

25. 1. 8

T. K. Torrey

SCS #1512

T H E
P R I E S T H O O D
O F T H E
Old and New TESTAMENT
B Y
S U C C E S S I O N .
In Seven LETTERS.

S H E W I N G

That there is no other Way to prove the
Lawfulness of Ministerial Mission.

W I T H

An A N S W E R to the Principal Objections.

By *ROBERT CALDER*, M. A. Late
PRESBYTER of the Suffering Church of SCOTLAND.

E Z R A, ii. 62.

These sought their Register among those that were reckoned
by Genealogy; but they were not found; therefore were they,
as polluted, put from the Priesthood.

H E B R E W S, v. 4.

And no Man taketh this Honour to himself, but he that is
called of God, as was *Aaron*.

E D I N B U R G H :

Printed for J. W I L S O N, Bookseller in the
Exchange.

SCS #1512

T O T H E R E A D E R.

SUCCESION being the Divine Character of the Gospel Priesthood in the New Testament, as it was for the *Aaronical* Priesthood in the Old, according to the Scriptures, it concerns every one who sets up for a Minister, to be sure of his evidence ; yea, and it concerns the people, (as I make out in these following Letters) to know whether or not they live under the conduct of such a Ministry, as may lawfully Preach, administer Sacraments, absolve Penitents, and thrust out stubborn Offenders, which can no otherwise be but by *Apostolical Succession*.

Now, if a *Presbyterian* tells me, that their *Presbytery* succeeds to that *Presbytery* mentioned in *1 Tim. iv. 14.* that laid hands on *Timothy* ; I shall ask him, by way of reply, How can he prove that more than a *Jesuit*, if he were so ridiculous as to assert, That his order was in the days of *Moses*, from that Scripture, *Numb. xxvi. 44. Of Jesui came the family of the Jesuits ?* For neither of them can produce catalogues of their Succession.

We can condescend upon the time when *Presbytery*, *Jesuitism*, and *Socinianism* began, and that was fourteen, if not fifteen hundred years after the days of the *Apostles*. We may therefore reasonably conclude, that that Church Government that lasted longest in the Church, and has been universal in *Europe*, *Asia*, and *Africa*, the beginning whereof we cannot trace in any age betwixt us and the *Apostles*; that, I say, should be the Government, that did preserve the Faith that was *once delivered to the Saints*, and transmitted to posterity; and that it is the Government to which *Christ* promised, that *the gates of Hell should not prevail against it*, and to be *with it to the end of the world*.

They have a dreadful account to make, who wilfully shut their eyes against the light, and make their followers swallow down, for undoubted oracles, false maxims and sayings, or erroneous glosses upon true texts of Scripture.

I shall briefly hint at some popular tricks, whereby they mislead the poor people; as,

I. To call *Episcopacy*, *Popery*: It is ordinary to give odious names to any thing that they intend to make hateful.

I thought it unworthy of *John Knox*, in his pious and serious Treatise on Fasting, in his Book of *Common-Prayer*, printed at *Edinburgh* by the heirs of *Andrew Hart*, 1635, to express himself thus: *Popes, Cardinals, and Horned Bishops*. By this scandalous epithet, he intended to raise monstrous ideas in the heads of the people, to make Bishops odious. Thus his pretended Successors call reformed Episcopacy *Popery*, tho' it be the greatest bulwark in the world against it.

II. A second instance of their abusing the people, is making them believe, that *the Advocates for Prelacy make a fairer appearance from human Writings, than from canonical Scriptures*. *Nazianz. Quer. Pag. 109.* Whereas,

There can be nothing more false. For we tell them, that we have the Divine Institution of the Old Testament for our Pattern, *to wit*, the inequality of *High-priest, Priests, and Levites*. And we defy the earth to prove, that our Saviour changed the imparity of the Old Testament into a parity of the New. Yea, the contrary was foretold by the Prophet *Isaiah*, lxvi. 21. *And I will take of them for Priests and Levites, saith the Lord.* Here was an imparity

to be in the New Testament. We tell them that our Saviour, in his own College, had twelve Apostles above the seventy Disciples; here is one rank or class above another, whom he governed when personally upon earth, and he deputed the higher order to govern after his Ascension. And we tell, from *Acts* vi. 6. and viii. 14. that these *Apostles* conferred a power upon men that were full of the Holy Ghost, to share with them in the Government, and that by the significant ceremony of *imposing of hands*, but not an equal power with themselves. For *Philip* the *Deacon* converted *Samaria* to the Christian Religion, and baptized them; but could not lay hands upon them; for that belonged to an higher office, as appears from the fore-cited places of Scripture.

We tell them, That St. *James* was Bishop of *Jerusalem*, where (according to Presbyterians) there were at least thirty thousand Christians, as I make out in this Essay: And we see, that St. *James* presided authoritatively in the first general Council at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* xv.

Again, we tell them, That allowing the Presbytery mentioned, 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. was a society of Presbyters, (con-
trary

trary to the opinion of St. *Jerome* and Mr. *Calvin*, their pretended Patrons); yet that ordination of *Timothy's* was mainly and chiefly the act of the Apostle St. *Paul*, who calls it the *laying on of his hands*, 2 *Tim.* i. 6.

We tell them of the seven Churches of *Asia*, with learned Presbyterians their concessions of their being Episcopal.

We tell them, that *perishing in the gainsaying of Corah*, *Jude* verse 17. signifies an inferior Clergyman's rising up against his superior in the Church, and that this sin may be committed under the Gospel, as well as under the Law.

We tell them, that they may as well unscripture the Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*, as to unbishop themselves.

These, I think, with several other Scriptures, backed with the practice of the Universal Church, and the Exposition of the Ancients, may prove sufficient to confute that falsehood, to wit, *That Prelatists make a fairer shew from human Writings, than from canonical Scripture.*

III. Another fallacy they impose upon their followers, is, That *Bishop* and *Presbyter* is all one in Scripture; the names are common, and therefore no one order
above

above another. At this rate they may reason, that all the Priests in the Old Testament were High-priests, because *Aaron* and his sons are called Priests, *Lev. i. 7, 8.* and also argue thus, That *St. Stephen* the Deacon was an Apostle, because the *Apostle St. Paul* calls himself a Deacon.

IV. Another false way of reasoning they use to impose upon their Readers and Followers, is, That,

The ancient and modern advocates for Prelacy have different opinions about Episcopacy, and therefore there is no real foundation for it.

I have answered this before, thus: Put this argument in the *Jews* mouths against Christians, then the Christian Religion is nothing, because the Professors divide among themselves; some asserting the divinity of *Christ*, and others denying it: Again, off goes the canonicalness of the Scriptures, because some books are doubted among Christians. Others may conclude, there is no such thing as *Antichrist*, because of the different opinions about him. Again, *Herod* and *Pontius Pilate*, were right when they agreed to crucify *Christ*, and *St. Paul* and *Barnabas* were wrong, because they
contended

contended among themselves : Yea, by this way of arguing, Satan's kingdom is right, and *Christ's* is wrong, because the subjects of Satan agree, and *Christ's* subjects have contentions among themselves.

V. Another trick they put upon the readers of their books against us, is, That they never take notice of the answers given by us to their principal arguments : For example, they still cite arguments from Dr. *Stillingfleet's Irenicum*, which, they think, make for them ; but they never take notice of his own retractions and answers to himself ; as many speak of *David's* sins, but few of his repentance.

When they object, that St. *Patrick* ordained three hundred and sixty-five Bishops in *Ireland*, who, say they, could not be Diocesans, because so many ; which is very false ; for there might be a thousand Diocesses in *Ireland* : It is all one whether a Diocese be one mile or twelve miles. They never heed the answer given to them, *That every one of these Bishops had nine Presbyters under them.*

When they object against us, That it was the custom of *Alexandria* to elect
one

one of their own number whom they called *Bishop*; they suppress the return we make to them, to wit, *That neighbouring Bishops were called, to give the consummative act of Consecration.*

VI. A sixth thing I charge upon them in abusing their followers, is their arguing from an *Accessory* to a *Principal*, or from what is not essential to that which is: As for example, to argue from a *Diocese* to a *Bishop*, which is not an essential correlative; for the Apostles were Bishops at their first consecration, before ever there was a *Diocese*, or a *Parish*, in a Magistratical way: It is not a particular place, but power in the Priesthood, that we plead for, in any part of the world.

I add to this, their arguing from the primitive Christians, their state of persecution to their after-state of prosperity; which is to reason from a circumstance to a substance.

I have answered, and still continue to answer thus: I suppose that, when the *Israelites* had been settled in the land of *Canaan*, some crack-brain'd Schismatick had set up against the rational constitutions in Church and State, and endeavoured to withdraw them from obedience

dience to their Governors, by arguing from their present state, to the state of their forefathers in the wilderness, by a pathological popular harangue, after this manner :

O Sirs ! What innovations are now since the days of our forefathers ? In the wilderness there was no Circumcision, no stately Temples and Synagogues, no leaning at taking the Paschal Lamb ; for they took it standing, in haste, and with their staves in their hands : there were no feasts of Tabernacles then. Yea ! then Moses and Aaron were protested against as usurpers of the people, their natural right of liberty and property in Church and State, by the Saints of the L O R D, who suffered martyrdom in a congregational way, saying, Numb. xvi. at the beginning, You take too much upon you ; for all the congregation is holy as well as you. And did not the survivors of these holy Martyrs cry out against Moses, saying, You have killed the people of the LORD. Verse 41.

Ought not such a litigious fellow to be sent to a wilderness with his adherents, rather than be permitted to disturb the peace of the land of promise ?

VII. The last thing I charge our antagonists with, is, That the present Presbyterian champions do not insist upon the proof of their Ministry, from the point of Apostolical Succession, as I prove here, that their predecessors did, very judiciously, against the *Erastians* and *Independents*; witness their *Jus Reg. Eccl.* printed in 1647. If they have now quitted this plea, it is certainly because they could not prove it; as I, with submission to better judgments, endeavour (and I hope with success) to prove *Episcopal Ordination* by *Apostolical Succession*, in this Performance, which I defy a counter party to overthrow, unless they demonstrate to the world, that there is some other thing than Succession that is the fundamental Charter of the Ministry, which, I am sure, that the pretence to *grace, gifts, sound doctrine, and popular calls* cannot be: And if men, that are called *Protestants*, object many inconveniencies against me for this undertaking, I have in this small tractate answered them. And it will be found, that all the absurdities will light at their doors who oppose, and cannot be charged upon these that do defend, *That the Gospel Priesthood is founded upon Apostolical Succession.*

It

It was the Presbyterian principle in the 47th year of God, and it is as true now as it was then; let them therefore prove that they are the Successors of the *Apostles*, or the Successors of that *Presbytery*, which, they say, laid hands on *Timothy*; or the Successors of the *fixed Moderators*, which they acknowledge in the first three Centuries; or the Successors of the *Culdees* in *Scotland*. Yea, let them give a catalogue of their Succession from *John Knox*; for if they hold not by the Succession, and prove what they affirm, they have no advantage of *Independents*, *Brownists*, *Erastians*, nor *Enthusiasts*. And if they shelter themselves under the wings of any of the forementioned *Sectarians*, let them answer their predecessors arguments against them, which I have abridged in these following Letters. Let them tell us when was *Episcopal Ordination* questioned, as we can prove that the *Ordination* of *Ischyas* by *Colluthus*, a Presbyterian in *Athanasius's* time, was rejected as invalid. The power of *Ordination* is what *St. Jerome* grants to be the privilege of the *Bishop* above the *Presbyter*, in his letter to *Evagrius*, when he says, *What is it that a Bishop does that a*

Presbyter may not do, except Ordination? And in his Dialogue to the Latiferians, he says, That the welfare of the Church consists in the dignity of the High-priest, to whom, if there be not some matchless power allowed, there will be as many divisions in the Church, as there are Priests.

It is but reasonable that the *Christian Church* should be as orderly and regular as the *Jewish Church* was; and the first Christians borrowed many of their usages from the *Jews*: For example, The two Sacraments of *Baptism* and the *Lord's Supper*, were answerable to the *Jewish Baptisms* and their *Postcœniums* after the *Pasover*: *Ordination* by imposition of hands, is derived from their *Ordination* in the *Synagogue*; our *Cathedral Churches* answer to their *Temple*, and our *Paroch Churches* to their *Synagogues*; our *Churching of Women* to their *Purifications*: And why not our *Bishops, Priests, and Deacons*, conform to their *High-priests, Priests, and Levites*, and the *Apostolical Succession* preserved and proven, as well as the *Aaronical*?

Arise, O LORD, into thy rest, thou, and the ark of thy strength.

Let thy Priests be clothed with righteousness, and let thy Saints shout for joy.

LETTER

OF THE

DIVINE RIGHT

OF THE

PRIESTHOOD

BY

S U C C E S S I O N.

L E T T E R I.

S I R,

Y O U earnestly desired me to give in writing, the substance of what pass'd betwixt us, for four or five days together, upon the *divine right of the Priesthood or Church Government*; of its conveyance from its first institution to the end of the world, and of what is the proper subject of that power; And how to distinguish a true Mi-

nistry from a false, a Minister lawfully sent, from an Intruder, Pretender or Invader of that sacred Function; and you seem'd to be convinced, that personal gifts, either natural or acquired, were not of themselves sufficient to capacitate any private person in Church or State, to exercise any office in either, without a commission from the undoubted superior to authorise them in their specifical offices: For, as capacity to command soldiers, or to judge between neighbours, was not sufficient for any person to assume a Captain's office in the field, nor a Sheriff's post in a shire; so neither was a man's profound skill in scripture or ecclesiastical learning, enough for him, to take up the ministerial Calling, without his being solemnly invested with a power to exerce the same, by a person or persons, that had power to convey holy Orders from CHRIST and his Apostles.

You granted also, that pretence to the spirit of personal holiness, was not sufficient to authorise men to preach, baptize, or absolve penitents, or thrust out stubborn offenders: For then every religious Lunatick, deep Dissembler, and hypocritical Jugler, may thrust himself

himself into the holy Ministry, and set up a teacher of every erroneous opinion.

Neither can the civil Magistrate be the fountain of this power, as Erastians do maintain; neither can the people or body of believers confer this power, according to the Independents: This the learned and judicious Presbyterians, in their *Jus divinum regiminis ecclesiastici*, printed 1647, have proven in the 9th and 10th Chapters of that book; and in the 11th Chapter, "They prove, that CHRIST'S own Church Officers are the proper receptacles and immediate Subjects of that Church power."

And in their Appendix to that book, in answer to certain queries from the Independents, "They prove, that the Ministry comes by succession from the Apostles, by this promise, Matth. xxviii. 20. *Lo I am with you to the end of the world.*" And in that Appendix they cite the Testimony of Independents, confessing, that the conveyance of ministerial power thro' a Popish Channel, cannot make void ministerial Ordinances. This is consonant to what Mr. Samuel Rutherford, in his *Plea for Presbytery*, C. 10. P. 142.

as it is cited by Mr. William Vilant in his *Review of the History of the Indulgences*, P. 535. "We have not separate
" from Rome's Baptism, nor Ordination
" of Pastors."

And Mr. William Robertson, in his *Dissenters Self-condemned*, cap. 5. printed in 1710, cites the authority of the learned Dissenters, asserting the same thing upon the matter, and particularly, the *Jus divinum ministerii evangelici*, done by a Provincial Assembly, and printed at London in 1654, Part 2. P. 41, 43,

We are not (say they), "to renounce
" divine Ordinances, because of circumstantial defilements annexed to
" them : Baptism and Ordination were
" found for substance in the Church
" of Rome, and therefore to be re-
" formed, but not renounced."

Again Part 2. P. 33. they tell us,
" That the Ministry ; which is an Institution of CHRIST, passing to us thro'
" Rome, is not made null and void ; no
" more than the Scriptures, Sacraments,
" or any other gospel Ordinance, which
" we now enjoy, and which do all descend to us from the Apostles, thro'
" the Romish Church."

Again

Again the Assembly of Presbyterian Ministers (says the said Mr. R.) tells us in that same book, P. 38. Part 2. " We
 " must distinguish betwixt the Church
 " and the apostasy of it, between the
 " corn and the tares that are in it : This
 " the Apostle seems to do (2 Thess. ii.
 " 4.), where he puts a difference be-
 " tween the *Temple* of God, in which
 " the *Man of Sin* shall sit as God, and
 " between the *Man of Sin*, sitting in
 " this Temple. The *Man of Sin* is no
 " part of this Temple of God, but a
 " plague of leprosy, infecting, defiling,
 " and polluting it. But yet (say they),
 " the Temple of God (which is his
 " visible Church, as appears from 1.
 " Cor. iii. 16. 17. Rev. iii. 12. and
 " xi. 1. 2 Cor. vi. 16.), doth remain
 " where the *Man of Sin* sits, even as
 " the Church of Pergamus did, where
 " the *Seat of Satan* was ; and tho' we
 " renounce the *Antichristianism*, which
 " pollutes the Temple of God, yet
 " we do not (say they) renounce the
 " Temple itself. "

So from this they conclude, that
 the Apostacy, Idolatry, and false Wor-
 ship of the Church of Rome, does not
 unchurch her.

But

But further they say Part 2. Page 42.

43.

“We will a little compare the Apostacy
 “ of the *Ten Tribes*, with the Apostacy
 “ of the Church of *Rome*. The *Ten*
 “ *Tribes* did not only worship God af-
 “ ter a false manner, by setting up
 “ their Golden Calves in *Dan* and *Bet-*
 “ *el*, but afterwards, in the reign of
 “ *Ahab*, they directly worshiped false
 “ Gods, and set up *Baal* and *Astaroth*,
 “ and fell away, (wholly as they say)
 “ from the true God, and yet notwith-
 “ standing of all this, when the Pro-
 “ phet came to anoint Jehu, he saith un-
 “ to him (2 Kings ix. 6.) Thus saith
 “ the LORD God of Israel, I have anoin-
 “ ted thee King over the people of the
 “ LORD, even over Israel; here note
 “ (say they) that they are called the
 “ people of the LORD, notwithstanding
 “ of their Apostacy.”

To this Sir you replied, that you never thought Presbyterians laid any claim to a Succession from the Apostles, nor did you ever think them the Successors of that Presbytery, that laid hands, together with St. Paul, upon Timothy, 1 Tim. iv. chap. verse 14. “ Neglect not the gift that is in thee, which
 “ was

“was given thee by prophecy, with the
 “laying on of the hands of the Presby-
 “tery,” compared with 2 Tim. i. 6.
 “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.”

And you told me, that the Papists affirm with great assurance, that neither Episcopal nor Presbyterian, nor any set of Protestants, have Ordination by Apostolical Succession, and that the Protestant Bishops could not prove their Succession; because, as Papists affirm, there was an interruption made in the days of Queen Elizabeth, when there was no Protestant Bishop alive, and to be Popish Bishops would not give Ordination to Protestants; for this would be to continue a Schism against themselves.

For this you desired my thoughts and reading in a few sheets of paper, because you had other avocations, and had not all the books that I cited, but that you would trust my integrity in the citation of authors. Withal you told ingenuously, that the difficulties which troubled Chronologers, should be no stumbling to you; because all parties
 who

who allowed the divine Right of Scriptures, were equally obliged to answer Deists and mockers of Revealed Religion; and learned men have given as great satisfaction in this point, as the matter will bear.

I therefore lay down this position, That the power of Church Government is founded upon a continued Succession from its first Institution.

It was so in the Aaronical Priesthood, and now is in the Christian and Apostolical.

1. First then, That Succession by divine Institution, was the principle of unity in the Old Testament, and the test whereby to discover presumptuous Upstarts, Self-Seekers, and Self-Senders, we see clearly, from the history of the whole sixteenth chapter of the Numbers, when Corah and his mutinous confederates commenced a rebellion against Moses their supreme Magistrate, who, in Deut. xxxiii. 5. is called King in Jeshurun; and a Schism against Aaron their High Priest; that God decided the controversy by a miraculous judgment against the mutineers, who did not pretend to bring in a new Creed, nor a new Worship, but to derive their power from
the

the people, saying, Numb. xvi. 3. that all the congregation was holy as well as Moses and Aaron.

2. Was it not easy for the meanest of the people to know, who was the Successor of Aaron, when Manasseh, brother to Jaddi High Priest of Jerusalem, set up a Temple in mount Gerizim in Samaria, by means of Sanballat his father-in law, an uncircumcised heathen?

3. When Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, had possessed himself of the kingdom of Israel, with the Ten Tribes revolting from Rehoboam, is it not said, that he made the people of Israel to sin? And was not this by inventing a new Priesthood, out of the lowest of the people, which were not of the Tribe of Levi; by which means the thread of the Aaronical Succession was broke? And by setting up calves at Dan and Bethel, as we read at large in the 1st of the Kings, xii. 26, 30, 31.

4. Did not our Saviour determine the debate betwixt the Jews and the Samaritans, when he says. John iv. 22. Salvation is of the Jews, *that is*, says a learned Commentator, Salvation comes by the Jews to others?

5. Is

5. Is it not observable from Luke xvii. 14. that CHRIST his sending the Samaritan Leper, with the nine Jewish Lepers, to the Priests of Jerusalem, and not sending him to the schismatical Priesthood of Samaria, that the cause was decided in favours of the Church of the Jews, for all the scandals and corruptions it was charged with?

6. Did not our Saviour sufficiently discover his aversion to the Samaritan Priesthood and Worship, when it is said, Luke ix. 53. "And they did not receive him, because his face was as though he would go to Jerusalem;" *that is*, say the large Criticks, because the Samaritans knew CHRIST and his Apostles to be Jews, and that they were going to Jerusalem to pray, or, as Dr. Whitby says, to celebrate the Passover.

7. *Lastly*, Does not the care which the Jews took to preserve the list of their Priests, as well as of their Kings, and that because their whole Temple Service, the effect of their Sacrifices and Expiations, depended on it, shew how exact they were to keep up the difference betwixt a Priesthood of God's Institution, from one of human invention, like to Jeroboam's?

And

And do we not find, that Josephus being a Priest, not only depends on genealogical tables for the proof of his descent, but adds, that all their Priests were obliged to prove their Succession from an ancient line; and if they could not do it, they were excluded from officiating as Priests, and that in whatsoever part of the world they were, they used this diligence? This is cited by Dr. Whitby in his Commentary on Matth. i. 6. out of Josephus *contra App. lib. 1. p. 1036*; and the truth of what Josephus says, appears from the Text cited in the title-page of this book. Ezra ii. 62. The children of Habaiah sought their register among those that were reckoned by genealogy; but they were not found; therefore were they, as polluted, put from the Priesthood.

*Follows a CATALOGUE of
the Jewish High Priests, from the
first Institution of Aaron, to our
Saviour's days.*

1 Aaron. 2 Eleazar. 3 Phineas. 4 Abishua. 5 Bukki. 6 Uzzi. 7 Zerachiah.
C 8 Meraioth.

8 Meraioth. 9 Amariah. 10 Ahitub. 11 Zadok. 12 Ahimaaz. 13 Azariah. 14 Johanan. 15 Azariah. 16 Amariah. 17 Ahitub. 18 Zadok. 19 Shallum. 20 Hilkiyah. 21 Azariah. 22 Seraiah. 23 Jehozadak, who went into captivity when the LORD carried away Judah and Jerusalem by the hand of Nebuchadnezzar.

These I have set down out of the 1st Chron. vi. 4 to 16. according to the syllabication of our English Bible, omitting several others in the foresaid list, who were mentioned as High Priests : As for example, after Amariah the ninth High Priest, Eli, Ahimelech and Abiathar, supposing Scripture sufficient for my purpose.

The rest during the time of the captivity till the Maccabees, and from them to the days of our Saviour, I have set down out of the great historical and geographical Dictionary, having compared it with Dionysius Petavius.

During the Captivity were.

1 Josue. 2 Joachim. 3 Eliahib. 4 Jehoida the 2d. 5 Jonathan. 6 Jaddus. 7 Onias the 1st. 8 Simon the Just. 9 Eleazar

9 Eleazar the 2d. 10 Manasses. 11 Onias the 2d. 12 Simon the 2d. 13 Onias the 3d. 14 Jason who bought the Priesthood. 15 Menelaus, a Simoniack. 16 Lyfmachus, a Simoniack. 17 Alcimus, an Ufurper.

Follow those who begun anno 3886 of the World, and of Rome 586.

1 Mattathias. 2 Judas Maccabæus. 3 Jonathas. 4 Simon 3d. John called Hircan. 6 Aristobulus King and Priest. 7 Alexander Jannius. 8 Hyrcan. 9 Aristobulus. 10 Hircan re-established. 11 Antigonus. 12 Ananel. 13 Aristobulus. 14 Ananel re-established. 15 Jesus son of Phabes. 16 Simon. 17 Matthias. 18 Joazar. 19 Eleazar 3d. 20 Jesus son of Sias.

In the year of CHRIST from 16 to 61.

1 Ishmael. 2 Eleazar 4th. 3 Simon. 4 Caiaphas. 5 Jonathas and his brother Theophilus. 6 Simon, surnamed Cantheras. 7 Matthias 2d. 8 Elionee. 9 Simon Cantheras re-established. 10 Joseph. 11 Ananus. 12 Ishmael. 13 Joseph

seph called Caba. 14 Ananus son of Ananus. 15 Jesus son of Damneus. 16 Jesus son of Gamaliel. 17 Matthias 3d, son of Theophilus. 18 Phanassus, who was High Priest when Jerusalem was taken.

Sir, I thought it needless to insert the years of the world in which the High Priests governed the Church, because it was not to my chief design, and the omission can do no prejudice to my undertaking ; and I have St. Matthew his first Chapter, and St. Luke his third, for my patterns, giving a list of our Saviour's Genealogy, without mentioning the years or time of his Ancestors.

I think this may serve to prove, that the Church in the Old Testament, consisting of the Ministry of Priests and Levites, was preserved in the Succession of the High Priests. The next thing I am to prove, is, that the Priesthood of the New Testament can be proven after the same manner, which shall be the subject of my next Letter. In the mean time I give you my hearty service, and desire to know, what Observes or Censures yourself or any of your Friends have upon this, and the faults shall be amended in the next to you,

From your humble Servant, &c.

LETTER

L E T T E R II.

S H E W I N G

That the Christian Priesthood descends by Apostolical Succession from CHRIST, as the Jewish Priesthood descended by Aaronical Succession by GOD's Institution.

GOD is the God of order, therefore all things ought to be done in order and decently. 1 Cor. xiv. 40.

We find in 1 Chron. xv. When David brought up the Ark from Obededom, that in the 11th verse he calls for Zadok and Abiathar the Priests, saying to them, that they were the *Chief of the Fathers* of the Levites, and therefore "They and their brethren should sanctify themselves, to bring up the Ark of the LORD : and verse 13. for, because ye did it not at the first, the LORD our God made a breach upon us, for that we sought him not after the due order."

We find in the Old Testament, that an order was instituted in the Church of the Jews, and that they were governed by High-Priest, Priests and Levites, and that there were Priests of the first and second order ; 2 Kings xxiii. 4. And in the 1 Chron. vi. 31, and 32. when David had appointed the Singers “ in the House of the LORD, after the “ Ark had rest, that they waited on “ their office, according to their order. ”

All Societies civil and military, all trades and occupations must and ought to have their rules of order ; and it is not presumed, that the Christian Church should want its own laws, to govern its members, or that, as the Author to the Hebrews says, Chap. iii. 1. 2. “ That “ the Apostle and High Priest of our “ Profession, CHRIST JESUS, who was “ faithful to him that appointed him, “ as also, Moses was faithful in all his “ house. Verses 5. and 6. Moses verily “ was faithful in his house as a servant, “ for a testimony of those things which “ were to be spoken after ; But CHRIST “ as a Son over his own House. “ &c.

As CHRIST came not to *destroy the law, but to fulfill it* ; so neither came
he

he to destroy the Priesthood, but to better it, he himself being a Priest for ever, after the order of Melchisedec.

These words Heb. xii. 26. "Yet once more, I shake not the Earth only, but also Heaven," are not meant of the material Heavens or Earth, but of the Judaical State and Levitical worship and Service, which, Heb. ix. 10. "Stood in meats and drinks, in divers washings and carnal ordinances, imposed on them until the time of Reformation."

These things were shaken at the Coming of CHRIST, and Heb. xii. 27. This word, once more, signifies the "Removing of those things that are shaken, as of things that are made, that those things that cannot be shaken may remain:" That is, the Levitical Priesthood and Sacrifices were to be shaken, that the Gospel Priesthood and State might remain unshaken, and continue to the end of the world: For our Saviour did not alter Judaism to another religion, but from a ceremonial to a substantial, from a literal to a mystical, from a carnal to a spiritual Judaism.

I could multiply as many Scriptures from the Old and New Testament, as might fill as many sheets as I design to write upon this Subject, to prove that,

Neither the Son of God, nor the Holy Ghost, nor good Angels, nor good Men, ever came on God's embassy or service, without a special mandate or commission from himself; and consequently they who come of themselves in his name, not being sent by him, can never promise a blessing to their labours, in an usurped Ministry; Thus Jerem. xxiii. 32. "Behold, I am against those that prophesy false dreams, saith the LORD, and do tell them; and cause my people to err by their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not, nor commanded them; therefore they shall not profit this people at all, saith the LORD."

It is seldom that such Self-senders and Self-seekers preach sound doctrine unmixed with error; for when they go out of the common road, the plain and straight way, to wit, Apostolical Succession, they are forced to betake themselves to pitiful defences, such as inward calls, impulses of the spirit, personal gifts, the power

power of the people, or of the magistrate; but so it is not with those that are truly sent of God. We find, St. John i. 6. that CHRIST's Fore-runner John the Baptist was sent of God.

We have many passages in the scripture, of CHRIST's being sent, as John xiii. 20. " Verily verily, he that receiveth whomsoever I send, receiveth me; and he that receiveth me, receiveth him that sent me. " Matth. x. 5, 6. 7, 8. CHRIST sends his Twelve Apostles to the lost sheep of Israel. And after the Resurrection he says to them, John xx. 21. " As my father sent me, so send I you. " And Matth. xxviii. 18, 19. 20. " And Jesus came and spake unto them; All power is given unto me in Heaven and in Earth; go ye therefore 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, whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo I am with you alway unto the end of the world. "

We read in St. Luke x. 1. That the seventy Disciples went not till they had their master's commission to go. And in the days of the Apostles, we find that

that the new order and office of Deacons, did not exercise their part of Church Government, untill they were authorised thereto by the Apostles, who were their superiors, altho' these seven were *men full of the Holy Ghost*. See Acts ch. vi. and first six verses.

If then the *Son of GOD*, who had the spirit without measure, did not adventure upon his prophetic office, till he got a solemn consecration after his baptism, the Holy Ghost descending upon him in a visible glory, and a voice was heard, saying, "This is my beloved son in whom I am well pleased :"
How wary ought men to be (tho' never so well gifted) before they venture upon the sacred ministry, without power given to them by CHRIST, to whom all power in Heaven and Earth was given ? He that comes upon his private spirit, and not hearing what the spirit says to the Church, gives ground to libel him with these queries : " Friend " how comest thou hither ? And how " canst thou preach except thou be " sent ? " When CHRIST JESUS, the great prophet of the world, would not go on, till he received an ordination from Heaven, to the conviction of men's senses,

sences, they seeing the Holy Ghost descend, and hearing a voice declaring that Jesus was the person that the Father sent to teach and reform the world.

The necessity of mankind stood in need of CHRIST's coming into the world, thousands of years before the fullness of time ; and when he came, it stood in need of his preaching before he entered upon the course of his ministry ; yet this his not coming sooner, being a secret in the bosom of Omniscience, who knows how to govern the world, should teach men not to take up the ministry but in CHRIST's own way, who came not into the world till the Father sent him, nor set up for a Prophet or Minister till he got commission : So likewise his Apostles whom he sent, as his father sent him, received their consecration in these words. St. John xx. 22, 23. " When he breathed on them, he said, receive ye the Holy Ghost ; whosoever's sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them, and whosoever's sins ye retain, they are retained. "

The receiving the Holy Ghost, did not signify the power of working miracles

racles, or the use of speaking the language of every country they came to ; for that was not given till fifty days after the resurrection, or ten days after the ascension : Nor did it signify the sanctifyng graces of the spirit ; for that must come by our working together with the spirit of God in the use of the means, to wit, the Word, and the Sacraments, by our own industry in working out the work of our salvation : And all Christians are obliged to have faith, hope and charity, which are the graces of the spirit.

