



Thomas F. Jones
2 vols
61



Agnew of Shrewsbury



*Puritan
Collection
Division RL*

*SCC
9008*

110 B

2

No 142

The Two verses in the volume
are written by Thomas Forster,
Principal of the New College,
St Andrews. J. J.

A
Review and Consideration
Ex Libris Rob. Of Two late *Agnew & Pryor* *pt B*
PAMPHLETS. *2*

The First Entitled,
Queries to the Presbyterians of Scotland, by a Gentleman of that
Countrey.

The Second,
A Querie turn'd into an Argument in favours of Episcopacy.
Exposing the Unsound Principles, and Popish Tincture and Tendency of both; and Vindicating the Government and Constitution of this Church from the Cavils and Aspersions contain'd therein.

To which are Annex'd
Counter-Queries offered to the Prelatists of Scotland.

As also
Considerations upon Church-Government: [Thomas Forrester]

Wherein the most material Points agitated in the Episcopal Controversie, and, in special, upon the Debate and Question of *Antiquity*, are succinctly cleared; Together with a Defence thereof against Exceptions and Animadversions of a Manuscript, suppos'd to be written by J. S. The whole intended for the further Confirmation of the Testimony of our Church, and Encouragement of her sincere Members in Adherence to her true Gospel Constitution.

Prov. 14. 6. A Scornor seeketh Wisdom, and findeth it not; but Knowledge is easie unto him that understandeth.

Ila. 8. 20. To the Law and to the Testimony; if they speak not according to this Word, it is because there is no Light in them.

2 Cor. 13. 8. For we can do nothing against the Truth, but for the Truth.

De Cælo querendus est Iudex, sed ut quid pulsamus ad Cælum, cum habeamus hic in Evangelio Testamentum. Optat. Milevit. contra Parmen. Lib. 5.

Review and Consideration

Of Two late

PAMPHLETS

By the Rev. James
Gordon, Minister of Scotland, by a Gentleman of the
Court.

The first of these two pamphlets is a history of the
Reformation in Scotland, and a description of the
present state of the Church, and of the Government and
of the State of the Nation, and of the State of the
Church, and of the State of the Nation, and of the
State of the Church, and of the State of the Nation.

The second of these two pamphlets is a history of the
Reformation in Scotland, and a description of the
present state of the Church, and of the Government and
of the State of the Nation, and of the State of the
Church, and of the State of the Nation, and of the
State of the Church, and of the State of the Nation.

By the Rev. James Gordon, Minister of Scotland, by a Gentleman of the Court.

The first of these two pamphlets is a history of the
Reformation in Scotland, and a description of the
present state of the Church, and of the Government and
of the State of the Nation, and of the State of the
Church, and of the State of the Nation, and of the
State of the Church, and of the State of the Nation.

The second of these two pamphlets is a history of the
Reformation in Scotland, and a description of the
present state of the Church, and of the Government and
of the State of the Nation, and of the State of the
Church, and of the State of the Nation, and of the
State of the Church, and of the State of the Nation.

()
TO THE RIGHT HONOURABLE

Sir PATRICK JOHNSTON
Lord Provost,

Archibald Rule, }
William Neilson, } *Bailies ;*
George Lawson, }
George Lind, }

Sir Samuel M^cclellan

Dean of Gild ;

William Jeffrey *Thesaurer ;*

Mr. Henry Hamilton *Deacon Conveener ;*

*And the rest of the Honourable
Council of the City of EDINBURGH.*

RIGHT HONOURABLE,

THE following Treatises sent to me by some Judicious and
Worthy Persons (who, out of a Generous Regard to
the present Establishment, without any other Byass, or Lower

Motives, have been at the Charges of Publishing them) I have, at their Desire, Presum'd to Dedicat to Your Honours. Had the Reverend and Learn'd Author thought fit to Prefix his Name to them, I perswade my self, the known Character, which, by his Great-Personal Accomplishments, and Useful Writings he hath justly Obtain'd in this Church, would have sufficiently Recommended them to Your Honours.

THE Aim and Work of the Author (which he hath Manag'd with Great Advantage) is to Brush off the Dust, the Adversaries of our Church have been pleas'd to cast upon Her. And indeed they do little more than Rake into the Dung-hill of long since Antiquated Arguments, and present Threed-bare Topicks in a New Dress, to Amuse Unthinking and Unwarrie People. A very Superficial Acquaintance with the late Controversie 'twixt Us and the Prelatists will let us see, that several of their Arguments touch not on the Merit of the Cause, but are manifestly False Reflections on the Ministry of this Church and their Judicial Procedures : Not unlike the Old Serpent, who, after he has got his Death-Stab, will be still Nibbling at the Heel of Him that gave it.

Right Honourable, If it would not Trespass upon Your Modesty, I would Acquaint the World with the Great Encouragements,

()
ments and Support You have given to Piety and Vertue, both
by Your Authority and Example, and Publish Your Disinterest-
ed Zeal for Suppressing of Vice in this Populous City.

THAT the Unerring Spirit of GOD may Preside in all Your
Counsels, and Direct Your Determinations, so as to be a Never
Failing Fountain of Justice, whose Streams may Refresh the
Good Town, and that Your Honours may be as Eminent for
Your Administrations, as for the Trust that is put upon You,
is the Sincere Prayer of,

Right Honourable,

*Your most Obliged and Humble
Servant.*

ALEX. HENDERSON.

T O T H E

Judicious and Candid Reader.

TIS long since observed (shall I say, experienc'd by the Learned and Judicious, in Point of Debate) that since the Press has helped the Pen, many of all Dispositions will needs be Scribling, and procacious Wits, and Self-seekers, upon various Designs, of Covetousness, or suppos'd Credit, are Emulous to appear in Print ; Many, to shew that which passes in the World for Learning or Parts, and lest they should appear worsted by Adversaries, in Debate, when once engaged, will needs, from the old Principle of Pride, make a shew this way in publick, tho' Truth be never so much obscur'd by the Clouds they draw upon't, Enemies harden'd, and the less discerning stumbled ; Many, to court a Party with whom they have embark'd, will needs in this way, tho' never so weakly, appear to fence for their Interest. And this, no doubt, has set a work, in our day, many Smatterers and fanciful Heads to enter the Lists of Debate ; Altho', besides the loss of precious time, and endeavours this way, in stead of reaching the Praise they catch at, they do blot their Name, in the Judgment of the Impartial ; And, which is worst of all, sadly wound their Conscience, and mar the Peace thereof.

And as this Disposition has signally appear'd in our Age, so especially in this Controversie about Church Government. There have been various Methods thereof contended for ; But, the Debate running mainly betwixt the Episcopal and Presbyterian, the Controversie is now come to such an Issue, that the Scripture Decission in favours of the Establish'd Government of this Church, is beyond Debate with all sincere Enquirers, and Lovers of the Truth and Way of GOD.

The lamentable dear-bought Experience of the dreadful Tendency and Effects of a Prelatical Erastian Hierarchy (that grand Tool of Arbitrary Government and Tyranny) having, at last, opened the Eyes of this Nation, and thereupon excited, to shake off that Antichristian Yoke, and, together with our National, to Restore and Establish the true Gospel Liberty of this National Church, her Courts and Judicatories of Divine Appointment, the blessed Effects whereof have been seen and felt in the Advancement of Edification (the great Design of Gospel Ordinances) and the Propagation of a Faithful Ministry through the whole Land, except in so far as oppos'd by Popish and Malicious Adversaries : This true Church has open'd Her Arms (I may say, abundantly wide) to Receive all of the Episcopal Clergy, even to Ministerial Fellowship, who (if not Scandalous, or Censurable) are willing to joyn themselves in Communion with Her, and engage a Non-opposition, an Obligation so necessary to the Preservation of our Church, that no Person of common Sense can quarrel it; Wherein her Moderation has so convincingly appear'd to all Impartial Observers, as may justly stop the Mouth of Calumny. Notwithstanding whereof, the Endeavours of the Lord's Servants, to establish in this Church and Nation true Gospel Purity, Peace and Unity, have met with uncessant Contradiction, and Counter-actings of a Set of Men, who have therein, I may truly say, appear'd in their own Colours, that is, Persons of such Principles and Practices, and prosecuting such Designs as tend to overturn and supplant this Reformed Church in her present Gospel Establishment, in so far discovering Heart Enmity to Truth and Godliness.

This their Opposition, in the whole Series and Scope thereof, has, by this time, so convincingly appear'd, as discovers them beyond the Fallacy of all transparent Disguises, which are now found off a self-contradicting Visage. They pretend the profoundest Respect to Civil Authority, and there is no end of their Clamorous and Lying Imputations upon Presbyterians, as persons of Seditious Turbulent Principles, and Despisers of Magistracy : But, were ever Seditious Designs, or Practices, more palpably exemplified than in their Way and Carriage, since the late happy Revolution ? Not to mention their en-

couraging of, and secret Embarking with Conspiracies, and more open, even Arm'd and Violent Appearances against the Establish'd Government, which severals of them very probably may be found guilty of; Have they not otherways put signal and arrant Affronts upon it, in their many Illegal and Law-baffling Practices, whereof the Instances are obvious, and daily multiplied? Yea even in their very Sermons and Pamphlets, this is apparent. Does not the Crying up Passive Obedience, to the highest Apex of Turkish Slavery, Treasonable Reflect upon this Nation's Assertion of Liberty in the late Revolution? And have they not imputed the Establishment of our Church to Seditious Humour? Witness J. S's Assertion in the Epilogue of his Voluminous Pamphlet; Not to mention the multiplied Imputations of this Nature daily vented by his Associats, together with their avow'd Intrusions upon a Legally Establish'd Ministry, and Exciting Persons of all Ranks, whom they can prevail upon, to Oppose and Supplant the same, with many such like Practices, which convincingly, and to a Demonstration discover this their Seditious, Turbulent Disposition. And is it not strange, and most unaccountable, that they will needs plead a Favour of the Government, while their Principles and Practices are so palpably levell'd at the Design of Overturning it; And that such Men should have the Confidence to plead at Her Majesties Bar for Legal Favours, who so far Disown Her Authority, as to refuse so much as to Pray for Her; Nay who in Prayer, severall of them, if not the whole, are known to Arraign Her before the Supreme Tribunal of the Almighty, as an Usurper of the Throne, while Praying for another Sovereign, as having the just Right and Title to it.

Further to evince their Unsound and Inconsistent Principles and Methods, they would seem to appear Zealous for the Divine Right of Prelacy, as an Apostolick Government, derived from Apostles, and standing upon such a Divine Basis, that the shaking and disowning of it, Overturns the very Foundation of a true Gospel Church and Ministry. I need not mention, in proof of this, Dodwell and Sage, with several others our late High flow'n Pleaders; We have a clear and recent Instance in our Querist here examin'd, who, following, in this, the rest of his Tribe, is bold, in his confident Anger, or rather angry Ignorance, to asperse all such Churches, as are not of a Piece

with the present Church of England, as Sectaries and Schismatics, broken and cut off from the Union of Christ's Church and true Bodie, yea has the Impudence to call Ministerial Ordination therein, but a meer Cheat and Fallacy. Notwithstanding whereof, 'tis notourly known, that, as the Chief Hierarchicks and Pillars of the English Church, which they so warmly, yea, so servilely Court, have alwise own'd the Erastian Mould of Government, thus practically and avow'dly throwing up the Intrinsick Power, and Divine Right of the Church in this Point, whereof the present Constitution of that Church is a convincing Proof, so the Patrons, Erectors, and Upholders of our late Scottish Prelacy did, and do own the same Principles and Design: And who knows not, that the Church Government, if so it may be called, for which our present Pleaders and Pamphleters profess such Veneration, and contend with such blind Zeal, was of as ingrain'd Erastian Mould, as ever had a Being; Our now pretended Jure-Divino Prelacy being in the late Establishment thereof, entirely given up (yea, and with our Prelats hearty Consent and Concurrence) to the absolute Disposal of the King: For, by the Laws Establishing this Government, the Foundation thereof was laid in the Supremacy, and Prelacy being Erected upon this Foot, was a Hierarchy of a compleat Erastian breed; Since, by this Legal Establishment thereof, it was declar'd His Majestie's Crown-Right, to Determine in all Church Meetings, and matters therein cognoscible, as he thought fit, according to his Established Laws. Let any peruse the Establishment and Progress of the Supremacy in the late Reigns, nay the express Declarator of His Majestie's Popedom, by Sir George Mackenzie in his Institutions, and this will be evident beyond all Contradiction.

Moreover, there is such a Vein of Popish Disaffection to the True Reform'd Religion, running through the Writings, especially the late Pamphlets of that Set of Men, such a deep Tincture of Popish, Arminian, yea and in a great measure, Socinian Errors, therein apparent, that we cannot but therein admire and adore the infinite Wisdom, the just Judgment of the Holy and Jealous GOD, who is not mocked, in giving up Persons to such crooked Courses, who state themselves in Terms of Contradiction to the Reformation and true Union of a well Reform'd Gospel Church.

Is it not strange, and most unaccountable Perverseness, that our Confession of Faith Established in Parliament, should be flouted, disown'd, and oppos'd, by such punie Companions? A Confession digested according to Scripture Rules, so exactly Correspondent to the Confessions of all Reform'd Churches, and, in so far, a Sacred Bond of Fellowship with them, a Confession chalking out the Pathway of that Truth which is according to Godliness, in opposition to Errours on the right and left Hand, and this after the exactest Diligence, joyn'd with Prayer and Supplication to the GOD of Truth, by an Assembly of Divines, I may truly say, beyond the hazard of the least Imputation of Flattering Partiality, deserving the Character of one of the most Godly, Learned, and Orthodox, that ever Britain saw, and this with Concurrence of this National Church, in her Supreme Judicatorie. What but a Spirit of Enmity to the Truths therein asserted, could prompt to this? I have known some of the Chief of them solemnly pos'd upon it, what Chapter, what Article they excepted against, who, tho' persisting in an Obstinate Refusal to own it, could by no Importunity be prevail'd upon to give the Instance. Will not many be apt to suppose, that in this aliquid Mysterii alunt, and thus aliquid Monstri, which is now verified by their publish'd Snarlings at some Passages of that Confession.

'Tis no less unaccountable Obstinacy, or shall I call it subtle Heterodoxie, in this Point and Controversie of Church Government, that tho' with many big Words and proud Ostentation, they assert the Divine Right of Prelacy, the Apostolick Constitution and Necessity of that Government, to the Being, and right Constitution of Gospel Churches, yet they cannot be drawn forth to a true Scripture Debate, to a formal Discussion of this Question, according to the true Laws of Dispute, from the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, or to give direct and formal Answers to Arguments against it, and for Presbyterian Government, drawn from this Doctrine and Practice, and the Constitution of the Apostolick Churches represented in Scripture; So that, amidst all their multipl'd Citations of Fathers, and pretended Patrociny of the Ancient Church, and Glamours of Antiquity giving Sentence in their Favours, little, or nothing

nothing can be seen adduc'd for their Cause, from the truly Authentick Writings of infallible Apostles. Nay it is come to this pass with these Men, that they will needs set up as in an Infallible Chair, that which they call the Antient Churches Practice, to Determine the Sense of Scriptures Debated, or brought against them in this Controversie; Making, thus, this pretended Practice of the Church, the self-evident Primary Rule, the Scriptures but the Half, and to speak so, the general ambiguous part of it. A known Popish Device long since Exploded by all the Orthodox and truly Reformed Churches, as highly Reflecting upon the Perfection of Scripture, the genuine Scope thereof, and the Wisdom of GOD in giving to his Church this Authentick Rule of Holiness and Righteousness. Thus we are told over and over, ad nauseam, of Lines of Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, of the Churches constant Practice and Reception of Hierarchical Prelacy; And this pretended Universal Reception (which notwithstanding, in point of Fact, they can never make appear, and which has been frequently exposed by the best Searchers) they will needs have to be the Sure Foundation, and the Authentick Rule to lead us in to the Apostles first Constitution of Churches. To this Scope, and by this Rule, we must Interpret whatever is Recorded in Scripture thereanent. To make this apparent, besides many other obvious Instances, and our Querist's frequent Smatterings to this purpose, J. S. tells us, in his Voluminous Pamphlet, Chap. 2. p. 63. That, having Manag'd this great Performance of proving a true and proper Episcopacy in Cyprian's Age, and having laid this Foundation, he will run it up to the Apostolick Age and Constitution. Here is then the Foundation, and the Apostles Doctrine and Practice must be so understood, that it be a suitable Superstructure. I had thought, the Gospel Churches, in point of Government, as well as of Doctrine and Worship, had been built upon the Foundation of the Apostles, and that our LORD's Faithfulness, upon whose Shoulders the Government of his House is, had been in this Point parallel'd with, yea prefer'd to that of Moses, and that, consequently, what he has Recorded in his Testament, and Sealed with his Blood, had been the proper Rule and Foundation of our

our Belief and Perswasion in this Point, and this Paramount unto, yea, Exclusive of the meer Practice, or Profession of the Church, in the Third, or any Age.

'Tis also Noticeable, as a further Proof and Confirmation of what is said, that our New Episcopal Pleadings, notwithstanding of their High Pretences of a Divine Right for their beloved Hierarchie, yet when put to it, and Debated with from Scripture, are found very Shie in admitting the Scripture Determination of a fixed unalterable Species of Government, as might be Clear'd by Instances, not a few, in their Pleadings. We all know, how Stillingfleet's Irenicum has been Hugg'd and warmly Embrac'd by the Generality of that Clergy. Thus Bishop Honnieman, in his Survey of Naphtali, in Pleading for the then Ecclesiastick Supremacy, Ridicules a Distinct Church Government from that of the Civil. Thus Bishop Burnet, in his Conferences, runs so High in Asserting the then Existent Supremacy, that there's little or nothing he will have to be of a Divine Right in Point of Church Government. We see also, how this Determination of a Species is Impugn'd by the Author of the Animadversions subjoyn'd. So that, to the long Run, and in the Issue, it is apparent, that the Magistrats Laws, with the Correspondent Practice of the Church, is, with these Men, become such a Leading Superlative Rule, that the Scripture Decision, is in a great measure Disown'd, and, at best, made a meer Ambiguous Mute, a Rule so General, Versatile, and (so to speak) indigested, that it must have the premis'd Decisions to make it of any Significancy in this Point.

Moreover, we have a clear Discovery of the Popish Tincture and Tendency of their Principles and Pleadings, in their Joyning Issue with Papists, in the Arguments adduc'd to uphold the Hierarchy, the very same with such as are made use of by the Popes Advocats to Uphold and Support his Triple-Crown. This may seem strange in Men pretending to own a Protestant Profession: But the Mystery of this Mysterie lies here; The Popish Hierarchy is of such a Mould, Founded and Upheld by such Principles, that it must needs run up to the Apex of an Infallible Head; And the Prelatick Hierarchy, being of that same Nature and Cut, and in it self a Member of the same Body, a Branch of the same Tree, when the Pope

is professedly shaken off, another Head must be in his Place, a Visible Principle of Unity (as J. S. Asserts, the Bishop is to his Diocese); And thus it must Issue in a Civil Pope, as Sir George Mackenzie has own'd our King to be in place of the Pope: Whence none have been such Zealous and warm Pleaders for, and stickling Upholders of Arbitrary Government, and our King's Transcendent Sovereignty over Parliaments and Laws, as Prelats; Witness their Principles and Practice in both Nations. 'Tis true, a Becket's Mitre did once push the Crown of England, as said one of their Poets, and their many Seditious Practices in Opposition to Monarchs are Recorded; But then they had a strong and prevalent Patron, the Man at Rome with the Triple Crown, whose proper immediat Subjects they held themselves, who could Trample on Emperours Necks, Threaten the Greatest Monarchs with Rome's Thunder and Lightning, Loose Subjects from their Allegiance, and Arm them against their Princes; But now that the Scene is chang'd, and the Monarch is Pope, they must Serve their New Master, who, as Bishop Gladstones expresses it in his Letter to K. James, can nod them Down at his pleasure, if they be not Gloss and Cordial to Court Designs, and become not Faithful Creatures to their Assum'd Head, and Faithful Subjects of the New Civil Papacy. But for a simple Gospel laborious Ministry and Government, by Courts of a Divine Mould and Subordination, Censuring all Scandals, and in all Church Members, according to Scripture Rules, with Gospel Impartiality, wherein Congregations have a Right to Call Pastors, and Ruling Elders, Representing them, are constituent Members of Church Judicatories, Down must this Fabrick go as a blazing Star and Comet of prodigiously dangerous Influence, and of a formidable Aspect upon the Hierarchy; And this we find their Principles and Practice Zealously levell'd against. Hence Bishop Whitgift, Arch Bishop of Canterbury, tragically Complain'd to Q. Elizabeth, as if the Hierarchy were going to Wrack, and implor'd Her Help, when a Motion was but made in Parliament for Removing that Shameful Thing, and Grievance of all good Men, scil: The Pluralities and Non-residences: Not to insist upon that which is imputed to that Queen, That she Disown'd, if not laid aside, one of Her greatest Bishops, for dealing with Her in order to the Establishment of a Teaching Ministry throw the Nation.

If some Prelats have appear'd of a better Natural Humour, and more Affected to the Protestant Religion, and have accordingly, upon this Ground, withstood some Arbitrary Court Motions, and Popish Designs, 'tis owing meerly to the premis'd Ground of their Personal Qualities, not at all to the Nature and Mould of the Hierarchie it self. So that they fall into a meer unaccountable Paralogism, who, upon the Ground of such like Opposition, and even that made to the Popish Designs of the late K. James by some English Prelates, will Conclude that Government and Hierarchie a Barrier against Popery ; For that late Instance, it is well known, that the visible Prospect of that Prince's Acting the Phaeton, and hastening his Downfall, together with a piece of Self-Interest and Reputation, as likeways the convincing Discovery, how the Body of the People stood Affected to him and his Designs, in a great Measure, if not absolutely prompted them to that Appearance, which has ever since Rendered them so Popular. We know, that several of the more modest and better Humour'd Papists have profess'd Aversion from, yea, and Abhorrency of the Massacre of Paris, and such like Barbarous Murders committed upon Protestants, yet 'tis known, that their Infalible Head the Pope's Holiness, did with the Extremest Complacency entertain the News of that Massacre, appointed Processions and other Signs of Joy at Rome and elsewhere, sent his Legat to Congratulate the French King, upon that glorious Effort in Defence of the Church. And therefore, as none can be so Brutish as to deny, that the Popish Principles do natively lead to such Tragical Issues, the Obligation and Native Tincture whereof, must needs have the Ascendant over the more Calm and Modest Humour of some Subjects of that Hellish Hierarchy ; The same may be applyed to the Case of Prelats, and in special with respect to the late instanc'd Opposition of K. James. The Principles and Interest of the Hierarchie being of a Piece with Arbitrary Government, and knit unto such a Supreme Head, and Absolute Supremacy, as the Native Complexion thereof doth require, this Interest must needs Oversway, and have the Predominant over the Better and Calmer Temper of some Persons, when Actions most unaccountable come to be Stated as apparent fit Means and Expedients for Upholding this beloved Hierarchy, and the proper Design thereof.

As for the Prints here Examin'd, I suppose, the Weakness, as well as Heterodoxie thereof, has obviously appear'd to all judicious Persons, who have Perus'd the same, together with the virulent Tincture of the large Preface prefix'd to the first. I have therefore been slow, tho' Solicited, to offer this Account of them, expecting some might have done it better, and in a more Compendious Method, but finding these Pamphlets very Current, and Commended by that Party, I bestow'd some spare Time upon the First; And having thereafter seen the Second, much of a Piece with the Preceeding, and, in a great Measure, a Nauseous Repetition of the Silly Paralogisms wherewith it is Stuff'd, I have offer'd also my Thoughts upon it, supposing the Design and Connexion of both did Require the same.

I judg'd it also Expedient to Offer some Counter Queries to that Party, to Draw them Forth, if possible, to a Scripture Dispute upon upon this Point, which, if Formally and Scripturally Manag'd, (and I am not without Hope, Some will be stirr'd up to Undertake this, if any of that Party shall thus Enter the Lists, who will acquit themselves to more Advantage than ever I could) I am sure, Actum est de Causa Episcopatus, its Antiscriptural Frame and Weakness will appear, when it is come to this fair Trial.

As for The Considerations upon Church Government, after Subjoyned, I had of a very considerable Time since, even several years ago, Offer'd them to a Gentleman of the Episcopal Perswasion, upon his Desire, who having Perus'd them about six Weeks and more, Return'd them, without the least Hint of any Reply to be made by himself, or any other, tho' I have been credibly Inform'd, they were Communicated to Mr. S. But the Gentleman's Declining as is said) any Reply to be Offer'd, either by himself or any other, having perswaded me, that neither he nor Mr. Sage did intend any Answer or Debate, I was somewhat Surpriz'd, when Inform'd by a Rev. Brother, to whom I had Entrusted the Delivery of my Papers to the Person mention'd, that a Paper containing a pretended Reply was sent unto him, which he had keep'd by him of a considerable Time, as judging upon Perusal thereof, that it was of such a Matter, and Mould, as did not deserve my Notice; And thus it was also judg'd by another Judicious Person who had Perus'd it. I Confess I was Desirous to see it,
but

but a very considerable Time intervening betwixt the Gentleman's Re-delivery of these Papers, in the Manner instanced, and the Offer of this pretended Reply to the Person mentioned, and much more Time ere I had any Notice of it; I must confess, it appear'd Odd and Unaccountable, that tho' this goodly Piece appear'd to have been the Subject of no small Times Advise'ment, yet it was not only Offer'd in such manner, as I was left to a meer Conjecture about the Author, (what ever probable rectitude there is in my Conjecture, which I do judge has not miss'd the Mark) but likewise that it was drawn up in such Dull and Illegible Writ, that for my own part, who am none of the best Skill'd in Reading bad Writ, I was in no Capacity to Peruse it. The Truth is, upon this Ground, as likewise, because of the Characters of it mention'd, I had of a considerable time laid it aside; But being about to send these Considerations to the Press, I caus'd a Person well seen in Reading Writ Transcribe it. And upon perusal, I found it indeed such a Piece as Answer'd the Description I had of it; Yet knowing the Humour of the Party, and that probably it is now in the hands of severals, as an Answer to the Considerations mention'd, I Judg'd it expedient to offer this Confutation of it, wherein I have Declin'd nothing Considerable in it, scarce one material Sentence, if any in it may be call'd so, a Capite ad Calcem, which the Author, whoever he be, must needs acknowledge. Therefore I have not Judg'd it expedient to burden Paper further, or swell this Tract to any greater Bulk, which is too big already, in offering to the Press this pitiful Pasquill.

As for the Repetition and Co-incidence of some Passages, the Reader will not think it Strange, when understanding that several things here Joyn'tly presented, were written upon various Occasions and at a Considerable distance of Time, when there was no Design of Offering them to Publick in this Conjunction: What appears repeated, the Judicious may easily pass over; And for the Readers of the lesser Size in Point of Knowledge, they may reap some Advantage in Refreshing their Memory. The Prolixity, I know, will be readily Quarrell'd; And, no doubt, a Sufficient Answer might have been redacted

ted to much shorter Limits ; And I acknowledge, it hath Swelled to this Bulk, after putting Pen to Paper, much beyond Intention ; Yet, if the Variety of the Matter be considered, and the necessary Clearing of several Things adduc'd by the Querist, for pretended Illustration and Enforcement of his Queries, 'tis hoped, that the Ordinary Reader, not so fully seen in the Popish, or Episcopal Controversie, for whose Use this is mainly, if not only, intended, may reap Considerable Advantage by the more dilated Accounts and Explication of these Points.

I shall Detain the Reader no further from the Perusal of these Sheets, and shall only add - my serious Prayer, that the GOD of Truth may lead him into all Truth, with all the Lovers of Holiness, and put his Hand to the Rearing up of his fallen Tabernacle in our Married Land, Revive His Work, and Glorifie the House of His Glory, so as all Impiety and Error may stop its Mouth, and His Glory may Shine in his own Instituted Ordinances, until His Churches Warfare is Accomplished.

CONTENTS

Of the Review of the *Queries* to the Presbyterians of SCOTLAND.

CHAP. I.

Wherein is Examin'd the Virulent Preface prefix'd to this Pamphlet.

THe *Querist's* precipitant Folly noted, and giving Advantage to the Presbyterians, in embracing several Popish Tenets. As also the Prefacer's Self-contradiction in commending the *Querist* for abstaining from *Personal Reflections*, who, notwithstanding, has stuff'd his *Preface* with outrageous Railings against Presbyterians. *Page 1, 2*

His Argument for Prelacy, taken from the *Jewish Priesthood*, and Inference therefrom for proof of Prelacy, improv'd against him. *2*

His Argument from the Subordination of the Seventy to the Twelve Apostles, as likewise from the standing Office of the Diaconat, to prove that there were Church-Officers of different Ranks, to which Apostles were Superiour, discovered to be utterly Unserviceable to his Scope. *3*

His Argument from *Eph. 4. 11, 12.* and *1 Cor. 12. 28.* made appear to fall utterly short of a suitable Conclusion to his purpose, and improv'd against his Pleadings, as drawing several Absurdities upon him. *4, 5*

His absurd Extension of the Deacons Office, with respect to Preaching and Administration of the Sacraments, noted and confuted.

His Reasoning from the Power of *Timothy* and *Titus*, in reference to conferring Sacred Orders and Censuring Presbyters, Refuted and found short of reaching a Conclusion against Presbyterians. His insolent angry Confidence noted. *6, 7*

His Reasoning against the Distinction of Ordinary and Extraordinary Officers, wherein he imputes to Presbyterians a Begging of the Question, but is discovered to involve himself therein. Upon the Hypothesis that this Distinction is good, his pitiful Inference, that the Church was at first propagated by Ministers of different Orders, noted and improv'd against him. *Page 8*

His Reason and Notion against this Distinction, taken from the Relation of that which is *Extraordinary* to some antecedent settled Order, Examined and found Impertinent; Which is made appear in some *Queries* against *Moses's* Extraordinary Office, which is found thereby Impeach'd, as likewise the Office of Apostles. *9, 10*

His Demand. *What need was there to employ Extraordinary Officers, to do that for which Provision had been made by Appointment of Ordinary,* discovered to be founded upon the absurd Hypothesis of a prior Institution of Ordinary Officers, and a Super-institution of the Extraordinary, and thus to stand cross to the Divine Appointment under both Dispensations. *Ibid.* Where also his Demand, *What was wanting, to Extraordinary Officers to oblige them to have Recourse to the Ordinary,* is Examin'd and Refuted from the Instances premis'd.

That the fixing of Ordinary Officers of the Church through the World, was both necessary for the Churches Preservation, and

the great Scope of the Exercise of the Apostolick Office, notwithstanding whereof the Apostles stood in no need of Ordinary Officers for Direction and Instruction in their Office. Page 11

The Prefacer asserts that Ecclesiastick Government being Consider'd, whether with respect to the Original of Church Power, or the Charismata, the Gifts and Qualifications of Officers, either they were all Ordinary or Extraordinary, how absurdly, made appear; And from the same Grounds it is Demonstrated, that in the beginning of the Gospel, there was a necessity, some Officers should be Ordinary, others not. 11, 12

The Prefacer's next Argument against this Distinction, taken from the Communication of Extraordinary Gifts to Laicks as well as Ministers, considered and refuted. The futility of his further Inference noted, *viz* That this Distinction is unserviceable against the Succession of Ecclesiastics in that comely Order, which our Lord and his Apostles Established; a Conclusion utterly extraneous to the Point in Question. 12, 13

The absurd Application of this Succession in his Principles further noted. Ibid.

His Argument against Extraordinary N. Testament Officers, taken from the removal of a Scripture Pattern for the Church to imitate in the Ministry and Government thereof, since extraordinary Examples are no Precedents, nor design'd for Imitation, Examined and found grounded upon a false Supposition, and a begging of the Question, and improven against the Episcopal pleadings from the Office of Apostles and Evangelists, which is made appear to be Extraordinary. 13, 14

His Argument against the premis'd Distinction of Ordinary and Extraordinary Officers, taken from our Lord's promis'd Presence with his Messengers to the End of the World, consider'd, and refuted, and retorted upon himself, with respect to what he must needs acknowledge anent the Office of Prophets, as distinct from Apostles and Evangelists, Gifts of Tongues, Miracles, Gifts of Healing. The absurdity wherein he is involv'd, whether he own these Offices to be expir'd, or not, with respect to Our Lord's promis'd Presence. 15

His Assertion, that the same work which the Apostles, and Evangelists did in their days, was to be perform'd by Authoriz'd Persons to the End, at large confuted, and loaded with gross Absurdities; in special, as he extends the Assertion to all Officers mentioned in the New Testament, and so as likewise to include the Extraordinary Gifts communicated to Laicks. Pages 16, 17, 18

The Plenitude of Apostolick Power, which he holds to import an Authority and Jurisdiction over all Subordinat Officers and Believers in Christ, he, notwithstanding, will needs own to be Necessary, Perpetual and Permanent; how absurdly, at large made appear. 19

That what was Ordinary in the Apostles Office, and to be deriv'd in a Succession respects properly and primarily the Pastoral Office, prov'd from several Scripture Grounds. 20

The Prefacer's Railings against the Covenant noted, which cast a deep Reflection upon K. Charles 1, and 2d. 20, 21

The Prefacer's Gloss upon the Apostle John's Reprehension of Diotrephes, who lov'd the Prebeminence, *viz*. That Prebeminence is not the thing Condemn'd, but the undue Affecting of it, confuted from the Scope and Contexture, as also from Parallels, and discovered to be a Popish Evasion opposite to the Sense of Sound Divines. 21, 22, 23

His Impudence in the pretended Retorsion upon Presbyterians, as acting the Diotrephes in opposing Prelats, which he pretends to instance in the Assemblies Act at Glasgow 1638, at large made appear, and Demonstrated from the Account of the Matter of Fact, the State and Carriage of Prelats, their Gross and Illegal Usurpations upon this Church, together with their other Scandals grounding that just Act and Censure. 23, 24

This further Confirmed from what he Confesses of K. Charles his full Satisfaction with the Proceedings of Church and State, in Opposition to Prelates in the Parliament 1641. Ibid.

The Prefacer's Assertion, That there is no Instance of Ordination, and Jurisdiction by meer Presbytery

Presbyters to be found in Scripture, Consider'd and Refuted by Instances. Pages 25, 26

His Argument taken from the deriv'd *Episcopal Authority*, which he offers to prove from 1 Tim. 1. 3. and 5. 19 Tit. 1. 5. Considered and Refuted from the Office of these Evangelists, and the Subject Matter of the Epistles. 26, 27

His Self-contradicting Folly, in Charging a *Diotrephes* Ambition upon Presbyterians, altho' acknowledging that Presbyterian Government sets all Ministers on a Level, noted and made appear: As also the Retortion is offered, that the Hierarchie sets Stairs and Steps for ambitious Climbers, to be Bishops, Arch-Bishops, Metropolitans, &c. That Calvin asserted Presbyterian Government to be a Reverse of the Government of the Primitive Church, a gross Calumny. A Reference made to the Tractat, entituled the Counter Essay

Ibid.

The Prefacer's gross Distortion of that Passage, *Do all things decently and in order*, made appear, whether as applied to Patronise Symbolical Ceremonies in Worship, or Prelates and Arch-Prelates in Government. 27, 28

His Inconsistencie noted; In Charging Presbyterians with the Rebellion of *Core*, in withstanding Prelates; In Asserting the Divine Institution of Prelacy in the Holy Scripture, and yet, in his Method of pleading from the premis'd Text, bringing it within the Compass of a Circumstance of Government, Alterable according to the Prudence of Church Governours. His Mistake and Misapplication of that Passage, 1 Cor. 11. 16. made appear. 28, 29

His Assertion, that the whole Model of Presbyterian Government is contrary to Scripture, a bold, ignorant Assertion. His alleading that Presbyterians pretend Scripture, not only for their Constitution, but for every thing that's peculiar to it. Consider'd, and Charg'd with Ignorance and Obscurity. *Ibid.*

The Prefacer's Address to his Presbyterian Country-men, to consider GOD's Institution under the Legal Dispensation, as to the Ministry and Government of the Church, the Institution of our Saviour and Practice of his Apostles; that GOD under both Dispensations did Institute

Ministers of different Ranks and Orders, distinguish'd by Marks of Authority and Power; that Paul sets forth the different Ranks and Functions of the Christian Ministry with Resemblance to the natural Body; Examined, and his Unsoundness and Inconsistency therein made appear, 1. In acknowledging the Gospel Dispensation another, and distinct from the Legal. 2. In Crossing the Gentleman *Querist*, who founds the Office of a National Primat upon that of the High-Priest, which is Contradicted by the deriv'd standing Office of Apostolat. It is also made appear, that the Admission of different Ranks of Church Officers under both Dispensations, touches not Presbyterians, with whom the Question is anent different official Degrees in the Pastoral Office. Page 30, 31

The Prefacer pretends to answer the Objection, that People are not so much Edified by the Episcopal Clergy, as by the Presbyterians: His Answer taken from Christ's Institution of Prelacy, &c. Scann'd at some length, with a Summary Account of Prelacy's Opposition to the Scripture Pattern. 31, 32

His large Eruetation of Outragious Anger and virulent Reproaches upon the Work of Reformation since the 1638, both in Scotland and England, as having destructive Issues of damnable Doctrines, Blasphemies, Enthusiasms, the crumbling of the Church into factions; Consider'd and Confuted at some length. As likewise his renewed Banterings about the Covenant. 32, 33, 34

The Prefacer mentions B. Guthrie's Manuscript; Upon which an Account is given of this Prelate at some length, as a meer time serving Vertumnus. 35, 36

His Charge of Murders of all Ranks upon Presbyterians; from him that sat on the Throne, to her that grinds at the Milln, which he also asserts to be the Effects of the Covenant from the year 1640, to 1660, Considered and Refuted at large. 36, 37

How unjustly the Civil Wars and Bloodshed are Charged upon the Covenant, convincingly made appear; Where an Account is also given of the Inundation of Profanity of all sorts attending the Erection of the

the late *Prelacy* in this Nation. *Ibid.* Which was also notic'd by the Marquess of *Argyll* in his Speech upon the Scaffold. Page 38, 39

The Zealous Endeavours (and not without Succels) of *Presbyterians* to promote Piety, and suppress all Profanity made appear. *Ibid.*

That the main Abettors of growing Profanity, are the *Non-jurant Jacobites*, bigot *Prelatists*, and Popishly affected Persons, asserted and cleared. 40

This Examen of the *Preface* closed with a Prayer for the *Prefacer's* Repentance, if in the Land of the Living, for his attaining more Prudence, more knowledge ; And with an Advertisement, if he consult the Peace, or Reputation, either of Himself, or his Friend, to beware of sending again into this Countrie, *Pamphlets*, and of such a Nature, as is this here Examin'd. *Ibid.*

CHAP. I I.

A Consideration and Review of the Queries of the first Chapter, *Exposing the Querist's Ignorant and Popish Notions, anent the Testimony of Early Antiquity, and the Practice of the Primitive Church, as Authorizing and Determining the Sense and Interpretation of Difficult, or Contraverted Texts of Scripture ; As likewise his Ignorant Demand of Express Scriptures, to fortify the Answer of every one of his Queries,*

That the Scriptures do Exhibit the perfect Rule of all *Credenda, Facienda*, and *Petenda*, made appear, with Application to the Point of Infant Baptism, Lay-men and Women receiving the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. 41, 42

The Passage of 2 *Pet.* 3. 16. Mentioning some things hard to be understood in *Paul's* Epistles, cleared. The *Querist* Homologating the Popish Adversarie in this Citation made appear. 43, 44, 45

His Assertion of the Necessity of Consulting early History, and the Practice of the Church, in order to the Understanding of the Difficult Scriptures, found a Popish Evasion, and loaded with Absurdities. 45, 46

His Foolish Demand of Express Scripture

to Fortifie the Answer of his *Queries* Noted. 47

What Deference and Authority is allowed to Sermons and Commentaries upon Scripture, cleared. 47, 48

That the Church is not Infallible, and in what Sense the *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, cleared. 49, 50

The *Apostles* were furnished with a fix'd Rule, and had Infallible Inspiration in the Management of their Work and Office, how and in what respects, made appear. 51, 52, 53

The pretence of Miracles to patronise *Episcopacy* Refuted. 54, 55

The Point of Separation from the *Episcopal Church*, touch'd. 55, 56

CHAP. III.

CHAP. III.

Containing an Answer to the Queries of the II Chap. And Examining this Pamphleter's Popish Inconsistent Notions, anent the Jewish Oeconomy, as Exemplifying a New Testament Pattern of Episcopal Government; And his Assertion of the Necessity of an Union thereunto: Together with his Absurd Pleading for the Denomination of Priests, as the proper Official Name or Epithet of Gospel Ministers.

HOW far the Jewish Oeconomy and Laws are fulfill'd and abolish'd by Christ, clear'd.

Pages 56, 57, 58

The Distinction of the Law of Nature and the Law Positive, clear'd. As also whether the Law concerning Forbidden Marriages obliges Christians, and upon what Ground. The Querist's Ignorance in this point noted.

