambition, and to restrain these cruel Dissentions, which tended to the ruin of that Church; it was at last concluded, that the Ecclesiastical Government of *Corinth* should be settled in one, as the Bishop of that See. In which sense that Passage of *St. Jerom* before-mentioned, *In toto orbe decretum est, &c.* may very well be explained; though it is brought out upon every turn to prove, that Episcopacy is not of Apostolical Institution: Since it shews the contrary; that Constitution, according to him, having been made by the Apostles themselves; and that lest *one should say, I am of Paul; and another, of Apollos; and another, of Cephas; and another, of Christ.* From that time the Church  
of

of *Corinth* had one Pastor establish'd over it; to whom the care of it was committed, preferably to all others, as being the sole Bishop of it. We do not meet in Ecclesiastical Antiquity with the Names of the Bishops, who governed that See during the first Century. But we have no reason to doubt, after the Apostolical Establishment, that the same Order was continued in it. And several Passages I have already quoted out of *St. Clement's* first Epistle to the *Corinthians*, do evidently imply it.

The same thing I must say of the Church of *Smyrna*, which ought not to be forgotten here; no more than the other *Asiatick* Churches, which being chiefly planted by their Labours, were under the \* Inspection of *St. John*: Though I have had already occasion to speak of that of *Ephesus*, the chief Metropolis of them. In that Church then, the Apostle having selected *Polycarp* out of its Clergy; appointed him, upon the Death of *Bucolus*, to hold the Chair †; the first Year of the Emperor *Domitian*, and of Christ the 82<sup>d</sup>; as he was very well worthy. This holy Man, as we are told ‖, governed that See eighty six Years, *viz.* to about the Year of our Lord 167. He, of all others, would not doubtless have neglected to oppose any, if there had been such, that would have changed, about the middle of the second Century, (as is pretended) the Discipline he had learned from the Apostle, and seen him practise. But what is most observable here, is, that *St. John* is directed by the Spirit to stile him, and the other six Bishops of *Asia* he writes to, *Rev. ii. 1, &c. Stars, and Angels*; and

---

\* Tertul. adv. Mar. lib. 4. cap. 5.

† Iren. lib. 3. cap. 3. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 14.

‖ Act. Polyc. *Wake's* Apost. Epist. Præf. p. 79. Ann. 147.

that Jesus Christ is said there, *to hold them in his right hand.* Which certainly can amount to no less, than an Approbation, and Confirmation of that Order of Ministers in the Church, and its Excellency.

I presume, it would be needless to instance in the Churches of *Philippi, Thessalonica,* and some others, for more Proofs of this Matter. Neither will I spend time in repeating the Relations of various Legends, which tell us of a great number of Bishops, who were sent during the first Century into *Italy, Spain, France,* and even *England,* to be the Directors of several Christian Churches, which had been already planted there: Because their Testimony is not authentick, being intermix'd with palpable Fables. Yet it is not to be concluded thence, that there were no Bishops sent into some parts of those Countries, and elsewhere, to settle the Apostolical Succession in them, which was to be spread throughout the whole World, by the Ordaining of Pastors to govern the Church; though we have not the Names of them, for want of Memoirs of those Times. Notwithstanding the second Century shews sufficiently, that there was Provision made for the first; since we see in the very beginning of it, almost every where, famous Churches served by a numerous Clergy, at the Head of whom appears a Bishop, who has the Administration of Ecclesiastical Affairs in chief. Which proves the Continuation of the Apostolical Tradition in the second Century; as I shall more explain in what is now to follow.

## C H A P. XVI.

*Wherein is proved, that the Hierarchical Government continued the same in the Second Century, as in the First.*

TO make a full proof of this to my purpose, pursuing my former Method, I shall first shew in general, that the same Form of Government was observed in the Church of the second Century, as of the first. And afterwards particularly, that the Distinction of the three Degrees in the Ministry was kept up during that Period. For if the Churches of the second Age have maintained the same Polity, as those of the first; and if in both the Episcopal Order has been distinguish'd from the Presbyterial, and this from the Diaconal: Then it must of necessity be owned, that such an Administration must have been derived from the Apostles. And likewise that far from making any Innovation in its OEconomy, as to the Substance of it; the Christian Church of that time has but continued the ancient, and first Form; and followed therein the Pattern of its Founders, in a successive Imitation of them.

And to begin with the Church of *Antioch*, as I did before; and carry on the Episcopal Succession through this Century in that See: *Ignatius* being dead, \* *Heron* succeeded him in the Chair; and held it to the 12th Year of *Adrian's* Reign, which answers to the Year of Christ 129. Immediately after him † *Cornelius*

*In the Church of Antioch.*

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 3. cap. 36.

† Ibid. lib. 4. c. 20.

was appointed, in the same manner as his Predecessors had been; and stood at the Head of that Church till the fifth Year of *Antoninus Pius*, or the 142<sup>d</sup> of Christ. Then *Heron* the Second of that Name, or rather *Eros*, till the Year 166, or 168, according to \* *Nicephorus* of *Constantinople*. Then the Learned *Theophilus*, in the Year of Christ 168. whose Books, *ad Autolyicum*, are still extant. After him *Maximinus*, in the Year 180. And lastly, appeared the famous † *Serapio*, who began to govern the Episcopal Chair of *Antioch* about the Year 189. So that we have here an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops in this See, throughout the whole second Century, conformable to that of the first, the establish'd Order continuing the same. Nothing is here altered from what it was in the time of the Apostles, as to the Substance of it. Though there may be several Pastors at *Antioch*, one has the Chair after another committed to him, preferably to the rest; to be the Rector, and Moderator of it. And no Dispute arises about it, at least that we know of. But as *Ignatius* succeeded *Evodius* in the first Century, so does *Cornelius* succeed *Heron* in the second, in the Church of *Antioch*; and so of the rest. If then the Elections of the second Age were not conformable to the Apostolical Establishment, those of the first must be contrary to it: For there appears no difference between them. It is true, this may be thought one, *viz.* that *Evodius*, and *Ignatius* seem to have been Bishops together of the See of *Antioch*; which destroys the Superiority, which might obtain in the second Century, where there was but one Bishop at one time; and consequently *Evodius*, or *Ignatius*, was but as a President, who moderated be-

---

\* *Niceph. C. P. Chronogr. p. 417.*

† *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 19.*

tween his Equals, as it is pretended. But besides what has already been said upon this Point; I answer, 1. That it does not appear, neither did I affirm it, that *Evodius*, and *Ignatius* held jointly the Episcopal Chair of *Antioch*, or at the same time: That would destroy the Unity of Episcopacy. It is true, they were Bishops together; but in a different respect; as I have already explained It in this, and in some other Cases. *Evodius* was first Bishop of that See, and then *Ignatius*; as we commonly reckon that Succession: "Remember, says *Ignatius* himself, in his Epistle to the Faithful of *Antioch*, (which, though falsely ascribed to him, is of good Antiquity) "the blessed *Evodius*, your  
 " Pastor, who was after the Apostles first appointed Bishop over you. 2. The Church of *Antioch* being not less Populous in the second Century, than in the first; and being more likely to have increased in the number of Ministers: There is no ground to affirm, that it had not more Pastors than one in it, though it had but one governing in chief. *Heron*, *Cornelius*, &c. are named, as those who kept up in that See the Apostolical Succession. 3. The Bishops of that Church, in the second Age, had no other Order, nor no other Degree, than those in the first: Each of them received the same Episcopal Ordination by the Imposition of Hands, and thereby had the Government of that See committed to him. Call him *President*, or *Moderator*, or by what other Title you will; I shall always understand him who was the Bishop of that Church; and whose Office it was to Govern it, and confer holy Orders, by virtue of the Authority he had, and the Apostolical Succession which resided in him. Upon which Principle, I must affirm, that *Serapio*, towards the end of the second Century, received by his Ordination of Bishop, no other Right, Authority, or Pre-eminency, than *Ignatius* possessed

towards the end of the first. For my part, I can discern here but the same Order, and the same Custom, which was observed all along from the beginning.

Of *Byzantium*  
or *Constantino-*  
*ple.*

And therefore to make out the Episcopal Line in the Church of *Byzantium* or *Constantinople* throughout this Century, as I have endeavoured in the first; reserving those of *Jerusalem*, and *Rome* for the last proof, that there was no Innovation attempted in the Apostolical Government, either before or after the time pretended: I shall take up the Succession here, where I left it off in that See. *Polycarpus* then being dead; *Plutarchus* came into the Chair, which he held sixteen Years, according to the best \* Account we can get. To him succeeded *Sedecio*, who held it nine Years. Then *Diogenes*, who held it fifteen Years. It is true, that *Nicephorus* of *Constantinople*, who is most to be rely'd upon in this matter, does not mention these three last Bishops: But whoever considers the various Accidents which Books are subject to, will easily be satisfied with the Evidence that is left us. After *Diogenes* came † *Eleutherius*, who governed that Church seven Years. And he was succeeded in it by *Fælix*, who governed it five Years. As this was by *Polycarpus* the second of that Name in that See, which he was Bishop of seventeen Years, according to *Nicephorus* the Patriarch. And then *Athenodorus* took it up, and held it four Years. This Man built a Church in *Eleæ*, which was afterwards beautified, and enlarged by *Constantine* the Great. Then came in *Euzoius*, who governed sixteen Years. And lastly, *Laurentius* in this Century, who held eleven Years.

---

\* *Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. lib. 8. cap. 6.*

† *Niceph. C. P. Chronogr. p. 412:*

The Church of *Alexandria* was no less uniform in this Point, than *Of Alexandria.* the other Apostolical ones. For <sup>a</sup> *Cerdo* being dead, *Primus*, or *Priamus* succeeded to the Chair, and <sup>b</sup> held it ten Years. Then came <sup>c</sup> *Justus*, or *Justinus*, in the third Year of *Adrian*; who held it till about the thirteenth Year of that Reign. Then <sup>d</sup> *Eumenes*, or *Hymeneus*, till the sixth Year of *Antoninus Pius* the Emperor: <sup>e</sup> *Nicephorus*, C. P. allows him but ten Years. After him <sup>f</sup> *Mark* the second of that Name, or *Marcianus*, who governed that Church thirteen Years, says <sup>g</sup> *Nicephorus*; but *Eusebius* ten. Then <sup>h</sup> *Celadion* did the same, being Bishop of that See ten Years, according to the Patriarch; fourteen according to our Historian. After him governed *Agrippinus*, till the Year 180. He had for his Successor <sup>i</sup> *Julianus*. To whom succeeded <sup>k</sup> *Demetrius* about the Year 189. who governed that See forty three Years; pretty far into the third Century. Is there any thing changed here in the Form of the Government of the Church of *Alexandria*, from *St. Mark* to *Demetrius*? Does not one Bishop regularly succeed another, by a due Ordination? Let our Adversaries tell me, under which of them the Discipline was altered. Had one a Degree, which the other had not? And did not the Church of *Alexandria*, in this Age, practise punctually the same things, in respect of the Government, which it had done in the preceding? The same Order is observed every where: And why? Because no other is owned, or established in

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. cap. 4. <sup>c</sup> Ibid.

<sup>d</sup> Iren. Ibid. cap. 11. <sup>e</sup> Niceph. C. P. Chronogr. p. 416.

<sup>f</sup> Iren. apud. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 11. <sup>g</sup> Ibid.

<sup>h</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 19. <sup>i</sup> Ibid. lib. 5. c. 9.

<sup>k</sup> Ibid. cap. 22.

the Christian Church by the Apostles. And therefore Sr. *Jerom* said, as I intimated before, \* “That  
 “ at *Alexandria*, from *Mark* the Evangelist even  
 “ to *Heraclas* and *Dionysius*, the Presbyters always  
 “ chusing one of themselves, and placing him in a  
 “ higher Degree, did call him the Bishop.

To go on with the Church of *Athens*. *thens*; though we have no account extant, how the Chair was supplied immediately after the Death of *Publius*, † who suffered Martyrdom, probably under *Trajan*: Yet it is not to be doubted, but care was taken of it, unless some extraordinary Accident hinder'd it. It can hardly be said, that such a Church, as was that of *Athens*, was served by no Bishops during a considerable space of Years; though we read not their Names, and there might be a numerous Clergy in it. This is however certain, † that *Quadratus* succeeded to the Episcopal Chair in that See, under the Emperor *Adrian*, about the Year of Christ 119. This is that *Quadratus*, who coming into a Church, which was almost ruined by Persecution, restored it to its pristine Luster. And that in such a manner, that observing the Emperor to continue his Violence against it; he took occasion, whilst *Adrian* was at *Athens*, to compose an Apologetick in behalf of the Christians; wherein he shewed their Innocency, and the great Injustice that was done them, in condemning them to Death; and had the Courage to present it himself to him. *Eusebius*, ‡ and *Jerom* assure us, that that piece was worthy the Apostolical Doctrine. But unhappily for the the Christian World, that Apology is lost; as are

---

\* Hierom. Epist. ad Evagr.

† Dionys. Corinth. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 23.

‡ Ibid.

‡ Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 3. Hieron. Cat. de Script.

several other Monuments of Antiquity, which would be of mighty use to us, to inform us of the State of the Church in the first, and purest Ages: But Time, which devours all things, has robbed us of them! However the Emperor was so far affected with it, that he abated much of his Fury against the Christians. Such was the Zeal, Vigilancy, and Occupation of those, who (our Adversaries pretend) raised Episcopacy in the second Century to its pitch; and that by a Spirit of Ambition, very contrary to the Humility of the Apostles! But who can believe, if he be not prejudiced beforehand; that Persons, *who were made a Spectacle unto the World, and to Angels, and to Men*; and were look'd upon *as the Off-scouring of all things*; should dream of extending the Bounds of the Ministry; as if their Founders had not left them a Field wide enough to cultivate? Would not at least some Lover of the ancient, and Fundamental Constitution; some good Disciple, and Religious Observer of the Traditions of his Fathers; have ventured to write a few Lines against such Innovators, to bring them back to the Law, and the Gospel; and to perplex them in their bold Enterprize? But to return to the Apostolical Succession in this See of *Athens*: *Quadratus* dying towards the end of *Adrian's* Reign, we may suppose the same Form of Government continued; since \* *Origen*, who lived some time after, extols this very Church for its good Order, Calmness, and Disposition, beyond all their secular Assemblies.