These words then of consecration, *receive ye the Holy Ghost*, signifies a ghostly or spiritual power to teach and govern a christian corporation, to absolve penitents, to receive Jews and Heathens into their society, when instructed in the faith, and with authority to thrust stubborn offenders out of the Church ; and this power of governing by laws was to continue in the days of miracles, even over persons that had the extraordinary gifts of the Holy Ghost : So the seven who were made Deacons by the Apostles in Acts vi. 6. were by election presented before the Apostles, who laid hands on them, not

to confer the Holy Ghost upon them ; for we find they were full of the Holy Ghost before their nomination and election ; but to confer a share of the Government upon them for the exigencies of the times. And we find in Acts x. 44. 45. 46. &c. when Peter had preached to Cornelius the Centurion, and his friends, that the Holy Ghost fell upon them, to the astonishment of the Jews, who heard the Gentiles speak with tongues : We find that these very heathens were baptized with water, because they received the Holy Ghost, as well as the Jews : So we see, that the extraordinary gifts were not excepted from the law of CHRIST, which was to be a perpetual and standing ordinance in his Church. Matth. xxviii. 19. *Go teach and baptize &c.* The gift of prophecy and of tongues did not exempt persons from obeying the rules and canons of their superiors. St. Paul governing authoritatively the Churches of his own plantation, gives rules to these in Corinth, who were extraordinarily gifted ; 1 Cor. xiv. 40. and particularly to exercise their gifts decently and in order

In short then, the Apostles proved their mission from CHRIST in their own time, supplied their mortality by ordaining their cotemporaries and survivors, and they theirs, transmitting the first commission that CHRIST gave, and so on to the end of the world. Read Acts xiv. 23. Tit. i. 5. 2 Tim. i. 6. 2 Tim. ii. 2. Rev. i. 20.

It follows then, that there can be no lawful exercise of a ministerial power, but what is conveyed by Succession from the Apostles : And no man can invade this office, without incurring the guilt of Sacrilege and presumptuous usurpation ; for tho' St. Paul says of himself, 1 Cor ix. 16. *Wo unto me if I preach not the Gospel* ; yet may we say to an Invader, *Wo be to thee if thou preach the Gospel*, without a call or mission from the GOD of order : For the spirit gives no commission to break his own establishments ; such a person cannot profit the people by his usurped administration, as the Prophet, Jerem. xxiii. 32. said of the false Prophets in his days ; for, if the anger of the LORD was kindled against Uzzah, who put his hand to the Ark to save it, when the oxen in Nachon's threshing floor did shake it, and if

if the LORD smote him till he died, what judgment may not such Invaders be afraid of, when God punished Uzzah, even when there was a seeming necessity of saving the Ark ; 2 Sam. vi. 6. 7. 1 Chron. xiii. 9. 10. ? Azariah with four-score of Priests withstood Uzziah, and told him that it did not appertain to him *to burn Incense to the LORD* ; 2 Chron. xxvi. 18. So may we say to Intruders. It does not belong to you to preach or baptize ; for, as the Apostle says, Heb. v. 4. “ No man taketh this “ honour unto himself, but he that was “ called of God, as was Aaron.”

And this call from God cannot be from a giddy multitude, that follow every kind of vain doctrine, and have itching ears, taking a surfeit at ancient and wholesome truths, heaping up preachers to themselves : Of such St. Paul speaks, 2 Tim. iv. 3.

Yet such men will intrude themselves upon lawful pastors and their labours, and pretend to have come in at the door that was never opened to them, *as Satan presented himself when the Sons of GOD came together* ; Job i. 6. So do these thrust themselves into the Church, and accuse, libel, and slander

the true ministers of God's word, as the devil did Job, calling him a *Temporizer*, and one that served GOD for interest; and all this notwithstanding of the testimony that God gave of Job, for a man of honesty, integrity, and without hypocrisy.

I add no more at this time, thinking it sufficient already what I have given out of the Old Testament, to prove the Succession of the Jewish Priesthood. My next shall be of the Christian Priesthood; in the mean time I rest,

Your Humble Servant, &c.

L E T T E R I I I .

S H E W I N G

That Antients and Moderns proved the Mission of the Christian Priesthood, as well as the Faith, by Succession.

THE Post-Apostolical writers made *Succession of Bishops* to be the test, rule, and standard of a *Gospel Priesthood*

hood, and a distinguishing mark against Innovators, Hereticks, Schismaticks, Impostors, Usurpers and Upstarts ; and if this line were once broke, that which was cut off, was but like a finger separated from the body, from which it could receive neither life nor motion.

I begin with St. Irenæus Bishop of Lions, who lived in the 160th year of GOD, in several parts of his learned book against Heresies. And, first, from the 3d Book and 3d Chapter. “ We
“ can reckon those from the Apostles
“ successors, to our times, who taught
“ no such things ;” meaning the *Heresy* that he is confuting. And in that same Chapter, he says, because it was too tedious to reckon the succession of all Churches, therefore he pitches upon the succession of the most conspicuous, and most ancient, and best known Churches, founded, as he says, by the most glorious Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul ; and there he gives a catalogue of Bishops, to his own days. - Again, *lib. iii. c. 40.*

He shews, that where “ The Church
“ is, there is the Spirit ; and where the
“ Spirit is, there is the Church. They
“ defraud themselves of eternal life
“ who are not in the Church ; That

“ Church, which is founded upon the
 “ Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers.”
 Eph. iv. And speaking of the Schif-
 matics who neglect hearkening to the
 Word of God, and the use of Holy Or-
 dinances, he says, “ They are estran-
 “ ged from the truth, they wallow in
 “ error; being tossed thereby, they
 “ have one sentiment of the same thing
 “ at one time, and a different one at a-
 “ nother, as times change, and never
 “ have solid nor fixed knowledge, affec-
 “ ting rather to be triflers and players
 “ upon words, than to be the Disciples
 “ of the Truth.” And *lib. iv. c. 43.*
 “ We must obey these Priests who are
 “ in the Church, who have their suc-
 “ cession from the Apostles, and who,
 “ with the succession of Episcopacy,
 “ have received the sure Gift of truth,
 “ according to the will of the Father :
 “ As for others who cut themselves off
 “ from the principal succession, what-
 “ ever part of the world they are in,
 “ they ought to be suspected as Here-
 “ ticks, Dividers, saucy Hypocrites,
 “ Self-pleasers, doing things for gain or
 “ vain-glory; all such persons depart
 “ from the truth.”

And *lib. iv. c. 14.* speaking on Eph.
 iv. “ Of CHRIST’s giving to his Church
 “ first

“ first Apostles, then Prophets, and then
 “ Teachers, he says, Where the gifts of
 “ our LORD are, there must we learn
 “ the truth, and that is with those that
 “ have succession in the Church from
 “ the Apostles. Christ made so many or-
 “ ders in the Church for our sake, and
 “ those expound the Scriptures without
 “ hazard of misleading us.”

The next authority I produce, is from
 Tertullian, who lived in the 200th year
 of our LORD. in his Book *Of Prescrip-*
tions against Hereticks, chap. xxxii.

“ Let them (saith he), declare the o-
 “ riginal of their Churches; let them
 “ turn over, and find out the order of
 “ their Bishops, running down by suc-
 “ cession from the beginning; that this
 “ first Bishop of their's had an Apostle,
 “ or Apostolic men, that never separa-
 “ ted from the Apostles, for his founder
 “ and predecessor; for, after this manner
 “ do the Apostolic Churches make their
 “ computations, as the Church of Smyr-
 “ na has Polycarp placed there by St.
 “ John, and the Church of Rome
 “ has Clement ordained by Peter; and
 “ even as other Churches can demon-
 “ strate, who were ordained Bishops o-
 “ ver them, by those of the Apostolic
 “ succession.”

The

The next testimony is from St. Augustine, who lived in the 396th year of God, against Faustus, the Manichee.

“ Dost thou not see what weight the
 “ authority of the Catholic Church has
 “ in this matter, which being establish-
 “ ed on the most firm foundations of
 “ the Apostolic See, does endure to
 “ this very day, by the race of Bishops,
 “ succeeding one to another, and by
 “ the consent of so many nations under
 “ their government?”

Succession was the touch-stone, by which the Church examined ministerial Mission, and the doctrine of Faith that was once delivered to the Saints; and very good reason, for there is no other way: As for the Erastian, Independent, and Enthusiastick way, none have advantage of one another, and all of them are liable to unanswerable absurdities. The Church of England holds by succession, and the Presbyterian authors of the *Divine right of Church Government*, when they grappled with Independents, held by the same.

The learned Dr. Burnet, in his exposition of the twenty-third article of the Church of England, lets us see, that a Succession of Pastors ought to be in the
 Church;

Church; that this is settled by the Apostles, and must continue to the end of the world, and, P. 257. of that book, lays down the danger of men's taking this authority without a lawful vocation.

“ The argument of this from the
 “ standing rules of order, of decency,
 “ of the authority in which the Holy
 “ Things ought to be maintained, and
 “ the care that must be taken to repress
 “ vanity and insolence, and all the ex-
 “ travagancies of light and ungoverned
 “ fancies, is very clear. For, if every
 “ man may assume authority to preach
 “ and perform Holy Functions, it is cer-
 “ tain religion must fall into disorder,
 “ and under contempt: Hot-headed
 “ men, of warm fancies, and voluble
 “ tongues, with very little knowledge
 “ and discretion, would be apt to thrust
 “ themselves into the teaching and go-
 “ verning of others, if they themselves
 “ were under no government. This
 “ would soon make the public worship
 “ of God to be loathed, and break and
 “ dissolve the whole body.

“ A few men of livelier thoughts,
 “ that begin to set on foot such ways,
 “ might, for some time, maintain a lit-
 “ tle credit; yet so many others would
 “ follow

“ follow at that breach, which they had
 “ once made on public order, that it
 “ could not be possible to keep the So-
 “ ciety of Christians under any method,
 “ if this were once allowed. And
 “ therefore those, who, in their heart,
 “ hate the *Christian Religion*, and desire
 “ to see it fall under a more general
 “ contempt, know well what they do,
 “ when they encourage all those Enthu-
 “ siasts that destroy order, hoping, by
 “ the credit which their outward ap-
 “ pearances may give them, to compass
 “ that which the others know them-
 “ selves to be too obnoxious, to hope
 “ that they can ever have credit enough
 “ to persuade the world to. Whereas,
 “ those poor deluded men do not see
 “ what properties the other make
 “ of them. The morals of Infidels
 “ shew, that they hate all religions
 “ equally, or, with this difference, that
 “ the stricter any are, they must hate
 “ them the more: the root of their
 “ quarrel being at all religion and virtue.
 “ And it is certain, as it is that which
 “ those who drive it on see well, and
 “ therefore they drive it on, that if
 “ once the *Public Order*, and the *Na-*
 “ *tional Constitution* of a Church is dissol-
 “ ved,

“ ved, the strength and power, as well
 “ as the order and beauty of all religion
 “ will soon go after it: For, humanly
 “ speaking, it cannot subsist without it.”

We see then how *Succession* is the only way to prove a *lawful Priesthood*: There is no sense can be made of these words, *Lo, I am with you to the end of the world*, but by holding to *Apostolical Succession*: It is an argument of a desperate cause, when we must defend ourselves with sophistry, quibbles, and naughty subtilties: ministerial acts performed by such Self-comers and Self-senders are null and void; for these cannot be called *Workers together with GOD*, because GOD has not sent them; and he has not promised to work with those whom he has not sent: So that these false Prophets deceive, and are deceived; men's Salvation is not only uncertain, but extremely in danger. Men put a trick upon their own souls, who yet are very wary, that they be not cheated by their neighbours in a penny of their temporal interest: It is such men that Atheists, Devils, hypocritical Politicians, make use of, to overturn order, and at last the Christian Religion itself: And it is a plague of GOD upon men to be
 left

left a prey to every damnable Heresy ; especially if temporal interest be at the bottom. And it is impossible to confute the errors of Erastianism, Independency, or Enthusiasm, without holding by the Succession; and this is to hearken to the words of the Prophet, Jeremiah vi. 16. “ Stand ye in the ways and see, “ and ask for the old paths, where is “ the good way, and walk therein.”

Sir, Let me hear more frequently from you, and of the censures which friends or foes, or men of different sentiments, pass upon what is already sent to you, by,

S I R,

Your humble Servant, &c.

LETTER

LETTER IV.

P R O V I N G

Ordination of Episcopal Presbyters and Deacons in these three kingdoms, by the continued Succession of Bishops, in the Universal Church, since the days of the Apostles.

S I R,

I Have shewed the necessity of lineal and uninterrupted succession, to prove the validity of the ministerial function, and the great danger in the want of it; particularly, that the administrations of such are null and void, because God hath not sent them. With all I shew the concessions of Presbyterians, p. 3, 4, 5, of this book, *to wit*, that *Ordination handed down by Papists*, is not invalid by that conveyance.

Now I prove, that Episcopal Presbyters and Deacons, in Scotland, England, and Ireland, have Apostolical Ordination and true Mission, from Bishops succeeding to one another, since the days of the Apostles.

I begin with the year 1662, after the Restoration of King Charles II. who in that year restored Episcopacy in Scotland, all the former Bishops, under the Spotswoodian Metropolitanship, being dead, except Bishop Sydserf of Galloway.

In the foresaid year, Mr. Sharp, Mr. Lighton, Mr. Fairfoul, and Mr. Hamilton, were called up to London, and these were first ordained Deacons, after Presbyters, and afterwards consecrated by Bishop Juxon, Lord Bishop of London, in King Charles I.'s time, and afterwards translated to Canterbury in King Charles II.'s time.

This account of their Ordinations and Consecrations is given by Mr. Rogers in his history of the Restoration.

I have not the book at hand, nor can I get it among my acquaintances, but I remember that he finds fault with them, for taking Ordination at that time: because he thinks it may infer the invalidity of their Presbyterian administrations.

I am not to insist on this point: but it is certain, that several Presbyterians submitted to Episcopal Ordination, as Mr. Manton, Chaplain to Oliver Cromwell, was ordained in 1660 by Bishop Sydserf,
being

being then at London. Mr. Calamy, Mr. Burges, Mr. Fulwood, and Mr. Humphrey, received Episcopal Ordination a long time after they had performed ministerial acts in the Presbyterian way. For this, see the learned Dr. John Durrel, in his *Vindiciæ Ecclesiæ Anglicanæ*, in the 4th leaf of his answer to the Apologist's preface: that part of the book is not marked with figures, but it is in the 8th page; see also the 7th chap. page 56. And for the earnest desire of foreign Presbyterians to have Episcopal Ordination, see his 34th chap. of the same book. We find also, that Mr. Richard Baxter received Ordination from Bishop Hall, to put matters beyond doubt.

I here set down the proof of the Episcopal Clergy's Ordination from the year 1662, up to the beginning of the Reformation by Arch-Bishop Cranmer in the year 1533; and from Cranmer to St. Austin the monk, the first Arch-bishop of Canterbury, sent by Gregory the Great, in the year 568, or 566 by others. And from Gregory up to the days of the Apostles, St. Peter the Apostle of the Circumcision, and St. Paul the Apostle of the Uncircumcision.

The Succession of Bishops, and Archbishops in Britain, up to the Apostles.

- 1662 James Sharp, *Archbishop of St. Andrews*
 1660 William Juxon, *translated from London to Canterbury*
 1633 William Laud
 1610 George Abbot
 1604 Richard Bancroft
 1583 John Whitgift
 1575 Edmund Grindal
 1559 Matthew Parker
 1555 Reginald Pool
 1533 Thomas Cranmer
 1504 William Warham
 1502 Henry Dean
 1486 John Morton *Cardinal*
 1454 Thomas Bouchier *Card.*
 1452 John Hemp *Card.*
 1443 John Stafford *Card.*
 1414 Henry Chicheley *Card.*
 1396 Thomas Arundel *Lord Chancellor*
 1381 William Courtney
 1375 Simon Sudbury *Lord Chan.*
 1367 William Whitlesey
 1366 Simon Langham *Card. and Lord Chan.*
 1349 Simon Islippe
 1348 Thomas Bradwardin
 1333 John Stratford *Lord Chan.*
 1327 Simon Mepham
 1313 Walter Reynolds
 1294 Robert Winchelsey

1278 John

- 1278 John Pekham
 1272 Robert Kilwarby *Card.*
 1244 Boniface of *Savoy*
 1234 S. Edmund
 1229 Richard Wethershed
 1206 Stephen Langton *Card.*
 1193 Hubert Walter *Lord Chan. and Lord Chief Justice*
 1191 Reginald Fitz-Jocelin
 1184 Baldwin *S. Benedicti*
 1171 Richardus Monachus
 1162 Thomas Becket *Lord Chan.*
 1138 Theobaldus
 1122 William Corboyl
 1114 Rodolphus *Chief Justice*
 1039 S. Anselm
 Vacavit Sedes Annos 4.
 1070 Lanfrancus
 1052 Stigandus
 1050 Robertus Gemeticensis
 1038 S. Eadlinus
 1020 Agelnothus
 1013 Livingus
 1006 S. Elfegus
 993 Alfricus
 990 Siricius
 988 Ethelgarus
 959 S. Dunstan *Lord Treasurer*
 934 S. Odo
 924 Wolfelmus *Lord Chan.*
 915 Athelmus
 889 Pleigmundus
 871 Atheldredus
 830 Coelnothus
 829 Theogildus
 804 Wolfredus

- 791 Athelardus
 762 Lambertus
 759 Bregwinus
 740 Cuthbertus
 735 Nothelmus
 731 S. Tatwinus
 693 S. Brithwaldus
 668 S. Theodorus, *a Grecian*
 Vacavit Sedes Annos 4.
 654 S. Adeodatus, *or Deus dedit, was the first*
 Englishman that ruled this See.
 634 S. Honorius
 624 S. Justus
 619 S. Melitus
 614 S. Laurentius
 596 S. Augustinus Monachus
-

*Follows a LIST of the Bishops of
 Rome, from Gregory the Great, to
 the Apostles.*

- 590 Gregorius Magnus
 578 S. Pelagius
 573 S. Benedictus
 560 Joannes 3^{tius}
 555 S. Pelagius
 540 Vigilius
 537 S. Sylverius
 535 S. Agapetus
 532 Joannes 2^{dus}
 530 Bonifacius 2^{dus}

- 526 Fœlix *4tus*
 524 Joannes *1mus*
 514 S. Hormisda
 499 S. Symmachus
 497 Anastasius *2dus*
 492 S. Gelasius
 483 Fœlix *3tius*
 468 Simplicius
 461 S. Hilarius
 440 Leo Magnus
 432 Sixtus *3tius*
 424 S. Cœlestinus
 419 S. Bonifacius *1mus*
 417 S. Zozimus
 402 S. Innocentius
 398 S. Anastasius
 355 S. Siricius
 367 S. Damasus
 385 S. Fœlix *2dus* *vivente Liberio*
 352 S. Liberius
 337 Julius
 336 Marcus
 314 Sylvester
 311 S. Miltiades *Martyr*
 309 S. Eusebius *M.*
 304 S. Marcellus *M.*
 297 S. Marcellinus *M.*
 284 S. Cajus *M.*
 275 S. Eutychianus *M.*
 273 S. Fœlix *1mus* *M.*
 261 S. Dionysius *M.*
 260 S. Sixtus *2dus* *M.*
 257 S. Stephanus *M.*
 255 Lucius *M.*
 254 S. Cornelius *M.*
 239 S. Fabianus *M.*

- 238 S. Antherus *M.*
- 233 S. Pontianus *M.*
- 227 S. Urbanus *M.*
- 221 S. Calistus *M.*
- 203 S. Zepherinus *M.*
- 194 S. Victor *M.*
- 179 S. Eleutherius *M.*
- 175 S. Soter *M.*
- 167 S. Anicetus *M.*
- 158 S. Pius *M.*
- 154 S. Hyginus *M.*
- 142 S. Telephorus *M.*
- 132 S. Sixtus *M.*
- 121 S. Alexander *M.*
- 112 S. Euaristus *M.*
- 103 S. Anacletus *M.*
- 93 S. Clemens *M.*
- 81 S. Cletus *M.*
- 70 S. Linus
- 44 S. Peter *Apostle and Martyr, Bishop of the*
Circumcision, *and St. Paul of the Uncir-*
cumcision.

You see, Sir, what proof we have for the ministry by Apostolical Succession; and I hope, you will not say that this is the worse, because Bellarmin makes it one of the marks of a true church; for Presbyterians made Succession their plea against the Independents, as I have shown you in my first Letter: It is true, that CHRIST was the Son of God, tho' the Devil said it, and truth is the same from

from Papists mouths, as well as from Protestants.

You find in the list of the Bishops of Rome, that three and thirty of them successively died Martyrs : And that the three orders of divine institution, *to wit*, the Bishop, Priest, and Deacon, was not only at Rome, but in other places, has been proven several times by learned men. Hear what Mr. Calvin says in the 4th book of his institutions, 4th chap. at the beginning.

“ There is a threefold Ministry com-
 “ mended to us in the Scripture, and
 “ whatever Ministry was in the primi-
 “ tive Church, was distinguished into
 “ three orders : For, from the order
 “ of Presbyters, there was chosen Pas-
 “ tors and Doctors; the rest were to in-
 “ spect manners and censures : The
 “ care of the poor was committed to
 “ Deacons. St. Jerom mentions five
 “ orders in the Church, *to wit*, Bi-
 “ shops, Presbyters, Deacons, the Fi-
 “ deles or Faithful, and the Catechu-
 “ meni ; three of these were of the
 “ Clergy, the other two of the Laity.”

It is in the persons of Bishops, that the Succession of the inferior Clergy, Presbyters and Deacons, is preserved :
 and

and that three distinct names, orders and offices, were in the days of miracles and martyrdom, is clear from Anastasius, who lived in the 9th century, and from Platina, who both wrote the lives of the Popes.

We find that Euaristus, who lived in the 112th year of GOD, ordained five Bishops, six Presbyters, and three Deacons.

Alexander, who lived in 121, ordained five Bishops, five Presbyters, and three Deacons.

Sixtus or Xystus, who lived in 132, ordained four Bishops, eleven Presbyters, and eleven Deacons.

Telesephorus, who lived in 142, ordained eight Deacons, fifteen Presbyters, and thirteen Bishops; and Hyginus, his successor, ordained five Deacons, fifteen Presbyters, and six Bishops.

It is plain, then, that these holy men and martyrs should understand Apostolical practice and government, and the meaning of the Scriptures, as well (if not better), than those who live sixteen hundred years after them.

There is nothing more clear, than that this distinction was in the first
three

three centuries; for mention is made of three orders in all the Epistles of St. Ignatius, who was St. John the Apostle's scholar, *to wit*, of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; and you know that the genuine edition of these Epistles is vindicated against the sophistry that is used to support a cause, which cannot otherwise stand but by these pitiful shiftings.

Clemens Romanus, who lived in the 80th year of GOD, enumerates four orders in the Church, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, § 40. His words are,

“ To the High Priest proper offices
 “ are committed: To Priests, their
 “ proper station is assigned: Levites
 “ have their proper Ministries; and a
 “ Layman is bound by Laick precepts.
 “ Let every one of you, brethren, give
 “ thanks to GOD, living conscientiously,
 “ without transgressing the prescribed
 “ rule of his service or ministry.”

This distinction of orders and offices was not in Rome, but in other places; for the great Origin in Alexandria, in his book concerning prayers, when he has spoken of the duties common to all Christians, subjoins these words.

“ Besides

“ Besides these common and universal debts, there is a debt peculiar to these that 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 Bishops is the greatest : It is exacted by the Saviour of the whole Church, and the Bishop must smart severely for it, if it be not paid.”

Again, in the eleventh homily on Jeremiah's prophecy, he has these words ; “ More will be required of me who was a Presbyter, than of a Deacon ; more of a Deacon than of a Laick ; but he has most to account for, who has ecclesiastical principality over us, *to wit*, the Bishop.”

That *Succession* is the divine *Charter* and *Test* of the Ministry, I think is pretty clear. You will find that Eusebius, and others, reckon the Successors of the Apostles to their own time, in the four great patriarchal Churches, *to wit*, Jerusalem, Rome, Antioch and Alexandria ; of which last patriarchat, St. Jerom says, that it was a custom for the Presbyters of the place, from the days of St. Mark, downwards to Heraclas and

and Dionysius, in the time of a vacancy, to chuse one of their number, whom they stiled their Bishop; and what will this prove, that he was only a fixed Moderator? Or that their election and nomination was a consummative act? Or was there no more done in making him a Bishop, but their chusing? Was there no consecration following thereupon, by Bishops of neighbouring places? Eusebius, a Bishop in Palestine, observes no different form of consecration and ordination in Alexandria from other churches; for Anianus was ordained by St. Mark, *Euseb. Ecc. Hist. lib. 2. cap. 24.* Abilius succeeded to Anianus. *Euf. lib. 3. cap. 13.* and was ordained by St. Luke, by the traditions in the Apostolical Constitutions. Cerdon succeeded to Abilius, *Euf. lib. 3. § 24.* ordained by several Bishops that went to the city for that purpose, according to Severus Alexandrinus, contemporary with Eutychius, who lived in the ninth century. Primus succeeded to Cerdon.

This Primus lived in the days of Adrian, who in his letter to Servianus the Consul, which is inserted in the life of Saturninus, by Vopiscus a Latin
F historian,

historian, which letter was written in the year 132, giving a character of the Egyptians, he the said Adrian mentions their Patriarchs, Bishops and Presbyters.

I know it will be said, that Bishops had no diocesses, and a Bishop then was but a pastor of a single congregation. To which I answer, that it is not a diocess that makes a Bishop, more than a parish makes a Minister, but the power of ordaining and governing, preaching and administering Sacraments, and the power of the keys, whether they have diocesses or parishes. But *secondly*, it will be found, that the Apostles governed, and exercised acts of authority and jurisdiction, even in their absence, over the colonies of their own plantations: So did St. Paul, 1 Cor. v. 3. *For I Verily as absent in body, but present in spirit, have judged already, as though I were present, concerning him that has so done this deed.* Also, Col. ii. 5. and 2 Cor. xi. 28. *And besides those things that are without, that which cometh upon me daily, the care of all the Churches.* Did not St. John authoritatively govern the seven churches of Asia? And if it be enquired, How can any man govern a province

vince of so many parishes? I answer, as well as the High Priest governed the national church of the Jews: Or, as St. John and St. Paul governed the churches of their own gatherings, with their inferior clergy: as well as a King can command three kingdoms, or as Xerxes could command an army of an hundred and seventy thousand men, by his officers and inferior commanders.

If men shall still insist upon a congregational way, a local, presential and personal communion, which the Author of the *Enquiry into the Constitution and Discipline of the Primitive Church*, printed in 1692, page 26. seems to do; I answer, that the distinction of the three orders of the clergy, *to wit*, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, is as manifest as that of the Old Testament of High Priests, Priests and Levites, which order was but very low as to a worldly condition, when the Israelites were in the Wilderness; and such was the case of the primitive Christians in the first three centuries.

No doubt but these first Bishops wished for the prosperity which came afterwards to their successors in Constantine the Great's time; so that their

narrow and pinching circumstances, was no rule for posterity, more than the case of the Israelites in the Wilderness, was for their offspring in the land of Canaan, where there were considerable variations, without altering the substantial part of the Priesthood, when in the Wilderness.

That Author, (I say), page 26. who is called Sir Peter King, tells, that a diocess then was but like a parish now, and vouches St. Cyprian's authority for it, Ep. 63. § 10. p. 177. *We celebrate the Sacrament, the whole brotherhood being present.*

I have answered this and much more, in the vindication of St. Ignatius's Epistles, and I told that the Archbishop of Canterbury may say so, on every Easter day, of the whole national church of England; and I cited the learned Thomas Edward, against Mr. Clarkson, giving an instance out of *Josephus de bello Judaico, lib. 7. cap. 17.* quoted by *Eusebius, lib. 3. cap. 5.* that,

“ Three millions of Jews, legally
 “ clean, communicated with the High
 “ Priest, and partaked at the altar in
 “ the Temple of Jerusalem, tho' they
 “ approached it not in their own persons;

“ sons ; and he adds, that this was about
 “ the space of two hours, in one and
 “ the same afternoon. The inference
 “ that the said Mr. Edward makes of
 “ this, is, Let Independents show how
 “ all the males in Israel, (the women,
 “ if clean, not excepted), could person-
 “ ally communicate with the High
 “ Priest, and I will solve how all Eng-
 “ land and Wales may communicate
 “ with one Bishop, three times a year.”

Now if they would say any thing to
 their purpose, they ought not to prove,
 that some congregations had Bishops; but
 that all that had congregations under
 them were Bishops; and that there was no
 distinction betwixt a Bishop and a Presby-
 ter, as Priests and Levites, in synagogues
 among the Jews, were not High Priests.

I refer the congregational men to
 what the Presbyterians said in *Jus Re-*
gim. Eccl. printed in 1647, p. 214. who
 assert, and (in my judgment) do prove
 very pointedly, that in divers cities
 there were more congregations than
 one, particularly in Jerusalem ; p. 214.
 “ 1. From the multitude of believers
 “ in that church. 2 From the multi-
 “ tude of church officers there. 3 From
 “ the variety of languages there. 4
 “ From the manner of Christians pa-

" blic meetings in these primitive
 " times, both in the church of Jerusa-
 " lem, and in other churches ; p. 216.
 " Upon these words, Acts xxi. 20. " And
 " when they heard it, they glorified
 " God, and said unto him, Thou seest,
 " brother, how many thousands of Jews
 " there are which believe, &c." Our
 " translation (say they) seems herein
 " very defective, rendering it how ma-
 " ny thousands ; whereas it should be,
 " according to the Greek, how many ten
 " thousands ? And these myriads seem to
 " have been in the church of Jerusalem,
 " seeing it is said of them, " verse 22.
 " The multitude must needs come to-
 " gether, for they will hear that thou
 " art come." Now considering this em-
 " phatical expression, not only thou-
 " sands, myriads in the plural number ;
 " not only myriads, ten thousands in
 " the plural number ; but how many ten
 " thousands ; we cannot in reason ima-
 " gine, but there were at least three
 " ten thousands, viz. 30,000 believers,
 " and how all these should meet toge-
 " ther in one congregation, for all ordi-
 " nances, let the reader judge."

From their concession, I reason thus ;
 These thirty thousand believers, (and
 for ought we know, of many myriads,
 there

there might be an hundred thousand believers); I say the thirty thousand could make up thirty congregations; were there thirty Bishops in Jerusalem; whereas, at that time, we hear but of St. James, who was the only Bishop?

In this national church of Scotland, several Bishops had congregations, yet all the Ministers in the diocess who had congregations, were not Bishops: For every captain is a soldier, but every soldier is not a captain; every moderator is a minister, but every minister is not a moderator. Now let those, who in former times founded their divine right of church government upon Apostolical succession, (as the Authors of the divine right of church government pretended to do), prove it from the Presbytery that laid hands upon St. Timothy, with St. Paul. 1 Tim. iv. 14. and 2 Tim. i. 6. conform to the primitive Proestros, Præles or Moderator, as I have proven Succession from Bishops descending from the Apostles to our own days, and then the debate is ended; and we are both fortified against the Romish champions, who deny the Apostolical Succession of all Protestants, which I shall touch, with other things, briefly in my next to you: in the mean time I bid you a hearty farewell.

L E T T E R

L E T T E R V.

B E I N G

*An Answer to several Objections
against the former Letter.*

S I R,

I Received yours, and I give you hearty thanks for the account you give me of the late conversation you had with a mix'd company, who, upon your reading of my letters to them, gave their different sentiments. One said, that he thought all governments were alike, and that the people, especially the vulgar, were not concerned in the Clergy's disputes, if sound doctrine be preached to them; nor should (said he) Clergymen jumble the people with the notion of Succession; for all national churches cannot give the authentic registers of their descent from the Apostles, and
Clergymen

Clergymen should preach nothing but Faith and Repentance.

Another said, if a Christian, not in orders, should preach the Gospel in a heathen island, that he has a call from God to the ministry of that place, if he has proselyted, and sufficiently instructed the people in Christianity.