59, 60

The Unwarrantableness of Separation from the Jewish Church, tho' corrupt; utterly unserviceable to prove Subjection to Prelates, and doth plead against Separation from this Church in her present Constitution.

Ibid.

Our Saviour's Ordaining twelve Apostles, and seventy Disciples absurdly pleaded by the Querist to Patronize Prelacy. His absurd Assertion of our Lord's adopting two Jewish Rites of that Church, viz. the Postæmium and Baptism to be two Sacraments of the New Testament, at large made appear upon important Grounds.

61, 62, 63

In what Sense the Apostle Heb. 5. may be said to argue from the Old Constitution, to the New, clear'd, and the Querist's absurd Distortion noted.

63, 64

In what Sense Luke made use of the also clear'd.

Ibid

Whether the Succession of Matthias to Judas, the Orders of Levites and Priests, plead

for Episcopacy, clear'd, and the unserviceableness of this Argument made appear from several Grounds.

Page 65

The Querist's pretended Answer to the Objection, A Bishop over Pastors, and the High-Priest over all the Priests, is such a Medium as will plead for a Papacy; viz. That under the Law, there was but one Temple and Altar, that the Jewish Nation was one Provincial Church, &c. largely scann'd and baffled; The strength of the Objection fortified by several clear Grounds; And the Unsoundness and Inconsistency of his Subterfuges made appear.

65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70

His pleading for the Denomination of Priest or Sacerdos, as a Designation proper to Ministers of the Gospel, largely Scann'd; The unwarrantableness thereof Demonstrated by several clear Scripture Grounds. 71, 72, 73, 74. His Quibbling anent Melchisedeck, as being a Type of Christ, yet not offering Sacrifices, confuted.

74, 75

His Argument taken from Isaiah's calling Ministers of the Gospel Priests, Isa. 66. 21. The Apostle Peter's mentioning Sacrificers under the Gospel, 1 Pet. 2. 5. As also from the Altar mention'd, Heb. 13. Examined and Refuted.

76, 77, 78

That Pastors assuming the Title of Ministers, not of Priests, obliges not to refuse to live by the Altar in a Gospel sense. 78, 79

CHAP. IV.

Wherein are Examined the Queries touching the last Appeal in Controversies about Matters of Religion; Exposing the Author's Popish and Inconsistent Notions in this Point, in special with respect to the Churches Authority, in determining the Number of Canonical Books, the Sense of the Scripture, and the final Determination of Controversies; As likewise, the Introducing and Establishing New Offices, and New Parts of Worship under the Gospel.

THE *Querist's* Popish Principles and Design noted, in point of the last Appeal in Controversies of Religion. That the Authority and Genuine sense of Scripture, neither in it self, nor as to us, depends upon the Testimonie of the Church, clear'd by several Grounds; As also, that the Scripture is Authentically Interpreted only by it self. What the Churches Office is in this point made appear. Pages 80, 81

The Testimony of Protestant Divines in this point Exhibited. 82

His Argument, That those that liv'd nearest the Apostles times, must have best known the Meaning of the Sacred Writings; utterly unserviceable to his Scope: This made appear upon several Grounds. 83

His Assertion, That the Churches universal Testimonie in all Ages, as to Scripture, is Infallible; Disprov'd from several Grounds. 84

In what respect she is a competent Witness of the Faith and Doctrine to be receiv'd, and with respect to the Number of Canonical Books, clear'd. 84, 85, 86, 87

That Passage of Mal. 2. 7. anent the Priests Lips preserving Knowledge, and the Law to be sought from him. And that of 1 Tim. 3. 15. Where the Church is said to be the Pillar and Ground of Truth; Consider'd and Explain'd at some length. The *Querist's* absurd Pleading thereupon made appear. 87, 88, 89

The *Querist* holds an Enquiry needful at the first Representatives of the Church, to know the Catholick Doctrine, and reject Heresie, how absurdly, made appear. 90

The *Querist* foolishly confounds receiving Divine Truths from the Church, as the ordinary Instrument, with giving Infallible Belief to her Testimonie. Some Distinctions offered to clear this. Pages 91, 92

The *Querist* pleads for a Power in the Church, to Introduce and Establish New Officers under the Gospel, and to expect God's Approbation, which he endeavours to prove by the Advice of Moses's Father-in-law, for making Rulers of the People, which was *ex post facto* approv'd by God; how absurdly and impertinently, clear'd from many Grounds. 92, 93, 94, 95

His impertinent Instances, and Extraneous to this Scope, *scil.* the Institution of the Feast of Dedication, the Feast of Purim, and our Lord's adding the Postcœnium to the Passover; approving thus (in his Sense) a Rite but of Ecclesiastick Institution; at large Scann'd and refuted. 96, 97, 98

His Proof of the Churches Power to lay aside some things of Divine Institution, from the Instance of Hezekiah's Destroying the Brazen Serpent; absurd and Antiscriptural, clear'd by several Grounds. 99, 100

As likewise his Argument taken from the after Celebration of the Passover, not with Loyns girt, and a Staff in their Hand: This also clear'd by several Grounds. His Argument also taken from the laying aside the Diaconess, from the Ordinance anent not eating Blood, the anointing the Sick with Oyl; made appear to be frivolous and impertinent. 100, 101, 102, 103

CHAP. V.

Examining our Querist's Notions (in his IV Chap.) touching the Succession to the Apostolick Office, and Exposing his gross Ignorance and Impeachment thereof in his Pleading for an Apostolick Succession : As likeways, his Ignorance and Foolish Conceits upon the Point of Ordination, as proper to Apostles, and in Opposition to the Authority of Presbyters therein.

THe Querist will have Lay-men and Women as effectually Debarr'd from the Lord's Supper, given only to Apostles (Church Officers), as Bishops are debarr'd from being Successors to the Apostles; how absurdly, made appear by several Gtounds.

Pages 104, 105

The Apostles were to Teach all Nations, and many Nations after their Decease were not yet instructed; a pitiful Ground to prove a Succession to their Office.

106, 107

In what Sense the pouring forth of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles (evidenced in the Gift of Miracles, speaking with Tongues, Healing the Sick, &c.) is a distinguishing Mark of the Apostolick Office ; At large made appear. 108, 109, 110

As also, in what respect the Holy Ghost was given by Successors of Apostles by Imposition of Hands : Where the pretended Sacrament of Confirmation is Impugn'd.

111, 112

The Querist endeavours to prove that the Commission, *Mat. 20. 19 To Teach all Nations*, was no distinguishing Mark of an Apostle, but continued to their Successors, upon the Ground of our Lord's promised presence to the End of the World; from a Presbyterian Minister's Ordination, which ties him not so to one Paroch, but that he is thereby *in toto* to Preach to other Paroches, yea, to another Nation, &c. how absurdly, clear'd at large. 113, 114, 115, 116.

Wherein the Difference is clear'd betwixt the Pastor's Relation to the Church Catholick, and that of Apostles.

What part of the Apostolick Office does not appertain to Successors, clear'd.

Pages 117, 118, 119

In what capacity the Apostle Paul Acted in the Ordination of Timothy, clear'd, 119, 120, 121. Wherein several Impertinencies of the Querist are made appear.

In what Capacity these Officers were who concurr'd with Paul in Timothy's Ordination ; As also, those who accompanied Paul in his Return from Macedonia, who are mention'd, *Acts 20. 4.* clear'd ; And the Querist's foolish Notions in this point detected.

121, 122, 123, 124

His Objection Answered ; How this Presbytery could lay on Hands upon an Evangelist.

124

Also the Objection, If Presbyters have power to Ordain Evangelists, why do they not send out Evangelists to the Unconverted Nations? Answered, and made appear to be frivolous, and retorted upon the Querist.

125, 126

In what sense the Apostle Paul ascribes the Gifts to the laying on of his Hands, *2 Tim. 1. 6.* And how consistent with the Presbyteries Imposition of Hands, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* clear'd at large ; And the Querist's Foolish Pleadings detected. 126, 127, 128, 129.

CHAP. VI.

CHAP. VI.

Wherein are Examined and Confuted the Querist's frivolous Answers (Chap. V) to some Presbyterian Arguments (especially that taken from Acts 20.) against Timothy's Episcopacy.

THe Querist's Foolish Cavil, That *Presbyterians* infer that *Timothy* was not at *Ephesus*, or was not a Bishop, because in *Paul's* Charge to the Church-Officers of *Ephesus*, they are call'd Elders; Discovered at large. *Pages 130, 131*

Our Argument, that *Timothy* is not mention'd particularly in the Exhortation to the Elders, improven at some length; And the Querist's Evasions, scil. 1. That he is included in the general Compellation. 2. That he was instructed in all parts of his Office by word of Mouth; As also, that he is not excluded from his share in the pathetick Exhortation; fully Confuted, and made appear to be repugnant to the Scope and Context, as also to the Episcopal Hypothesis and Pleadings. *132, 133, 134*

That *Timothie's* Travels through the Churches, clearly pointed at in Scripture, are inconsistent with his Establishment as Bishop of *Ephesus*, clearly prov'd. *135, 136*

The Querist's foolish Enquiry, anent the *Diocesan Bishop's* warrantable Deputation of some part of his Episcopal Power to Presbyters; Detected, as being *de Subiecto non supponente*, and from several Grounds disprov'd. *136, 137*

His Inference, that if the Bishops could delegate some of their Communicable Power in their absence, why might not Apostles have done the same; Palpable Impertinent, as arguing from what Officers, may do, who are acknowledged utrinque of Divine Appointment, to what Prelates may do, about the Warrantableness of whose Office the Question is stated. *137*

His next Conclusion, drawn from the premis'd Supposition, viz. That Episcopal Acts done by a Company of Presbyters, are not sufficient to prove any intrinsecal Episcopal Power lodg'd in them; made appear to be equally absurd. *138*

CHAP. VII.

Wherein are Considered the Queries of the VI Chapter, anent the Extent and Limits of the Apostles Commission, the Office of the LXX Disciples, and Evangelists, the Succession of Bishops to Apostles; Exposing the Querist's Antiscriptural Inconsistent Notions; And, in special, in Point of a Lawful Succession and Derivation of the Ministerial Office from Apostles.

That the Apostles could confine their extensive general Commission by a voluntary Partition, is *gratus* suppos'd by the Querist, and impertinently pleaded from *Peter's* being the Apostle of the Circumcision, and *Paul* of the Gentiles, which is made appear from several Grounds. *Pages 139, 140, 141*

The Apostle *Paul's* not meddling with any Church which himself had not Planted, a Groundless Pleading to the same Scope, which is at large Disprov'd and Everted from the Scope and Contexture, from Parallels, from the Nature of the Apostolick Office, and the Judgement of Interpreters. *142, 143, 144, 145, 146*

The Nature of the Office of the Seventy Disciples, whether Extraordinary, or to be Succeeded to, clear'd from Scripture, and the Judgment of Interpreters. Page 147

A Succession to Apostles in the full Extent of their Power, disown'd and pleaded against by Dr. Barrow. 148, 149

The Nature of the Office of Evangelists, what it was, clear'd from Scripture; The Sense of the Universities of Leyden and Saumer Exhibited thereanent. The Querist's inconsistent Notions in this point expos'd. 149, 150, 151, 152

The Succession of Bishops from Apostles Exhibited by some of the Antients, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, &c. in vain pleaded by the Querist; And how unserviceable this is to his Scope, made appear. 152, 153, 154

That some Canonical Books of Scripture, were not at once receiv'd by all the Antients, or that there is Difference in the Catalogues as to some of them, a groundless and unsuccessful Answer, to what is pleaded against the pretended Succession of Bishops to the Apostles, from the maim'd and contradictory Accounts thereof, Exhibited by the Fathers. *Ibid.* Where is also made appear the Querist's foolish Cavil against the Different Reading of the Original Text, and that the antientest Copies are follow'd, because of the greater Number. Pages 154, 155

The Querist's Odd and unaccountable Assertion, viz. That Office-bearers of the Christian Church must as clearly derive their Succession from Apostles, as the Priests were oblig'd to clear Succession by the Register mention'd, Ezra Chap. 2. Expos'd at large. The Nature of a true Succession from Apostles clear'd, and several palpable Inconsistencies in the Querist's Reasonings upon this Point, made appear. 155, 156, 157, 158

His Calumny and Asperision upon the Famous Mr. Robert Bruce, viz. That he did Officiat as a Pastor for Ten years before put in Orders; A gross and lying Imputation. 158, 159

In what Sense Pastors are called to Ratify the Covenant betwixt GOD and Man, clear'd; And the Office of Non-preaching Prelates thereby upon this Ground expos'd. 160

CHAP. VIII.

Wherein are Examined our Querist's Ignorant Notions upon the Point of the Apocalyptic Angels, and his Foolish and Antiscriptural Pleadings for the Acceptation of the Term Angel for a single Person.

THE Querist's Medium against Presbyterians, viz. If the Seven Angels be Seven Presidents, it must be made appear there were some Number of Presbyters in each of the Asian Churches, else the Scheme of Presbyterian Government is marr'd, or Beza's Opinion of a President must be rejected; Expos'd, and found a Foolish Unaccountable Notion. Pages 161, 162

What Change of Presidents Presbyterian Government admits of, clear'd. *Ibid.*

That the Seventy Translate the Word Messenger, Mal. 2. 7. by the Term Αγγελος, whereby John Represents the Apocalyptic

Angels, is utterly remote from affording any Patrociny to the Diocesan Prelate. As likewise the Denomination of Stars. Page 163

The Commendations given to some of these Angels, and Reprehension of others, does not impeach the collective Sense of the Term Angel. 164

The Querist's Foolish Inference from Presbyterians Account of the Angels, viz. That all the Christians in these Churches, were to be equally Blam'd for the Faults reprovd in the Epistles; Expos'd. 156

That the collective Sense of the Word Angel, gives no Advantage to Independents against

against Presbyterian Government, either to argue for the Power of Lay-men in Church Government, or the Independency of Parochial Churches; clear'd at large.

Pages 166, 167

The *Querist's* Evasion from what we plead upon Rev. 2. 18, compar'd with 24. viz. That the Term *Angel* is represented in the Plural Number, anent the Apostles using of an Apostrophe, expos'd and Confuted.

As also, his repeated Evasion of Dr. ed.

Mours, and others, that the Particle *Kad* is wanting in the Copie of K. James's Library at St. James's.

Page 169

His Foolish Cavil, that the Collective Sense of the Term *Angel*, will oblige to interpret the *Angel* mention'd Chap. 20, 22. in the same Sense; Expos'd.

169, 170

His Dilemma. That these Churches must needs be *Diocesan Bishopsricks*, or it must be absurdly suppos'd there were but Seven Paroch Churches in all the *Proconsular Asia*; Answer-

168.

170, 171

CHAP. IX.

A Consideration and Answer of the Queries of the VIII Chap. Anent the Constitution of the Council of Jerusalem; The Office of Ruling Elders; The Right and Warrant of Presbyterian Church Judicatories, &c. Exposing the Querist's Ignorant and Antiscriptural Notions in these Points.

THe *Querist's* Notion anent the Constituent Members of the Church of Jerusalem, Acts 15. Expos'd; In special touching the pretended Suffrage of Deacons therein, and their Authority to Baptize.

Page 172

His Enquiry, what the Ruling Elder is, and if a Lay-man, how he comes by a Decisive Vote in Church Affairs; Consider'd; And the Office of Ruling Elder, clear'd from Scripture.

173, 174

Calvin's Judgment in this Point clear'd in his Comment upon the chief Texts controverted, 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Rom. 12. 8.

175, 176

Upon the *Querist's* Demand of Express Texts of Scripture for Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, or Commissions of Assemblies, as now in use in Scotland, a clear Consequential Scripture Proof of these Judicatories is exhibited. Page 176, 177, 178. Rejecting, as groundless, his Demand of Express Texts as above, and this Demand farther Baff'd by a Counter-Demand of Express Texts of Scripture, for

Primats, Arch-Bishops, Bishops, Chancellors, Commissaries, Prebends, Deans, Chapters. Ibid.

The *Querist's* Foolish Cavil, That Popery and Presbyterie joyn Issue against Episcopacy, prov'd by the Speech of *Lainex General* of the Jesuits (in the Council of Trent) against the Divine Right of Episcopacy; at large

refuted and expos'd. Pages 178, 179, 180, 181

That *Bellarmin* asserts the Divine Right of Prelacy, and that the Principles of the Hierarchie do necessarily resolve in a Papacy; made appear.

180, 181, 182

That it was not merely the want of Opportunity, but a Principle against Episcopacy, as an unlawful Government, that prompted the first Reformers to Establish another Form, prov'd from a large Testimonie of Universities and Reform'd Divines, and the Confession of the Reformed Churches. 182, 183,

184

Calvin Vindicated, and his clear Assertion of Presbyterian Government, proven from his Writings.

184, 185, 186

As also, the Judgment of the Church of Scotland from her first Reformation.

Ibid.

His

His repeated Quibble of Separation from an Episcopal Church, expos'd. Page 186

The Act of Parliament Establishing Presbyterianism, as suitable to The Inclinations of the People, unjustly and foolishly parallel'd with these Acts in K. Charles the 2^d's Reign, Establishing Prelacy, in Point of an Impeachment of the Churches Intrinsic Power; which is made appear in a Parallel and Comparifon of the Nature and Design of the one with the other, and upon several important Grounds. 187, 188, 189, 190

The Grounds Establishing Presbyterian Government, made appear to be Fix'd and Unalterable, even in the Sense and Construction of our Laws. The Frame of the late Prelacy grossly and palpable Erastian, clear'd. Ibidem.

Submission to the Establish'd Government of this Church *toto celo* different from a Submission to the late Prelacy, in point of Recognizing the King's Ecclesiastick Supremacy. 191, 192

The pretended Explanation of the Test, alleg'd by the Querist, a meer cover of Fig Leaves, and utterly unserviceable to hide the Odious Nature of it; And the Horrid Guilt of such as took that Wicked Engagement, clear'd from several Grounds of Law and Reason. Pages 192, 193. Whereof the very Practice of some of the Episcopal Clergy is a convincing Proof. Ibid.

That the chief Patrons of Prelacy own the Erastian Principles, and disown the Churches Intrinsic Power; Clear'd. 194

Our Prelatists pretended Limitations of the Test by a Reserve of the Churches Intrinsic Power, as practis'd in the first three Centuries, fastens a Self-contradiction upon them.

The palpable Contradiction of the Test to the Confession of Faith, therein pretended to be Recogniz'd and Own'd; Made appear in several Instances. Ibid.

The CONTENTS of the Confutation of the Querie turn'd to an Argument in Favours of Episcopacy.

Several Absurd and Inconsistent Assertions of the Arguer, noted. Page 198

He owns a Succession to the Apostolick Office, as Ordinary, which yet he will have to be Vouch'd by Miracles. He Charges a Breach of Regularity upon Presbyterians, in the Administration of Baptism, because of varying in Words, in point of the Parents Obligation, tho' he acknowledges the Matter it self is adher'd to, and can produce no Act of our Church in point of astringing Ministers to a Set of Words. This National Church as presently Establish'd he calls a Party, and of *Selfaries*. Ibid.

His Foolish lying Imputation farther noted, viz. That Presbyterians disown them as not of Christ's Flock, who joyn not themselves to a Party, tho' they own the Articles of the Creed, and the Scriptures to be the Word of GOD; That some are in hazard

of Excommunication, because they believe a Superiority of Church Officers to be of Christ's appointment. Page 199

The Charge retorted upon himself in putting the premis'd Imputations upon such as are not of a piece with the Church of England, in point of Government and Worship. Ibid.

His Foolish Imputation upon the Assemblies sending Ministers to Preach in the North, noted. His Self-contradiction noted in censuring this Church, as refusing to initiate any who have a Right to Baptism, and can claim it, unless upon such Engagements upon the Parents as are at this time usual, as cross to Christ's Institution; Yet owning his English Hierarchicks refusing this Ordinance to such as will not have it Administrated with the Sign of the Cross.

The same Inconsistency further noted, in that he holds our LORD's restricting the Apostles Commission to such Things as He Commanded, while yet he owns the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, with other Symbolical Ceremonies retain'd by the Church of England, as Additional to this, and other Gospel Ordinances. Page 200

The pretence of that Churches present legal Constitution, retorted and improv'd against this Arguer. 201

He argues from the Promise, *Mat. 28* 20. to prove a standing Succession to the Apostolat, calling it *vastly comprehensive*, wherein it is made appear that he excludes Successors. 201, 202

His Argument taken from the Necessity of a Divine presence to fit the Apostles for their Work; As also his next, taken from the Necessity of this Presence, in Order to the Churches Subsistence amidst Enemies from without and within, are made appear to be insufficient to Support his Hypothesis. His Unsoundness and Inconsistency upon several Grounds made appear. 202, 203, 204

He endeavours to load with several Absurdities, the Orthodox common Principle anent the Temporary Commission and Office of Apostolat. He reckons up Five. The 1st, That it would follow, that none but Apostles had a Right or Title to Act by virtue of it. The 2^d That the Promise is thus unintelligible, Examined and Refuted. 205, 206. The 3^d. That if the Commission was Temporary, none had Authority after the Apostles, to Teach or Disciple any of whatever Nation. The 4th. That our Saviour design'd to have his Doctrine no more taught after their Death, or was indifferent how, and by whom it was to be propagated; Examined and Confuted. 207, 208. The 5th Pretended Absurdity, That thus Christianity must be Extinguish'd, the Churches Head having given no Rules for Constituting and Governing that Society; Confuted. Ibid. and Page 209

Our owning Officers who are not Call'd, and in Orders, a frivolous Caviel. 209

The Arguer's great Topick and Argument, A Commission is given to the Apostles,

and a Promise to be with the Apostles to the End, therefore there are, and must be Apostles to the End of the World, for him to be with; A pitiful Paralogism, in his Sense, and with respect to his Scope; Which at large is made appear, yea, and upon such Grounds as himself must acknowledge. Pages 209, 210

In what respect the Apostles Commission is continued, and in what not, clear'd. 211

As also, the Difference is stated betwixt Successors of the Apostles *simpliciter*, and Successors in the Apostolat, in a formal Sense. Ibid.

The Arguer's Foolish Hypothesis, That what Branch of the Apostles Commission was not to be Succeeded to, falls not within the Compass of the Promise; Expos'd. 212, 213

Upon what Ground *Matthias* was Substituted to fill up the Vacancie by the removal of *Judas*, Clear'd. And this very Practice improv'd against the Hypothesis of the Apostles Ordaining Successive Apostles. 213, 214, 215

Our Saviour's Establishing a Holy Policy as Mediatory King, a pitiful Ground to support his Hypothesis. 216

His Contradiction to Dr. *Monro* noted, Ibid.

The Apostles Authority over *Timothy* and *Titus* mention'd by him as a Medium to prove the Difference betwixt Apostles and Bishops, to which our Arguer's silly inconsistent Answer is noted and expos'd 217, 218

Our Arguer driven upon this Objection to own a Patriarchat, as included in the Commission and Promise. Where his ignorant Inconsistency is further expos'd. 218, 219, 220

His Foolish Appeal to the Principles and Practice of the second and third Centurie, expos'd. 220, 221, 222

His Elogies of *J. S.* noted, whose Contradiction to Dr. *Scott* is made appear, in point of the Office of the 70 Disciples. 222

The Arguer undertakes to prove, that nothing was Extraordinary in the Office of Apostolat, that none of their Prerogatives were Incommunicable, and to disprove the Instances thereof. His Attempt upon the first, viz. The indefinite Universality of the Apostles Commission, taken from the Presbyterian Principle.

Principle anent a Minister's Relation to the Church Universal, Expos'd; and their own Dr. Barrow set in pursuit of him. Pages 222, 223

That the Apostles by Explanation of the Holy Ghost restricted their general Commission, and fix'd in particular Posts, a gross and groundless Supposition, contradictory to the Sense of Orthodox Divines. 224, 225

His Attempt upon the Second Prerogative, anent the Gift of Tongues and Miracles, consider'd His frivolous Evasion, that it was not confin'd to Apostles, expos'd. 225, 226, 227. Where it is clear'd, in what respect, these Gifts were the Badges of the Apostolick Office.

The Arguer's Assertion, viz. That these Gifts were Credentials and Evidences of their Commission, as the first Propagators of a positive Religion, and thus not necessary to be devolv'd on their Successors, has overthrown all his Pamphlet; which is at large made appear in several Instances, 227, 228, 229

He asserts, the Apostles were to be Succeeded to in every thing proper to them as such, yet not in the Credentials instanced; How absurdly and inconsistently, noted. 230, 231

His Attempt upon the third Mark, scil. The giving the Holy Ghost by imposition of Hands, is, that the Church Primitive believ'd the Holy Ghost was confer'd by the Imposition of Bishops Hands in Confirmation; Wherein his absurd Confounding the Spirit's Ordinary and Extraordinary Gifts, the Ordinary and Extraordinary Evidences, &c. is made appear and expos'd. As likewise his Contradiction to Dr. Barrow, who asserts this incommunicable Apostolick Priviledge. 231, 232, 233. Where also is consider'd the Instance of Ananias imposing Hands upon Paul, and the unserviceableness thereof to his Design made appear.

That the fourth Mark, scil. Infallibility in Teaching, was peculiar to Apostles, at large made appear, from the Nature and Scope of their Offices, from his own Pleading, from the Sense and Pleadings of their own Dr. Barrow, and other Learn'd Divines. 233, 234, 235

That Infallibility in Teaching did necessarily

attend the Gift of Miracles, in vain pleaded by the Arguer; And this Hypothesis confuted upon several important Grounds. Pages 235, 236, 237

This further Confirm'd by a Summary of Scripture Grounds offer'd to this Scope, by the Author of the Nullity of the Romish Faith. 237, 238, 239

The Arguer's impertinent Allegation of Paul's Reprehension of the Apostle Peter, and Paul and Barnabas Quarrelling and Parting Asunder, to this Scope, expos'd. 239, 240

His Arguing for Episcopacy from the Policy of the Church from the beginning of the World, from the Government of the Patriarchs, from the Jewish Oeconomie, the Subordination of Priests resolving in one High-Priest; His Inference to prove the same Mould of Government continued in the New Testament from this Ground, That it was a comely Order; That Christ came not to Destroy, but to Fulfill the Law; That, if this Model must be Typical, Christ fulfill'd it by copying after it; At large Scann'd, and made appear to consist of most unaccountable Notions. 240, 241, 243, 243, 244

Several other gross Inconsistencies, and unaccountable Errors observ'd in this Pleading. 244, 245, 246

That his Arguing Pleads for a Pope over the Catholick Church visible, evidently made appear, and the nakedness of his silly Subterfuges and Answers to this Argument, laid open, viz. This, 1. That there can be no universal Pastor, because the Unity of the Headship must resolve only in Christ, which is found equally to Impeach his Assertion of an Universal Oecumenick Head under the Old Testament, such as he asserts; That this Principle overthrows an Universal Vicar or Suffragan, either under the Old or New Testament Dispensation, evidently made appear. 246, 247, 248

His Contradicting J. S. herein also made evident. Ibidem.

His next Answer, that the Universal Suffragan or Head destroys the Commission given the Apostles, whereby every one of them was, and every

every one of their Successors succeeding in full Power, becomes each a Representative of the *Apoſtles*, Independent on any other Head but *Chriſt*; Discover'd to be a Shameful Self-destroying Blunder, overthrowing his Scheme of the New Teſtament Oeconomie, as alſo both the *Scottiſh* and *Engliſh* Hierarchy. Pages 248, 249

How vainly he boatts, that his Principles do more Support *Proteſtant* Arguments againſt the *Papacy*, than thoſe of *Preſbyterians*, made appear. 250. And that the *Prelatick* Principles do evidently give a handle to the *Popiſh* Pleadſers for an *Oecumenick* Head, or *Biſhop*. *Ibidem*.

His Aſſertion, that *Prelacy* is not diſown'd by the Reform'd Churches, and that *Miraculous* Gifts were vigent after *Prelacy* was Eſtabliſh'd, and that none endow'd with theſe Gifts have given a Teſtimonie againſt it; conſider'd and refuted. 251, 252

His grand Argument againſt *Preſbyterians* conſider'd, viz. That the firſt *Presbyters* after the Reformation, had either their Orders from *Biſhops*, and thus muſt own their Power to Ordain, unleſs they diſown their Authority to Act as *Presbyters*, or betake them to the Suffrage of the People, and thus ſtand oblig'd to prove ſuch a Power lodg'd in them; Or, if an inward Impulſe be pretended, he demands *Scripture* Inſtance of our Lord's appointing ſuch a Call, and ſufficient Vouchers from every individual Pretender thereunto. 252, 253, &c.

The Senſe of *Proteſtant* Divines, and *Universities* Baffling the ſame Pleading us'd by the *Popiſh* Adverſarie, exhibited. That 'tis one thing to have a *Vocation* by the means and *Ministry* of an impure Church, or corrupt Officers, another thing to have it from ſuch a Church. In what Senſe a *Vocation* may be in divers reſpects both *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary*, clear'd. 252, 253, 254

In what Caſes the *Ordinary* Call may be diſpens'd with? What Intereſt the Call of the People, and an inward Impulſe have in this Affair, diſcuſs'd and clear'd at large, from the Senſe and Pleading of *Du Moulin*, The *Profeſſors* of *Leyden*, The *University* of *Saumur*, and *Turretin*, from 253, to 260

The grand *Popiſh* Objection (which is alſo the *Baſis* of our Arguer's Notion) that

the acknowledgement of a lawful *Miſſion* in the Church of *Rome*, for *Subſtantials* thereof, will infer, that it is at rue Church, and impeach the Doctrin and Practice of our Reformers in Separating from the ſame, conſider'd and refuted. Pages 260, 261, 262

The Senſe of the Famous *Voëtius*, and our Learned Mr. *Gillespie*, in this point is exhibited. *Ibidem*.

A Recolleſtion of the whole, in a more cloſe Application to our Pamphleter's Argument, wherein ſome Diſtinctions are adduc'd, touching the *Essentials* of Ordination, and adhering Corruptions. The proper End of Ordination it ſelf, with its conſequential Obligation, and the corrupt perſonal End of Ordainers. The *Fountain* and *Primary* Author of a *Gospel* Ministry, and the impure Channel of either *Uſurping* Adminiſtrators, or *Adventitious* Corruptions. As alſo, betwixt the perſonal Succeſſion, and Doctrinal, &c. 262, 263, 264

The Pamphleter's Argument, That the firſt Ordaining *Biſhops* gave not *Presbyters* a Power to Ordain, and therefore they have it not, conſider'd. As alſo his Inference, That if this be not admitted, they muſt betake them to the Suffrage of the People; Or, if neither be admitted, to an inward Impulſe and Call, fooliſhly repeated, and the Confutation thereof renewed, 264, 265, 266, 267. With ſome Additional Diſcoveries of the Unſoundneſs thereof.

A threefold Retortion of his Argument and Notion offered. 1. That theſe *Biſhops* falſifie their Ordination, as to its Nature, End, and Deſign, who were Ordain'd in the Church of *Rome*, and Embrac'd the Reformation. 2. That *Biſhop Spotſwood* with the other *Prelates* conſecrated with him in *England*, either ought to have been re-ordain'd *Presbyters* before they were thus Conſecrated *per ſalum*, or if they were own'd as lawful Paſtors, the Lawfulneſs of *Preſbyterial* Ordination was acknowledg'd, and in either Caſe his Notion ſtricks againſt his Principles and Pleading. 3. That the Conforming Clergie in *K. Charles II.* Reign, ought by his own, and the *Prelatick* Principles to have been Re-ordain'd, ſince they were Ordain'd by *Presbyters* only; and ſeeing

ing they were not Re-ordin'd, the Lawfulness of their *Presbyterial* Ordination was own'd, &c. That the denyal of a Lawful *Presbyterial* Ordination will go far in proof of the Nullifying their Ministerial Acts, and supposing our Arguer to have been Baptiz'd by such a Minister, he is pos'd whether the Scope and Series of his Arguing will Oblige him to be Re-baptiz'd.

Page 268

Jerom's Epistle to *Eugrius* vindicated. As likewise *Calvin's* Institutions. Lib. 4. C. 4.

268, 269

In disowning a Lawful *Presbyterial* Ordination, the Arguer has impeach'd the Ministry of most Reform'd Churches, cast a foul Blot both upon *K. James VI.* and the two *K. Charleses*, as also upon the most Famous *English* Bishops, and Eminent Pleaders for Prelacy, who are found to have disown'd the Divine Right thereof, and own'd the Identity of Bishop and *Presbyter* in the Scripture accounts of these Offices.

270, 271, 272, 273

Famous Protestant, yea, and Episcopal Divines disown the appropriating the Name of *Priests* to Gospel Ministers.

273, 274

The Churches Intrinsic Power disown'd by Bishop *Whitgift*, and several Chief Pleaders for Prelacy. Our King own'd as Pope over the Church of *Scotland*, by Bishop *Spotswood* and Sir *George Mackenzie*. Bishop *Gladstones* own's the Bishops as his Majesties Creatures, to stand or Fall at his Nod.

274, 275, 276

The Hierarchie and Ceremonial Worship of the Church of *England*, disown'd by Persons of Eminencie in the Communion of that Church, clear'd by a large Tract and Account of this Testimonie and Opposition against the same, from the Beginning of the Reformation; From *Fuller's* History, *B. Burnet's* History of the Reformation, even from *Heylyn* himself.

277, 278, 279,

280, 281

The Advances of this Testimonie and Opposition remarked in the year 1564, 1572, 1580, 1585, 1587. In which last the House of Commons Petition'd against the Violent Usage of Ministers for Omission of some Rites prescrib'd in the Book of Common-

Prayer. In the year 1588. A Synod at *Coventry*, decreed against the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, and the calling of Bishops. Mr. *Cartwright's* 39 Articles of Non-conformity. *K. James* writes to stay the Hard Usage of Non-conform'd Ministers. Page 278

K. James's Testimonie to the sincere Constitution of the Church of *Scotland*, in Opposition to that of *England*: The *English* Reformers preserv'd the Popish Rubbish, not from any liking they had to them, but in Compliance with the Queen's Inclinations. Bishop *Jewel*, *Horn*, *Grindel*, and *Cox*, their Testimonies against the Ceremonies.

279

Bishop *Burnet's* Account of the Luke-warm Reformation in *England*, several Testimonies to this Scope from *Camden*, from a Friend of *Hooker* in his Letter to him, from *Pilkinton*, Bishop *Bilson*, Dr. *Fulk*, Dr. *More*, Mr. *Chillingworth*.

280

Idolatry own'd by the *English* Prelatick Church, in point of the Image of the Trinity, and Barbarous Cruelty thereof, against Non-conformists, noted.

281, 282

Pluralities and Non-residences adher'd to by Bishop *Whitgift*.

Ibidem.

The *English* Ceremonies regrated by some of that Churches Sons, and derided by *Papists*; Condemn'd even by Bishop *Davenant*, and Bishop *Taylor*.

283, 284

Stillingsfleet Opposes and Confutes the Succession of Bishops from Apostles, and who plead for this Succession, do add (in contradiction to this Pamphleter) a Restriction of the Ordinary, in Opposition to their Extraordinary Power, 285, 286. Therein chastising his Unrestricted Account hereof.

The Arguer's Assertion, that Apostles betook themselves to particular Provinces, oppos'd and baff'd by *Stillingsfleet*.

287, 288,

289

J. S. Opposes our Arguer in several remarkable Points of the Controverſie, which is instanc'd, 1. In the Assertion of the Bishops Independent Power and Authority. 2. In that *J. S.* owns the Church of *Israel* to be a National, the Arguer only a Provincial Church. 3. In that the Arguer will have the LXX Disciples a standing Inferiour Order of Officers, whom *J. S.* holds to be only temporary.

parary

porary *Missionaries*, constituted for an Errand which could not possibly be more than temporary. *Pages* 289, 290, 291, 292, 293

J. S. Made appear to have contradicted Dr Scott in this point. *Ibidem.*

The Arguer's Ground and Topicks in this Pamphlet, impeach and strick against the Apostles Acting in Faith, in the important and great Duties of their Office, as Robbing them of a Right to the Covenanted Presence of their Master imported in the

Promise, at large made appear, and the Argument formally prosecuted. *Pages* 293, 294

The Pamphleter's Arguing excludes the Apostles *Infallibility*, *Gifts of Tongues*, &c. from the Compass of the Commission and Promise, because not deriv'd in a Succession. His Inconsistencie herein noted, in pleading for a Succession to the Apostolick Office, *as such.* 295, 296

The CONTENTS of the *Queries* offered to the Prelatists of SCOTLAND.

THe Chief *Prelatists* disown any fix'd Form of Church Government; How this consists with our present Pleadings for the Divine Right of Prelacy? Why the Word *Επισκοπος* made use of in Scripture to point at the Office of a Pastor, is by Prelatists appropriated to the Bishop, as distinguishing'd from the Pastor? The Authority and Exercise of Government being ascribed to Pastors joyntly in their fix'd Colleges, or Juridical Courts, how Ecclesiastical Power and Jurisdiction can be monopoliz'd and concentred in the Prelate? *Page* 298

Queries touching the Ruling Elders Office as exhibited 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. Pastors Collegiat Interest in the Highest Censure, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4. Anent Pastors or Presbyters concurrence with the Apostles in the first *Christian Council*, *Acts* 15 *Timothies* Ordination by a Presbytrie, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 298, 299, 300

Anent Pastors essential Interest in Government (imported in the Terms of Rulers, Governours, Bishops, &c.) invaded and inroach'd upon by Prelates, who also disown a due Subjection to the Prophets enjoynd, 1 *Cor.* 14. 29. The Prelates distinct Ordination, pretended distinct Work, official Interest in Parliament as a Member, distinct Qualifications from the Pastor, sent a packing in the Scripture

Roll, and Characters of Ordinary Church Officers. The Prelate *qua talis* bound to Preach to no Flock, and in this his Office appears standing Cross to Scripture Rules. *Pages* 301, 302, 303

Our LORD's Commission to Preach the Gospel, impeach'd by the Prelatick Office. The Prelates pretending to be the Principle of Unity to his Diocese, importing an absolute Dominion, stands in contradiction to the true Scripture Episcopacy, as also in this respect to that notable Text *Mat.* 18. 15, 16 And the Gradation in point of Judicial Procedure, which is from the lesser to the greater Number. 304, 305

The Pastoral Relation imports an Obligation of Personal Performance of Duties to the People; The Prelate therefore being the pretended proper Pastor of the Diocese, assumes an Office impossible to be manag'd and perform'd. 306, 307

Prelates assuming State Offices, as constituent Members of Parliaments, and other Civil Judicatories clearly Condemn'd by clear Scripture Rules, demonstrated at large in Five Instances. 307, 308, 309, 310

No shadow of the Bishops Office pleaded for by our Prelatists in the Office of Apostles. 310

The Peoples Right to call a Pastor, impeach'd by the Prelatick Office, as also the Office and Right of the Ruling Elder. 311, 312

The

The late Prelacy in Scotland gross Eraft- anism, and therein cross to the Scripture Rules of Church Government. Pages 312, 313
 The Members of this Church of Scotland own'd our *Confessions of Faith*, and exhibited no New *Confessions*, whereby their Orthodoxy may be made appear. 314

The CONTENTS of the *Considerations* upon Church Government.

DR. *Stillingfleet's* Notion anent the Indifference of the Forms of Church Government, made appear to be contrary to Scripture, upon several important Grounds. Pages 316, 317, 318
 Scripture Instances exhibited, condemning the Diocesan Prelate, inhancing all Ecclesiastick Authority in the Diocese in his own person. 319, 320, 321, 322, 323
 The pretended Episcopacie of *Timothie* and *Titus*, over *Ephesus* and *Crete*, confuted from clear and important Grounds drawn from the Epistles themselves, and from the Testimonie of Famous Protestant Divines and Universities. From 324, to 330
 A pitiful Evasion from our Argument upon *Acts* 20. precluded, *scil.* that the Term *Επισκοπος* imports Inspection, but not Authority; And made appear to be cross to Scripture Accounts of this Term. Pages 330, 331
Eusebius's History can give no irrefragable account of Church Government, as to the point of Antiquity. 332
 As neither *Ignatius's* Epistles, whereof the Spurious Nature is made appear. 333, 334, 335
 The pretended Catalogues of Bishops from Apostles and Evangelists, made appear to be utterly unserviceable to our Prelatists. 335, 336, 337
 As likewise the suppos'd Condemnation of *Aerius*, upon ground of his Judgment, as to the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter. 338, 339, 340, 341
Augustine's remarkable Testimonie, asserting that the Church is only to be found, and Demonstrated in the Divine Oracles, exhibited. 341, 342

The CONTENTS of the *Review* of the *Exceptions* upon the *Considerations* premis'd.

CHRISt's Political Headship over the Church, foolishly equiparated with GOD's Political Headship over all Rationals, and found an inconsistent Evasion. Pages 344, 345, 346
 The *Animadverter* quarrells the Induction instanced to prove a Species of Government, because not amounting to prove a peremptorie Institution, how irrationally, made appear. 346, 347
 The Nature of a Divine Right clear'd, and how it may be made appear in this point of Government. Pages 347, 348, 349
 The *Animadverter* alleges a lawful Derivation of Power from the Head, whether Governours Act in Parity, or Imparity; That Christ's Prophetical and Priestly Office exclude New Revelations and Meritorious Satisfactions, yet his Kingly Office excludes not superadded Laws and Measure of Government, how absurdly and inconsistently, made appear. 349, 350
 The Churches Power given by Christ [e] for

for her own preservation, gives her no Warrant for Authorizing Officers not of Christ's Appointment. That the *Dogmatick*, *Criticke*, and *Diathectick* Power given to the Church, cannot be applicable to all Forms of Government, made appear. Pages 350, 351. Where the Passage of *Rom. 15. 4.* is Defended from his Cavils.