As for the Church of *Corinth*; Of *Corinth*.  
 though Antiquity has not left us the Names of the Bishops, who governed that See towards the end of the first, as we may suppose, and in the beginning of the second Century: Yet we

---

\* Orig. contr. Cels. lib. 3. p. 128.

find, that *Primus* about the middle of this held the Episcopal Chair. For *Hegesippus*\* tells us, "That in travelling to *Rome*, he saw him, and convers'd with him; and adds farther, "That that Church continued in the true Faith. And † *Dionysius* succeeded him in that See, about the Year of Christ 170. But not the *Areopagite*, who was Bishop of *Athens*, as I have shewn; but the other called *Dionysius* of *Corinth*, who amongst others writ an Epistle to the *Athenians*, wherein he speaks of the former. After this excellent Person, we meet with another, who came into his room, in the Year 196. || It is the famous *Bacchylus*, who was had in such esteem in all the Churches of *Greece*, that by his Authority he summon'd a Synod, to examine the Question about the Day whereon *Easter* was to be kept; which did then very much disturb the Peace of the Christian Church. This he could not have done, if he had not been look'd upon as the principal Director of the Churches of *Achaia*. And hereby, *i. e.* by his Advancement into the Episcopal Chair, appears the Uniformity between *Corinth*, and the other Christian Churches in the second Century, as to the Point of the Ecclesiastical Government, and the Apostolical Succession.

If we desire to have Examples of this nearer home; we have but to turn our Eyes towards *France*, where we shall meet with some Churches in this Century, which were governed by Bishops, as soon as they embraced the Christian Religion; as namely *Lyons*, and *Vienne* upon the *Rhône*. It is true, it was but about the beginning of this Century, that Episcopacy appears to have been settled in those Churches; because we have no certain ac-

---

\* *Heges.* apud *Euseb.* *Hist. Eccles.* lib. 4. cap. 22.

† *Ibid.* cap. 23.

|| *Ibid.* lib. 5. cap. 22.

count, that the Gospel passed into the *Gauls* before that time; or indeed into this Western part of the World. But it is evident by the Proceedings of the Persons, who were sent thither, what kind of Discipline they had learned from their Instructors; since they administered the Episcopal Government there. For they formed a Clergy, establish'd Sees, and govern'd 'em themselves in chief: They Ordained Ministers, exercised Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, and transacted the Affairs of their respective Flocks. And one Bishop succeeded another in the Chair. Which is plain particularly in the Church of *Lyons*; whose first Bishops in the second Century, are owned by all the Christian World. \* The first that came thither, was *Pothinus*, who was a Disciple of *Polycarp*, and suffered Martyrdom in the Year 177. This Man was then ninety Years of Age; so that he might have began to exercise his Pastoral Office pretty early in that Church. *Irenæus* was sent hither likewise; but it was in the quality of a Presbyter: For so † *Eusebius* tells us expressly; and elsewhere it is said, that *Pothinus* had a Presbyter under him, who was probably *Irenæus*. But this is certain from the same Ecclesiastical || History, and others, that he succeeded him after his Death in the Chair of *Lyons*, as Bishop of that See, in the eighteenth Year of the Emperor *Marcus Aurelius*; and that he held it about twenty three Years, viz. to the Year of Christ 202. Which was that fatal Year, wherein *Severus* the Emperor almost destroyed that great City; wherein *Irenæus* had instructed, and governed a noble Church, with much Pain, and no less Prudence. *Irenæus* then laboured with, and under *Pothinus*; but he did not come into his Chair, till

---

\* Yien. & Lugd. Eccl. Epist. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. c. 1.

† Ibid. cap. 4.

|| Ibid. cap. 5.

after his Death: That the Order establish'd in the Christian Church from the beginning, should be Religiously observed, and the Unity of Episcopacy maintained; as they had seen it amongst their Predecessors in the Faith. And indeed this good Man, who had been \* brought up under *St. Polycarp*; and who had his very Gestures in his Mind, and remember'd the Things he discours'd of, and even the Words he us'd; as the Historian tells us; would not have violated the Apostolical Government himself, if others had made any attempt that way. But *Irenæus* shewed himself a Bishop † when he came to the Chair; as appears from the manner, and Stile he with his Clergy writ in to *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, about his having dared to Excommunicate the Bishops of *Asia*, for refusing to subscribe to his Judgment concerning the Celebration of *Easter-Day*. For in that Letter he treats him but as his Equal, and speaks to him with an Episcopal Authority.

As to the Church of *Vienne* upon the *Rhône*; which is said to have been founded by *Crescens*, according to || *Ado's* Chronology, under the Reign of *Nero*: In the time of *Trajan*, and *Adrian* Emperors; after the Death of *Zacharias*, *Martin* a Disciple of the Apostles, held the Episcopal Chair in that City. To whom succeeded *Verus*, who had been likewise an Auditor of the Apostles; and then another, named *Iustus*, and *Dionysius*; as the same Author relates, who was Archbishop of that See, and flourish'd in the Year 859. ‡

In short, what was practis'd in these several Churches before mentioned, in respect of the Episcopal

\* *Iren. Epist. ad Flor. Ibid. cap. 20.* † *Ibid. c. 24.*

|| *Ado's Chron. Æt. Sextâ.* ‡ *Cav. Hist. Lit.*

Succession; was universally observed in all the others, which had learned the same Discipline from the Apostles, and were resolved to keep it inviolable. And though it is pretended by our Adversaries, that an Innovation being made in this Point by *Hyginus* in the Church of *Rome*, about the middle of the second Century, that of *Ferusalem* followed the Example; (which I have shewn to be wrong, according to their own account) it is very easie to prove the contrary; as I am now going particularly to do. The Jews then having held that Chair, as I have intimated, till the nineteenth Year of *Adrian's* Reign, *viz.* for about an hundred Years, in a regular Succession of thirteen Bishops, besides *St. James*, and *Simeon*, (whose Names, according to \* *Eusebius*, are *Justus*, *Zaccheus*, *Tobias*, *Benjamin*, *John*, *Matthias*, *Philip*, *Seneca*, *Justus*, *Levi*, *Ephrem*, *Joseph*, and *Judas*) there was care taken, that the Apostolical Succession should not fail in that See. The Disasters that beset that Nation, one would think, might have changed the establish'd Order, and kept them from making any more Bishops of *Ferusalem*. But on the contrary, though their Jewish Presbyters were in a manner extinct, by the entire Destruction of their City: Because the Apostolical Establishment was Religiously observed in the Christian Church, and Episcopacy was look'd upon as necessary to its preservation; they chose to have a Stranger for their Bishop, one that was not of their Extraction, rather than want one. And therefore *Mark* was appointed in that See, upon the Failure of the Jews, or for other Reasons; though he was a Gentile by Birth; after the manner of his Predecessors, about the Year of Christ 136. that the Episcopal Succession might be continued at *Ferusalem*, which had had the Honour the

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 5.

first to have an Apostle for its Bishop. Moreover that there might be no Interruption in it; as soon as this good Man had suffer'd Martyrdom, as it is supposed, being the usual Lot of the Bishops in those Days; *Cassianus* was put in his room: And afterwards the others, till *Narcissus* inclusively; who are named in the Catalogue which \* *Eusebius* has gathered of the Bishops of *Jerusalem*; or in that fuller one of † *Nicephorus* of *Constantinople*, with the Time of their holding. What Innovation was then made, or followed in the second Century, by the Church of *Jerusalem*? What was there, and then done, as to the appointing of Bishops, but what was in use before? Nothing, but continuing an Order, which was begun; and imitating a Pattern, which the Apostles themselves had set by their Institution, and Practice.

The Church of *Rome*, against which  
*Of Rome.* the great Out-cry is raised, without distinguishing the Times; and which is charged with having Innovated first; was no less careful, than that of *Jerusalem*, and the rest, to maintain the Apostolical Polity. For the Episcopal Succession was duly kept up there, as we have seen, from the very time of the Apostles to *Evaristus*, viz. till the beginning of the second Century, wherein he suffer'd Martyrdom ||, about the twelfth Year of *Trajan's* Reign; the ‡ *Romish* Writers say later. This Order was too well grounded, to be changed afterwards in that See: *Rome* will have still a Bishop to govern it, after the Example of the first Age. And therefore *Evaristus* was no sooner dead, (having <sup>a</sup> Ordained five Bishops, six Presbyters, and two Deacons) but <sup>b</sup> *Alexander* succeeded him

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 12.

† Niceph. C. P. Chronogr. p. 409, 410.

|| Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 1.

‡ Plat. de Vit. Pont. Rom. Vit. Evar. <sup>a</sup> Ibid.

<sup>b</sup> Iren. apud Euseb. Ibid. lib. 4. cap. 6.

in that Chair; which he held ten Years; during which time he <sup>a</sup> Ordained five Bishops, five Presbyters, and three Deacons. After him came *Xistus*, or *Sixtus*, in the Year of Christ 130. according to the Latins; who governed that Church ten Years; and <sup>b</sup> Ordained four Bishops, eleven Presbyters, and eleven Deacons. Then *Telesphorus*, who held that See eleven Years, according to *Petavius*, and others; and <sup>c</sup> Ordained thirteen Bishops, fifteen Presbyters, and eight Deacons. Then *Hyginus*, who likewise <sup>d</sup> Ordained six Bishops, fifteen Presbyters, and five Deacons. This last died in the Year of Christ 156. having been in the Chair four Years, according to *Petavius's* account; sealing the Truth of the Gospel, and of his Ministry with his Blood, in the Reign of *Antoninus*. Then succeeded *Pius* in that See, according to the Catalogues of *Irenæus*, and *Hegeſippus*; but he was taken off by Martyrdom, though it is not agreed in what Year of Christ; after he had <sup>e</sup> Ordained ten Bishops, nineteen Presbyters, and twenty one Deacons. After him came *Anicetus* into the Chair, who held it till the Year of Christ 173. (though that is not agreed neither) in which he suffer'd Martyrdom; after he had <sup>f</sup> Ordained in his Life-time, nine Bishops, nineteen Presbyters, and four Deacons. Then *Soter*; who <sup>g</sup> Ordained eleven Bishops, eight Presbyters, and nine Deacons. Afterwards *Eleutherius*; who, it is said, was the first Bishop of *Rome*, that died peaceably in his Bed; all his Predecessors having suffered Martyrdom. He departed this Life in the Year of Christ 192, according to the *Romish* Writers; after he had <sup>h</sup> Ordained fifteen Bishops, twelve Presbyters,

<sup>a</sup> Plat. Ibid. Vit. Alex.

<sup>b</sup> Ibid. Vit. Sixt.

<sup>c</sup> Ibid. Vit. Tel.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. Vit. Hyg.

<sup>e</sup> Ibid. Vit. Pii.

<sup>f</sup> Ibid. Vit. Anicet.

<sup>g</sup> Ibid. Vit. Sot.

<sup>h</sup> Ibid. Vit. Eleuth.

and eight Deacons. His Successor was *Victor*, under \* whom was that great Difference in the Church about the Celebration of *Easter-Day*: And who held that See till the Year of Christ 201. He † Ordained twelve Bishops, four Presbyters, and seven Deacons. Lastly, came || *Zephyrinus*, who was the last Bishop of *Rome* in the second Century, or the first in the third. And thus you have a perpetual course of Episcopacy in this Church; which having sprung up in the time of *St. Peter*, and *St. Paul*; ran through the first, and second Century, without Alteration, and but little Intermission. A thing worthy our serious Consideration, that the Episcopal Succession was more stable in the Church, than the Truth of those Doctrines, which were look'd upon as immoveable: So deeply was that Order riveted in the Minds of the Christians! Which could not have been so, if it had not been grounded upon the constant Tradition, which was derived to them from the Apostles.

*Wherein no Innovation made; nor in the other Churches.*

This I take to be a sensible Demonstration, that there was no Innovation made in the Church of *Rome*, as our Adversaries pretend, as to the Ecclesiastical Government; nor as to the Distinction of the Degree of Bishop from that of Presbyter, during the second Century. For nothing was done therein, but exercising the Order already establish'd; maintaining an Uniformity in this Point with the other Christian Churches, which acted in the same manner; and conforming exactly to the Tradition, and Practice of the preceding Age. And therefore let it not be said here any more, that the Church of *Rome* proceeded otherwise, than the others; and that it was the Bishops of it, that

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. c. 22.

† Plat. Ibid. Vit. Vict.

|| Euseb. lib. 6. cap. 21.

first began the alteration in the Apostolical Discipline, as to this part. For besides that no such change was made any where, as I think I have fully proved; it decreed nothing about the Form of the Government, or the Administration of the Church; but what was in use at *Antioch, Jerusalem, Byzantium, Alexandria, Athens, Corinth*; and generally in all the Churches of *Asia, Europe, and Africa*. The other four great Apostolical, and other Christian Churches, had their Primate, as well as that of *Rome*; and in the appointing of a Successor, they observed the same Formalities. The Bishops of *Lyons, and Vienne* upon the *Rhône*, had the same Right, Authority, and Pre-eminency, as he of *Rome* enjoyed. Each of them held the Government in chief within his District, Province, or Diocese; and had the Power of conferring Orders, and exercising Church-Discipline. The Episcopal Chair belonged to each during his Life: And when he died, another succeeded him in it; and was invested with the same Dignity, and Authority. The Reason whereof can be no other, than that all the Christian Churches of that time acted upon the same unalterable Principle; *viz.* upon the Model which was left them by the Apostles, and the Apostolical Men of the first Age. For if that Principle had not been fix'd, and constant amongst them; what likelihood is there, that they should all agree in observing the same Discipline? If any Innovation had been attempted to be made in the second Century; would not some one or other have opposed such an Enterprize? And there being some of those Bishops as yet living, who had been the Disciples, and Auditors of the Apostles; would not they have been offended, and at least declared against those, who were for altering the Order establish'd in the Christian Church? And lastly, is it not a great Disgrace put upon the

pious

pious Memory of all those holy Bishops of the second Century, who were either Confessors, or died for the Name of Jesus Christ; to charge them with being Innovators, and having overthrown the Apostolical Establishment, and that by a Spirit of Ambition? These things deserve the serious Consideration of our Adversaries; whatever they may think of it.