Again you tell me, that others who were Presbyterians gave their different sentiments : Some told, that the Presbyterians pleaded Succession, as I do acknowledge in my former letters, and do cite their own authority for it ; particularly, The divine right of church government, printed in 1647 ; so that I had nothing to say against them upon my own hypothesis and concession. Another seemed not to lay stress upon Succession, because he thought it uncertain ; for the Romanists could not condescend upon St. Peter's immediate Successors, as the Author of parochial Bishops made out, (as he thought) to a demonstration. Another said, that the church government in the first three hundred years, was Presbyterian, according to these Scottish pleaders for Presbytery ; and that the Culdees, who were the first, (at least early) Professors
of

of Christianity in Scotland, wanted Bishops ; and consequently were Presbyterians. Yea also, that the first Reformers were Presbyterian ; and therefore Presbytery was natural to Scotland.

Another (who was a moderate Episcopal man) said, that he could not come up to such rigorous measures as I laid down ; because this would unchurch all the foreign Protestants, who write very discreetly for the English Episcopacy, and could heartily submit to it : and that they had sound doctrine and worship ; and that Archbishop Spottiswood, with those that went along with him, received consecration only, without being made Priests, in England.

Another pleaded the Erastian principle ; another the Independent way. But, last of all, the Roman Catholic came in for his share, and told, that no Protestant Kirk nor Church could plead Succession ; and instanced our Apostacy in Arch-Bishop Cranmer's days, the Naig-head Ordination ; and that there were no Bishops in Queen Elizabeth's days, that could consecrate Matthew Parker, Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, who succeeded to Reginald Pool after Cranmer ;

Cranmer ; and that all the right which Parker and his Successors had, was merely Parliamentary, and not Divine nor Canonical. You therefore desire me to give you my thoughts plainly and briefly upon all, which I shall do, (if I can) to the satisfaction of the ingenuous and unprejudiced.

First then, as to the Latitudinarian way, of thinking any ministry, whether Prelacy, Presbytery or Independency, alike, if the men preach sound doctrine ; it is a very erroneous, and consequently a very dangerous, opinion ; for a principle I cannot call it, because it has no foundation either in reason or revelation ; for it opens a door to all Heresy, and to every Impostor: It is inconsistent with God's providence and CHRIST's promise: with God's providence in the governing of his kingdom of heaven upon earth, as if he had left his rational creatures without laws and rules to conduct them, in their private or public, temporal or spiritual, capacities. As also, it is inconsistent with the promise that the Saviour of the world, the great Shepherd of the flock, and the High Priest, and Bishop of our souls, made to the Apostles, his substitutes and
deputes,

deputes, namely, to be with them to the end of the world : For, as the sacraments cannot be altered in their matter, nor in their form, no more must the Apostolical Succession be left to an arbitrary looseness of the wills of those that are given to changes, and with whom none should meddle. It is as necessary for Clergymen to preach up the Apostolical Succession of the ministry, as it is to instruct the people in that fundamental article of the Creed, I believe in the Holy Catholic Church, the Remission of sins, &c. For a Church is a society of men professing the christian religion under lawful Pastors, who have power to preach, administer sacraments, and remit sins. It is as lawful for ministers to teach the people what is the true Ministry, as it is to direct them what the true Church is ; and we have our Saviour's example, instructing the woman of Samaria, St. John iv. 24. where the true Church was.

If it be necessary for the people to have the seals of the Covenant of Grace, it is necessary to have them from persons authorised to dispense the mysteries ; otherwise they are given but by

a dead hand; and tho' the vulgar be not scholars or antiquaries, yet reason tells them, that whosoever has the exercise of any office, ecclesiastic or civil, should have it from the person or persons that have power to give it; otherwise, it is an usurpation. It is natural to argue, that Ministers should make Ministers, upwards to the first institution, as they know that the monarchy of the three kingdoms is hereditary, and may know, when an invasion or usurpation makes an interruption in the Succession: after the same manner we can inform the meanest capacity, that Episcopacy has been the standing government of the Church since the Ascension of our Saviour, and the Descent of the Holy Ghost, throughout all nations; and the adversaries to that government cannot condescend on the age when Episcopacy began, or made any encroachment upon the government that CHRIST appointed in his Church to the end of the world. But, on the other hand, if we can make out when Presbytry, Independency or Erastianism, began, then it is easy to prove, that none of these come by Apostolical Succession; and consequently,

that they are not of divine right, nor are their ministerial acts of any value to the people.

If noble families prove their antiquity from their charters, we think that the ministers of the gospel should prove theirs by Apostolical Succession, which is their warrant to be faithful and lawful shepherds. And the people are concerned to know, from what hand they receive their mysteries, and their absolution, as persons in a great family, the Oeconomus or Steward, that gives them their meat in due season ; or for men to have discharges for payment of their debts ; or for a penitent rebel to have remission for High-Treason.

Is it possible, that such an universal change as Episcopacy in the Eastern and Western Churches; could surprize men in an instant ?

“ When I shall see (says a learned Au-
 “ thor) all the democracies and aristo-
 “ cracies in the world, lie down and
 “ sleep, and awake into monarchies, then
 “ will I begin to believe, that Presby-
 “ terian Government, having continued
 “ in the Churches during the Apostles
 “ times, should presently after (against
 “ the Apostles doctrine, and will of
 CHRIST),

“CHRIST), be whirled about like a stone in a masque, and be transformed into Episcopacy.”

Next, as to the plea of necessity, and the case of a learned and pious man's coming into an island, or any other place in the world, inhabited by heathens and infidels, and having instructed them in the Christian Religion, has not such a man (say some) a call from God to be an Apostle to that people, which he hath brought over to the knowledge of CHRIST, without the ceremony of an ordination, or the plea of Apostolical Succession?

I answer first, that necessity is neither the case nor the plea of the Anti-prelatists in Britain: for they judge and teach, that that party is the true government (as they think), according to scripture and primitive antiquity; and that they are obliged to oppose Imparity or Prelacy, as not agreeable to either: And though their ancestors laid claim to Succession against the Independents in 1647, in their *Jus Reg. Eccl.* yet not being able now to prove their plea, they are forced to shelter themselves with the principles which in former times they vigorously opposed,

by such arguments, as they cannot answer, when managed against them by Episcopal hands, who stuck closely to Apostolical Succession, and proved their claim by this very principle: so that it is not necessity that our Presbyterians pretend for their want of an Episcopacy, but a law for the divine right of Presbytery, and an obligation by an oath to raze and extirpate it from off the face of the earth.

As for the foreign Presbyterians, who wish they had Episcopacy, and do write very honourably of it, I say, they are under no such necessity; for if they have not fire in their own houses, they may light their candle in their neighbours. They may follow the example of the united Brethren of Bohemia, called Hussites, who, after a long and tedious war with the Romanists, were allowed by the council of Basil to have their worship in a known tongue, and the use of the Cup in the Sacrament of the LORD'S Supper; but several Hussites refusing to join in with the Romish communion, were thereupon forced to fly the mountainous places near Silesia, where they lived together in great unity, amity and piety: They be-
thought

thought themselves how to preserve a seed of the ministry, lawfully ordained by the successors of the Apostles: For this cause, they waited a long time, to see if it should please God to incline some of the Romish Bishops to break off, and then they were sure of continuing the Succession; but finding no appearance of this, they gave over hopes, and betook themselves to another expedient, which was *anno* 1467, when about seventy Presbyters, scattered throughout Bohemia and Moravia, met together, and, after several prayers and tears, besought God to direct them in that weighty case: And after having tried the will of God by lot, they went to the Waldenses. Stephanus their Bishop, having called another Bishop with some few Presbyters, declared and proved their uninterrupted Succession by Bishops from the Apostles, to that very time: The Bohemian ministers being convinced, received consecration from them, and thereby became happy instruments of preserving the Apostolical Succession in the Bohemian Church.

I have recorded the story more fully in my Divine Right of Episcopacy, p. 24, 26, 27. out of Dr. Durell, his *Vindiciæ*

Ecclesiæ Angl. cap. 34. p. 506. and from a learned and worthy-countryman of our own, in a pamphlet called, “ The Primitive Church Government, in the practice of the Reformed Church of Bohemia.”

There may be interruptions in some national Churches, and corruptions in others, but the Apostolical Succession has never failed ; so that the reformed Churches are not exposed to the necessity of making ministers of persons whom they judge to have gifts, grace, sound doctrine, and the call of the people, for want of Apostolical-Succession.

And as for the case of a pious and learned Christian Layman falling into an heathen country, which he instructs in the Christian Religion, this is no argument for him to take up the ministry at his own hand: he may teach the morals of Christianity, and devotions, but not meddle with the mysteries of Religion, the Priesthood and Sacraments.

Our blessed LORD has promised his effectual presence to be with the sacred Priesthood, and their administrations, to the end of the world, which (we are sure) he has performed from the time of his glorious Resurrection to our own days ;

days ; consequently, no pretended necessity can authorise men to take a course of ministration in the Church, which directly overturns the Apostolical Succession. The Father Almighty's providence never permitted such a necessity as should overthrow his beloved Son's promise, of being with the Christian Priesthood and their administrations, so long as mortality continued. His promises are yea and amen ; and we are sure they will never fail : For though there be many devices in a man's heart, we are sure, that the council of the LORD it shall stand, *Prov. xix. 21.* as it has done from the beginning of the promise till this very day.

In short, then, the British Presbyterians pretend no necessity ; but, on the contrary, are sworn confederates against Episcopacy, as such : And the foreign Churches need not lye under such a necessity ; they may remove it when they will : No temporary, accidental, or contingent necessity can be made a rule against the absolute necessity which God has made a perpetual standard in his Church ; for no institution of God can be taken away but by the same authority that made it divine. Divine commands

mands cannot be taken away but by divine countermands. The necessity is not forced, but chosen, affected, and of their own making; therefore let us pray God to take away the prejudice of their education, and bring them into the bosom of the Church.

The next objection is, that the nearer you come to the Apostles, the Succession is more uncertain; for example, it is disputed, whether Linus or Clemens, Cletus or Anacletus, did succeed to St. Peter, and was never yet determined. To which I answer, first, that the Presbyterians, who pleaded Succession against the Independents, were obliged to give an answer to this, if it had been then objected against them; 2. I answer, that it is not (as I told you before), diocesses that make Bishops more than parishes make Ministers, but the power of ordination and conferring commissions on the cotemporaries and survivors; for St. Peter was before them Bishop of the Circumcision, and St. Paul of the Uncircumcision; and the twelve Apostles were Bishops before they went to teach all nations; and why might not Linus and Clemens be so too, without having any encouragement from
the

the civil magistrates, who then were their persecutors, instead of appointing them Diocesses, Parishes, Salaries, Manſes and Glebes; Their caſe was but like the High-Prieſt, Prieſts and Levites in the Wilderneſs: So that you are not to argue from the ſtate of adverſity to proſperity, or from changeable circumſtances to unchangeable ſubſtantials; the one might have been ſucceſſor to St. Peter, the other to St. Paul.

Next, for the buſineſs of the Anti-Popes Anacletus and Innocent the 2d, the one at Rome, and the other at Avignon; this is a very ſenſleſs argument againſt the Apoſtolic ſucceſſion; for if both were Biſhops in any other part of the world, they had power to conſecrate or ordain Succeſſors to the Apoſtles where ever they lived; and their contentions for place did not unbishop them, more than the diſſenſion betwixt St. Paul and St. Barnabas did un-apoſtolate them: For, ſuppoſe that two Presbyters having right ordination, ſhould contend who ſhould be Miniſter of a Pariſh, having tempting emoluments, and a luſty benefice, and in their contention the one ſhould preach in the Kirk, and the other in the Kirk-yard,

yard, and both of them baptize that same day, are not both their baptisms valid for all their contentions?

Again you tell me, that one of the Presbyterians of the company said, Why any more dispute, if (according to my letter) the Presbyterians own their ministry to be founded on Apostolical Succession? I answer, that the position is true; but let them prove that they themselves have it, according to Scripture, and the universal practice of the Church, which is the best living commentary upon it, and is the surest proof for the Canon of the Old and New Testament, infant Baptism, and the observation of the LORD's day.

Then, as to their plea from the Culdees, the early Professors of Christianity without Bishops in Scotland, particularly in the Isle of Hyi, Jona or Icolmkil, it is both unreasonable and false: For *1mo.* How unreasonable is it to argue from obscure, uncertain and fabulous accounts, against the clear principles and evident practice of the universal Church, in the Eastern and Western parts thereof? *2do.* Supposing it as true as it is false, I ask, Were these Culdees without Bishops, Successors to the Apostles?

3^{to}. Are the Presbyterians now Successors to these Culdees as such? 4^{to}.

If these Monks were Presbyterians, why are not the Presbyterians Monks, according to the custom of their supposed predecessors the Culdees? 5^{to}. Either

that time of the Monks was a perfect or imperfect state of the Church. If a

perfect state, then all the Christian world over was wrong except them-

selves; which I think will take a considerable time to prove: If imperfect,

why should it be a standard, a rule, yea, or an argument for Presbyterian Go-

vernment? Samaria was converted to Christianity, and baptised by Philip the

Deacon; therefore that Church Go-

vernment should neither have Bishops nor Presbyters: Some part of the Indies

were converted to the faith by Edeusius and Frumentius, two Laymen; there-

fore these parts ought not to have Cler-

gymen: A woman is said to be the first instrument of converting the Iberians

to the faith; therefore (according to this way of arguing) it is the female

sex, and not males, nor Clergy, should govern in that part of the world. 6^{to}.

May not St. Jerom's question, in his epistle to Evagrius, Why dost thou object
to

to me the custom of one City? May it not (I say) be pertinently retorted to the Culdean Presbyterians, Why do you object to us the custom of a small Island? But *lastly*, the thing is false in matter of fact; for, upon a critical review, it will be found, that the Monasteries of these times were the schools and universities, where youth were brought up, and fitted to be put in holy Orders; and being recommended by their superiors, were ordained by proper Bishops; and they were but as those Monks in France, and other countries governed by Bishops. Whoever desires full satisfaction in this point, let him read our learned and accurate countryman's remarks upon Sir James Dalrymple his Historical Collections, with an Answer to the Vindication of the Ecclesiastical part of them, printed at Edinburgh in 1714.

I come now to another passage of your promiscuous conversation, which is, That Presbyterian Government continued for the first three hundred years in the Universal Church; which if it did, it was certainly an unsupportable grievance, when it was shaken off in an instant; and it were strange how all Europe,

Europe, Asia and Africa, should jump from Presbytry into Prelacy in one day's time, without the consent and decision of a General Assembly. What! Was there not one dog to bark? Not one watchman to give the alarm? Nay certainly, this their saying is as true, as that the watchmen about the holy grave were asleep, when CHRIST'S Disciples came and stole the body of our Saviour by night : St. Matth, xxviii. 13, 15. And it is this lie that keeps the Jews in their obstinate unbelief to this very day ; and this lie was the contrivance of the false teachers at that time : What a judgment is it, then, to be under the ministry of those that deceive, and are deceived?

I have elsewhere exposed the absurdity and falsehood of this opinion, in these following questions ; as 1mo. If Prelacy began after Presbytry, in the four hundredth year of GOD only, will it not follow that the Fathers and Councils, and the holy Writers, such as St. Augustine, St. Athanasius, St. Basil, and Eusebius, were Apostates, Blockheads, yea and Anti-Christians, in varying from the primitive model, CHRIST'S institution, and the Divine Right of Church,

Government, if it be true that Presbytry was the government of the first three Centuries? *2do.* Will it not follow, that Aeriſius, who was condemned for an Heretick, for aſſerting a parity among the Clergy, and that there was no difference betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter, that he (I ſay) was the only orthodox man in the Church, though he had not ſuch a following as St. Athanaſius, againſt the whole world, when he oppoſed the Arians? *3^{do.}* How came the Presbyters, who were an hundred times more in number than the Biſhops, not to erect a General Aſſembly, to proteſt their right againſt the General Council of Nice, conſiſting only of 318 Biſhops, and remonſtrate againſt the encroachments and uſurpations which were made upon the Divine Right of Presbytry, which (according to Scotch Presbyterians) continued for three hundred years after the Apoſtles? *4^{to.}* What ſenſe ſhall we make of CHRIST's promiſe, of being with the Apoſtles to the end of the world, if he was not with their lawful Succeſſors the Presbyters but for 300 years? And how comes the Antichriſtian Government of Prelacy, to continue above
thirteen

thirteen hundred years afterwards, without any national Church Government in the world being ever Presbyterian? 5^{to}. Will it not follow, that Old Testament Prophecies of the Ministry's being in an Imparity in the New Testament, and the Magistrates becoming a blessing in the Christian Church, have fail'd, as well as CHRIST's promise of being with his Church to the end of the world? Now, as to that of the Ministry's being one order above another, we find in *Isaiah* LXvi. 21. *And I will take of them for Priests and for Levites.* That the Priests were above the Levites is not questioned, but that the Priests had Chief Priests, is proven from *1 Chron.* xxiv. 6. *Chief of the Fathers of the Priests and Levites;* so it is in verse 31. So, *Ezra* viii. 29. *Watch ye and keep them until ye weigh them before the Chief of the Priests, and the Levites. and Chief of the Fathers of Israel at Jerusalem, in the Chambers of the house of the LORD.* So, *Neh.* xi. 14. 15. 16. There are two named Overseers, which is the same with Bishops. Next, as to the Magistrates being prophetically promised in the Old Testament, to become a blessing to the Christian

Church, is clear from *Isa. XLIX. 23.* That Kings should be nursing Fathers, and Queens nursing mothers: I say, Will it not follow, that these things have failed in the prophecies, if Parity was the true Church Government in the three first centuries; and if Prelacy came in with Constantine the Great, the first Christian Magistrate, that that Magistracy was a curse instead of a blessing? 6. Will it not follow that, in the first three centuries, the Presbyterians who refused Bishopricks in the time of persecution, and accepted of it in the time of prosperity, were temporizers, and that (as the Devil said of Job) they would not serve God for nought.

7^{mo}. Will it not follow, that Mr. Calvin was an Heretick, who said he knew no curse that was great enough for them that would refuse the Cyprianick Episcopacy? Or that Beza was mad, who counted those mad that resisted the English Episcopacy? Or that Melancthon was beside himself, when he said, "Would to God it lay in me to refuse Episcopacy; for I foresee that hereafter will grow up a greater tyranny in the Church than ever?"

As

As for that pretence, that Presbyterians were the first reformers in Scotland, and therefore they have a right to continue that government; This is of a piece with that of the Culdees, and it is both false and unreasonable; false, because there were no Presbyterians at that time, nor was ever a Presbyterian government heard of in the world before it: For, if some Priests, as John Knox, had a hand in the reformation, this did not make them the Apostles Successors; for though they had ordination in themselves by Bishops, they could not ordain Presbyters, more than persons that are baptised are commissioned to baptize others. I am surprised to read Mr. John Lauder's answer to Mr. Dodwell, in the preface of his book, called *The ancient Bishops considered*, pag. 22. 23. thus reasoning,

“ The ordained receive no more power
 “ from their ordainers, than they actual-
 “ ly intended to give them; But when
 “ the Popish Prelates ordained the Pas-
 “ tors, they never intended to give them
 “ the power of Bishops, but the power
 “ of Presbyters only; wherefore they
 “ actually received no more but the
 “ power

“power of Presbyters, when they
“were ordained.”

His answer is, “We must not think
“that intentions can alter the nature of
“things; if a person intending to give
“half a crown to a beggar, give him
“a whole crown, will the intention
“convert the crown into an half
“crown.”

To which I answer, that secret and
concealed intentions cannot alter the
nature of the thing, if the revealed in-
tention of the Church be pronounced
in the due form of words; for exam-
ple. If a wicked Priest, in compact
with the Devil, intending to baptize in
in that name, should baptize in the
name of Father, Son and Holy Ghost, is
not the Baptism valid for all this?
So I apply, that the Bishops, before
the reformation, did not ordain Priests
by their secret wills to give them the
power of ordaining others, but with
the revealed will of the Church. In-
deed, if a Bishop should be in such a
mistake, forgetting himself, and should
ordain one a Priest, whom he intended
but to ordain a Deacon, the person or-
dained is a Presbyter, notwithstanding
the mistake, and the Bishop cannot re-
tract

tract the thing that is done; but the person giving a crown to a beggar, when he intended to give but an half crown, may well call back for the other half. But Episcopal consecration was never given to John Knox, either design'dly or by a mistake: Therefore Mr. Dodwell's argument stands where it was.

But, in the next place, I still enquire, Were the first reforming Presbyterians the Apostles their successors? And can the present incumbents reckon up their succession to these Presbyters, after their settlement in a Superintendency and Book of Common-prayer?

8vo. If Presbyterian government should continue in Scotland, because Presbyters had the main hand in the reformation, (if we may believe them) then why should not Episcopacy continue in England by the same way of reasoning? And why should Presbyterians use all wit and power to extirpate the succession of the first reformers in England.

As for the moderate Episcopalian, his opinion in your mixed conversation, who said, This opinion of Succession would unchurch all foreign protestants, which

which is very uncharitable : I answer, *no*, That Succession is not an opinion, but a certain, sure and solid principle : Neither is it uncharitable ; for the judgment of charity must not clash with the judgment of certainty and discretion : For, allow them to be a diffusive Church, because they own the fundamental articles of the Creed, you can never make them a part of the representative Church ; that is, that their teachers are the Successors of the Apostles. Withall you cannot call me uncharitable, because I defend this principle ; for all the charity in the world can not make them to be what they are not : Moreover, if their Church ministry be of divine right, this will unminister ten thousand times more ministers in the Christian world than they are in number. Yea, let them take to them the Popish Hierarchy to their Presbyterian Parity, the number of Christians under Episcopacy will exceed them both. Now, to tell me that this gives a handle to the Papists, and diminishes the body of the Protestants, is not to the purpose ; for it is not party that we are contending for, but truth : I would not have the word Popery made a bugbear nor a

scar-

scar-crow, to deter men from acknowledging the good things in that Church; neither do I wish that the word Protestantism should be made like the great Diana of the Ephesians, to countenance every error that is among those that protest against Papists. This is not to hold with Papists against Protestants, but to contend for the truth; or to believe that CHRIST is the Son of God, tho' the Devil said it; for would not a Presbyterian hold with a Popish Priest, disputing against a Socinian, who denies the divinity of CHRIST? yea, and with a Turk, maintaining the absolute decree, against an Arminian? Yea, would he not hold with a Popish Priest, defending, against a Quaker, the sacraments of Baptism and the LORD's supper, to the end of the world? And do not the Socinians and the Quakers go under the name of Protestants? Yea, will not Presbyterians go in with the Jesuits, defending the privilege of the subjects to dethrone malversing Kings, against the Protestants that hold the doctrine of passive obedience and non-resistance? And why may not Episcopal Ministers hold with the Papists in the principle of Apostolical Succession? Now, to tell us that this

unchurches

unchurches the greatest part of Protestants, is not relevant; for they do unchurch themselves; and it is not reasonable to think, that charity or compliment can make them ministers who have not Apostolical Succession: for we should reason them up to us, and not humour them in their errors; especially when their fault is a thing that can be helped, as I have already made out. It is the greatest charity in the world to tell men their duty and their danger. It is truly their error that hinders the enlargement of the reformation. I find in the learned and reverend Doctor Thomas Brett, in his account of Church Government and Governors, that in the conference at Hampton-court, Pag. 38. Monsieur Rogne, who was the French Ambassador at that time, said, "That if the reformed Churches had kept the same orders among them that were in England, he was assured there would be many thousands of Protestants more there than now there are."

So that we sin against knowledge and conscience, to think them right whom we know to be in the wrong. We have a maxim, *incommodum non solvit argumentum*;

mentum; the objection from inconvenience does not solve an argument that is true in itself. If, at the beginning of the reformation, a Popish Priest should have argued against Luther and Calvin, thus; What! Is all the Christian world wrong but you, who come without miracles to prove your being sent? What Church in the world do you join with, when you skip from us? Would we think this a good argument against the reformation? Would it be a good argument against preaching the Gospel, that there is no salvation but in JESUS CHRIST, from Acts iv. 12. because, some might say, this would damn the unconverted Jews and Gentiles? Would this be uncharitable doctrine to preach, that Cheats, Oppressors, Whoremongers, and debauched persons, cannot enter into the Kingdom of Heaven; whereas it is but to warn them of their danger, and to bring them to their duty? If any, by fraud, tyranny, and many other unjust ways, has made a great estate, shall hear a sermon upon repentance, and proving that restitution of ill-gotten goods is a necessary ingredient to make repentance acceptable, if he should say with himself, restitution will
 beggar

beggar my numerous family, can this, I say, be an apology for the wretched usurer not to restore goods unjustly purchas'd? Or will it save him in the day of Judgment? If we should argue against a rigid Supralapsarian, preaching absolute reprobation, saying, That this doctrine of absolute decrees renders some desperate, and makes others become their own executioners, should this prevail with the orthodox Divine, to give over preaching sound doctrine, for all the inconveniencies that follow? So I say, that if the principle of Apostolical Succession be true and necessary, ten thousand arguments from inconveniency cannot overthrow it.

The authority the moderate Episcopalian gave in defence of his opinion, was an instance from Archbishop Spottiswood's History, that, in King James VI's time, three Scots Divines went to London, and received consecration, without being ordained Deacons or Priests, which Bishop Andrews pleaded should be done before they were consecrated, because their Scots ordination was not by Bishops. It was answered (as is said) by Archbishop Bancroft, that ordination, where Bishops could
not

not be had, must be esteemed lawful, as it was the case of foreign protestant Churches, and this reason prevail'd in the meeting. To which I answer, *1st*, That neither charity nor courtesy, nor ten thousand authorities, can make wrong right, or falsehood truth : *2dly*, That Dr. Bancroft had a much better reason, which was the thing that satisfy'd Bishop Andrews, and that was, the lesser was included in the greater ; and that Nectarius was made from a Layman Bishop of Constantinople, and Ambrose Bishop of Milan ; so that a single consecration makes a Bishop, who by his character is a Priest and a Deacon. See Heylin's history of Presbytery, Page 387. I may add, *3dly*, That this same was pretty uncanonical, and of bad consequence ; therefore the Bishops of England thought it not fit to make this a preparative, and they mended it at the consecration of Bishop Sharp.

But then they tell us, That Dr. Burnet, in his Exposition of the 23d article, acknowledges foreign Divines to be true ministers : To this I answer, *First*, Let him, or any, reconcile that with the necessity of Apostolical Succession, which I have cited from his Exposition

of the articles, Page, 27. But I give another answer to him out of the Acts of the Apostles, xii. 2. *and Herod killed James the brother of John with the sword,* 3. *And because he saw it pleased the Jews, he proceeded further to take Peter also.* I leave the application to my Reader. But you'll find, in his Exposition of that article, when he has done all he can for that successionless ministry, that his reason is no better than that of the Papists, who permit women to baptize in case of necessity.

The next thing you mention in your mix'd conversation, was the Erastians pleading for magistrates being the fountain of Ministerial or Priestly power, which is largely and learnedly confuted by the Presbyterian authors of the divine right of Church power, in the year 1647. The mediums on which they insist, from Page 82, to 96. are,

1. " The keys of the kingdom of
- " heaven were never given to the civil
- " magistrate as such ; therefore they
- " cannot be the proper subject of Church
- " government. There was full power of
- " Church government in the primitive
- " Church when no magistrate was chris-
- " tian ; yea when all magistrates were
- " persecutors of the Church ; and so far
- " from

“ from being their nursing Fathers, that
 “ they were their cruel Butchers ;
 “ therefore the magistrate is not the
 “ proper subject of this power. 3.
 “ The magistratical power, really, spe-
 “ cifically, and essentially, differs from
 “ ecclesiastical power ; therefore can-
 “ not be the proper subject of it. 4.
 “ The civil magistrate is no proper
 “ Church Officer ; therefore not the
 “ proper subject of this power. 5. The
 “ civil magistrate, as such, is not pro-
 “ perly subject to CHRIST’s mediatory
 “ kingdom ; therefore is not the re-
 “ ceptacle of Church power from
 “ CHRIST ; for whatsoever ecclesiasti-
 “ cal ordinance, office, power, or au-
 “ thority, CHRIST gives to men, he
 “ gives it as mediator, and head of the
 “ Church, by virtue of his mediatory
 “ office, and for gathering, edifying,
 “ and perfecting of CHRIST’s kingdom,
 “ which is his Church ; therefore they
 “ cannot have formal Church power
 “ from CHRIST. 6. Magistrates can-
 “ not be the proper subject of Church
 “ power, because of the absurdities
 “ that follow thereupon. As 1. Con-
 “ fusion betwixt the office of the ma-
 “ gistracy and of the ministry. 2. It
 “ 1 2 “ confounds

“ confounds the Church and Common-
 “ wealth. 3. Heathens, women, and
 “ children, might be Church governors.
 “ 4. The Church government might
 “ be monarchical in one man, &c.”

I add one thought to this, from that
 learned and pious gentleman Mr. Robert
 Nelson, his Companion to the fasts and
 festivals of the Church, Page 558.

“ That tho’ the magistrate cannot con-
 “ fer spiritual power, yet when the
 “ Church received the benefit of in-
 “ corporation and protection from the
 “ State, the Church was content to
 “ suffer some limitations to the exercise
 “ of its power, and thought herself
 “ sufficiently recompensed by the ad-
 “ vantage that accru’d to her by the
 “ incorporation.”

The foresaid learned Presbyterian au-
 thors, from the 10th to the 11th chap-
 ter of the foresaid book, shew, that the
 community, or body of the faithful,
 cannot be the receptacle of Church
 power.

“ 1. Because they have no commission
 “ from CHRIST. 2. No warrant for the
 “ exercise of the actual execution of
 “ the power of the keys. 3. They
 “ have no promise of the spirit of the
 “ ministry,

“ ministry, and gifts to that end. 4.
 “ They are nowhere in scripture coun-
 “ ted Church governors. 5. Several
 “ absurdities follow from making them
 “ Church governors. As 1. It lays a
 “ foundation for the Brownists confused
 “ democracy, and abhored anarchy;
 “ for if every member of the body be
 “ an officer, where is the organical
 “ body? and, If all be governors,
 “ where are the governed? If all be
 “ eyes, where are the feet? and, if
 “ there be none governed, where is
 “ government. 2. Hereby the com-
 “ munity or body of the faithful, even
 “ the meanest member, are vested
 “ from CHRIST with full power and
 “ authority, actually to discharge and
 “ execute all acts of order and jurif-
 “ diction, without exception; for ex-
 “ ample, to preach the word authori-
 “ tatively, dispense Sacraments, to or-
 “ dain officers, admonish offenders, ex-
 “ communicate the obstinate and incor-
 “ rigible, and to absolve penitents ”

“ 3. An absurdity cited from Mr.
 “ Baillie, Chap. 9. P. 108. his Dissuasive
 “ against Independents, is, That peo-
 “ ple will be extremely unfitted for,
 “ and unwarrantably taken from their

“ several duties, that lye upon them,
 “ in point of conscience, to discharge in
 “ their general and particular callings,
 “ in spiritual and secular matters, on
 “ the LORD’s day, and on their own
 “ days.”

“ 4. The community of the faithful
 “ being accounted the proper subject
 “ of the power of the keys, has not
 “ only power to elect, but also to or-
 “ dain their own pastors and teachers.

“ Their affirmative inference is,
 “ That CHRIST’s own officers are the
 “ proper receptacle of Church power,
 “ Chap. 11. from Page 180, to Page
 “ 195. I need not abridge their proofs,
 “ for there, and in their Appendix,
 “ in answer to some queries from the
 “ Independents, at the end of that book,
 “ they shew that the ministry came, and
 “ must come, in a series of Succession
 “ from the Apostles, and that ordinati-
 “ on is valid, tho’ it come from the
 “ Papists.”

As to the last account you give of the
 Papist, in your promiscuous company,
 who positively asserted, that there was
 no Apostolical Succession to be had in
 any protestant Church whatsoever, and
 that the Priesthood of England, that
 laid

laid the greatest claim to it, is but a mere Usurpation.

I answer, 1. That this is grounded upon a falsehood and calumny, purposely invented to bring contempt upon the reformation ; which is, that so many, as Parker, Sandys, Grindal, Horn, Juel, Scorie, &c. went to a tavern at the sign of the Naig-head in Cheap-side, a street in London, and ordained one another. This is proven, by Francis Mason and Bishop Bramhall, to be a manifest untruth ; for they produced the public registers, which Archbishop Abbot caused publish, and shew to some Priests, that made a handle of this figment, to delude their Disciples and to gain Profelytes.