The *Animadverter* pretends to disown the Bishop's *Sole Power*, and pleads in point of Prelacy, the Dependencies enumerated *1 Chron. 24.* how unjustly and inconsistently made appear. 352. Where a Passage of the *Altare Damascenum* is vindicated.

The Epithets, Denominations of Pastors not consistent with Subordination to a Pre-late, made appear: The Ruling Elders Office is vindicated from the *Animadverter's* Cavils, and in special that Passage, *1 Tim. 5. 17.* 353, 354

As likewise that Passage, *Acts 15.* with *1 Tim. 4. 14.* 354, 355, 356

In what Sense the Evangelistick Office was confer'd in *Timothie's* Ordination; And that the Word *πρεσβυτεριον* imports a *Con-sistorial Meeting.* 356, 357

The Instance of the *Corinth Presbyteries* Ex-communication of the Incestuous, forces the *Animadverter* to gross Antiscriptural E-vasions. 357, 358

His Foolish Defence of what is alleg'd of the Bishop of *Salisbury.* 358, 359

Several other Absurdities of our *Animad-verter* upon the Point of *Timothie's* Ordina-tion noted. As also his pitiful Defence against the Objection that *Timothie's* sup-pos'd Episcopacy at *Ephesus* stages him as an Apostat. 359, 360, 361

That *Timothy* was enjoin'd to commit what he had heard from the Apostle to Faithful Men, pleads against an Episcopal Succession; The *Animadverter's* pitiful Evasion contradicting his Fellow-pleader *Dr. Morro.* 361, 362

Timothie's Evangelistick Office asserted by the University of *Saumer*, with others. Their Testimonie vindicated from the *Animadverter's* Cavils. That Famous *English* Doctors, yea and Bishops, have Disown'd the Divine Right of Prelacy. 363, 364

That the Term *Evangelist* imports a pe-culiar Office. Pages 364, 365

The *Animadverter's* Answer to what's pleaded from the Epistles to *Timothie* and *Titus*, against their pretended Episcopacy, consider'd and Expos'd. 365, 366, 367

Dr. Pearson's Chronological Account of the Date of these Epistles, a vain Subterfuge, contradicted by *Hammond*, *Lightfoot*, &c. and improv'd against the Episcopal Cause. *Ibidem.*

This Argument taken from the Subject Matter of the Epistles further improv'd, and several pitiful Evasions of the *Animadverter*, expos'd. 368, 369, 370

Animadversions upon the 4th Consideration consider'd and expos'd. 371

For the point of Antiquity, his Defence of *Eusebius* confuted. 371, 372, 373, 374

His Defence of *Ignatius's* Epistles confuted; As likewise his Attack upon Mr. *Jamelson* in this point. 374, 375, 376, 377

His Answer to a Passage of *Stillingsfleet* ex-pos'd. 377, 378

His Answer to the Testimonie of *Clemens* for the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, at large Consider'd and expos'd. 378, 379, 380

As likewise his Defence of several Pas-sages of *Ignatius.* 380, 381, 382, 383, 384

His Exceptions upon that point of the Succession of Bishops from Apostles, at large con-sider'd and expos'd. 384, 385, 386, 387

Stillingsfleet found in this point, to Oppose and Baffle him. 387, and 389, 390

The *Animadverter's* Exception to what is offer'd anent the Condemnation of *Aerius* consider'd. 390, 391

His Answer to the Passage of *Augustin* Epistle 19. As likewise anent the early Reception of Christianity in Scotland, con-sider'd. 391, 392

The Episcopal Syllogism, our *Animadver-ter* Attempts to mould better, but has therein expos'd himself and marr'd his De-sign. 394, 395

His pretended Confirmation of the Major and Minor, consider'd and expos'd at some length. 395, 396, 397, &c.

His gross and Popish Assertion, that the Universal

Universal Belief of all *Christians* in the Apostolick, and two next Ages, is the best Reason we have for Believing, that such, or such a Book, belongs to the Canon of the Scripture.

His Inference, that this is as good a Reason for Believing the Apostolick Institution of Episcopacy, expos'd. *Ibidem.*

His Popish Tincture in this point noted, and *Augustin* oppos'd against him. 395, 396

His Equiparating the Reception of the Canon, with the Reception of Episcopacy, further expos'd. 397. Where his Ignorance of the true State of the Question, and Method of Arguing is noted.

His Arguings upon the Point of Certainty of a *Traditional Conveyance*, consider'd. 399,

The Minor of the premis'd Syllogism being not only denied, but Reasons of the Denial offer'd, the *Animadverter* can only repeat the Proposition denied, without the least shadow of a Reply.

Nor to the Instanted early Aberration of the Church. *Ibid.* As also

His Answer to the Testimonie of *Augustin* consider'd at large. 403, 404, 405, &c.

His Foolish Evasion, that *Augustin* in expressing himself Zealously for the Authority of the Scripture, he means only, that it is the great Rule of Faith, and no other Arguments are needful to Determine a Controversie when it can be clear'd from Scripture; Expos'd, and made appear to oppose *Augustin's* Scope, yea, and the Sense of Episcopal Pleadings. *Ibidem.*

He alleges that *Augustin* excludes not the unanimous Suffrage of the Primitive Church, in Matters wherein the Scripture is not so full and plain, how impertinently, clear'd from several Grounds

A further Account of *Augustin's* Sentiments in this Point exhibited, which intirely excludes his Evasion.

That the *Animadverter*, in some Citations of *Augustin*, has Wrested his Words, made appear.

That therein he is Embark'd in a Popish Design of drawing *Augustin* to Patronize Unwritten Traditions, and equal them to Scripture, convincingly made appear, and in Special from the Pleadings of the *Rhemists* upon 2 *Thess.* 2. 15. Where the same Passage of *Augustin* cited by our *Animadverter*, is offered by them, and improv'd to his Scope.

This further made appear from the Answer of *Cartwright* and *Fulk* to the *Jesuites* upon this Passage, where the Orthodox Sense of *Augustin* is made appear.

The same Orthodox Sense of *Augustin*, vindicated and asserted by the Professors of *Leyden*.

Some Inference drawn therefrom.

The *Animadverter's* Citations further improved against him.

That *Augustin* in point of a Divine Proof of Infant Baptism, laid the main stress on the constant Custom and Tradition of the Church, absurdly asserted by our *Animadverter*, and that he is therein inconsistent with himself, clear'd.

That the Scripture treats of some Things, yet not so fully and plainly, but that Recourse must be had to Tradition, for a more full Discovery, a Gross and Popish Error, impeaching the Perfection and Perspicuity of the Scripture.

The *Animadverter's* Application of the Testimonies of *Augustin* to the Point of Episcopacy, and the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, consider'd, and his pretended Testimonies to this Scope made appear to be utterly Unserviceable to his Design.

The Conclusion of the Whole.

ERRATA.

Page 3. Line 7. after incompatible, add understood as Contemporary. P. 12. l. 18. Read to be Directed and Authoriz'd. P. 14. l. 19. R. Officers of. P. 17. l. 7. R. this. P. 25. l. 18. R. Assembly 1638. P. 26. l. 38. R. Jurisdiction and Government. P. 30. l. penult. R. and, by Consequence, with Jurisdictional Power therewith necessarily conjoyn'd. P. 42. in Marg. R. Act. 20. 7. P. 45. l. 8. R. Mine-dig. P. 59. in Marg. R. Turretin, Inst. Theol. Elenct. Loc. XI. Q. 1. 2. P. 89. l. 2. R. Dictators. P. 105. l. 19. R. standing Apostolick. P. 112. l. 24. R. Persons. P. 126. l. 20. R. Pastors Constituted. P. 136. l. 23. R. the Term Bishop. P. 156. l. 35. after Adam R. (if at least, the History of our First Parents, only at first Created, were Abstracted from, or Obscure) Ibid. l. 36. R. to have attempted. P. 166. l. 16. R. Regim. Eccles. P. 178. l. 19. dele Have. P. 182. l. 8. R. vel præcarvenda. P. 188. l. 15. R. to Enact it. Ibid. l. 24. R. of our Parliament and Laws, of a Higher. P. 216. l. Antipen. R. The standing and Continuing Office. P. 241. l. 22. R. notwithstanding cannot. P. 275. l. 4. R. Convincing Ibid. l. 7. R. Gladstones in his Letter to K. James. Ibid. l. penult. R. of Unity. P. 282. l. 4. R. œcclia, of the Stile of the Scripture, pag. 34. et seqq. P. 286 l. 31. R. J. S. Vind. of Principles, &c. Chap. 4. §. 87. P. 292 l. Antipen R. which must needs, to all Men, in your Sense, import. P. 299. l. 4 R. Highest Character. P. 314. l. 16. after Dr. Scott, add, in this Homologating the Instances premis'd, yea and of a piece in point of Principle and Design with our Scottish Episcopalians, and much Esteem'd by them. P. 316. l. 15. to the Citations add, 1 Tim. 5. 17. P. 331 l. ult. R. Hypotyposes. P. 332. l. 29. R. Meredith Hammer. P. 334. l. 24. R. Potestate. P. 335. l. 30. R. Judicum et Principum. P. 341. l. 21. R. certè. P. 343. l. 12. R. a particular. P. 344. l. 12. R. and subjects the same. Ibid. l. 13. dele in point of Duty. P. 361. l. 3. R. for any thing they know or can make appear, and thus in their Principles actually Bishop.

A

Review and Consideration
OF THE FIRST
PAMPHLET;
ENTITLED,
Queries to the Presbyterians of
SCOTLAND.

CHAPTER I.

Wherein is Examined the Virulent Preface prefix'd to this Pamphlet.



HAT Dr. Usher said of Heylyn, *That, in point of Theologie, he had need to learn his Catechism*, may be truly averr'd of this Querist, who had spent his time much better in reading and pondering our Confession of Faith and Catechism, or some easier and shorter Systems of Theologie; the solid Knowledge whereof, together with something of that Christian Modesty and Humility injoyn'd Phil. 2. 3. would, no doubt, have sav'd him the Labour of these poor ignorant Queries, and his Reputation from that blot of precipitant foolish Confidence he has thereby incurr'd, with all unprejudic'd

A

unprejudic'd persons of Judgement and Learning, who have perus'd this idle Pamphlet; To which a solid Answer may be given, in Recommending to him the Reading of some Common Places, or ordinary Commentaries, to which he appears a meer Stranger.

In this Pamphlet the Author has, more than he is aware of, given Advantage to the Presbyterians, in shewing himself Ignorant of the Protestant Doctrine and Pleadings against Popery, having embrac'd several Popish Tenets.

The Preface, which takes up a great part of the Pamphlet, has *Self-contradiction* written visibly in its Fore-head. The Author (a Friend of our Querist) commends his Modestie, in *abstaining from Personal Reflections*, but shews he has never learn'd it himself, having stuffed his Smatterings with outrageous Railings, and Reflections upon all who come under this Character of *Presbyterians*, who, he cannot but know, do take up a great part of the most Renown'd Divines in Christendome, besides many others of an Eminent and Honourable Character. He charges Mr. Forrester with Reproaching Learned Men; But, whatever their Character in point of Learning be, he treats them no otherways than they treat themselves, in laying open their Errors. And the Vices he chargeth Presbyterians with, viz. *The despising the Practice of the first and purest Ages, because against them*, is obviously a piece of Self-contradicting Error, and his ominous Stumbling in the Threshold, if he include (as needs he must) the first Scripture Antiquity, to which, he alledges, immediatly thereafter, Presbyterians do appeal. He should know, that Presbyterians, with all sound Divines, do distinguish a *Despising* from making the Primitive Churches Practice the *Cynosura* and Rule of either our *Faith* or *Practice* in any Point of Religion; which he might have found the Author he names to have demonstrated by Scripture and Divine Reason.

His Argument, whereby he impugns our Assertion of the Parity of Pastors (which he ignorantly represents *A Parity among Authoriz'd Officers in the Church*) taken from the *Jewish Priesthood*, he might have found soundly Answered and Baffled by Presbyterians; yea, and by Protestant Divines writing against the Papacy. He tells us, *It was not simply Unlawful, because of GOD's Appointment*. So say Presbyterians: So was all the Jewish Pedagogie, Sacrifices, &c. But the simplest Presbyterian, or any of Common Sense, can tell him, That not to be *Simply Unlawful*, that is, to have been Lawful (*scil.* upon Ground of an Institution), and yet to be *Unlawful ex hypothesi*, (*scil.* upon Ground of the obsolet Institution) are very well consistent. Or else, 1. His addition of *Simply* to *Unlawful*, would be impertinent and groundless. 2. Else he must admit of a High Priest over the Catholick Visible Church, in conformity to the Jewish

Jewish Priesthood; for, this was God's Appointment, in his own Church. So that our Prefacer deserves small Thanks from his Party for this Notion, which pleads directly for the Papacy as well as Prelacy, yea and, in a strange *Judaizing* Inadvertency, obtrudes all the Jewish Pedagogie into the Christian Church; such as Circumcision, Passover, &c. taking up thus the Jews Plea against the New Testament Ordinances; it being evident, that both OEconomies are incompatible.

His next Argument (and this of Affinity with the former, and both a threed-bare couple, by Presbyterians as oft baffled as repeated) is taken from the *Subordination of the Seventy to the Twelve Apostles*. He tells us, *He knows none who affirms that they were Equal*. But, knows he none who affirm, that both Offices were Extraordinary? If none such are known to him, he is yet a Stranger to, and must be set to begin his Acquaintance with Protestant Divines. Besides, when he is better acquaint with Commentators, he may find, there are not wanting who deny this Difference, and ascribe to them the same Authority with Apostles, and the same Instructions; as there are others who deny their standing Mission, which, if admitted, removes the Ground of his Question. See *Poole's second Part*, also *Calvin, Beza*, with others, upon the place.

But the next Argument is, "That Deacons were Ordain'd as a standing Office, Rules delivered about their Qualifications: *Whence I infer*, saith our Prefacer, *That there were Church-Officers of different Ranks, to all which Apostles were Superiour*. Whence I infer him an inadvertent Ignoramus in Dispute; and in this Controversie. For, the Question is not, never was, anent an *Imparity of the New Testament Church-Officers*, since Presbyterians acknowledge it, and that there is a standing Imparity even among Ordinary Officers, Pastors being above Ruling Elders, and they above Deacons: But, to set our Prefacer here on his right Ground, the Question is Twofold, which he should advert to. 1. Whether the Apostolick or Evangelistick Office and Superiority was Ordinary? Which Presbyterians deny, holding the Negative of this Question. 2. Whether the Pastoral Office admits of different Degrees or Species, so as one suppos'd Pastor, a Prelate, has the Doctrinal and Jurisdictional Key Properly, Primarily, Immediately intrusted to him, and this with respect to a whole Diocese, the Pastors thereof having no Authority but in a precarious Dependencie upon this Prelate? This also Presbyterians deny, holding the Pastoral Office to have essentially included therein an Interest and Ministerial Authority, both as to Order and Jurisdiction.

His next Argument is, "From *Eph. 4. 11, 12.* with *1 Cor. 12. 28.* anent a beautiful Order and Subordination of Church-Officers, which our Prefacer tells us, he proposes, *to beat down the Idoliz'd Equality among*

Church-Officers. But he should have understood, 1. That in these parallel Texts there is an Enumeration (in the Sense of all sound Interpreters) of Extraordinary and Ordinary Officers. 2. Hence it appears, that instead of beating down a fancied *Presbyterian Equality*, this his *General Inequality* among Church-Officers, which he would thus underprop, is but a Puppet, his own meer *Petitio Principii*, wherein the Presbyterians are not in the least concern'd. Again, he is told, that the *Pastoral Office* admits of no Degrees. Not to stand upon any particular Account exhibit by Interpreters, of the Nature of these Offices enumerated in the Parallels mentioned, as extraneous to our present Purpose, the *Pastor* and *Teacher*, in the Judgement of best Interpreters, are one and the same Office; to which purpose 'tis well observ'd, that the Particle or Word (*some*) in *Eph. 4. 11*, is not added to *Pastors* and *Teachers*, as to the other Degrees mentioned, nor standing betwixt the two Names; besides that the *Pastor's* and *Teacher's* Work is much one and the same, the two names being often put one for the other in Scripture, and both conjoyn'd in the Tryal of Ministers, *1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1. 7, 8, 9*. Thus the *Belgick Divines* upon the place.

But, upon serious search of these Texts, our Prefacer will be found more dangerously to have involv'd himself in this Argument than he is aware of (taking along the Series and Scope of what we have heard from him), and that he has rais'd thus a Ghost which will prove a Frighting One. For, 1. Making the *Apostolick Universal Inspection* over the *Catholick Church* a standing Ordinance, he will thus set up 12 Universal Infallible Patriarchs, with Collateral Power: And here's a puffing Work, to get his so much boasted of Antiquity to Echo this Assertion. 2. This appears to juggle out the Argument from the Priesthood; for, if the *Jewish Church* had but One Superintendent High-Priest, and the *Christian Church* Twelve, here's a true Inequality with a Witness, but such as one of the two must go down and outweigh the Other. Further, 3. Our Prefacer tells us, that, in *1 Cor. 12*: and in the other Parallel, *The Apostle argues from the Structure of the Humane Body*, and brings all home to the Government and Ministry of the Church; And therefore, according to his Sense and Pleading, the Apostle, saying, *v. 21. The Head cannot say to the Feet, I have no need of you*, must point at a Political Head, and High-Priest. Thus the High-Priest will gain it upon the Apostles. 4. What will our Prefacer make of Governments, mention'd *v. 28*? Presbyterians alledge, they are a distinct Order of Officers, and can make appear, they are neither the *Pastor* nor *Deacon*, but, in the Text, stand distinguish'd from both: And since all Officers, according to him, here enumerated, are of a standing Nature, thus the Invidious *Ruling-Elder*, nill he, will he,

he, will get in upon him. Finally, What will our Prefacer make of the *Gift of Tongues and Miracles*, since here we read of *Miracles*, or *Workers of Miracles*, *Gifts of Healing*, *Diversities of Tongues*? Are these Offices still Vigent, and of a standing Necessity, or not? If Vigent, where do they, or have they appear'd? He will not own, I suppose, the Church of *Rome's* Miracles for such a standing Office. If he own, that these Offices are gone, then, in stead of beating Presbyterians with this his sham Notion, he must needs beat off some of his Officers from a standing Use and Necessity; and thus must acknowledge the Church may be well tempered without some of these Officers. Thus Presbyterians will evite his Argument by his Concession; since his Topick concludes a standing Necessity of all; Else he will say, the Apostle's Similitude is Lame and Unfuteable, since the well tempered Body can want none of its Parts or Members.

After Apostles, our Prefacer tells us, he finds another Order of *Ecclesiasticks* ordain'd by Apostles, viz. *Deacons*, Act. 6, and Rules deliver'd ancient their Qualifications, 1 Tim. 3. What this signifies, to Conclude an Imparity in the Pastoral Office, the Presbyterians, and all Men of common Sense, are yet to learn; since a Subordination and Imparity of the New Testament Office-Bearers is not deny'd; and the Inference of an Official Imparity in the Pastoral Office, drawn therefrom, they hold to be a *Baculo ad Angulum*, and pitifully Nonsensical Arguing a *Genere ad Speciem affirmativè*. But further, there are two things in his Discourse Presbyterians cannot but censure. The One is, That he will have the *Deacons* Authoris'd to *Preach the Gospel*, and *Administer Sacraments*; whose Office, all do acknowledge, had respect to Serving of Tables and Ministring to the Poor, as is evident from that Text, Act. 6, cited by him, where is exhibit a Scripture Standard of their Institution; And if therein our Prefacer will make it appear, they are intrusted with Preaching the Gospel and Administring the Sacraments, or can prove it from this, or any other Text, I will undertake for Presbyterians, they shall give him *Murus Vitis*, and acknowledge him a *Magnus Apollo*. The Text affords the clear Ground and Occasion of this Institution, scil. a Complaint of the Neglect of the poor *Grecian* Widows in the daily Ministrations of Charitable Contributions, whereupon the Apostles, calling the Multitude, told them, *It was not fit they should leave the Preaching of the Word to Serve Tables*, and did thereupon appoint the choosing out of fit persons for this Employment, that they might not be diverted from Preaching the Gospel; to which, he will easily acknowledge, Baptism was annex'd, since thereby persons were Initiates into the Church. But, 2. In the Parallel cited by our Prefacer, 1 Tim. 3. the Qualifications of the *Deacon* are set down, and

Presbyterians desire to know of this Sagacious Person, 1. In what place of the Context he finds them Authoris'd to Preach or Administer the Sacraments? 2. Since there is another Officer there describ'd, who must be Apt to Teach, and is preferr'd to the Deacon, who has no such Qualification requir'd of him, how came he to overlook him in this his grand Proof of Subordination of Officers, since he will acknowledge, the Apostles were superiour both to the One and the Other? No doubt his ascribing to Deacons an Authority to Preach or Baptise, of whom no such thing is hinted in the Text cited by him, and denying it (at least implicitly) to such, to whom it is so expressly ascrib'd, is such a piece of Inadvertency, as requir'd a Retraction, or new Addition to the Errata.

As for the Power of Timothy and Titus, in reference to conferring Sacred Orders, and censuring Presbyters, pleaded by him in the next place; he should know, that Presbyterians here deny two Points, wherein he begs the Question: 1. That either Timothy or Titus had, in Churches Constitut, a Power in this Point Paramount unto, or Exclusive of that of Pastors or Presbyters, since Presbyters or Pastors are found Instructed with such a Power, being own'd as Rulers, Bishops, Governours, Overseers, and the Exercise thereof found competent to them; a Presbytery laying hands on Timothy, 1 Tim. 4. 14: The Corinth Presbytery putting forth the high Sentence of Excommunication, 1 Cor. 5. 5. Pastors and Presbyters concurring in the first Council with Apostles, and enjoining and Authorizing the Decrees thereof, Acts 15. 6, 22, 23; with 16. 4. The whole Jurisdictional Power being, in Paul's last Farewell, intrusted to the Pastors or Presbyters of Ephesus, without any hint of Timothy's Interest therein as their Bishop, Acts 20. 28. 2. The Presbyterians deny the fix'd Station or Inspection of Timothy and Titus in or over any one Post, but do make appear their transient Office and Inspection opposite thereunto, and that before and after their Instructions in these Epistles, during their Residence in these Churches. So that his Supposition of their fix'd Station and Episcopal power in these Churches, is such an insipid and repeated *Petitio Principii*, as has been often expos'd. Of the same Nature is that which he adds, Of Apostles sending persons to Churches, such as Tychicus, Onesimus, &c. as founding his Conclusion aim'd at, scil. An Imparity in the Pastoral Office; for, as for that blind General, which he infers, scil. Superiour and Subordinat Ecclesiasticks, 'tis evident as noon-day-light, that 'tis nothing to the Point or Question: And yet our Prefacer is bold to tell us, that 'tis as easie to make two Contradictory Propositions true, as to reconcile Parity among Ministers of our Religion to these Scripture Instructions and Accounts. If by Ministers of our Religion (for the Terms are general) he understand all New Testament Church-Officers, 'tis easily admitted;

admitted ; tho' Presbyterians still hold, that some of these Institut Officers, from which he draws his Conclusion of Subordination, were Extraordinary, and to pass off with that Exigence of the Christian Churches State, while the Foundations thereof by our Saviour's Infallible first Builders were a laying, whose Office, Gifts, and Universal Inspection could no more be succeeded to than the Churches Foundation could be twice laid, and the N. Testament Church Ordinances twice prescrib'd. So that our Prefacer falls into the Contradiction he ascribes to us, in making this Extraordinary Office, in a formal Sense, Successive and Ordinary. 3. The Question being about *Parity* and *Imparity* in the *Pastoral Office*, the Admission of Subordination in the N. Testament Officers, can no more impeach that Pastoral Official Parity which we assert, than the Assertion of Official Parity among Apostles, and in that Office, will impeach that Instituted Subordination which he mentions. The following Eruption of our Prefacer's angry *Bilis* [*Let the unprejudic'd Reader Judge, with what Face Presbyterians can pretend Scripture for their beloved Parity, or entitle their Books, written in Defence of Presbytery SCRIPTURE PLEAS?*] the Presbyterians do entertain with pity of his Ignorant Transport as a piece of that *confident Anger* imputed by *Solomon* to the *Fool* : And we can appeal to the same Unprejudic'd Judge to give Sentence upon the Answers he has offered to Scripture Arguments for Official Parity of Pastors.

But our Prefacer, after his Superficial Rovings, will come home to the Point, and Impugn our Distinction of *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary Officers*, which we see doth effectually cut the Sinews of the premis'd Superficial Arguing. He tells us, 1. *That this is gratis dictum, being affirmed by us of the Gospel Ministry, with Relation to Ministers acting in Parity.* This is somewhat in the Clouds and obscure. Our Assertion and Principle (the same with that of the Body of Protestant Divines, in this point) is, That in the N. Testament Accounts and Schem of Officers, some were Extraordinary, such as *Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets* in the stricter acceptation, some Ordinary and of standing Necessity. scil. *Pastors, Elders, Deacons.* If by *Gospel Ministry* be understood all Officers, he must needs acknowledge some of them Extraordinary, as is above hinted, or swallow gross Absurdities. And in this we warrantable retort his Charge of *begging the Question*; and his supposing the Office of Apostles and Evangelists to be Ordinary, we affirm to be his *gratis dictum*, there being Arguments to the Contrary not so much as mentioned by him, far less Answered. But taking the Term of *Gospel Ministry* as restricted to the Pastoral Office, (tho' he unjustly Charge upon us such a Restriction) we say it is no Extraordinary, but a standing Office,

face, succeeding the Apostolate in what is Ordinary, *viz.* in the Power of Order and Jurisdiction, as conjoyn'd in one Office. Thus, 'tis our Principle which we maintain, and our part of the Question, opposite to his Affirmation of Imparity in the Pastoral Office: So that we do as justly, and much more Charge him with *begging the Question*: Which is evident two ways, 1. We not only suppose, but prove an Official Parity in the Pastoral Office, by Scripture Grounds known to all that are acquainted with this Controversie; and therefore, we do not merely suppose and beg it, as he doth poorly presume, 2. In that all along he argues an Imparity in the Pastoral Office, or that there are higher standing Officers than the Pastor, from the Superiority of Apostles and Evangelists, the one to the other, and both to Inferiour Officers. Now, who knows not, that the standing Office and permanent Superiority of Apostles and Evangelists is the Question betwixt him and us, whereof we make the contrary appear.

But the 2d. Answer is, *That supposing the Distinction to be good, it allows the Christian Church to have been at first founded, govern'd and propagated by Ministers of different Orders, and in so far excludes Parity or Presbytery.* Which Answer how childish it is, is obviously apparent. For, 1. If our Distinction is Good, as he will suppose, then he must suppose, that all Officers higher than the Pastor are ceas'd, and consequently the Pastors are left to govern as the highest Authoriz'd Officers. and say we in Parity; for all his pretences of Imparity are drawn from the superiour Orders to the Pastor, which now he doth, with us, suppose to have gone off. 2. He saith, *We thus admit the Church to have been once govern'd by Ministers of different Orders; which excludes, in so far, Parity.* What pitiful trifling is this? There's no doubt that this doth exclude Parity of Officers simply considered, which we never asserted; but that this ever did, or doth exclude Official Parity in the Pastoral Office, we deny. So that, if by Ministers he mean Church Officers in general, our Concession, no doubt, imports so much; If he mean by New Testament Ministers, Pastors Labouring in the Word and Doctrine, their Official Parity is not in the least injur'd by this Concession. Here I must again mind him, that his denying absolutely the Extraordinary Nature of any New Testament Officers, will plead for Twelve Universal Infallible Patriarchs and Inspectors of the Catholick Church: And beside, looking back to his Notion anent the Jewish OEconomy inspected by One Supreme High-Priest, and what may be in his Principles drawn from the Inspection of John the Apostle, when the rest were remov'd, the Man with the Triple-Crown seems to have a fair Plea from his Pleading. 3. This common Distinction of Ordinary and Extraordinary Officers, our Prefacer is bold to call

call *Futious* and *Impertinent*. A bold Charge put upon the Sentiments of so great a Body of Protestant Divines and Reformed Churches, who have constantly own'd this Distinction, upon such solid and unanswerable Grounds, as he has never concern'd himself to search and understand. His great Reason is, *That what is Extraordinary, must needs have a Relation to some antecedent settled Order, which in this Case cannot be assign'd.* That it has a Relation to a settled Order, is true: But why not a Relation to an Order to be immediately settled, without the Limits whereof this Order stands? Else let this Gentleman suffer me to entertain him with these Queries. I. Whether thinks he, *Moses's* Office was Extraordinary, who is appointed to be God's Mouth and Messenger, to deliver to *Israel*, as a Church, yea, and Nation singularly devoted to God, the Laws both Moral, Ceremonial, and Judicial, to institute and appoint the Sacred Priesthood and Ministry, to give the Fundamental Laws of the Kingdom instructing their Kings and all inferior Judges in their Offices, to be the special Inspector of both, to deliver all the Ordinances of Worship to be observ'd by all God's People, to be the Typical Mediator betwixt God and the People? as is clear in the Solemnity at the delivering of the Law, *Exod. 19. 20, &c.* and in many other Instances wherein he is declar'd to be Singular in his Office and Privileges, see *Numb. 12. 7. Deut. 34. 10, 11, 12.* If he deny his Office to be Extraordinary, he is an Extraordinary to all Interpreters and Divines, and in this as *Heteroclite*, as in his other Conceits. If he own him to be Extraordinary, then, Ily, I enquire, to what *Prior established Order* in the Church & State of *Israel* (I mean, a National Order, with respect to a National Church and State), had this Extraordinary Office Relation? If he say, it was Extraordinary with respect to the common Order of Priesthood and Civil Government then to be established, so, say we, was the Office of Apostolat: And in this he must yield the Cause to us, and acknowledge his Notion of [*Extraordinary*] *Futious* (to return to him his own Term), which he will needs have to respect a *prior established Order*, and that there was an Ordinary settled Order of both Priests and Civil Officers by *Moses's* Ministry, wherein several parts of his Office were recommitted to ordinary standing Officers, which did no wise impeach this Extraordinary Office of *Moses* himself, or render it of an ordinary Nature; and, by parity of Reason, neither could the Committing the Administration of Word and Sacraments, and the Jurisdictional Power to Ordinary Officers, render the Office of Apostles Ordinary, who, as *Moses* in the Old Testament Dispensation, were God's Extraordinary Messengers to Institute in God's Church a standing Ministry, and deliver his Mind as to the Worship, Doctrine, and Government thereof. upon whose Foundation, in this respect,

spect, the New Testament Church is said to be built, *Eph. 2. 20.* I hope our Prefacer will not say upon the Foundation of either Pope or Prelats, their pretended Successors : Nor can he, without the greatest absurdity, and a clear *Implicantia in Adjecto*, assert, that there was a New Testament Ministry prior to that of Apostles, and to which it could have respect.

But says our Prefacer, *If there was a settled Order of Men, sufficient to perform the Functions, and Ministries of the Christian Religion, what need was there to imploy Extraordinary Apostles, Evangelists, and Prophets, to do that for which Provision had been made, by appointment of ordinary Officers?* This Question may be retorted thus, Since, in the Jewish Oeconomie, the Civil and Ecclesiastick Sanhedrim, with their Subordinat Judges and Ministers, were sufficient to perform all necessarie Offices and Duties, both of the Sacred Priesthood, and Civil Government, what need was there of a Moses to Institute, Direct, and Superintend them under this Dispensation? He still supposes (how pertinently let any judge) a *Prior Institution* of such Order and Officers as we call Ordinary, and a Super-institution of that which we call Extraordinary. If the Holy ONE, the GOD of Order, judg'd it fit, both under the Jewish and Christian Dispensation, to authorize Officers, with an Extraordinary Power to Institute and Direct, as his Mouth and Messengers, the ordinary standing Officers, and deliver his Ordinances to his Church; why will this Man quarrel the Wisdom of the Almighty in this Point? Nay, doth not the necessity hereof evidently appear to all Men of common Sense? Our Saviour did not create at once a Christian Church, and a fix'd Ministry of standing Ordinances therein, but thought fit to call Twelve Special Messengers to be his Mouth and first Ambassadors, to lay the Foundation of the Gospel Church, to deliver the Ordinances of the Doctrine, Worship, and Government to the same. This required a Special and Extraordinary *Legation, Infallibility in Doctrine, Extraordinary Gifts*, and the cloathing of these first Messengers with such Universal Authority, and *Infalible Inspection* over the whole Catholick Church, both Members and Officers, as is impossible to be competent to any Ordinary Officers. But, saith our Prefacer, *If the Extraordinary Office was first institute, which is absurd, because it has a Relation to the Ordinary as its Correlat; what was wanting to the Extraordinary Officers of the Church, to oblige them, to have Recourse to the Ordinary, and Sole Order of Presbyters?* I will not say, that in this Objection, there's much wanting to this Prefacer of very Ordinary Sense. Who ever said, that the Extraordinary Officers had something wanting in their Office, obliging them to have Recourse to the Ordinary Officers for a due Exercise thereof? Let an Inquiry be made, what was wanting to the Office of *Moses*, to oblige him.

him to have Recourse, in the exercise of his High Extraordinary Function, to the Ordinary Priesthood and Ministry; and let the evident and necessary Return be the Ballance to weigh the Judgement and Sense of this Objection. Who knows not, that the Apostles Infallible Conduct of the Spirit, in the Execution of their Universal Extraordinary Inspection over the whole Church, both Members and Officers, put them beyond the reach of having Recourse to the Ordinary and Standing Officers, for Direction and Instruction therein? And, in a word, besides that his Objection doth absurdly suppose the pre-existence of the Ordinary Office to the Extraordinary (whereof above), whoever understands the Scope and Intendment of the Apostolick Office will necessarily acknowledge, that the fixing of Ordinary Officers in the Christian Churches through the World, was both necessary for the Churches Preservation, and the great Scope of the Exercise of the Apostolick Office; and accordingly, the Apostles may be rationally said to have Recourse, even to an Ordinary Ministry, for the managing the Churches Concerns in an Ordinary standing Gospel Method; which we find accordingly exemplified in the Apostles practice, as is evident in the Instances exhibited.

The Prefacer adds, *That whether we consider the Work of Ecclesiastical Governours and Government, or the Original of Church-Power, or, the Charismata, the Gifts and Qualifications, wherewith they were endow'd, either they were all Ordinary, or Extraordinary.* Herein I differ so far from him, that, upon this very Ground, I will prove, there was a necessity, that some in the beginning of the Gospel should be Ordinary, others not. The work of Ecclesiastic Government, as committed to the first Officers, the Apostles, for the Original moulding of the Christian Church, was but to gather the Churches by the Voice of the Gospel (whereof the Apostles were the first Heralds), by Infallible Authority to deliver the lively Oracles to them, accordingly to Institute all their necessary Officers, to direct them in the Nature and End of their several Offices, to prescribe the Gospel Worship, as distinct from that of the Jewish Oeconomie, to take Inspection of the whole Church planted, and to be planted, direct the Duties, both of Officers and Members. This he cannot but acknowledge to have been the Work of our Lord's first Messengers and Governours of his Church, which consequently he must acknowledge to be Extraordinary; and sure, he will not be so absurd as to assert, that either the first Officers Instituted by the Apostles, or all succeeding Officers were, or could be of this Nature. Next, for the *Original of Church Government*, 'tis our Saviour's great Commission as Mediator and Messenger of the Covenant, who having a Donative Kingdom as Head of his Church, and in the Capacity of Head and King, he prescribes the Laws, Offi-

ces, and Ordinances thereof, in the Execution of which Glorious Legation and Trust he committed to his Apostles the Authority above-express'd, and for the End mention'd; which doth clearly include and reach both the Ordinary and Extraordinary Offices. And finally, as for the Gifts and Qualifications of the first Messengers, they were suted to this Rectoral Power intrusted unto them, such as *Gifts of Tongues, Infal-libilitie in Doctrine, Gifts of Miracles, &c.* Now, upon these Grounds, considering the first Original State of the Gospel or N. Testament Church, all could not be *Extraordinary*, since the Extraordinary Rectoral Power of Apostles did necessarily respect the settled Ministry and Ordinances in such Nature and Extent as is above describ'd. They had for their Work the Foundation of the Gospel Church to lay, prescribe its Ordinances, settle its standing Officers: This could not be twice done, consequently by no Successors: In this, therefore, they were necessarily Extraordinary; they had an Universal Superintendency over the Officers in all Churches planted, and to be planted. And this Apostolick Relative Office and Power, our Prefacer's Logick will acknowledge to have a Correlat. scil. *The Ordinary Officers to Direct and Authorize.* Again, Ordinary Officers being limited in their Inspection, to their particular Precincts and Watch-Towers, under the Catholick Inspection of these first Catholick Infalible Officers, upon the same Ground and Medium, they could not be all such Catholick Infalible Officers. Which is further Confirm'd by that Text, 1 Cor. 12. and Illustrated by the Apostle's pungent Querie, *Are all Apostles, are all Teachers, &c.* and the Similitude of the Natural Bodie, wherein all Parts have not the same Situation and Office: So that 'tis evident to the most obvious Consideration, that in the first Constitution of the Church, there was a necessity of a mix'd Set of Ordinary and Extraordinary Officers, as is evinc'd in the beginning of the Jewish Oeconomie by the Ministry of *Moses.*

But our Prefacer will next disprove our Distinction of Ordinary and Extraordinary Officers from this Ground, viz. *That Extraordinary Gifts were common to all, to Laicks as well as Ministers, and therefore concludes, that the Distinction, as we use it, is unserviceable against the Succession of Ecclesiasticks in that comely Order and Subordination which our LORD and his Apostles established.* But besides that he must needs, in this Point, distinguish the *Δύναμις* and *Ἐξουσία*, the Gifts and Authority or Power; else, in a Compliance with *Anabaptists*, he will deny the Distinct Office of a Ministry upon Communication of Ministerial Gifts to many privat Persons, and consequently these Gifts, which he calls *Extraordinary*, even upon supposal of such a large Communication in the first Times of the Gospel,

he

he must grant, did not of themselves entitle to the Apostolick Office, nay to any Church Office, and tho' materially the same, yet were formally, as to Extent and Exercise, and the proper immediat End thereof, distinct from these Gifts in the Apostles, or other Extraordinary Officers, these given to Apostles in special being to Seal their Apostolick Authority, and Universal Mission and Legation, and to fit them for Managing the great Duties and Trust committed to them: Besides this, we say, he should have considered, that the Presbyterians distinguish the Gift from the Office formally considered; the Office lying in that Universal Rectoral Authoritative Intallible Inspection over the whole Catholick Church, the delivery of our Lord's Mind as his immediat Messengers, as touching the Worship, Doctrine, Discipline, and Government of the Gospel Church, an Authority and Work which, without the grossest Contradiction imaginable, none can assert, could be deriv'd into a Succession; else the Churches Foundation could be twice laid, and the Ordinances twice delivered. Besides that, thus there behov'd to be standing Apostles vested with such Infalible Power to the end of the World. He tells us our Distinction is against the *Succession of Ecclesiasticks in that comely Order which Christ did Institute*. 'Tis indeed against such a Succession as is hinted, and of Twelve Infalible Patriarchs to Superintend the Catholick Church, both Members and Officers, which all Reform'd Churches are against: But in no whit is this against that *comely Order* of a Gospel Ministry, Superiour and Inferiour Officers, Subordination of Courts and Judicatories, which our Lord and his Apostles established. What he means by *leaving us no Ranks of People in the Church as the Consequence of our Assertion*, is somewhat mysterious. Must the Difference of the Ranks of People, Distinction of Church Officers and Members, the Distinction and Subordination of Ecclesiastick Courts evanish, because Extraordinary Gifts and Offices are ceased? Who of common Sense sees not the Absurdity of such an Inference.