*But an exact  
Uniformity ob-  
served.*

But to have a more particular View of the Uniformity of the Church of Rome in the second Century, with the first; let us again cast our Eyes upon the Form of its Government; and we shall meet with the same Face in both. And to set aside at present some intricate Successions in the beginning; though it can hardly be doubted, that *Linus* was appointed by *St. Paul*, and that after him came *Cletus*: *St. Peter* committed the Chair to *Clemens*. After his Death, *Evarestus* succeeded him in it (as the Latins, and others would have it.) Then came into it *Alexander*, &c. *St. Peter* Ordained *Clemens*, and appointed him to hold that See; without which he would have had no more Title to it, than another. And it was by a regular Ordination likewise, that *Alexander* possessed it after *Evarestus*: And then *Xistus*, and *Telesphorus*. *Clemens* governed that Church, whilst he was at Rome: And so did *Hyginus*, till the Day of his Death. Though there might be several Presbyters, and even Bishops in it, in the Sense I have explained; *Clemens* appeared at their Head, as the Primate of that See: So did likewise *Evarestus*, *Alexander*, *Xistus*, and *Telesphorus*; and the rest, to the end of this Century. They succeeded one another in the same manner, and enjoy'd the same Authority; and perform'd the same Office, to perpetuate the Ministry in the Church. Can there be any thing more uniform, than the Order observed by those holy Men?

It will perhaps be ask'd here, To what end were so many Ordinations of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons made; both at *Rome*, and doubtless elsewhere? To which it may be answer'd; That the Gospel being to be preached throughout the World, and Christian Churches establish'd amongst all Nations; besides the Occasions of the Churches already gathered, and daily increasing: It was necessary, that those which had the Apostolical Succession in them, should have Ministers of all sorts ready, to send them into several parts of *Asia*, *Europe*, and *Africa*, to plant the Faith, to water and cultivate it, and to propagate it far and near. To this purpose were *Pothinus*, and *Irenæus* sent into *Lyons*; and probably *Zacharias*, and *Martin* into *Vienne* upon the *Rhône*: And so others into other Places, and Countries; as *Germany*, *Spain*, the *Gauls*, and *Britain* it self; though their Names are unknown to us at this Day, or not well agreed upon. And how many might be wanting in *Egypt*, *Numidia*, *Croatia*, upon the *Danube*, upon the *Rhine*; and even amongst the *Maures*! It is not to be doubted, but those excellent Servants of Jesus Christ, who sat in the Apostles Chair, were duly careful to provide for the Necessities of the Christian Church in general. And therefore they had in readiness, it is to be supposed, a competent Number of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, for the Work of the Ministry. By which means the Banner of the Cross was displayed every-where, though not at the same time in all places. Whence it comes to pass, that some Countries having received the Gospel sooner than others; and most pretending to the coming of one of the Apostles, or a Disciple of theirs, to convert them to the Christian Faith; there have been such Disputes amongst several Churches concerning their Antiquity.

But when I asserted, that the Right of Ordaining belonged to the Bishops in their respective Sees, I would be understood in a due Sense. And the more, because to render that Power odious, some have endeavoured to make it pass for Worldly, and Tyrannical; as if it were a downright Usurpation; and a means to let into the Ministry all sorts of Men, according to the Humour of the Prelate. But that is a meer Imposition of theirs; and a wrong Consequence drawn from true Principles. For though the Right of Ordaining did belong to the Bishop; yet it was not free for him to admit whom he pleased, according to his Fancy: At least after the Church had made particular Canons, and Regulations about it; besides the general Directions of the Apostles. The Candidate for Orders, as I may call him, was to be examined; and found worthy, and capable of the Office, both for his Piety, Wisdom, and Parts; he was to have the Character, and Approbation of the Church; and lastly, the Voice, and Consent of the Clergy gave no small weight to his Call. His Admission was not performed, before the Bishop had taken the Advice of those, who shared with him the care of the Flock: And then he proceeded to the Solemnity of Ordination, by the Imposition of his Hands, with the assistance of his Presbyters. And no other had the Power to do that, without him; because it was his Prerogative, founded upon his Degree, the Apostolical Succession, and good Order. Notwithstanding which, there was much Caution used, and many Formalities observed, in admitting Men into the holy Ministry, as I have said: The Congregation was called together, to approve the Person; and the Bishop did not Ordain, without asking the Advice of his Clergy. And for a proof, that this was the Practice of the Primitive Church; we have but to read that Passage of *St. Cyprian*, directed

directed to the Clergy, and People; \* *In Ordinationibus Clericis, Fratres Carissimi, solemus vos antè consulere; & mores, ac merita singulorum communi consilio ponderare.*

From what has been said upon this Head, and the Parallel I have been making of the Churches of the second Century between themselves, and those of the first, from the time of the Apostles unto *Trajan's*; I form this short Argument, for a summary Answer to our Adversaries. If all the Christian Churches, during the whole course of the second Century, have been ruled according to the same Discipline; and if that Discipline was the same with that, which was establish'd, and practis'd in the preceding Age: Then there has been no Innovation, nor no essential Change made in their Government; then there has been an exact Uniformity in the Ecclesiastical Administration of the first, and second Century; and the same Formalities have been observed in both, as to the Institution of Men into the Ministry; the latter imitating the former, as its Pattern. But it is evident by what I have related, and the Draught I have drawn of the Order of the Primitive Church, in the whole extent of Christianity, which is known to us; that all the Christian Churches, during the whole course of the second Century, have been ruled according to the same Discipline; and that that Discipline was the same with that, which was establish'd, and practis'd in the preceding Age. Whence it necessarily follows, that there has been no Innovation made; but an exact Uniformity observed, as to the Government of the Church by Bishops, both before, in, and after *Hyginus's* time, to the end of the second Age of Christianity.

---

\* Cyprian. Epist. 38.

## C H A P. XVII.

*Wherein is proved, that the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry continued the same in the second Century, as in the first.*

**H**AVING thus represented in general the Form of the Government of the Church in the second Century; I am now to proceed to a particular proof of the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry; and to shew that it continued the same then, as in the first. It is true, that strictly, or rather according to the just Rules of Disputing; it lies upon those that deny this, to prove that it was not so in the beginning, or to mark the time when it began to be otherwise. For since I have produced general Authorities, which declare that plainly to have been the Discipline of the Church in the first Age; and likewise given an account of the distinct Ordinations of Ministers in the See of *Rome* then, conformably with the Practice of other Christian Churches. And since I have done the same, in some measure, in the second; I think, I am fairly in possession of the Distinction of the three Degrees in the Ministry; and that it belongs to our Adversaries to shew the contrary. But not to deal so rigorously with them; I shall go on here to prove by particular Instances, with proper Testimonies; that the three Orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, were continued in the second Century, as in the first. Wherein, I presume, it is not expected, that I should exhibit particular Lists of all the Ordinations that were made in the Christian

stian Church during that Period; that would be both a tedious, and an unnecessary Work, in a matter of Fact, which is not so much denied, as pretended to be an Innovation: And therefore I shall content my self, for Method's sake, to instance in some Examples, which are best attested, and most remarkable.

If the few Monuments which are left us of the Ecclesiastical History of the first Age, did not set this Matter in a full Light for that time; which however the Divine Providence has provided for, as we have already seen: The constant Practice of the Christian Church in the beginning of the second Century, would be a great Presumption in behalf of it. For if there was then a Distinction made in the Degrees of the Ministry, it was so done, because the several Churches had so received it: It being morally certain, that if there had not been a Rule, or a Custom establish'd, there could not have been amongst them all such an Agreement, and such an Uniformity in the Form of the Government. How otherwise would the Churches of *Asia, Europe, and Africa*; between which the Distance scarce admitted of any Correspondence; have unanimously concurred in changing all on a sudden, so essential a Point of the Ecclesiastical Discipline? I must therefore now proceed to the second Age of the Christian Church; wherein I am to shew, by particular Instances, that pursuant to the Practice of the first Century, the Orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, were distinguish'd.

Our Adversaries pretending, that the Innovation was first made in the Church of *Rome* in this Century; whose Example, they say, that of *Jerusalem*, and the others followed afterwards: If I had but the several Ordinations, which the Bishops of that See made, during that Age, conformably to

the Custom of those of the preceding; it would be, I think, a convincing Proof of the Fact. For there has not been one of those Bishops, but has Ordained some to be Deacons, others Presbyters, and others Bishops; as we have taken notice of before. Whereof we have an account in the *Liber Pontificalis* of *Damasus*, though more probably of *Anastasius*, or whoever was the Compiler of it; and in *Platina's Lives of the Popes*; which give us an account of those various Ordinations: One Primate having sometimes Consecrated fifteen Bishops, another nineteen Presbyters, and another twenty one Deacons. And if so, what alteration have they made in the Practice of their Predecessors, who did the same thing; and taught them to do so by their Example?

But to proceed in this matter, according to my proposed method, by particular Authorities, and Instances: *Justin Martyr* \*, who flourish'd about the middle of this Century, giving an account in his second Apology for the Christians, of the manner of their holding their Religious Assemblies, and celebrating the Holy Eucharist; makes mention of the *Πρεσβυτῆρ*, *Antistes*, or *President*; who could be no other than the Bishop of the Church; and of the Deacons: And relates what part each of them performed upon those Occasions. *Hegesippus*, who was his Contemporary, tells us † amongst other things, in what remains to us of his Writings in *Eusebius*; that *Eleutherius* was *Anicetus's* Deacon, and that he succeeded *Soter* in the See of Rome. *Nicephorus Callistus* says expressly ‡, that another *Eleutherius* was Ordained Deacon at fifteen, Presbyter at eighteen, and Bishop of *Illyricum* at

---

\* Just. Mart. Apol. 2. pro Christian. sub finem.

† Heges. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 4. cap. 22.

‡ Niceph. Call. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 29.

twenty Years of Age. If his Testimony is true, one can hardly speak more distinctly of the three Orders in the Ministry. But if there were any ground to doubt of it; our Adversaries will not deny that of the Faithful of *Vienne*,<sup>a</sup> and *Lyons*; who observe that Distinction: Nor that of *St. Hieron*<sup>b</sup>. And he supposes it in his Argument, in his Letter to *Evagrius*; viz. that from the time of *St. Mark*, who was the first constituted Bishop of *Alexandria* by the Apostles, to *Heraclas*, and *Dionysius*, there were those three Degrees of Ministers in that Church; and that no others were owned there, as of Apostolical Institution. I may not omit here that Passage of *Irenæus*, because he lived within this Period, concerning the Apostolical Appointment of Bishops, which he plainly affirms there; “ The Tradition of the Apostles, *says he*, is evident in every Church to those who desire to know the Truth: For we can produce those who were ordained Bishops by the Apostles, and their Successors to our own time, who neither taught nor knew any such thing: With others to the same purpose<sup>d</sup>. Nor that of *Hegesippus*,<sup>e</sup> That the true Faith remained in all the other Successions of Bishops, and all the other Cities; and that the Heresies arose by departing from them.

Now to come to very particular, and remarkable Instances in this Century; the Interview between *St. Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*, and *Anicetus* Bishop of *Rome*, is a matter of Fact well known in History, and particularly attested by *Irenæus*<sup>f</sup> in *Eusebius*. This Man relates, that *Polycarp* went

<sup>a</sup> Vien. & Lugd. Eccl. Epist. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. l. 5. c. 1.

<sup>b</sup> Hieron. Epist. ad Evagr.

<sup>c</sup> Iren. adv. Hær. lib. 3. c. 3.

<sup>d</sup> Ibid. l. 4. c. 63. l. 5. c. 20.

<sup>e</sup> Heges. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. c. 22.

<sup>f</sup> Iren. apud Euseb. Eccl. Hist. lib. 4. c. 14.

from *Asia to Rome*, (doubtless <sup>not</sup> of his own Zeal for the Peace of the Catholick Church, or as deputed by his *Asiatick* Brethren) to confer with *Anicetus*, upon the occasion of the *Quarto-deciman* Controversie, which was then on foot between the Eastern and Western Churches, and began to perplex them very much. They did not agree upon that Point, it seemeth. But yet *Anicetus*, notwithstanding their Disagreement in Opinion, as to this, and some other matters; out of a Principle of Civility, Union, and Concord, \* allowed *Polycarp* to Officiate in his Church; and even, out of respect to him, to consecrate the Sacrament there in his presence. What can be concluded hence, but this; that the Chair, and Ecclesiastical Government of *Rome* did belong to him? For if all the other Ministers of that Church had been equal to him in Dignity, *Irenæus* would not have express'd himself so; but would rather have said, that notwithstanding that Dispute, the whole Body of the Clergy met, to deliberate amongst themselves, whether they should give *Polycarp* leave to administer the Sacrament in their Church? And that they all consented to it. To shew therefore that *Anicetus* possessed a superior Degree to his Presbyters, and the rest; and that the Government of that See was placed in him, as the Bishop thereof; *Irenæus* tells us, that it was he, that allow'd, or gave *Polycarp* leave to Officiate in his Church. If this Proceeding of his does not demonstrate a peculiar Right in him, and his Superiority above his Clergy, (supposing he had one; which, I presume, is not here doubted of;) then I am at a loss, what to ground any Judgment upon. The Letter *Polycrates* Bishop of *Ephesus* writ to *Victor* Bishop of *Rome* †, which

---

\* *Iren. Epist. ad Vict. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 5. cap. 24.*

† *Ibid. Polycr. Epist. ad Vict.*

is found likewise there in *Eusebius*, to let him know the Sense of the Bishops of *Asia* concerning the Day on which *Easter* was to be celebrated; is another Fact to my present purpose. There he reckons up by Name several Pastors, who had had the Government of Churches within the Province of *Asia*; and specifies them by their Dignity, *viz.* *Polycarp* Bishop of *Smyrna*, *Thraseas* Bishop of *Eumenia*, *Sagaris* Bishop of *Laodicea*, *Papirius* probably another Bishop, *Melito* Bishop of *Sardis*; besides seven of his Relations and Kinsmen also Bishops; amongst whom, he says, he made the eighth. And why does he add this Quality to their Names, think we? but certainly to distinguish them from the rest of the Clergy, who were not of the Episcopal Order. And since I am upon *Victor*, and the great Debate which broke out in his time into an open Breach, about the keeping of *Easter*-Day; I will relate one Fact more, which may put this Point out of dispute, being full upon it. The Bishops of *Rome* then, his Predecessors, having not been able, by all their Exhortations, and Arguments, to bring over those of *Asia* to their Judgment; and to persuade them to celebrate the Feast of *Easter* upon the next *Sunday* after the Full Moon of *March*; (each pretending Apostolical Tradition for their Usage:) It is intimated \* by the Historian, that *Victor* summon'd a Synod; that an Epistle † was written to the *Roman* Church, to which his Name was prefix'd; and that he || Excommunicated the Bishops of *Asia*, his Brethren. There was therefore a Clergy in the See of *Rome*; and he, as their Primate, summon'd a Synod of them; that being part of his Right, and Prerogative, which the others could not exercise

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 23.