2. I answer, That in Queen Mary of England's days, Bonner Bishop of London, Nicolas Heath Archbishop of York, and Thurlby Bishop of Ely, had no ordination but by protestant Bishops ; and if this was invalid, the Priests ordained by them were no Priests, and could not consecrate the Host. And if this be true, then the worship of the Host at that time was idolatrous.

3. I find other Papists, such as Cudsemius, cited by Doctor Prideaux, in his

his *Fasciculus controversiarum*, Pag. 246. printed at Oxford in 1649, acknowledge, that the Ordination and Succession of the English Church is both catholic and valid ; only that it is schismatical.

But I find, that the person who endeavours to prove the invalidity of the orders of the Church of England, insists upon other topicks, which is very solidly confuted by the learned Doctor Gilbert Burnet, in his Vindication of the ordination of the Church of England, printed *anno* 1677. His argument is, That the ministers of the Church of England are not Priests, because their form of ordination is defective ; which is thus :

Receive the Holy Ghost : whose sins thou forgivest, they are forgiven, whose sins thou retainest, they are retained ; and be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of GOD, and his holy Sacraments, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. After which, the Bishop delivers a bible to him, saying, “ *Take thou authority to preach the word, and minister the holy Sacraments in the congregation where thou shalt be so appointed.*”

from

From this he subsumes, "That by
 " the form of ordination, the power
 " of consecrating the Sacrament of
 " CHRIST's Body and Blood, is not gi-
 " ven, the words only importing a
 " power to dispense the Sacraments,
 " which any Deacon may do."

To which it is answered, That, if
 our form be the same in which CHRIST
 ordained his Apostles, we may be very
 well satisfy'd that it is good and suffici-
 ent: And that it is so, we read, St.
 John xx. 22. Besides, it is answered to
 the Papists, that we judge not any
 form so essential as to annul all ordina-
 tions that have been made by any o-
 ther; for then we should condemn the
 ordination both of the primitive Church-
 es, and of the eastern Churches at this
 day.

They cannot but acknowledge, that
 the form of giving orders in their
 Churches, was not instituted by CHRIST,
 nor received in the Church for divers
 ages, which made Pope Innocent say,
 " That the forms of ordination were
 " ordered and invented by the Church,
 " and were therefore to be observed;
 " otherwise it was sufficient in giving
 " orders, to say, be thou a Bishop, or,
 " be

“ be thou a Priest. Dr. Burnet, Page 22 ”
 So that if this be an essential defect in the English ordination, then there were no true Priests in the primitive Church for divers ages, nor at this day in the Greek Church ; yet neither of these can be acknowledged by the Church of Rome.

Page 40. He shews, that the power of consecrating the Sacraments, is very fully and formally given in our ordination, in these words, “ Be thou a faithful dispenser of the word of God, and “ of his holy Sacrament.” And that they bewray great inconsideration, that think the word *dispensing*, is barely the distributing of the sacrament, which a Deacon may do ; for dispensing is more than distributing ; and it signifies to administer the sacrament by virtue of this office, as a Steward of the mysteries of God. 1 Cor. iv. 1. And that this is the true meaning, appears from common use, which makes it more than barely to distribute, and from the declared meaning of those who use it, which is the only rule to judge of all doubtful expressions.

A second objection is, That the Church of England has no other than

a Parliamentary power. It is answered, that they who compiled the Liturgy and Ordinal, had no other power that way than what Christian Princes did give before in the like cases ; and it is known how far the civil magistrate may make laws, and give commands about sacred things. It is known what orders David and Solomon, Jehosaphat, Hezekiah and Josiah, gave in such cases, 1 Chron. xxiii. 6. xxiv. 19. 1 Kings ii. 27. 2 Chron. xvii. 7, 8, 9. xxix. 4, 5, 15, and 27. xxx. 2.

A third objection is, That we have our orders from those that were not Bishops, because they have no more power than the first protestant Archbishop of Canterbury Matthew Parker had, who was the chief, and from whom (as it were the conduit of all) jurisdiction was derived to the rest. That he had no such power and jurisdiction the Papists prove ; because they that confirmed and consecrated him, had no such power to confer upon him of themselves ; to wit :

William Barlow Bishop of Bath and Wells, afterwards elect of Chichester ; John Scorie late of Chichester, now elect of Hereford ; Miles Coverdale of Exeter,

Exeter, and John Hodgskins Bishop Suffragan; " Who were none of them
 " actual Bishops of any See, but two
 " elect only; and another quondam
 " only; and so had no actual jurisdic-
 " tion at all; the fourth only Suffragan
 " to Canterbury, and who had no jurif-
 " diction but what he had from the
 " Archbishop of Canterbury, much less,
 " authority to give him jurisdiction o-
 " ver himself, and all the Bishops in
 " the land; as the other three had no
 " power at all to give him, much less
 " so transcendent an one; because none
 " can give what he has not."

To which I answer, That the very objection from a Popish champion's pen, is enough to justify the ordinations of the Church of England: But he is disingenuous in saying, that Matthew Parker was the first protestant Archbishop of Canterbury; for Thomas Cranmer was 26 years before him, and in his time consecrations and ordinations were given to those that turned Popish in Queen Mary's days, and esteemed valid.

2. To say that none can install a Bishop in a jurisdiction above himself, is false; for, Who invests the Popes
 with

with their jurisdiction? Do not the Cardinals do it, and are they not as much the Pope's Suffragans as Hodgskins was Canterbury's?

3. If he insists upon the two Bishops being elect to other Sees, and that one of them had no See at all, let me ask, If, when St. Athanasius was banished out of Alexandria, and others thrust in his place; or when Liberius was banished out of Rome, and Fælix (whom they acknowledge a righteous Bishop) put in his place; they could have ordained Priests and Bishops, had these orders been null, because they were violently thrust out of their Sees? Certainly persecution and violence rather makes the glory of ecclesiastical functions shine more brightly, but cannot be imagined to strip them of their character, and to disable them from exercising the office of their function. P. 78.

And to tell us that these Bishops had not power from JESUS CHRIST, but from the Queen and Parliament, is false and trifling; for they gave but the civil Sanction, legal Security and Protection, to those that had their power from CHRIST by Apostolical Succession: For, does it annul the ordinations

of the Gallican Church, that it did submit to the Anti-popes at Avignon? Does it annul the ordination of the eastern Churches, that the Patriarch of Constantinople is installed by an order from the Grand Signior? P. 90.

You see, Sir, four Bishops acknowledged by the Papists to be in the days of Queen Elizabeth, and they being Bishops, had power of conferring orders by Apostolical Succession. I add to this, that the Papists, especially the Jesuits, are as great enemies to Episcopacy, particularly the primitive and protestant Prelacy, as the Presbyterians and other Sectarians can be; for they would have all the power swallow'd up into the Popedom. I read a passage of a letter out of the book, called, *Foxes and Firebrands* Part II. P. 111. and cited by Dr. Brett, P. 119. in a letter from a Popish missionary in the days of King Edward, rehearsed at large by the said Doctor, speaking of the Protestants abroad, with a design to make Edward and his heirs their chief defender; and to have Bishops as well as in England, "Which, (says he) if it come to pass that Heretick Bishops be so near, and spread abroad, Rome and the Clergy utterly fall."

So you find what a gross mistake they are in that call our protestant Episcopacy Popish, which the Papacy endeavours to ruin, and which itself would ruin the Papacy, if it had such footing abroad as it has in Britain and Ireland. Sir, I add no more, but that I continue

Your Most Humble Servant, &c.

L E T T E R VI.

Proving that Deists hate Episcopacy, as being the Support of the Christian Religion.

S I R,

I told you in my last, that though the Papists have preserved the Apostolical Succession, yet they have limited the Primitive Episcopacy too much, and are the greatest enemies to the Protestant Prelacy; otherwise the Reformation might have had greater footing through Christendom before this time of day. I must now let you know, that

the Deists, who are the greatest enemies in the world to the Christian Religion, cannot get their cause wrought in a more effectual way, than by undermining the Hierarchy. An excellent instance I have out of the Turkish Spy : The author is a person that appears a great bigot for the Alcoran, yet hates all revealed Religions alike : Vol. II. P. 186. where he shews, that there is no subverting of Christianity, till Episcopacy is first abolished.

“ The Christian Church (says he)
 “ seems to be a stately building, where-
 “ of Prelacy is the corner-stone ; if
 “ this were removed all would fall to
 “ the ground. That which they call
 “ the Hierarchy, if it could once be
 “ dissolved, or pulled down, we should
 “ soon see all Christendom laid in ruins.
 “ This Hierarchy is a gradual subordi-
 “ nation of Archbishops, Bishops, and
 “ Priests ; the inferior depending u-
 “ pon the superior, and all deriving
 “ their orders and dignities from their
 “ chief Patriarchs. These are the links
 “ which compose that chain that fastens
 “ Christendom together : Were this
 “ once broke, the united interest of
 “ Europe would soon fall to pieces.
 “ The

“ The way must be by beginning at the
 “ lowermost link ; could but the Priests
 “ be rendered independent on the Bif-
 “ hops, and on each other, it would be
 “ a fair step to the dismantling of the
 “ out-works, these Priests drawing an
 “ infinite number of people after them ;
 “ as it is apparent in Geneva, Holland,
 “ Swisserland, and other places, where
 “ they have quite abolished the order
 “ and authority of Bishops : And it is
 “ observable, that none of these fore-
 “ mentioned countries, since that time,
 “ have ever been instrumental in op-
 “ posing the victorious arms of the Ot-
 “ toman Empire ; as if, with the down-
 “ fall of Episcopacy, the charm were
 “ dissipated, which had for some ages
 “ precipitated these nations (among o-
 “ thers), to a rash and obstinate resistance
 “ of that force, which is destined by
 “ fate to conquer and reform the world.
 “ Weigh well this thought, and thou
 “ wilt find that the order of Bishops is
 “ essential and necessary to the good es-
 “ tate of Christendom ; And that the
 “ only way for the Mussulmans to un-
 “ dermine all Europe, will be to sup-
 “ plant this order, and introduce an
 “ ecclesiastical independency among

“ the Priests, by which means every
 “ one shall assume to himself, not on-
 “ ly his proper fragment of the torn
 “ dignity, but the whole fundamental
 “ power of a Bishop, taking upon him
 “ to do these offices, which, before,
 “ it was not accounted lawful for any
 “ but a mitred head to perform. Hence
 “ in time will follow innumerable in-
 “ conveniencies, distastes and broils;
 “ and perhaps as many Schisms as there
 “ are particular Priests to head them :
 “ Since every one will be apt to think
 “ himself capable of dictating to all the
 “ rest, and judge it below him to re-
 “ ceive the law from any. Thus will
 “ there be a clear stage for ambition,
 “ avarice and lust, to act their parts on;
 “ and when, by the craft of designing
 “ men, the superstition of bigots, and
 “ the easiness of the credulous, the
 “ greatest part shall be so divided, that
 “ it will be difficult to find two men
 “ of the same mind in articles of faith;
 “ it will then be easy, either by the in-
 “ telligible reasons of the Alcoran, or
 “ the more cogent arguments of the
 “ sword, to plant the true and undefiled
 “ faith in these countries.” Dr. Brett,

his Account of the Ancient Government, P. 96, &c.

Sir, This letter deserves our serious consideration; for the more you shake off Episcopacy the more near you come to Turcism; for, what a prodigious swarm of monstrous Heresies were broached in England after the revolution of 1641, Pagitt's Heresiography, and Edwards's Gangrena, abundantly testify: And there was a design then set on foot to enlarge the Protestant interest, and that was by joining in communion with the Turks, "Because," said the Projectors, "They were Orthodox in the main: For they believed in one God; they looked on CHRIST as a great Prophet; they owned the absolute decrees, and they hated Popery." This you may read in several pamphlets of the learned Dr. Lefly, and particularly in his Rehearsals. In short then consider that the Papists, Presbyterians and Deists, especially the last two, are the greatest enemies to Episcopacy; and so I bid you Farewel.

LETTER

 L E T T E R VII.

*Shewing the Defence of Episcopacy,
from the pen of a professed Enemy to
the Established Church of England.*

S I R,

THE reverend and learned Dr. Brett, P. 82, 83, &c. has furnished me with a surprising passage of a part of a gentleman's speech, in the House of Commons, upon that which was commonly called, The Root and Branch bill ; which was entitled, *An act for the utter abolishing of all Archbishops, Bishops, their Chancellors and Commissaries, Deans, Deacons and Chapters, Archdeacons, Prebendaries, Canons, and all their Under officers.* Sir E. D's Collection of Speeches, P. 63.

His

His words are these, *ibid.* P. 127.

“ They who deny that ever any such
 “ Bishops, (that is, Bishops presiding
 “ over Presbyters) were in the best and
 “ purest times, I intreat some one of
 “ them (if any such be here) to stand
 “ up and shew me, teach me, how I
 “ may prove, that there never was an
 “ Alexander at Macedon, or a Julius
 “ Cæsar, or a William the conqueror in
 “ the world. For, Sir, to me as plain it
 “ is, that Bishops-president have been
 “ the constant, permanent, and perpe-
 “ tual governors of the Church of God
 “ in all ages. And this being matter
 “ of fact, I do hope that historical
 “ proof will be sufficient adequate
 “ proof in that, which in its fact is
 “ matter of history ; but proofs here
 “ are so manifold and clear, that I
 “ borrow the free and true assertion of
 “ a worthy and learned gentleman, (Sir
 “ Thomas Aston’s Review of Epilco-
 “ pacy, P. 1.). *It may be thought want*
 “ *of will rather than want of light, which*
 “ *makes men deny the antiquity of Bishops*
 “ *in the primitive times.* “ Therefore
 “ answer not me, but answer Ignatius,
 “ answer Clemens, Tertullian, Irenæus ;
 “ nay answer the whole undisputed con-
 currence

" currence of the Asian, the European,
 " and the African Churches, all ages,
 " all places, all persons : Answer, I
 " say, all these, or do as I do, submit
 " to the sufficient evidence of a truth."
 " Again, P. 139. he says, " Parity of
 " degrees in Church Government hath
 " no foundation in holy scripture, and
 " is as absonous to reason as parity in a
 " state or family. Indeed it is a fancy,
 " a dream, a mere non-entity ; it neither
 " hath nor never had a being. If it be
 " any thing, it is absolute Anarchism,
 " and that is nothing ; for privation of
 " government is not a government."
 " And then again he shews, P. 144.
 " That a Bishop's office was perpetual,
 " not temporary, in these words : " But,
 " Sir, I have heard some among us say,
 " if then we must have a Bishop, let
 " him be like a pilot, only for a voy-
 " age ; let him be like yourself, a
 " speaker only for a Parliament. But
 " I do affirm, *ab initio non fuit sic*. Your
 " Bishop of old was not occasional, *pro*
 " *re nata*, and immediately degraded ;
 " nothing so ; but continued a fixed,
 " constant, perpetual moderator and
 " president for life, unless outed for
 " his own demerits ?"

What

What but demonstrative truth could have extorted such a speech from a declared enemy to all the Bishops in England, and a profess'd foe to the Hierarchy. I conclude then from *Jeremiah vi. 16.* *Ask for the old paths ; where is the good way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your souls : But they said, we will not walk therein.*

Adieu.

TESTIMONIES of *Fathers, and of Mr. Calvin, of the Power and Succession of Bishops.*

I Need not cite passages from St. Ignatius ; for it were almost to transcribe more than the half of his genuine Epistles, to prove the distinction betwixt Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons.

Our Lord, whose precepts we ought to revere and observe, settling the honour of the Bishop, and the state of the Church, speaks thus in the Gospel, and says unto *Peter, I say unto thee, thou art Peter,*

Peter, and upon this Rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hell shall not prevail against it; and unto thee will I give 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. From thence forwards the ordination of Bishops, and the state of the Church, has continu'd through all the changes of times and Successions, so as that the Church is founded upon the Bishops, and every act of the Church is governed by them, who are its Prelates. *Cyp. Epist. 27.*

St. *Augustine*, in his commentary on *Psal. xlv. 17. Instead of thy Fathers thou shalt have Children, whom thou mayest make Princes in all lands*; has these words; "What is the meaning of this, " *Instead of thy fathers thou shalt have* " *children?* The Apostles were sent " *as fathers* : *Instead of the Apostles,* " *sons are born to thee* ; they are made " *Bishops* : For from whence are " *these Bishops born that are now* " *in the world?* The Church herself " *calls them Fathers* ; she bare them, " *she has placed them in the seats of* " *the Fathers* : Do not then think thy-

" self

“ self deserted, because thou seest not
 “ *Peter*, because thou seest not *Paul*,
 “ because thou seest not those by whom
 “ thou wast born ; out of thine own
 “ offspring thou hast obtained a father-
 “ hood: Instead of thy Fathers, Sons
 “ are born to thee: Thou shalt make
 “ them Princes over all the earth.

“ What *Aaron* and his sons, and the
 “ *Levites* did in the Temple, this the
 “ Bishops, Priests and Deacons claim to
 “ themselves in the Church: That we
 “ may know that the Apostolical tra-
 “ ditions were taken from the Old Tes-
 “ tament, and that the safety of the
 “ Church depends on the dignity of the
 “ High Priests, to whom, if a greater
 “ and more eminent power was not
 “ given, there would be as many Schisms
 “ as Priests.” *Jerome’s Epistle to Eva-*
grius.

“ But do you think it sufficient to
 “ say, that they are Orthodox and sound
 “ in faith? Suppose they are, yet still
 “ their ordination is null and invalid ;
 “ and then what can their faith or any
 “ thing else signify ; Christians ought
 “ as earnestly to contend for valid ordi-
 “ nation, as they ought to do for their
 “ very faith itself ; for if it be lawful

“ for every pretender to consecrate,
 “ and make themselves Priests, then
 “ farewell *Altar*, farewell Church and
 “ Priesthood too.” *St. Chrysoft. Tom. 3.*
Page 822. Edit. Savil.

“ I had always a great reverence
 “ for the Bishops of your Church, to
 “ whom I gave inward reverence as
 “ as well as outward respect, and would
 “ gladly have served them in settling of
 “ the English Church ; and my judg-
 “ ment is, if we may have such an
 “ Hierarchy, in which the Bishops so
 “ excell others, that they refuse not
 “ subjection to CHRIST, but would
 “ depend upon him as their only head,
 “ and refer themselves to him ; in which
 “ they preserve brotherly communion
 “ among themselves ; that they are u-
 “ nited by nothing more than the truth ;
 “ in which case I denounce him wor-
 “ thy of all curses, who does not ob-
 “ serve such an Hierarchy with all re-
 “ verence and obedience: And I would
 “ to GOD such a Succession had con-
 “ tinued to this day ; it should easily
 “ have obtained from us the obedience
 “ that it deserves. I do account the
 “ government by Archbishops a moder-
 “ ate honour, as being within the com-
 pass,

“ pass of a man’s power to execute,
 “ which the Pope’s pretended authority
 “ is not ; and the antient Church did
 “ appoint Patriarchs and Primates in
 “ every province, as a bond to unite
 “ Bishops in concord.” *Calvin’s answer
 to Mr. Cartwright’s representation of
 Archbishops and Bishops.*

From the Spirit of *Corah, Dathan,*
 and *Abiram*, Good Lord deliver us ; amen.

F I N I S.

L 2

THE
JOURNAL
OF
THE
PROGRESS
OF
THE
HUMAN
MIND
IN
THE
NINETEENTH
CENTURY
BY
J. H. STUART

FROM THE
ORIGINAL
MANUSCRIPTS
BY
J. H. STUART

1812

1

T H E
S E C O N D P A R T
O F T H E
S U C C E S S I O N
O F T H E
P R I E S T H O O D
I N T H E
O l d a n d N e w T E S T A M E N T .

O R,

A Challenge to all that want *Episcopal Ordination*, to prove the
Validity of their Ministerial Acts.

BY ROBERT CALDER, M.A. Late.
PRESBYTER of the Suffering Church of
SCOTLAND.

JEREMIAH, xxiii. 32.

Behold I am against them that prophesie false dreams, faith
the Lord, and do tell them, and cause my people to err by
their lies, and by their lightness; yet I sent them not,
nor commanded them: Therefore they shall not profit
this people at all, faith the Lord.

St. JOHN x. 1.

Verily, Verily, I say unto you, he that entereth not by the
door into the sheep-fold, but climbeth up some other way,
the same is a Thief and a Robber.

*Would to God such a Succession had continued to this day ; it
would easily have obtained from us the obedience that it
deserves. Calv. de necess. Reformation. Part I. P. 96.*

E D I N B U R G H :

Printed for J. W I L S O N, Bookseller in the
Exchange.

T O T H E

R E A D E R.

IF the Apostolical Succession be the foundation of the Gospel Ministry to the end of the world, it naturally follows, that they who cannot prove their Ministry by this rule and standard, cannot be Ministers of JESUS CHRIST, who promised to be with the Apostles, and their successors to the end of the world: Consequently their ministerial acts must be null and void, and they cannot profit the people, being but Usurpers of the *Sacred Priesthood*, tho' they should write ten thousand volumes, and object ten thousand inconveniencies against our principles, such as unchurching all that want this Succession. It is reasonably presumed, that the government that has lasted always in the Church, is the same that was established by our Saviour, and that which is not so old as an hundred chiefs of kindred in Scotland, by some two, some three hundred of years and upwards, cannot be the government of CHRIST's institution. Yet, such is the corruption of mankind, that when pleasure and profit

fit has debauched the conscience, and got the ascendant over reason, the supreme faculty of the soul, and makes it a slave to interest against duty, it will find a thousand shifts and subterfuges to defend the cause it has espoused; so Advocates, when they plead the cause of Criminals, by many quirks and tricks in law, endeavour to bring the Pannels off. It is a sad matter that this should be among Christians, who are all bound to truth and sincerity; but it falls out (according to the Proverb), Shew me the man and I shall shew you the law: So shew them worldly interest, and they will find out scripture. So we may say, new kings new laws: We may add, new models of Church government, new glosses and new senses upon scripture, according to the changeable fashion of the times. Mr. Lacie, a ringleader of the Camisars in England, being about to set off his married wife, and to take another, pretended a call from the Spirit to ratify the deed; yea, and found scripture for it, in *Hos. i. 2.* *Go, take unto thee a wife of whoredoms.* Nothing so ridiculous or absurd but may be rendered probable by argument or reason. There was never a damnable

Herefy

Herefy but got some followers. I instance the Cainians in the second century, called after Cain, who held, that the way to be saved was to satisfy their lusts: They composed a book which they called St. Paul's Ascension to Heaven, which they filled with blasphemies, and gave out, that these were the revelations made to him, when he was rapt up to the third Heavens. They had a great veneration for *Cain, Corah, Dathan and Abiram*, the Sodomites, and particularly, for *Judas*, because his treachery occasioned the murder of **JESUS CHRIST**. Ephraim Pagit's Herefiography gives an account of most abominable Heresies that broke forth in Oliver Cromwel's days, to the great scandal of Christianity. The Independents, in 1647, in their warm disputes with the Presbyterians, gave the same names to them which Presbyterians gave to the Bishops and the Clergy, *to wit*, Brats of Anti-christ, the whore of Babylon, the Beast, and the *Man of Sin*: And the Enthusiasts, who thought that every man and woman among them was taught of God, gave out, that the order of ministers was just what the Independents called the Presbyterians. And the truth is,

Lay

Lay aside the practice of the universal Church, ancient and modern, and let men put their own sense on the scriptures, that which the Tremblers produced for themselves by the sound of the letter, was, and still is, more taking than all the scriptures which the other two parties produced for themselves. For example, That there was no need of ministers in the gospel days : That the saints should be all taught of God ; for the prophecies were to be fulfilled ; That the Spirit was to be poured out on all flesh ; That all God's people were Priests, Rev. i. 6.

I have shewed in the Preface to the first part of the Succession to the Priesthood, several methods that our enemies take to impose upon their followers ; as 1. To call Episcopacy Popery. 2. Their confidence in giving out, that the advocates for Episcopacy make a fairer show from antiquity than from canonical scripture. 3. That Bishop and Presbyter is all one in scripture. 4. That mens different opinions about Episcopacy, is an argument that there is no foundation for it. 5. That they never notice the answers given to their arguments. 6. That they argue from

an accessory against the principal; and from circumstances against substance.

7. That they never offer to prove their own ministry. There can be no arguing, says a moralist, with a man that is obstinate in his opinion; for when he has once contradicted you, his mind is barred up against all light; none but manly souls can unsay what they have said, and forsake an error when they have found themselves in the wrong.

It is not every one that has the humility of St Augustine, who is famous for his retractions, and would not stand against light, which some reckon to be a sin against the Holy Ghost; hearing they will not hear, and seeing they will not see. Heresy and Schism are works of the flesh, according to the Apostle St. Paul, and not an error of the judgment only; for it is observed, that Heresy and Schism break forth upon the prospect of some worldly design.

I charge the party I deal with as guilty of abusing, perverting, and misapplying the holy scriptures. It is in the power of their teachers, to make multitudes of the simpler sort abhor the observation of Christmas, by telling, from St. *Luke* ii. 8. That CHRIST's nativity

nativity could not be in the winter-time, because the shepherds were keeping their flocks at night ; as if all countries were alike, or as if shepherds did not so in colder countries. They seek no more against Bishops gowns or canonical garbs, than that the Pharisees wore long robes ; when it is evident, that it was pride, covetousness and hypocrisy, that our Saviour charged them with, and not their garbs. Paul left a cloak at Troas, therefore he was no Bishop, is enough to deceive the poor people ; but it is all one if it serve a turn. Mr. Richard Hollingworth, in his *Modest Plea for the Church of England*, P. 78. &c. mentions, in the time of the long parliament, several dishonest perversions of scripture, as the agreement betwixt the Garlick and Onions of Egypt, and the ceremonies of the Church of England. It were easy to fill several sheets to this purpose ; but I shall mention some few, whereby they generally abuse the people in preaching and in printing : As,

1. *St. Luke xxii. 25. The Kings of the Gentiles exercise dominion over them, &c. ver. 26. But ye shall not be so ; but he, that is greatest among*
you,

you, let him be as the younger are to the elder, and he that is Chief as he that does serve. 1 Pet. v. 5. Isa. xxvii. Matthew xx. 25. Mark x. 42.

Answ. 1. Put this Scripture in Level-
 lers mouths, the use they will make of
 it is, That there should be no govern-
 ment, civil nor ecclesiastical, supreme
 nor subordinate, among Christians, and
 that heathen Kings turning Christians,
 should abdicate their kingdoms and
 power, and level themselves with their
 subjects; which is against the common
 sense of mankind. 2. It is as imperti-
 nently applied to ecclesiastical go-
 vernment; for a parity among church-
 officers, never was in the world; for in
 the Old Testament there were High-
 priests, Priests and Levites; and Christ
 in his College was above the twelve
 and the seventy: And sure the Apostles
 governed the churches which they
 planted. 3. May not the occasion of our
 Saviour's uttering these words lead men
 to the right understanding of them?
 For two Apostles dreaming that their
 matter was to be a temporary King, or
 secular Monarch, petitioned that they
 should be next the King in his court:
 He tells them that his kingdom was of
 M another

another nature, and that they were not to govern like heathen Kings, at their will and pleasure, tho' they were to sit upon the twelve thrones of Israel: His government was for the good of his subjects, and not like some secular Princes, that governed tyrannically, making their will a law. 4. The words Chief and Greater supposes an order of superiority and subordination among them, but withal recommends humility. 5. Tho' our Saviour did not put the sword in the hands of church governors (which is the civil magistrate's office), yet he gave them the power of the keys, to receive converts, and thrust contumacious offenders out of the church, where he appointed different orders for the government thereof. 6. The libelling the Bishops for meddling in secular affairs, or for tyranny, comes very ill from those whose principle it is to dethrone Kings, and to force nations against their consciences, under pain of excommunication and forfeiture, to swear to their Covenants and engagements: such men are not displeased that the kirk should have the power of the sword and of the keys together; but it grieves them that
the

the Pope should have it, and themselves should want it.

But lastly, What can this Scripture make for Presbyterian government in a parity, when the words Chief and Greater in that same text relate to an imparity? But, in short, let those who make use of these texts against us, tell us what service it can do them? Are they the Successors of these Apostles in their ministry, or in the humility that was recommended to them by their master?

There is another Scripture they have put in the mouths of the ignorant vulgar, and that is 1 *Pet.* v. 3, 4. *Not as being Lords over God's heritage*; this they expressly set down against Lord Bishops: At this rate, the Quakers may argue against Mr. James and Mr. John, *Matth.* xxiii. 10. and so may a melancholy bigot scruple to call any man Father, from the 9th verse: Whereas, besides the common way of commenting upon the word Heritage, it may be rendered lot, portion or possession; so in the Old Testament, in the books of Joshua and Judges, it is taken, and so in the New Testament, the Apostles and their Successors the Bishops, were

Treasurers of the stock that came in to the church, by some that sold their estates, and other benevolences of the people, and this was disposed of to the Clergy and the poor, as the chief governors of the church found convenient: These who had the management of that sacred money, were not to look upon themselves as Lords or Proprietors of that stock, which was mortified for pious uses, but as Stewards answerable for their trust. *See* Dr Whitby on that place.

Another passage of Scripture they abuse, against the hierarchy, liturgy, rational rites and ceremonies, and the laws of the church, by virtue of the power which the governors have to do things in order and decently, is *Coloss. ii. 21. Touch not, taste not, handle not*; which the Apostle speaks not as his own words, but as the words of the hereticks and false teachers in his own days, who forbid the use of marriage, and of meats, as of themselves unlawful: The sound of words, without considering the sense, is enough to them: Many other Scriptures are thus perverted, to keep up faction and schism.

2. In the next place, when the holy Scriptures are thus treated, what may they not do with ecclesiastical history and Post-apostolical writers and fathers, which are not translated in all nations as the Scriptures ? Of this we have too many evidences: For what more clear than St. Ignatius's Epistles, for Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons ? What shift have they against this ? Either to deny their authority altogether, or else, as some of our countrymen do, to make them Presbyterian ? And tho' they be confuted to a demonstration, yet still, right or wrong, they are wedded to their new opinion, so as to baffle all ecclesiastical history: Is there any thing more clear than St. Cyprian, for the distinction among clergymen ? yet a Cyprianus Isotimus will make him Presbyterian, tho' Monsieur Daille acknowledges, " That it is clearer than the sun " at mid-day, from the Epistles of St. " Cyprian, That not only the offices, " but also the names of Bishop and Presbyter, were distinguished all the Roman world over."

It will appear in the following letters what use they make of St. Jerome, to no purpose, for their cause. Mr. William

Jameson will make Gregory Nazianzen, Bishop of Constantinople, plead against his own order, in these words, "Would
 " to God there were no Prelacy, no
 " prerogative of places!" Whereas the father speaks against the ambition and intrusion of Maximus, a Cynick philosopher, whom he had converted to Christianity; and most ungratefully would take his place over his head: he therefore speaks of the growing power of Bishops over one another, and not of Bishops over their own Presbyters and Deacons. See Du Pin on the life and writings of Greg. Nazianzen, and also the Author of the Answer to the Parochial Bishop. This letter of the parochial Bishop to a prelatical Gentleman, cites a sentence out of Isidorus Pelusiota on the title-page of his book, thus, "Seeing it is evident, how vast a
 " difference there is betwixt the an-
 " cient humble ministry, and the pre-
 " sent tyranny, why do you not crown
 " with garlands the lovers of parity and
 " equality?" But he leaves the reader to find this sentence in the writings of that holy and learned man, and perhaps we may read the most of all his epistles before we light on it. This wor-
 thy

thy person was a Priest of Damietta, a city in Egypt, and lived a monastic life; he was a severe censor of the abuses in his time, particularly of those that were guilty of simony, covetousness and selling of ordinations; and charges the Bishop of Damietta with these crimes, which he justly might do, and object against them the humility, self-denial and simplicity of their ancestors, without the least intimation of their being Presbyterians. But the design of Nazianzen, Querela, and of this parochial Bishop, was to make their readers believe, Gregory Nazianzen and Isidorus were Presbyterian, in their judgments; whether this be *ex inscitia aut nequitia*, out of ignorance, which is want of knowledge, or out of design, which is want of conscience and honesty, I shall not determine; but it is certain that there may be tyranny and ambition in a Presbyterian parity as much as ever was seen in a Papal hierarchy, and this kings and kingdoms have found to their sad experience.