But our Prefacer next suggests, *That the making different Orders of Church Officers of the New-Testament Extraordinary leaves the Church, in After-Ages, no Pattern in Scripture, to imitate in the Ministry and Government thereof; since Extraordinary Examples are no Precedents, nor design'd for Imitation*. A pitiful false Supposition and Begging of the Question. Do we therefore hold that all different Orders of Officers were Extraordinary, or that there are no standing Orders of Ordinary Officers, because we hold, that some Officers were Extraordinary, and some not? What Consequence is this? He should know, that as we hold the Office of Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Extraordinary, passing off with that Infant-state and Exigence of the Church, so we hold, there are standing Orders of Pastors, Elders, and Deacons,

Deacons, imitable and imitated in the Gospel-Church, whose standing Authority, with respect both to the Power of Order and Jurisdiction, and the Churches comely Order, generally we find appointed and authoriz'd by the Apostles, and Exemplified in the New Testament Churches Practice; and, consequently, recommended to the Churches constant Imitation in all Ages, for the necessary Ends and Uses thereof. And if, as he says, *Extraordinary Examples are not design'd for Imitation*, it follows necessarily, that the Instance of Apostles and Evangelists Extensive Inspection was not for such a Design; and therefore, Prelates, Arch-Prelates, Metropolitans, Patriarchs, and Popes, pretended Imitation is absurd, and Anti-scriptural. He adds, *That the same Work which Apostles and Evangelists did in their days, was to be perform'd by authoriz'd Persons to the End*. That the Exercise of the Power of Order and Jurisdiction, was to continue to the End, is certain, the Churches Subsistence necessarily requiring the same: But, that the same Work which Apostles and Evangelists perform'd, as respecting their formal proper Office, was to be continued, is so far from being certain, that 'tis most false and absurd, as is evident from what is said. The Apostles by an immediate Mission, as Catholick Officers in the Church Catholick, were to plant Churches through the World, to deliver our Lord's Institutions of the New Testament Church anent Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, to Direct and take Inspection thereof, by an Infallible Authority. Evangelists were to Water their Plantations, to bring Reports of the Churches State to the Apostles, as such Infallible Inspectors, and Instructions and Commissions from the Apostles to the Churches. Now, where are the Persons Authoriz'd for this Work? As for Teachers, whom he joyns with them, either he makes them One with Apostles and Evangelists, and thus contradicts himself in his former Accounts of these Offices as distinct; or if he own them, and their Work, as of a distinct Nature, *viz.* to Preach the Gospel, and Administer Sacraments, within a certain Precinct, with ordinary proportioned Jurisdictional Authority, and a due Subjection to the Prophets and Superior Judicatories, we acknowledge this *Work is to be performed by Authoriz'd Persons to the End*. But then, he is absurd in making this Work and Office *One with that of Apostles and Evangelists, and of a standing Necessity*, which are so evidently different, and vastly Discrepant in this Respect. For that Argument which he adds, *of Our Lord's promis'd Presence with his Messengers to the end of the World*, he, or his Friend, might have found it Answered by the Author to whom he would seem mainly to offer these Queries, the Promise having Respect to the *True Church and standing Ministry*, whereof the Apostles laid the Foundation, as Master-Builders; so that what was in their Office as of perpetual Use and

and Necessity, derived into a Succession, and to be continued and propagated in the exercise of a true Gospel Ministry and Ordinances of the Word, Sacraments, Government, and Discipline, instituted by the Apostles: Such standing Ordinances and Officers, we say, upon Ground of our Saviour's Institutions, are allowed his *Promised Presence to the end*. But that the Office of Apostolat or Evangelist, taken in a proper formal Sense was to continue upon Ground of this *Promise*, no Protestant Interpreters did ever dream. Nay, our Prefacer must needs acknowledge this, and baffle his own Argument; For he reckons Prophets distinct from Apostles, and Evangelists among the standing Orders of a Gospel Ministry, *Eph. 4. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 28*. And he must add, according to his Scope and Exposition, *Gifts of Tongues, Miracles, Gifts of Healing*, which, in his Sense and Pleading, must needs make up also distinct Orders of a fix'd Gospel Ministry. For all these Orders he will have the Apostle set down with a *First, Secondly, Thirdly*, to beat down Presbyterian Equality, and exemplifie standing distinct Orders of the Ecclesiastick Officers. Now, I would know, what he would make of the *Prophets* here set down, as a distinct Order from *Apostles, Evangelists, and Teachers*, if not to specify an Office of foretelling things to come, and expounding, by a special Instinct, the more difficult Scriptures and Prophecies, such as was *Agabus*. See *Proseß. of Leyd. Diss. 42. Tb. 22*. Did our Lord's promis'd presence suppose, or will it infer the standing Necessity of this Office, or not? Whatever Answer he make, he will find this *Query* and *Dilemma* so pungent, as to push him down. If this, with other Officers mention'd, are standing upon this Ground, let our Prefacer present us with his Spectacles, and let us see where they exist. Might not such an Assertion cover him with Blushes, and expose him to the Contradicting Exposition of all the Churches, that I say not the Hissing of all Men, and the Confutation of Experience, especially including the Offices of *Healing, of Miracles, &c.* which the Apostle places in distinct Orders, and (to use B. *Honiman's* Phrase) makes an *Ordinal Numbring of them*, as *First, Secondly, &c.* If he hold these Offices to be expir'd, then, 1. He must acknowledge his Clamouring against Presbyterians, for distinguishing (with the Current of all Protestant Divines) the New Testament Officers into Ordinary and Extraordinary, is futile, and his Argument to impugn this Distinction to be of the same Stamp. And, 2. He must acknowledge, that our Lord's general Promise, *Matth. 28*. will not bear his Conclusion of the *standing Necessity of all the Offices mention'd in the New Testament*, but, with us, he must own; That the Promise, tho' not exclusively, yet mainly, respects such as are of *perpetual Use* and Necessity, as distinguish'd from such as are expir'd and gone off with the Churches.

first Exigence. He tells us, *That the same Work which the Apostles and Evangelists, &c. did in their days, was to be perform'd by authoris'd Persons to the end of the World, who have a Right to the Apostles Plenitude of Power, perpetual Authority and Jurisdiction over all subordinat. Officers and Believers in Christ.* Upon this Assertion, First, I would know, (since he collates Eph. 4. 11. with 1 Cor. 12. 28. which he will have exactly parallel, as setting down the standing Orders of Church Officers) why he omits the Secondary Order of Prophets, set in the second Rank next to the Order of Apostles, in both these Texts, and prefer'd in Order to that of Evangelists, Eph. 4. who, in the other Parallels, are not at all mention'd? One would think, that *aliquid Mysterii alit*, that something frightened our Prefacer from advancing this Sacred Order of Prophets, as of a standing Necessity. If I may offer a Conjecture, I suppose, he was afraid of clashing with, and contradicting his Account of the enlarg'd Gifts of Prophecie, which he exhibits as Vigent in the first Times of the Gospel, from Joel 2. upon which he asserts, *That all sorts of People, Old and Young, Men and Women, had extraordinary Gifts.* What Exceptions this large Assertion is lyable unto, I will not now stand to inquire. But good Mr. Prefacer, here is *Sisyphus's* Stone still returning, for the Query is, What kind of Offices these were, which the Apostle places so high *betwixt Apostles and Evangelists*? Was it to foretell things to come, and by extraordinary Inspiration to expound and apply difficult Scriptures and Prophecies, and that in publick Assemblies, for the Churches Edification? If this be said, and that the Office was intirely of this Nature, it will be a hard saying, and grate the Ears sadly, to assert, that *all Persons, Young and Old, Men, yea Women* (by the Apostle forbidden to speak in the Church) *had this Gift and Office.* For if so, why did God make this Office so Eminent in the Church? If their Work and Office was properly and mainly to Teach, then their Office was properly Ordinary; for he will not deny, that Ordinary Teachers had, at this time, singular Gifts. And if so, the Question still recurs, Why are they distinguish'd from Teachers, and set in so high and distinct an Order before, and above that of Evangelists and Teachers in the Apostle's Ordinal Numbring? Since therefore, according to his Scope and Description, these Offices are own'd as Ordinary, it follows, that the New Testament Church has had a Mank and Lame Constitution for many Centuries, since Officers, with such Gifts, are no where now existent, and besides our Lord's promised presence, according to his Pleading, appears sadly impeach'd. 2ly, Whereas he says, *'Tis certain, that the same Work which the Apostles, and Evangelists, Teachers, &c. did in their days, was to be perform'd by Authoris'd Persons to the end.* I have heard, that a blind [*&c.*] in an Oath

Oath made once a great Contest in *England*; and surely our Prefacer's [*&c.*] here is like to creat him Trouble enough. No doubt, it must, here, in this Man's Sense and Scope, respect all the Orders mention'd in the premis'd Parallels, which he will needs make a *Hercules Club* of, to beat down Presbyterian Parity of Offices, so that it must, to make the Antithesis good, import fix'd and standing distinct Orders. Then let us view the rest of his Apostolick Muster, and search the Churches Rolls for them. Here are, then, *First Apostles*, *Secondarily Prophets*, *Thirdly Teachers*, after that follow other Orders, as *Miracles*, or mighty Works, next *Gifts of Healing*, then *Helps*, then *Governments*, then *Diversities of Tongues*. I need not stand to shew how these Orders are understood by Protestant Divines and Interpreters; but that Three, at least, of these here mention'd, if not more, are ceas'd, as Extraordinary, is doubted by no Protestant Interpreter I know. Not to mention *Prophets*, we have here *Miracles*; that the Apostle means some Order of Men and Church Office, none will doubt; *viz.* such as were impower'd to work Miraculous Operations, and those of a more remarkable Nature. Thus the Continuators of *Pool's Annotations*. Such as *cur'd Diseases, otherwise incurable*, and had Power of inflicting *Miraculous Fearful Punishments* upon Opposers of Truth, as was inflicted by *Paul* on *Elymas*, and by *Peter* on *Ananias* and *Sapphira*. Thus the *English Annot.* The *Belgick Divines* understand it to the same Scope, of such as had *the Gift to confirm the Doctrine by Miracles*. *Gifts of Healing*, in the Judgment of Interpreters, imports another distinct Order of Officers, whose Work and Office was to Cure Incurable Diseases, as also others, but yet had no Power of Miraculous Operations of a further Extension, as the first Order had. Thirdly, for *Diversities of Tongues*, this special distinct Order is judg'd to import such an Office, as had a singular respect either to Speaking in a *strange Tongue*; or in some 'tis suppos'd to import the Ability of Interpreting, separated from the Ability of Speaking, which the Apostle places in the last Order, to extenuat the *Corinthians* magnifying this Office and Gift: A Gift, say the foresaid Continuators, not given to all, but to some, who were much magnified on this Ground. However, not to stand upon the Sentiments of the Nature and Differences of these Offices offer'd by Interpreters (whereof a Graphical Exact Description *Judicious Calvin* doth esteem a Difficult Work, these Offices being long since ceas'd and much unknown to us); That there were such Offices and Functions in the first Gospel Church is denied by none, and that they are now expir'd is equally acknowledg'd. Now, I would ask our Prefacer, Where is that Work perform'd, and by whom, which he doth here mention, as manag'd by Apostles, Evangelists, and the *&c.* of

other Officers, and to be still continued in the Gospel Church? By what Orders of his belov'd Hierarchy are the ensuing Functions managed? viz. The Prophetical Office of Foretelling future Events, the Exposition and Application of hard and difficult Prophecies by the same immediat Impulse and Inspiration, the Confirmation of the Doctrine of the Gospel by Miraculous Operations and Punishments of the Refractory, the Miraculous Healing of Diseases, Speaking with, and Interpreting of strange Tongues, by the same special Instinct without Study and Learning the same. Or if he own it, that all these Functions are ceas'd, Where is that continued performance of the same Work which Apostles, Evangelists, Teachers, and the &c. did in their days? And how doth this consist with Christ's Promis'd presence to the end with all the first Gospel Ministers? Besides, if these Gifts of the Holy Ghost were to be pour'd out upon all, Men, Women, Old and Young, how comes the Apostle to state them in distinct Offices? And since these Gifts comprehend the Teaching, Preaching Gift, will he be bold to affirm, that not only Women, but Children, were authoris'd and fitted to Preach the Gospel in the first times thereof, as he insinuates from that Passage, Joel 2? But further, how will this consist with the Apostle's Queries, which himself pleads, *Are all Apostles? Are all Prophets? Are all Teachers? Are all Workers of Miracles? Have all the Gifts of Healing? Do all speak with Tongues? Do all interpret?* The Apostle's Question here, as elsewhere, imports a peremptory Negative; but will our Prefacer give him the Lie in a contradicting Affirmative? How can that same Work perform'd by all these Officers, and whereby they were distinguish'd from others, be of a standing Nature, since these Functions were ceas'd many Centuries of Years ago? So that, of necessity, he must either accommodate this Promise to such Works and Offices, as are of a standing Necessity and Nature, and interpret the same as respecting the Continuance of a Gospel Ministry to the end, not the expired Functions premis'd, and thus yield the Cause to the Presbyterians; in acknowledging Works and Offices Ordinary and Extraordinary, or impeach not only the Sense and Judgment of Protestant Divines and Churches, together with convincing Experience of all Christians, but, which is most of all, our Saviour's Promise of a Non-performance, and want of Efficacy and desirable Issue.

That Plenitude of Apostolick Power, wherein they must be succeeded, which he holds to be Necessary, Perpetual, and Permanent, our Prefacer expresseth thus, that it is an Authority and Jurisdiction over all Subordinate Officers and Believers in Christ. That the Apostles had a Supreme, Infallible Authority and Inspection over the whole Church, planted and to be planted, and all Officers and Believers in Christ, I know no body doubts of it, who read

and consider the Scripture Accounts of the Apostolick Office : But that this Office and Inspection, in the Extent and Nature thereof, as is above express'd, was of a Permanent Nature, and to be Succeeded unto, I know none, who disown the Pope's Pretensions, who assert it, if not this venerable Prefacer, with his Querist, and our late new Phantastick Pleaders. Nor can he evade by alledging a Succession in point of Jurisdiction and Authority over all Subordinate Officers in a certain limited precinct, which he may pretend to be his Sense from that which follows (whereof anon) ; for he asserts this Succession expressly with respect to the Plenitude of the Apostles Power and Jurisdiction over all Subordinate Officers and Believers in Christ. I wonder, what this Man will call the Plenitude of the Apostles Power, and that with respect unto their Jurisdiction over all Subordinate Officers and Believers in Christ, if he would apply it any otherwise than in this Extent, which was necessarily and essentially included in the Apostolick Office and Inspection : And it being thus, I would know who the person or persons are, who have thus succeeded ? Sure he will not ascribe it either to Bishops, Arch-Bishops, or Metropolitans, if, at least, he will accord with his Querist, who pretends, tho' in this inconsistent with himself, to disown a Supreme High-Priest, or Pope, over the Catholick Church, albeit he will admit him over a National Church, and this, no doubt, least he should have angered his Grace, the Metropolitan of England. Here, I must, obiter, offer it to Consideration, which doth clear the Subject we are upon, that, in the Sense and Pleading of all Protestant Divines against a Papacy, tho' there were more Popes in a pretended Collateral Supremacy possessing that Chair, they are upon this ground equally reprobate and disown'd, as when this Infallible Supremacy is ascrib'd to One. But if the Supreme Inspection over all Ecclesiasticks and Believers, and that in an Apostolick Plenitude, as this Man expresses it, he will acknowledge to be competent to no succeeding Officers ; Then I will infer against him, 1. The Necessity of acknowledging an Apostolick Extraordinary Inspection, which neither is, nor could be succeeded unto. And that, 2. He consequently loseth his Argument from Christ's promised presence to the end, to prove such a Succession. And, 3ly, that he loseth his Argument from the Jewish High-Priest's Supremacy, as of the same Nature, in point of a Succession of Power, with that of Apostles.

In Explication of this Assertion, our Prefacer Subjoyns, *That that Superiority, and Subordination, necessary among the Governours of any Society, and remarkable in all the Scripture accounts of Church-Government, must needs continue.* Such a Superiority and Subordination in Church-Government, as is necessary among all well govern'd Societies, we never denied :

But he should have understood himself and the Point better, before he took upon him to appear in this Debate : He should have considered, I say, the Point in Controversie, and State of the Question, which is anent the *standing plenitude of Apostolick Inspection and Authority to be deriv'd in a perpetual Succession*, which we deny ; and Affirm, yea and make Good the Contrary. For, 1. We find the Apostles committing what was Ordinary in their Office to Pastors, Elders, Deacons, as the constant standing Officers of the Church, *Acts* 14. 23. with 6. 1, 2, *Phil.* 1. 1. *Acts* 20. 28. *Acts* 15. 2ly. As we find these Officers of a standing Nature and Necessity, so we find Judicatories made up of Pastors and Elders acting with Aristocratical Power, and cloathed with Jurisdictional Authority, 1 *Cor.* 5. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 3ly. We find the Apostles injoyning Obedience to these standing Officers in the Exercise of their Authority, and Discharging a Lordly Superiority in any of them over their Fellows, 1 *Pet.* 5. 2, 3. 1 *Thes.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 13. 17, 24. 3 *Job.* 9. So that 'tis this Man in his novel Invention of the Hierarchy, not we who disown the Scripture Pattern, preferring a Novel Invention to it. What follows in this and the next page, is meer Banter and foolish Railery, as is most of all that ensues in this long Preface, which I have no humour to retaliat.

For his Railing against the Covenant, he should have understood, that the National Covenant of Scotland, as necessarily understood and Explain'd against the Corruptions that had been introduced contrary to this Nation's Libertie and Laws, was Ratified by King Charles I. (whom he entitles the *Glorious Martyr*) in full Parliament, with the greatest Satisfaction, professing himself a *Contented King, with a Contented People*, as this Pamphleter acknowledges. And for the Solemn League and Covenant, which he next foully exclaims against, who knows not, that there was nothing in it, but what, in the present State and Exigence of Affairs, was a necessary result of, and founded upon that first Covenant mentioned, which K. Charles I. found, at last, Declaring in his admired *Ever Begun*, that the great End of the Covenant, in good Men's Intentions, was to *establish Religion in purity, and the Kingdoms in peace* ; a design to which the Solemn League is so expressly in its Nature levelled, that no man of Sense can deny it : And for his Son K. Charles II. he did oftner than once, Solemnly, yea even in his Coronation Solemnity, receiving the Crown of this Kingdom, and that with deepest Attestations of his Sincerity, Swear and own that Sacred Oath, and profess his Sincere Designs to adhere to it and prosecute the Designs thereof ; so that no greater Assurances could be had by a Christian People from a Prince professing Christianity : And therefore, this

this pretended Royalist, and his Fellows, had more consulted the Reputation of both these Kings, if never touching upon this Point. That the Wars ensuing these Covenants were the *proper Fruit of Presbytery*, needs a better Proof than this Prefacer's Assertion. If he say, it was the Occasion of the Bloody Wars ensuing, So, say I, was our Lord's Coming in the Glorious Dispensation of the Gospel, the Occasion of the Sword and Divisions, as himself asserts; and let this man take heed, he blaspheme not that Prince of Peace, who said, *I came not to send Peace, but a Sword and Division.*

But our Prefacer will next remove the Objection from *Diotrephes*, who is rebuked for *loving the pre-eminence*: He tells us we must consider this place calmly, and I have considered it with all the Sense and Calmness I am capable of: But that, in this Argument, we discover our own Pride and Ignorance in *trampling upon Precedency and Superiority*, I look upon as an Eruption of his calumnious Folly. The Sum of what he Answers is, *that Pre-eminence is not the thing which is there condemned, but the undue affecting of it, and his rebelling against the Apostle St. John, his Ecclesiastick Superior.* This Answer and Gloss he might have found solidly Refuted by Presbyterians. I must crave leave to dissent from him: My Reasons are, 1. I find our Saviour reprehend a *πρωτος* and *pre-eminence among his Apostles*, a chief place and Precedency, and that absolutely in it self condered, and therefore among Ministers and Pastors, and other Inferior Orders. Let our Prefacer, or any for him, shew me a Reason why a *Protos*, or Official Pre-eminence (for that is the Point here in Question) was Discharged among Apostles, and in that Sacred Order, and not also in the Office and Order of Pastors or Ministers of the Gospel. His Friend Dr. *Monro*, with B. *Honnieman*, leading the way to this Prefacer, will needs avoid this Argument, following *Bellarmin*, Fore-leader to them all, and other the Pope's Proctors, when alledging it was the Affectation only, the *Modus rei*, not the *Primacy* it self, which our Lord discharg'd in that Parallel, *Mat. 20. 25.* This Answer serving very well the Popes Mitre, has been so frequently expos'd by Protestant Divines, as repugnant to the Scope and Contexture, that I need not insilt upon it. The Antithesis in our Lord's Answer, pointing at that Greatness which he allow'd in opposition to the Primacy forbidden, viz. *a sincere, humble, Ministerial Service*, doth clearly Exclude this Answer; the unsoundness wherof further appears from this, that such a Gloss makes our Lord's Reprehension and Exhortation rather to inflame the Apostles Inquiry and Contest, than quash and silence the same, if reprehending only the manner of seeking, he tacitly commended the thing it self, as desirable,

rable. 2ly. I find, the Apostle Peter (the Papists suppos'd Primat) copying out this Reprehension of Pre-eminence or Primacy, and applying to Pastors the same Prohibition, which himself and his Fellow Apostles got from our Lord, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. *Feed the Flock of God which is among you, --- not as being Lords over God's Heritage; to which he opposes a Command of Ministerial Diligence. I suppose, a Pre-eminence and Lordship are, in this Case, as in themselves, of so near a Cognation and Affinity, that our Prefacer will never be able to disjoin them.* 3ly. I find, that what *Diotrephes* is Charg'd with in the Text under debate, is this that he was *φιλοτιμῶν*, one that lov'd Pre-eminence; I compare it with 1 Tim. 3. 1. *If a man desire the Office of a Bishop, εἰ τις ἐπισκοπὴν ἀρέσκει, he desires a good work.* Here then is a lawful Desire, and commendable, of a Bishop's Office, which certainly has in it an ardent love to the thing; Now, if this Pre-eminence and Episcopacy be all one, why is the simple Love of it reprehended? If the Love of the one be warrantable, the other not, the Love and Desire in it self considered as the collated Parallels will evince, then the Object in the one Case is Unlawful, and the other Lawful, and a Gospel Episcopacy and Pre-eminence Objectively considered are in point of Lawfulness Opposites and Antipodes. 4ly. I find, the Apostle John (whose Impression of our Lord's discharging a Primacy and Pre-eminence upon the occasion wherein he was singularly concern'd, none will doubt of) lays down this Love of Pre-eminence as an Evil influencing the Carriage of this contumacious *Diotrephes* towards himself, which doth evidently Confirm what is said anent the inherent Evil of this his Love of Pre-eminence, in it self considered; and his Contumacy against the holy Apostle may be in all reason supposed the Issue of this Pre-eminence-affecting humour, since this Wretch could not but know the holy Apostle's disowning such Pre-eminence, and the Inconsistencie thereof with his Doctrine and Practice. Finally, good Interpreters make the places of Peter and John parallel: Thus the Dutch Divines upon this Passage, shewing, *that out of Ambition he Exalted himself above his Fellow-Brethren, seeking after this, to Lord it over them (the very thing the Apostle Peter discharg'd), and draw all Respect to himself.* Bullinger Exemplifies this in Prelates Pre-eminence, not to mention others. And in that they were his Fellow-brethren, and by the Apostle put under that Character, v. 10. over whom this Pre-eminence was affected, amongst whom he would needs be accounted highest, as the English Annot. express it, the Pre-eminence, in it self considered, appears Unlawful, whatever way he coveted and sought it. From all which it appears, that our Prefacer's Gloss

and

and Evasion, viz. *that Diotrephes carriage did suppose a lawful pre-existent Office*, falls under a double Correction and Imputation. 1. That the same, in point of the Warrantableness of the Charge, and Office it self, tho' not pre-existent, may be said of that Primacy discharg'd by our Lord, and about which the Apostles were emulously contending, and ambitiously too (a Tincture of this being in all Men by Nature), viz. *that the Office in it self was lawful*, yea, and, in the Sense of all Romanists (if not some Prelatists) to be shortly existent. This Pleading we find our Prelatists Homologating, in special Dr. Monro and B. Honnieman, as is above touch'd. 2ly, This Gloss and Answer supposes, that Ambition cannot prompt a Man to aspire after a Pre-eminence, *either not before existent, or disown'd by a true Church*, which solid Reason and common Experience confutes; and I may say, the late dear bought Experience of the Church of Scotland. We all know who was, upon K. Charles's Restoration and begining of his Reign, Intrusted to deal in the Concerns of this Church at Court, whose Ambition of Pre-eminence, and a Primar's Mitre, tempted and prompted him to betray that Trust, and Exalt himself above all his Brethren; And how he afterward Acted the *Diotrephes* in casting out many Faithful Brethren out of this Church, is yet fresh in the Memories of the People of GOD.

What follows of Reflection and Banter against Presbyterians, is not worth the noticing. He will have them *Diotrepheses in opposing Prelates*: A just Accusation, if he can prove their Authority and Superiority to have the same Warrant with that of the Apostle John. He aggravates this Opposition from *the Assemblies Act at Glagow 1638, Deposing Bishops, and Excommunicating them contrary to their Oaths, comparing them in this to Korah in his Rebellion against Moses*. Had the Man understood the Case of our Church, and with a Conscientious Sense thereof, he would have been asham'd ever to utter, much more to Print such Ignorant Stuff as this is, which exposes him to the Derision of all who know the Affairs of Scotland. 'Tis evident, from the Current of our Church-History, that these Prelates had, contrary to their own Engagements and Oaths, Incroached upon, and Invaded the Authority of our lawful Assemblies, and, in compliance with K. James's Design of introducing Prelacy under pretence of being Commissioners of the Church in Parliament, and of being fix'd, constant Moderators of Judicatories (a Course oppos'd and protested against by Godly Ministers), had screw'd up themselves to abjur'd Prelacies, and this against the Act of that Assemblee at Montross in Anno 1600, which being inveigled by

by such pretences, did at first give way to this Constitution of Commissioners to Sit in Parliament, the Act being with Certification of Deposition, Infamie and Excommunication, if ineroaching upon the Liberties and Jurisdiction of this Kirk, and receiving a Consecration to the Office of Episcopacy, which Act passed with these Restrictions, K. *James* himself being present in that Assemblée, as is acknowledg'd even by *Spotswood* in his History. And what Work these false perjured Prelates made (who stood thus, and by our National Covenant oblig'd against this Usurping Hierarchy) when they had got into their Seats, all *Scotland* both Church and State knew, and sadly Smarted for it ; when, in compliance with B. *Laud's* Designs, they corrupted our Doctrine with Arminian and Popish Errors, our Worship with *Perib* Articles, and overturn'd intirely the whole Frame of our Church Government, and the Judicatories thereof, to make way for their Arbitrary Power. Of which Gross Illegal Usurpations the Liturgie and Book of Canons, obtruded by their means upon this Church, in Opposition to the Laws and Constitutions of both Church and Kingdom, are standing Witnesses. And besides all this, these Ambitious Gentlemen, and true *Diotrepheses*, were not satisfied with this Opposition to the true Original Constitution of this Church, and overturning the same, by B. *Laud's* Influence at Court with King *Charles* ; but also they made high Ineroachment upon the Nobility, and in a piece of ambitious Rivalry with them, had got themselves Install'd in some chief Offices of State, so that the Nation could no longer indure their wicked Usurpations. But after long Wrestlings, having obtain'd from K. *Charles* to call a free General Assemblée, according to the ancient legal Constitutions of this Church, to which these Prelats were Summoned to Answer to the Charges given in against them, instead of appearing, they declined the Authority of this highest Judicatory of our Church ; for which, according to the Constitutions thereof, they deserved Summar Excommunication. The Assemblée having Answered and Confuted the frivolous Grounds of their Declinature, and sustained themselves their lawful proper Judges, entered into the Consideration of the Libels Exhibited against them, and upon the preceeding Grounds touched, and other gross atrocious Scandals legally proven against severals of them, they Deposed them all from the Office of the Ministry, others they Excommunicated. For clearing this premised Account of our Affairs, let any peruse the Historie and Acts of that Assembly. *Rushworth's* Collections, Bishop *Burner's* Memoirs of the Dukes of *Hamilton*, the Scots Commissioner's Charge against *Canterbury* exhibited to the Parliament of *England*, besides several other

Other Accounts of that Time; and this will be evident beyond Exception.

Moreover, this Prefacer confesseth, that King *Charles* went away a Contented King, from our Parliament, owning himself satisfied, by his own Solemn Profession in full Parliament. And in this Parliament, *Anno* 1640. compar'd with its Session 1641, from *July* 15, wherein the King himself was present, the Proceedings of that and the subsequent Assembly, had the Civil Sanction added thereunto, and were Ratified in opposition to Prelacie, and the forementioned Corruptions introduced by the Spurious Brood of our *Scottish* Prelats, rescinding all Acts in favours of their Office and Usurpations; the King, for Himself and Successors, promising, *in verbo Principis*, never to come in the contrary of that Statute and Sanction, or any thing therein contained. As for these Oaths which Prelats had exacted of some Intrants during their Usurpation, how wicked and materially unlawful they were, is evident from what is premised; and, in special, from the Grounds mentioned in the Narrative of the Assemblies Declarative Act, anent the Nullity of these Oaths and Ingagements.

The Prefacer is bold to assert, *There is no Instance of Ordination and Jurisdiction by mere Presbyters to be found in Scripture, tho' it be clear, that others of a Superiour Order Ordain'd Presbyters and Deacons, and Governed Churches.* I Answer, 1. Granting that there are Scripture Instances of Persons of a Superiour Order with Presbyters in these Acts of Ordination and Jurisdiction; Yet, if we can make it appear, that their Office was of such a Nature, as is now past off with that first Exigence of the Church, and that Presbyters did Authoritatively concur with them, which is evidently made good in the Instance of *Timothy's* Ordination, and the great Apostolick Council, *Acts* 15. wherein the Text is Clear and Express in pointing out Presbyters Authoritative Concurrence, in the Disquisition, the Sentence, the Authoriz'd Canon, and the Decretal Epistle, his Assertion and Scope is easily overthrown. It is evident, that, in that Council, the Apostles acted not as Apostles, but as Elders, (exhibiting therein a fair Pattern of Official Parity of Pastors) stating the Question and Debating it, together with the other Ministers, in the ordinary way of Disputation and Conference. But, 2. Whereas he demands an Instance of Presbyters acting in Parity in Ordination and Jurisdiction, I exhibit to him the *Corinth* Presbyters Excommunication, and Censure of the Incestuous *Corinthian*. What is pretended of *Paul's* Authorizing it, is sufficiently refuted by that Author whom he mentions. The Apostle reprehends them for not putting forth their Censures before he wrote unto them, and asserts their Authority to Judge those that were within in that Church, by their

Intrinsic Power, as Officers thereof. I exhibite to him the Instance of *Timothy's* Ordination, by the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, wherein Presbyterians have made appear, that *Paul's* presence, tho' suppos'd, doth rather Confirm than Invalidate their Authority; the Presbyterial Ordination being clearly distinguished from *Paul's* laying on of Hands, in Order to the Gifts (which as Apostle he did thus confer), and from the Prophecies which went before concerning him. This is farther convincingly evident, upon Supposal of *Paul's* Extraordinary Adventitious Concurrence as an Apostle, which consequently must needs be understood to be Cumulative unto, not Privative of the Presbyteries Power here asserted. Moreover, I exhibite the Instance of the Elders of *Ephesus*, who jointly, in *Paul's* last Farewel, have the whole Government of that Church committed to them, and are commanded to Exercise the same as Bishops set up by the Holy Ghost, without the least Hint of the Superintendency or Inspection of any Officers of a Superiour Order. A like Instance there is in these Church-Officers, 1 *Pet.* 5. enjoyned by him joyntly to take the Oversight of that Church, and Exercise a Ministerial Authority therein; but withal inhibiting them expressely to as& the Lords or Prelats, consequently discharging any one of them an Episcopal Pre-eminence over their Fellows.

For that derived Episcopal Authority of *Timothy* and *Titus*, which he next alledges from 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. and *Ch.* 5. 19. *Tit.* 1. 5. Presbyterians have made appear, how utterly unserviceable it is to the Episcopal Design. 1. In that it is evident in Scripture, that they were fix'd in no Post nor Watch-tower in God's Church, but had only a transient occasional Ministry, and Inspection in these Churches, without any fixed Station therein; That both before and after their Inspection supposed in these Epistles, they are found to have thus Visited and Watered the Apostles Plantations, and many other Places; That their transient occasional Inspection is evident in the Epistles themselves, together with the Apostles recalling them from these Places, to the further prosecuting of their Evangelistick Employment. 2. Presbyterians have made appear, that there is nothing in these Epistles can evince their Singular Prelatick Authority, in the Acts either of Order or Jurisdiction, or which can Impeach and Exclude the necessary Authoritative Concurrence of Presbyters where they were settled. By their Evangelistick Office they were injoyn'd an Inspection for the time; but the Apostles exhibiting to them Precepts anent the Jurisdictional Government, can no more be supposed to give them a Power Paramount unto, and Exclusive of Presbyters Concurrence, where settled, than his Injunctions and Precepts anent the Pastoral Duties of Reading and Preaching the Word, rightly dividing the same, making

ing full proof of the Ministry, &c. of taking heed to themselves and their Doctrine, or anent the more extensive and general Duties of Watchfulness, Sobriety, Patience, Meekness, Diligence, &c. can bear such a Conclusion. So that there is not the least shaddow of a Prelatical derived Authority over these Churches apparent in these Epistles mentioned. That Presbyterian Ministers, in this Exclusion of Prelats, acted the *Diotrepbes*, as this Man is bold to affirm, is a Self-contradicting Calumny; since himself acknowledges Presbyterian Government sets all Ministers on a Level; And he will not say, they covet any of our Prelats usurped places. In Presbyterian Government all Ministers being of equal Official Power and Authority, subject to the Inspection and Censure of their Brethren in Lower and Higher Judicatories, there is a sure Curb put upon Negligence, Unfaithfulness, and all aspiring *Diotrepbeses*, for such a Preheminence as can in this Government have no Subsistence, nor, consequently, Temptation to it. Whereas in the Hierarchy there are set Stairs and Steps enough for ambitious Climbers, to be Deans, Arch-deans, Bishops, Arch-bishops, Metropolitans, and Cardinals too, if our Hierarchy shall but arrive at its native Apex, and Culmen of a Supreme Patriarchat. That *Calvin* asserted Presbyterian Government to be a *Reverse of the Government of the Primitive Church*, if he meant the True Primitive Apostolick Church, nothing is more false. If he meant, that *Calvin* holds Innovations to have early crept into the Church, as the fixed *πνεύμα*, and such like Aberrations from the Scripture Pattern, it is nothing to the point, and utterly remote from proving his Assertion. His blind Citation of Institutions, *Lib. 4.* without pointing to any particular Chapter or Section thereof, shews with what Diffidence of his Cause he asserted this. But *Calvin* and *Beza* are in this point fully vindicated by the Author whom he mentions, in his Tractat, Entitled, *The Counter Essay*, in Answer to a Pamphlet bearing the Inscription of, *An Essay upon Church Government, out of the Writings of Calvin and Beza.*

The Prefacer will have the Church authorized to determine Circumstances of Worship and Government, upon the precept, *Do all things decently and in order.* That which falls within the compass of *Meer Circumstances*, common to Civil and Sacred Actions, and which could not, and were not needful to be determined in Scripture, being left to the Regulation and Prudence of Church Governours, are to be determined according to this Rule, is easily accorded. Our Prefacer inferrs, that Asserters of Episcopacy have vindicated the Church as to her Appointment, with respect to Order and Decency. But if he include or understand their Vindicating by this Rule, the setting up either Significant Symbolical Ceremonies of Worship, or Prelats and Arch-Prelats in Government,

we hold that both the one and the other, being obtruded *Parts* of Worship and Government, not such alterable Circumstances as are meant in the premised Text, they do palpably impeach and transgress this Rule, since the Decency and Order cloathing these Actions, or supposed parts of Worship and Government, still supposes these pre-existent parts, as Duties falling within the compass of Divine Commands, since they are such Duties as *are to be done*, scil. to God upon his Warrant: And it is long since we were injoynd, *Deut. 12. 32. What thing soever I command you, observe to do it, thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.* And we know how our Lord applyed that passage of *Isa. 29. 13. [In vain they worship me, teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men]* against humane Traditions, *Matth. 15.* from the beginning to *v. 10th.* But I wonder, if Mr Prefacer will assert, with Bishop *Honyman*, Prelacy and Presbytery to be but different Circumstances of the same Substantial Government; If so, I hope he will allow us at present the Substantials of Church Government, and give some grains of Allowance to the Prudentials of our Honourable Parliament, in removing that alterable Circumstance of Prelacie, holding fast the Substantials of Government in the present Establishment. He cites the Apostles words, *1 Cor. 11. 16. If any seem to be contentious, we have no such custom, nor the Churches of God:* Then, let him, and all his Party, lay aside their Contendings for their Circumstance of Prelacy, since the Church of *Scotland*, together with the Nations Representatives, have disown'd it. But who can trace or understand such pitiful proteus Triflings? In what is past, we have heard him asserting Prelacy to consist of a standing Set of Divinely appointed Church Officers, as necessary for the Being and suitable Subsistence of the Christian Church, as the Parts and Senes of the Body, for its Subsistence and Actings (from these Texts, *Ephes 4. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 12. 28.*); so that the shaking off his beloved Prelacy, these glorious Successors of Apostles and Evangelists, makes us guilty of the Rebellion of *Core*, and withstanding the Institution and Government of the Christian Church delivered to us in the holy Scripture: But here, and in the same page, wherein this Institution is asserted, it is found to be only a Circumstance of Government, alterable according to the prudence of Church Governours. If this be not his meaning, he doth in this Assertion beat the Air, and touches not Presbyterians, who never denyed this in *Thesis*: Tho' I must tell him, by the way, that he mistakes that Passage, *1 Cor. 11. 16. [If any Man seem or list to be Contentious, we have no such Custom, neither the Churches of God]* if supposing (with Bishop *Andrews*), that the Apostle resolves the Lawfulness not only of alterable Circumstances, but even of Symbolical Ceremonies upon the Churches meer Custom, as if the Apostle would thus stop the Mouth of a Wrangler against his former adduced Reasons,

sons, for what he is there ordering in point of Decency; since this were to assert, not without Blasphemy, that a Wrangling Wit could avoid or disprove the Holy Ghost's Reasons. But, when the Apostle says, *If any list to be Contentious, we have no such Custom*, he limits this to the Practice and Custom of Sinful Contention, disowned by all true Lovers of Church Unity. But, says our Prefacer, *If the Controversie turn upon these Points with Presbyterians, so they were right in the Main, he would not contend with them*. What then angers him? Why, it is this, *That they pretend to Scripture for their Constitution, and every thing that is peculiar to it*. This, saith he, is provoking to any Man who is convinced, that their whole Model of Government is contrary to it, to shew his Abhorrence of such Assuming Boldness. If, by our Constitution, he mean the Church Officers, which we hold to be of Divine Appointment, and of standing Use and Necessity, such as Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons, with Subordinate Courts of Parochial Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, National Assemblies in a National Church, these we hold to be of Divine Appointment. And it had become this Prefacer's Modesty and prudence, had he consulted right the Reputation of either, to have considered the Scripture Proofs exhibited by Famous Divines, Vindicating and Asserting these Courts and Officers, in Opposition to the Hierarchical Model; ere he, or his Querist, had suggested their pitiful Notions against that which they appear never to have understood nor considered. And, in telling us of his Abhorrency of this Constitution, he hath stretched, no doubt, his Anger far beyond his Reason. *But he is Angry at our pretending* (we say, *Exhibiting*) *Scripture not only for our Constitution, but every thing that is peculiar to it*. What he means by [*every thing that is peculiar to it*] is not so clear: If he mean that which is peculiar *in esse talis*, or properly and essentially distinguisheth this Model as its necessary specifick Difference, whereby it is distinguished from other Models pretended to, we hold, that the same Scripture, which evinceth the Model it self to be Divine, will, by Consequence, include and prove this also to be such; If by [*every thing peculiar*] he means such alterable Circumstances of the manner and method of its Exercise, as are left to the Regulation of the Prudence of Church Rulers, which, in their Various and Different Use, do not Impeach or Intrench upon the Essential Nature of the Constitution it self, (tho' such are very improperly called peculiar to the Government), I know no Presbyterian, who pretends any special Scripture Warrant for the same, beyond the General Rule mentioned.

Our Prefacer next makes a Solemn Address to his Countrey-men of the Presbyterian Perswasion, who have Zeal for God and a due Regard to the Holy Scriptures, to consider God's Institutions under the Legal Dispensation.