† Ibid.

|| Ibid. cap. 24.

without him, or without his Authority. He must be Blind, that does not see in the summoning of this Synod, the Inscription of that Epistle in his Name, and the Excommunication he decreed; that the other Pastors were not Equal to *Victor*. It is true, he abused his Power, in that he took upon him to Excommunicate the Bishops of *Asia*, because they would not comply with him. But the Abuse of a thing does not destroy its lawful Use; nor do even some acts of Tyranny, and Male-administration, abolish Order, and the Right of Government. On the contrary, they affirm it; since they are founded upon it, and that without them it would not be Male-administration, and Tyranny; which are nothing else but the acting contrary to the Order, and Right establish'd. *Victor* abused his Eminency in that Church, that is all that can be said: But he could not have done it, if he had not been possessed of it.

But to confirm this Point farther, and to give other Instances in other Churches: *Dionysius* Bishop of *Corinth*, as appears from his Epistles, \* abstracted by *Eusebius*; was no Stranger to the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry. For in that to the *Athenians*, or the Faithful of *Athens*; he not only makes mention of *Publius*, and *Quadratus*, their Bishops; but † attributes their Defection from the Faith to the Death of the one, and their Recovery to the Coming-in of the other. And writing || to the Churches of *Crete* or *Candia*, which were at that time very numerous; he mightily commends their Bishop *Philip*, to whose Care they were committed. There were certainly other Clergymen in that Island, wherein *St. Titus* had taken so much pains to settle the Gospel: Yet he

---

\* Dionys. Epist. apud. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. lib. 4. cap. 23.

† Ibid. ad Athen.

|| Ad Gortyn. &c.

particularly mentions but one as their Bishop; which shews pretty well the Distinction between them. In his Letter \* to the Churches of *Pontus*, he takes likewise particular notice of their Bishop *Palmas* by Name. In that he writ † to the *Gnosians*, he exhorts their Bishop *Pinytus*, not to lay the Yoak of Celibacy upon his Clergy; which intimates plainly his Superiority over his Presbyters, and Deacons; and his Distinction from them. For if he had had no Authority over them, it would not have been necessary for *Dionysius* to exhort him, not to injoyn them Celibacy. They would have slighted his Injunction; and told him, he might continue a Virgin, if he pleased; but as for them, that it was free for them to Marry. The ground of his Writing then was, that the Bishop of *Gnosius* having the chief Government of his Clergy in his hands, he abused his Power; and would rashly impose Laws upon them, which were contrary to their Evangelical Liberty, and did not belong to his Station. Now I am upon *Dionysius's* Epistles; *Quadratus* succeeded *Publius*, after his Martyrdom, in the See of *Athens*; as I have observed before out of that Author; and consequently he was Bishop of that Church in the time of *Adrian*. And yet *Eusebius*, ‡ and *Jerom* make him a Disciple of the Apostles; and assure us, that he came in some time after his Predecessor. Which may very well be, according to the Principles I go upon. For *Quadratus* was then an ancient Man, *i. e.* when he succeeded *Publius* in the See of *Athens*; and he might have been admitted into the Ministry by the Apostles, or at least have been a Disciple of theirs: Probably he was at first a Deacon, or Presbyter in

\* Ad Amastr. &c.

† Ad Gnosf.

‡ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 37. Hieron. de Script. in Quadr.

that Church, or perhaps a Coadjutor, or Titular Bishop. But he was not installed Bishop of *Athens*, nor own'd for the *Antistes*, till a long while after, *i. e.* till after the Death of *Publius*; as *Dionysius of Corinth*, and *Eusebius* himself inform us. The Bishop then was at that time distinguish'd from the Presbyter, and even from the Coadjutor, as to his Pre-eminency: And that the Presbyter might be promoted to the Episcopal Chair, there was need of a new Ordination, or Consecration. I shall add to this, what *Eusebius* tells us, after he had named some of the most eminent Bishops in *Commodus's* time; \* "That besides them there were innumerable others, as it may be believed, who flourished in those Days.

I have drawn up a Catalogue before of the several Bishops, who successively governed the Church of *Alexandria*, from the Apostles time to *Demetrius*, who was the last that held that See in the second Century, and pretty far in the third; during whose Administration we meet with some Instances relating to the Matter in hand. The first is of *Pantenus*, which is very remarkable. † This Learned Man, by his great Talents, had set up, or rather continued in that City, a flourishing School, wherein he publickly taught Divinity, as a Catechist, or Professor of Theology. And as *Alexandria* was ‡ famous in the World, the Indians who had received the Gospel by the Preaching of the Apostles, or those appointed by them; applied themselves to *Demetrius*, and desired him to send amongst them some able Christian, to confirm, and instruct their Nation in the Faith. The Bishop thought he could not chuse a fitter Person than *Pantenus*. And therefore sent him into those Eastern Countries;

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 22.

† Ibid. cap. 10.

‡ Hieron. de Script.

where, by the Blessing of God, he much edified the People, and did great Service to Religion, whilst he lived there. From which account I infer, that *Pantænus* was probably a Presbyter, or at least a Deacon of the Church of *Alexandria*, when he taught Divinity there in the publick School; since *Demetrius* took him out thence, to go and preach the Gospel to the Indians; or that if he was not, he Ordained him, before he sent him away. *Eusebius* says expressly, \* “ That he was Preacher of the “ Gospel of Christ to the Eastern Nations: And reckons him amongst the Evangelists of that time. For now if *Demetrius* had not enjoyed a superior Degree, *Pantænus* might have gone of himself, without any application made to the Bishop: And the Indians wanting such a Man, upon Information of it, he would have said, I think it proper for me to go and exercise my Faculty amongst them, and I want no Mission. But he could not go, and answer their Request, unless he was in Orders: For none can take upon him an holy Office of himself; nor even go, unless he is sent, and Commissionated thereunto by his Superior. What farther verifies, that he was but a single Presbyter, or Deacon, is, † that being full of Days, and Labours; he returned to *Alexandria*, to die in his own Country; where we do not find by History, that he held any other Station in that Church, than that he had before. If he had been Bishop of it, that would not have been omitted. On the contrary, it appears, who succeeded *Demetrius* in the See of *Alexandria*; not *Pantænus*, but *Heraclas*. There was therefore then a Distinction of Degrees in the Ministry; *Demetrius* was a Bishop, and *Pantænus* a Presbyter, or one step lower. This is evident || likewise in the

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 10.

† Ibid.

|| Ibid. lib. 6. cap. 6.

Case of *Clemens Alexandrinus*, *Pantænus*'s Successor in that famous School; who though he was endued with great Gifts, was called by Providence to be but a Presbyter of *Alexandria*\*: And never was raised to the Episcopal Dignity, no more than his Predecessor, or his Successor *Origen*. However he expressly owns † the three Degrees in the Ministry. And it is he tells us amongst others, ‖ that *James* the *Just* was constituted Bishop of *Jerusalem* by the Apostles, as we have taken notice before; *viz.* inasmuch as he was appointed by them Bishop of that City, where they ordinarily resorted, as being the Center of the Christian Religion; till in process of time they were obliged to leave it, to go and preach throughout the World amongst the Gentiles, even to the remotest Nations, the Gospel which the Jews rejected. However there always resided in it, during the Stay of the Apostles, this proper Bishop, one of their Collegues. And even after the *Romans* under *Titus* had taken, and destroyed that miserable City ‡, according to *Eusebius*'s Computation; some of them met there, to chuse *Simeon*, and settle him in the place of *St. James*: So dear was the Salvation of their Country to them! I must not separate *Origen* from his two Predecessors in the School of *Alexandria*, though he flourished most in the third Century, to which we are not yet come: And therefore reserving his Doctrine concerning this Subject for that Period, I shall only mention here his Case as a Presbyter, which makes for my present purpose. *Origen* then having acquired much Reputation at *Alexandria*, he took a Journey to *Cesarea* in *Palestine*; where he

---

\* Ibid. cap. 11. Alex. Epist. ad Antioch.

† Clem. Alex. Strom. lib. 6. p. 667. Ibid. lib. 7. p. 700.

‖ Ibid. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 1.

‡ Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 3. cap. 11.

grew into such Esteem with the Bishop of that place, and of *Jerusalem*, that they thought fit to confer on him the Order of the Presbyterat\*. This being known to *Demetrius* Bishop of *Alexandria*, who in the bottom of his Heart valued his Merit at first no less than they; it fell out afterwards, that he became angry at his Person, by an envious Disposition natural to Man, which cannot brook the splendor of another's Talents. Whereupon he writ to the two Bishops, who were concerned in his Ordination; and blamed their Conduct in admitting him to be a Presbyter. And to justify his censuring their Action, he informed them of a thing, which he said, he had kept thitherto as a Secret: Which was, that *Origen* being young, and taking those Words of our Saviour literally, *Matth. xix. 12. Some have made themselves Eunuchs for the Kingdom of Heaven's sake:* (Or rather, that being obliged at that time to be much with Women, whom he instructed; to prevent Temptation) he had Castrated himself. Let this be as it will; it is evident, from this Relation, that *Origen* was a Presbyter, and not a Bishop as *Demetrius*: And that since he received his Presbyterat from those of *Jerusalem*, and *Cesarea*, theirs was a superior Degree to his. In all which Authorities, and Examples, whereof I have alledged a good number; we may clearly see the Form of the Ecclesiastical Government throughout the second Century, the Subordination in the Ministry, and the Distinction between the Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon: So that I think, I need not enlarge any more upon it here.

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 8.

## C H A P. XVIII.

*Wherein is proved, that the Hierarchical Government continued the same in the third Century, as in the first, and second.*

I Am come now to the third and last Century, which I propos'd to my self to consider; wherein, according to the Method I intended to pursue, I must examine, whether throughout this Period to the Council of *Nice*, which was held about the beginning of the fourth Age, the Church had the same Form of Government, as in the two preceding? For after that famous Council, there is no Obstinacy can make us doubt, that the Christian Church was universally governed by an Episcopal Hierarchy, till the last Age save one; wherein our Fathers found themselves oblig'd to Reform the Church, which had corrupted the Doctrine of Religion; and chang'd Episcopacy into Tyranny, by setting up a Pope, who Lorded it over the Consciences of Men, and the Authority of Princes. Which makes the Episcopal Government appear odious at this Day to several Churches, and States, which have cast off the intollerable Yoak of the *Roman*; not considering that it was not the Form of the Government, but the Corruption of it, that was to be redress'd. This was Judicially observ'd in this part of the Kingdom of *Great Britain*, whilst they fell elsewhere into the other Extreme, by settling another Discipline, which overthrowes the Episcopal. But I may boldly affirm, that had they proceeded abroad after the manner of *England*,

the

the Reformation of Religion would have made a quicker, and greater progress, both in *France*, and other Countries of *Europe*, than it has: And those Protestant Churches, which have been driven away, would be at this time fully possessed of the Land of their Nativity. I am willing to believe every thing that may be said in favour, or excuse of the first foreign Reformers, from the Circumstances of Time, and State of Affairs, when they began their several Reformations, and to look upon them with all the Compassion, and just Allowances, that are due to good Men, who were eager, and zealous to come out of *Babylon* on any terms. But all that can be alledged for them, tho' it may excuse, yet in my opinion it cannot strictly justify their casting off Episcopacy, much less the perseverance of their Churches in the Abdication of it, because they are no longer under the Difficulties, and Obstacles, which are pleaded in excuse of their first Reformers from necessity, especially the want of orthodox Bishops, which they may now have, and might have had for many Years past. But what Excuse can be pretended for such of them here, as have found an Orthodox Hierarchy establish'd in this Church; and yet will not conform to it: But especially for the Natural-born Subjects, who have causelessly withdrawn from it, and can by no means be prevailed upon to submit to it? Certainly the Non-conformity of these is Inexcusable; and the more, because it proceeds from a refractory Spirit, which kecks at the sight of those who are Commissioned to have the Rule over them, and whom they ought to obey. And the more yet, because it is the effect of a most unaccountable, and pernicious Principle; that it is contrary to their Christian Liberty; and that where there are Superiors, there must be all manner of Violence, and Disorder. Whereas nothing is more plain, than that it is by the just Obedience the Inferior pays to the Superior, that good Order is preserved in Government; without which

both Religion, and the Civil Administration, would be but Licentiousness, and Anarchy.