There is another wrong handle which they make of Tertullian, who lived in the second century, and that to support themselves in extemporary prayers; which

which is, *Sine monitore quia de pectore* ;
 “ We pray without a Monitor, because
 “ from the heart.” Which is spoken
 in allusion to the heathen worship, in
 the invocation of their greater deities
 by name, repeated by the Priest, and
 by the people after him, and both had
 a Monitor or Custos that corrected them
 when they went wrong.

Or, because we pray heartily for
 long life to Emperors, without any to
 force us to it ; for so the words in that
 sentence do bear, *Oramus vitam pro-*
lixam pro imperatoribus.

Or, *thirdly*, It signifies, we go to our
 secret prayers without a prompter or
 monitor.

Fourthly, It was a worship in which
 the people did vocally join, and which
 they were acquainted with before hand,
 which is clear in another passage from
 Tertullian upon prayer. “ Our voices
 “ must be low, and we must not speak
 “ louder than is necessary.” So it is in
 our book of Common Prayer. “ I be-
 “ seech you, as many as are here present,
 “ to accompany me with a pure heart
 “ and humble voice.” All these make
 good sense.

For if the Minister did compose a
 prayer with which the people were ac-
 quainted,

quainted, or prayed extempore, still he was a monitor, prompter or rouser in devotion to them.

3. There is a third way our adversaries take, and that is to perplex and jumble the controversy with the notion they have of congregations, as the Independents, and of parishes, as the Presbyterians do; but both agree that it was without a Bishop. I have proven St. James his diocesan prelacy over the Presbyters of Jerusalem, and St. John's over the Asiatick churches, and St. Paul's over his own plantations; and surely that kind of government is presumed to be throughout the world; for the Apostles intended uniformity; *1 Cor. iv. 17. xii. 17. xi. 16*. But there were no parishes then as we have now. Parishes, according to Moreri's dictionary, were appointed by Fabianus the 21st Pope, who divided Rome among the seven Deacons, and Diocesses by Dionysius assigning a church-yard and parish to every Presbyter. Pope Marcellinus brought the number of diocesses to twenty five. The first who instituted parishes in England was Honorius, Archbishop of Dover.

"In the first ages of Christianity," says the learned Mr. William Nelson, in his
Right

Right of the Clergy of Great Britain, "there were no determinate boundaries. But when St. Peter had ordained Priests, and Cletus had ordained them to a certain number, Evaristus, who was also Bishop of Rome, assigned to each Priest his title, that is his parish, which was the place where the converts usually assembled to worship. Forty years after, Hyginus Bishop of Rome placed a Priest in every parish, and the chief of these Priests he called Cardinal Presbyters. Pope Dionysius was the first that divided the western diocesses into parishes."

"The word *Parochia*, says the same author, was by the ancient writers used in a more large and comprehensive sense; for the churches of Alexandria, Carthage, Corinth, Ephesus and Jerusalem, were called parishes; but then it was not only a particular one that was comprehended by that word, but all the towns and villages near that city, within which circuit there were many churches and congregations of Christians."

"This (saith he) appears by Eusebius, who tells us that Lætus was president at Alexandria, and of the rest of Egypt; but that the superintendency of the parishes where Lætus had the civil government,

vernment, belonged to Demetrius, who was Bishop Parochiæ, that is of the whole church of Alexandria, and was as large as the civil diocess.”

The learned Dr. Thomas Brett, in the 7th chapter of Ancient Church Government, tells us, that the church revenues throughout the whole diocess, were still collected and paid to the Bishop, by whom they were divided into four parts; which custom continued in some places to the ninth century, or longer; for in the council of Salisbury, convened *anno Dom.* 807, it was decreed (according to ancient custom) that the tythes should be divided into four parts, *viz.* one to be allotted to the Bishop, another to the Clergy, a third to the poor, and a fourth belonging to the buildings for the churches: So that then ministers were not maintained as now, by the church dues arising within the precincts where they served.

The places set apart for public worship were at first called titles, several of which were within the city itself, and others in country villages which belonged to that city, and were within the bounds of the Episcopal diocess. He tells us that, before the end of the fifth century, the Presbyters of Rome had
fixed

fixed titles, which they added to their names in subscriptions : So wrote Cælius Januarius Presbyter, Tituli Vestinæ, &c. whereas before, we find Presbyters in general called Priests of such an Episcopal church, as a Priest of Rome, Alexandria, or Antioch.

The same erroneous notion our adversaries have of the word Altar : They tell us, there was one altar in every congregation, and therefore that a Bishop could have no more under his care than as many as could conveniently hear and receive the Sacrament from him : Whereas, our Saviour and his Apostles, and their immediate Successors, retained as many of the Jewish customs as did consist with Christian liberty ; so Clemens Romanus, in his first epistle to the Corinthians, calls the Bishops, Priests and Deacons ; High-priests, Priests and Levites ; so these Presbyters and Deacons kept altars in subordination to their Bishops ; as the Jewish synagogues had altars, but in subordination to the temple, and yet all of them but one altar by the principle of unity, as well as all made but one Jewish church ; so we say, one faith, one baptism. There were two altars in the temple, and yet but one in a spiritual sense, 2 Chron. vii.

7. The two tribes, and the half tribe upon Jordan, were allowed an altar, when the children of Israel found that they intended no schism, *Josh. xxii. 22.* There were several altars in Canaan before the building of the temple, *Judges vi. 26.* We find, *1 Kings xix. 26.* the prophet complains, That the altars were thrown down.

There was then but one church in an imparity of Priesthood in old Israel, and what should change it to a parity in the new Israel, is not easy to find by scripture, reason, or the practice of the universal Church. We find the Jewish form of church government never altered under their Captains Moses and Joshua; nor under the Judges; nor under the Kings; nor in the wilderness; nor in the land of Canaan; nor did the Christian Priesthood alter under Heathen persecutors, nor under Christian patrons. It is true, we find our Scottish martyrs for the Solemn League and Covenant, left a testimony against Episcopacy; but the primitive Bishops in the days of miracles and martyrdom, died for CHRIST, never repenting of their Prelacy, looking on it as a Christian order, and not an usurpation; but they think that their Moderator makes

up the Bishop, tho' he be not the center of unity, nor the Successor of the Apostles.

4. A fourth stratagem they use, is to argue from the infancy of the church to the increase thereof, as if the same coat which served our Saviour when a child, should serve him when he came to the full stature of his manhood. When magistrates turned Christian, many things were in better case than when they were Persecutors; St. Paul wrought with his own hands: But certainly it is better now that his successors have a legal maintenance; better have cathedral and parish churches, than to have hired houses, as St. Paul, *Acts* xxviii. 31, 32. or upper rooms, or go from house to house.

5. Another device they have, is a very false way of reasoning; when we tell them of the antiquity of Bishops, they tell us, "Antiquity does not secure from error." This arguing from opinion to matter of fact, is most unreasonable; it is as if you would reason thus, Papias vented his opinion of the Millennium, therefore there was no Bishop at Jerusalem nor Alexandria, &c. Or thus, There are various disputes about civil government, some founding it in
the

the people, some in the peers, some in parliaments, others in the right of heritage; these things are uncertain; therefore it is not certain that the Prince of Orange came to England in 1688, which was known all Europe over. This, I think, any person will judge a bad argument.

6. Another false way of arguing, is casting up the privilege that Presbyters had of old; whereas many things were granted to them by permission, but never the power to ordain others: But this is not their case; Presbyters then did things *Episcopo permittente*, but now they act *Episcopo prohibente*; the one in dependence of the Bishop, the other in opposition to the Bishop.

But last of all, and the saddest of all is, their abusing the credulity of the people, men of weak judgments, strong passions, and wild fancies, keeping them in ignorance of the dreadful sin of schism, which some fathers, particularly St. Cyprian, reckons a sin against the Holy Ghost; and so St. Bernard makes three branches of that sin, *Nolle obedire, simulata Pietas, et omne Schisma*. Rebellion, hypocrisy, and Schism, from all which sins good Lord deliver us.

The

THE
SECOND PART
OF THE
SUCCESSION
OF THE
PRIESTHOOD
OF THE
Old and New TESTAMENT.

LETTER I.

S I R,

“ I Congratulate your safe return, and
I give you hearty thanks for the distinct account you give of the entertainment my last Performance on the Succession of the Priesthood met with, and the various sentiments of men about it, how it pleases some, and displeases others ; particularly because it gives offence

fence by unchurching foreign Protestants that wish well to Episcopacy : In answer to which I send you the following thoughts."

1. **T**HAT such men do not well understand the nature of offence or scandal in the Scripture stile, when they take it for provoking men to anger and displeasing them ; for very often it signifies to lay a trap, snare, or stumbling block in the way of the weak, and to pervert them from their duty : And, in this case, offence may be given, tho' not taken ; and in other cases offence may be taken and not given. They who preach schismatical or heretical doctrine to their deluded disciples, give offence to them ; and yet they are not provoked to anger, but are led into sin : *He that spareth the rod (saith Solomon) hateth the child. Prov. xiii. 24.* Here the foolish fond father gives offence to the child, and yet both are pleased, and think they love one another. The father that corrects the Child, does his duty, and gives no offence tho' the child be displeased.

And whereas it is said, That it unchurches a great body of Protestants ; I

answer as formerly, That truth will be truth tho' the Professors be never so few, and a multitude can never make error to be truth; *Multitudo errantium non parit errori patrocinium*; It is not great numbers of misled persons that can make falsehood truth, or right wrong. Let therefore the reformed Churches look to the consequence themselves; for, as the Apostle says, 2 Cor. xiii. 8. *We can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth. Illud possumus* (says the Moralist) *quod jure possumus*; *We can do that which we can do lawfully, or by an unerring rule of duty.* It is not our saying that foreign Reformers are true ministers that will make them so, if they cannot prove that they are the Successors of the Apostles; and that is the thing they cannot pretend to. I am informed, that the learned Dr. Grabb, when he examined the fundamental charter of the ministry, found that it could never be proven but by Succession, and that no reformed Church could lay claim to it but England; and therefore left Germany, his own country, and came over to England, where he lived and died in the bosom of an Apostolic Church.

Again

Again the word Protestant may deceive the simple and unwary, by the very sound of it; but wise men know, that neither Protestantism nor Popery is our religion, but Christianity only; and the definition of a Church, is a body of believers professing the Christian religion under lawful pastors. Now, lawful ministers must prove their mission immediately or mediately; immediately, none now a-days pretend to it but Enthusiasts or Semienthusiasts; and we know not what to make of them in point of reasoning; for when we think we have them, we immediately lose them: They run hither and thither, wanting a solid foundation to fix on.

Let, then, these whom I deal with at present, distinguish themselves from *Enthusiasts*, *Erastians*, or *Independents*, against whom the learned authors of *Jus Reg. Eccl.* argued most solidly, (as I have shew'd in the first part), and shew their ministry by Apostolical Succession, as they pretend, or else give over the cause, and answer the arguments of these learned Presbyterians in the 1637.

If the sound of the word Protestant catch a man by his ear, without solidity

dity in the brain, he may swallow down any Heresy that ever was condemned in the primitive ages; for Jews and Turks do protest against Papists: Enthusiasts that deny an ordained ministry, and Independents who slight Apostolical Succession, are Protestants; Socinians, that deny the divinity of our Saviour, are Protestants; Deists, who ridicule revealed religion, are Protestants; and Atheists, that mock the notion of a deity, go under the name of Protestants: So, it is very dangerous to mislead men with the name of a thing which destroys Christianity: For, as I said, neither Protestantism nor Popery is religion, but Christianity; So that the question remains still unanswered, *viz.* Whether or not they, who go under the name of ministers in the reformation, can prove that they are the Apostles Successors; because there is no other way to prove a lawful ministry?

However some of the foreign Protestants, so called, plead necessity, and wish they might have an English Episcopacy, and others pretend a divine Right of Presbytery: But the British Presbyterians abjure Episcopacy, and such are excommunicated by Calvin, and are accounted madmen by Beza.

But

But I see no ground for their pretence to necessity; for they might get an Apostolical ordination by having a consecration from England or Greece, without imposing unlawful terms of communion upon them; and this might tend much to the reformation of Christendom; but the hand of Joab makes the impediment.

I offer another thought upon this head, the unchurching of foreign Protestants, and that is, If Presbyterians be right in this debate, and Episcopalians wrong, this will unchurch twenty thousand more christians than the foreign Churches are; for it has been often told them, That let them join their Presbyterian parity with the Popish hierarchy, there are three times more Christians in the world, than Papists and Presbyterians are, and that under Episcopacy and Apostolical Succession.

Let it be also considered, that the foreign Churches have the shadow of Episcopacy, and (as Calvin says) nature abhors a parity. There is a profest Episcopacy in Denmark and Norway, and other places have Superintendents and general Superintendents, tho' they cannot lay claim to Apostolical Succession; but

but of the Succession of Sweden I shall treat hereafter.

I know it is said, that Presbyterian Churches are more charitable ; for they acknowledge the validity of Episcopal ordination, but we do not acknowledge theirs : This is like the Popish argument, That Protestants acknowledge there may be salvation had in the Popish Church, but the Papists deny that Protestants can be saved. I answer, That the consent of both parties in an opinion, is not a rule ; but Metaphysical principle and truth is the rule to steer by. The Logicians tell us, that contingent propositions may be true or false, as the matter is to which it is applied. Herod and Pontius Pilate, tho^t differing in other things, yet agreed against truth itself. It was an argument the Donatists, a sour, churlish and peevish pack of Schismatics from the Catholic Church, made use of against the Orthodox, “ That it did acknowledge the
 “ baptism of the Donatists, and did not
 “ rebaptize them ; but so did not the
 “ Donatists with them ; therefore, by the
 “ confession of adversaries, the balance
 “ was cast on their side who did re-
 “ baptize those that departed from the
 “ Catholic

‘ Catholic Church. ’ The Orthodox did not rebaptize those that came over to them from the Donatists, nor did they re-ordain their Priests, nor Novatian Priests : The reason is, because they had Apostolical Succession by Bishops.

But the argument which the Papists make use of, is not universally true on either side ; For some casuists among the Romanists do affirm, that the Rul-ticks, and the simpler sort of those in Germany, that go under the name of Hereticks, and do not err stiffly, standing out against light, cannot be formal Hereticks, because they have the Catholic faith in their baptism, which cannot be lost but by erring stubbornly. Again, several Protestants are as dogmatic as the Papists are, and affirm, “ That a man living and dying in the “ Popish principles cannot be saved. ” And Mr. Dodwell, in two letters, makes a strong doubt of it.

As for the rest of the arguments which seem to plead for Presbytery, I shall take notice of them hereafter. In the mean time I rest yours, to serve you.

L E T T E R

 L E T T E R II.

Wherein is considered the pretended Defence which Presbyterians make for their cause, out of St. Jerome, on Titus i. 5.

S I R,

I Shall first set down St. Jerome's very words, and consider whether they are of any advantage to the Presbyterian cause. The words are these, before such time as, by instigation of the Devil, factions, or parties, were made in religion, and people began to say, I am of Paul, and I of Apollos, and I of Cephas, the Churches were governed by the Common Council of Presbyters; but afterwards, when every one accounted any whom he had baptized to be his own, and not CHRIST's, it was decreed through the whole christian world

world, That one chosen out of the Presbyters should be set over the rest, unto whom the care of the Church should belong, that the seeds of Schism might be taken away. "

They do the reverend' and learned Father a great injury, that interpret this with a Presbyterian meaning; for it will appear, they make him guilty of presumption, falsehood, and gross contradiction ;

First, In asserting a thing for which he brings no proof, either from Scripture or Post-apostolical writers; for St. *Jerome*, living in the beginning of the fifth Century, affirms quite contrary to all that were before him, *to wit*, St. Clemens, St. Ignatius, and all the four centuries preceeding his time, if his meaning be Presbyterian.

Secondly, They will render him guilty of blasphemy, *to wit*, That CHRIST and his Apostles did institute a Presbyterian parity; but it was found very inconvenient, and therefore it was found expedient that Presbytery should be converted into an Episcopacy, *that is*, a government of divine right should be turn'd into one of human right, because the devil prevail'd more on Presbytery

O

than

than on Episcopacy, and that the government of CHRIST's institution was not such a fence and bulwark as the remedy that men found out afterwards ; a great reflection upon the wisdom of our Saviour and his Apostles, who could foresee the inconveniencies that should ensue upon Presbyterian government.

Thirdly, Will not this make him guilty of gross contradictions, if his meaning be Presbyterian ? Because in many places, particularly in his 85th *Epistle to Evagrius*, he asserts, " That Bishops, " Presbyters and Deacons, are in the New " Testament correspondent to High- " priests, Priests and Levites in the Old " Testament." And in that same *Epistle* he tells us, " That, from the days of " St. Mark the Apostle, the Church of " Alexandria was governed by Bishops till " the time of Dionysius and Heracles, " who succeeded to Demetrius, in the 231, " which was in the third Century." And in the forementioned *Epistle*, does he not propose the question, " What is it " a Bishop can do, but what a Presbyter " may do, except ordination ? " And, in his Dialogue with the Luciferians, he says, " The wellfare of the Church " consists in the dignity of the High-
priest

“priest, to whom, if some matchless,
 “power be not given, there will be as
 “many divisions in the Church as there
 “are Priests.”

Fourthly, Is not this a reflection upon Presbyterian government, that they themselves were forced to make Bishops, because they could not subsist without a change ; and that this was in the Apostles days, whether before or after *Timothy* was made Bishop of Ephesus, or *Titus* at Crete?

Fifthly, Is it not a reflection upon St. Jerome himself, or all the Presbyterian apologists for him, that they can never condescend upon the time, place, or persons, by whom this change was made, *throughout the whole world*, as the Father words it ? for it is certain the imparity was before the general council of Nice ; and if it was in the Apostles days, I have proven in the first part, that they kept the government of their own plantations in their own hands, and intended that their Successors should do the same.

Sixthly, If universal custom did make Episcopacy a law, and a standing government throughout the world, continuing for 1500 years, by what rule have

Presbyterians right to reverse that custom, without gathering the world together to reassume their pretended right? Are they sure to stand out against the instigation of the devil at this time, more than they did in their first institution, when they were forced to metamorphose their Presbytery into an Episcopacy? Are they sure to keep peace and unity better than in the days of the Apostles? Was it not for the better that this change was made? And if a man may pass from his own right, by what law can he recover it upon his repentance, if he do not shew the very condition upon which it was first surrendered, and the breach made upon the other side? The Hebrew servant, by the ceremony of having *his ear thrust through with an awl*, Deut. xv. 17. was to be a servant for ever. Now if Presbytery, for very good reasons, did alter itself into Episcopacy, when schisms broke forth in the church of Corinth in the days of the Apostles, and that one order above another was found to be the proper remedy for this sore disease, and this remedy did continue for 1500 years; What reason is there to alter this scheme of government, when

when we have not the Apostles alive (who had an infallible conduct) to interpose their authority, and to countermand their own decrees throughout the world?

But *lastly*, If we can fall upon a plain exposition to save St. Jerome, that great light of the church, from speaking untruths, absurdities, and inconsistencies, this deserves very well to be considered: For it is certain, he speaks not the sense of Acrius, who, in the 4th century, was condemned as an heretick, for saying that Bishops and Presbyters were all one, which is the Presbyterian opinion. His sense then can be no otherwise than this, which is agreeable to other ancients and his own expressions: "That, in the days of the Apostles, the name of Bishop and Presbyter was common, but this did not infer a parity in the church; for the Apostles were above these Bishops and Presbyters, and kept the government of the churches which they planted, in their own hands: But the church increasing, and the Apostles being near to the finishing of their course, and running out their race, they set up their Successors, to whom the name of Bishop

was peculiarly appropriate, as having the power of the Apostles over Presbyters and Deacons, and so to continue to the end of the world." This is agreeable to reason, and to the practice of the universal Church; and will make good sense of the words of St. Jerome, in his comment on Titus i. "Let Bishops know, that it is more from custom than by any appointment of our Lord, that they are superior to Presbyters."

All which may be granted without injury to the cause which we plead for; for the Father means, that this distinction was made rather by Apostolical institution and practice, than by our Saviour; which does not deny our Saviour to have been the foundation of this government; for, in the days of his humiliation, he being the virtual Church, kept all the government of his college of Apostles and Disciples in his own hand; but in that same college, there was one rank above another, to whom government and power was to be given at the resurrection, and exercised after the ascension.

I think the handle that Presbyterians make of the learned Dr. Sage's words, makes nothing to their purpose for a parity,

parity, viz. " That the twelve Apostles
 " first commission had not constituted
 " them governors of the Christian
 " Church, if their commission had not
 " been renewed after the resurrection of
 " Christ; for the Christian Church could
 " not be founded till our Lord was risen,
 " seeing it was to be founded on his re-
 " surrection."

It is clear then, that St. Jerome's words
 plead nothing for Presbyterian parity;
 for what should exempt him from the
 censure of the Church, of being con-
 demned for an heretick, more than Ae-
 rius, who, in the end of the fourth cen-
 tury, missing a Bishoprick, fell upon
 this revenge, to make himself a Bishop
 in his own opinion, because the Church
 thought him unfit for a Bishoprick?

It is acknowledged, that St. Jerome
 was a man of too warm a temper, and
 of very keen resentments when pro-
 voked; and I will not say but he had
 reason to plead for his own order of
 Priesthood, that was insulted by some
 rich Deacons, whose insolence came to
 that height, as to take precedency of
 the Presbyters; " who (as St. Jerome
 " confesses) might do any thing that a
 " Bishop did, except ordination." It
 is

is a very odd exposition that Dr. Rhind, in his *Vindication of the Kirk*, puts upon St. Jerome's words, *Excepta Ordinatione*, that is, *The ordering of the meetings*. It is plainly as senseless an interpretation as Jesuits put upon them, making the words to be an error of the printer, alledging it ought to be *accepta Ordinatione*, having gotten Ordination. But what will not men say, when they are resolved against the clearest light? If men are resolved not to look upon the light, they will close their eyes. I shall take notice of the rest of your arguments at greater conveniency. Farewel.

P O S T S C R I P T.

I Find the very learned Author of the *Brief Account of the Ancient Church-Government*, Page 201. accuse Blondel and Salmasius (the two champions for Presbytery) with partiality and breach of promise, by their appealing to St. Jerome as a patron of Presbytery, in his 85th epistle to Evagrius, citing a passage which the foresaid advocates for Presbytery think does make
for

for them, and not answering the clearest passage in it all, which makes for Episcopacy, to wit, *Ut sciamus Apostolicas traditiones*, &c. *That we may know that the Apostolical traditions are taken from the Old Testament; what Aaron and his sons, and the Levites, were in the temple, the same, Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons, should claim to themselves in the Church.*

This Blondel leaveth unspoken of, tho' he intituleth his book, *Apologia pro sententia Hieronymi*, saying he would treat of it in his sixth Section; but in his book he has only three sections. And so Salmasius (who wrote before him), in his book against Episcopacy, hath left it untouched, saying he will answer to it in his book *De Ordine Ecclesiastico*; but when he wrote that book, he forgot his promise.

 L E T T E R III.

In Answer to those that endeavour to prove the validity of the Ministerial Acts of those that want Episcopal Ordination.

S I R,

YOU desire me to say something in the case of the Jewish Church and Priesthood, as it was stated in our Saviour's time : Which seems to make very much for foreign churches, and for those that want Episcopal Ordination. For, as Dr. Burnet says in his Exposition of the 23d article, Page 382. " God had, " by express law, fixed the Priesthood " in the eldest of Aaron's family ; and " that therefore, tho', that being a theocracy, any prophet impowered of God " might have transferred this office from " one person, or branch of that family, " to

“ to another ; yet, without such an au-
 “ thority, no other person might make
 “ any such change. But after all this,
 “ not to mention the Maccabees, and
 “ all their successors of the Asmonean
 “ family, as Herod had begun to change
 “ the High-Priesthood at pleasure, so
 “ the Romans not only continued to do
 “ this, but, in a most mercenary man-
 “ ner, they set this sacred function to
 “ sale. Here were as great nullities in
 “ the High-priests that were in our Sa-
 “ viour’s time, as can be well imagined
 “ to be : For the Jews keeping their
 “ genealogies so exactly as they did, it
 “ could not but be well known in whom
 “ the right of this office rested ; and
 “ they all knew, that he who had it,
 “ purchased it ; yet these were in fact
 “ High-priests ; and since the people
 “ could have no other, the atonement
 “ was still performed by their ministry.
 “ Our Saviour owned Caiaphas, the sa-
 “ crilegious and usurping High-priest,
 “ John xviii. 22, 23. and as such he
 “ prophesied, John xi. 51. This shews
 “ that, where the necessity was real and
 “ unavoidable, the Jews were bound
 “ to think that God did, in consideration
 “ of that, dispense with his own precept.

This

“ This may be a just inducement for us
 “ to believe, that whensoever God, by
 “ his Providence, brings Christians un-
 “ der a visible necessity, of being either
 “ without all order and joint worship, or
 “ of joining in an unlawful worship ; or
 “ finally, of breaking thro’ rules and
 “ methods, in order to the being united
 “ in worship and government ; that of
 “ these three, of which one must be
 “ chosen, the last is the least evil, and
 “ has the fewest inconveniencies hang-
 “ ing upon it, and that therefore it may
 “ be chosen.”

I must say, that they are far to seek,
 who will make this a defence for the
 lawfulness of the ordination of foreign
 or British Presbyterian kirks ; for none
 of them pretend necessity, but as-
 sert the divine right of Presbytery, in
 opposition to Episcopacy, by their own
 exposition of the scriptures, contrary to
 the universal and primitive practice of
 all the churches in the world. So that
 the Presbyterians will never thank the
 champion that makes such a defence in
 their behalf. And yet, in my opinion,
 they have no better : Their predeces-
 sors (as I have cited in the first part,)
 disclaimed magistrates and people, as
 the

the foundation of the ministry, and very solidly refuted these opinions, and founded it upon Succession ; but being unable to prove their own, they must wander, or shelter themselves under the wings of Independency or Enthusiasm ; consequently their ministerial acts must be void : There is a nullity in their baptisms, and in presuming to administer the Eucharist. But, in the next place, I answer with the learned author of the *Invalidity of Lay Baptism*, in his Appendix, page 176, &c.

First, That tho' things were as the expolitor represents them concerning the Jewish Church, yet it will not follow, that the ministrations of those that cannot prove their ministry by Apostolical Succession are valid ; because the Christian Church never was, nor ever will be reduced to that state of the Jewish Church : For the supposed usurpation affected the whole church of the Jews ; because the atonement by the Jewish High-priest could only be made in that one place called the Holy of Holies, which was in the temple at Jerusalem. Even a true High-priest could not do it in any other part of the world. But the ministrations of the Christian

P
Priesthood

Priesthood are not so confined to place; they are equally valid over the face of the whole earth; so that if wicked civil powers in one country should banish or destroy Christian High-priests, the Bishops: Or, in another country, those High-priests themselves should defile God's worship, to that degree that it would endanger our salvation to join therein; yet still God's promise of being with his Apostles, his High-priests, *to the end of the world; and that the gates of hell shall not prevail against his Church,* secures us thus much, that this destruction or defection of the Christian High-priests, shall not be universal; some shall be found on earth with whom we may communicate, and from whose hands men may receive valid ordination, to minister in holy things: So that, if in one city or kingdom they are persecuted, they may flee into another; and if they are destroyed in one dominion, they may be found in another. And this in fact has been hitherto verified, from the first planting of Christianity to this day; insomuch, that no Christian Church has been reduced to that universal defection here supposed to have been in the Jewish: For even
in

in the worst times of Popery, they that reformed, without Bishops to head them, might, if they would, have procured ministers to be ordained by Greek or oriental Bishops, or by reformed Bishops in England, if their own corrupt Bishops refused to ordain them. And it is not sufficient to object, that the labour and travel, thus to obtain valid ordination, is excessive great, and in some circumstances next to impossible; for men can easily overcome these imaginary mountains of trouble and danger, in case of health, wealth, pleasure or profit; for the wonders of the deep, storms, tempests, the fear of robbers, pyrates, and merciless murderers, do not terrify them from their pursuits: And is not a valid ministry preferable to these? So that the case of the usurped Priesthood of the Jews could not be helped in any other part of the world; but so is it not in the Christian Church; for the atonement could only be made at one altar, from which, by supposition, the instituted High-priest was forcibly kept by the secular power of the Romans.

Secondly, This learned Author, in answer to Dr. Burnet's Exposition, which

says, " That God had, by an express law, fixed the High-priesthood in the " eldest of Aaron's family;" denies, that this express law is to be found in the Canon of holy Scripture; for we find the institution to have been expressly in Aaron and his sons. See *Exod.* xxviii. 1, 2, 40, 41, 42, 43. See also xl. 13, 14, 15. Again in *Lev.* xvi. we have an exact description of the atonement, and of the High-priest's ministration thereof in the holy place once a year, but not one word of Aaron's eldest son. Verses 32, 34. See *Lev.* xxi. 10. *Numb.* iii. 10. xviii. 1, 7.

It will be said to this, That God himself commanded Moses to consecrate Eleazar the eldest son of Aaron, to be High-priest instead of his father, *Numb.* xx. 25, 26, 27, and that therefore the law confined the High-priesthood to the eldest son's line.

The consequence cannot be allowed from this particular instance; because the standing law about the Priesthood is, *That it shall be in Aaron and his sons*; and there is another law concerning the very same office, that excludes the eldest, as well as any other of Aaron's sons, from that great dignity, if he should

should chance to have any impediment mentioned in that law. *See Lev. xxi. 17 to 23.* And it cannot be fairly affirmed that God would secure the eldest sons from every one of these blemishes, that they might minister before him within the veil.

Again, the scriptures record several High-priests who were not of the line of Eleazar the eldest, but of Ithamar the younger son of Aaron. For example, Eli, in the time of the Judges, *1 Sam. ii. 27, 30.* Ahimelech in the reign of King Saul, *1 Sam. xxi. 1. xxii. 15.* called also Abiathar, *Mark ii. 26.* the High-priest whom King Saul slew. So likewise another Ahimelech in the reign of King David, *2 Sam. viii. 18.* and in the reign of King Solomon Abiathar. These, it is plain, were not of the line of Eleazar; for his sons are mentioned particularly by name, *1 Chron. vi.* and not one of these High-priests is reckoned among them; yet they executed the office, and no mark of infamy is set upon them for so doing, because they were not the strangers who, by the law of Moses, were to die for coming within the veil. And certainly if they had been invaders of

the High-priesthood, God would have given us some notice of his dispensing with his own supposed law, or else some mark of his displeasure at their usurpation, to have warned others from the like sin for the future : as he did upon King Saul, for but offering a burnt-offering, when he had no authority to do so, being no Priest.

We do not see that the Priesthood was fixed in the eldest of Aaron's family ; and therefore when any other of Aaron's sons got into the High Priesthood, which required that it should be in Aaron and his sons, the essential Law of God concerning the High Priesthood was not vacated. And this was the case of the Maccabees, and all their Successors of the Asmonean family ; they were of the sons of Aaron, and therefore valid High-priests.

“ Again, says the same learned Author, the High-priests in Herod's and the Romans time, they were also of the sons of Aaron ; for notwithstanding the wickedness of setting that office to sale, Josephus assures us, that it was done with this particular regard, that these who obtained it were in Holy Orders. His words are these :”

“ Herod

“ Herod having now received the
 “ kingdom from the Romans, made no
 “ longer any scruple of choosing the
 “ High-priests out of the Asmonean
 “ race ; but conferred the honour in-
 “ differently upon persons, tho’ never
 “ so obscure provided they were but
 “ in Holy Orders.” *Book 23. Cap. 8.*

This shews, that Herod and the Ro-
 mans, as wicked as they were, had so
 much regard to the Jewish Laws, as
 not to prostitute the High Priesthood to
 any who were not of the seed of Aaron.
 And therefore it is reasonable to con-
 clude, that the High-priests in our Sa-
 viour’s time were valid High-priests.