Dispensation, as to the Ministry and Government of the Church, which was the Christian Church under another Dispensation, the Institutions of our Saviour and Practice of his Apostles. I do heartily imbrace his Exhortation, and do suppose, that all such whom he Addresses, do seriously consider both. But what is that, which, in both, he will have us to consider? Why, he is hopeful, that, if not blinded with prejudice so, as to shut our Eyes against Light, (a sad Imputation upon such as have Zeal for God, and a due Regard for the Holy Scriptures, which our Prefacer's [if] makes compatible with this Zeal and Regard), we will consider, that God, under both Dispensations, by Divine Appointment, enjoined Ministers of different Ranks and Orders, distinguished by Marks of Authority and Power; and such different Ranks and Functions of the Christian Ministry are set forth by Paul with Resemblance to the Natural Body. Now, will our Prefacer be satisfied with a fair Concession, he shall thus have it, viz. That we own God's Appointment of Different Orders of the Church-Officers under both Dispensations: Only, with this Concession, I must mind him of of three things, 1. We are glad he acknowledges, that the Legal Dispensation was different, and another Dispensation from that of the New Testament Ministry: And then, I hope, he will be content, that, from a True Zeal for God, and Regard to the Scriptures, we tell him, with the Apostle, Heb. 7. 12. That the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a Change of the Law, viz. God's Appointment, respecting both Worship and Government, is obsolete and changed, so that we are not under the Obligation of either. 2. We must also mind him, that he will do well to admonish his dear Friend, the Acute Gentleman Querist, to seek a better Foundation for the Lawful Office of a Primate over a National Church, than the High Priest's Presidency over the National Church of Israel. For if that Dispensation be another, and distinct from the New, and removed, so that the New is come in its place, the Foundation of this Argument, as likewise that of the Pleaders for the Triple Crown, is fallen. 3. That God appointed Church Officers, and Ministers of different Ranks, under both Dispensations, is a Point which Presbyterians never denied, and they cannot but wonder at this trifling faint way of Dispute in him and his Fellows, in stating the Controversie so far and remote from the Point in Question, which, they are told, is this, Whether the Pastoral Office, which naturally and necessarily respects both Order and Jurisdiction, admits of different Official Degrees and Orders? Whether an Officer entrusted with the Administration of the Word and Sacraments, or Seals of the Covenant, the highest Acts of Sacred Performances (by Bishop Burnet's Confession), and, by Consequence, whether Jurisdictional Power conjoined therewith, can admit of any Superiour Officer of Divine Appointment in the

the standing Ministry of the New Testament? For, as for Apostles, we hold, that in this Office simply, and in it self considered, or with respect to the standing Ends of a Gospel Ministry, abstracting from the Apostolick prerogatives above-touched, Pastors were, and are Equal to them, and their proper Successors in this derived Ordinary Ministerial Office. Now, let our Prefacer, or the Gentleman Querist fairly Assault us upon this Principle, and boast at the putting off of their Armour.

What follows in this Preface, is such trifling Bantering Stuff, that 'tis not worth the noticing. He proposeth an Objection, which he calls popular, and no doubt a pitiful one as he proposeth it, scil. *That People are not so much Edified by the Episcopal Clergy as by Presbyterians.* His main Answer to this Objection, is taken from his begg'd Supposition of Christ's Institution of Prelacy, and hiding himself in the Clouds of this General Description of Episcopacy, as importing only a *Distinction and Subordination among the Clergy*, he tells us, that *Christ appointed some Apostles, some Prophets, &c. for the Edifying of the Body, and can this comely Subordination, saith he, cross the Design of Religion?* No doubt, that Instituted Subordination cannot; But we say, this Design is Crossed by the Subordination he pleads for, viz. a Prelate or Arch-Prelate's Superiority over several Hundreds of Pastors and Flocks, who, by his Office, is obliged neither to Preach nor Administer Sacraments, nor tyed to any Flock or Watch-tower for this End; who robs Pastors of all Power of Government; has an absolute Spiritual Lordship over them, and whose Deputs and Suffragans they are in all Official Actings of a Gospel Ministry; who is also a Spiritual Peer in the highest National Civil Judicatorie or Parliament; who Deputs in the Ecclesiastick Administrations Persons not Ordained; who Lords over Ministers as their Spiritual Lord and Head, who Authorizes by his Usurped Power Preachers with Pluralities of Flocks, of whom they take no Inspection but by Deputs, and those capable of no Ministerial Duties to them; who are not tyed to reside with their multiplied Flocks, but may live at Court, or where they list: Such a Hierarchy and Subordination (which, in point of Fact, he will not deny to be existent in *England*, at least, and is the Mould of his Darling Hierarchy so much Courtied, and pleaded for by him and his Associates) we affirm, is Anti scriptural, cross to the Gospel, wherein all Ministers are Commanded diligently to Feed and Watch over their Flocks*, are discharged Dominion and Lordship

* 1 Pet. 5. 3. over their Brethren*, are enjoyned to give themselves
 † 1 Tim. 4. 15. wholly to their Ministerial Work †, to beware of
 || 2 Tim. 3. 4. Worldly Entanglements, as they would please Christ
 a 2 Tim. 4. 2. their Master ||, to preach the Gospel in season and
 out of season a. Let him say, if this be for **Edification**, as he asserts
 his beloved Prelacy is.

The rest of this Preface is made up of a full Legend of Imputati-
 ons on the Work of Reformation, and the late happy Revolution,
 Restoration and Establishment of this Church; renewing the old
 Prelatick Cant, and Imputation of Sedition and Rebellion upon the
 most just Actings of our State and Church, the Vindication of our Na-
 tional and Spiritual Liberties. *Must we prefer*, says our Prefacer, *our In-*
ventions to the Divine Appointment? God forbid we should, but we
 prefer a Teaching Ministry, attending God's Work in all the Duties
 thereof, and Exercising Discipline in a due Subordination of Ecclesi-
 astick Courts, for promoting Godliness, and Censuring all Scandals,
 whether in Ministers or in People, to such a Hierarchy as is above
 described, and is adapted to no such Design and End. He tells us,
 the Churches of *Britain* were not Edified, but Destroyed by the
 Rebellions after the year 1638, and *Damnable Doctrines, Blasphemies and*
Enthusiasms prevailed in England, after Episcopal Government was pul-
led down, which was the Fence of Religion. As for *Scotland*, we can
 appeal to the Knowledge and Experience of all the Surviving Godly,
 yea of all knowing Persons, what glorious Advances in Reformation,
 both in Heart and Practice, of solid Edification, and evidently en-
 larged Down-pouring of the Spirit of Grace and Supplication upon
 both Ministers and People, attended the Restoration of our true
 Gospel Church-Government, and the Renovation of our Vows for
 the Preservation and Maintenance thereof, which the Opposition
 and Banter of this Adversary, with his Associates, will never wear
 out of the Hearts of the truly Godly, and knowing. And as for
England, what a Fence, or rather Offence, his beloved Hierarchy was
 and has been to Protestants, and the true Protestant Religion, let
 their dear Martyr Bishop *Laud*, and his underling Clergy, their Prin-
 ciples and Practice Testifie: What Advances of Popery and Superstition;
 What horrid unheard of Persecution of the Seekers of God's Face;
 Ejections of many Hundreds of Godly Faithful Pastors, for not Sub-
 mitting to his Orders of Sports on the Sabbath day, and other Popish
 Superstitious Mandats; What imminent Hazard of Overturning that
 Reformed Church, as well as the true National Liberties, and Funda-
 mental Civil Government, by the Influence of the Popishly affected
 Clergy

Clergy and Courtiers, and in special the Influence of this Hierarchy on King Charles the First: Let these, we say, testifie and determine of the Truth or Falshood of this Assertion. As for *Enthusiasms* and *Sectarys* after prevailing, no Man of common Sense can impute them to the Presbyterian Government, which was never there established: And all who know the State and Affairs of England at that time can testifie, that as the Godly and Faithful Ministers of England, and others who owned that Government, still opposed the *Sectarys* their Designs and Principles, both in Writing and Acting; so these *Sectarys* had always the erecting of Presbyterian Government as their Eye-fore, as knowing how effectually the erecting of this Wall of the House of God, and the established Vigor of True Gospel Discipline and Censures, would have curb'd all their Insolencies and mischievous Principles and Designs. Our Prefacer further charges, *The crumbling of that glorious Church into factions, upon endeavours to set up Presbyterie, and thereupon wisheth Presbyterians to consider what he has said, and prays they may have Understanding in all Things, for Edification, Peace, and Order.* But Mr. Prefacer, if Endeavours to erect a true Gospel Government, in opposition to an unlawful Hierarchy, hath occasioned this Crumbling you talk of, it impeaches neither the Lawfulness of Presbyterian Government it self (for, as for Independencie, he should know, we own it not; and our Question is a-
 gent that Presbyterian Government which the Vows of both Nations engaged them to erect) nor the Parliamentary Endeavours for that End and Effect. His Prayer for understanding what tends to Edification, Peace, and Order, Presbyterians do accord to, and in a due Charity do return it to himself, and do put it up for all his Party, who, we are sure, stand in great need of that Mercy and Apostolick Blessing; for never were professed Protestants more guilty of a Supercilious Schismatic breach of Unity than they are. Is it not known, all England over, that several Hundreds of Godly Orthodox Ministers, whom many Churches would have imbraced as a Blessing, have been and are kept from *Church Communion in Government and Worship*, who are content to keep Fellowship therein, notwithstanding of their established Hierarchie (so studious are they of Peace and Unity in the Reformed Churches), and yet to this day have that Door shut upon them, unless they will submit, yea, and swear Submission not only unto the Hierarchy, but unto these Ceremonies which themselves hold indifferent, and we, with the Body of Protestant Divines, Popish and Scandalous.

As for his renew'd Banterings about the Covenants, I am not of an Humour to Retaliat his insolent clamours: These Sacred Oaths have been so fully Vindicated by several Learned Pens, as renders his Rail-

ings not worth noticing. He will not reproach us for Burying it, as *some of our Friends do*. If any Friends do so mistake us, we pity them; But I am free to tell him, that the great important Duties ingaged to in these Oaths, and respecting Reformation according to our previous Engagements in the Word of God, all the truly Godly Ministers and People in this Church, have a due conscientious Sense of the same. He tells us, amidst his other bantering Clamours, that he may say with *Zipporah*, *It was a bloody Covenant to Britain*. See the precipitancy of foolish Anger, *Zipporah* reproached God's Covenant of Circumcision and this Seal of it as Bloody, in her passionat rage, and our clamouring Antagonist here, upon the matter, and looking to his Scope and applying Parallel, apparently accords her. Now, I hope, he will acknowledge, that *Zipporah's* charge and reproach of this Sacred Ordinance, and consequently upon the Covenant sealed by this Ordinance, was unjust, and that its being bloody and very uneasie to her, was no just Ground of Accusation; so that the Gentleman is in the Briers of an intangling Dilemma, which will probably scratch him: Either he must acknowledge, a Worthy Covenant and Seal thereof may be occasion of Disturbance and Blood, without any Imputation on its intrinsick Value and Worth, and, consequently, that this his Argument against the Covenant is Foolish and Impertinent, or else he must justify *Zipporah's* Plea and Anger against God's Covenant of Circumcision: Let our Prefacer choose him which he will imbrace, and reckon upon his Advantage against us in either of the two, especially since the Strain of his Discourse, as well as the Thing it self, cuts him off from the Pretence of a meer Allusion in this Matter. Had this Man prov'd the Covenant to have been the Cause of the Blood and Murthers he mentions, and that in its Design and Principles, it had a native necessary Influence thereupon, he had spoken to the purpose. As for what he adds of *Sir George Mackenzie's* Defence of *King Charles's* Government, I refer him to the Reply offered unto it, and can confidently appeal to all persons of Judgement and Integrity, acquaint with our Laws, as touching the Validity of that Defence. In a little view of it, I discovered such a virulent partial Strain, and shattered Inconsistencies, that I really Judge, they badly consulted that Gentleman's Reputation (whose Learning and Knowledge of our Laws none will doubt) who exhibite to publick view that pretended Defence under his name, if I may suppose it was thus drawn and offered after his Death. Among other Instances I offer this; He reproaches the Covenant, and endeavours to asperse and expose it, as the grand Fountain and Foundation of all the Rebellions and Disorders in *Scotland*, among which pretended Issues and Effects, he

sets down several Papers of some poor simple weak distressed people, driven upon pinnacles and precipices of Errors in point of Government, by such barbarous Oppressions as would make even the wise Man mad, in some of which the Covenant is expressly disowned; so that it is the greatest prevarication imaginable, to assert that the Covenant influenced such principles and practices.

As for Bishop *Guthrie's* Manuscript, which our Prefacer next mentions, driving, it seems, the same Design of aspersing the Covenant, and the Reformation of this Church, as the Cause of these Disorders, Wars, and Tumults mentioned, it falls under the same Consideration with the other Pamphlet, as being of a piece with it, and, as all our Prefacer's Arguing this way, a parcel of poor transparent Sophistry. Tho' I have not had occasion to peruse these Memoirs, yet, having of knowing persons understood its Tendency and Tenor to be of this Nature, having also had some Knowledge of the Man, I cannot but touch here a little this persons Carriage, that it may appear what Judgement we are to make of his History. Being a Minister about the time of Prelacy's real or apparent Down-fall, and when the National Grievances did grow to such a Crisis, as influenced the shaking off this Yoke, who so Zealous against Prelats as this Man? In his Sermons he compar'd them to *Tobia* and *Sanballat*, in their malicious opposing the building the Temple and Walls of *Jerusalem*. In his Discourses to this purpose, he did so far run out to such passionat, and sometimes unbeseeming Expressions, that he grated the Ears of some persons of Honour his Hearers, tho' no Friends to Prelats. He had once an odd Allegory and Similitude (no doubt too rude for the Pulpit), comparing the Bishops and their Interests to a Coach, the Devil he made the Coach-man, the Prelats the Horses drawing it, the quickning Whip-lashes he represented to be the great Offers of fat Benefices, State-Offices, and the like, whereby this furious Coach-Man drives hard, and made these Horses rush on so furiously. He told the people of their long lawn Sleeves, what odd Stuff was couched therein. Well, such was the Mans Humour at this time. Being thereafter (as were many Temporizers) upon important Grounds legally proven against him, deposed from the Ministry, he was after some time, upon profession of his Repentance, Reposed and Re-admitted to the Exercise thereof; Such was the Moderation and candid Charity of Church Judicatories, even in those times, which some Men will call most rigid. When upon King *Charles's* return and setting on the Throne Anno 1662, Prelacy came to be again obtruded violently upon this Church, without the least shadow of her Consent, by that Parliament which basely sold and mancipat the Nations Liberty to an Arbitrary Govern-

ment, against our fundamental Laws, this Man, who loved always to swim with the Stream, and court the Rising Sun, was among the readiest Conformists to it; which a person (much, it seems, of his Disposition) perceiving, who had, as he, inveigh'd against Prelats, when that Interest was like to fall, in a Similitude of one carrying behind him a Cloke-bag (or Waller, as the *Scottish* Term is) stuff'd with dangerous Wares, against Church and State, sent him some droll Satyrick Lines:

Mi Frater said he, *Ye and your Sanballat,*
And I with my Pock-manty Waller,
Thought Prelats to restrain:
Sanballat now d-fyes our Fead,
The Horonite has up his Head,
And Mounted is again, &c.

Upon the Vacancy of the Bishoprick of *Dunkel*, the first Bishop whereof continued not long in that Seat, this Mr. *Gutbrie* falling intimate with Bishop *Sharp*, who loved to have a Son in his own Image (such a double-fac'd Gentleman as himself) interposed for getting him installed in that See. And here we end this little Story of the Man. When this Authors famed Memoirs are by that Party Re-printed, they will do well to do him the Justice of annexing this Memoir of himself, that his History may be Weighed and Valued accordingly.

For what our Prefacer adds of the Murthers of all Ranks, from which none were exempted from him that sat on the Throne, to her that grindeth at the Mill, as the Effects of the Covenant, from the Year 1640, to the Year 1660, &c. Nothing can be in the Judgement of Men of Understanding more false and impertinent. As for the Bloody Civil Warrs raised by *Montrose* and his Party, How Active himself was in it; How passive the Body of the Nation, Church, and State; How unjust and wicked, both in its Rise and Progress, wherein the Kingdom and State of *Scotland*, was upon the Defensive, and in four or five Battles their Blood cruelly shed; How just, consequently, the Executions were upon some Remains of these that were Active in this Blood-shed, especially upon that Rout of the *Irish* Rebels joyned with them, who were guilty of the Murther (as is computed by some) of 100000 Protestants in *Ireland*, is evident to all who know the Affairs of that time, and can make impartial Judgement thereof. Let any peruse the Estates of *Scotland's* Reply to *Montrose's* Declaration, in his last Invasion, in the Year 1650; And this will be evident beyond Exception.

The Prefacer is bold "to charge Abounding Immoralities in Scotland," upon Presbyterian Government settled therein, and asserts, that "errors, Infidelities, Blasphemies, and all sort of Debaucheries do more abound, and are more bare-faced under its Influence, than formerly. For evincing the bare-faced Impudence of this Charge (to return his own Term), I dare confidently appeal to all Men of Candour and Conscience in Scotland, to the Recorded Acts and Progress of our Assemblies, since Restored to their Liberty, their instant Interposings with the Civil Powers, the Correspondent Laws Enacted for Suppressing all Wickedness and Immorality, the Impartiality notoriously appearing in Censuring all Immoralities in such as profess to own the Established Presbyterian Government: And who knows not, that the Wickedness he mentions, abounds with our *Jacobites*, Non-jurants, and Men disaffected to, and Enemies of the present Establishment: And the Retardments of the Execution of Civil Laws, and Church Canons against such Wickedness as he mentions, all Men that know Scotland do know, have their Rise from the Opposition to Presbyterian Government in the just Exercise thereof by the Men of his Kidney and Gang, who cannot endure the Restraint of their Wicked Immoralities by the just Curb of that Discipline appointed by our Lord, and avowedly declare (yea some of the Chief of their Clergy) they had rather embrace Popery than Presbytery. What Advances the Mystery of Iniquity, and bare-faced Popery, and all that wicked Superstition and Idolatry, had in the late Reigns, if I should undertake to Delineate, were to Light up a Candle to show the Sun at Noon-day; and how the Design of Introducing it, which was come, in both Kingdoms, to the Birth, did, in the late happy Revolution, miscarry. What an Inundation and Deluge of Debauchery, and Profanity of all sorts, came into this Nation *pari passu* with Prelacy, and attended their Wicked Ejecting of a Godly, Faithful, Conscientious Ministry, to the Number of Three or Four Hundred, and filling their Places with such a Gang and Set of Men, as were, for the Generality, the Shame and Scandal of the Gospel, and guilty of most notorious Profanity (if Swearing, Whoredom, Drunkenness, Sabbath-breaking, may come under such a Character), all Scotland have such a Sense, and hath so long smarted under the Effects thereof, as neither this, nor probably any succeeding Age, will blot out the Remembrance and Impression of the same. I have my self known some of the Vulgar sort, upon the obvious Observation of this visible and evident Issue of the Erection of Prelacy, complaining, that the Land was become generally Profane and Debauched. May I here mind this Prefacer, or rather the Gentleman Querist, of the Words

of an Eminent Peer of Scotland, the Marquess of Argyle, who was very Active in bringing home King Charles in the Year 1650, and set the Crown of Scotland on his Head, in a grateful Requital whereof, the Prince, in the Beginning of his Reign 1661, cut off his Head at the Cross of Edinburgh, and let it upon the Tolbooth, as a standing Monument of his Remembrance of the Service done to him. This Noble Patriot, at his Death, when way was making for Prelacies Erection, took Notice, in his Speech upon the Scaffold, of the Formidable Advances and Growth of Profanity. *I may say truly, said he, tho' I have been a Prisoner, I have not had mine Ears shut, I hear assuredly (no doubt, Assuredly; for, by this time, all Scotland was Resounding East, West, South and North, with this sad Noise and afflicting Observation to all that feared God, or had any Sense of Religion), that Drinking, Swearing, Whoreing, were never more common, never more countenanced, than now they are.* He told the People, That if Magistrates did not restrain, and People abandon this Wickedness, there was no doubt, but God's Wrath would pursue both. If there were a true Account and History of the almost innumerable Instances of Drunkenness, Uncleanliness, Horrid Oaths, Blasphemies, Immoralities and Debaucheries of all sorts, Strange and Barbarous Unnatural Murthers, Children of Parents, Husbands of Wives, Wives of Husbands, Avowed and Deliberat Sabbath-Breaking (in Remembrance of, it seems, and coveting much the Renovation of Bishop Laud's Book of Sports, our Episcopalians dear Martyr), Blasphemous Mockeries of Religion and a Deity, Abounding under the late Reigns, it might make the Ears of all, that have any Impressions of a Deity, of a Heaven, of Holiness, to Tingle, and their Hearts to Tremble. For Popery it was so become in fashion (before ever King James ascended the Throne with a bare-faced Design thereof), that Jesuits, and all Romes Trafficquers, were avowedly prosecuting their Masters Work and Service, in so much, that one of that Number, *Dempster at Aberdeen*, had the Boldness to send some of his Profelytes, to challenge Mr. Menzies, Professor of Divinity, to a Dispute, whence ensued a Personal, and thereafter a Paper Debate, since printed. A Parallel Instance to which, in the Town of Dundee, and with respect to such an Issue, is still upon Record, which put the then Minister, Mr. Rait, to a Defence of the Protestant Doctrine, since printed. When one of the Ministers, in Mr. Sharp the Primat's Diocess, complained, at the Diocesan Meeting, of the Affront and Opposition of Papists, the Venerable Primat told him, it was the Presbyterians they were to set themselves against. This, a Presbyterian Minister, yet alive, can testify, who was an Ear Witness. Many are the Instances, which may be exhibited,

hibited, of this Insolency of Papists, at that time. The Instances, also, are notour and sad, of the Blasphemies of that Horrid Villain, and Professed Atheist, *Christopher Irwin*: Some Accounts I have heard of this Wretches Blasphemous Mockeries of a Deity, that I truly Tremble to reflect upon. This Man, Professing Medicine, was Employed and Converſed with by persons of the greatest Rank, without Controul; whereas a Youth, who had been sometime in the Colledge of *Edinburgh*, upon Reading of some Mischievous pamphlets, falling under Impressions of Deism, and found guilty of Blasphemies against the Trinity, and our Saviour's Incarnation, and, in Judgment, appearing Obstinat, all *Scotland* know, was, according to our Laws against Blasphemers, made an Example of Shame and Justice, being Hanged betwixt *Leith* and *Edinburgh*, and appointed to be Buried there, in the place where notorious Criminals and Malefactors are Hanged in Chains, and denyed the Common Place of Christian Burial. This I, with many others, was Witness to. Tho' this Poor Youth, a little before, and at his Death, Confessed his Guilt, Professing to Flie to Christ for Mercy, and was related to some of Eminent Note, and even of his Judges. Now, let our Prefacer, or any of his Party, produce, if they can, such an Instance of Exemplary Impartial Justice upon the many Blasphemers, during the Time of Prelacy.

What remains in this Preface, is of a Piece with the preceeding Virulent Railings, and Bantering Stuff, so notoriously False and Confuted by the Observation and Knowledge of all Persons of Common Ingenuity, that it is a sufficient Confutation to Read it. Among other absurd Insolencies, he is bold to Charge several Afflicting providences, such as, the Burnings in *Edinburgh*, Famine, Epidemical Sicknesſes, the Miscarrying of the Affair of *Darien*, &c. upon the Erecting of Presbyterian Government; an Inference so Remote and Senseless, that, to Repeat it, is to Refute it: Our Prefacer should have had so much of very Common Prudence, as to foresee an Obvious Retortion, and far more probable, from many sad Providential Issues attending upon King *Charles II's* Restoration and Government, such as, the Plague, the Burning of *London*, the Miscarrying of several Sea Adventures, and Strokes that way, the Selling of *Dunkirk*, with other Ominous Advances of the *French King's* Greatness and Designs, upon the proportion'd Ruines of the Greatness and Honour of *England*, not to insist upon the Tragical Murthers of *Essex*, *Bedford*, and *Sir Edmondbury Godfrey*. He is bold to appeal to the People of *Scotland*, Whether, since Presbytery was established therein, they have found such happy Effects of more Orthodoxy in Faith, and Improvement in Morals. And I dare make the same Appeal,

that

that they have, and, for Proof, may again attest the Current of our Assemblies Acts and Procedure, since this Happy Revolution and Establishment, so Convincingly Adapted (and, we bless God, not without Success) to these great Ends of Establishing Truth and Godliness, for Suppressing Popery, and all Errors and Immoralities, for Establishing a Laborious Faithful Ministry through the Nation, the many Addresses to the Civil Power, for Strengthening their Hands in this Good Work. We may also renew the same Appeal to all Unprejudic'd Observers, that the grand Impediment of this Blessed Design hath flowed from our Bigot Prelatists, our Non-jurant *Jacobites*, and Popishly Affected Persons, who are known to have used all Mischievous Endeavours to Obstruct the same, whereof their late Project of Procuring from the Queen a Letter, Incouraging their Non-jurant Clergy to Encroach upon a Legally Established Ministry, is none of the least, upon which, Disaffected Persons to the Government, and many Profane Debauched Wretches, have been encouraged to withdraw from the Inspection of the Lord's Servants, and from the deserved Censures of their Scandalous Immoralities. *That some Supporters of Presbytery are the Scandal of Christianity, that Infidelity, Blasphemies, and all sort of Debaucheries do more abound, and are more Impudent under its Influence, than formerly,* is such a notorious Untruth, that Mr. Colvil, were he alive, might apply to it what he said in his Verses of a Calumnious Historian anent the Affairs of *Scotland*, and our Presbyterian Church in special, *All the Devils Blush, he Lies so.* But I pray the Lord give this Man, if in the Land of the Living, Repentance, more Prudence, more Knowledge and Sobriety, and then, I am sure, his Penitent Reflections, and Self-Reverges, for thus accusing the Brethren, yea a whole Church, will be his best Remedy, and all our desired Revenge. Thus I have done with our Prefacer, when I have added one Word, That, since the Advantage he expected of this Shameless Calumnious Banter he hath stufft his Preface with, he could only, in Reason, hope for it from his *English* High-Flyers, and such other Credulous Persons in that Nation, whose Ignorance of *Scottish* Affairs, together with their Prelatick Bigotry, renders them capable of believing his False and Foulsome Imputations upon Presbyterian Government, and whose Plagiary Credulity is much of a piece with that of those, who received, and, with Complacency, hugg'd that Fardel of Ridiculous Lies, Entituled, *The Scots Presbyterian Eloquence*, He should have kepted his Learned Preface and Pamphlet from stepping over the Border to *Scotland*, where he might be well assured, it could be no otherways entertained, than with the Derision of some, and the Pity of the

Chap. II. *Queries to the Presbyterians of SCOTLAND.* 41
the more Serious, from a Sense of his Petulant Folly, and several other Vices, wherewith he hath Blotted himself, and is therein Staged and Expōsed to all Men of Sense, who know our Affairs,

CHAP. II.

A Consideration and Review of the Queries of the First Chapter, Exposing the Querist's Ignorant and Popish Notions, anent the Testimony of Early Antiquity, and the Practice of the Primitive Church, as Authorizing and Determining the Sense and Interpretation of Difficult or Controverted Texts of Scripture; as likewise his Ignorant Demand of Express Scriptures, to Fortify the Answer of every one of his Queries.

COME we now to Examine these Goodly Queries, so highly valued by our Prefacer. The first Querie is, *How far the Testimony of Early Antiquity, can be allow'd for clearing many Places of Scripture, in Matters of Doctrine, and Church-Government?*

To this the Answer is easy and clear, That all Orthodox Divines, all the Reformed Churches, yea and the Ancient Fathers themselves, hold the Scriptures to be the Only Judge, or (as some do speak more properly) the Only Rule, not Antiquity, as to all Matters of Doctrine, and all Substantials of Church-Government: So that, whatever Helps this Testimony may be suppos'd to afford, in order to such a Clearing as he mentions, yet 'tis neither a part of the Canon, nor of it self Infallible, but, as all other Subordinat Helps, still Examinable thereby.

To the Reason annexed unto the Query, *viz. That there are many things believed and practis'd, for which there is no Positive Command.* It is Answered, not to stand upon the inquiry, what he means by *Positive Command*, that, if we acknowledge the Holy Scripture to be the Perfect Rule, as to all *Credenda, Facienda, Petenda* (as all Protestant Churches do, and the Scripture asserts it self to be, in many clear Testimonies), then it necessarily follows, that nothing is to be believed or practis'd in Point of Doctrine, or Substantials of Worship and Church-Government, but what is either expressly, or, by necessary and good

Consequence, contained in Scripture; Such as are these things he instanceth, *scil.* *Infant Baptism*, whereof the Comprehensive Command and Institution of our Saviour *, the Practice of the Apostles in Baptizing Households †, whereof Infants are a part, as also great Multitudes ||, the clear Succession of this first Seal of the Gospel-Covenant into the old Seal of Circumcision, in its proper Design of the Early Initiating Children into God's Church *, and the Apostles Assertion of the Federal Holiness of Children †, clearly importing this standing Title, and this Birth-right Privilege, as being born of profess Religious Parents within the Bosom of the Church Visible, are sufficient Scripture Proofs and Warrants; so that we need not go to any Practice of Antiquity to Legitimate the same. This also we assert of his other Instances. For the Change of the Jewish Sabbath into the Lord's Day, this hath been cleared by several Divines in Learned Treatises. Had he read *Caudrie*, Mr. *Durham* upon *Rev.* 1. 10. with several others, this might have saved him the Labour of this Foolish Query. A seventh part of Time to be set apart for Solemn Worship, being enjoined in the fourth Command, we have, for Warranting the Change of the Seventh Day into the First, our Lord's reiterated Converse with his Apostles on that Day of his Resurrection, Exemplifying and Recommending thus the Relative Holiness of the Day *, the special Character and Denomination thereof, *Rev.* 1. 10. wherein it is called *κυριακή* *ἡμέρα*, the Lord's Day, which cannot be otherways understood, than with a special Respect to our Lord's Appointment and Institution, as the Holy Supper is called *κυριακὸν δεῖπνον*, or the Lord's Supper, upon the same very Ground, the Practice of the Apostles, and the Churches in their Sacred Solemn Worship, clearly determining this Point †.

For *Lay-Men and Womens* receiving the Sacrament, the same Grounds that prove them Church Members, professed Believers, and in Covenant with God, and thus purchased by Christ's Blood (whereof none needs Information from Scripture, if not this pitiful Querist, who, it seems, hath never seriously read his New Testament), will ground their Admission to this Sacrament. For *Sprinkling* in stead of *Dipping* in *Baptism*, the Word in the Original *βαπτίζω βαπτισθαι* being applyed not only to Immersion, but likewise Aspersing or Sprinkling *, moreover, the thing signified by Baptism being designed by the Name of Aspersion †, the Sufficiency of Aspersion to represent the Analogy betwixt the Sign and the thing signified,

* *Mat.* 28. 19.† *Act.* 16. 33.

with 15. v.

1 *Cor.* 1. 16.|| *Act.* 2. 38, 41.

and 8. 12.

* *Colos.* 2. 11, 12.† 1 *Cor.* 7. 14.* *Mat.* 28. 1, 9.*Luke* 24. 21, 36.*Joh.* 20. 19, 26.† *Act.* 27.1 *Cor.* 16.* *Mark* 7. 4.*Luke* 11. 38.† 1 *Pet.* 1. 1.*Nb.* 10. 22.

fied, clears this abundantly; Besides what may be added, touching the Nature and Design of the Institution, which is fully thus Answered; and that the Power and Efficacy of this Sacred Ordinance, depends not upon the Quantity of the Water, but upon the Divine Blessing attending the Institution; that, in the Old Testament, there were various Lotions and Aspersions, which our Lord, in this Institution, had respect unto, whence the Blood of Christ, the Thing signified, is called the Blood of Sprinkling, *Heb. 12. 24.* The eschewing of the apparent Hurt of Infants in Colder Climates, and consulting Decency in Baptizing the Adult (when the Case so requires) do plead for this Method, in the Judgement of Protestant Churches.

Our Querist, "Upon Peter's pronouncing some things in Paul's Epistles *Hard to be Understood*, will enquire, If the Early History and Practice of the Church be not necessary Explainers of some Places of Scripture?"

I Answer, First, The Judgment of Protestant Writers upon this Place, is, 1. That the Apostle pronounceth these *Hard Things*, with several Limitations and Restrictions, *viz.* not only with respect to Paul's Epistles; But, 2^{ly}. shews, that these Hard Things are *Some*, only, or the fewest Number. 3^{ly}. He restricts and limits the Same to what he hath been discoursing about, *scil.* the period of Time. Next, the Wresters or Misunderstanders of these Hard Things, the Apostle puts under this Character, that they are *Unlearned* and *Unstable*, which he cannot be supposed to Impute to all to whom he Writes; But, on the Contrary, must suppose the Greatest Part to be so Stable and Knowing, as to be in a Fitness to search the Scriptures, and thus, comparing Scripture with it self, to reach the Mind of God in these, and, consequently, any other Difficulties. To which may be added, in the *Third Place*, That the Apostle, nor no Scripture else, sends us to the Churches Practice or Canons, for a Resolution of Scripture Difficulties, but Recommends to us the exact Searching of the Word of God it self, *John 5. 39.* and Prayer for the Spirit's Influence, who did Dictate the Scriptures. Thus the holy *Psalmist*, *Pf. 119. 18.* compared with *1 Cor. 2. 10, 11, 12, 13.* To all which may be Added, that these Hard Things refer not to the manner of the Proposal in the Epistles, but to the Things themselves, the Greek Pronoun (*Οὗτος*) not being in the Feminine Gender, and relating to the Epistles. Things themselves may be great Mysteries; yet the manner of Proposal as clear, and adapted to the Understanding of the Sincere, and such as can Spiritually Discern,

as the Thing can admit of, 1 cor. 2. Thus even *Lorinus* and *Estius*. See *Poole* on the place.

But to shew how our Pamphleter strikes in with Papists in this Querie, let any read the Popish Pleadings from hence, for their Traditions, and making the Scriptures but the half Rule, the Churches Practice and Antiquity the other; in special, the *Rhemists*, and *Bailius* in his *Catholick Catechism*, and this will be evident beyond all peradventure. First, For the J-suits of *Rhemes*, "They found their Charge of Obscurity and Difficulty upon the Scriptures, from this very Passage cited by our Querist; and do Charge Protestants for Admitting nothing as the Rule, but the bare Scriptures. *Luther* they Reproach, for saying, that the Scriptures were more plain than the Fathers Commentaries. Moreover, they Charge Protestants with a Devilish and Seditious Arrogance, because they expect not the Prelates and the Churches Judgment for understanding the Scriptures; holding, that the Things treated of in the Word of God, and the manner of Writing is hard and high, and by God's Providence purposely Written in such sort. *Bailius* the Jesuit, in his Catechism, enquiring, whether the Scriptures be Perspicuous, makes his *Catholicus Papista* to Answer in the Negative; and among other Arguments, to evince the Scriptures Obscurity, his Catholick adduceth the premised Text of Scripture, which he tells us, is *alienum a Judicio Reformatorum*. He pretends to Answer the Objection, *that all things necessary are clearly revealed*, asking, if in these things, which are Difficult, there be nothing necessary to Salvation. I need not shew the Learned *Rivet's* Answer, in his *Catholicus Orthodoxus*, and Confutation of what is premised, which is to the same Scope with what is already touched: To which he adds, What can be said of *Paul's* Writings, which may not be Objected against Traditions, since they are involved in the same, or greater Obscurities? He after cites a Notable Passage of *Crisostom*, *Rom. 3.* on *Thessal. 2.* *Omnia sunt dilucida et recta quæ sunt in Divinis Scripturis; manifesta sunt quæcunque sunt necessaria*, All things are Right and dilucid in the Divine Scriptures, and manifest which are necessary.

But to shew further the Folly of this Querie, since our Querist will not deny, that these Difficulties in *Paul's* Epistles, in his Sense, and according to this his Rule, had a necessary Explication in the Churches Judgment and Practice, when the Apostle *Peter* Noted these Hard Things to be understood, since otherways there wanted a necessary Explication for clearing Scripture Difficulties; and the Divine Wisdom shall be reflected upon, as leaving the Church destitute.

destitute of a necessary Rule for clearing Difficulties ; And then it will Puzzle our Querist to Answer these Queries. 1. How comes it, that the Apostle *Peter*, in Noting the Malady, Points not out the Remedy, so necessary for Removing the Same ? Nay, that the Scripture no where else, Points us to such a Remedy for clearing Difficulties ? Our Saviour, in the great Debate with the *Jews* anent his Office of *Messia*, appealed to the Scriptures, enjoyning to Search, or minding them, as the Word *ἀπορῶτε* imports. But neither he nor his Apostles, sent any to the Churches Practice or Tradition in that, or Subsequent Ages, for clearing Scripture Difficulties. 2ly. Since this Rule must hold in all Difficulties, or else this Querist must shew, why the Difficulties in *Paul's* Epistles, come under this Rule, and none else upon the same Ground ; How will it appear, what Churches Practice or Canons do clear Difficulties ? and why Some, and not all ? else the Rule is not Uniform : If there are other Difficulties, as Weighty and necessary to be Resolved as those mentioned, which notwithstanding have no such Practice or Canon to clear them, how shall they be Resolved ? If by Scripture it self, comparing it with it self, which is the Protestants Rule, why are not all Difficulties equally thus Determinable ? Besides, since it is beyond all Peradventure, that not only Church-Canons and Traditions are found Involved in very considerable Difficulties, but the Churches Uniform, Universal Practice, in any Age or Century, is a Difficulty it self, hard enough for the Learnedest to penetrate into ; How then shall this be a Rule to clear Obscure Places, to every Searcher of Scripture (whom this Man will acknowledge concerned in the Discoverie) which is it self involved in such Obscurities ? 3ly. It may be further enquired, whether this Rule will not make the Churches Practice the *Dioti*, the *Ratio a-Priori* to Determine Scripture Sense, making thus Men, the Rule of our Faith ? Finally, it may be enquired, what can be the Remedy in the Case of the early Aberrations in the Churches Practice, from the Scripture Path, where of several Instances are given, and of Errours (so far as Credit is to be given to Hystorie) universally held, such as the Errour anent the Vision of God, that the Souls of Saints departed, see not the Face of God, till the Judgment of the Great Day, the Errour of Free-will, which obtained till *Augustin* rejected it, who flourished in the 4th. Century, the Millenary Errour, and the like ?

Our Querist demands *Express Scripture for refusing this Rule, and once for all clear, express Scripture Answers to all his Queries.*

For the first Part of his Demand, I hope what is said, is a clear

clear and Scripture Answer thereto; But if he by *Clear* mean *express Scripture*, that is in so many Letters and Syllables, and thus Disown Scripture Consequences, he has Disowned the Protestant Doctrine, and joyned Issue with Papists, such as Cardinal *Perron*, *Cottonus*, *Arnoldus*, *Veronus*, as likeways with the old *Arrians*, *Macedonians*, and others. The necessity of admitting Scripture Consequences this Gentleman Querist might have found Demonstrated by Protestant Divines from clear Scripture Grounds; As *first*, From the Scriptures *express Design*, as to this Improvement thereof by Doctrine, Reproof, Correction, Instruction, &c. 2 *Tim.* 3. 16. *Rom.* 15. 4. which Improvement and Use cannot be Reached without Rational Inference, and, Consequently, the Application and Improvement of our Reason. 2^{ly}. From the Command given to Men as Rational Creatures, to *search the Scriptures*, *Joh.* 5. 39. to Dig for, and Search out the Gold, the Nucleus, the Kernel, and Sense, not to rest in a Superficial Knowledge of the Shell of bare Words, 3^{ly}. From the Wisdom of God, who, in proposing his Word and Oracles, Commends to us what is clearly deduceable therefrom; and, consequently, calls for the use of our Reason in such rational Deductions. 4^{ly}. From the Practice of Christ and his Apostles. Thus our Saviour *Matth.* 22. 32. proved the Resurrection from the Covenant Promise, *Exod.* 3. 6. *I am the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob*, where there is nothing *express* of the Resurrection. Thus the Apostles proved *Jesus* of *Nazareth* to be the *Messiah* promised in the Old Testament, by Consequences drawn from the same: And many such Instances can be Exhibited.

Thus our Querist hath run to the Popish Camp, before he hath done with his very first Querie, in that he will have us Ruled by Tradition for clearing Scripture Difficulties; besides, that, in Demanding *express Scripture* for what we hold, and to prove every Answer to his Queries, he flies to the Exploded Refuge of Gross Hereticks. But I would gladly know, Where hath he *Express Scripture* to Fortify these two Opinions? If they be the Objects of his Faith, and in his Principles Divine Truths, he stands Obligated by the same Principle to produce *Express Scripture* for them; and if this he cannot perform, to Disown them. Where hath he *Express Scripture* for presenting this Learned Volume of his Queries, since in this Practice he will profess to Act in Faith, and the Scripture is Clear and Express, that *whatsoever is not of Faith*

* *Rom.* 14. 23. *is Sin* *

Our Querist offers this Reason of his Demand, because

cause the Gentleman whom he Addresses, when pinched with Antiquity, rejects every thing for which Text of Scripture is not given in Religion and Church Government. But how little Sense or Reason doth this Gentleman Querist discover in this his Reason and pretended Retortion? Will he be bold to say, that when we demand Scripture Proof for every thing in Religion and Church-Government, we either demand *express Scripture* exclusive of, or disowning just and necessary Consequences, or *express Scripture* for every thing that is merely circumstantial in Religion or Church-Government? If he cannot say, that we do either, how pitiful is his Reason, and how irrational is his indentifying either the *Substantials* and *Circumstances* of Government, or his making one and the same *clear Scripture Proof*, and *express Scripture Proof*? Was not our Saviour's Proof of the Resurrection against the Sadducees, from *Exod. 3. 6.* *clear Scripture Proof*? but will he say it was an *Express*, and not a *Consequential* Proof. Come we now to the second Querie; which is this.

Q U E R I E II.

IF it be a Fault to say, some places of Scripture are cleared by Apocryphal Writings, whether this condemns not all Commentaries and Sermons?