It is not so difficult to extricate the State of the Church-affairs in this third Century, as in the two preceding; whether because we have more Relations of it extant, or that the Churches multiplied, and gathered strength throughout the World, notwithstanding the terrible Persecutions they underwent by the Cruelty of the Heathen Emperors? And indeed the Episcopal Government not only continued, and the Distinction of the three Degrees was kept up in the Ministry; but the Number of the Bishops increasing through the multiplicity of Churches, and Cities converted to the Faith, with the Country about them, it was thought necessary about this time, in several parts, to unite them under one Archbishop, Primate, or Metropolitan; or they appeared more visibly to be so already, by the meeting of Synods. At first, when the Gospel was preach'd but in few places, and before the Christian Religion had diffused it self far and wide, as it did afterwards; the Bishops, who were settled in the Cities, governed the Churches that had been gathered there, and in the Country adjoining; and instructed, and edified them, with the assistance of their Presbyters, or Deacons. Thus it was at *Jerusalem, Antioch, Corinth, Athens*, and other Districts; where the Bishop had the superior Administration of Affairs, and his Clergy under him; and the several Congregations made as it were one Body of a Church. But in the Times following, when Bishops came to be *Ordained in every City*, Tit. i. 5. or as it is in the Original, *καὶ πόλιν*; *i. e.* according to the City, as it was the Custom in every City, to have a chief Magistrate; it was judged requisite, to answer the general Occasions of the-Provincial, National, and Catholick Church; and for Order's sake, that those particular Churches should associate together, and be under the Direction of an

Arch-

Archbishop, Primate, or Metropolitan; whose Seat was in the Metropolis, or Mother-City. What probably had been done, or was intended to be done in the very time of the Apostles; when Bishops, and Churches were grown numerous in a Province, or Country; or were like to become so. For thus *St. Timothy*, to whom *St. Paul* committed the Government of the Church of *Ephesus*, which consisted at first of the Christian Congregations in that City, and the Suburbicarian Country; had the general Superintendency of all the Churches of the lesser *Asia*, being then an Ecclesiastical Province, as we have observed before. And thus *St. Titus*, whom the same Apostle left in *Crete*, to supply what was wanting, and form that Church; was appointed by him Director of the whole Island, which is said to have had an hundred Cities in it. But in this Century, Christianity was so diffused every where, and the Churches were so increased in Number; that it became as it were a general Rule, to reduce them under the Inspection of a Primate; To the end a good Harmony and Agreement should be preserved amongst them, both in Doctrine, and Discipline. And so the Bishop of <sup>a</sup> *Alexandria*, which was look'd upon as the Mother-Church, and the Center of Episcopacy; was Primate of *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*; the Bishop of *Rome* Primate of *Italy*, or the Western Provinces <sup>b</sup>; the Bishop of *Lyons* Primate of the *Gauls* <sup>c</sup>; the Bishop of *Carthage* Primate of *Africa* <sup>d</sup>: And so of the rest, which might be named here. In which Quality they summon'd Synods of their Comprovincial Bishops, when the Occasions of their Churches re-

---

<sup>a</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 2. cap. 15. Ibid. cap. 24.

<sup>b</sup> Conc. Nic. Can. 6. Ibid.

<sup>c</sup> Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 23.

<sup>d</sup> Conc. Constantinop. in Trull. Can. 2.

quired it; as \* *St. Cyprian* did one at *Carthage*, of sixty six Bishops, to decide the Question, Whether Children were to be Baptized the third, or eighth Day after their Birth? And so had † *Agrippinus* call'd one before, of the Bishops of *Africa*, and *Numidia*; to determine another Dispute, Whether those that had been Baptized by Hereticks, were to be Baptized anew? To say nothing of the great Council of that Province under *St. Cyprian*, which consisted of eighty seven Bishops; or of others in other Places: Which it is not necessary to mention here.

But though the Government of the Church lies open throughout this Period, and can hardly be controverted by our Adversaries; yet to follow my proposed Method, I must shew how the same Hierarchy was continued in this Age, as in the two former; and the Distinction of Degrees observed in the Ministry. To which purpose, I need only produce such real Facts, and good Authorities, as are to be met with up and down in the History of the Church, and the Writings of the Fathers in this Century. The first thing then that I am to shew, is how at this time there were Bishops in the several Churches, who presided over the rest of the Clergy within their Districts. Upon which the second depends, as a necessary Consequence; that the Degrees in the Ministry were distinguish'd; and that the Orders of Presbyter, and Deacon, were inferior to that of Bishop.

It would be tedious to carry on here the Succession of the Episcopal Line in the several Churches I have mentioned in the second Century; and it would be even useles to do it. For there is no Man, that is the least conversant in Christian Anti-

---

\* *Cypr. Epist. 64. ad Fidum.*

† *Ibid. Epist. 71. ad Quintum.*

quity, but knows the Name of every Bishop in those famous Sees; and that the Fathers have left us exact Lists of them in their Writings. There we may see, who were the Bishops that succeeded those of the second Age, in the Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, and the others I have instanced in; even throughout the whole course of this. But especially we have therein a just Catalogue of those of *Rome*; and an account of their Lives, Doctrine, and Discipline. How they held that See one after another; and Ordained in their respective times Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons. And how they even called Synods of them, as Primates in their Province, when the Occasions of the Church required it. And though it cannot be denied, that some of them carry'd it very high, and had even then too much Influence over the Comprovincial Clergy; yet it must be confessed too, that there were others within that Period, who acquitted themselves worthily; and were either Martyrs, or Confessors for the Cause of Christ. Amongst these I cannot forbear naming three, viz. *Lucius*, *Stephen*, and *Sixtus*; who held the See of *Rome* successively, and succeeded one another in the Glory of their Sufferings: And whom I should blush to accuse of having been so much as willing, out of a Spirit of Vanity, to overthrow the ancient Discipline, to establish a Tyrannical Government in the Church.

But though, to avoid being tedious, I think it not material to draw up a Catalogue of the Bishops of those celebrated Churches in this Century; yet there is one Instance, which I may not pass over in silence in the See of *Jerusalem*; because we meet with a Fact in it, which tends much to the clearing up of the Ecclesiastical Discipline of the Primitive Times. And it is that of *Alexander*

Bishop of *Neocæsarea* in *Cappadocia*; of whom *Eusebius* \* relates, that he was afterwards constituted Bishop of *Jerusalem*; tho' *Narcissus*, who filled the Chair, was then alive: And that in regard of his great Courage in bearing up against the Sufferings of Persecution, which were in a manner unavoidable in those Days. This extraordinary Proceeding of the Church, is a matter of Fact in History, which requires some Reflection to be made upon it. And the more, because I have insinuated all along, that in the first Ages of Christianity, though there might be several Bishops in one and the same Church, either as Coadjutors, or barely Titular; yet the Chair, and the Episcopal Authority belonged but to one Person, the Bishop of that See; and could not be divided. Notwithstanding here are two Bishops, who seem to preside at the same time over the See of *Jerusalem*; and two Heads, as it were, that appear upon the Body of its Clergy; which looks monstrous! But it is evident from the Relation, that this was an extraordinary Case, and out of the common Road: So that far from destroying the Unity of Episcopacy, and the indivisible Authority of one Bishop in one Church; it proves, and confirms it. For the Historian takes notice of it, as of an unusual thing. A plain sign, that the Custom was otherwise; and that the Constitution was, *one See to be governed by one Bishop*. And if it happen'd differently in the Promotion of *Alexander*; it was but an Exception made to the general Rule, to associate him with *Narcissus*, and place him in the Chair with him. The Establish'd Order was not observed, upon his particular account, or rather his Colleague's: And there were non-common Reasons for it, whereof the History † gives us these two. One is, that *Narcissus* being grown

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 11.

† Ibid.

very old, and infirm; Aged an hundred and sixteen Years; and consequently unable to exercise the Episcopal Office; and *Alexander* a Person of a distinguish'd Merit: Lest the Church should suffer too much by the Age of the one, and for want of the Assistance of the other; it was thought but prudent to step over the Rule, Necessity sometimes dispensing with the Law. And the other Reason given, is Miraculous, and Divine, *τι θεοπερίπιον*; For the same Historian\* reports, that the Day that *Alexander* enter'd the City, (besides a private Warning to him in a Dream, to go thither) a Voice was clearly heard, by those who were most eminent for Sanctity amongst them, saying, *Go out, and receive him, whom God intends for your Bishop.* Whereat the Clergy, and People, thinking that Heaven it self gave its Vote for the Admission of *Alexander*; both by this Reason of Providence, and that of Necessity, they received him for their Bishop; and look'd upon his Promotion as Heavenly, and from God. But upon the whole matter, it is pretty plain, that *Narcissus* retained but the Title of *Bishop* †.

I might here shew, how the same Hierarchy obtained in all the other Churches, where the Christian Religion was planted; and set down the Names of the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, which I find in History; that this Form of Government might appear to have been universal in the Church. And indeed it was so: For neither in the Times before, nor in this I speak of, were there Christians seen, who made a Sect apart, independent upon a Bishop. If some turbulent, and ambitious Spirits, ran into a Schism; it was never to the Destruction of the Episcopal Authority: The

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 11.

† Ibid. Alex. Epist. ad Antin.

very Schismaticks glorying in it, that they had a Bishop upon whom they depended. It would have been an odious Object in those Days, to see a Church professing Christianity, without a Head, and a Subordination in its Ministry. And therefore I shall but here and there give some Instances of this Matter, as they come in my way; that I may proceed with the Authorities of the Writers in this Century; which is my second Method of prosecuting this Argument. The Fathers then, that have been most eminent for their Writings within this Period, were *Tertullian*, *Origen*, of whom I have already given some account, and *St. Cyprian*; who not only in their Works, but by their very Example prove Episcopacy, and the Distinction of the Degrees in the Ministry.

To go on then whence I left off, in the last Chapter, *viz.* the famous School of *Alexandria*; *Gregory of Neocæsarea*, who was first called *Theodorus*, and his Brother *Athenodorus*, were both Disciples of *Origen*, when he taught in *Cæsarea*, a City in *Palestine*\*. Under this excellent Master they improved so much, that being Natives of *Neocæsarea*, they were promoted to the Episcopal Dignity in the Province of *Cappadocia*||; and the former in the place of their Birth †, the Metropolis of that Country. This *Gregory* was afterwards surnam'd *Thaumaturgus*, *i. e.* Worker of Miracles; as very well he might be, if that be true which is ‡ recorded of him; *viz.* that when he was made Bishop, he found but seventeen Christians; and and when he died, he left but seventeen Heathens in his Diocese. *Heraclas*\*, who succeeded *Origen*,

---

\* Greg. Thaum. Paneg. ad Orig.

|| Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 30.

† Greg. Nyss. Vit. Gr. Thaum.

‡ Ibid.

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 3.

was first a Presbyter of the Church of *Alexandria*; but after the Death of *Demetrius* was advanced to the \* Episcopal Chair in that See. And so was likewise † *Dionysius*, after he had been ‡ Rector of that School, and a Presbyter of that Church; as appears in History. And so were others made Bishops, after they had been Presbyters. But it is observable, that *Nicephorus Callistus*, || in the Catalogue he has drawn up of the Bishops of *Constantinople* to the time of *Constantine* the Great, names *Dometius*, Brother of the Emperor *Probus*, and his two Sons, Nephews to him; *viz.* *Probus*, and *Metrophanes*. Which, if true, shews the Episcopal Degree to have been in an high Esteem at that time in the World, since a Brother, and two Nephews of the Emperor did not think it below them to bear that Quality: And that they would not doubtless have done it, if it had not been look'd upon as a distinguish'd Station in the Church. And as that Office was in great Veneration, so it had no less Authority over Persons of all Ranks; who willingly submitted to its severest Censures, and respectfully underwent its most grievous Penances. Which gives me occasion to relate here a Fact, we meet with in *Eusebius*, \* *viz.* that *Philip*, who was the first *Roman* Emperor that was converted to the Faith, having declared his Intention to be present at the *Easter-Devotions*; (this was about the middle of this Century) the Bishop of *Rome* would not receive him, till he had first made a publick Confession of his Sins. This shews in what Post the Bishops stood in those Days, and how much they were raised above the inferior

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 26.

† Ibid. cap. 29.

‡ Ibid. 35.

|| Niceph. Callist. Hist. Eccles. lib. 8. cap. 6.

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 34.

Orders; since they set Rules to the Emperors themselves, and expected a Compliance from them to the Discipline of the Church. The very Pagan Emperors made a Distinction between them, and the rest of the Christian Clergy. It is evident in *Galien's* Edict, who held the Empire in the Year of our Lord 260. that he look'd upon Episcopacy, as the highest Degree in the Ministry. For being inclined to cause the Persecution to cease, which was carry'd on against the Christians in several Provinces of his Dominions; he issued out a Rescript, which he \* directed to *Dionysius, Pinnas, Demetrius*, and the other Bishops; to let them know, that it was his pleasure they should be all recalled, who had been forc'd away upon the account of their Religion; and that no Disturbance should be given them in their Assemblies.

*Tertullian*, though a Man of great Parts, and a zealous Defender of the Christians; never rose higher, than to the Degree of a Presbyter in the Church of *Carthage*: But yet has left us several remarkable Passages in his Writings concerning this matter. In his *Apology* † he takes particular notice of the Bishops, under the name of *Seniors*, (which answers to the word *Presbyters*, the Original Name of Bishops) as presiding in their Religious Assemblies: *Præsident probati quique Seniores, Honorem istum non Pretio, sed Testimonio adepti: neque enim pretio ulla res Dei constat.* And in his Book *De Coronâ* || he seems to insinuate, as if they received the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper from none but the Presidents, or Bishops; *Ecclesiæ Sacramentum nec de aliorum quam Præsidentium manu sumimus.* But in his Book *De Baptismo* ‡ he is

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 7. cap. 13.

† Tert. Apol. cap 39.

|| De Cor. cap. 3.