Thirdly and lastly, says this learned
 Author, in answer to Bishop Burnet’s
 Exposition upon this point, “ The a-
 “ tonement was still preserved by their
 “ ministry ;” that is, as the Exposition
 alledges, “ The usurping Priesthood in
 “ our Saviour’s days.” That the learn-
 ed Author calls begging the question,
 affirming the thing he should have pro-
 ven, *to wit*, “ That the supposed u-
 “ surping High-priests performed not
 “ any attonement at all ” And the rea-
 son of his denying is, That if they were
 not instituted High-priests, their pre-
 tended

tended sacerdotal acts, attempting to propitiate the divine nature, were as null to that purpose, as King Saul's was before them; that is, wholly null and void. But *2dly*, Tho' they were truly High-priests, as he grants they were, yet it does not appear, that any atonement for the sins of the Jews was made by their ministration in our Saviour's time: for the people were appointed to wrath and vengeance. Our Saviour *wept over them, because, through the hardness of their hearts, the things which belonged to their peace were hid from their eyes*: So that an offering by the most regular High-priest was of no efficacy to atone for such sinners.

But Dr. Burnet goes on in defence of successionless ordination, and says, "That where the necessity was real and unavoidable, the Jews were bound to think, that God did, in consideration of that, dispense with his own precept."

To which our learned Author answers, "That this must be acknowledged in one sense, and absolutely denied in another. It must be acknowledged, that God in such real and unavoidable necessities, dispenses with his own precept;

cept; that is, does not expect us to obey it, when it is out of our power to obey it. He then dispenses with our non-ability to perform it; and so imputes not unto us the omission of it. But then it is absolutely to be denied, that in such real and unavoidable necessity, where we cannot have his positive institutions, he dispenses with them, by allowing us to commute, and put instead thereof our human institutions, to serve for the same purposes as the divine one: because it would infer that God would equalize a human institution to his own divine one. For the Jews always, when they thought and practised as the Mosaic Law directed them, reckoned that God would not, in cases of greatest necessity, allow them to substitute their own inventions in the room of his positive institutions. For thus, when they were in captivity in Babylon 70 years, they did not dare to sacrifice, because they were destitute of the temple and altar, where God had placed his name, and where the institution required his sacrifice to be offered; and to this day they give the same reason why they do not offer any material sacrifice as formerly, because they

they have not the appointed temple and altar. So that we may reasonably conclude, that when we cannot have nor obtain God's positive instructions, we must not set up our own instead thereof."

P O S T S C R I P T.

YOU see how solidly Dr. Burnet is confuted, when he has racked his wit to do the successionless cause a piece of service; and the answer given may serve to strangle all that any other can say, tho' he should have written a thousand sheets upon the head. For 1. They cannot pretend necessity. 2. They do not pretend to it; for they exalt and prefer their government to Episcopacy. 3. We find, that if God, in his providence, will have his positive institutions to perish, (which Christ promised should never be so in the Gospel Ministry) the inventions of men cannot make up that loss, or come in place thereof.

LETTER

L E T T E R IV.

The Answer Presbyterians give to the Plea of Succession, 1. That it is doctrinal, and not personal. 2. Of the concessions of learned Papists and Protestants, for the validity of Ordination by mere Priests or Presbyters.

THE ordinary answer that is given against the Apostolical Succession is, That what Fathers and Protestants meant by it, is doctrinal and not personal Succession: Which, in my humble opinion, cannot make good sense; for one doctrine does not succeed to another: We are to contend for the Faith that was once delivered to the Saints; but one faith does not succeed to another; for the faith never dies; nor does one bible succeed to another, otherwise

otherwise we might be multiplying creeds and bibles every day : But it is that same faith and doctrine taught by the Apostles that is continued in the church, by the preaching of those that are lawfully authorized by the Bishops, who are the Successors of the Apostles, whose posts and offices are preaching the word, administration of sacraments, absolving of penitents, and other ministerial acts ; I say, by Successors supplying the mortality of their predecessors, according to Christ's promise, *Matthew xxviii. Lo ! I am with you to the end of the world.*

Secondly, As to the concessions and opinions of Canonists and Schoolmen among the Papists, That the ordination of Priests without a Bishop, may be valid ; and the concession of Protestant and Episcopal Divines for the validity of the ministerial acts for foreign churches that have no Episcopal ordination, and are not the personal Successors of the Apostles, I give these following thoughts.

1. That it is not our charity, nor civility, nor the opinions of learned men, that can make those Gospel Ministers, nor their administrations valid, who are
not

not authorized by Bishops, who prove at least a presumptive Succession to the Apostles, which their opposers cannot disprove.

2. There are as learned men, and who, with greater strength of reason confute their opinions, particularly Dr. Hickes, Mr. Dodwell, and the author of *Lay Baptism invalid*.

3. They who give such concessions, do more harm than good; for it puts their readers in the belief, that a Presbyterian ministry is as good as an Episcopal in such and such circumstances, and that their administrations are as valid as if they were the Apostles Successors; and that it is needless to seek an Apostolical ordination where it may be had, as it can never be wanted, if men be willing to have it: Moreover, it makes people think Church government to be but indifferent, or ambulatory, and that it is impossible to find out what is right or wrong, or to know what is true or false; withall, it makes men entertain mistaken notions; for *charity*, says the Apostle, 1 Cor. xiii. *rejoiceth in the truth*, and not in error or falsehood. Charity must be accompanied with knowledge and reason, truth and certainty: Now,

Q

that

that the administrations of those who are the Apostles Successors, and of those who are not, shall be valid, is not consistent with reason nor revelation. It opens a door to all heresy and schism. It is not charity to soothe men in their errors; charity without truth and certainty is but stupidity. If there seem to be any harshness or bad consequences in all this, let us see at whose door the sin doth lye.

4. I answer, That the best and most learned Bishops, and foreign Presbyterians allow of Episcopal ordination; but so do not the Episcopal allow of theirs, which I have shewn, in the first letter, to be no Popish argument: I think, then, when a thing is certain on the one side, and uncertain on the other, it is reasonable to yield to the safest side, as Messrs. Burges, Baxter and Manton did, to take away all doubt, by submitting to Episcopal ordination. And so after the restoration of King Charles, in the year 1662, Messrs. Sharp, Fairfoul, Lighton and Hamilton yielded first to be diaconate, then to be presbyterate, and thirdly to be consecrated Bishops, as Roger Coke, Esq; in his *Detection of the Court and state of England in the four last reigns*,
Vol.

Vol. ii. printed in 1694. Page 121. relates: The book is wrong paged, for it has 121 twice; but the account is in the last 121st Page. And that author is somewhat displeased with that submission; because he thinks it was a virtual acknowledgement of the invalidity of their Presbyterian ministry.

5. The Presbyterian argument, from the concession of learned antagonists; Popish or Protestant, is not coming to the point, nor is the question rightly stated: For the question is, Whether or not there can be a ministry commissioned to preach and baptize, &c. that have not Apostolical Succession, which cannot be proven but by Episcopal ordination, the constant and universal practice of the Church, which is the surest living commentary on the scriptures?

6. I oppose to all the counter-concessions of the learned reformers, which may be seen in the miscellany numbers, particularly in the Appeal to Calvin's Tribunal, where the reader may see his approbation and testimony of hierarchy, liturgy and ceremonies, &c. the transcribing whereof would exceed the volume which I am printing at present; particularly in his Answer

to Mr. Cartwright's representation of *Archbishops and Bishops*, where he "denounces all curses against those who do not observe such a hierarchy with all reverence and obedience; and he accounts a government by Archbishops a moderate honour, as being within the compass of a man's power to execute. And the antient Church did appoint Patriarchs and Primates in every province, to unite Bishops in concord." See this more largely cited in the first part. See also, in the fore-said miscellany numbers, P. 61. Calvin's opinion of his ordination of Presbyters without Bishops, where he says, "It were greatly to be desired, that a continued Succession might be preserved, that the office might be delivered from hand to hand, &c."

Again, in the same 61st Page, where he gives his sentiment of the Bishops having the sole power of ordination: "And here he supposes it agreeable to Apostolical practice; for there was at Ephesus a college of Presbyters, when St. Paul ordained Timothy; and tho' the Apostle tells us of the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*, 1 Tim. iv 14. yet in another place " he

“ he mentions the imposition of no
 “ hands *but his own*, 2 Tim. i. 6. I
 “ do not understand, says he, the first
 “ place to be meant of the college of
 “ Presbyters, but of the ordination it-
 “ self, as if the Apostle had said, see that
 “ the grace of God given thee by im-
 “ position of hands, when I made thee
 “ a Presbyter, be not in vain.” St.
 Jerome said this before him. So that
 Calvin’s meaning is, *neglect not the gift*,
 (that is the office) of Presbytery, or of
 a Presbyter, *which is given to thee by*
prophecy, that is, by the spirit of dis-
 cerning *which is in me*, and by which
 I found thee a qualified and fit person
 to receive the office of a Presbyter, by
 the *laying on of my hands*.

I find Mr. George Gillespie, in his
Treatise of miscellany questions, pub-
 lished by Mr. Patrick Gillespie, printed
 at Edinburgh, anno 1649, pass his civil
 censure upon this exposition of Calvin’s,
 page 98. thus, *quandoque bonus dormitat*
Homerus. “ Sometimes the great Ho-
 “ mer takes a nap : ” Or as we say in
 a Scottish proverb, *a four-footed horse may*
snapper ; or, in English, may stumble.
 This, I think, is but a sory confutation
 Q 3 of

of Calvin's exposition, and of St. Jerome's authority before him.

I could bring in a cloud of witnesses of the reformers, as Luther and his followers; and Melancthon, who say, " Would to God it lay in me to restore
" the order of Bishops, for I foresee
" what manner of government we
" shall have, and that thereafter will
" spring up a greater Tyranny than
" ever." But.

7. *Lastly*, the learned men of Protestant Episcopalians grant their allowances with a warrant, caution and limitation, by which they strangle all the Presbyterian defences. For Bishop Downham, in his *defence of his consecration sermon*, and Mason's *defence of ordination*, page 168 to 171. Dr Field, *lib. 3. cap. 39.* and others, except some cases of necessity; such as these,
" If all the Bishops in the world were
" dead or destroyed, turn hereticks or
" persecutors of the truth, and refuse
" to ordain any that will not subscribe
" their errors; or, if some Christians
" in a desert island had no access to
" Bishops."

It is told in the preceeding letter, that the Church of God was never brought

brought to such a pass, nor never shall be; and if God will suffer his positive institutions to perish, I do not see how men can mend the matter, unless they come with extraordinary credentials to prove their mission. But the Presbyterians do not thank any man for such concessions, for they plead a divine, scriptural, apostolical and primitive right, by their own exposition of the scripture and fathers, against the practice of all antient and modern Churches in the world; and consequently these concessions fall to the ground.

I find Presbyterian authors cite several schoolmen and canonists against the divine right of Bishops, which it were tedious here to repeat; but a short answer may suffice, *to wit*, that these authors do so, to magnifie the power of the Pope, whom they account the visible head of the Church, and CHRIST'S Vicar-General upon earth, and swallow the primitive Episcopacy into the Papacy. So authors, whom Presbyterians cite in their favours, allow of one Bishop by divine right over the clergy, but the Presbyterians none at all.

But,

But, to do the Papists justice, their learned men censure such opinions as are injurious to the primitive Episcopacy, as *Franciscus a Sancta Clara, apolog. Episcop.* P. 125. cited by the learned Anonymus author of the *Brief account of the antient Church government*, page 251. The words are, "They are not
 " found to be divines but trifling law-
 " yers, who first broached and vented
 " this opinion, if we may call it an
 " opinion. The ground of this opi-
 " nion arises from the respect they
 " bear to the Apostolic See; but it
 " were greater deference to the su-
 " preme See, to search after truth, and
 " having found it to declare it, than,
 " under colour of respect to that See,
 " to belch forth new opinions unknown
 " to antiquity."

And the council of Trent, Sess. 23. Chap. 4. declares, "That Bishops are
 " true Successors of the Apostles; that
 " they are above Presbyters, and that it
 " belongs to them to confirm and to
 " confer Holy Orders." And the 6th Canon of the same Session is this, "If
 " any say that there is no hierarchy in-
 " stituted by divine appointment, which
 consists

“ consists of Bishops, Presbyters, and
 “ Deacons, let it be an anathema. ”

So we find that the authorities which
 Presbyterians cite from Papists and Pro-
 testants, can do them no service.

I could fill a volume in favours of
 Episcopacy from Presbyterian authors
 and reconcilers, as *Monsieur Daille de*
Script. Dion. and Ign. fals. attrib. lib. 2.
cap. 38.

“ It is clearer than the sun at mid-
 “ day, from such of the writings of Ori-
 “ gen as are extant, and especially from
 “ Cyprian’s epistles, that, towards the end
 “ of the third century, not only the of-
 “ fices and functions, but also the names
 “ of Bishop and Presbyter were distin-
 “ guished.” But Calvin goes a greater
 length, as I have proven in the first
 Part.

And our learned countryman Dr.
 Forbes, in his *Irenicum* tells us, “ That a
 “ church where no Bishop is, may be a
 “ church, tho’ imperfect ; ” yet in his
 second book, and 12th proposition, as-
 serts, “ That he sins against Christ, who-
 “ soever he be, Clergyman or Laick,
 “ who despises the authority of his Bi-
 “ shop, and denies obedience to the
 “ just

“just commands of these who are under the Episcopal power.”

The Reverend and learned Dr. Scott, in his *Christian Life*, vol. 2. chap. 7. page 294. speaks as much as any living did, or can do, for those that have not Episcopal Ordination. Thus, when he says, “Tho’ the instituted government of Episcopacy be necessary to the perfection of a church, yet it doth not therefore to the being of it ; for even in the Jewish Church, wherein all things were determined by divine institution, even to the minutest circumstances, there were sundry deviations from that institution, which yet did not unchurch them. It was a great deviation in them to offer sacrifice in their high places, after God had determined them to sacrifice only at the temple at Jerusalem. It was another great deviation in them, to make Priests out of other families, after God had determined them to the family of Aaron ; and yet it is certain, that neither the one nor the other did unchurch them. And if these deviations from divine institution, which were the effects of their negligence, did not yet unchurch them, it is not

“ to

" to be imagined that such deviations
 " from it as are the pure effects of ne-
 " cessity, should unchurch others.---And
 " by the same reason, whenever the
 " Divine Providence doth, by unavoi-
 " dable necessity, deprive any church of
 " its Episcopacy, it thereby, for the pre-
 " sent at least, and whilst the necessity
 " continues, releases it from the obliga-
 " tion of the institution of Episcopacy,
 " and allows it to administer its govern-
 " ment and discipline by a parity of
 " Presbyters. And therefore, so long
 " as it did not renounce the Episcopacy,
 " but still continues in communion
 " with other churches that enjoy it, it
 " ought to be looked upon, and com-
 " municated with, as a true (though a
 " maimed one) of the Church Catho-
 " lic: For the Catholic Church never
 " denied her communion to any Chri-
 " stian, or community of Christians,
 " upon any unavoidable deviation from
 " positive institution. It was without
 " doubt as great a deviation from posi-
 " tive institution for Laymen to bap-
 " tize, as for a parity of Presbyters to
 " govern, ordain, &c. and yet, in cases
 " of necessity, the Catholic Church al-
 " ways allowed the baptism of Laymen,
 " as

“as deeming baptism in itself more
 “necessary, than the administration of
 “baptism by persons in Holy Orders.”

To this it is answered in short, That what is said to Dr. Burnet in the preceeding third Letter, may suffice to invalidate what the learned Dr. Scot has written upon this head. For the parallel betwixt lay baptism in case of necessity and Presbyterian ordination will not hold; for the first does fall out when a commissioned person cannot be had to baptize, but the second does not, nor ever did, nor ever will fall out, so long as Christ's promise stands. The foreign churches and British Presbyterians may have Episcopal ordination if they will; but they think they are not exposed to that necessity, which charitable and learned authors in the Episcopal communion plead in their behalf; for they believe their own constitution more reformed from Popery than the Episcopal is, and Presbytery more scriptural and primitive than Episcopacy.

2. They who are for Lay-baptism plead necessity only, but the Presbyterians plead authority for what they do.

3. Presbyterians will not allow that Laymen should baptize in case of necessity, nor do the Doctors of the Church of England allow it; tho' it was sometimes practised about the beginning of the reformation, and allowed by others

Withall, with due defence to the learned Doctor, it is denied that ever the Catholic Church did allow of it; for they who studied the case, have found that it was a Romish corruption, and that it was opposed mightily by many in the African church; and the learned Author of the *Invalidity of Lay-baptism*, has solidly demonstrated this to be a Romish corruption, a Montanistical notion in Tertullian; and that it is not of such absolute necessity as to invade the Priestly office, but to trust the soul to God that made it, rather than transgress his positive institutions.

4. The British Presbyterians make it their business to affront, rabble, extirpate, and swear Episcopacy out of the world, as an Antichristian corruption.

5. The learned Dr. Scot will find many Divines against his opinion on this head. There is a learned anonymous Presbyter of the Church of Eng-
R
land,

land, who has written on the *Divine Right of Episcopacy*, printed in 1708, who in his preface, written by the reverend and learned Dr. George Hickes, has these words : “ As I am as much
 “ as any priest in the Church of Eng-
 “ land for fraternal correspondence with
 “ the foreign reformed churches, so I
 “ think the best use that can be made
 “ of 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 ob-
 “ blige 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 and unalienable go-
 “ vernment of the Church. I think
 “ this much more becoming the cha-
 “ rity of a Christian Bishop or Priest,
 “ than to sooth them up in their error,
 “ and devise shifts of arguments against
 “ the authority and practice of the Ca-
 “ tholic Church, to harden both their
 “ magistrates and ministers in the con-
 “ tinuance of a sinful exorbitance, which
 “ they

"they ought to repress." He concludes with the words of my Lord Chancellor Clarendon, transcribed out of an imperfect letter, written by his Lordship a little before his death at Rhoan 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 of England thought to be of the same religion with the other, whilst 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 seemed to grieve

R 2

" that

" 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 meek-
 " ness 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 con-
 " demned 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 will become
 " every true son of the Church of Eng-
 " land to have that reverence for it, as
 " not to prostitute his dignity to a com-
 " pliance with a less perfect communi-
 " on, when he is not necessitate to it.
 " It was no light reproach that Tully
 " charged upon a great part of the Ro-
 " man Senate, *Qui spem Cataline molli-*
 " *bus sentiis aluerunt, conjurationem-*
 " *que nascentem, non credendo correbora-*
 " *verunt.*

“ It had been very happy for the
 “ church, if it had suffered only by her
 “ enemies, and those who hated her,
 “ who were never numerous enough
 “ to have destroyed her : Its ruin pro-
 “ ceeded from those who wished her
 “ no harm, but thought by little com-
 “ pliances to have satisfied the desires
 “ of many men, who appeared more
 “ moderate than the rest.”

When this noble Peer was in banish-
 ment in France, he would not commu-
 nicate in that church, but kept his own
 chaplain with him ; and being advised
 to keep communion with them, for his
 own present interest and ease, and be-
 cause they were irreconcilable enemies
 to the Papists, he says, “ To communi-
 “ cate counsels with them, may possibly
 “ be at some times convenient and law-
 “ ful ; but to communicate in the sa-
 “ crament, that was instituted for the
 “ reconciliation of mankind, with them
 “ who are, and because they are irre-
 “ concilable 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.”

And being told, That his compliance would reconcile many good men to him, whereas the contrary would provoke them; he said, "This is a question
 "pertinent indeed, but can never be
 "stretched into an argument to recon-
 "cile a man, who loves himself no bet-
 "ter than I do, and who fears no new
 "misfortunes more than I do.

"I have always had a reverence for
 "old Eleazar, who would not be per-
 "suaded 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 ways to dissemble, where-
 "by many young persons might think,
 "that Eleazar being fourscore years old
 "and ten, was now gone to a strange
 "religion, and so through my hypocri-
 "sy should be deceived by me, and I
 "get a stain in my old age, and make
 "it abominable." 2 *Maccabees* vii. 24,
 25, &c.

I wish this noble Peer of famous me-
 mory, had many more neighbours of
 the

the Clergy and Laity, of his principle and practice.

6. The learned Dr. Scot has, in the fore-cited place, page 296. said as much as can confute all the defences he makes for foreign Churches, thus :

“ Tho’ a community of Christians
 “ may be a true part of the Catholic
 “ Church, and in communion with it,
 “ tho’ it have no Episcopacy, yet it is a
 “ plain case, that if it rejects the Epis-
 “ pacy, and separates from the commu-
 “ nion of it. it thereby wholly divides
 “ itself from the communion of the
 “ Catholic Church : For whether Epis-
 “ copacy be of divine institution or no,
 “ this is matter of fact granted on all
 “ hands, that, for twelve hundred years
 “ at least, all these churches into which
 “ the Catholic Church hath been distri-
 “ buted, have been subject to Episcopal
 “ government and discipline; and there-
 “ fore they who now separate them-
 “ selves from Episcopal communion, as
 “ such, must in so doing separate them-
 “ selves from the communion of all
 “ churches for twelve hundred years
 “ together; and then either all these
 “ churches must be out of communion
 “ with the Catholic Church, and con-
 “ sequently,

“ frequently, during all that time, there
 “ must be no such thing as a visible
 “ Catholic Church upon earth, or else
 “ these communities of Christians which
 “ separate from all these churches, must
 “ be schism and separation from the
 “ Catholic Church.”

7. *Lastly.* Think upon this, That the answering of Dr. Burnet, and of Dr. Scot, is as good as if ten thousand were answered upon the same subject; for it is not the opinion of judicious men, but the reasons which they give that should be convincing; but we find that other learned men dissenting from them, give stronger reasons, and this should cast the balance, and end the debate. Adieu.

P O S T S C R I P T.

BEcause people make a handle of the concessions given on both sides, I shall here present you with Mons. le Moyn, professor of divinity at Leyden, his letter written to the Bishop of London in the year 1680. It is one of the three letters annexed to Stillingfleet's *Unreasonableness of Separation*. The other two are by Mons de'l Angle,
 and

and Mons. Claude. The passage I cite out of Le Moyn's letter follows.

“ For Episcopal government, what is
 “ there in it that is dangerous, or may
 “ reasonably alarm men's consciences?
 “ And if this be capable of depriving
 “ us of eternal glory, and shutting the
 “ gates of heaven, who was it that en-
 “ tered there for the space of fifteen
 “ hundred years, since, for all that time,
 “ all churches in the world had no o-
 “ ther kind of government? If it were
 “ contrary to the truth, and attainment
 “ of eternal happiness, is it credible
 “ that God had so highly approved of
 “ it, and permitted his church to be ty-
 “ rannized over by it for so many ages?
 “ For who was it that governed it? Who
 “ was it did make up its councils as well
 “ general as particular? Who was it
 “ that combated the heresies with which
 “ it hath been at all times assaulted?
 “ Was it not the Bishops? And is it not
 “ to their wise conduct, to which, next
 “ under God, his word is beholden for
 “ its victories and triumphs? And, not
 “ to go back so far as the birth and in-
 “ fancy of the church, Who was it that
 “ in the last age delivered England from
 “ the error in which she was envelo-
 “ ped?

"ped? Who was it that made the
 "to rise there so miraculously ag
 "Was it not the zeal and constanc
 "the Bishops and their ministry,
 "disengaged the English from the
 "pression under which they had gr
 "ed so long? And did not their exan
 "powerfully help forward the re
 "mation of all Europe?"

Again, near to the end of his le
 he writes thus ;

"For, to speak the truth, I do not
 "that their meetings" (meaning t
 of the English dissenters) "are of
 "great use, or that one may be r
 "comforted there, than in Episc
 "Churches: When I was at Lon
 "almost five years ago, I went to
 "verals of their private Assemblies
 "see what way they took for the
 "struction of the people, and pre
 "ing of the word of God ; b
 "profess, I was not at all edified b
 "I heard one of the most far
 "Non-conformists; he preached
 "place where there were three
 "and three or four-score of wom
 "he had chosen a text about the
 "ding of the ruins of Jerusalem,
 "for explication of it, he cited A

“ and *Vitruvius* about an hundred
 “ times, and did not forget to mention
 “ a proverb in Italian, *duro con duro non*
 “ *fa muro*. All this seems to me no-
 “ thing to the purpose, and very improp-
 “ er for the poor women, and very far
 “ from a spirit that sought nothing but
 “ the comfort and edification of his
 “ hearers.”

It may be presumed, that a famous professor of divinity, would publish nothing but what was agreeable to sense and reason, knowledge and conscience.

Adieu.

L E T T E R V.

S I R

YOU tell me, the last day, when you was in a mixt multitude, that the Presbyterian party boasted, that their books against us were not answered; but they answered all that we can say. To which I return these following thoughts. 1. Men fancy with themselves, that, if this be not particularly named, then they are not answered. 2. The question is, If what they have written

written be an answer to us? It is no writing much but well and solidly that can abide the test. 3. I shall take but half a sheet against all the volumes they have written, and tell them, in the 4th place, that there is no Episcopal minister but can prove his ordination from the Apostles by the Bishop who ordained him; and no Bishop but can derive his Succession in a list of predecessors from the Apostles. But 5. We give then a defiance to prove their ordination from John Knox, who was but a mere Priest at the reformation, and was never invested with a commission to ordain others, nor any simple Priest or Presbyter for 1500 years, before John Calvin at Geneva, who pleads mere necessity for what he did, and, as I said, wished that the Succession might have been continued in the church. But 6. If what they say themselves can never prove the validity of their ministry: and *Lastly*, If what they say against us can never help them, (for they own the validity of our ordination), then the ingenuous world must confess that their cause is gone, and that their ministerial acts and mission have no promise of the blessings which are annex'd to the performances

formances of those that are lawfully sent. For two contradictory ordinations cannot be true. Come then and let us reason together. They tell us,

1. That the word Bishop, Elder, or Presbyter, are all one in the New Testament; and therefore not one order above another, but a direct Presbyterian parity; no superiority nor inferiority: For the Bishop is a Presbyter, and the Presbyter a Bishop. At this rate, they may say, the word Imperator signifies an Emperor, and a General of an army, therefore both one. The word Dux, signifies a Duke and a Captain, therefore every Captain is a Duke. The word Father signifies a natural Father, a King, and a spiritual Pastor. The word Ruler signifies a King, and a Chancellor, &c. therefore no supreme, no subordinate governor. The word God, signifies the Creator of the world, and a King and Benefactor is called a God in the scripture stile; therefore there can be no difference betwixt the Creator and Creature; and, is it not blasphemy to say they are both one?

The word Minister signifies a Minister of the State, as well as a Minister in the Church; I hope you'll not say

S

they

they are one, more than a Deacon in a Church, or a Deacon of a Craft in a city is one and the same; or that a ruling Elder and a preaching Elder in the Church are both one; otherwise a ruling Elder, tho' a shoemaker or weaver, is a Bishop, if Bishop and Presbyter be one, according to the Presbyterian way of reasoning. In the Old Testament the scripture mentions Priests and Levites; but are not Chiefs or High Priests understood? We mention the Angels of Heaven; are not Archangels implied? When we speak of the House of Lords, does not this include Dukes, Marquisses, Earls, &c.? What a pitiful quibble is it to say, that a Bishop is called a Presbyter, and a Presbyter a Bishop, therefore no chief Bishop or chief Presbyter? Do we not read in scripture of a chief Man, chief Captains, chief Fathers, chief Men, chief House, chief Priests, chief Princes, and chief Singers? Will not Presbyterians grant that Deacons were Ministers of the Gospel, and that the word Deacon should be translated Minister? But were all Deacons Bishops or Presbyters? Must they not then acknowledge, in this case, that there was an inequality

inequality among the first Ministers of the Gospel?

You may here see the power of prejudice and interest, by such a pitiful argument as that of the community of names, to keep up a faction and schism in the Universal Church, by an undaunted successionless ministry, and to abuse the ignorance and credulity of their followers. For 1. They settle a model of church government which was never known till of late, and then they seek scripture to prove it, like some that make a sermon and then seek a text for it; whereas, I think, the text should have been the mother of the sermon. 2. They tell us, That we read, *1 Tim. iv. 14.* of the *Laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*; therefore no superiority among churchmen. It is answered by way of question, What Church in the world, Post-apostolical Writer, Father, or Council, understood this in the modern Presbyterian sense? Neither St. Jerome nor Mr. Calvin ever understood it to signify a society of preaching Elders, but the office of a Presbyter. But if they will have it so, pray, was not the Apostle St. Paul the principal Agent in that ordination, and

calls it particularly the *laying on of his hands*. 2 Tim. i. 6. And it is observable, that the two Greek propositions *δια* and *μετα* signify *by* and *with*; *by*, the principal; and *with*, the concurring cause, *that is*, by the hands of Paul, with the hands of the Presbytery. If they will have the word Presbytery to signify their own sense, Will it not follow, that a Presbytery may give to a single person the power that the whole Senate or meeting has not in itself? And why do not they make among themselves one fixed perpetual Bishop, as that Presbytery gave the power of jurisdiction and ordination to Timothy, as the ancients understood it, and all learned criticks, Popish and reformed, except those that are resolved not to be convinced, and to keep up a faction? And they object to us, that the Presbyters of Alexandria used, upon the death of their Bishop, to chuse one of their number, whom they called Bishop; Why then do not they follow this practice? But in this I have shewn their mistake in the first part, that, tho' they did nominate their Bishop, yet neighbouring Prelates were called in to give the consummative act of consecration

eration. But *Lastly*, What signifies all this, if they cannot prove themselves successors to that Presbytery that laid hands on Timothy? For there is no Presbyter ordained by Bishops among us, but can prove their Succession in the persons of the Bishops that ordained them, and that upwards to the Apostles. But then they go to the fathers; and herein I tell them, that if St. Jerome fail them, they can get no service of the fathers, unless they reckon Aerius a father, whom the fathers condemned as an heretick, for maintaining a parity among Churchmen; but, in my second letter, I have shown the absurdity of those who pretend that St. Jerome's testimony makes for Presbytery.

The next thing they contend for is, that the primitive Bishop was a Parochial, and not a Diocesan. To which I answer, that it is not a diocese that makes a Bishop, nor a parish that makes a Minister, more than a gown makes a Curate, or a grey cloak makes a presbyterian Teacher. There are now a-days Bishops that have no diocesses, and ministers that have no parishes, yet have lawful ordination and Apostolical Succession: Let then these par-

ochial Bishops, as Presbyterians call themselves, prove their Succession, as we prove our Diocesans, and there is an end of the controversy; and otherwise nothing is said, tho' they should write ten thousand volumes in their own cause.

I find a Pamphlet printed in 1714. above eighteen sheets of paper, called, *A letter from a parochial Bishop to a prelati cal Gentleman in Scotland, concerning the Government of the Church*; Which, I think, is a good abstract of all that the party has written on the head. But he founds all that he says upon a very gross mistake in his notion of the word parish, taking the antient notion of it in the modern opinion that we have of it at this time; for what if a parish signifies a diocess, comprehending several meeting places for worship under a chief Bishop or Presbyter, call him as you will, is not then the title of this book spoilt? Now, why not a Diocess in the Christian Church, as well as one Church of the Jews was under one High-priest? Pray! was not St. James Bishop of Jerusalem, where, according to the authors of *Jus Reg. Eccl.* as I have cited in the first Part, there

were

were many myriads, that is, many ten thousands. *Acts xx. 21. that believed, and were zealous of the law?* This Church was governed by St. James, and taught by his Presbyters, before ever the word parish, in the modern sense, was heard of.

For we find, that St. Paul's going to Jerusalem for a consultation in a great and weighty business, *Acts xx. 17. 18. St. Luke says, Next day we went in to James, and all the Elders, i. e. Presbyters, were present.* We find James called by his own name, by way of excellency, as all the chief rulers were among the Jews, according to that Rabbinical rule, *Rabbi is greater than Rab, and Rabban is greater than Rabbi, but he that is called by his bare name, without any title, is greater than Rabban.* See the Preface of this second part upon the word parish.

The author of the *Parochial Bishop* has read the writers of his own party, but neither he, nor any of them have given a faithful answer to what we say; but for this he has a *salvo* in the end of his book. P. 141, where he desires of the person he writes to, not to "nibble at" some particulars in his book, and to
 " pass

“ pass by the rest, as Mr Sage did with
 “ Dr. Rule, by undertaking to prove
 “ that there was Episcopacy in St. Cypri-
 “ an’s time; and Mr. Calder with Mr.
 “ Jameson his Nazianzen Quereia,
 “ fastens upon a particular place of
 “ Ignatius’s Epistles.”