Ans. What he means by Apocryphal Writings is not so clear: If the Books commonly called so, he should understand, that we give them the credit of other Humane Writings, such as *Josephus* in point of History, or such like Moral Writings in other things; and whatever clearness may be supposed, as to some Matters of Fact, or History, deduceable from such Writings, we hold it still to be a Subservient Clearness *tuto calo*, differing from the Rule and Canon it self, and no part of it. But withal, we have more Venerable Thoughts of the Sermons and Commentaries of the Lord's sent Ambassadors, who have Authority accordingly to be Expositors of his Law and holy Oracles, Stewards of the Mysteries of God, and are, as in that Capacity, suppos'd to undergoe God's instituted Tryal by the Prophets, as touching such a competent measure of the Spirits Gifts of Knowledge, Utterance, &c. as the Lord hath promised to his Servants and Ministers to the end of the World. Since God hath declared, that Faith comes by Hearing, * *Scik* the Word preached, and hath declared a Sent, Teaching, and Scripture expounding Ministry, improving the Word for Doctrine, Reproof, Exhortation, Correction,

See Jer. 2. 8.
1 Cor. 4. 1. 2
Cor. 3. 6. 1 Cor.
14. 32. 2 Tim.
4. 2. 1 Tim. 3. 2.

* Rom. 10. 17.

† 1 *Thm.* 3. 16, 17.¶ *Eph.* 4. 11, 12,

13.

* 1 *Cor.* 11. 1.† 1 *Cor.* 10. 15.¶ *Acts* 17. 11.

ation, and Instruction in Righteousness †, to be the great Mean of Conversion, and building up Believers in Knowledge, Faith, Holyness, until all the Elect are made up ||; Yet, as *Paul* would not have the People to follow him otherwise than as he was a follower of Christ *, and commends to the Judgment of Discretion, what he taught, saying, † *I speak as to wise Men, Judge ye what I say*, and Hearers are commended for searching the Scriptures, touching the Truth of what he delivered ||: The same we say of Ministers now, the Word being their Rule; what they deliver from it is to be received upon this Divine Warrant, and with a due subordinat Regard to their Sacred Office, as being God's Mouth and his Ministers: Yet people are to give no Implicit Faith to what is delivered, but upon a due Understanding and Search of the Scriptures, that command in a general Sense reaching People as well as Pastors. This Answer doth also satisfy the next part of his Querie, which is *anent the Regard due to Explanatory Doctrine, when Inspiration is ceased*. God's Spirit is promised in a competent measure, both to Preachers and Hearers, fitting them for all necessary Duties, upon their asking of him, and their Faith in the blessed Redeemer, which Promise is still made good to all God's faithful Ones, with Respect to every piece of their Warfare, till it is accomplished, tho' infallible Inspiration, which respected the Writing the infallible Oracles is gone. *Isa.* 59. 20, 21. *Rom.* 11. 26, 27. 1 *Cor.* 2. 11, 12, 13, 14. &c. *Rom.* 8. 8, 9, 10, 11. *Ephes.* 1. 13, 14.

Q U E R I E III.

WHether Augustin's Rule hold good, [*what the Universal Church holds, and was not institute by Councils, is truly Apostolick*] ? If this be not admitted, he asks, *What Scripture it contradicts*?

To this the Answer is easie, from what Orthodox Divines hold touching the Churches Fallibility, and in opposition to the Popish pretended Infallibility. Which, had this Gentleman understood (and sure he should, before he offered to write Queries), he would have seen the negative Answer to his Querie, fortified by solid Reasons. There is a distinction of the Church *Visible* and *Invisible*: The Church *Invisible* cannot Err *Objectively*, in respect of the Infallible Rule, God's directing Word; Nor *Totally* and *Finally* in a Subjective Sense; that is, in the Foundation, and so as to cease to be; Yet, while in time, is subject to Mistake and Error, as well as other Remains of Corruption. As for the Church *Visible*,

Visible, gathered in Assemblies through the World, whether Collective in its Members, or Representative in its Rulers, whether particular Churches apart, or associat conjunctly in Councils, in neither respect is she Infallible, but lyable to Error, and that both in Faith and Practice, whether as to Questions of Right, or Matters of Fact. This is the Consistent Judgement of Orthodox Protestant Churches, as might be cleared by a large account of their Confessions, and the Testimony of Protestant Divines. See *Turret. Loc. 18. de Ecclesia Quest. 11. Professors of Leyden Synops. pur. Theol. Disp. 40. de Eccles. Thef. 44. Dr. Strang de Interpret. & Perf. Scripturae, & de Jndice Controversiarum Lib. 1. Cap. 16. Universit. Sammer. Syntag. Thef. 17. Loc. de Infallibilitate Ecclesiae Thef. 33. Chamier Panstr. Cathol. Tom. 5. de natura Ecclesiae cap. 14.* See for Confessions of the Reformed Churches, touching the Scriptures absolute Perfection, and the Imperfection and Fallibility of the Church, *The Helvetick Confession, Article 1, 2, 3, 4. The English Confession Anno 1562. Article 6th. with 19, 20. The Scottish Confession Article 19th. The Confession of Saxony in that Article, Quae bona opera facienda. The Confession of Wittemberg, in the Article De Sacra Scriptura. The Confession of Bohemia, Article first, De Sacris Scripturis.* The Reasons are taken, First, from the Imperfection of Regeneration, of Knowledge, and Grace, while in time; absolute Perfection herein being proper to the Church Triumphant. Here we know in part, 1 Cor. 13. 9. We walk by Faith, 2 Cor. 5. 7. Who can understand his errors, saith the Psalmist, Psal. 19. 12. 2ly, Promises to the Church have a tacite or expresse Condition of Perseverance, John 8. 31. If you abide in my word ye are my Disciples indeed. Such also are these Chap. 14. 21, 23. anent the Lord's Presence, and Communion with him, upon Obedience, Love, and Faithful keeping his Word. Paul tells all the Churches, if they abide not in God's Way, they may expect such Severity & Off-cutting as the rejected Jews, Rom. 11. 22. Many other Reasons are easily adduceable, such as the Instance of the Jewish Church, who had fairest Pretences to Infallibility, yet horribly Apostatized and Erred, the Experience of all Ages, wherein the Church has had its Errors, together with the great Defection of the Gospel Church prophesied of, 2 Thes. 2. and in the Revelation, wherein the Churches Defection, and that for several Ages, is pointed out, and described. During this Defection, all the World is said to wonder after the beast, Revel. 13. 3. And the true Remnant are said to flee to the wilderness, Revel. 12. 6. and to be reduced to a small number, worshipping in the Altar, while the Utter Court is given to the Gentiles. Revel. 11. 1, 2. I need not stand to resume the Answer of contrary Objections. To that taken from the Promise of the Spirit; 'Tis Answered, That

this is to be understood, with respect to different Degrees and Measures, from that Influence of the Spirit conferr'd upon Apostles, which this Promise cannot be suppos'd to import. Moreover, in so far as the Church attends to her Rule, she is called, *The Pillar and Ground of Truth* 1 Tim. 2. 15. Which Expression and Phrase points at her Office of Retaining, Proposing, and Defending the Word of Truth, but cannot be suppos'd to import Infallibility, since the Church of *Ephesus* was not such, to which this Promise was written. Again, we are commanded to *bear the Church*, Matth. 18. 17. as the Jews were injoynd to obey the Judge judging according to the Law, but not absolutely, *Deut.* 17. 12. Christ's promised Presence still respects the following of commanded Duty. Several such Objections may be read, and seen resolv'd, in the premised Authors, and others upon this Subject. As for the affirmative part of the Answer, since 'tis not ours, we are not concern'd in it, or any suppos'd Consequence drawn therefrom. For what he hints of *Jerom's Toto orbe Decretum*, 'tis spoken to in *Rectius Instruendum*, and other pieces.

His 4th Querie, touching *Tertullian's Rule*, Scil. *Such things wherein the Church is One, have not come by Error, but by Tradition*, Scil. *Apostolical*, is of the same Nature with the former, and founded upon that false Popish Supposition of the Churches Infallibility; and therefore receives the same Answer. Besides, there being Instances given of pretended Apostolick Tradition, and the Churches Practice thereupon, which are disown'd by all the Orthodox, such as these mentioned by *Basil*, and the like, the unsoundness of this Ground is apparent, and the premised Answer equally evident.

The 5th Querie, in way of Dilemma, is, *Whether our Saviour, before his Ascension, did leave every thing concerning Church Government positively determin'd, with his Apostles, or not?* If he did, what need was there of the universally acknowledged Inspiration, since they had been thus furnished with a fix'd Rule to walk by? But, if they were only commanded, and instructed in the General, and the Spirit given to direct them in particular Management, the Controversie runs to this Issue, *what the Apostles did in Matter of Fact?* Or, *what Government they did actually establish to be the lasting Government of the Church?* To the first Branch of the Querie we Answer, That these Terms (*Every thing, and positively determin'd*) do need Explication. There was no need of a particular or positive Determination of every thing concerning Church-Government. Paul remits the Circumstantial to the general Rule of Decency and Order, and the Prudentials of Church-Governours, yea, somethings respecting the *Decorum* of publick Worship, and eschewing *Indecency* therein, to the very *Light & Law of Nature*. *Doth*

not Nature it self teach you, saith he to the Church of Corinth, that if a woman pray uncovered, it is a shame to her, &c. 1 Cor. II. 14. 2ly, If we respect the Substantials of Government, Scil. the Officers, Qualifications, Courts, and such like, it may be well sustain'd, that our Saviour, in the 40 days after his Resurrection, Instructing his Apostles touching the Nature of his Kingdom, Acts 1. 3. gave them Commands and Instructions thereanent, and likewise touching the Gospel Worship. The Apostle Paul declares that he delivered to the Churches, in this Point, what he received of the Lord, 1 Cor. II. 23. And none will doubt, that the other Apostles walked by the same Rule. To that part of the Querie, viz. *That if furnished with a fix'd Rule, what need was there of Inspiration?* I Answer 1. There was still need for their Saving and sutable Impression of the same. I hope, he will grant, 'tis one thing to have a Solid, Unerring Rule prescrib'd, another thing to have a Saving, Abiding, Infal- lible Impression thereof, which required the Spirit's Infalible Conduct. The Church has an Infalible Rule, yet may Erre for want of such Im- pression. 2ly, This was necessary in Order to the Faithful, Exact, In- falible Improvement and Application thereof, the infalible exact Follow- ing of this prescrib'd Rule in their Doctrine and Practice, and especi- ally in the Faithful Infalible Record thereof in their Writings, who were (several of them) to be the Spirit's Scribes and Amanuenses, and were carried by the Holy Ghost Infalibly, (as the Apostle Peter phrases it, 2 Pet. 1. 21.) and singularly influenc'd in this Work. He will not say, that the Doctrine which the Apostles delivered, and which is the Churches Foundation, was then only given to them, or inspired in the time the Apostles taught, and that they had no previous Im- pression by our Lord's Instruction. 3ly, We may also distinguish be- twixt that Plat-form or Idea of the Doctrine, Worship, and Govern- ment delivered by our Lord, with some Sutable Impression there- of before his Ascension, and that more full gradual Discoverie, Degrees of Gifts, and Exercise of Grace, attending the Spirits down-pouring on the Day of Pentecost, whereby their Knowledge, Gifts, and Graces, were singularly enlarg'd. Besides, Moses had the Rule prescrib'd, and the Pattern of the Tabernacle on the Mount; yet who will say, he had not need of an Infalible Conduct of the Spirit, in order to actual un- erring Directions and Applications, and an Infalible Impression accordingly, even as to every pin of the Tabernacle. Our Querist will not say, that Ministers, having an Infalible Rule to walk by, & thus being Objectively Infalible, are therefore Subjectively or practically Infalible as to a perfect Impression, and correspondent Improvement of their Infalible Rule. So that, these being distinct things, the prescribing of the Rule infalibly

in the case of the Apostles, is very well consistent with, yea, and did require, the Spirits Infallible Conduct in the Exact and Unerring Improvement and following thereof; the Apostolick Office necessarily requiring both, as our Querist cannot deny.

The other Branch of the Question is, *If the Lord only Instructed in general, and gave the Holy Spirit to Direct in particular Management? If by general Commands and Instructions, he means such as respect the necessary Officers, Offices, Qualifications, Courts of the Church; and by particular Management, such as respects the Exercise in particular Churches, and Circumstantials of Government therein; 'Tis Answered, that our Lord never gave such immediate Instruction anent these Circumstantials. This general Command (as he Terms it) with correspondent Instructions, respecting the Nature and End of Church Officers and Courts, importeth a positive Determination of the Species of the Government, and nothing of the Government it self, or Substantials thereof, but had this Infallible Inspiration in it's Management.*

To proceed with our Querist; If we say, the Apostles were Infallibly Inspired, with respect to the particular Management in his Sense, he asks, *Whether the Matter comes to this Issue, What did the Apostles do in Matter of Fact? Or, What Government was actually Established by them, to be the lasting Government to the End of the World?* Very well: Let it come to this Issue, including withal, as needs we must, what clearness, in this Point, may be had in all the other N. Testament Writings, for Determining us in this Matter. What is the great Projection of our Querist, when we are brought to this great Issue? Why, *If the Accounts, saith he, be not so clear in themselves, of this Matter of Fact, but various Interpretations are fix'd on them, and serious Men of different Perswasions are fully convinc'd, each of them are in the Right, and have Scripture on their side, how shall this Controversie, as to the true Sense of those Scriptures be cleared, but from the early Ages of the Church, and the nearer the Apostles the better. In this Projection, first, He Charges upon the Apostles, in Contradiction to his Supposition of their Infallibility in particular Management of Church-Government, that tho' Christ gave them the General Rules and Idea of Government, and the Holy Spirit to Direct in particular Management, yet, in this Management, and their Doctrine thereanent deliver'd to the Churches, they set down no Species of Government to which the Church is Infallibly tyed. For, if the Species be describ'd, so as that the Churches are to follow this Sampler and Pattern upon the Mount, sure the Churches meer*
Practice

Practice is not, cannot be our Rule in this Point. 2^{ly}. He is yet farther Injurious to the Apostles, in supposing, that tho' the Apostles had the Spirit's Infallible Conduct in this particular Management of Government upon the Lord's General Directions, yet all that's Written and left upon Record in this Point, is like the Heathen Oracles, so Dark and Obscure, that Serious and Knowing Men can never reach its Meaning, but must have the Churches Practice as a Clew to wind them out of this Labyrinth. So, it seems, neither were the Apostles so Faithful as they ought to have been, in giving Enigma's and Inextricable Riddles instead of Rules of Government, nor (*horresco referens*!) the Spirit, in his Conduct, so straight and Infallible as was necessary: For he tells us, that what the Apostles have Written, is not in it self so Clear as to have prevented this suppos'd Mist of Debate, and that of Godly Serious Men on both sides, who may be suppos'd to seek the Spirit's Light in their Inquiry.

Again, if our Querist Evade by saying, that tho' he assert these Dictats are not so Clear, but that Different Interpretations are fix'd upon them, he doth not Charge an Objective Unclearness upon the Things themselves: Then I Answer, That, besides that his Words will not bear this Construction, (for he Charges an Obscurity upon them, *in themselves considered*) he loses the Design of his Query, which is to send us for clearness to the Churches practice. For, since this may be said of Hundreds of controverted Scripture Truths, he must make the Church's practice the Universal Rule, or go to Rome for the Infallible Visible Judge, there being such multitudes of contending Parties, who profess all of them a serious Searching for Truth, and Opposing, in these Debates, Scriptures to each other.

Finally, I would know of this Querist, since the Churches early first Practice, after the Apostolick Age, is so very Dark in the History, by Confession of *Eusebius*, and *Scaliger*, and of the best Inquirers; And since he will not aver, that these Records of the Churches Practice, are either, 1st. More clear than the Apostolick Records Extant in Scripture; or, 2^{ly}, Of equal certainty; And 3^{ly}. Since he will not deny, that there are as warm Debates and Contests touching this Primitive Practice, and the Records thereof, betwixt Contending Parties (in his Charity, Learned and Knowing) in this Point of Church-Government, Episcopalians thinking that these Records stand clear for them, so also Presbyterians, and so Independents; How, I pray, shall this Leaden Rule of the Churches after-practice

practice be preferr'd to the Scriptures Unerring Golden Rule in this Matter ?

VI. Querie is, *If Miracles did not cease before Episcopacy obtain'd in the Church, Whether does not that show God's Approbation of it ? Or, will not this prove Episcopacy not inconsistent with God's Pleasure, and the Marks of a True Church ?* I Answer, He should know, that we deny these Miracles ceas'd, so that his Query is airy, without a Foundation. And he should have made his Proposition Absolute, not a Conditional one with an *If*. Again, 'tis an harder Task than this Gentleman, or any for him, can manage, to assign the fix'd period of the ceasing of Miracles. Nay, granting Episcopacy to have obtain'd before the ceasing of these Miracles, Will that plead for the Warrantableness thereof ? Did not the Devil sow his Tares while Men slept, *Matth. 13. 25* ? And were there not many Corruptions in the Churches of *Asia*, when our Lord by his Messenger *John* wrote to them ? And he will not say that Miracles were so early ceas'd. But did the continuance of Miracles warrant these Corruptions ? Did the Lord's sending an *Elias* with Miracles confirming his Message, and after him an *Elisha* with double Miracles, after the ten Tribes Defection, Confirming the same True Doctrine, together with such like Gifts attending, in after Times, the Prophets Ministry, reach any Patrocinio to the Defection and Corruptions, which had then obtain'd ? So that our

a 1 King.
12. 28, 29.

b 2 King.

18. 4.
c Revel.

2. 14, 15.
with 20. V.

d 1 Cor.

15. 12.

e 1 Cor.

11. 21, 22.

f Gal. 6.

12, 13.

Querist may Argue thus for *Jeroboam's Calves a*, for all the Corruptions which the ancient *Jewish*, and *Christian* Church was guilty of, the Wickedness of a *Jezebel b*, the Errour of the *Nicolaitans c*, the Doctrine of *Balaam*, Eating things Sacrific'd to Idols, the Toleration of Fornication as a Thing indifferent, the denial of the Resurrection *d*, the holding of Feasts in the place of the Sacred Celebration of the Lord's Supper *e*, the retaining and pleading for Circumcision, and other Antiquated Ceremonies *f*. If he say, these Evils are Testified against ; I Answer, 1st. Be it so ; yet he will not say, that the Gospel Churches, while tainted with these Corruptions wanted

the Essence of Churches, and so the Scope of his Querie falls, viz. that what is consistent with the Essence of a Church, is not Reprehensible : So might Prelacy be, tho' the Thing it self is a Corruption. For his Inference, *That Separation from a Church, which is Episcopal, cannot be Vindicated from Schism* : 'Tis Answered, Tho' this were granted, what can our Querist gain ? As for the Dissenters in England.

land, their Plea stands sure upon this Ground, that tho' Episcopacy be Establish'd, a Government we hold, and make Good to be contrary to the Word of God ; yet Ministers ever disown'd a Separation from the Worship (*viz.* a Lawful Gospel Worship), removing the Scandalous Popish Ceremonies, acknowledg'd by themselves Indifferent ; nor did Ministers there ever refuse Concurrence for the necessary Exercise of Discipline, allowing them the Essential Privilege of all Pastors, *viz.* to Deliberate and Vote in Judicatories, for the great Ends of Church-Government : But who knows not, they are Excluded from both, and their just Demands in both, deny'd by the Prelats and their Upholders, who are as afraid of Godly Ministers Association in their Worship and Government, upon the Terms Instanced, as Popes are of General Councils, lest their Corruption in both should wear off. As for *Scotland*, our Querist cannot but know, that this National Church is Established Presbyterially, and no Quarrel is made with Episcopalianism, as to their Episcopal Principles formerly owned by them ; but a Door is open'd for Communion, both in Worship and Government : As for the Worship none are Excluded from it ; nor are there any sinful Terms propos'd to barr Communion in it, it being the same for Substance as was formerly, upon which Ground themselves pleaded for adherence thereunto : And for Ministerial Fellowship, and Association in the Government, they are admitted to it, (if not Erroneous in Doctrine, nor Scandalous in Practice) upon their Engagement to all necessary Duties therein, and to own the Establish'd Government, an Engagement so necessary for the very being of the Government it self Establish'd by Law, that no Man of common Sense can quarrel the Equity and Necessity thereof. So that, 'tis palpable, that the Schism lies at their Door, who reject these Terms of Admittance, and refuse to Joyn to this National Church, when so fair a Door is opened ; and alike they are Guilty of this Schism, who shut that Door of Fellowship in Worship and Government which God has opened.

Our Querist Demands an Instance from us, of Separation from the Church in the purest Age of it, upon the account of Bishops, which Learned Presbyterians assert to have Govern'd the same. His Question wants a Foundation, the Prelacy about which our Question is had never Place in the Purest Times of the Church ; if he understand the Prelacy now existent in *England*, and lately in *Scotland*, and in these Purest Times include (as needs he must) the Apostolick Times. To say, that Presbyterians, yea, Learned Presbyterians, and
in

in Pleading for Presbyterian Government, acknowledge the Apostolick Church, and the immediately succeeding, to have been govern'd by Bishops, is such a gross Falshood, so palpably inconsistent with their Principles, yea common Sense, that the very Reading thereof impeaches our Querist of Dull and Unaccountable Inadvertency.

C H A P. III.

Containing an Answer to the Queries of the Second Chapter : And Examining this Pamphleter's Popish Inconsistent Notions, anent the Jewish Oeconomy, as Exemplifying a New Testament Pattern of Episcopal Government; And his Assertion of the Necessity of an Union thereunto : Together with his Absurd Pleading for the Denomination of Priests, as the proper Official Name or Epithet of Gospel Ministers.

HIS First Query has several Branches, to which a particular Answer shall be return'd. 'Tis touching the *Jewish Oeconomy*, and how far it is Fulfill'd in, or Abolish'd by Christ, according to the Title of this Chapter : Pursuant to which Scope, the first Query, in general, is, *If all of it may not be imitated which was not truly Typical.* In Answer to this, He should know, that Divines make a Threefold Partition of their Laws : Some were given to them as Men in general, so the *Law Moral* proper and common to Mankind as such ; 2ly, Some were *Ceremonial*, given to them as a Church under that first Dispensation of the Covenant ; 3ly, Some were *Judicial*, given to them as a Nation regulated in its Civil Government and Laws immediately by God. The first obliges all Men, as being the Transcript of that Holy Law written in Man's Heart in his Original Integrity, representing an intire Scheme of his Duty to God and Man. The *Ceremonial* contains a Delineation of the Rule and Plat-form of Divine Worship in that first Dispensation of the Covenant, containing shaddowing Ordinances representing Christ the Substance, *Colos. 2. 16. 17. Heb. 10. 1.* The *Law Political* or *Judicial* is that which determines the Duties of Magistrats and Subjects, with Rules respecting the Commonwealth of *Israel*, containing also certain Promises and Threatnings, according to the Rule of both Tables, especially the second. The last two are, as it were, Appendices of the first,

first, which is the Ground of their Obligation; the Ceremonial respected the manner of Worship, according to the first Table; the Judicial respected the Duties, especially of the second Table, with a special respect to that People in their present Case and Circumstances. The *Law Moral* differs from the other *Two*, in that it is founded upon the *Law of Nature*, and is naturally in some measure known; but the other on the *Law Positive*, flowing from the Actings of the Divine Pleasure in the Revelation thereof. They differ also in Duration, the *first* being Eternal and Immutable, the *other two* Mutable and Temporal. They differ also in Respect of the Object, the *first* being Universal, respecting all Men, the *other* Particular, respecting the Jews; the Judicial as a distinct Commonwealth dedicated to God; the Ceremonial respected the State Ecclesiastical, as a Church under Age, and in its Minority. They differ also in their Use; the Moral is the End of the other *Two*, which are subservient thereunto. * Now, to his Query, we say, the *Moral Law* is universally and necessarily binding upon all Men, the *Typical* and *Ceremonial* is not, for the Reason already exhibited. The *Judicial* is no otherways binding, but in so far as immediately flowing from the *Law Moral*, and in so far as abstracted from the particular State and Circumstances of that Nation, to which it was primarily adapted. This satisfies the second and third Branch of the Query, *scil.* If the *Jewish Oeconomy and Laws*, binds not in what did not concern the Jews, as a distinct People, possessing the Promis'd Land, and living among Heathens, with whom they were forbidden Communication in most things. Or, 2ly, In what was abrogated by our Blessed Saviour himself, or by his Apostles. To which we say, 1. That, in both these Respects, the *Ceremonial Law* totally, and several *Judicial Laws*, are abrogated. Besides, these first Branches take not up the whole so exactly of what is abrogated; For, the *Tôles*, and Rules of the Government of that People must be consider'd, with an intire Respect to their State, in all Circumstances thereof, and so exceeds the Limits of that special Priviledge of enjoying the Promis'd Land, and such Laws as did forbid Communication in some things with Heathens. Moreover, this Abrogation must be consider'd, with an Adequat Respect to the New Testament Oeconomy, as it stands Describ'd and Delineated in Scripture, and as pointing out the N. Testament Church, standing under, and tied to that Dispensation, and as wholly opposite unto, and exclusive of the intire Model of all the *Ceremonial Law*, and also these Rules and Laws respecting the *Taxis*, and Order establish'd among them, as a Nation peculiarly

* Thus Turretin, *Instit. Theol. Elen. Part. 2. Quæst. 1. 2. Profess. Leid. Diss. 10. Dissus. Sedanens. Pag. 240. & seqq 268, 273, &c. with our Divines generally.*

thus govern'd by God, in the whole of its Constitution, Civil as well as Ecclesiastick: as a Church. Moreover, as to what was abrogated by our Saviour and his Apostles, we say, That, as the Apostle declares. (*Heb. 7. 11, 12.* and elsewhere) the Jewish Priesthood, and, consequently, all Rules respecting it, to be chang'd and abrogated; so the Apostles, enjoying Obedience to all Lawful and Civil Ordinances of Various Nations diversly thus Moulded, where Churches were then, or thereafter to be establish'd, have fully declared, that the Christian Church is loos'd from that particular *Taxis* and Mould of the Judicial Laws given by God to the Jewish Nation, unless in so far as they immediately flow from, and are necessarily connected with the Law Moral, which is universally binding, as is said. Our Querist asks, *If we are not allow'd to argue from their Constitution to ours, how comes the Decalogue to be binding, and to be a Law to us, and many things of their Law, particularly the 20th. Chap. of Levit. which regulates the Cases of Marriage, forbidding all within certain Degrees of Consanguinity and Affinity to be Married together?* To this the Answer is easie from what is said, that the Law Moral is still binding, and whatever is properly and immediately reduceable thereunto, and, consequently, that in the Instance premis'd, which is of this Nature.

But, to set this in a clearer Light, I will offer to our Querist somewhat of the Sentiments of Protestant Divines upon this Head, to which he appears much, if not wholly, a Stranger. 'Tis then to be observ'd and consider'd, that the Foundation of all Laws of God, given to his Creatures, is his Fundamental Right over them; and this is Twofold: First, There is a *Jus* or Right *Dominii*, *scil.* of Possessing, Disposing and Using them as their Proprietor, according to his Holy Pleasure; This flows necessarily from the Absolute Sovereignty and Essential Holiness of God: Again, there is a *Right* or *Jus*, call'd *Regiminis* or of Government, respecting Rational Creatures, whose Absolute and Supreme Legislator God is; and this has a special Relation to his giving of Laws, and his Judgment thereupon: This, again, is either *Natural* or *Positive*; That Right which is Natural and Essential, is such, whereby God cannot prescribe Duties to Rational Creatures, whereof the Opposite would imply a Contradiction, or somewhat Opposite unto his Essential Holiness; the Reason is, because they are not simply or absolutely founded upon the free Actings of the Divine Will, but have their Foundation in the Essential Perfection, Sovereignty and Holiness of the Divine Nature. The *Law Positive* is that, whereby God, from his free and meer Pleasure, has prescribed such Duties, enacted such

Laws,

Laws, as he could have not prescrib'd and enact'd, and whereof he had Power to have prescrib'd the Opposite, or not to have prescrib'd the same, in that which is call'd *the Antecedent Sign of Reason*, without any prejudice of, or wronging his Infinite Perfection and Holiness, or Hazard of Contradiction in the thing it self. Besides his Divine Natural Uncreated Right, which is call'd *Primary*, as founded on the Nature and Holiness of God, there is another Right, which is call'd Created or *Secondary*, as being founded on the Nature of things themselves, according to the Constitution and Appointment made by God, and the Decent Harmony of things, consider'd in their Mutual Relation to each other, which, tho' necessary upon Hypothesis of this Constitution, yet, notwithstanding, is not of the same *Primary Necessity* with the first, neither have the Duties flowing therefrom an Obligation of the same Degree, the first being Immutable, and such as God could not dispence with the Obligation thereof; Thus he could never command nor dispence with the Hatred of himself, Idolatry, Perjury, Lying: The other, tho' it contain a Natural Rule of Rectitude, yet, because supposing such a certain State of Things, it is capable of Alteration in certain Cases; upon Alteration of Matters themselves, of Persons, or Circumstances; such as, the Killing of a Man, the taking of that which belongs to another, forbidden in the sixth and eight Commands; which, upon Change of Circumstances, may become Lawful, upon Warrant of a Divine Command interpos'd. Some things therefore, in the *Law Moral*, are simply Immutable, and that both in respect of God and our selves; some things, again, in respect of us, are indispensable, not in respect of God, who, as Supreme Legislator, may, in some Cases, dispence with his Law *.

To apply this to the Instances adduc'd by our Querist, these *forbidden Marriages* belonging to the *Moral Law Positive*, and founded thereupon, are (as all things of the like Nature) still binding and obliging under the New Testament Dispensation. Our Querist's Denial of this, because allowed to the Children of Adam, is foolish; for then, according to the Distinction exhibited, there was no such State and Condition of the things themselves, as was needful to found this *Positive Law*, which, therefore, not having a Being, there could be no Transgression of it. And, as for the contrary Practice of the Patriarchs (after objected by him), whether we suppose their Ignorance of the Law, I mean that respecting Polygamy,

* Thus the Learned
Turretin Profess.
Leid. Diss. 18. de
Lege Wendel.
Syst. Maj. pag. 1459,
1460, &c. Mus-
cul. Loc. Com. Pag.
254, 255, &c.
Chamier Lib. 15.
C. 12. Lib. 23.
C. 3. Tom 3. with
many others upon
this Subject.

as to God's first Institution of Marriage, or an Invincible Ignorance of the after Rules, spoken of *Levit. 20.* or plead, with others, God's Dispensing with his own *Positive Law* in such Circumstances; in either Case, the Moral Binding Force of the Precept it self, and the Rules after-mention'd, is no whit Impeach'd or Infring'd. But, to argue from the Binding Force of the Decalogue, to the Obligation or Standing Force of the Jewish Oeconomy, is so palpably absurd, that, besides what is offered, nothing needs to be further added. For what he after adds in his Query, it is not worth the noticing : His asserting, without any Restriction, *That Moral Laws are such, as God dispenseth not with,* discovers his Ignorance of the premis'd Protestant Doctrine on this Head. The same may be said of what he cites from *Mat. 5. 17.* *Our Lord's coming not to destroy the Law, but to fulfil it,* and that our Righteousness must exceed that of Scribes and Pharisees, who sate in *Moses's Chair*, and of our Saviour's raising even the Moral Law to a Higher Pitch, than the Jews thought of : For, as 'tis certain, that the *Moral Law*, as such, is still binding, so that *Higher Pitch* he mentions, (if he rightly understand himself, or the Point) he cannot but acknowledge, must respect the Standing Spiritual Nature and Extent of the Law, which these Pharisees had mistaken and corrupted.

II. Query. *Whether it deserves not to be remarked, That, tho' the Jewish Church was very Corrupt, and Degenerate, not only in Practice, but also in its very Constitution and Fundamental Principles, yet, our Lord did not separate from their Communion, and commanded the People to observe what the Pharisees commanded, as their Lawful Rulers, sitting in Moses's Chair, and succeeding the Seventy Elders. He allow'd not the People to forsake their Communion for their Personal Faults, or Erroneous Doctrine.* I Answer, This Query hath no Conclusion or Inference to his Scope; And any Conclusion or Inference he can draw from it, will plead for a Non-Separation from the Church of Scotland, as now Constituted, and the Officers thereof, notwithstanding what Errors or Vices their Party impute to us. I shall not stand to Criticise upon his imputing to the Jewish Church, at that time, a *Corruption in its Constitution and Fundamental Principles*; but sure his Hypothesis makes the Conclusion premis'd the more forcible. If he plead this for Subjection to Prelates, we deny, either that they are the True Officers of this Church, or, where they have obtain'd Power and Interest in Government, that they sit in *Moses's Chair*, or have, as Prelates, a Lawful Succession to Apostles; whereof afterward. So that this Conclusion has no Connection with the premis'd Command of our Saviour.

III. Query.

III. *Querie.* Whether our Saviour's Ordaining Twelve Apostles, and Seventy Disciples of a lower Order answering exactly to the Jewish Sanhedrim, his adopting two Jewish Rites obtaining in that Church, tho' not appointed in the Law, viz. the Postcænium and Baptism to be the two Sacraments of his Church, will prove that he was not for altering whatever in the old Oeconomie was capable of being for advantage in the New? I Answer, 1. That the External Ordinances proper to that first Oeconomie are altered, and the New come in their place, has a full Scripture Testimony: They are called, *Shadows whereof Christ is the substance*, Collos. 2. 17. *A yoke which neither we nor our fathers were able to bear*, Acts 15. 10. *Weak and beggarly Elements*, Gal. 4. 9. *Rudiments of the world from which we are delivered if dead with Christ*, Collos. 2. 20. *The law given by Moses opposite to that grace and truth which came by Jesus Christ*, John 1. 17. *The ministrations of death in stones*, opposed to the *Ministration of the spirit and of life in the Gospel*, 2 Cor. 3. 7. 8. *Carnal ordinances impos'd until the time of Gospel Reformation*, Heb. 9. 10. *The Churches pedagogie and schoolmaster unto Christ*, Gal. 3. 24. That our Lord the true Melchisedeck, the offspring of Juda, of which Tribe Moses spake nothing of Priesthood, has instituted, as the only Priest of his Church, a new Ministry and Law, making a change of both Ministry and Law of the Old Testament Oeconomie, Heb. 7. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15. The Scripture also informs us, *That he has nailed to his Cross all that Hand-writing of these Ordinances*, Coloss. 2. 14. *That he has abelished the Law of Commandments as the Corner-stone, making of both Churches One*, Eph. 2. 15. 2ly, That our Lord imitated the number of the Twelve Tribes in chusing Twelve Apostles, and the number of the Sanhedrim, in the choice of the Seventy inferiour Disciples, is *gratis dictum*, which our Querist should prove, not assert without Proof. For 1. What end can any assign of this Imitation? Was the Christian Church, gathered through the World, to have Twelve distinct Tribes, with Twelve distinct Heads and Patriarchs, having a Collateral or Equal Power, such as were those of Israel, at least until the Government was actually established in the Tribe of Juda? Who will be bold to assert this? 2ly, That our Lord respected not the number of the Twelve Tribes in this Institution of the Apostles, is plain by addition of a Paul after the number of Twelve made up; and some will assert, of a Barnabas also. Again, as for the Seventy, the Querist cannot prove any such Samplar taken from the Sanhedrim, as he alledges: This Number was chosen for a transient Preparation, being sent two and two to places whither the Lord was to come, without any Institution of a Subordinat Ministry, in the Judgement of several of the Learned, whereof there appears no Footstep in the Sacred Text. Besides, what Mystery will our Querist find in the Lord's sending

ing them two and two? What Imitation was there of the Oeconomie in this Dual Number? I know there want not Fancies of Allusions here to *Moses and Aaron*, and the like: But the Reason appears Evident, *viz.* for their mutual Strengthening and Assistance in this Work. There are also other Fancies of Allusions in this number of the Seventy, *viz.* to the Seventy of *Jacob's* Family, *Gen.* 46. 27. the Seventy days mourning for him, *Gen.* 50. 3. the Seventy Palm Trees, *Numb.* 33. 9. the Seventy years Captivity, &c. But, leaving these Fancies, tho' it were granted, that the Seventy were an inferior standing Order to the Apostles; Why might they not be Evangelists, whose Office was to pass off with that of the Apostles themselves? which, if suppos'd, does quite overthrow the Scope of his Querie, and doth evince, that 'tis founded upon a meer begging of the Question. Again, 3ly, Our Querist will needs have the Inference to follow, *That what was useful in the Old Oeconomie is to be retain'd in the New.* Now, to make sense of this Inference from his deduc'd Instances, he must needs hold a standing Patriarchat of Twelve Apostles, a standing New Testament Sanhedrim, for the Church Catholick. But if none of these will follow, where is the Standing of this Piece of the Old Oeconomie, as useful in the New? If he say, he means distinct Orders of Officers, and Courts Subordinat to Bishops, then he contradicts himself, and looseth his Argument for retaining what is useful in the Old Oeconomie; for that stands upon the Institution of Twelve Apostles, by a Copy taken from the Twelve Tribes, and the Precise number of Seventy Disciples, according to the number of the Sanhedrim, which he makes Seventy: So that, his hiding himself, when pursued, in this general Conclusion of distinct Orders and Officers, proves him a very faint and unsound Disputer. 4ly, Upon supposition, that both Offices of Apostles and Evangelists are ceas'd, which is fully prov'd by our Divines, by Arguments to which he can make no Answer, this Retention of such a Piece of the Old Oeconomie in the New, evanishes as Smoak before the Wind, and in supposing these Officers ordinary, he begs the Question. 5ly, Our Lord's ordaining Baptism and his Holy Supper, in Imitation of the Rites mentioned by him, and adopting them to be two Sacraments of the New Testament Church, is but a piece of our Querist's presumptuous Folly, and Antiscriptural boldness, whereof he neither doth, nor can offer any shadow of Proof from Scripture, even granting there were such Rites existent. Finally, Tho' all he seeks were granted, *viz.* our Lord's Imitation alledged in adopting of such Rites, how will he prove the same Authority in Men, or say the Church, to make such a Translation? Our Saviour, by his Supreme

Supreme Dominion over his Church, as her only Head and Lawgiver *, the Corner-stone of both Buildings, and of the Old and New Oeconomies †, in appointing, by his Sovereign Prerogative, the New Testament Ordinances, might Retain and Adopt thereunto whatever Pieces of the Old Oeconomie he thought fit : But who is that Man, that Church, yea, or Angel, that has this Authority ? So that whatever Adoptings or Translations of this nature he may be supposed to have made, must stand, and that upon the Sole Ground of his Sovereign Authority, and none must presume to add to his Testamentarie Prescriptions hereanent ||.

* Eph. 1. 22. with
4. 15. Col. 1. 18.
with 2. 19. Isa.
33. 22. Jam. 4.
12.

† Eph. 2. 20, 21.
1 Pet. 2. 6.

|| Gal. 3. 15.

IV. *Querie, If it be Lawful to argue from the Old Constitution to the New, as the Apostle does in the Epistle to the Hebrews in many places, particularly as to the Gospel Ministry, Heb. 5. 4. I Answer, This Querie labours of Obscurity, to give it no worse name. If he mean such an absolute Arguing as tends to introduce every piece of that Oeconomie into the New, 1st. He contradicts himself, 2ly, The Author of that Epistle. 1. Himself; for he acknowledges, in the very next page, that the Jewish High-Priests supposed and included a Sovereign Precedency over the Church of the Jews, and is not imitable in the New Testament Dispensation, nor consequently valid to infer such a President over the Christian Church, because of the Speciality of one Temple, one Altar, at which only all Israel were to offer Sacrifices. 2ly, He contradicts the Apostle, who asserts Chap. 7. 12. That the Priesthood of the Old Testament Dispensation being changed, there is by necessary Consequence a change also of the Law, scil. The Ordinances respecting their Worship and Government. But if by [Arguing from the Old Constitution to the New] he means an Arguing, 1st, In that which is essential to Government in general; Or 2ly, Such Arguing as respects Church Government as such, or in esse talis, scil. That it depends in all the Substantials of it, upon Divine Institution, as God commanded Moses to imitate his Pattern on the Mount, in the whole Frame of the Tabernacle, Heb. 8. 5. This is easily admitted, and as the Instance he exhibites, Chap. 5. 4. No man takes this honour to himself, but he that is call'd of God as was Aaron, makes evident in the Point of Government.*

But our Querist from his distorted Sense of Heb. 5. 4. doth further infer, and inferring asks, *Whether the Citation Acts 1. 20. His Bishoprick let another take, proves not, that the Apostles were Bishops?* I must confess, that this Inference is so remote and subtile, that it passes my comprehension, and I suppose of any Man who has a sutable Exercise

cise of his Reason. The Apostle says, None must, without a lawful Calling, invade an Ecclesiastick Office, since *Aaron* was call'd of God to his Office; *Ergo*, the Citation *Acts* 1. 20. *His Bishoprick* (or Office, as the Episcopal Translators themselves render it in the Margin) *let another take*, proves the Apostles were Bishops, *scil.* in the Prelatical Sense of the Hierarchical Bishop intended by our Querist. The Man that Argues at this rate, may prove *quidlibet ex quolibet*. It will follow indeed, that the Apostles had a Lawful Office and Charge, to which they were called: But if he infer, that it was of the Episcopal Mould, such as he pleads for, I would ask him, whether *Aaron* had not such an Episcopacy, to which he was call'd of God, and whether that of the Apostles was of the same Nature? This last our Querist disowns, and therefore their Episcopacy must be restricted to the New Testament Oeconomie and Rules, or else he must say that all the parts of that Oeconomie are introducible into the New, which, as is above touch'd, he afterward disowns, however in this inconsistent with himself, as will also after appear. But shortly, to any that but reads that Text, 'tis evident, that in the Accomplishment of *David's* Prophecy anent *Judas*, the Apostle *Peter* pleads, that his Apostolick Office and Charge, or Apostolick Inspection, as the Term properly signifies, is to be given to another: But that the Apostolick Office, Episcopacy, or Episcopal Inspection, was properly and formally such as Prelats assume and plead for, is a Consequence utterly Remote from this Antecedent. Therefore his next Inquirie, *Why they are not succeeded by Bishops, if the Apostles were such, as well as by Presbyters and Deacons*, has a ready Answer, *scil.* The Apostolick Office containing Eminenter all Lawful Offices and Officers, who were according to Divine Warrant to succeed them, these Officers mention'd, do in their own Sphere, and for the proper Design of their Function, succeed them. But the Office of a Prelate, according to the Principles of our Episcopalians, has no Warrant in Scripture, but stands in Opposition to the Rules thereof in point of Church-Government.