‡ De Bapt. cap. 17.

very plain, as to the Right of Adminiftring the Sacrament of Baptifm, that it is derived from the Bifhops; wherein likewise he exprefly mentions the three Orders in the Miniftry: *Dandi quidem (Baptifmum) jus habet summus Sacerdos, qui eſt Epifcopus debinc Presbyteri, & Diaconi; non tamen ſine Epifcopi auctoritate, propter Eccleſiæ honorem; quo ſalvo, ſalva pax eſt.* To which I ſhall add another Paſſage of the ſame Author in the ſame Book, \* *De Coronâ*; wherein ſpeaking of the Manner of Adminiftring this Sacrament, he tells us, that *Aquam adituri priùs in Eccleſia, ſub Antifitis manu conteſtamur, &c.* Which Cuſtom, of making the Baptifmal Vow in the Church before the Biſhop, continued to be obſerved afterwards in the Churches of *Africa*, when Baptifm was adminiftered. And in how many places of his Works do we find him ſuppoſing, or diſtributing the Clergy into the three Orders of Biſhops, Presbyters, and Deacons! and even aſſerting the Apoſtolical Inſtitution of the firſt! By all which is evident, what Opinion he had of the Superiority of Biſhops over the reſt of the Clergy, and of the Diſtinction of the Degrees in the Miniftry. In his Book † *De Præſcript. Heret.* he makes this Challenge to the Hereticks; *Edant origines, &c.* “ Let them publiſh the Ori-  
 “ ginal of their Churches, and unfold the Suc-  
 “ ceſſions of their Biſhops in order from the be-  
 “ ginning; ſo that it may appear, that the firſt  
 “ Biſhop had one of the Apoſtles, or Apoſtolical  
 “ Men, who lived with the Apoſtles, for his Pre-  
 “ deceſſor. For thus the Apoſtolical Churches re-  
 “ port; as that of *Smyrna* affirms *Polycarp* to be  
 “ placed there by *St. John*, and that of *Rome* re-  
 “ ports *Clement* to have been Ordained by *St. Peter*.  
 “ In like manner other Churches ſhew them, whom

\* De Cor. cap. 3.

† De Præſcript. Heret. cap. 32.

“ being

“ being made Bishops by the Apostles, they had  
 “ Propagators of the Apostolical Doctrine. And  
 let the Hereticks shew the same. And elsewhere  
 to the same effect : \* *Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas,  
 apud quas ipsæ adhuc Cathedræ Apostolorum suis lo-  
 cis præsent : habes Corinthum, habes Ephesum, ha-  
 bes Philippos, habes Romam, &c.*

---

## C H A P. XIX.

*Wherein the same Proof is continued,  
 concerning the Hierarchy, and the  
 Distinction of the Degrees in the Mi-  
 nistry, in the third Century.*

**O**rigen comes here regularly after *Tertullian* :  
 And therefore, though I have accounted for  
 him before, (*viz.* Chap. XVII.) as a Presbyter,  
 for the Reason there alledged ; I must now, as I  
 promised, deliver his Doctrine concerning this mat-  
 ter, as an eminent Author, who flourished within  
 this Period. And here I may first break out, as I  
 did but just now in the last Case mentioned, into  
 an Expostulating Exclamation : In how many places  
 of his Writings does *Origen* suppose, or distribute  
 the Clergy into the three Orders of Bishops, Pres-  
 byters, and Deacons ; and even assert the Divine  
 Institution of the former ! Particularly in his *Exe-  
 getical*, and some other Works !

But to instance in some of the most remarkable  
 Passages, relating to this Subject ; in his second

---

\* *De Præscript. Heret. cap. 36.*

Homily † or Discourse upon the *Canticles*, (whether right, or wrong, is not material to enquire; since it is but in Confirmation of his Opinion, and the current Doctrine of his time) he discovers a Prophetical Vision, concerning the three Orders in the Ministry, which he there enumerates. In his eleventh Homily \* on *Jeremiah's* Prophecy, he has these words expressly; “ More will be required of  
 “ me, (who was a Presbyter, as we have seen)  
 “ than of a Deacon; more of a Deacon, than of  
 “ a Laick: But he has most to account for, who  
 “ has the Ecclesiastical Principality over us all;  
 “ viz. the Bishop. In his twentieth Homily || on  
 St. *Luke*, he speaks thus; “ If Jesus Christ, the Son  
 “ of God, is subject to *Joseph*, and *Mary*: Shall  
 “ not I be subject to the Bishop, who is of God  
 “ ordained to be my Father? Shall not I be sub-  
 “ ject to the Presbyter, who by the Divine Vouch-  
 satement is set over me? In his Commentaries upon  
 St. *Matthew*, he alledges peculiar Texts of  
 Scripture against the second Marriages of Priests,  
 and Deacons; (such was his Opinion) as distinguish'd  
 from Bishops: Besides those he urges against the  
 second Marriages of these latter. In the same he tells  
 us ‡, That St. *Paul* describing what Bishops ought to  
 be, says, *That they must be no Brawlers, nor Strikers;  
 but meek, and of gentle Behaviour*; having all those  
 good Qualifications, which those Stewards ought to  
 have, whom our Lord sets over his Family; as St. *Luke*  
 has it. And there † explaining that Passage of this  
 Evangelist, *And he that is Chief, as he that serveth*; he  
 takes it for a Precept to a Bishop. In his third Book

† Orig. Hom. 2. in Cant. Cant. apud Hieron. Tom. 7. p. 119.

\* Idem. Hom. 11. in Hierem.

|| Ejusdem Exeget. Edit. Lat. Hom. 20. in Luc.

‡ Ibid. Hom. 31. in Matth.

† Ibid. Hom. 12.

against *Celsus*, he supposes, that the Apostle, *1 Tim.* iii. gives the Character of a Bishop, as distinguish'd from a Presbyter. In his Book concerning Prayer; discoursing of the Debts contained in that Petition of the Lord's Prayer, *Forgive us our Debts, as we also forgive our Debtors*; after he has spoken of the Duties common to all Christians, he subjoins, \* " Besides these more common or universal Debts, " there is a Debt peculiar to such as are Widows " maintained by the Church; and there is a Debt " peculiar to Deacons; and another peculiar to " Presbyters: But of all these peculiar Debts, that " which is due by the Bishop, is the greatest; it is " exacted by the Saviour of the whole Church; " and the Bishop must smart severely for it, if it is " not paid. And if our Adversaries will admit of a fair Consequence, and give credit to *Eusebius*, who tells us, † that *Origen* in his fifth Commentary upon *St. John's* Gospel, holds the Opinion concerning the Church's being built upon *St. Peter*; it is not to be question'd, but he believed, as the other Fathers did, that Episcopacy was of Divine Institution.

The Story of *Novatus*, and *Novatianus*, contains so many Particulars, relating to the State of the Hierarchy in this Century; that I may not pass it by here, without insisting a little upon it. We have it related by *Eusebius*, who quotes the Testimonies of *St. Cyprian* Bishop of *Carthage*, and *Cornelius* Bishop of *Rome* at that time, for what he says. There then *Cornelius* writes Letters to *Fabius* Bishop of *Antioch* concerning *Novatianus*, whereof that Historian gives an Abstract. But before I proceed to that, it will not be amiss, that I inform the Reader first of what the Bishop of

---

\* *Idem.* πειρ' Ευχης, pag. 103. Edit. Oxon:

† *Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 25.* ‡ *Ibid. cap. 43.*

*Carthage* writes about *Novatus*, in his Letter to the Bishop of *Rome*. After he has then given him a Relation \* of several Disorders he had caused in his Church, whereof he had Ordained him a Presbyter; he accuses him particularly, that by his Factions, and ambitious Humour, he had procured *Felicissimus* to be admittted Deacon, without his (St. *Cyprian's*) Permission, or Knowledge. But † *Cornelius* takes the thing higher; and acquaints *Fabius*, that the Bishop of *Carthage* having conceived some Love, and Esteem for *Novatus*; would make him a Presbyter; which his Clergy, and People opposed strenuously; because he was one of those who were Baptized in Bed: Yet that he prevailed at last by his Intreaties, having ask'd their consent, that he might Ordain that one Man only; and promising, that it should be no Precedent for the future; which was granted. Let that be as it will: The Account goes on, ‡ that this *Novatus* being of a turbulent Spirit, and seeing himself a Presbyter; he was not satisfied with having made a Schism at *Carthage*; but he would needs go to *Rome*, to propagate it, or join with that which was on foot there already; and perhaps to advance himself. And indeed he, or || rather *Novatianus*, (tho' they are confounded in History) who was a Presbyter of *Rome*, and associated with the other in his Faction; aspired to that See: Though by an affected Humility, he swore several times, that he had no Thoughts of it. But his Proceedings soon shew'd the contrary. For between them they got three Bishops to come to *Rome*, where they had made a Party amongst the lower Clergy; and to Ordain him Bishop of that Church; and this to

---

\* Cypr. Epist. 52. ad Corn.

† Corn. Epist. ad Fab. apud Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 43.

‡ Cypr. & Corn. Ibid. || Corn. Ibid.

thrust out *Cornelius*, who had been duly \* settled there. To which end they raised a Sect in the Church, upon the occasion of the Lapsers; pretending that those that had yielded to Persecution, were not to be received into Communion again. And to make their Party conspicuous, they called themselves *Cathari*, or the Pure; as if they had been holier than others in their Profession, and Principles, particularly upon the account of their Severity to those Men. Whereby several well-meaning Persons were imposed upon; and even some, otherwise worthy Presbyters, joined with them *bonâ fide*, (if that may be properly said) for a time. But these at last left them, being convinced of their Hypocrisie: And those very Men that had Ordained the Schismatick, were brought over to acknowledge their Fault. For the Bishops of the Province, perceiving that *Novatus*, or rather as I have said, *Novatianus*; or, if you will, both of them; disturbed the Peace of the Church by their Schism, and Faction; met together in a Synod † at *Rome*, to the number of Sixty, besides the Presbyters, and Deacons, who were present at it: And deposed the Usurper, who would juttle *Cornelius* out of the Chair; after they had first condemned his Errors, and Proceedings. The Names of those Bishops are set down in one of those Letters, which *Cornelius* writ to *Fabius*; as are those of the others, who afterwards subscribed to their Decree, though absent, in Testimony of their approving that Condemnation. But I must not forget to take notice, that the same *Cornelius* in || one of those Letters, charges *Novatianus*, that he had procured himself to be Ordained Bishop of *Rome*; “ being wilfully ignorant, that in a truly Catholick

---

\* Euseb. Hist. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 43.

† Ibid.

|| Ibid.

## EPISCOPACY Asserted. ' -

“ Church, (such as was that of *Rome*) there ought  
“ to be but one Bishop; though there may be ma-  
“ ny Presbyters, (as there were forty four then in  
“ that Church;) *i. e.* that according to the Apo-  
stolical Tradition, and lest the Unity be divided,  
there ought not to be jointly two Bishops in one  
and the same See. Those are his very Words, as  
they are reported by *Eusebius*; or the plain Sense  
of them.

I shall not examine here, how *Novatus* is con-  
founded in the Writings of the Fathers with *No-  
vatianus*, though they were two distinct Men; or  
whether in that Confusion the Actions of the one  
are attributed to the other? That is not necessary  
to my present purpose. It is sufficient, that the  
things I have reported, are true of the one, or the  
other; according to the Testimonies of *St. Cyprian*,  
*Cornelius*, and *Eusebius*. My business is now, to  
make some Observations, and lay down some  
Truths, which are evidently contained in that Ac-  
count. It is apparent then, 1. That it was the  
received Doctrine of that time, that there ought  
to be in one Catholick Church, wherein the Unity  
of the Spirit is held, but one Bishop to Govern it,  
though there may be several Presbyters under him.  
For *Cornelius* represents it as a Crime, and an af-  
fected Ignorance in *Novatianus*, that he should  
attempt to step into the Chair of *Rome*, when him-  
self was possessed of it already; a thing the other  
could not be ignorant was unlawful, and contrary to  
the universal Practice. 2. That those who were on-  
ly admitted into the Office of Presbyters, were not  
thereby made Bishops. If it had been otherwise,  
*Novatianus* had no need to procure three Bishops  
to raise him to the Episcopal Dignity, and to ob-  
serve the accustom'd Formalities: Being Presbyter  
of *Rome*, he was likewise Bishop, if these Orders  
are not different. 3. That the Office of a Bishop,

was a higher Degree in the Ministry, than that of a Presbyter. If it had been otherwise; the Pride of *Novatianus* would not have made him pretend to be a Bishop: But he knew what he was about; and he look'd upon that Station in the Church, as an eminent one, and worthy his Ambition, which could not be satisfy'd with his being a Presbyter.

4. That there was a Distinction made in the Synods between the Bishops, and the Presbyters, as being of different Orders. The sixty Bishops, who met in the Synod at *Rome*, to condemn *Novatianus*, and the Principles of that Sect; held another Rank in that Assembly, than the Presbyters, and Deacons. 5. That Bishops could not be Ordain'd, but by Bishops; and a certain number was necessary for that, two or three, prescribed by the \* Canons of the Church. The Custom was, † that the Metropolitan sent Circular Letters to all the Neighbouring Bishops in his Province, to come and assist him in the Choice of the Person, and some in performing the Ceremony of Consecration; as I have intimated before. Whereas a Bishop in his Church ordained Presbyters, after he had ask'd the Advice of his Clergy, and the Approbation of the People. *St. Cyprian* Ordained *Novatus* Presbyter; but *Novatianus* was forc'd to get three Bishops, it seems, to be regularly Consecrated; without which he knew he could not pretend to it. 6. That it was look'd upon as a fault, to procure another Bishop to Ordain a Man, without the proper Diocesan's License. Otherwise *St. Cyprian* would have had no cause to complain, that by the procurement of *Novatus*, *Felicissimus* was so admitted into the Order of Deacon.

I perceive, I am insensibly fallen upon *St. Cyprian*; who was one of the most eminent Fathers

---

\* Can. Apost. 1.