This is enough to cast all that he has written; For Dr. Rule laid the whole stress of the cause upon it, saying when any proves that the “ Cyprianic Bishop
 “ was superior to Presbyters, we shall
 “ give Cyprian and him leave to call
 “ us schismatics.” What needed the learned Mr. Sage go any further with him? And, Mr. Calder made good his vindication of St. Ignatius’s Epistles, it was enough to answer all the Presbyterians in the world; and the strongest arguments that Mr. Calder has adduced for his plea, remains unanswered by the party, particularly that of the Presbyters of Alexandria naming one of their number whom they made Bishop; but they will not tell, as I have proven, that there was a consummative act by neighbouring Bishops; which this author might read in answer to Mr. Jameson. But seeing this pamphlet is solidly confuted by another hand,

I shall say no more about it. But still I desire them to make good their own ordination and succession from the Apostles.

But some may say, that the Papists give us as strong an home-thrust as we give to the Presbyterians, and so we are not flying free. To which I answer, That this makes not us to be in the wrong, nor Presbyterians to be in the right; Apostolical Succession is the rule to prove a lawful ministry, and this is the thing that we lay claim to, and prove by a list of Bishops from the foundation of the gospel; and it was the plea of Presbyterians in their *Jus Reg. Eccl.* as I have shown in the first part, but they never attempted to do it; yea it is impossible for them: Why? They rebel against and separate from those who are the Successors of the Apostles. But further, if the Papists could prove against us what they alledge, it would be usurpation in us to continue in the exercise of our ministry, and yet the Succession not to fail; for we could go to Greece for it, and receive ordination without imposition of unlawful terms. But we are not put to these straits: For we have answered all that
the

the Papists say against us, without making new commentaries upon the scriptures and the fathers.

As for their objections against imparity and subordination, from these words, *Luke* xxii. 25. 26. and 1 *Peter* v. 3. I have answered that in the preface, to which I refer you.

In short then, let them prove their mission by Apostolical Succession, and prove that Presbyterian government was primitive and universal, otherwise give over the cause. I bid you farewell.

P O S T S C R I P T.

IT is observable that ordination by mere Presbyters was accounted a nullity in the ancient Church, as Musæus and Eutychianus, two Grecian Presbyters, having uncanonically ordained some clerks, they were declared in the Council of Sardica. *Con.* 18. 19. but in the rank of mere laymen. See *Bev. Tom.* 1. P. 505.

There was also one Maximus, a pretended, but no real Bishop, who having taken upon him to ordain some, this act

act was declared null by the Council of Constance, 2 *Can.* and 4 *Bev. Tom.* 1. P. 91.

So it was determined in a synod at Alexandria, by the famous Confessor Hosius and other Bishops there assembled, that Ischyra who was ordained by Colluthus, a mere Presbyter, should be declared to be no Clergyman. *Synod Alexan. apud Athan. Apol.* 2. *Epist. Synod. apud Bin. T.* 1. P. 405.

The Council of Hispalis degraded a Priest and two Deacons, because the Bishop of Agabra being affected with sore eyes, and having some presented to him to be ordained Presbyters and Deacons, did only lay his hands upon them, suffering a Presbyter that stood by to say the prayers over them, and read the words of ordination. This being considered in the aforesaid Council, it was determined that the Presbyter that assisted, for his boldness and presumption, would have been subject to the Council's censure, but that he was before deceased: Next that the Presbyters and Deacons who were so ordained, should be actually deposed from all Sacred Orders, *Counc. Hisp.* 2 *Can.* 5. *Ann.* 619. *Bin. T.* 2. *Par.* 2. P. 326.

This

This is told the Presbyterians by many of our Casuists that write on the head, particularly by a learned and accurate pen, John Jacques, in his *Ordination by mere Presbyters void and null*. Printed in 1707. Now if ordination by Clergymen inferior to Bishops be not valid, far less is ordination by the people or Laymen, and no other thing are Presbyterian teachers who want ordination by Bishops.

L E T T E R VI.

An answer to Mr. Alexander Lauder Incumbent at Mordington, his Book, called, The ancient Bishops considered, both with respect to the extent of their jurisdiction, and nature of their power. In answer to Mr. Chillingworth and others.

S I R,

BEcause this book is so much cried up by the party, (tho' it be altogether,

ther, as I take it, upon the Independent lay) and is mentioned as unanswerable by De Foe, whom Dr. Lesly takes to task in his *Rehearsals*. I shall consider the method, which Mr. Lauder takes to confute Dr. Chillingworth's demonstration, which is as follows.

The Apostolical Institution of Episcopacy demonstrated, by William Chillingworth.

“ IF we abstract from Episcopal go-
 “ vernment all accidentals, and con-
 “ sider only what is essential and neces-
 “ sary to it, we shall find in it no more
 “ but this : An appointment of one man
 “ of eminent sanctity and sufficiency to
 “ have the care of all the churches
 “ within a certain precinct or diocese,
 “ and furnishing him with authority, not
 “ absolute or arbitrary, but regulated
 “ and bounded by laws, and moderated
 “ by joining to him a convenient num-
 “ ber of assistants, to the intent that all
 “ the churches under him may be pro-
 “ vided of good and able pastors, and that
 “ both of pastors and people, conformity
 “ to laws, and performance of their duties
 T “ may

“ may be required, under penalties, not
 “ left to discretion, but by law appointed.

“ That this government was received
 “ universally in the church, either in
 “ the Apostle’s time, or presently after,
 “ is so evident and unquestionable, that
 “ the most learned adversaries of this
 “ government do themselves confess it.

“ Petrus Molinæus in his book *de mu-*
 “ *nere Pastoralis*, purposely written in
 “ defence of the Presbyterian Govern-
 “ ment, acknowledgeth, That presently
 “ after the Apostle’s time, or even in
 “ their time (as ecclesiastical story wit-
 “ nesseth) it was ordained, that in every
 “ city one of the Presbytery should be
 “ called a Bishop, who should have pre-
 “ eminence over his colleagues, to a-
 “ void confusion which oft-times ariseth
 “ out of equality. And truly this form
 “ of government all churches every
 “ where received.

“ Theodorus Beza, in his tract *de tri-*
 “ *plici Episcopatus genere*, confesseth in
 “ effect the same thing : For having di-
 “ stinguished Episcopacy into three
 “ kinds, *divine, human and satanical*,
 “ and attributing to the second (which
 “ he calls *human*, but we maintain and
 “ conceive to be Apostolical) not only

" a priority of order, but a superiority
 " of power, and authority over Presby-
 " ters, bounded yet by laws and canons
 " provided against tyranny : he clearly
 " professeth, that of this kind of Episco-
 " pacy is to be understood, whatsoever
 " we read concerning the authority of
 " Bishops or Presidents (as Justin Mar-
 " tyr calls them) in Ignatius, and other
 " more ancient writers.

" Certainly from these two great de-
 " fenders of Presbytery, we should never
 " have had this free acknowledgment,
 " so prejudicial to their own pretence,
 " and so advantageous to their adver-
 " saries purpose, had not the evidence of
 " clear and undeniable truth enforced
 " them to it : It will not therefore be
 " necessary to spend any time in con-
 " futing that uningenuous assertion of
 " the anonymous author of the *Cata-*
 " *logue of testimonies for the equality of*
 " *Bishops and Presbyters*, who affirms,
 " That their disparity began long after
 " the Apostle's times ; but we may safe-
 " ly take for granted that which these
 " two learned adversaries have confes-
 " sed ; and see whether upon this foun-
 " dation laid by them, we may not, by
 " T 2 " unanswerable

“ unanswerable reason, raise this super-
 “ structure :

“ *That seeing Episcopal Government is*
 “ *confessedly so ancient, and so Catholic, it*
 “ *cannot with reason be denied to be Apo-*
 “ *postolic.*

“ For so great a change, as between
 “ Presbyterial Government and Episco-
 “ pal, could not possibly have prevailed
 “ all the world over, in a little time.
 “ Had Episcopal government been an
 “ aberration from, or a corruption of
 “ the government left in the churches
 “ by the Apostles, it had been very
 “ strange, that it should have have been
 “ received in any one church so sud-
 “ denly, or that it should have prevail-
 “ ed in all for many ages after. *Vari-*
 “ *asse debuerat error Ecclesiarum ; quod au-*
 “ *tem apud omnes unum est, non est erratum,*
 “ *sed traditum.* Had the churches er-
 “ red, they would have varied ; what
 “ therefore is one and the same amongst
 “ all, came not sure by error, but tradi-
 “ tion. Thus Tertullian argues, very
 “ probably from the consent of the
 “ churches of his time, not long after
 “ the Apostles, and that in matter of o-
 “ pinion much more subject to unob-
 “ served alteration. But that in the
 “ frame

“ frame and substance of the necessary
 “ government of the church, a thing
 “ always in use and practice, there
 “ should be so sudden a change as pre-
 “ sently after the Apostle’s times, and
 “ so universal, as to be received in all the
 “ churches, this is clearly impossible.

“ For what universal cause can be as-
 “ signed or feigned of this universal A-
 “ postacy? You will not imagine that
 “ the Apostles, all or any of them, made
 “ any decree for this change when
 “ they were living, or left order for it
 “ in any will or testament when they
 “ were dying: This were to grant the
 “ question, *to wit*, That the Apostles
 “ being to leave the government of the
 “ churches themselves, and either see-
 “ ing by experience, or foreseeing by
 “ the Spirit of God, the distractions and
 “ disorders which would arise from a
 “ multitude of equals, substituted Epif-
 “ copal government instead of their
 “ own. General councils, to make a
 “ law for a general change, for many
 “ ages there were none. There was
 “ no Christian emperor, no coercive
 “ power over the church to enforce it;
 “ or if there had been any, we know no
 “ force was equal to the courage of the

“ Christians of those times : Their lives
 “ were then at command (for they had
 “ not then learned to fight for CHRIST),
 “ but their obedience to any thing a-
 “ gainst his law was not to be com-
 “ manded, (for they had perfectly
 “ learned to die for him); therefore
 “ there was no power then to command
 “ this change, or if there had been any,
 “ it had been in vain.

“ What device then shall we study,
 “ or to what fountain shall we reduce
 “ this strange pretended alteration ?
 “ Can it enter into our hearts to think,
 “ that all the Presbyters’ and other
 “ Christians, then being the Apostles
 “ scholars, could be generally ignorant
 “ of the will of CHRIST, touching the
 “ necessity of a Presbyterial govern-
 “ ment ? Or dare we adventure to think
 “ them so strangely wicked all the world
 “ over, as, against knowledge and con-
 “ science, to conspire against it ? Ima-
 “ gine the spirit of Diotrephes had en-
 “ tered into some, or a great many of
 “ the Presbyters, and possessed them
 “ with an ambitious desire of a forbid-
 “ den superiority ; Was it possible they
 “ should attempt and atchieve it once,
 “ without any opposition or contradic-
 “ tion ?

"tion? And besides, that the con-
 "tagion of this ambition should spread
 "itself, and prevail without stop and
 "controul, nay without any noise or
 "notice taken of it, thro' all the
 "churches in the world, all the watch-
 "men in the mean time being so fast a-
 "sleep, and all the dogs so dumb, that
 "not so much as one should open his
 "mouth against it? But let us suppose
 "(though it be a horrible untruth),
 "that the Presbyters and people then
 "were not so good Christians as the
 "Presbyters are now; that they were
 "generally so negligent to retain the
 "government of CHRIST'S Church
 "commanded by CHRIST, which now
 "we are so zealous to restore; yet cer-
 "tainly we must not forget nor deny
 "that they were men as we are. And
 "if we look upon them as mere natur-
 "al men, yet knowing by experience
 "how hard a thing it is even for policy
 "arm'd with power, by many attempts
 "and contrivances, and in a long time,
 "to gain upon the liberty of any one
 "people, undoubtedly we shall never
 "entertain so wild an imagination, as
 "that, among all the Christian Pres-
 "byters in the world, neither conscience
 "of

“ of duty, nor love of liberty, nor a-
 “ verseness from pride and usurpation
 “ of others over them, should prevail
 “ so much as with any one, to oppose
 “ this pretended universal invasion of
 “ the kingdom of CHRIST, and the li-
 “ berty of Christians.

“ When I shall see, therefore, all the
 “ fables in the Metamorphoses acted and
 “ prove stories ; when I shall see all
 “ the democracies and aristocracies in
 “ the world lye down and sleep, and
 “ awake into monarchies ; then I will be-
 “ gin to believe that Presbyterial govern-
 “ ment, having continued in the Church
 “ during the Apostles times, should pres-
 “ ently after, against the Apostles doc-
 “ trine and the will of CHRIST, be
 “ whirl’d about like a scene in a mask,
 “ and transform’d into Episcopacy. In
 “ the mean time, while these things
 “ remain thus incredible, and in human
 “ reason impossible, I hope I shall have
 “ leave to conclude thus: Episcopal go-
 “ vernment is acknowledged to have
 “ been universally received in the
 “ Church presently after the Apostles
 “ times. Between the Apostles time
 “ and this, presently after, there was
 “ not time enough for, nor possibility
 “ of

“ of so great an alteration. And there-
 “ fore Episcopacy, being confessed to
 “ be so ancient and Catholic, must be
 “ granted also to be Apostolical. *Quod*
 “ *erat demonstrandum.*”

Follows Mr. Lauder's pretended con-
 futation of Dr. Chillingworth; which
 is as great a confirmation of him as the
 highest flyer in the Church of England,
 could imagine and publish in defence
 of that demonstration.

Mr Lauder in Pages, 67, 68. &c.
by applying what Monsieur Arnaud
says of Transubstantiation to Epis-
copacy, writes as follows.

“ **I**F the ancient Church was Presby-
 “ terian, and believed, that Pastors
 “ acting in parity was a divine instituti-
 “ on, it could not come to that state it
 “ was in in Aeri-^{us}'s time, without an uni-
 “ versal change in belief and practice;
 “ and it cannot be imagin'd, this change
 “ could happen but one of these two
 “ ways, which are both equally impos-
 “ sible. 1. That this change was made
 “ in an instant; so that when all Chri-
 “ stians believed, till such a time, the
 Church

“ Church should be ruled by Pastors a-
 “ sing in parity, they began all of them
 “ together to believe the Church should
 “ be ruled by a Bishop, and, going to
 “ bed Presbyterians, arose Episcopal in
 “ the morning, not knowing how, and
 “ forgetting quite what they formerly
 “ were. But this is so absurd, that I
 “ stand not to refute it. Or, 2. That
 “ this change was made insensibly ; that
 “ some introduced the opinion of Epif-
 “ copacy ; that these some had but few
 “ followers at first ; but at length this
 “ opinion was spread insensibly every
 “ where.

“ According to this supposition, there
 “ behoved to be a time, to wit, when
 “ this opinion first arose, in which it was
 “ followed by a small number of persons
 “ only : another time in which this
 “ number was greatly increased, and
 “ equal’d that of those who were against
 “ Episcopacy ; another in which this
 “ opinion was master of the multitude,
 “ tho’ oppos’d still by many others, who
 “ were for Presbytery ; and, in fine, ano-
 “ ther time, in which it reign’d peace-
 “ ably and without opposition : Which
 “ is the state in which most Presbyteri-

“ans will acknowledge it was when
 “Aerius appeared in the world.

“If the opinion of the Prelatists was
 “an innovation, it is impossible it could
 “come in insensibly, without passing
 “through these degrees. Yet every one
 “of these degrees contains insupporta-
 “ble absurdities.

“To begin with the first: If Prela-
 “cy was introduced by one or a few
 “persons, how is it possible their name
 “could remain unknown; or that they
 “could propose such a surprising alte-
 “ration in the government, without
 “any person’s being astonished at it,
 “or setting himself to oppose the
 “same? Is it possible the Presbyters,
 “ruling Elders and Deacons, did not at
 “all perceive this rising tyranny; or
 “perceiving it, made no opposition
 “thereto? How is it possible, that be-
 “ing persuaded the Church should be
 “govern’d by Pastors acting in parity,
 “they should submit their reason with-
 “out contradiction to one, who should
 “publish, contrary to the opinion and
 “practice of all Christians, that the
 “Church should be ruled by a Bishop?

“The belief of the mysteries, and
 “the news of God’s becoming man to
 “save

“ save sinners, had the opposition of
 “ sense and reason to overcome, and
 “ prejudices the souls of men were pre-
 “ engaged with ; wherefore it made at
 “ first a prodigious noise, and raised the
 “ whole world against those who prea-
 “ ched it, and could not be established
 “ without books, sermons, disputes,
 “ miracles, and the shedding of the
 “ blood of an innumerable number of
 “ martyrs : Yet they would have us
 “ believe such a mighty change could
 “ be made in the government of the
 “ church, even from aristocracy to
 “ monarchy, without either sermons,
 “ books, disputes or martyrs ; and tho’
 “ Presbytery was settled by the Apostles
 “ themselves, and remain’d in posses-
 “ sion without controul for many years ;
 “ yet Episcopacy might be set up in all
 “ the churches of the world without
 “ contradiction, opposition or astonish-
 “ ment, and so much without any
 “ noise, that the authors and time of
 “ this strange innovation have remain’d
 “ altogether unknown.

“ But how came it, that they who
 “ abandoned the ancient government
 “ of the Church by Presbytery, to em-
 “ brace this novelty, perceived not

“ the

" the alteration? How is it that they
 " did not write and testify, that they
 " had been in an error hitherto by
 " wanting Bishops? How came it that
 " they accused not their pastors of de-
 " ceiving them wickedly, and cried
 " not, *Verba iniquorum prævaluerunt*
 " *super me?*

" Nevertheless nothing of all this is
 " to be met with: For it is matter of
 " fact, that, since the Apostles days to
 " the time of Acrius, we can find no
 " proof that any, in publishing that Pre-
 " lacy is a divine institution, thought
 " he proposed an opinion in any thing
 " different from the common belief of
 " the ancient church, or that in his
 " own time.

" It was never heard, that any was
 " delated either to Presbyteries or Ge-
 " neral Assemblies, for having publish-
 " ed, either by word or writing, that
 " Episcopacy was the Apostolical go-
 " vernment of the church.

" It was never heard, that any Fa-
 " ther, Presbyter or Council whatso-
 " ever, troubled themselves with op-
 " posing Episcopacy, or testified that
 " they who were advancing it, were
 U " bringing

“ bringing in Antichristian tyranny in-
 “ to the church.

“ It was never heard, that any eccle-
 “ siastical author or preacher com-
 “ plain’d, that a pernicious alteration
 “ of the Presbyterian government of
 “ the church was made, or beginning
 “ to be carried on in his time, because
 “ some were for setting up Bishops.
 “ All the dogs were dumb, as says Mr.
 “ Chillingworth.

“ Moreover, if we consider Episco-
 “ pacy in these chimerical degrees,
 “ through which it behoved to pass, ac-
 “ cording to the Presbyterian suppositi-
 “ on, before it could arrive at that
 “ height in which it was afterwards,
 “ the extravagance of the Presbyterian
 “ supposition will appear yet more in-
 “ supportable. For it behoved neces-
 “ sarily to be, that there was a time in
 “ which the belief of Episcopacy,
 “ which they suppose was not that of
 “ the ancient church, was so mix’d in
 “ the church with the belief of Pres-
 “ bytery, which they think was the
 “ true and ancient opinion, that the
 “ one half of the Presbyters and peo-
 “ ple were of the one opinion, and the
 “ other half of the other.

“ Neither

“ Neither can it be supposed, tha
 “ this division of opinion and practice,
 “ was in different provinces only, but
 “ it must be admitted, according to
 “ the Presbyterian supposition, that in
 “ the same provinces, cities, churches
 “ and families, the faithful were all
 “ divided with respect to the govern-
 “ ment, some believing that Episcopa-
 “ cy was Apostolical, some Presbytery.
 “ And that this division was not only
 “ in the Roman church, but the Greek,
 “ Armenian and Egyptian churches.

“ If these suppositions be join’d with
 “ matter of fact, which the Presbyte-
 “ rians cannot deny, *to wit*, That till
 “ Aerius no person ever opposed Pre-
 “ lacy, or doubted of the divine insti-
 “ tution thereof, the greatest absurdi-
 “ ties imaginable will follow. For ei-
 “ ther it must be supposed, that this
 “ general division, with respect to the
 “ government, remain’d unknown to
 “ Presbyters and people ; or, if it was
 “ known, was wholly neglected by
 “ both, so that they attempted no re-
 “ medy. But both these suppositions
 “ are contrary to common sense.

“ To examine the first, That this
 “ division remain’d unknown: Is it

“ possible a rational man can persuade
 “ himself, there was a certain time
 “ when brethren were oppos’d to bre-
 “ thren, wives to their husbands;
 “ Presbyters to Presbyters, not in one
 “ province, but in all the provinces of
 “ the world ; not about a speculative
 “ point, which few persons concern
 “ themselves with, but the government
 “ of the church, which belongs to
 “ practice ; and yet no person was sen-
 “ sible of such a division ; not one soul
 “ ever knew that his father, friend or
 “ pastor was of an opinion contrary to
 “ his own in this point ? That this
 “ strange diversity of opinion should be
 “ wholly unknown, not a year only,
 “ but for many ages ?

“ But if we suppose, That this di-
 “ versity of opinion about Episcopacy
 “ was not unknown either to pastors or
 “ people, it is yet more contrary to rea-
 “ son, and all that can be gathered from
 “ experience, to imagine, that this so
 “ strange a division made no noise, and
 “ stirr’d up no disputes ; that pastors
 “ and people, tho’ divided among them-
 “ selves about a point of such impor-
 “ tance as might have caused them look
 “ on one another as enemies, could ne-
 “ vertheless

“vertheless remain united in commu-
 “nion and perfect amity, without any
 “thing like Pentland or Bothwel-bridge
 “work among them.

“If we suppose the church could live
 “in profound peace, when its members
 “were so divided, we must also sup-
 “pose, that people then were of ano-
 “ther species than those of this age.
 “For it is impossible people now can
 “hinder themselves to defend their
 “own opinion by books and disputes,
 “and to endeavour the conviction of
 “those they judge to be in an error,
 “to accuse them before ecclesiastical
 “tribunals, and condemn them, if they
 “had authority, which cannot but oc-
 “casion noise and rupture of commu-
 “nion.

“It necessarily follows, the men of that
 “age, if they could continue in such a
 “deep sleep, notwithstanding such dis-
 “union, had neither charity to their
 “neighbours, nor zeal for God, nor
 “eagerness for their own way, *that is,*
 “they were not men. I know not what
 “can move those, who are not touched
 “by such absurdities.”

I have fairly laid down Mr. Lauder's
 parallel of Episcopacy, with Monsieur

Arnaud's pleading for Transubstantiation, and I give the following animadversions upon it.

First, If Transubstantiation can be proven from scripture, antiquity, and the constant practice of the Universal Church, I shall believe the one as well as the other : For sure I am, that some canonical books of the New Testament, have undergone greater debates in the first ages of the church than Prelacy ever did.

Secondly, I argue thus, that every thing that can be known, must be so by sense, reason or revelation ; but Episcopacy can be known by all the three, which Transubstantiation cannot ; therefore Mr. Lauder's parallel is not to the purpose ; we have all the proofs in the world for the one, which we have not for the other : For things are proven by physical evidence, demonstration and testimony. Things that are apparent are so in respect of sense, as that the sun shines, or fire burns. Again things, tho' not evident to sense, may be so to reason, which is a faculty in the soul enabling a man to draw conclusions from evident principles. Things may be known antecedently by
their

their cause, or reversely by their effects: So we proceed from principles evidently known to consequences certainly concluding.

Testimony is either divine or human; we believe that what God has said is true, because he is wise and cannot err, he is good, and will not deceive.

Human testimony, by which we proceed in the ordinary affairs of life, by some is called moral certainty, in which the world in most of things, especially public matters of fact, cannot be deceived, as that there was such a person as Alexander the Great, or that there was such a city as Nineveh.

When our blessed Saviour turned water into wine before the company that did celebrate the marriage in Cana of Galilee, this was physical evidence to them; when the report thereof was received upon their testimony that saw it, it was moral certainty to them that believed it.

Thirdly, To apply this to the case in hand, Transubstantiation and Episcopacy are quite different subjects, not capable of the same way of probation; The first contemplative, metaphysical and mystical:

myſtical: the ſecond is viſible, evident and hiſtorical. And can ſacramental phraſes, that are figurative and myſterious, be reaſoned upon after the ſame manner, that things apparent or evident, or matters of fact can be diſcourſed on? For example, Can the perſonalities of the Deity, the unity in trinity, and trinity in unity, be ſo evident as the hiſtory of our Saviour's birth, life, paſſion, reſurrection and aſcenſion? But,

Fourthly, We tell the Papiſts, that the very word Tranſubſtantiation was not heard of for ſeveral centuries; but what age ſince the Apoſtles, what place in the Chriſtian world, did not hear of Biſhops, Presbyters and Deacons, where Chriſtian Churches were planted? The Chriſtians in the firſt ages ſaw and knew it in their days, and we know it by moral certainty in our days, as the world knows at preſent by physical evidence, what church government is in the eaſtern and weſtern churches.

Fifthly, Epiſcopacy is a government known by ſenſe, and agreeable to reaſon and revelation: For it is very reaſonable that one order ſhould be above another; for Arch-angels in heaven are above Angels. Epiſcopacy was in the
Old

Old Testament in High-priests, Priests and Levites. And what was instituted in the Old Testament and not repealed in the New, ought to continue so long as the reasons thereof continue: Our Saviour upon earth, in his college of twelve Apostles and seventy Disciples, had the government of his own seminary in his own hand, and was in the Old Testament stile their High-priest, the Apostles the Priests, and the Disciples the Levites: and, in the New Testament stile, he was their Bishop, the Apostles the Presbyters, and the seventy the Deacons. The Church Government was devolved upon the twelve at the resurrection; the seventy had no government until they were assumed from the lower to the higher rank, as Matthias was, to fill up the vacancy which fell out by the apostacy of Judas, or to be apolloled themselves as believers increased. The seventy were to the Apostles in place of Presbyters, and the Deacons were laymen full of the Holy Ghost, upon whom the Apostles laid hands, without the concurrence of the seventy: So that imposition of hands, to confer some authority for the constant government of, the Church,

was

was used in the days of miracles. And the Church Government continued from the days of the Apostles in an equality throughout the world for five hundred years : And if Mons. Arnaut's proof for Transubstantiation be as good, let the world judge.

Sixthly, The Papists say, " They have no
 " reason to believe it, because it is a
 " mystery, and we are to believe
 " our senses till a greater authority than
 " our senses contradict our senses ; for ex-
 " ample in *Gen. xviii. 2.* when the three
 " Angels came to Abraham, he took
 " them to be men of ordinary gen-
 " eration like to himself, and would en-
 " tertain them as strangers ; but when
 " he was convinced that they were not
 " as he thought his senses represented
 " to him, then he believed another
 " thing." I answer, That if the Papists
 give us as good revelation for the one
 as we have for the other, I see no
 reason why we should not believe the
 other if their parallel holds.

But, *lastly*, The Papists tell us, That
 " Transubstantiation is a word that
 " the church was forced to coin, as
 " the church did the word Personality,
 " Trinity, Sacrament, and particularly

"

“ word Consubstantial, to signify the di-
 “ vinity of our Saviour, and his being
 “ of the same substance with the Fa-
 “ ther ; and why not, say they, the
 “ word Transubstantiation, to express
 “ the real presence of the body and
 “ blood of Christ ? ” I answer, if there
 be (as I said before) as good reason for
 the one as the other, why not be-
 lieve it ?

But Mr. Lauder, page 80, &c. tells
 us (if the letter be adhered to), “ As
 “ many sentences may be produced in
 “ favours of Transubstantiation, as for
 “ Episcopacy : ” For example, Cyril of
 Jerusalem, *Catech. Mystag.* in the end
 of a long citation, says, “ Rejoice in the
 “ Lord, being persuaded of it as a thing
 “ most certain, that the bread which
 “ appears to your eyes, is not bread,
 “ tho’ your taste doth judge it to be so,
 “ but that it is the body of Jesus Christ :
 “ And that the wine which appears to
 “ your eyes, is not wine, tho’ your sense
 “ of taste takes it for wine, but that it
 “ is the blood of Jesus Christ.” To the
 same purpose he cites St. Ignatius, Ju-
 stin Martyr, and St. Ambrose.

To which I answer, that Mr. Lauder
 has said very well, and spoke his word
 with

with a warrant : Thus, *If the letter be adhered to* ; so that I think he will allow of what these fathers said, speaking in a mystical sense. But pray ! Is history and matter of fact to be expounded like romance, poetical fictions, or sacramental phrases ? I could add several Protestants saying as much, but I shall content my self with Mr. Calvin, first out of his *Institutions, lib. 4. cap. 17. § 24.* “ I do not measure
 “ this mystery with human reason, nor
 “ subject it to the law of nature ; for,
 “ if any ask me concerning the manner
 “ I will not be ashamed to confess that
 “ it is a mystery too high for me, to
 “ comprehend in thought, or express in
 “ words. We captivate our minds,
 “ and suffer them not to mutter one
 “ word.”

See him also on the *1 Cor. xi. 24.*
 “ Neither does CHRIST offer us the
 “ benefit of his death and resurrection,
 “ but that very body itself in which he
 “ suffered and rose again.”

Sir, I have presented you with Mr. Lauder's confutation of Dr. Chillingworth's demonstration, and my own animadversions upon it, which I leave to the censure of the impartial reader:

In

In my opinion, he has done the Episcopal cause greater service than he has done to his own ; which minds me of what I read of one Phalereus, who being stabbed in the breast by an enemy, was cured of an imposthume held desperate by the physicians.

And yet Mr. Lauder passes a compliment upon himself, triumphing, as if he had given a dead stroke to the cause of Episcopacy, by overturning Chillingworth's demonstration for it, in the following words : " I am persuaded
 " the reader now is beginning to be a-
 " shamed of Mr. Chillingworth's de-
 " monstration, and inclines to pity the
 " weakness of those, who suffer them-
 " selves to be surprized by such a con-
 " temptible sophism ; and that our
 " Episcopal friends will never trouble
 " us with it any more, nor so much
 " as speak of it before a man of sense." And much more to this purpose he has in his own commendation.

Mr. Lauder speaks with a great deal of assurance ; he was assured beforehand to be believed by the party, who will credit any thing that comes from the mouths or pens of those who delude them, against the common sense of

mankind: Yea, if they would contrive to preach up the doctrine of transubstantiation, they are assured their implicate disciples will believe them.

The great Chillingworth's demonstration stands firm and sure, for all that is said against it, as well as his works remain in credit with the learned world after his death, notwithstanding the disgrace that Presbyterians (particularly Dr. Cheynel Incumbent at Petworth) endeavoured to put on his person and books. He (the said Dr. Chillingworth) had desired on his death-bed to be buried with the office of the burying the dead, according to the Church of England, but instead of that, he was persecuted to his grave, the said Dr. Cheynel throwing his books in with his corps, with these words, "Get you gone ye cursed books which have seduced so many precious souls; go rot with your author!" The Doctor prints an account of this his gallant behaviour, and is commended by Dr. Calamy for it.

What could a Pope, that pretends to infallibility, do more than this Dr Cheynel did in this case?

And

And now, Sir, to conclude, if Dr. Chillingworth's demonstration for Episcopacy stands fixed, and rather fortified than confuted by Mr. Lauder, I hope you will acknowledge it to be a shield and bulwark against all that he, or all the party have written against Episcopacy, and in defence of Presbytery. I remain, as formerly, your very humble Servant.

P O S T S C R I P T.

I Would not have meddled so much with Mr. Lauder's book, but that a gentleman of good learning, and a true son of the Church, told me, that it was in such vogue with the party, that they confidently asserted, that an answer could never be made to it so long as the author was in life, and then they would not be at the pains to read the answer after his death. Besides, I find mention made of it by Mr. De Foe, as an unanswerable piece, in the learned Dr. Lesly's *Rehearsals*, Vol. ii. Numb. 32, 46, and 47. The jest is, That when De Foe had extolled the book, so that it could not be had in any Stationer's shop,

in London, nor could be borrowed from De Foe himself, it behoved Dr Lesly to call for it at London, on the other side of Tweed.