For what he adds of *Luke's* making use of the Seventy, in his Translation of the Term; as the granting the Equivalencie of both Terms is nothing to the purpose, so he must be Advertis'd, that the Holy Pen-men of Scripture spoke *ὡς τοὶ ἑβδομήκοντες* *, *As they were carried by the Holy Ghost*, and therefore were not at their own Arbitriment or Disposal, to Use or not Use such or such Expressions or Phrases, and cannot, without a great Incongruity, be said to have borrowed or made use of the Phrases or Words of other Authors, to express

* 2 Pet. I. 21.

express what the Holy Ghost dictated unto them, seeing both Matter and Words are immediatly Divine, and, according to the premis'd Scripture, flowing from the Spirit's immediate Influence. Our Querist further asks, *Whether the History of the Election of Matthias to succeed Judas doth not shew, that the Apostles thought, that they ought and must be succeeded to as such?* I Answer Negatively, and offer this Reason. The History mentions, that in the Accomplishment of the Scripture-Prophecy, there was One to be Substituted to fill up Judas's Room as an Apostle, and to take part in the Apostolick Ministry, as such; but that, therefore, this Apostolick Office and Ministry was Ordinary, and to be Succeeded unto by standing Officers of the same nature, does no ways follow: Which I prove two ways, 1st. The Nature of the Office, as Delineated in Scripture, is such as can admit of no Succession, as all Orthodox Divines do assert against the Popish Pleadings, understanding still the Office in a proper formal Sense, as is said. 2^{ly}, In all the Apostles Labours and Doctrine, in reference to a Successive Standing Ministry (whereof afterward), there is not the least hint of a Succession of Apostles or Evangelists.

V. Querie, *Whether the Orders of Levites and Priests, having by God's appointment, Overseers called by the Seventy, Bishops, according to the New Testament Language, and these Overseers One over them, or an Arch-Bishop, besides Aaron, who was the Type of Christ, our High-Priest, does not make for Episcopacy in the Christian Church?* To this the Answer is Easie, and Negative, as is clear from what is above hinted. If we acknowledge the *Taxis* and special Frame of that Oeconomie to be remov'd, as Orthodox Divines do hold against the Popish Pleadings, according to the Apostles assertion, *Heb. 7. 12.* And 2^{ly}, if we acknowledge (as needs we must, unless we impeach our Saviour's Faithfulness paramount to that of Moses, according to the same Apostles assertion, *Heb. 3. 5, 6.*) a new Scheme and Frame of the New Testament-Ministry, depending upon our Lord's Special Appointment, 'tis this Pattern we must look unto, and not fetch our Measures from the Jewish Antiquated Oeconomie.

But our Querist moves to himself an Objection, *That this is a Popish Argument, and by Parity of Reason will plead for one chief Bishop or Pope over the Christian Church, seeing the Jews had but one High-Priest.* To which he Answers, *That under the Law there was one Temple and Altar, and it was not lawful to offer upon any other than on that Altar, and in that place which God did chuse, which makes that Nation but one Province, so that the utmost this can infer is, that every National Christian Church ought to have a Metropolitan or Arch-Bishop, to whom the rest of the Bishops and Clergy ought*

to be in some Subjection, and he to continue their Superiour for Life. The Unserviceableness of which Answer several ways appears. 1. He absurdly asserts that this was Properly, or Solely, the Reason, why there was but one High Priest or President set over that Church. For 1. The Author of the Epistle to the Hebrews can shew him, in his many Comparisons, (which our Querist should have heeded better) that the Typical Nature and Actings of his Office, his Special Ministries Representing our Saviour's Priesthood, were the proper Grounds

* See Chap. 7, 8 9. of our Lord's appointment of this Sacred Function *.

Let the special Privileges of Aaron, the Typical Shadowing Nature of his Priestly Ornaments peculiar to him, as expounded by Protestant Divines, his Mitre, his Crown, his Pectoral, his Sacred Girdle, his Yearly Entering into the Holiest with Blood and Incense, and such like, be considered, and this will be evident beyond Exception. 2ly, Suppose there had been no such President with such Privileges, but there had been a College of Priests upon an equal Level, yet this could not have been inconsistent with God's appointment of One Temple and Altar for Sacrifices, as he cannot but know, the ordinary Priests stood obliged, by God's Command, to perform these Sacrifices at that One Temple and Altar; so that, what Privileges were peculiar to the High-Priest, were properly Typical, and did not flow from this Ground; All the ordinary Sacrifices, Expiatory, Gratulatory, Censures, and Absolutions; as to Leprosie, and the like, were such as the Priests had equal Interest in.

But again, in the Second Place, how absurdly doth he make, upon this ground, the Jewish Church but one Province? A silly evasion, no doubt, from the force of this Objection. I had thought, that if ever there was a National Church fitly Represented, it was that of the Jewish Nation and Church; else David was mistaken, when he said, Psal. 147. 19, 20. He sheweth his Word unto Jacob, his Statutes and his Judgments unto Israel, he hath not dealt so with any Nation, and as for his Judgments they have not known them. And Moses when he told them, Deut. 4. 34. Hath God essayed to go and take him a Nation from the midst of another Nation, by Temptations, Signs, &c. Does he not, as the Mouth of the Lord, deliver this his Command and Promise, Exod. 19. 5, 6. Now therefore, if ye will obey my Voice indeed, and keep my Covenant, then ye shall be a peculiar Treasure unto me above all People, for all the Earth is mine, and ye shall be unto me A KINGDOM OF PRIESTS AND AN HOLY NATION. In which respect they were not to be Reckoned among the Nations, Numb. 23. 9. But were to dwell alone. Compared with Deut. 4. 7. What Nation is so great, who hath God so near unto them, as the Lord our God is in all things

things that we call upon him for. vers. 8. *And what Nation is there so great, that hath Statutes and Judgments so Righteous as all this Law which I set before you this day.* 2 Sam. 7. 23. *And what one Nation in the Earth is like thy people, even like Israel whom God went to redeem for a people to himself.* &c. vers. 24. *For thou hast confirmed to thy self thy people Israel to be a people unto thee for ever, and thou Lord art become their God.* Behold the Nation of the Jews frequently express'd as under a Church Relation, and in Covenant with God. If this Scripture Light will not convince our Querist, that they were a National Church properly so called, yea, the only Catholick Church at that time, I know not what will. So that, in despite of this poor Evasion, his Argument clearly pleads for a Chief Bishop or Pope over the Christian Church. To make which further clear, in the *Third Place*, upon this Supposition, that they were a National Church, as is above evinced, And 2ly, the only Catholick Church then upon Earth (which I suppose none, except this Querist, will deny), and had such a President over the same, I will thus inforce the Objection against him, *Scil.* That his Pleading will introduce a Papacy. *First*, The Church Catholick was thus govern'd under the Jewish Oeconomy by a Standing Supreme High-Priest; *Ergo*, So ought it to be still govern'd. The common Orthodox Answer taken from the Typical Nature of that Oeconomy, the Removal thereof under the Gospel, he cuts himself off from; For he holds, that our Saviour was not for Altering what was useful in that Oeconomy: And his Fellow Pleader, the Author of the Three Dialogues, having asserted a High-Priest distinct from the Typical, infers thus, *What better Order for governing the Christian Church than God's own Order, thus exemplified* *. And our Querist is in this express, *That there was one Supreme President over all the Overseers of the Priests, and not only over the Priests themselves, and this besides Aaron who only was the Type of Christ.* So that he clearly joyns with his Fellow in this Antecedent and Consequence. And we may add a third, Dr. Monro, who expressly affirms †, *That the Taxis and Order of that Oeconomy was never abrogated, but stands under the New Testament.* So that, in despite of all Contradiction, our three Episcopal Pleaders are joint Harmonious Proctors for a Papacy. 2ly, The Church being such a Body as all the Parts thereof partake of the Nature of the whole, and, in particular, Organick Churches, the Nature of the Church Catholick, and these Arches above Arches, with the Supereminent Arch over all, belonging (according to our Querist) to the necessary Taxis and Structure of the Church as such, as is evident from the Structure of his Pleading, it necessarily

* See Differences of the Times, about page 60.

† Inquire into the new Opinions, page 27.

cessarily follows, that, remove what was Typical, the Order it self stands. For he will not deny, that the Supreme President, whom he distinguisheth from the Typical, belong'd to the *Taxis* and Order of that Church, as a Necessary and Essential Part thereof, yea, and that in the Capacity of a Church, and, moreover, as God's only Church then upon Earth. 3^{ly}, He judges the High-Priest's Office Exemplified in that of Apostles (how consistently, I shall not now Debate). All do know, and this Gentleman will not disown it, that they had an Universal Infallible Official Inspection over the Catholick Church: For, as for what he after asserts, anent their Concerted Measures of Exercise, it doth no whit Impeach their Essential Radical Authority over the whole Church, as having an Immediate Relation, *Abu Secundo*, thereunto. Now, when the Apostle *John* surviv'd so long all the rest, cloath'd with this Authority, here was clearly Exemplified, in his Principles, the High-Priest's Supremacy over the Church. Again, 4^{ly}, He says, *That this will plead for a Primacy over every National Church.* Hence, 1st, He must acknowledge, his Answer to the Objection is naught, and inconsistent with it self, since thus he removes the Ground of it; for he assigns this Reason, wherefore one President was set over the Church of the Jews, *viz. That they were tied to One Altar and Sacrifice, to One Temple, or Place of Solemn Worship*; but, sure, he will not adventure to say, that every National Church is thus tied to *One Altar and Sacrifice, to One Temple and Place of Solemn Worship*: So that, if his Ground hold good, this will no more plead for a President over the National Church, than over the Universal. 2^{ly}, He says, *This Ground made that Nation but a Province.* This is odd, a Nation taken into God's Covenant, intirely form'd into a Church, having its Model of Government and Worship prescrib'd by him, yea, and in this distinguish'd expressly from all Nations of the World, as God's Only Church then existent, as is above evinc'd; yet this Nation become but a Provincial Church. I wonder, how this Gentleman will define a National Church, as distinct from a Province; or if he thinks, that the National Church of *England* has not Subordinat Provincial Churches, or Diocesses, standing in relation to that National Church; and if so, to what Superior Church, had the Jewish Provincial Church such a Relation? 3^{ly}, What will he say, in such a Providential Case, which is not impossible, that an Emperour's Power and Authority should be extended over all the Church Visible? Now, if his Measure of a Nation's being under One Civil Head and Governour, or many Provinces, in this respect, Coalescing into One Nation, must infer, and regulat this Supreme President or Metropolitan; here is a clear

Foun-

Foundation for a Papacy in his Principles. Finally, he asserts, *That this Ground of the High-Priest's Presidency, will plead for a National Metropolitan, yea, and to continue for Life*: And if so, why not, I pray, for an Hereditary also, and in one Family, since this is as well Exemplified in the High-Priest, as the other? And his Ground seems to admit no Disparity; he knows the Maxim, *A quatenus ad omne valet Consequencia*. If this must follow, because Exemplified in the High-Priest, and is not abolish'd as Typical, but belonging to the *Taxis* of a Provincial Church, or, if he will call it, National; so must the other, which equally belong'd to the *Taxis* of that Church: Nor will he be able to show, why the fixing the Priesthood to one Family was Typical, and not also the Continuance of his Superiority during Life, which, he must acknowledge, did some way point out our Saviour's Eternal Unchangeable Priesthood; So that, of necessity, he must either exclude or include both. 2ly, His unrestricted Assertion of this President of the Provincial Church his Absolute Continuance during Life, cannot but sadly grate the Ear of the Intelligent. What if he be Scandalous, turn Schismatick, Heretick, commit Treason, and so run such a Risk as *Abiathar* did, who was banish'd for his Treason, and another put in his place; or, must he be such a Pope, as, *durante vita*, stands upon an Infallible, and thus Uncontroulable *Basis*? Here it cannot be omitted, how inconsistently, having made the Ancient Jewish Church but a Province, as a Church, he after makes his Inference from this Presidency of the High-Priest, to support the Conclusion of the *Taxis*, and Frame of a *National Church*, with Subordinate Provinces. But sure, in point of this Continuance especially, he will not make one and the same, the State and Privilege of the President of every Provincial Church, Subordinate to a National, with that of the National President himself, else he will run into a palpable Contradiction, and raze the Foundation of his Arguing. 'Tis further observable, that the Author of the Three Dialogues *, makes "the Argument for
'a Supreme President, to have stronger Force under
'the New Testament, because of the *Larger Extension*
'thereof, and the Danger of Schisms, and the Necessity
'of preventing them the greater: And what better way for this, *saitb*
'he, than God's way, thus exemplarily pointed out to us? and, in so far, justling with our Querist.

*See Differences of the Times, ubi supra.

For these Subordinations of Priests and Levites mention'd in the rest of this Query, 'tis sufficiently obviated by what is said above: I therefore only add, that, 1. This Variety, or Subordination of Presidents, had a necessary Connection with the Frame of their Worship in Vari-

ous Sanctuary Offices: For this I will offer to him Bishop *Bilson's* Information, [*Perpetual Government, Chap. 7.*] who shews, "That the Offices of the Sanctuary, the Rites and Ceremonies of Sacrifices, from which all the other Tribes, except the Levites, were restrain'd, were not of one kind; so that it needs be no wonder, that these Degrees of Administrators were distinguish'd, according to the Diversity of Offices and Services. But, in the Church of Christ, the Word and Sacraments, Concredited to all *Ministers* without Distinction (Mr. Querist, I hope, will not Censure him, for not calling them *Priests*), "as they are of one kind, neither admit any Difference of Administration or Celebration, so neither do they require different Degrees of Ministers. 2ly, It cannot be made appear, that the High-Priest, or any Inferiour Priests, had a Prelatical Pre-eminence in Judicatories, or a Negative over others in Ecclesiastick Judgments. *Junius [de Clericis, C. 24. Note 13.]* shews, "That, among the Priests, there was alike Participation of Honour and power, tho' in a different Order, partly in respect of Families, partly in respect of Times, the Ordinary Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction belong'd to the Assembly of the Priests, according to the Law. But we need not stand upon a Critical Inquiry into the Nature and Degrees of these Offices, 'tis a sufficient Answer, that that Fabrick is taken down, and so declar'd by the Apostle, and a Gospel Oeconomy and Ministry erected by our Saviour in its place. Our Querist, to make this Argument the stronger, has an Observe in the close of this Query, which quite ruins it, telling us, That these Overseers of Priests, Nehem. 11. 14, 22. are call'd by the Seventy, Bishops, and that the English Translators make use of the Synonymous Word for Bishops, Act: 20. 28. And to satisfy him in this, I tell him, that we heartily accept of all such Overseers and Bishops, as the Apostle there designs, this Name, with the thing consequently therein imported, being appropriated to the Elders or Ministers (not Priests) of the Church of *Epheſus*, when *Paul* gave them his last Charge of Exercising a Joint Episcopal Inspection over that Church, as Officers thereof, without the least Hint of a Superintending Arch or Bishop over them, nor of any Interest *Timothy* had over them in this Point, tho' then present.

VI. Query, Whether the Word *Sacerdos*, or Priest, may not be fitly apply'd to the Ministers under the Gospel, since the Aversion of many to that Word is chiefly from a Mistake, as if the Priest's Office consisted only in Off ring Sacrifices; whereas, in the first Institution of the Levitical Priesthood, Deut. 10. 8. there is no mention of Sacrifice, but only, that they were to stand before the Lord to Minister unto him, and to Bless in his Name, so that Sacrificing was no other way an Essential Part of the Legal Priest's Office, than Sacrifice was an Essential

Essential part of the Jewish Worship. To the Query it self I Answer Negatively, That this Epithet is not fitly apply'd to Ministers of the Gospel. And the first Reason I offer, shall be the Antithesis of the Reason he offers for it, *viz.* That the Term has properly a Relation to a Sacrifice and Offering, which, in the New Testament Oeconomy, is ceas'd, Christ's Offering having put an end to all Offerings and Sacrifices, consequently to Ministerial Priesthood. This Answer our Querist acknowledges to be that of many of the Reform'd Churches, yet is bold to call it a Mistake, as if the Priest's Office consisted only in *Offering Sacrifices*. But what if it consisted mainly, tho' not only, our Reason holds good, tho' it were granted, they had other Subservient Offices. He tells us, *That, in the first Institution of Levitical Priesthood, Deut. 10. 8. there's no mention of Sacrifices, but of their Standing before the Lord, to Minister and Bless in his Name.* But here I must inform him, That, 1. He mistakes the Order of Priesthood, when drawing the Institution thereof, properly and formally consider'd, from that place parallel with *Numb. 3. 16, &c.* with *Ch. 1. 49, 50, 51, &c.* where the whole Tribe was, in a general Sense, assum'd unto the Service of the Tabernacle, or Sacred Ministry, and (as *Numb. 3. 6.*) they were to be presented before *Aaron* the Priest, that they might Minister unto him, whose special Priesthood, consequently, is distinguish'd from this their general Office and Service. But for the proper Institution of the Priesthood, we must look to *Exod. 28:* where we find, that after God has describ'd, in the preceeding *Chap.* in order to the Levitical Worship, the Altar for Sacrifices, with the other Utensils thereof; in this *Chap.* *Aaron* is call'd to the Priesthood, to Minister unto God in that Office, his Garments, and his Sons Garments describ'd, wherein they were to be Consecrated, that they might Minister in this Sacred Priestly Office. *Chap. 29.* After an Account of *Aaron's* Inauguration with Sacrifices, pointing at the great Duties of his Sacerdotal Office, *v. 38.* The Ordinance is set down for the continual Burnt-Offering, as the Great and Special Duty of his Priestly Administration. *2ly.* In that Passage cited by our Querist, which respects the General Ministration of all the Levites, 'tis no strange thing, that these Offices, there mention'd, have no Relation to Sacrificing express'd, to which none, but the Priests, were admitted; these Offices of the Levites being of an Inferiour Nature, competent to them, with respect to the Tabernacle and Ark, and such like Services. And, as for the Blessing in the Lord's Name, *Psalm*, upon the place, shews, That the pronouncing of the Solemn Blessing of God upon the Congregation, which was done in God's Name, was a Work peculiar to the priests, not common to all the Levites,

vites, as is clear, *Levit.* 9. 23. *Numb.* 6. 23. And therefore understands it more generally, with respect to *Blessing*, *scil.* either God, in praising of him, which was a part of their Work, *1 Chron.* 16. Or, 2ly, The People, whom they did Bless, by Performance of those Holy Ministations, &c.

2ly, In innumerable places we find the *Priesthood and Sacrifices* conjoin'd, and the Relation of each to other asserted. See, amongst many others, *Lev.* 1. 5, 7, 8, 15. *Cb.* 2. 2, 8, 9, 16. *Cb.* 4. 1, 2, 14, 19, 20, 23, 24. *Cb.* 17. 6, 7. *Deut.* 20. 2. and 26. 3, 4. &c. But, most of all, we find the Apostle, in the Epistle to the Hebrews, conjoining them as *Correlates*; he shews, that every Priest must have somewhat to Offer, *Heb.* 5. 1. Every High-Priest taken from among Men, is ordain'd for Men in things pertaining to God, that he may Offer both Gifts and Sacrifices for Sins, *Heb.* 10. 11. Every Priest standeth daily Ministering, and Offering oftentimes the same Sacrifices. *Heb.* 8. 3. He tells us, Every High-Priest is ordain'd to Offer Gifts and Sacrifices; tho' Offering, simply considered, was not peculiar to the High-Priest, as is of it self evident, and, in the preceeding Text asserted; and the Apostle tells us, *v.* 4. of this 8. Chap. That they are Priests that Offer Gifts (consequently Sacrifices) according to the Law; Gifts and Sacrifices, in this Point of Offering, being expressly conjoin'd, *vers.* preceed. Upon which the Apostle infers, That, of necessity, our Bless'd Lord must have had somewhat also to Offer, clearly holding out, that else he could not be a Priest, nor Answer the Typical Priesthood in his Office. And *Cb.* 9. 6, the Apostle shews, That the Priests went into the first Tabernacle, accomplishing the Service, *scil.* the Great Duty of Sacrificing, in the 7. *v.* But, into the second, the High-Priest, not without Blood, which he Offered for himself, and the Errors of the People, and *v.* 9. he tells us, These Sacrifices were a Figure for the time then present. And the 15. *v.* he shews, That Christ, the Mediator of the New Testament, has taken these Offerings, and, consequently, that Priesthood, away.

A Third Reason I offer is this, we find indeed the whole Church of the Godly call'd a Holy Priesthood*, to offer up Spiritual Sacrifices, but we never find the Holy Ghost putting the Denomination and Character of Priests upon the New Testament Church Officers in all the New Testament Writings, when speaking either of Ordinary or Extraordinary Officers. We read of Apostles, Prophets, Evangelists, Ministers, Elders, Deacons, Stewards, Ambassadors, Rulers, and the like; Paul saith, So let a Man account of us as Ministers of Christ, *1 Cor.* 4. 1. And again, We are Ambassadors for Christ, *2 Cor.* 5. 20, &c. Why then shall we leave the Holy Ghost's Designations, and take an Old Testament Epithet, which

* *1 Pet.* 2. 9.
Rev. 1. 6.

which he never us'd in the New Testament Writings, and Descriptions of the Ministry thereof. This Gentleman talks of our Lord's Adopting what was useful in the Jewish Oeconomy ; Why then did neither he, nor his Apostles, Adopt this Title among the many Epithets given to the New Testament Officers ? He certainly knew best, what Epithets were proper for them.

4^{ly}, This Title and Epithet is disown'd by most, if not all, Protestant Divines, which might be cleared in a Multiplicity of Instances ; but, since our Querist acknowledges it, we need not stand upon it *.

5^{ly}, The Argument, *a Scandalo*, will plead for the Disuse of this Name, the Name and Thing being so grossly abus'd in the Popish Church. God commanded his People to abstain from many *Adiaphorous* Practices, upon this very Ground, of a Scandalous Likeness to Heathens, and lest Homologating them in such Practices might draw on a Conformity in more Weighty Matters. Hence flow'd the Command of *not Rounding the Corners of their Beard and Head*, Lev. 19. 27. and 21. 5. *Wearing a Garment of Linen and Woollen*, Lev. 19. 19. *Of not Sowing with Mixed Seeds*, Ibid. *And Plowing with Ox and Ass*, Deut. 22. 10. And several such like. In the New Testament, we are commanded to do nothing, whereby our Brother Stumbles, is Offended, or made Weak, Rom. 14. 21. *To give no Offence to Jew or Greek, or to the Church of God*, 1 Cor. 10. 32. *To abstain from every Appearance of Evil*, 1 Thes. 5. 22. *To hate even the Garment spotted with the Flesh*, Jude 23. Why then shall we Homologat and Harden Papists, by such a Practice as this Denomination will import ?

Our Querist acknowledges, *That Sacrificing was no other ways an Essential Part of the Priest's Office under the Law, than Sacrifice was an Essential Part of the Jewish Worship*. Thus he yields the Cause : For, if this was the Essential Part of the Jewish Worship, and this an Essential Part of their Office, then both must stand or fall together, as Correlates ; the Essential Part of their Office being gone, so must the Office it self, and, consequently, the appropriated Designation thereof must be obsolete ; else he must say, that the Office and proper Denomination may stand, tho' the Essential Part of it is remov'd.

He tells us, *That the Office importing a Mids-Man to stand betwixt God and the People, and Seal the Covenant, it includes all manner of Worship, which God may alter, yet the Office of Priesthood stands, as the Office of an Ambassador, who may receive fresh Instructions*. I Answer, The Office of a Priest, made use of in the Old Testament, and Denominating Officers thereof (for

* See Whittaker de Pont. Romi Quest. 1. C. 2. Stillingfleet's Iren. Part 2. C. 6. § 17. Sutlivius de Pont. Lib. 1. C. 8. Rivetus Censol. Orthod. Quest. 22. Pag. 281

is that about which our Question is) imports indeed a Mids-Man to Seal the Covenant, and Administer God's Ordinances, but with a special respect to the then Instituted Ordinances. This he must needs acknowledge, or contradict himself, in asserting the Offering of Sacrifice to be an *Essential Part of their Office*. And whereas he saith, it was no other way an *Essential Part of their Office under the Law, than that Sacrifice was an Essential Part of the Jewish Worship*: I Answer, neither were they Priests any other ways, but with a special respect to that Worship; and, in asserting, *That the Term has a respect to all manner of Worship which God shall appoint*, he begs the Question, and contradicts the special respect to that Worship which he acknowledges. His Similitude of the *Ambassador* will only plead for this, that there may be a standing Ministry under Various Dispensations of the Covenant, but halts in our Case; for, not only the Ordinances and Instructions are changed; but the Nature of the Office and Embassy it self, as having a special Relation to these Antiquated Ordinances and Instructions. We have made good, that the Ancient Jewish Oeconomy is altered, and, by necessary Consequence, the Nature of the Embassy, as essentially connected therewith. But our Querist tells us further, *That Melchisedec was a Type of Christ, yet Offered no Sacrifices*. I Answer, the Apostle's Scope, in the comparing of our Lord with his Type *Melchisedec*, is mainly to shew the Eternity of his Priesthood, which passes not from one to another; so that he takes away all Subordinate Successive Minist'ring New Testament Priests, in Correspondence to, and in Consequence of the Removal of the Antiquated Legal Sacrifices; which he largely asserts and proves: So that our Querist did not well to raise this Ghost; For, his holding a Subordinat New Testament Priesthood derived from Christ, strikes at, and impeacheth the Apostle's Reasoning and Scope, *viz.* That Christ is the Sole Eternal New Testament Priest, whose Priesthood admits of no Subservient Under-Priests; this being that wherein the Apostle especially places the Similitude betwixt *Christ and Melchisedec*, whose Priesthood, in the Old Testament Accounts, is represented as a continuing Priesthood, abiding still the same, and admitting no Substitutes or Successors. Again, the Apostle argues from the Conjunction of the Kingly and Priestly Office of *Melchisedec*, to point at and illustrate Christ's Extraordinary and Unparallel'd Priesthood, and strengthen the premis'd Conclusion.

As for what our Querist adds of the Sacrifice, *and that no Protestant Author affirms Melchisedec to have Offered, tho' Papists generally affirm it*; He shews himself sadly Ignorant of the Protestant Doctrine, and Controversie with Papists in this Point. Protestant Divines do, indeed, dis-

own his Offering a *Sacrifice* in that Action of his, of bringing Bread and Wine to Abraham, which they plead to patronize their *Mals Sacrifice*, and Sacrificing *Mals-Priests*, there being no Hint of this in the Text; but no Protestant ever disown'd, that *Melchisedeck's Office*, as a Priest, had a respect to Sacrificing, else he could not have been a Priest, since our Querist will acknowledge, that, under the first Dispensation of the Covenant, this was an Essential Part of the Priestly Office. 'Tis true, he calls Sacrificing, *a part of the Jewish Worship*; but he cannot deny, that there were Priests and Sacrifices, before that fix'd Institution in the Jewish Oeconomy: Nay, thus he breaks the Force of the Apostle's Argument, from *Melchisedeck's Priesthood* and Sacrifice to Christ's. But, saith our Querist, *Christ is a Priest for ever, and what Sacrifice hath he to Offer?* I Answer, he has Offered himself, and his Eternal Intercession upon his Offering, and its Eternal Merits speak him out an Eternal Priest, with an Eternal Sacrifice, in respect of its Efficacy; and, in this, the Apostle placeth the Excellency of his Sacrifice beyond the Legal, proving thus, that he was no Legal Priest, nor could be a Priest, if still upon Earth*: So that his Priesthood, according to the A- * Heb. 8. 4. postle, excludes all Suffragan Offering Priests.

But, saith our Querist (expressing herein his Popish Tincture), *If, upon Ground of his Intercession, on Account of that Sacrifice, our Saviour be a Priest, how can this Office of Priesthood be deny'd to the Celebration of the Sacrifice of the Holy Supper, and the Intercession made by his Priests upon that Account?* I Answer, upon the contrary, how can this be admitted? For, if Christ's Priesthood be Eternal, and such as can pass to no Suffragan, both in respect of his Offering and Intercession, both which are declar'd so to be by the Apostle; then, in the Holy Supper, there can be no true and proper Sacrifice, and, consequently, Priests in the Administration. 'Tis true, there is a Sacrifice of Praise, and a Ministerial Administration of those Symbols of that One Sacrifice, but that, upon either Account, there is, in this Administration, a Sacrifice respecting a Priesthood, is cross to the Apostle's premis'd Account of our Saviour's Priesthood and Sacrifice, and disown'd by all Protestant Churches, in Opposition to the Popish Adversary. As for Ministerial Intercessions or Prayers, who knows not, that all Divines do hold them, *totò genere*, different from our Saviour's Intercession: So that, by no imaginable Ground, can Ministers, upon this Celebration, come under the Denomination of either Priests or Sacrificers.

But saith our Querist, *It cannot be deny'd, there are Sacrifices under the Gospel, and he desires his Adversarie, who doubts of this, to read 1 Pet. 2. 5. Heb. 13. 10, 15, 16. Rom. 12. 1. yea, and an Altar too, Heb. 13. 1.* I Answer, It cannot be deny'd, that these Sacrifices are offered, and injoynd to be offered by all the true Members of the Church, who are declar'd all Priests, and a Holy Priesthood, by the Apostle Peter, in the place cited by him; all who are injoynd to go forth to our Blessed Lord by Faith without the Camp, are injoynd to offer these Sacrifices, *Heb. 13. 13, 15.* Now, Mr. Querist, here are *Priests* and *Sacrificers*, but where are the *Correlat*, the people to whom this Priestly Office is performed? Where is a standing distinct Official Priesthood with Sacrifices to be offered for the People? Let me improve a little these Texts. If the New Testament Priesthood and Sacrifices be the Duty and Privilege of all God's Church, then there is no Official Distinct Priesthood for offering New Testament Sacrifices under the Gospel Dispensation: But so it is, that the New Testament Priesthood and Sacrifices are the Duty and Privilege of all God's Church, or true Members thereof; Therefore, there is no Official distinct Priesthood, for offering New Testament Sacrifices under the Gospel Dispensation. Again, in that Text of *Heb. 13. 10.* The Apostle holds out Christ to be the only Altar of the Christian Church, sanctifying all the Gifts of the People of God, to which (let our Querist remark this) all outward Sacrificers have no Right, and, *The Sacrifices laid upon this Altar are the Fruit of our Lips, or Charity and Good Works, v. 15, 16.* This I hope our Querist will acknowledge to be proper to all the true Church of God, who (as is said in the former case) are in this respect all Priests and Sacrificers; And, in that place, *Rom. 12. 1. 'Tis our reasonable service we offer,* and which all are exhorted to. Since therefore this respects the general Duty and Privilege of all Christians, it can found no Argument for Official Priests and Sacrificers, as is said.

Our Querist adds, *That Isaiah calls the Ministers of the Gospel Priests, Chap. 66. 21. (in the Pamphlet printed chap. 67. which I do not find marked among the Errata) and so doth Jeremiah, chap. 33. 18. Prophecy- ing of the times of the Gospel. I Answer, As he calls them Priests, Prophe- sying of these times, so he likewise prophesies, That from one Moon to ano- ther, and from one Sabbath to another in the Gospel-times, they shall come to worship before the Lord, and in that place in Jeremiah, the Prophet shews that these Priests, the Levites shall not want a Man to offer burnt offerings before the Lord, and to kindle meat-offerings, and to do sacrifice continually.* I would ask the Querist, whether both Prophets do apply these Festivi- ties and Offerings to the Gospel-times, Yea, or Not, and assert the Ex-
istence

istence and Observance thereof under the Gospel Oeconomie, and do not rather express the Gospel Worship and Ministry, with Allusion to the Worship and Ministry then existent? If he assert the first, he doth palpably Judaize, and expose himself to the hissing of all Men of Sense, and assert that the Christian Churches must observe all the Jewish Festivities and Sacrifices in the Literal Sense, and make the Prophecie of *Zecchariah* formidable to all the Churches, *chap. 14.* who having prophesied, *v. 16.* *That the Nations shall go up from year to year, to worship the King the Lord of Hosts, and to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.* Addeth verse 17. *It shall be that whoso will not come up of all the Families of the Earth unto Jerusalem, to worship the King the Lord of Hosts, even upon them shall be no rain.* Doubling the Threatning again and again, verses 18, 19. *Upon such as come not up to keep the Feast of Tabernacles.* If he imbrace the second part of the Answer, as needs he must, *viz.* That there is here only an Allusion to that Worship and Ministry, then he loses his Argument for New Testament Priests in a proper Sense drawn from this Allusion.

I will not trouble our Querist with further Inquiry anent the Sense of that Passage, *Rev. 1. 6.* *That Believers are not only made priests, but likewise Kings, yea, and are asserted to be a Royal Priesthood, in 1 Pet. 2. 5.* cited by him; and whether this will infer the suitableness of the Denomination of Kings to Believers, in the common Literal Sense, and that the Christian Church must have such Official Kings. But of this enough. Come we then to the next Query, wherein we will find our Gentleman Querist still fencing for this Denomination. I only add, for what he touches of *Cyprian* and the Ancients retaining this Term, that, whatever Charitable Construction may be put upon their Sense, yet the horrid Abuse of the Popish Church instanced, doth sufficiently, together with what is said, evince the Unexpediency and Unsuitableness of that Retention of the Term he pleads for.

'Tis to this purpose considerable, which *Stillingfleet* has*, who, Censuring the common Mistake of Gospel Ministers Succession, by way of Correspondence and Analogy to the Priests under the Law, shews, that this has been the Foundation and Original of many Errors, that when, in the Primitive Church, the Name of Priests came to be attributed to Gospel Ministers, by way of Analogy and Accommodation, in Process of Time, Corruptions increasing in the Church, the Metaphorical Names of Priests and Altars, at last, brought in the Things themselves primarily intended by those Names, *viz.* *The Sacrifice of the Mass*; without which, they thought the Names of Priest and Altar were insignificant. This Mistake, he tells us, did run along through the Writers of the Church, as soon as the Name of Priests was applied.

* *Iren. Part 2. Ch. 6. § 11.*

applied to the *Elders* of the Church, that they derived their Succession from the *Priests* of Aaron's Order. The Jesuits of *Rhemes* †
 † *Act.* 14. 22. Censure Protestants, for using the Word *Elders* instead of
 23. *Priests*, which, they alledge, the Protestants Hatred of Priesthood has driven them unto. To which *Fulk* gives this Return, That the Name of *Priest* is avoided, because, by common Use, 'tis taken to signifie *Priests of the Law*, whose Name is never, in the New Testament, given to the Ministers of the Church, Censuring several of the Ancient Fathers their Confounding the Name of *Sacerdos* and *Presbyter*. To this purpose, *Cartwright*, having, at large, Censured the Jesuits Foolish Gloss, and their pretence of Antiquity, in the Use of this Term, shews, That the New Testament, elder than the eldest Times alledg'd by the Jesuits, doth carefully take heed of such Confusion, which, of purpose, thuns the giving of that Name *Sacerdos*, unto the *Ministers of the Gospel*, and that such Use of the Word must needs be unwarrantable, which overthrows the Distinction and Difference betwixt the *Ministers* of the Old and New Testament. Herein our Querist may notice, how that, not only *Cartwright*, but, his Episcopal Doctors have Censur'd his ascribing the Name of *priest* to Ministers of the New Testament, as a Popish Abuse, and upon the same Ground, that we have assign'd, of its Judaizing Tendency, and Relation to Sacrifice; and, in so far, have class'd him with the Papists in this Point, as Patronising (upon the Matter) the Mass-Sacrifice; shewing also the bad Tendency and Effects of the Ancients imposing this Name upon Ministers.

VII. Query, *Whether they, who refuse the Name of Priests, and take the Title of Ministers of the Gospel, ought not also to refuse to live by the Altar, to use the Apostle's Expression, or, at least, not to receive Tithes, these being as much Antiquated Jewish Names and Things, as the Word and Office of Priest and Sacrifice, in a Christian Sense?* I Answer, 1. As for the Names, in this Point, *viz.* Rejecting that of *Priests*, and Retaining that of *Ministers*, I made appear, that both the one and the other has a Divine Warrant. 2ly, We refuse not, in a Gospel or Christian Sense, to live by the Altar, that is, to receive a suitable Aliment and Maintainance necessary for executing this Holy Office; And God's Law hereanent, to which the Apostle alludes, tho', in its Speciality, it respected that Dispensation, yet, with respect to the end mentioned, *viz.* the necessary Maintainance of a Ministry, is founded upon the Law Moral, as may be evidenc'd from the Genuine Sense and standing Scope of the Second, Fifth, and Sixth Commands, as is explain'd by all Sound Divines. 3ly, We reject the Name of *Priest* upon the same Ground, that we

we reject the Name of *Altar*, *scil.* That Reciprocal Relation of both, which our Querist, with the Popish Adversaries, pleads for. Our Querist calls them *Antiquated Jewish Names and Things*, why then pleads he for introducing *Antiquated Names and Things*, and thus blots himself with a Contradiction, in acknowledging them Antiquated, in a *Christian Sense*? But he must be inform'd, that, tho' the Name and Thing of *Priests* is Antiquated, as is above clear'd, the receiving a suitable Aliment, in order to the more comfortable Officiating in Sacred Offices, tho' these Terms, whereunto the Apostle alludes, and whereby he expresses the same, are also Antiquated, is of a standing Nature and Necessity, neither of which can be said of *Priests* and *Sacrifices*, as is above clear'd.

C H A P. IV.

Wherein are Examined the Queries touching the last Appeal in Controversies about matters of Religion; Exposing the Author's Popish and Inconsistent Notions in this point, in special with respect to the Churches Authority, in determining the Number of Canonical Books, the sense of the Scripture, and the final Determination of Controversies; As likewise, the introducing and establishing new Officers, and new parts of Worship under the Gospel.

IN this 3^d. Chap. our Gentleman Querist falls in to the Popish Cause and Interest, and would briskly plead for it, but so unskillfully he manages their Weapons as herein he has pitifully expos'd himself; whether in point of Learning or Soundness, or both, let the Reader Judge.

I. *Query, How Controversies in Religion are to be determined? If by the Scriptures, how shall we come by the true sense and meaning of them so as to have an end put to Controversie? He holds, great regard is to be had to the Judgment of the Church in all Ages, which collected at first these Books that make up the Canon, being assured they were Written by the Apostles and others Divinely Inspired, having the Original Manuscripts preserved in several Ages after the decease of the Apostles, and those Holy Bishops and Martyrs who liv'd nearest to the Apostolick Age, must be allowed best to have known the meaning of those Sacred Writings.* In this Query 'tis a Question to me, whether this

this Person's Ignorance of the Protestant Doctrine, or Inconsiderateness in the point it self, be most conspicuous. 1. After a general insinuated Acknowledgement, that *the Scripture is the Rule*, he inquires, *how we shall come by the sense and meaning thereof, in order to the ending of Controversie.* Now, 'tis evident to all sound Protestants and Men of Judgment, that this is the Popish refuge in their multiplied litigious debates touching the Sense of the Scripture, and the Judge thereof, and in order to the design which this Man homologates, *viz.* to set up in the Church an *Infallible Tribunal* to determine this Sense. In short, the Protestant Answer is clear, that by comparing Scripture with it self, and imploring the Spirit's Illumination, who dictated the Scriptures, we reach the true and genuine sense thereof, especially by receiving Christ the eternal Light. We are taught by himself, and in the lively

Oracles, that *such as follow him shall not walk in darkness* *, and that, *if we do the will of God, we shall know his Doctrine that it is of God* †; And what the sense thereof is, *that believing we receive the Spirit who leads into all Truth* ||.