† Cypr. Epist. 68.

in that Age, and gives a very great Light into these matters, both by his Doctrine, and Example. That famous Man did not only arrive at the highest Dignity in the Church, though without his seeking, and much against his Mind; having shunned it as far as he could; (such was his Modesty :) But he ascended to it by degrees, and began at the lowest Office. For the Writer of his Life, \* *Pontius*, makes him to have been first a Deacon in the Church of *Carthage*; when he tells us, “ That whilst he was  
 “ one of them, *i. e.* a Deacon, ( for this Author is  
 owned to have been no more, ) “ he had an Inti-  
 “ macy with *Cæcilius*, an excellent Person, who  
 “ was then, both by Age and Honour, a Presbyter.  
 Then he was made a Presbyter. And lastly a Bishop. It would be as tedious for me, and the Reader; as it is unnecessary, after what I have already quoted, to instance in the several places, wherein *St. Cyprian* throughout his Works mentions the three Orders in the Ministry, as distinct, and subordinate; or to take notice of the many Terms, and Expressions he uses, to set forth the Eminency and Superiority of the Bishop over the Presbyters, and Deacons; or even to alledge those express Passages, wherein he supposes, or lays down the Divine Institution of Episcopacy. I shall therefore content my self with repeating some of the most remarkable Authorities upon these Heads; to shew the Doctrine of this Learned Father, and of his Time, concerning the Hierarchy of the Church.

Nothing is plainer, than that the Ecclesiastical State consisted of these three Orders, as distinct, and subordinate; if we do but examine the Inscription of *St. Cyprian's* † Letter to the Clergy, who by *Decius* the Emperor's Edict, were condemned to,

---

\* *Pont. Vit. Cypr.*

† *Cypr. Epist. 76. ad Nem. Fel. &c.*

and actually suffer'd in the Mines. The Letter is formally Inscribed or directed to the Bishops, whom he Names particularly; then to the Presbyters; and lastly, to the Deacons. Although in the Body of it he speaks jointly to them; and endeavours to comfort them in their common sorrowful Condition. He would never have committed such an Absurdity, if there had not been these three distinct Orders in the Ministry: But he writes there according to the Stile of his Time, and the Truth of the Thing. And even when he was in his Banishment, he considered the State of his own Church, as made up of himself, and his Presbyters, and Deacons: For he writes to these, as their Bishop; and exhorts them, in his absence, to take special care of the Poor, and the Confessors, and to comfort them in their Afflictions. If he had look'd upon them as one Order, he would not have so distinguish'd them; and if he had thought them his Equals, he would have treated them as his Collegues: But he knew, that he being their Bishop, they bore but the Degree of Presbyters, and Deacons.

The Contests which happen'd in *St. Cyprian's* time, between him, and some of his Clergy; and between other Bishops, and some of theirs; gave him occasion to express himself very plainly in several Cases concerning the Superiority of the Bishop over the Presbyters, and Deacons. Whilst he was in his Exile, some of his Presbyters, by their own Authority, and without consulting him, took upon them to restore the Lapsed to the Peace of the Church. What does *St. Cyprian* thereupon? He writes to them a sharp Letter, wherein he charges them with forgetting their own Station, and his: And tells them farther, that such a thing

---

‡ *Cypr. Epist. 14. ad Presb. & Diac.*

was never before attempted under any of his Predecessors. \* “ What, says he, ought we not to be  
 “ afraid of the Wrath of God ; when some Pres-  
 “ byters, neither mindful of the Gospel, nor of  
 “ their own Place ; neither thinking on the future  
 “ Judgment of God, nor on the Bishop their Su-  
 “ perieur for the time ; are so bold as to assume  
 “ all to themselves, to the Contempt and Reproach  
 “ of their Bishop : A thing never heretofore at-  
 “ tempted under any of my Predecessors ! *Roga-*  
*tianus* having written to St. *Cyprian* concerning an  
 insolent Deacon, who being likewise unmindful of  
 his own, and his Bishop’s Post in the Church, did  
 very much disturb him ; he returns him this An-  
 swer, to encourage him to make him sensible of  
 his Episcopal Power, and Superiority. † “ Deacons  
 “ ought to remember, says he, that our Lord chose  
 “ the Apostles, *i. e.* the Bishops, and Prelates ;  
 “ but that it was the Apostles, that after his A-  
 “ scension appointed the Deacons, to be Ministers  
 “ of their Episcopacy, and of the Church. Where-  
 “ fore as we (Bishops) ought to do nothing against  
 “ God, who makes Bishops ; so neither ought Dea-  
 “ cons to do any thing against us, by whom they  
 “ are made. It is necessary therefore, that your  
 “ Deacon, concerning whom you write, should do  
 “ Penance for his Insolency, and acknowledge the  
 “ Dignity of the Priest, and make Satisfaction to  
 “ the Bishop his Superior in all Humility. The  
 Letter that the *Roman* Presbyters, and Deacons writ  
 to || St. *Cyprian*, with whom they held Correspon-  
 dence, after the Death of *Fabianus* their Bishop ;  
 and which is found amongst his Works ; contains  
 a pretty plain proof, amongst other Points, that

\* Cypr. Epist. 16. ad Presb. & Diac.

† Ibid. Epist. 3. ad Rogat.

|| Ibid. Epist. Cler. Rom. 30. ad Cypr.

they believed the Episcopal Pre-eminency, and Superiority. For the See of *Rome* being then vacant, they acquaint him, that they had resolved amongst themselves, “ Till God gave them a Bishop, that  
 “ the Case of the Lapsers should be respited, *i. e.*  
 “ that they would not give them Absolution, unless they were in peril of Death; or to that effect. They thought then, that it belonged to the Office of their Bishop, as their Superior; and therefore they were willing to stay till they had one. They had been instructed, that the ordering of Ecclesiastical Affairs, and Discipline, was reserved to the Bishop: And they look’d upon the Government as suspended, until the Chair was filled up by him, who was to be set at their Head, according to the Apostolical Establishment. The Copy of the Confession of those three *Roman* Presbyters, *Maximus, Urbanus, Sidonius*, and others, who had been unhappily engaged in the Schism of *Novatianus*; which is inserted in a Letter of *Cornelius* to *St. Cyprian*, and found likewise amongst his; affords us another Proof of these things. There those three Penitents, retracting what they had done; in confessing their Faith, express themselves thus; \* “ We acknowledge, that *Cornelius*  
 “ is chosen Bishop of this most holy Catholick  
 “ Church, (*viz. of Rome*) by the Omnipotent God,  
 “ and by our Lord Christ. We confess our Error;  
 “ we have been imposed upon; we have been abused by Treachery, and ensnaring Talk. But tho’  
 “ we seem’d to hold Communion with a Schismatick, and an Heretick; yet our Mind was always sincerely in the Church. For we are not  
 “ ignorant, that as there is one God, and one Lord  
 “ Christ, whom we have confessed; and one Holy  
 “ Ghost; so there ought to be but one Bishop in

---

\* *Ibid.* *Corn. Epist.* 49. ad *Cypr.*

“ a Catholick

“ a Catholick Church. Our Adversaries may perhaps think, that some Terms in this Declaration are too strong; and that they favour too much another Cause, which we are not here pleading for: Though then every Church was called *Catholick*; as it might very well be, which professed the Purity of the Gospel, and the Unity of the Spirit. But we are not here disputing with those of modern *Rome*, whether the Bishops, before whom these Confessors recanted, intended to make them say, that there ought to be one Bishop over the whole Catholick Universal Church? The Question is, how the State of the Hierarchy stood in this third Century; and what was the Doctrine of the Fathers, who flourish'd in it, concerning the Institution of Episcopacy. Now it appears, by the publick Acknowledgment of those three eminent Penitents, that in a particular Catholick Church over the rest of the Clergy there ought to be a Bishop, and but one; and that he is thereunto appointed by God. Wherein it is observable, that this Profession was not forc'd from them, though it might be required at their Admission to the Peace of the Church; but that they made it freely, after mature Consideration, as the result of their Judgment: For they declare so much in the Letter, which they writ afterwards to St. *Cyprian* upon that occasion. \* “ We are certain, say they, that “ we having deliberately, *Habito consilio, &c.* And we may farther take notice, if we consider the Circumstances of this Affair, that it was not only the Belief of the Persons concerned; but also of the five Bishops, who received their Recantation; and of the whole Clergy, and People, who were present at it in a great multitude. For it is not to be imagined, that all these (not to mention the Church of *Africa*) would have expressed

---

\* Ibid. Max. &c. Epist. 53. ad Cypr.

so much Joy, and Satisfaction, as we are told by *Cornelius* they did, at such a Confession; if they had not thought it Sincere, and Orthodox.

I presume, I need not quote here the several Passages in *St. Cyprian's* Works, wherein he supposes, or expressly lays down the Divine, and Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy; that being, I hope, pretty clear by what I have already mentioned. However for *Method's* sake, I shall produce two or three of the most considerable, to shut up this third, and last Century. And the first is that remarkable one, which we meet with in that memorable Speech he made to the Bishops, at the opening of the great Council of *Carthage*, Anno 256. when the Question was to be debated, Whether the Hereticks were to be Baptized? There to engage them to deliver their Opinion freely, without fearing any one's Judgment, but God's, from whom alone they held their Office, and to whom alone they were accountable for their Administration; he exhorts them thus: \* " Let us all wait the Judgment of our Lord Jesus Christ, who alone has the Power of setting up us (Bishops) over his Church, to Govern it; and of Judging of our Proceedings. If it had not been the Doctrine of those Times, *St. Cyprian* would never have offered to express himself in that manner: There were too many honest, and able Divines in that Assembly, to swallow down such a fulsome piece of Flattery; if they had not been of his mind. The second Passage of *St. Cyprian*, is found † *Epist. 59.* where having shewn by several Texts of Scripture the Obligation of Christians to obey their Bishops, he recapitulates his Discourse; and summons it up into this:

---

\* Conc. Carth. Præf.

† *Cypr. Epist. 59. ad Corn.*

“ Seeing we have such weighty, and so many  
 “ other Evidences of the Divine Appointment of  
 “ the Sacerdotal, *i. e.* the Episcopal Authority and  
 “ Power: What strange Men must those be, who  
 “ cannot be deterr’d from being Enemies to the  
 “ Bishops, and Rebels to the Catholick Church,  
 “ either by the forewarning Commination of our  
 “ Lord, or the Vengeance of the Judgment to  
 “ come!

After what I have produced out of these two celebrated Authors, I have reason to expect, that our Adversaries will assent to that Position of the Learned Monsieur *Daillé*, a zealous Asserter of Presbytery; \* *Tertii jam ad Extrema vergentis Seculi tempore, penè ubique in orbe Romano distincta fuisse Episcopi & Presbyteri non tantum Officia & Munia, sed etiam nomina; ex iis quæ supersunt Origenis, & ex Cypriani maxime Epistolis, Sole meridiano clarius esse:* “ That it is clearer than  
 “ the Sun at Mid-day, from such of *Origen’s*  
 “ Writings as are extant, and especially from  
 “ *Cyprian’s* Epistles; that towards the end of the  
 “ third Century, not only the Offices and Functi-  
 “ ons, but also the Names of Bishop and Pres-  
 “ byter, were distinguish’d almost all the *Roman*  
 “ World over. And that they will not be so dis-  
 ingenuous, as to refuse to subscribe to that solemn Declaration of their great *Calvin*, in his notable Discourse concerning *the Necessity of Reforming the Church*; wherein, commending the Constitution of the Hierarchy, as it stood in *St. Cyprian’s* Days, he expresses himself in these words; † *Talem nobis Hierarchiam si exhibeant, in quâ sic eminent Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non recusent; ut ab illo tanquam unico Capite pendeant, & ad ipsum*

\* *Dall. de Script. Dion. & Ign. falsò attr. lib. 2. cap. 38.*

† *Calv. de Necess. Ref. Eccl. Tract. pag. 60. Edit. Amst.*

*referantur;*

*referantur; in quâ sic inter se Fraternal Societatem colant, ut non alio modo quàm ejus veritate sint colligati; tum verò nullo non Anathemate dignos fatear, si qui erunt, qui non eam revereantur, summaque obedientiâ observent:* “ That if the  
 “ Church (the Roman in his time) would agree  
 “ to such an Episcopacy; no Curses could be ima-  
 “ gined, which he should not think those wor-  
 “ thy of, who would not submit to it, and em-  
 “ brace it with all Reverence, and Dutiful Obe-  
 “ dience.

## C H A P. XX.

*The* CONCLUSION.

**W**Hat results from what I have said hitherto; and what other Inference can be made from the several Reasonings, Facts, and Reflexions, I have delivered in this Discourse; than that Episcopacy is of Divine, and Apostolical Institution, in the three Senses I have explained: That it was the Government of the Christian Church during the three first and purest Ages of it; and was intended by Jesus Christ, and his Apostles, to be Perpetual in it to the end of the World? Which is so true, and likewise that it is absolutely necessary for the maintaining a good Order in it; that I am bold to affirm, that if a general Reformation were to be attempted in the Protestant part of it, those very Men, who most oppose it, must as readily concur to the establishing of it; unless they would run into an Anarchical Confusion, as bad in some respects as that of Beasts. And even amongst some

of these Animals, however destitute of Reason and Judgment, we may observe, as to the Management of themselves, a Glimpse and Degree of Subordination. So then if there should be an OEcumenical Council of Protestant Pastors conven'd, or particular Synods held; they must either agree upon that Form of Church-Government, or continue divided, as to the Principles of outward Communion, Catholick Unity, and the Bond of Peace: They could never concur in the Fundamentals of Discipline; and what should be put up by the one, would be pulled down by the others; there would be eternal Wranglings between them. That the Unity of the Spirit therefore, in the Bond of good Government, may be preserved, and remain fix'd, not only in the Catholick, but particular Churches; there must be Chiefs, to hold the Bridle in their Hands; to enact Constitutions for Discipline, and to cause them by their Authority to be observed by all Persons concerned. Otherwise if all Ministers come to take upon them to be Equal, the Assembly dividing in its Opinions, that happy Union, wherein the very Subsistence and Welfare of the Church, as a Society, consists, will be dissolved; and nothing will be seen in it, but a miserable Distraction.