I cannot pass by one passage of Mr. Lauder's book, page 110. where he says,

" *A* In the ancient Church we meet
 " with three kinds of ecclesiastical officers,
 " Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons; the
 " Bishops were an order superior to the
 " Presbyters, and the Presbyters superior
 " to the Deacons; and very soon after
 " the departure of the Apostles, these
 " three distinct orders appeared in the
 " Church. *B*. This is a thing so evi-
 " dent, that it cannot be denied with-
 " out manifest absurdity. *C*. But the
 " difficulty will be to shew, what way
 " the early practice of the Universal
 " Church as to this particular, quadrates
 " with scripture? *D*. The arguments
 " which our Prelatists proposed for this
 " end, are very contemptible. *E*. The
 " arguments taken from the Levites, and
 " the different orders of the Priests un-
 " der the Old Testament, or from the
 " twelve Apostles and seventy Disciples,
 " and fictitious Episcopacy of Timothy
 " and Titus, are so very weak, (as has
 " been

“ been demonstrated to them an hun-
 “ dred times) that they can satisfy none
 “ but those who are resolved to be satis-
 “ fied, be the thing right or wrong.
 “ And so much has been said against the
 “ argument from the Angels of the
 “ Churches in the book of the Revelati-
 “ on, as renders it wholly ineffectual.

“ F. Nevertheless, that the practice
 “ of the Universal Church as to this
 “ particular, (or their having three
 “ distinct orders of Church officers,
 “ *Bishops, Presbyters and Deacons*) so
 “ soon after the times of the Apostles,
 “ should contradict scripture, or divine
 “ institution, is a thing that appears to
 “ me to be altogether improbable. And
 “ I am of opinion, that there is one
 “ place of scripture (which the Pre-
 “ latists overlook, or rather which they
 “ consider ordinarily as destructive of
 “ their cause, and which therefore they
 “ have tortured with a thousand im-
 “ pertinent glosses) on which the dis-
 “ tinct order of *Bishop* and *Presbyters*
 “ may be rationally founded; and which
 “ consequently makes it appear, that
 “ the ancient Church, by consider-
 “ ing the Bishops as an order distinct
 “ from Presbyters, and superior to them,

“ did not contradict scripture or divine
 “ institution so much, as many learned
 “ and pious men have imagined. ”

“ This text is, 1 *Tim* v. 17. There
 “ the Apostle saith, *G. Let the Elders,*
 “ *or Presbyters, that rule well, be counted*
 “ *worthy of double honour, especially they*
 “ *who labour in word and doctrine.* ”

I profess I know not what to make
 of this passage of Mr. Lauder's book ;
 for in *A.* and *B.* he says as much as all
 the Prelatists in the world can say, that
 the three distinct orders of Clergymen
 were soon after the departure of the
 Apostles, and that too in the Universal
 Church.

But, in that part marked by the let-
 ter *D.* he thinks it some difficulty to
 reconcile that universal order with the
 scripture. Strange ! Would the first
 Post-apostolical Bishops convey the
 scriptures to posterity, which would
 witness against their Apostacy, and fly
 in their faces, for deviating from the
 scripture Bishop ? How come they to
 make such a sudden election, and not
 one to protest against them, and this
 to be in the days of martyrdom and
 miracles ? And, if these Post-aposto-
 lical Bishops were wrong, who was
 right ?

right? Were the Gnosticks, Montanists, and other Hereticks?

As to that passage signed with the Letter *E*. I think there was never a Pope in Rome pronounced out of his chair more peremptorily than this author; and at this rate the strongest arguments on any head may be answered.

Mr. Lauder was assured before-hand, that the generality of his party would take his bare word upon it, tho' he had published the quite contrary. What? Are the arguments that Prelatists make use of for three orders so contemptible, from the orders of High-priests, Priests and Levites in the Old Testament? Then may he not give the lie to St. Jerome (his pretended patron), who gives this same reason in his epistle to Evagrius? Are the arguments of the twelve above the seventy, and the Episcopacy of Timothy and Titus, and of the seven Angels so weak? Can he assert this, without giving the lie to Calvin, Beza, and other learned foreign reformers? Were not the weakness of these arguments demonstrated an hundred times to the Prelatists? Might not Mr. Lauder set down three of the best of these demonstrations; but the reader
must

must take his bare and bold assertion for it?

F. Mr. Lauder is of the opinion, that it is altogether improbable that these three distinct orders, so soon after the Apostles, should contradict scripture. A great compliment indeed upon the holy Bishops and Martyrs, that it is *improbable they should contradict the scriptures*, which they were preaching and practising; so that if they did according to scripture, then the three offices of Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons, is of divine right.

G. But how that scripture, 1 *Tim. v. 17.* shall undo the Episcopal cause; and how we have tortured it with a *thousand impertinent glosses*, is like his usual confidence, in saying what he pleaseth, without the shadow of one proof. How that text shall undo the three orders, which Mr. Lauder thinks is not against scripture, I am yet to learn. I find the learned Joseph Mede has an excellent exercitation upon it; and the most impertinent gloss that ever I saw upon it, is, to make it a warrant for ordinationless Lay-elders, who are so far from having double honour, *that is*, of maintenance and esteem, that they have not so

so much as single honour. And (if I mind rightly) Mr. William Jameson in his Cypr. Istotimus, has given over that plea of Lay-elders ; for he saw it would not do for him from scripture or antiquity. Adieu.

L E T T E R VII.

Consisting of Queries extracted out of the First and Second Part of this Book of the Succession of the Priesthood, with a short Dialogue betwixt an ancient Peer, Chief of a numerous Tribe, and a Presbyterian Incumbent in his Parish.

Q U E R I E S.

WHAT is it that makes a Minister of Jesus Christ? Or what gives a Minister commission to preach, administer sacraments, or to absolve penitents?

tents? Whether is it the magistrate, or the people, or pretence to an inward call from the Spirit of God? Or natural and acquired gifts? Or, lastly, personal and Apostolical Succession? The learned Presbyterians against the Independents, in 1647, have with strong sense confuted Erastianism and Independency, and fixed upon Succession, as the rule to prove an authorised ministry from the Apostles, by virtue of that promise, *Matth. xxviii. 20. Lo, I am with you, &c.* as is proven in the first Part, page 98, &c. Is not this as true now as when they said it then? But how did they then, or can you now prove your Succession from the Apostles, as Episcopal Presbyters can and have done? See first Part, page 52. Is there then any validity in the ministerial acts of Presbytery that want Apostolical Succession?

2. What Priesthood in the world was ever governed in a parity, either Jewish, Heathen or Christian, and according to the law of nature, that abhors a parity, and according to God's positive institution in the Old Testament, of High-Priest, Priests and Levites, and his promise by the Prophet Isaiah, chap. lxvi.

ver.

ver. 21. to give a suitable Clergy in the days of the Gospel, *And I will take of them for Priests and for Levites.* See first Part, page 86. And when Christ, in his own college, keeping the government in his own hand over the twelve who were above the seventy, made such a distinction, was not this an imparity in his own time? Otherwise, if it was but an equality, why should not they be called the eighty-two, instead of the twelve and the seventy? And was not this a pattern of what was to be, after the Apostles got the power of making cotemporary Clergymen and Successors, to an order of superiority and inferiority, and that to the end of the world? Or were the persons whom the Apostles ordained to preach and baptize, and to do other offices in the Church, equal to the Apostles in power? Were the seven Deacons, *Acts vi. 6.* cloathed with a commission of *laying on hands* in ordination and confirmation, as the Apostles, or immediate mission, or Apostolical Ordination? Does not the contrary appear from *Acts viii. 14.*?

3. If you say that Bishops and Presbyters are all one in scripture, especially from *Acts xx. 28.* comparing it with

with the 17th verse, where they that are called Presbyters or Elders in the 17th verse, are called Bishops or Overseers in the 28th verse ; I ask, Does this make a foundation for a parity, or take away superiority among Clergymen? Were not the Apostles, who converted Jews and Heathens, superior to these Bishops and Presbyters as well as to the Deacons? Did they not keep the government of their own colonies and plantations in their own hands, as St. John over the seven churches of Asia, and St. Paul of Corinth, Ephesus, Philippi, &c.? But still the question is, Are you the Successors of the Elders and Overseers mentioned in that chapter? Or how do you prove your ministry from that? Or how do you know but there were Bishops distinct from Presbyters at that meeting? For do we not read in the 4th verse, that there accompanied Paul *Sopater of Berea, and of the Thessalonians, Aristarchus and Secundus, and Gaius of Derbe, &c.* whom the ancients account proper Bishops of the place? And might not the 28th verse be spoke to Bishops properly so called? But, be as it will, What church in the world for fifteen hundred years

was

was Presbyterian by that scripture, or what ancient Commentator expounded it in the Presbyterian sense? Is not the universal practice of the church sufficient to give light, when things are controverted, as in the case of Infant Baptism, the change of the seventh day of the week into the observation of the first day?

Or if you will make the *Laying on of hands upon Timothy by the Presbytery*, 1 *Tim.* iv. 14. an argument for Presbyterian government, how do you prove that that Presbytery was like to yours, consisting of a monthly or yearly Moderator, and Lay Elders, that are ignorant of the very fundamentals of Religion? Or that your Presbyteries are like to theirs, who had the Apostle for a Moderator, who attributes the action of ordination to himself, 2 *Tim.* i. 6. Or how can you prove that you are Successors to that Presbytery that laid hands on Timothy? Or why do not you make a Moderator, Superintendent, or Bishop over Presbyters, as Timothy was made, with a power of jurisdiction and ordination at Ephesus, or as Titus was at Crete?

Y

Or

Or if you will make use of the Apostle St. Paul's salutation in the first chapter to the *Philippians*, verse 1. ----- *To all the Saints at Philippi, with the Bishops and Deacons*, to make for your modern notion of Presbytery; I ask, Are not others opinions as good sense as yours? Some who say, That there was a College of Bishops there, waiting to be called wherever the Apostles (who planted the gospel in other places) should appoint them; or that there might be a Bishop there for the Circumcision, and another for the Uncircumcision, as were in other places, particularly at Rome? Or that Bishops were occasionally there? Or that the Presbyters were included in the Deacons; for Deacons signify Ministers? But then to give all that you would be at, let these Bishops signify Presbyters, and the Deacons an order inferior to them, what advantage will the Presbyterian cause have by that? Was there not imparity in that same case? Was there not one order above another? But then if you ask, Where was the chief Bishop? It is answered, That the chief Bishop was an Apostle of Apostolick Ordination, and at the writing of that Epistle

Epistle he was in company with St. Paul, *Philip. ii. 25. Epaphroditus your messenger*, which Presbyterians expound, one sent from the church of Philippi with a contribution of sacred money to the Apostle St. Paul; which will not hold; for the word *Αποστέλλον* cannot be taken in such a sense, for it would be *Αγγελον* if it signify'd messenger in the Presbyterian notion.

But still, to crown all, Are Presbyterians the Successors to these Bishops, or Presbyters and Deacons that were at Philippi? For unless they prove their mission by Succession, they can never prove their ministry.

4. How can Presbyterians, with knowledge and conscience, insist upon that new notion (the first author of it, for ought I know, was Mr. Baxter) to keep up a party, and to stand out against light, to draw over deluded disciples to themselves, and to tell us that the first Bishops were congregational or parochial Bishops, in the modern notion that they have of it? What! was every Elder under St. James, first of Jerusalem, a Bishop? There were many ten thousands of believers on the place, as the authors of *Jus Reg. Eccl.* acknowledge;

ledge ; now, could one Bishop serve them all ? Or were the several Elders or Presbyters at Jerusalem, Bishops of the place ? See first part, pag. 65. 66. But let Presbyterians prove themselves Successors to St. James of Jerusalem and his Elders.

5. When St. Ignatius, an Apostolical Bishop, disciple to St. John, in his Epistles, written in his way going to his martyrdom, and had no occasion to extol the order of Bishops for his own sake, being to be baptized in his blood ; when I say, in his seven genuine Epistles, found out by Dr. Usher a Bishop, and Vossius a Presbyterian, and proven to be so by Bishop Pearson, Du Pin, and others, mentions the three distinct orders of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, pray was there a Presbyterian parity to be imagined in that stile ? If these three orders were all equal, will not the interpretation run thus : Be obedient to Bishops, Bishops, Bishops, Presbyters, Presbyters, Deacons, Deacons ? But still, let Presbyterians prove their Succession from Post-apostolical Writers.

6. If you say that local, personal, and presential communion was required
with

with the Bishop of the place ; I say, that may be in a national church as well as in a congregation ; for may not all England communicate with the Archbishop of Canterbury on Easter-day, as well as three millions of Jews, legally clean, communicated with the High Priest, and partook with the altar in the Temple of Jerusalem, tho' they approached it not in their own persons ? See first Part, pag. 64. &c.

When there is an imparity in heaven among the Angels, and on earth in the natural and political body, in navies among mariners, in camps among soldiers, in universities among masters of colleges, and in every family among fathers, children, masters and servants, why should the Church of Christ, which is his mystical body, want beauty, order and harmony, in a decent subordination, which still was in the Old Testament Church, and still continues in all parts of the Christian world, till among some few of very late ? Nay, what power have mere Presbyters (tho' depending upon the Bishop) to give holy orders, more than a baptised Laick has to give baptism, or one that has received the sacrament of the Lord's Sup-

per, to administer that unto others? And if Presbyters ordained by Bishops, cannot confer that power on others, how can they who are not so ordained bestow it? And how can they who have shaken off the sacred order of Bishops, who are the Apostles Successors, presume to do it, without incurring the guilt and danger of perishing in the sin of Corah? And ought that power to be usurped that was never given to inferior Clergymen, nor ever was meant to be given to them at the plantation of Religion, nor at the reformation from Popery: How can they then exercise it without incurring the sin against Father, Son, and Holy Ghost?

A

D I A L O G U E.

B E T W I X T

An Ancient Noble EARL and a Presbyterian Incumbent in the Parish, named MR. JOHN, who came to pay a Visit to the Family : Relative to the First and Second Parts of the Succession of the Priesthood.

Mr. *John*.

MY Lord, I come hither to pay the duty I owe to your Lordship, and to your noble family, as being minister of this parish whereof your Lordship is heretor.

Earl. Mr. John, you are welcome to me, and so is any who has the name of a minister.

Mr

Mr. John. I hope your Lordship will grant me more than the bare name of a minister; for I am settled in the parish by the law of the land, and I was ordained by the *laying on of the hands*, as Timothy was, 1 *Eph.* v. 14. And I am sorry your Lordship does not strengthen my hands, by coming with your lady, children and servants, to countenance the worship and ordinances.

Earl. Mr. John, your grievance must have several distinct answers; and first, to be ingenuous with you, I think the bare name of a minister is too much for you, for none should be so called but such as are truly so, unless we speak in the Quakers stile, thus, *minister so called*. I find it commended in the *Angel of Ephesus*, *Rev.* ii. 2. *That he tried them which called themselves Apostles and were found liars*. And tho' you be established by the present law, that does not make you a minister; for I fancy you will not so far depart from the Presbyterian authors of *Jus Reg. Eccles.* written in 1647, who maintain very solidly against the Erastians, that the civil magistrate cannot be the fountain of the gospel ministry, nor can
the

the people be the original, as these authors have maintained against the Independents.

Mr. John. Not so my Lord, but by the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*.

Earl. The authors of the forecited book founded the ministry upon Apostolical Succession: Now, Sir, prove you that the Presbytery that laid hands on you, are lineal successors to that Presbytery that laid hands on Timothy, where the Apostle St. Paul ascribes the whole action to himself; and neither St. Jerome, nor Mr. Calvin, nor any ancient author ever understood it in your present sense of the words. I count them no Presbyters but such as are ordained by Bishops, who can derive their succession from the Apostles: For it is as reasonable that the Christian Clergy should be as exact and punctual in proving their descent from the Apostles, as the Jews were in the Old Testament, in proving their Priesthood from Aaron.

Mr. John. What! Will your Lordship unchurch all the Protestants in the world.

Earl.

Earl. I am not fond of the word Protestant more than the word Papist ; I find the Socinians go under the name of Protestants, who are guilty of the heresies of Ebion, Cerinthus and Carpocrates, denying CHRIST's divinity, and ascerting him to be a mere man. Presbyterians are Protestants, who maintain the error of Aerius, who was condemned for an heretick, for asserting, " That there should be no distinction " of higher and lower degrees among " Clergymen." In a word, Arians, Enthusiasts and Antinomians, go under the name of Protestants, and are all more guilty of a fundamental error than Papists. You have the worst things that Papists have, and which the best of themselves condemn. But you cry out against their maintaining *Apostolical Succession, set forms of Prayer, Feasts and Festivals, order and decency, as rank Popery.* And, Mr. John, do you think their ministerial acts valid that have no lawful ordination? For first, they are not Presbyters that are not made so by the Successors of the Apostles, which our authors prove ; and they who are so presbyterate were never allowed to confer that office upon others.

Mr.

Mr. John. Then (according to this notion) they cannot be within the covenant of grace.

Earl. Sir, it is not our charity nor civility, nor the concessions of the learned, nor the objecting many inconveniencies, that will make wrong right, or make them ministers who have not ordination by the divine rule of Apostolical Succession. If a man hearing a sermon on repentance, who has made a great estate by force and fraud, not asking a *question for conscience sake*, finds something in the sermon that kindles a fire in his conscience, *to wit*, That his repentance can never be sincere, nor acceptable to God, without *restitution of ill-gotten goods*; he will ease his conscience with this reason, that this would beggar him and all his family, and damn thousands in the world; I hope this is no good reason for him to persevere in his oppression of the tenants, and circumveening his neighbours.

Mr. John. My Lord, I hold myself still by the *laying on of the hands of the Presbytery*.

Earl. If a company of Laymen, many whereof have a competent measure of learning,

learning, and can preach sound doctrine, yet being displeased with the principles and practices of the present kirk, find a necessity for a reformation, and there-upon ordain five or six preaching Elders among themselves, and at length gather a great following, and are like to overturn your present kirk settlement, and perhaps, in process of time, may get law on their side, would you look upon them as lawful ministers?

Mr. John. No truly, because they depart from *the good old way*.

Earl. Sir, I say, that your Presbytery is neither good nor old; not good, because it has not Apostolical Succession; not old; for pray, Mr. John, how old do you think Presbytery?

Mr. John. As old as the Apostles.

Earl. So might this new supposed Presbytery say upon the same scripture which you cite for yourselves; but tell me of an Apostolic Church for three hundred years, when the church was under persecution, or afterwards when it came to its prosperity, *under kings who became nursing fathers, and queens who became nursing mothers*, that had such a Presbytery as you plead for at present? I can prove my own family to
be

be three hundred years older than your Presbytery; yea it were no hard task to prove an hundred Chiefs in Scotland older than Presbytery; but I will not contend so against Episcopacy: For under the Old Testament it continued since the first consecration of Aaron to the High-priesthood, and under the New Testament since the days of the Apostles; but the first that set up this new model of ordination by mere Presbyters in a parity, was John Calvin at Geneva, in the year 1541, which is but an hundred and seventy six years ago; now my first predecessor Dowgald was an eminent instrument in restoring Malcolm the third, the 86th King of Scotland, against the usurper and tyrant M'Beth, and that in the year 1057, which being subtracted from 1717, there remains 660, and subtract 176, years from 660, there remains 484 years older than Calvin's founding of Presbyterian government, which was never heard of before, in the persecution, nor in the prosperity of the Christian world. Moreover, Mr. John, you cannot prove a list of your succession from John Calvin (whose ordination as a Priest is very much doubted) in a li-

real Succession, nor from John Knox, who was but a mere Priest, that could not confer the orders of Priesthood, more than a baptised Layman can confer Baptism, nor they who receive the Lord's Supper can give it to them who have not received it.

Mr. John. My Lord, I am not for *vain genealogies*, 1 *Tim.* i. 4. *Tit.* iii. 9.

Earl. Mr. John, your way of reasoning is peculiar to your party, upon the mere sound of a word, like that of *Presbytery*, and *Lords over God's heritage*: For I am not debating my genealogy out of vanity, but merely to shew the unreasonableness of your pretences to the Sacred Office of the Priesthood, which you cannot prove from Calvin nor Knox, who had no power to ordain: Comparisons are odious we say; but if this comparison be true, it choaks your pretences to the ministry. And, Mr. John, Is there not a difference betwixt *vain genealogies* and genealogies? as there is betwixt vain philosophy and philosophy? vain repetitions, and repetitions that are not vain? Idle words, and words that are not so? Is there not a difference betwixt Episcopal Ministers that can derive their Succession from
the

the Apostles, and those that cannot do it from Calvin nor Knox? And were not genealogies found necessary to prove the Messias his humanity, witness St. *Matth.* i. and St. *Luke* ii.? Yea, were not genealogies in the Old Testament necessary to know who were Priests and who not, *Ezra* ii. 62. and vii. 64. As when the Episcopal Ministers the last year were found to be ministers according to law, by the Protestant Bishops who ordained them? And now in what part of the world, Mr. John, do you prove yourselves ministers in the manner they did?

Mr. John. My Lord, in the primitive times there was no such thing as Lord Bishops.

Earl. No more was there Mr. James's nor Mr. John's; and if there was no Lord Peter nor Lord Paul, no more was there Mr. Peter nor Mr. Paul.

Mr. John. My Lord, No such thing as diocesses and large revenues, nor Bishops sitting in civil Judicatories.

Earl. Mr. John, nor do I find Parish Churches, nor fifty, sixty, seventy or a hundred pounds a year of stipend, nor the pleasures of the fair sex for matrimonial conveniencies, in the primitive

times. And truly Mr. John, I find Presbyterian Parochial Bishops (as some of you call yourselves most ignorantly) as unmortified to the world as ever I saw an Archbishop : and Mr. John, it is often told you, that a Diocess makes not a Bishop more than a Parish makes a Minister ; but you will insist upon it (contrary to knowledge) to keep up the people to your interest.

Is that a good argument, that the present Bishops (encouraged by Christian Kings, when the ecclesiastic and civil states are cemented and concorporated) cannot be the Successors of the primitive Bishops, because they were poor and persecuted ? At this rate you may argue, that I am not the successor of Dowgald the first founder of my family, because he was not an Earl as I am, but the fifth Earl since the days of King James the sixth, and former twelve Lords Barons ; before that we were Knights ; and before that, we were but Good-mans, as we call them in Scotland ; besides my first Ancestor had, perhaps, not thirty pounds worth of lands, and had but houses of timber, stake and rice ; but his successors came to have ten thousand pounds a-year, with

with stately towers and palaces, and we became a great and mighty Tribe through the kingdom : Yea, and at this rate, Mr. John ought not to have his sixty pounds a year, because *St. Paul wrought with his own hands*. It was by such pitiful quibbles that in Oliver's days, and by new interpretations on scripture, you expelled the Apostolic Succession out of the Protestant Church, and by the same naughty subtilities, you are preparing to act the same game over.

The Episcopal Ministers shew their Charter, *St. Matth. xxviii. 20. Lo, I am, &c.* and *St. John xx. 21. As my Father hath sent me, &c.* and prove their Mission in a Succession of Bishops from the days of the Apostles ; but you think to overthrow this with your own gloss on these scriptures, *St. Luke xxi. 25. The Kings of the Gentiles, &c.* and *1 Pet. v. 4. Lords over God's Heritage*. But Sir, I shall present you with a parallel of your way of reasoning to destroy the Apostolical Succession, and I shall read it to you out of an ingenious author, *Diaphan.* page 120. and I crave your attention to the words.

“Cajus being the seventeenth knight of his family, which continued in a

flourishing state time out of mind, a faction arises to dispossess him of all that his ancestors enjoyed so long ; they tell him in general, That his ancestors were intruders, but differ very much about the time, one says 200, another 500, and another 800 years ; Cajus shews his father's succession, and an evident testimony under his hand, thus,

“ *Ego Gonvillus, &c. constituo Cajum filium meum Heredem bonorum meorum omnium.* “ I Gonvill, &c. constitute Cajus “ my son heir of all my goods.”

“ In come a company of trifling sophisters, A. B. C. &c. and wheedle him out of his ancient possession, after this manner.

“ 1. Says A. This is plainly corrupted, it was not written *Cajum*, but *Sajum* ; the corruption is easy on the bottom of the first letter.

“ 2. B. Let it be as it will, this testament is of no value, for it proceeds on an uncertainty, if not a false supposition ; for who can say, That you are that *Cajus*, or that you are *Gonvill's* son?

“ 3. C. You must be his son and actual heir while he was alive, or when he was dead ; not when he was alive, for right cannot be but in one at once ; not
when

when he was dead, for none can be son to him that is not, no more than any person that is alive can be father to him that has no being.

“ 4. D. Was this right which is conveyed to you in your father alone, or in some others besides? If in himself alone, why doth he say, *constituo*, i. e. *simul statuo*. I appoint together with others; and if so, why are they not named?

“ 5. It seems to me, (saith E.) Mr. Cajus, That this testament is rather against you than for you: For either you pretend to be his son, before this testament or after; if before, your own evidence witnesseth against you, *Constituo Cajum filium meum*, “ I make Cajus my son,” if after, then by this testament you are made his son.

“ 6. It doth indeed (saith F.) make him his heir; but what of what? Not of his estate, which we contend about, but only of his goods, and do you think, Mr. Cajus, that a dying man would speak improperly, truly no: Goods of mind, virtue, prudence, temperance, these according to Aristotle are properly called goods, and that of body and fortune improperly called so.

7. Let

“ 7. Let it be what kind of goods you will (saith *G.*), This very word *Meorum* overturns all your pretensions ; for these are your father’s words ; you say, well then, if it be so, either state you plead for, these goods are now either his, or not his ? If they be his, then they are not yours ; if they be now not his, then the very title you rely upon is false.

“ 8. A Testament (saith *H.*) is to be taken in its strict and rigorous sense, so the word *Omniun* spoils your plea ; you must have all his goods or none, but you have not his good face, nor his good endowments.

“ 9. Come, come, (saith *I.*) we needed not have gone so far, or used so many words ; Cajus pretends, that his father who made the testament was the last of 17 knights of his family : Out of his own mouth I will condemn him, with the very first word of his will, which he says his father made, which is *Ego*, the first person, and yet he says his father was the last person of 17 knights.”

Mr. John. My Lord, that is a very heavy charge on Presbyterians, that they interpret the Old and New Testament

ment after the same manner that these supposed triflers expounded Cajus his testament.

Earl. Yes, I know they do ; I could multiply examples to you on the head, as *The Kings of the Gentiles*, and *Lords over God's heritage*, by that way of reasoning ; and that there is no order of Clergymen above another, because Bishops and Presbyters are promiscuously taken : Yea, what think you of a cry'd up champion for the Presbyterian cause, (*M. W. F. Sum and Substance of Episcopal Controversy*, pag. 3. 4.) who tells us very confidently, " That the " Spirit of God had peculiar views of re- " forming Scotland, when the Prophet " *Isaiah*, *lv. 3.* said, *I will make an " everlasting Covenant with you, &c.* and " *Jer. l. 5.* *Come and let us join ourselves " to the Lord in a perpetual Covenant, " &c.*" and gives his reason thus, " For " till of late Scotland was reckoned one " of the utmost parts of the earth, or " known world." Now is there any thing in Cajus's testament more ridiculously commented on by the quibblers than this ? I am sure not one half so blasphemous, as to make the people believe that the bloody Solemn League and

and Covenant was prophesied as a gospel blessing? May not this man say any thing, and undertake to prove, (as he does), That St. Ignatius and St. Cyprian were Presbyterians. And could there be greater nonsense spoke, than to say, "That Christ died a martyr for "Presbyterian government." Mr. D. "W. Sermon, *Pf.* ii. 12. and to prove it from St. *John* xix. 19. "Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews?"

Or can there be greater nonsense than to say that Cain was an Arminian, Papist and Socinian? *Blackwell's Ratio Sacra*, page 7. Or that the saying of the Lord's Prayer in such a manner, or after prayers, "Is a lifeless, sapless, "loathsome worship." Mr. H. *Cass. Essays*, page 318, 320, "And that it "is an engine from Hell to subvert the "gospel." These things I cite to you from printed books, under the authors own hands; and now, when you deal so with the scriptures, what may not be expected of the use you make of ecclesiastical history, and of the ancient writers, which are not so commonly in mens hands as the bible is?

Mr.

Mr. John. My Lord, I am sorry that I have lost my errand in coming hither; for I thought to gain your Lordship to countenance the worship and ordinances.

Earl. Mr. John, tho' you had a lawful ordination I would not hear you, unless I knew before hand what prayer you put up for the congregation, who are obliged to know how they worship God as well as you, and to pray to God as well as to sing to God.

Mr. John. My Lord, I pray as the spirit directs me.

Earl. Sir, if extemporary praying be to *pray with the spirit*, will it not follow, that none in the congregation has the spirit but yourself, because none pray off hand but yourself? Besides, the people do not pray themselves, but they only hear you pray, as they hear you preach, but do not preach themselves. Again, if your prayer be by the spirit, if one shall write it in a short hand, and print it, what hinders it to be canonical scripture? And, 3^{dly}, Why do you write your sermons lest you speak nonsense to the people, and not your prayers lest you speak nonsense to God?

Mr.

Mr. John. My Lord, I come not hither to debate, but advise your Lordship to be a good example in the parish by countenancing the ordinances.

Earl. Sir, I have my own chaplain canonically ordained, who can derive his Succession from the Apostles by the Bishop that ordained him. I have the book of Common Prayer in my family, whereby the meanest servant is edified; we have confession, absolution, the form of sound words, scriptures read every day; baptized persons may read their duty, and they who are to communicate see their duty plainly in the communion office; my wife knows how to give thanks to God after child-bearing, and I know how to get my children confirmed, and we are all edified by the fasts and festivals of the church throughout the year.

Mr. John. Fasts and festivals! Old Popish trash!

Earl. Every thing must be called Popery that makes against you; but, Mr. John, the last Christmas fell to be on a Sunday; what text did you preach upon?

Mr. John. 1 Sam. xvi. 1. *And the Lord said unto Samuel, How long wilt thou*

thou mourn for Saul, seeing I have rejected him from being King over Israel.

Earl. What preached you on Easter-day?

Mr. John. 2 Kings viii. 13. And Hazael said, But what, is thy servant a dog, that he should do this great thing?

Earl. What on Whitsunday?

Mr. John. On Cant. vi. 6. 7. Thy teeth are as a flock of sheep, which go up from the washing, whereof every one beareth twins, and there is not one barren among them. As a piece of pomegranate are thy temples within thy locks.

Earl. Truly, Mr. John, I do not think the congregation can be much edified by sermons you make on these texts.

Mr. John. My Lord, come see and hear.

Earl. Nay, I think I do better to hear the mysteries of the Christian religion; The nativity and resurrection of our Saviour, and the descent of the Holy Ghost, who continues the ministry in the Church as succeeding to the Apostles, according to CHRIST's promise of being *with them to the end of the world*.

Mr. John. My Lord, I wish you would read the Presbyterian pamphlets as much as you read the Prelatick.

A a

Earl

Earl. Sir, I read both, and if you would read what is answered without prejudice, you would find your ministry to be without mission ; but to discourse upon charity with a worldly wretch, upon sobriety and temperance with an epicure, is all one as to persuade you out of your stipend by the doctrine of Apostolical Succession ; but if a change should come, you will see the Episcopal writings with other spectacles than you do now, as your predecessors overcame their obligations to the Solemn League and Covenant, and 700 of them kept their stipends. Sir, take you all your authors for Presbytery, Eduardus Dido-clavius, the Anagram of David Calder-wodius ; take you the writings of Mr. Forrester, Dr. Rule, Mr Jameson and Mr. Anderson, and prove yourselves ministers by personal Succession to the Apostles, otherwise I will not believe your mission, tho' you should write as many books as could fill the Bafs.

P O S T S C R I P T.

I Thought to have given some account of the Apostolical Succession of the Church of Sweden, and of several foreign Bishops that broke off from Rome and turned Lutheran, such as Gebhard Trushes Archbishop of Cologne, Vergerius and his brother, who were both Bishops ; as also of Dudithius a Bishop ; but I found it more proper to treat of this by itself ; because my design in this Second Part was to prove ourselves ministers, and challenge all the Presbyterians in the world to prove their mission, which from my heart I wish they could do, for the credit of the reformation. And tho' they should find an hundred errors in my performance, (as I hope there is not one that's wilful) yet this can make nothing for them, except they prove that they are Successors to those that got commission *to teach and baptize all nations.*

F I N I S.