But if the Episcopal Government is so necessary, and useful, for the maintaining a good Order in the Christian Church; I conclude it no less to be of Divine Institution: That very Consideration makes it so. For who can be the Author of a regular OEconomy, and especially of that which is to raise the Glory of the Ecclesiastical Society above all that is seen in this World, but God? If then God is the Author of good Order, and the Episcopal Government is necessary to maintain it in the Christian Church; it follows from thence,  
that

that he is the Author of that Government. And indeed, who can think otherwise? If we consider, that the Hierarchy is as ancient as the World; and that there was never any Church, I had almost said Religion, of any kind, but had a Subordination in its Ministry, except in these latter Days. It is agreed on all Hands, that under the *Mosaick* Dispensation, the Government of the Church was Hierarchical. And I have shewn, how under the Gospel Jesus Christ was so far from touching that, unless as to what was Typical, and Ceremonial in it; that he conformed to it, and gave a new Commission for the perpetuating of it to the end of the World: That his Apostles, by Inspiration from the Holy Ghost, not only approved it, but delivered several Instructions for the Exercise of it; and both practised it in their own Person, and appointed others to do the same; and that it ran through the three first and purest Centuries of Christianity, without any Contradiction; all the Faithful cheerfully embracing it. If these things are so, as I humbly conceive, I have made them evident, both out of Holy Scripture, and the most Primitive Antiquity; nothing therein appearing to the contrary: I hope, all dissenting Persons, that pretend to Sincerity and Ingenuity, will at last be convinced, that Episcopacy has been, and ought to be the Government of the Christian Church, notwithstanding the many Prejudices raised against it. And as a just Consequence of that, that they will readily comply with it, even for the sake of that good Order, which it is so peculiarly adapted to maintain.

I have alledged, that the Hierarchy is as ancient as the World; and that there was never any Church, or Religion of any kind, but had a Subordination in its Ministry, till the Reformation  
in

in *Europe*, when so many of the Reformers abroad, from an aversion to Popish Bishops, unhappily cast off Episcopacy it self, and set up another Form of Church-Government of their own devising, to the great prejudice of the Reformation, and hindrance of the Benefits of that entire Catholick Union, and Communion of ours with those other Reformed Churches, which otherwise had been in as much Perfection, as it was among the Churches of God in the best, and purest Times. But to return to the general practice of Religious Societies, this is another, and supernumerary Sense of the Divine Institution of the Hierarchy; that it has a natural, general, and constant Course in Religious Societies, which are numerous; and cannot be changed, without breaking the Laws, and Order of the Creation; or very much weakning them. For as Nature works but by the Impression of its Creator; we may properly say, that what it does in its essential, permanent, and indispensable Course, is of Divine Institution: Because it does it but by an Order, and Laws, whereof God is the Author; and according to his good Pleasure. This is chiefly a Question of Fact, where-in Experience gives this Supposition its full strength. For if it be true, that from the beginning of the World, all along to these latter Times; there has been no Religion, generally professed, without a Subordination amongst its Ministers: Whence can such an Universal Order, as old, and permanent as Nature, have proceeded; but from God, the Author of it, who so instituted it, according to the eternal Rules of his infinite Wisdom? Let us therefore briefly run over the several sorts of Religions, which have obtained in the World; and we shall see, whether the Position be verifiable. And those may be reduced, as contradistinguished from the *Christian*, and the *Mosaical*, which I have accounted for;

for; into that of the *Faithful* before the *Law*, the *Heathen*, and the *Mahometan*.

As to the Religion of the Faithful before the Law; though the Accounts of its Doctrine, and Discipline in Scripture, are but short and obscure; yet we may easily perceive, and rationally conclude thence, that the Government of the Church then was Hierarchical, and had a Subordination in its Ministry. For it is agreed on all hands, that during that Period the First-born Male in each Family, but where God was pleased by a particular Dispensation to order it otherwise, was not only the Prince, but the Priest of it: And that as to their general Concernments, whether Civil or Religious, the Eldest had a Pre-eminency over the rest. Since then the First-born in each Family, and the Eldest, as to their general Concernments, had such a Superintendency; and that by a Natural and Divine Institution: Doubtless on their publick Occasions there was an Order observed, and there must have been Superiors and Inferiors amongst them. What a strange Confusion would there have been else in their solemn Assemblies, if some Subordination had not been appointed! *Adam*, who was the First-born, or rather the first and only Created of all Mankind; as he had the Dominion of the World committed to him, *Gen. i. 28.* so he governed the Church in chief, as long as he lived, *viz.* nine hundred and thirty Years. So did his Son *Seth* with, and under him, *Gen. iv. 26.* whilst his Father lived; and after his Death, the rest of his own Life, as the Eldest-born reputed. And in like manner *Enoch*, *Noah*, and the other Antediluvian Patriarchs, who adhered to the Worship of the true God, till the Flood; as they had seen it practised amongst their Forefathers. It is not to be imagined, but both then and afterwards,  
the

the Patriarchs in their respective Families, and their Descendants; had the chief Places, as in the State, so in the Church; next their First-born Sons; and then others, in their order. To give one Instance or two of this after the Deluge: When *Noah* with his Family came out of the Ark, God renewed his Covenant with him, and his Sons; and granted him the Dominion of the New World, *Gen. ix.* as he had done to *Adam* of the Old; investing him with the Princely, and Priestly Power, which he exercised in chief for the space of three hundred and fifty Years. It is evident, that he was a Priest; since the Scripture tells us expressly, *Gen. viii. 20.* That upon his coming forth with all the Living Creatures out of the Ark, *he built an Altar unto the Lord, and took of every clean Beast, and of every clean Fowl, and offered Burnt-Offerings on the Altar:* And that he is called, *2 Pet. ii. 5.* a Preacher of Righteousness. And can we think, that when *Melchizedek* met *Abram*, returning from the Slaughter of the four Kings, and the rescue of *Lot*, his Brother's Son, *Gen. xiv.* that *Abram* look'd upon *Melchizedek*, as a mere First-born of some Family, who came to congratulate him upon his Victory, or to offer with him an Eucharistical Sacrifice to God for the same? Certainly in this respect he was Greater than the other: For he was the Head of his Family, and of a Family, which was the first of the Covenant; so that not only the Regalty, but the Priesthood belonged to him. But the extraordinary Respect *Abram* paid *Melchizedek*, upon this Occasion, by giving him Tithes of all; shews plainly enough, that he owned in him a superior Character to his. And particularly the Action of *Melchizedek*, in Blessing *Abram*, puts this Point out of dispute, that he was Greater than he: For it is *St. Paul's*

Maxim,

Maxim, *Heb. vii. 7. That without Contradiction, the less is blessed of the better.* I shall not determine here, whether *Melchizedek* was the same with *Shem*, as it is commonly received; or with *Ham*, as it is conjectured by a Learned \* Writer, not without great Probability? It is very likely, all Circumstances consider'd, that he was one of them two; which makes this Example of his highly apposite to my present Subject. He is said, *Gen. xiv. 18.* to have been *King of Salem*; and is stiled there, by way of Eminency, *the Priest of the most High God*: A very ancient, and notable Person in the Church; *Without Father, without Mother, without Descent, having neither beginning of Days, nor end of Life: But made like unto the Son of God*, as he is described *Heb. vii. 3.* and a Type of Jesus Christ, as to his Regal, and Sacerdotal Office; in Contradistinction to that of *Aaron*. He must have been one of the most eminent Pontifs of his time, enjoying a higher Dignity than the other Ministers of that Religion. Which makes that Judicious Author confess, tho' no great Friend to the Hierarchy, and representing that Church as purely Domestical, and each Family as in a State of Independency; † " That he  
 " believed, that he that was called a Patriarch,  
 " the Chief of a Family, exercised a kind of Su-  
 " perintendency over the Priesthood of his Infe-  
 " riors; and that he was as a High-Priest in his  
 " Family: And particularly, || " That it is most  
 " likely, that *Abram* paid his Homage to him,  
 " who was his Superior (*Melchizedek*) both by  
 " his great Age, and by the Privilege of having  
 " seen the Flood, and by the Dignity of High-

---

\* *Jur. Hist. Crit. des Dogm. &c. Part 1. Chap. 8.*

† *Ibid. Chap. 7. Pag. 62.*

|| *Ibid. Chap. 8. Pag. 69.*

“ Priest, wherewith he was invested in the Quality  
 “ of one of the Patriarchs of the World. And so  
 we may conceive the Church to have been govern’d  
 under *Abraham, Isaac, Jacob*, and the twelve Pa-  
 triarchs, till the Wilderness, and the Mosaical Dis-  
 pensation; as far as their Pilgrimage in the Land  
 of *Canaan*, and their Bondage in *Egypt* permitted  
 them to do it. And all this by a Natural, and  
 Divine Appointment, as to the Hierarchical Form  
 of its Government, and the Subordination amongst  
 its Ministers.

As to the Religion of the Heathens; whether  
 they derived that Order from the Impression of  
 Nature, or borrowed it from the People of God?  
 is not here very material, since it tends to the same  
 end, *viz.* to confirm the Natural, and Divine Insti-  
 tution of the Hierarchy in the Church: But it is  
 pretty evident, from the Accounts we have of their  
 Theology, which are plain in that, that they had  
 a Subordination in their Ministry. For how can  
 we think otherwise, if we consider either the Mul-  
 titude, and Distinction of their Gods; or their va-  
 rious Devotions, and Sacrifices, some vast ones,  
 even whole Hecatombs; or the great number of  
 their Priests; or the Quality of some of them?  
 It seems to have been a general Rule amongst them,  
 that their Priests should be taken out of their chief  
 Families, not excepting the Regal: The Poet tells  
 us particularly of *Anius*, that he was King of *Del-  
 phos*, and Priest of *Apollo*;

|| *Rex Anius, Rex idem Hominum, Phœbique Sacerdos* :  
 and the *Romans*, even after the Expulsion of their  
 Kings, when the Name was become odious to  
 them; had a *Rex Sacrorum*, a King of the Sacri-  
 fices, though he was Subject to their *Pontifex  
 Maximus*. And it is evident from Scripture, in

the time of *Ahab*, when *Elijah* challenged the false Prophets to a Sacrifice, for a tryal whose was the true God; that there appear'd of the Prophets of *Baal* four hundred and fifty, and of the Prophets of the *Groves* four hundred, which eat at *Jezebel's* Table, 1 *Kings* xviii. 19. Could this Religion have subsisted so long, and in so large a part of the World, under a Government of Parity, and without a Subordination in its Ministry? But the Matter of Fact is plain in the *Roman* History; where nothing is more notorious, than that the *Pontifices Maximi* had a Superintendency, and Authority over all Things sacred, and Persons; and were raised in Eminency, and Power, above the *Sacerdotes* of a lower Rank; and the *Pope* or *Victimarii*: To say nothing of the *Augures*, *Vestales*, and other *Religious* *Votaries*. Or that the Priests of their highest Deities, as they had the chief Care of their respective Temples, so they were distinguish'd from those that Officiated under them; as the *Flamen Dialis*, that of *Mars*, *Apollo*, and the rest. And as to the Religion of the *Mahometans*, which is supposed to be made up of *Judaism*, *Paganism*, and Institutions of their Founder's Invention: It is well known, that the Subordination is observed in it; so natural, and universal is that Order in all Religious Societies! But whence proceeds this Conformity between all Nations, and in all Ages, upon the Form of their Ecclesiastical Government, (give me leave to use the Expression as to some of them) And how comes it to pass, that being so different in their Religions, they have been able to agree in a Discipline, whereof the very Essence consists in a Subordination of Ministers? Why, it proceeds from this, as I have intimated, that such an Order seems to come from a Natural, and Divine Institution: And that God himself

himself has imprinted the Notion of it in Nature, and Nature in the Heart of Man.

But to return from this short Digression, and to put an end to this Discourse; all I foresee can be objected with any colour of Reason against what I have been asserting, and what is indeed the only Refuge of our Adversaries; is, that Jesus Christ left it to the Prudence of his Apostles, to settle what Government they pleased in his Church; and to order it according to the Circumstances of Times, and Places. But if what I have alledged; and I think, evidently proved out of Scripture, and undeniable History, is true; the Objection is already answered, and little more needs to be added, to lay it wholly asleep. And indeed can any one imagine, that our Blessed Saviour, who was the Wisdom of God, should refer to the Fancy of Men the Government of a Society, which was to bear up against the Gates of Hell; without giving his Commissioners their Instructions, either in his Lifetime, or upon his rising from the Dead; or at least directing them to the Inspirations of his Spirit? Or will any be so bold, as to affirm, that in his infinite Foresight he could not calculate a Form of Discipline, which should serve his Church to the end of the World; and be proper for all Times, and Places, to answer his eternal Purposes? He would have wanted that Prudence, which he depended upon in his Apostles. It was a Saying of the famous *Luther*, *That Humane Policy had ruined the Church*; which he knew to be true by Experience in the Communion he left, and reformed from; if not as to its outward Splendor, yet at least as to its inward Purity. But if no Arguments will prevail upon the Mind of these Men, to bring them off from this their beloved Opinion; let them fairly own, that Episcopacy is of Apostolical In-

stitution

stitution in this Sense, that the Apostles in their Prudence judged it the best Form of Ecclesiastical Government, and that it is the ancientest in the Christian Church; having been used throughout the three first and most uncorrupt Ages of it, and continued all along every where to the Days of the Reformation from Popery, as it is universally acknowledged. And since it was establish'd all the World over, upon the growing up of Christianity, and the Divisions of Christians amongst themselves; as the most effectual Remedy against Schism; according to the account of their *St. Jerom*, whom they so often appeal to: If they will not do it for other Reasons, let them embrace it for that, now the Protestant Church is grown populous in *Europe*, and is miserably divided in most Parts of it; but particularly in this great Kingdom, though at last united in its Temporal Government; that our Spiritual *Jerusalem* may be again at Unity in it self, and become at last a Praise in the whole Earth.

---

F I N I S.