2ly. Our Divines do hold, that the *Authority* consequently the *Genuine Sense* of the Scripture, neither in it self, nor as to us, depends upon the Testimony of the Church, which is made good by many clear Reasons. 1. Because the Church is founded upon the Scriptures, and receives all its Authority from the same, *Eph.* 2. 20. Hence all the Testimonie of the Church is *Ministerial*, not *Authentick*, or of it self to be believed as such. and as abstracted from this foundation of a *Divine Objective Scripture* certainty. 2ly. The Testimony of the Scripture is Prior and Antecedent to that of the Church, as being the *primum credible*, upon which the Churches Testimony depends as precarious. Which is further illustrated, in the *Third Place*, by this Reason, that otherwise we run into an evident Circle, if by the same method of arguing *a priori* we prove the Authority of the Churches Testimony from the Scripture, and likewise the Authority of the Scripture from the Churches Testimony. 4ly, The Testimony of the Church in it self considered is still *Humane*, therefore cannot found a *Divine Faish and Perswasion*; but this is proper to the Scriptures *Divine Testimony* which only hath the prerogative of being *Autoreis* ☉, or of it self to be believed, and self evident.

Again, that the Scripture is clear'd and interpreted by it self, has clear evidences, 1. From its nature, as the Law of the Supreme Lawgiver, whose Infallible Interpretation and Sense must therefore come from him

him that gave it. it being the Rule of Faith, the sealed Testament of Christ the great Testator *, the Law of the Celestial King, the only Head and Lawgiver of his Church †. 2ly, All *First Principles* are acknowledged to be *irresistible*, which can not otherwise be demonstrated than by their own Light, and, consequently, do exhibit their own sense; So that the Sense and Authority of the Scripture proceeds from the same Author, and is in the same method to be sought and acknowledged, otherwise there were a running into an *Infinitum*, or infinite Confusion. The Scripture in supernatural Knowledge is the first Principle: If the God of Nature and Truth has stamped clear evidences upon all first Principles, whereby they are of themselves known, who doubts that he has placed such in these most necessary *First Principles of saving Knowledge*? 3ly, This is also proved by an Argument *à Comparatis*: The Objects of Senses, upon a due Application, and the due disposition of the Faculty, are discovered to be such without any Argumentation, because of the propension and proportion of the Faculty to its Objects, as Light by its native Splendour, and so in other things. Bellarmin himself acknowledges that *Scripturis quæ libris Prophetiis & Apostolicis continentur nihil est notius, nihil certius; adeo ut stultissimus esse necesse sit, qui fidem illis tribuendam negat. i. e.* "That nothing can be more notour and certain than the Scripture it self; and that 'tis the outmost Folly, to deny Faith thereunto *.

* Heb. 9. 16, 17.

† Isa. 33. 21, Eph. 5. 23.

* Lib. 1. de V. D. C. 2.

3ly, As for the Churches Office in this Point; 1. She is the Keeper of the Sacred Oracles: The Tables of the Covenant are committed to her, Rom. 3. 2. 2ly, She declares and points out the Scripture, Isa. 30. 21. 3ly, Defends and vindicates the Scripture, the true Books from the Spurious, and is called therefore the Scriptures *Εὑαγγέλιον*. 4ly, The Herald to promulgate the same, Rom. 10. 16. And hence is also obliged, as an Interpreter, to search the Sense thereof. But all these import only a *Ministerial Service*, no *Magisterial Authority*, so that tho' we are led in *this Meth.d* to believe, yet not upon *this Ground*, as the Cause and Foundation of our Belief; Which two are in this Point to be exactly distinguished, as they are in themselves vastly Different and clearly Distinguishable. Thus Believers were brought to receive Christ by *John's Ministry*, and in that Method. *but not because of John*: And the *Samaritans* were brought to hear Christ upon the *Woman's Testimony*, but not by her Testimony, as the *Cause of their Belief*. These Things I have shortly offered from our Writers, which the Querist might have

* *Treecat. Opusc.*

Theol. Loc. de

Fide. *Marf. Col-*

leg. Theol. Loc.

de Theol. & Script.

Instit. Theol. Elenct. Part. 1. de Scriptura

de Authoritate Script. de Canone, &c. *Prof. f. Leid. Synopf. Theol. Disp. 2. de Script.*

Neceff. & Author. Disp. 3. de Lib. Can. Disp. 4. De Perfect. Disp. 5. De Persp. & In-

terpret. *Tofes Sedanenf. de Script. Authorit. Canone Authent. Perfect. Senfu, & Ufu.*

Chamier. Panftrat. de Canone Fidei, pag. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, &c. Whitaker contra

Scaplot. de Authorit. Script. Tom. 2. p. 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 17, 18, 19, &c. Calv.

Institut. Lib. 1. cap. 7. Ufm. Loc. Theol. Loc. 1. Quæft. 3. Tom. 1. pag. 433, 434.

Wilkes's Synopf. Papifm. 1. General Controverfie, concerning the Scripture. 4. Quæft.

pag. 35, 36. Hutteri Loc. Comm. Controv. de Script. Quæft. 2. p. 24, 25, &c. Gerard.

Loc. Theol. Loc. de Script. c. 2. p. 6, 7, &c. Mufcul. Loc. Comm. Loc. de Script. p.

179, 180, &c.

seen more fully opened in reading them *. And no doubt the solid understanding thereof, would have fav'd him the Labour of these ignorant Queries contain'd in this Chapter.

Amongst many others, I cannot but here reflect upon the Words of the famous *Du Moulin*, in Defence of the French Confession, against *Arnox* the Jesuite, upon this Point of the Testimonie of the Church, and of the Scripture, *pag. 16, 17.* After he has distinguish'd a Judgement of Discretion, whereby every Christian, who is to live by his Faith, must try the Spirits, 1 *John 4. 1.* And Secondly, a Judgement of Civil Sanction competent to the Magistrat. And 3ly, An Ecclesiastical Judgement of Decisions in National or Provincial Synods, to whom we owe Reverence and Subjection, until, saith he, the thing be better Known and Examined; this Judgement not being Sovereign, but subject to the Word, and examinable thereby. He adds, To esteem that the Church may judge of Matters of Faith, and the Sense of Scripture, with a Judgement of Sovereign Authority, and with Infallible Certainty, is a thing unjust and unprobable; For in the Question, Whether the Church is Judge or not; Is it possible (saith he) that the Church should be Sovereign and Infallible Judge therein? And when Question is made, What the Duty of the Church is; Is it reasonable the Church should be Judge, with full Authority deciding the same, for by this means she shall be bound to do no more than she will her self, and to obey those Laws which she shall give unto her self. And when Question is made of the Infallibleness or Authority of the Church, if the Church be Judge therein, she shall be Judge in her own Cause. He adds, If the Church were infallible Judge of the Sense of Scripture, her Authority should be much greater than that of God, for such an Interpreter would be much more obey'd than the Law-maker. Shewing this to be the Engine whereby the Pope has made himself great.

Next, As to that the Querist adds, That those who liv'd nearest the Apostles times, must be allowed best to have known the meaning of these Sacred Writings.

Writings. I Answer, Whatever Deference we owe to them, it is certain, that, 1st, Neither have we an intire Account of the Sentiments of all such; the first times after the Apostles being, in the Acknowledgment of the best Searchers, most dark, as to Matter of Fact, and barren of Writers, and, consequently, of the Sentiments of those who liv'd in these early Times: And thus, even in the Sense of our Querist, we fall short in one of the best Grounds of our Inquiry. 2^{ly}, Neither have we an Account of the Sense and Judgment of these Ancients, touching every Occurrent Difficulty in these Sacred Volumes (that I speak not of the whole Volumes themselves), which no Man will be bold to assert, without exposing himself. And, 3^{ly}, Their Interpretation and Testimony, however Harmonious, is not *avonises*, or of it self to be believ'd, and finally rested in; but, in the Judgment of all Protestant Churches, Examined by the first Authentick Rule. We know, that even the Doctrine of a Paul was Examined by the Bereans, who are commended for this Inquiry; or comparing his Doctrine with the Scriptures, which is, no doubt, a good Rule, as to all ordinary Teachers, who are tied and over-rul'd by the Sacred Canon, altho' Paul's Doctrine, as an Apostle, was Infallible, and, *eo ipso*, to be receiv'd, 1 Cor. 14. 37. which these Bereans, at this time, were ignorant of. I hope he will not say, the Church has an Authority Paramount to his: And this Examination being commended, does clearly import a Commendable Eying of the Scriptures, as the Test and Rule, whereby we must know the Truth and Certainty of all the Churches Dictates.

Our Querist adds further, *That tho' the Church has no Authority over the Scriptures, which is establish'd beyond Alteration of Men or Angels, Gal. 1. 8. yet the Universal Testimony of the Church in all Ages, as to the Scriptures, seems to him Infallible, and their Authority is to be submitted to in all Matters of Discipline, and great Deference given to her in Matters of Doctrine, tho' she has no Power to make Additions to the Christian Faith, yet she is a competent Witness what that Faith and Doctrine is.* I Answer, 1. If the Church be Infallible in this Point, as to these Testimonies here describ'd by him, then her Testimony is above the Scriptures, as is above clear'd: it being evident, to the most obvious Reflection, that this Infallibility ascrib'd to the Church, must, of necessity, be Paramount to the Scripture Infallibility, and must needs stand Antipode to that Infallibility, which is ascribable to the Scripture solely; for thus the Churches Testimony is to be received for it self, and, consequently, is not examinable by the Scriptures, a Principle disown'd by all Protestant Churches. 2^{ly}, He contradicts himself, in denying to the Church any Authority over the Scriptures, or over our Faith, yet ascribing this Infallibility

libility to her (which, as is evident in the Strain of his Discourse, he understands not in an *Objective*, but *Subjective* Sense); for who will deny, that *Infallibility in her Decisions* gives her this Dominion over our Faith, and clearly derogates from the *Scriptures Authentick Infallibility*, as is said. 3ly. What means he by *the Testimony of the Universal Church in all Ages*? Dare he say, that tho' we had the Testimony of the Universal Church in all Ages, touching the Scriptures, and the Sense thereof (which I believe were a rare Monument indeed), that either this Testimony is *autonomous*, Authentick, and for it self to be believ'd, or that, in this Point, it is Harmonious. How many various Sentiments have been of Councils and Fathers, as to Scripture Truths? Nor want there Differences, as to the Canon it self, and Integrity thereof. The Interferring of *Acts* and Decrees of Councils is notoriously known, and that in weighty Points of Scripture Truth. 4ly, How comes he to assert absolutely, that *the Testimony of the Church, as to the Scripture, is Infallible* (which he still understands, with respect to Scripture Truths, as is evident in the first State of his Query), and yet, to make a Distinction, *as to Submission to this her Infallible Decision, so that she's to be submitted unto in all Matters of Discipline, or Church-Government, and, for the Doctrine, only great Deference is due to her*. If her Decision and Testimony of the Scripture Sense, in all Points of Discipline and Government, be Infallible, and to be submitted unto, why not also her Testimony of the Scripture Sense, in Point of Doctrine? For our Querist will not deny, yea, owns it, that the Substantials, yea, and *Species* of Government, is contain'd and exhibited in Scripture, as well as an intire Scheme and System of the True Doctrine; Why then is she not to be submitted to in the Doctrine, as well as in the Discipline? We may, no doubt, give a Deference to a Person, without an intire Submission. He will not deny, we owe a Deference to Pastors Teaching us, yet, I believe, he will not own their Testimony to be Infallible.

He tells us, *She is a competent Witness of what that Faith and Doctrine is, which we are to receive*. But he must acknowledge, that to be a *competent Witness*, in a legal Forensical Sense, or, her giving such an External Testimony, or Recommendation, as is above describ'd, is one thing, and to be *Infallible*, another. And, if he Identify this Competency of a Witness with Infallibility, as to a Testimony in Point of the Sense of Scripture, and what that Faith and Doctrine is, which is therein held out, he contradicts his Assertion immediately premised, *viz. That she has no Power to impose any New Doctrine, or to make Additions to the Christian Faith*. But what if she should hold out that to be the Faith and True Doctrine, yea, and that to be the true Divine Discipline of the Church, which

which the Scripture owns not? In this case, whether must we receive her Testimony? If he say, she cannot give such a Testimony, or that, absolutely, we are bound to receive her Testimony, he still makes her Infallible therein, joining himself, in this Point, to the Popish Adversary, yea, and contradicts his premis'd Limitation; Or, if he suppose such an Exercise of her Power possible, in imposing new Doctrines, and making Additions to the Christian Faith, yea, and recommending and owning Church Government and Officers condemn'd in Scripture, how can he assert her to be a *competent Witness*, touching Scripture Truth (in this Case, wherein her Testimony is suppos'd false), or, that her Testimony, in either of the two premis'd Suppositions, is Infallible? It would also sute this Gentleman's Consideration, to Answer this Question, How shall her making Additions to the Christian Faith, her imposing new Doctrines, or, in Point of Government, recommending that to be own'd in Scripture, which the Scripture disowns, how, I say, shall such her Imposture be known and discern'd, while she, the *competent Witness*, by an Infallible Testimony, asserts the contrary, tho' the Thing it self, in Point of Fact, is true and certain? How shall we then judge, in order to our rejecting this new Doctrine, these Additions, and this Imposture, whether in Point of Doctrine or Worship? If we owe an Obedience and Faith to her Testimony, we cannot, it being alike Infallible, as the Scripture it self. Or if, in this Case, he suppose a real Error and Mistake, and our Judgment of Discretion and Rejection accordingly, what becomies of her Infallibility which he asserts? He seems to limite this Testimony, *that it have such Marks, as are not compatible to any Imposture.* But who judges of these Marks, and what if, in the Judgment of Discretion, her Testimony, in many Points of Scripture Truths, wants them, we are just where we were, and the same Inconveniency and Difficulty recurs, and either the Infallibility, or the Judgment of Discretion falls.

Another Inconsistency here observable, is, that whereas he ascribes *the best Knowledge of the Meaning of those Sacred Writings, to such early Bishops, and others, who were nearest to the Apostolick Ages*, thus distinguishing them, in Point of a certain Knowledge herein, from those of the remoter Ages, yet afterwards, he ascribes this Infalibility of a Testimony to the *Universal Church in all Ages.* We might here insist to shew him (which is, in a manner, universally acknowledg'd) how more the Ancients were, in Point of Knowledge, as to the Literal sense of Scripture, and many Difficulties thereof, in respect of the Divines of the later Ages, who are found to have more exactly studied and better understood many Truths and Mysteries contain'd in the Sacred Volumes,

lumes, according to *Daniel's Propheſie*, that in the later days knowledge ſhall be increas'd, Dan. 12. 4. The inſtances are not a few, and at hand: How great and palpable the miſtake of the Antients, has appear'd as to the Antichriſt and Myſtery of Iniquity (the moſt ſignal New-Teſtament Propheſie) is obvious to all that are acquaint with their Writings, not to inſiſt upon ſeveral other Errors ; ſuch as the *Millenary Error* anent Chriſt's Perſonal Reign ground'd upon a groſs miſtake of that paſſage, Rev. 20. 4, 5. the Error of *Free-will*, and of the *Vision of God*, that the Souls of Saints departed ſee not his Face till the Judgment of the Great-day. How groſsly that paſſage of *Genesis 6. 2.* *The Sons of God ſaw the Daughters of Men that they were fair, and took them Wives of all which they choſe*, has been miſtaken by ſome of the moſt eminent ancient Doctors, and interpreted of the *Fall of Angels*, literally ſo called, and a ſort of concubinat with Women, contrary to the clear ſcope and contexture, is notourly known ; Yea and that not a few groſs Errors are aſcrib'd unto them by Episcopap Doctors, yea Bishops themſelves, ſuch as Biſhop *Jewel's Reply to Harding*, Art. 1. Div. 5. *Sculter. Medull. Patr. Lib. 8. Cap. 24.* Biſhop *Whitgift's Reply to Cartwright* ; and others.

But not to inſiſt further on this ; our Querist after tells us, *That ſome Books of Scripture were ſooner, ſome later, by the Church, received into the Canon, and that the Church was at laſt (ſcil. not at firſt) fully ſatisfied as to their being genuine.* This is pretty. Now I pray, during this interval of the Churches demur, whether were the People of God oblig'd to receive theſe Books or not ? If they were, what is then become of this *infallible Teſtimony* ? And it ſeems a Judgment of Diſcretion was paramount to it : If not, Where is that innate Light, Splendour of Truth, Majeſty of Doctrine, the Sanctity, Sublimity, Truth and agreeableneſs to Man's Reaſon, theſe everlaſting Arguments (as he calls them in the next Querie) whereby the Scripture and the Chriſtian Religion commends it ſelf to all ? It ſeems that wha ever the Splendor be, and the efficacy of this Argument and Light, the Churches Teſtimony muſt give its Spectacles before we can ſee it. But of this enough.

II. Querie, *Whether the Churches determination anent the number of Canonical Books univerſally receiv'd as ſuch, upon ſuch evidence of their being Written by inſpir'd Pen-men, as ſhe could not be imp'd upon, conſidering her nearneſs to the Apoſtles, be not an Argument that great deference is due to her Teſtimony, both as to the Books themſelves, and their ſenſe and meaning ?* Answer, A due deference is eaſily acknowledged ; but he flinches from the point aſſerted in the preceeding Querie, which aſſerts an Infallibility in this Teſtimony, which according to the Scope and Series

ries of his Queries he understands in a *Subjective Sense*. 2^{ly}, Since he after presents the premis'd innate Evidences of a Divine Inspiration, as sure Arguments that the Scripture has God for its Author, and withal asserts, that God Co-operats by his Spirit with the serious and unprejudic'd Reading of the Word in order to the discerning of these Marks, and the Scriptures sure reception thereupon ; I would know of our Querist, whether this clear and infallible Reception upon the premis'd grounds, is attainable by a privat Christian, or not ? If not, how can he deny the Spirit's blessing to these means in contradiction to so many Scriptures, yea to himself, who cannot but ascribe a serious unprejudic'd Reading to the privat Christian, and a Right to this Promise of the Spirit's assistance thereupon ? If this be attainable, then the necessity of this previous Leading and Infallible Testimony of the Church in order to the same, falls to the ground. Since he asserts, that *the Scripture evidences it self to be agreeable to Man's Reason, and that 'tis perfective of Humane Nature*, and cannot deny the exercise of Humane Reason, yea and this Assistance and Co-operation of the Spirit to a serious searcher of Scripture and of the mind of God therein, with what sense or shadow of Reason can he deny this to be attainable antecedaneously to such recommendation of the Church, as he pleads for ? Moreover, That infallible Recommendation of the Church, which (following the Popish pleadings) he pretends, must needs be acknowledged to be founded upon the same very grounds of the premis'd Evidences of a Divine Inspiration, which are obvious to Humane Reason, and to the privat Christian, and consequently the Churches Testimony and Recommendation cannot be the *Proper, Prior*, far less, *sole ground* of this Reception ; but the standing, leading ground is the same, both for the Churches Recommendation, and the Believers Reception.

But our Querist has not yet done with his Popish notions and pleadings, telling us, that *the Priests Lips preserve Knowledge, and the Law was to be sought from his Mouth, as from an Oracle, and the Christian Church the Pillar and Ground of Truth, and great Depository of the Scriptures, is the best Guide in doubtful matters, having the Holy Ghost to lead her into all Truth*. Had he duely Read or Understood these Scriptures, and the solid Answers of the Protestant Divines to the Popish pleadings thereupon, he would have been ashamed to present this Argument. However, as for that first Text, he should have considered, 1. That it is so far from ascribing his suppos'd infallibility to the Priest's Decision, that, on the Contrary, the Priests are charged with unsound Decisions cross to the Law, and the generality were thereupon reprehended, *that*
they

they had gone out of the way, that they had not kept the Law, but were partial in it, that they had corrupted the Covenant of Levi, that they had dealt treacherously every Man against his brother, by prophaning the Covenant of their Fathers. That because they had departed out of the way and made many stumble at the Law, therefore the Lord had made them contemptible and base before all the People, Mal. 2. 7, 8, 9, 10. Moreover they are rebuked, from the contrary Duty and Practice of faithful Priests, from God's Covenant with Levi of Life and Peace in whose Mouth was the Law of Truth, who walked in Peace and Equity, &c. v. 4, 5, 6. Hence it convincingly appears, that the Priests were to give no arbitrary Decisions to be receiv'd as Oracles (as our Querist ignorantly pretends) because they were theirs; otherwise there had been no access for such a Reprehension. 2ly, If they were thus tied to the Law, and to give the Judgment of the Law, not their own meerly, the People were to give no implicate Faith to their Decisions, and blindly to follow them as Oracles, whether consonant to the Law or not; for this were to give them an Authority paramount to the Law it self, whereof they were the Ministerial Interpreters only, not Lawgivers. 3ly, The Judgment of Discretion is clearly held out here, and the People Examining the Priests Decisions by the Law, since the Law belonged to the Body of the Church, whatever Ministerial Interpreters God appointed. These Priests are charg'd that they made many stumble at the Law by corrupt Decisions, therefore God made them contemptible, and base before all the People, according as they were partial in his Law, and kept not his ways : Hence it appears, that by the Godly and discerning part of Gods People their Decision and Interpretations were by Gods Approbation rejected. They made many stumble at the Law; but if (as our Querist will needs affirm) the People were oblig'd to receive, without tryal, all their Decisions as Oracles, this stumbling he will thus impute to the Law, and exoner the Priests, and reflect upon the glorious Lawgiver, who gave the Priests such Authority. I hope he will not say, the Priests then had a greater Authority as to the Laws Interpretation, than the great Apostle of the Gentiles, whose Doctrine, we find, the Bereans examin'd by the Word, for which they have a signal Elogie put upon them by the Spirit of God: And that tryal of Spirits injoynd 1 John 4. was then, as well as now, the standing Duty of Gods People, being founded upon that Judgment of Discretion competent to all Members of the Church, who are arriv'd at the years thereof, and the necessity of acting in Faith, Rom. 14. 23. in the point of Obedience to Church Rulers. In a Word, there is here an intimation of the Priests Duty in preserving and faithfully Interpreting Gods Law,

that

that they might be the *Ministerial Directors* of God's People, not their *Magisterial Arbitrary Lawgivers* or *Directors*, else there could be no such Guilt as is here charg'd upon them, nor could the People sin in imbracing their Decisions. But, Christ the great Lawgiver, tells us, with respect to such Corrupters of his Law, That *the blind leading the blind, both shall fall into the ditch* *; And we find * *Mat. 15. 14.* *Jeremiah* threatening both the Corrupt Teachers; and such as follow'd them, *Jer. 14. 15. 16.* Tho' the deluded people pleased themselves with our Querist's Notion, in their Opposition to God's true Prophet. *Ez. 18. v. 18.* *Then said they, Come, and let us devise devices against Jeremiah: for the law shall not perish from the Priest, nor counsel from the wise, nor the word from the Prophet (we shall still seek the Law, and get Infallible Oracles from the Priests, and from the Prophets): come and let us smite him with the tongue, and let us not give heed to any of his words.*

As for that other Text, and our Querist's Popish pleadings thereupon, it were easie to discover, how exactly he has follow'd the Popish Agents, and his Masters, in this Point. Shortly, the Orthodox Sense, and Reasons of this Denomination, of *Pillar and Ground of Truth*, ascrib'd unto the Church, is, because God confirms the Truth in his Church, so that by the Church it is made known to others, as Magistrates fasten their Edicts to Pillars, that they may be made known to all Men; pointing also at the Churches Duty, to promulgate and confirm the Truth against Errors. Thus the *Dutch Divines*. *Pool* sheweth, that both Phrases of *Pillar and Ground* are much the same; the last Epithet signifying any Under-propping Basis, pointing at the Churches Duty to support and defend the Truth: Adding, That neither Truth, nor Saving Faith is established upon the Churches Authority, as Romanists pretend (so our Querist), but upon the Authority of God, the Author of it, so that the Churches Testimonie is not the Foundation of its Credibility. The same is the Sense of the preceeding *English Annotations*. To this Scope this Passage is Expounded by Judicious *Calvin*, *Ecclesia* (saith he) *ideo Columna est veritatis, quia suo ministerio eam tuetur ac propagat.* i. e. "The Church is the Pillar of Truth, because by her Ministry she defends and propagates the same. Making this parallel with *Rom. 10. 17.* where the Apostle shews, that *Faith comes by hearing the Word preached*. Some do refer both these Epithets to the words following. So *Camero* and others, constructing them thus; *The Pillar and Ground of Truth, and without controversie great is the Mystery of Godliness, &c.* But this we insist not upon.

For that *Promise of the Spirit**, which he after mentions, * John 16. 13. to prove his Assertion, Protestant Divines have discovered its Unserviceableness to this Scope; because it cannot be made appear, that the Church Militant is Absolutely, and always under this Guidance, so as to be kept free of manifold Sins, Corruption and Errors, since there is, in time, a perpetual *lusting of the flesh against the Spirit*, Gal. 5. 17. wherein the Flesh is oft-times prevalent, even in a Paul, as is clear Rom. 7. 15, 16, 18, 19, 20, &c. So that this can infer no absolute Infallibility in Church Guides.

For what follows in this Querie, he but in vain supposes, either that the Bishops of his Cut and Mould, were the Representatives of the Churches after the Apostles, or that they had this Extraordinary Unerring Assistance. He holds, *That an Inquiry at these first* [suppos'd] *Representatives is the true Method to find out Heresie, or Novel Doctrine, and to know the Catholick Doctrine universally received.* Say you so? Then it seems, the searching Christian for the Truth of the Doctrine, and to distinguish it from Error in its whole Extent (this he must say, else his Rule is not full and Uniform), must, first, be acquainted with, and search the Unanimous Sentiments of the first Christian Churches, of all their Bishops and Governours thereanent: And what Assurance, I pray, shall this Honest Searcher have, of these Uniform Sentiments, or Conclusions of the whole Representative Church, or Bishops in all the Churches spread through the World, *Europe, Asia, Africa*? And moreover, in every point of controverted Truth, how many Volumes must he read to reach this *Precious Elixir, Truth*? How shall he find Truth asserted, in opposition to every Error, in these Uniform Canons and Writings of the first Churches? Are there not many late Controversies they never heard of, and so could give no Judgement therein? How shall he know, after so many Centuries, and Popish Interpolations, that these Monuments are not falsified? Yea, how shall he know, that what stands recorded has not been contradicted by such Reverend Bishops or Fathers, who either have not Written, or whose Writings are lost? Is not the reciting of such a phantastick Conceit a sufficient Refutation? But our Querist has not yet done with his Popish Notions about the Churches Testimony, as appears in the

III. Querie, *If we receive not the Scriptures from the Church, whence, or upon what Testimony do we receive them? If from an inward Testimony, he asks, whether a Hearthen will be convinc'd upon his reading them, either in the Original, or his own Language, that they were dictated by the Spirit without farther helps? If it be affirm'd that he will, if it pleases God to assist him by his Spirit, he tells us this is to begg the Question; for God can work Belief with, or without*

without Scriptures. I Answer; Divines do, in point of Knowing the Scriptures, distinguish, *first*, the *Argument* upon which we believe them; Thus the Scripture by its Infallible Marks of a Divine Inspiration (acknowledg'd by our Querist) commends itself by way of Argument. *2ly*, The *Efficient Cause* of our Belief; And this is the Spirit who dictated the Scripture, the great Author of Faith and Saving Knowledge. *3ly*, The *Instrument and ordinary Method* by which we believe; And this is the Church, whose Recommendatory Testimony God makes use of for that End, as he did that of the Woman of Samaria. Again, when we speak of the Resolution of our Faith, we may understand it either in an *Objective Sense*, with Respect to the Things themselves to be believed; Thus 'tis resolv'd into the Scripture, and the Spirit's External Testimony expressed in the Scripture. Or *2ly*, In a *Subjective Sense*, or Formally, in respect of the Act it self of Believing; Thus it is resolv'd into the Spirit's Internal Testimony, ingrav'd and impress'd upon the Conscience, and speaking in the Heart. He testifies *Objectively*, in the Word, by way of Argument, upon which we believe: He testifies also *Efficiently*, and by way of *Efficient Principle*, influencing us by his Power to believe. Again, with respect to the Canon, there's a Difference betwixt a *Discerning and Declaring* of it to be such, and the *Authoritative Constitution* of the Canon, or deriving Authority to it, and giving it a Being, as such; Tho' the first is proper to the Church, the other is infinitely above the power of Men, yea, or Angels. Hence the Church has no Authority to give Laws binding the Conscience, *there being one Lawgiver*, Jam. 4. 12. *one Lord* of the Conscience, *who can save and destroy*. *2ly*, The Church is straitly prohibited to *add to the Divine Law*, Deut. 4. 2. with 12. 32. and if not to the Law of *Moses*, much less to the Gospel. *3ly*, In the Matters of God, all humane Laws are forbidden, *Matth. 15. 9.* *4ly*, The Church, in its Representative, is a *Subaltern Ministerial Judge*; Apostles were injoyn'd to teach God's People, to obey what our Lord had commanded, and nothing else, *Matth. 28. 19, 20.* Hence these things, wherein Church Constitutions take place, are such as respect *вѣдѣніе*, or the Preservation of comely Order, which oblige not out of the case of Contempt and Scandal.

Not to stand upon any critical further Examen of this Querie, which is fully Answered by what is said, he foolishly confounds a *Receiving of Divine Truths from the Church*, as the ordinary Instrument, or giving herein a due Deference to her Recommendation, with *Giving an Infallible Belief to her Testimony*, as he pleads *Qu. 1.* Again, he as unskilfully opposes *the receiving the Scriptures upon the Churches Recommendation, by way of Instrument*, unto *the Spirit's inward Testimony*; for, the one being Subordinate to the other,

they are, as all Subordinates, very well consistent. For the next Branch of the Question, touching *the conviction of the Heathen in reading the Scriptures*; I Answer, There is in the Scripture such an *Objective Evidence* acknowledged, even by our Querist, as may, of it self, convince all Heathens; but both the Heathen and Christian, in order to that *Subjective Evidence* mentioned, stand in need of the Spirit's Illumination. When he speaks of *being convinced without farther Helps*, if by *Helps* he understand such, in an *Objective Sense*, and in the Distinction mentioned; We say, he cannot, neither by these mentioned, nor the Churches Recommendation either, (which may come in among External Helps) without the Spirit's Gracious Influence: If, by *farther Helps*, therefore, he understands the Spirit's Illumination, which effectuates the *Subjective Perswasion*; We say, he may, even without any Church, or Mens Recommendation, reach this Understanding of the Scripture, and Acknowledgment thereof. When he tells us, *This is a Begging of the Question, because*, saith he, *God can Work by Means, or without them*, he understands not the Question: For, the Question is concerning God's Working by *this Mean*, and in *what Sense it can reach this Effect*. He acknowledges, there are *Intrinsic Evidences of the Christian Doctrine* (he must mean of the Divine Revelation), *that it is of God*, which he opposes to the Deists denying the same, and measuring all by *Humane Reason*; but, *there are Articles*, saith he, *which we receive meerly, because reveal'd, such as the Trinity, Incarnation, &c. which, none will say, are self-evident, as being above Reason*. And what then, I pray? If we believe them, because reveal'd, and as coming from God, they are *eatenus*, and under that Reduplication, self-evident, as all Divine Revelation is *divinisus*, and the first and proper Ground of Belief. But, saith our Querist, *the Church is our first Instructor*: In what Sense she is Instructor, and an Instrument of our Belief, we have heard; But if, by *first Instructor*, he either understand an Indispensably Necessary, and Infalible Instructor, and if he Confound the *Medium* with the *Motive* of our Belief, we reject the Assertion; because, as himself acknowledges, *our Faith were thus not a Divine, but Humane Faith*. It rests then, that the Churches Testimony is not *divinisus*, but, whatever Certainty is in it, is deriv'd from the Words *Objective Certainty*, as is above clear'd, and is illustrated by the Testimony of the Woman of Samaria.

IV. Query, *Whether the Church has Power to introduce and establish new Officers under the Gospel, and expect to have God's Approbation of it afterwards? As the Advice of Moses's Father-in-Law, for making Rulers of the People, which was ex post facto, approv'd of by God, and of them did the Sanhedrim consist, tho' it had not its first Appointment or Institution from God.* To the Query

Query it self I Answer Negatively, that the Church has no such Power. 1. This is repugnant to the Perfection of *Christ's Kingly Office*, which reaches to the Appointing Officers, Laws, Censures of his House, as Political Head and Lawgiver thereof: And, as it is Unlawful to Impeach the Perfection of his *Prophetical*, and *Priestly Office*, his Prophetical, in Delivering, and fully Revealing the Doctrine of Salvation, in Adding New Articles of Faith, as our Querist acknowledges, *Qu.* 1. his *Priestly Office*, in making more Saviours, and Impeaching his full Satisfaction; acknowledg'd also by our Querist; So it is as absurd, and the same Impeachment of his Kingly Office, to add to the Officers he has Appointed; Especially considering, 2^{ly}, the Apostle's Comparison betwixt Christ and *Moses*, *Heb.* 3. 5, 6. in Ordering the Concerns of the House of God, consequently touching this Appointment of Officers: For, 1. *Moses* appointed Officers and Orders in the House of God. 2^{ly}, His Appointment was fix'd and unalterable by any Humane Authority; And therefore, 3^{ly}, was not committed to the Disposal of the Magistrate. 4^{ly}, Nor were these Officers to denude themselves of their Power in the least, it being the Talent whereof they were to give an Account.

In the next place, the Nature of Church Officers pleads for this: For, 1. They are all Christ's Donation Gifts, upon his Ascension into Heaven, *Eph.* 4. and therefore must instruct this Donation in his Testament. 2^{ly}, Else they cannot Act in Faith, in the Administration of their Office; and what's not of Faith, is Sin. 3^{ly}, Else Christ's Kingdom were more Imperfect, than that of Earthly Kings, and not so well Modell'd as theirs; since, therein, no Man can enjoy an Office, which is not Authoris'd by the King's Laws.

Finally, I will prove this from his Prefacer's Discourse, who, 1. tells us of a large Set of Officers from Apostles to Deacons, who are all necessary to the suitable Subsistence of the Body of the Church to the end, with whom our Lord has promis'd his Presence, fitting them all as Members of the Body, for this its Preservation and Subsistence, till he come again; So that, according to our Recommending Prefacer, 'tis as Monstruous to add to these Divinely Constituted Members and Officers of Christ's Mystical Body, and makes it as Incongruous and Monstruous a Piece, as Superfluous Members do render the Natural Body. Again, 2^{ly}, One of the Prefacer's Arguments, for the standing of all these Officers enumerated by him, is, *That, if any were call'd extraordinarily, the Church is left without a Pattern in Scripture to imitate, or conform it self unto, in the Ministry and Government Ecclesiastical;* And therefore, according to his Pleading, 'tis absurd to set up any Officers,

cers, in after Ages, for which the Church has no Divine Pattern to imitate, and conform it self unto; But so it is, that, in setting up New Officers, not appointed of God, she has no Divine Pattern. Our Querist, therefore, and Prefacer, should have concerted their Measures better, that, in this Goodly Piece, they might not thus Act the *Midianites*, in destroying one another by their counter, inconsistent Notions and Reasons.

But let us hear the Gentleman's Reasons for the Affirmative: *Moses's Father-in-Law gave Advice for making Rulers, which was, ex post facto, approv'd of God, and of them the Sanhedrim did consist, tho' it had not its first Appointment or Institution from God.* Answer: Not to stand upon the huge Disparity, in this Point, betwixt Civil Officers and Church Officers, and his ignorant Confounding the Civil and Ecclesiastick *Sanhedrim* (distinguish'd by Orthodox Divines). [See this at large prov'd in *Aaron's Rod, &c. Ch. 2.*] which last he supposes to be made up of these Officers mentioned by him, he doth thus rudely and unskillfully suppose, that all the Ground of this Institution was *God's* after approving a prior *Humane Advice or Device* hereanent, which clearly contradicts the Text; for, *Jethro* shews, that his Advice was not Peremptory, but Conditional, upon Supposition, that *Moses* had the Mind of God herein, who was, in every Point of his Government, especially in this Matter of so high Importance, not to proceed without God's Mind asked and obtain'd. The Apostle tells us, he was Faithful in all the House of God as a *Servant*, and Servants must not Act, but upon their Master's Orders, and go his Errands. *Jethro* expressly thus Qualifies his Counsel, *Exod. 18. 23. If thou shalt do this thing, and God Command thee so, or God Command thee, which is only in the Original; that is, saith Pool* (that Wise Concerter and Consulter of the Judgment of Interpreters), *If God approve of the Course which I suggest, to whose Wisdom I submit my Opinion; for Jethro, saith he, might well think, that Moses neither would nor might make so great an Alteration in the Government, without consulting God about it, and Expecting his Answer.* As for that Reading, Both God will give thee his Commands, &c. i. e. Thou wilt have leisure to ask his Counsel in all Emergencies, 'tis much to the same Scope, since still it supposes the Absolute Necessity of a Divine Warrant, in every Momentous Piece of Government, consequently much more in this; Tho' *Jethro* gave him Counsel, he will not have him further to follow it, than God would be pleas'd to approve of it. The *English Annot.* from v. 19. observe, *That 'tis evident, as likewise from many Parallels, that Moses was to bring the Causes to God, to understand his Mind therein.* Now, since *Jethro* acknowledg'd, that all Weighty Causes

ses were to be brought to God, could he suppose, that such a Weighty Point, as this Alteration, was not to be brought to him? So that, there was here no Institution founded upon his Counsel, nor an Humane Counsel after approv'd by a Divine Institution, as our Querist suggests, but a Counsel so Qualified, as is above clear'd, by God's Command enliven'd into an Institution, tho' the Humane Counsel gave the Occasion, whereof there are Scripture Instances at Hand. The Case of *Zelophebad's Daughters*, gave Occasion for God's declaring his Mind, and extending and explaining the Law anent Inheritance of Daughters *; yet none will say, that the Proposal or Address made by these Daughters of *Zelophebad*, was the Ground of that Law; for, *v. 5. Moses*, before he gave any Answer to their Suite, brought their Cause before the Lord, that his mind therein might be known. So in the case of unclean Persons, or in a Journey whereof we Read, *Numb. 9.* and of Men unclean by a dead Body, represented to *Moses* as that which did stop their keeping the Passover in the day appointed by God: When the Case of these Persons defiled by a dead Body was brought to *Moses*, *v. 8.* we read, *Moses said unto them, Stand still and I will hear what the Lord will command concerning you.* He durst not alter even the circumstance of the time without God's special Warrant, whereupon, *v. 10, 11.* we find the Divine Answer and Oracle given anent the allowing in this & the like necessary Impediments the fourteenth day of the second Moneth. Now, suppose *Moses's* humane Judgment was clear in this matter, yet did this, or could this, ground the Institution, or warrant the Practice without it, tho' this was the occasion of God's declaring his Mind in the Case? Moreover, I would gladly know, if our Querist will deny, that *Moses* consulted God in this matter, and got his Answer before he proceeded to the Practice? If he did, then there was no Election of these Governours upon an humane Advice, but a humane Advice limited as is said, giving occasion to a Divine Warrant and Institution, which stricts against *Moses* acting upon *meer humane Wisdom or Counsel* in this matter: If he say, the Practice was antecedaneous to *Moses's* asking God's Mind in the Case, he makes him guilty of a most presumptuous anticipating God's Direction and mocking of Him. What Master would not look upon himself as mocked and affronted by such carriage of a Servant, as first proceeding to practice and then to ask his Masters Advice? We find, in the premis'd Instances, how tender *Moses* was in point of Light from God, in the Execution of every piece of his Office; Why then will our Querist make him inconsistent with himself in such a practice as this? Besides, how could *Moses* act

* *Numb. 27. 7.*
8, 9, 10, 11.

in Faith in such a considerable Charge as this without a Divine War-
rant?

Follow some more of our Querist's Instances of the Churches Power, to establish New Officers (for within these Limits is his Querie propounded, without any shadow of further extension). The first is, *The Institution of the Feast of Dedication*. In the next place he instances, to fortifie his Querie, *The Feast of Purim*, likewise *the addition of Baptism to Circumcision*, *the Postcænum to the Passover*, &c. In the first Instance and what follows, we may remark his prevarication in streaching them beyond the reach of his Querie, which is confin'd to the establishing of *New Officers under the Gospel*. But these Instances, the first and second in special, are, according to his scope, intended to Patronise the Churches Power and Authority to *make new parts of Worship* beyond the Limits of Gods Institution and Appointment. Wherein, however, we cannot but commend the Gentlemans Ingenuity ; for, indeed, they are of a near affinity, and so of one piece, that they are founded upon the same Basis and Medium. If the Churches Authority warrants the one, no doubt the other also, and his honest Popish Guides do discreetly joyn them both ; whereof the Instances are plentiful and at hand, which we need not stand upon. However, his first Instance is a pregnant proof of this Conjunction, *scil.* the Institution of the *Feast of Dedication* ; To which I Answer, that this Feast is disown'd as unwarrantable by Protestant Divines. Cartwright thus assailes the Jesuits of *Rhemes*, our Querists Brethren in the Cause, who do thus plead upon this Passage, *John 10. 22. That this Feast was instituted by Judas Maccabæus*, *Macc. Lib. 1. c. 4.* Christ, say they, vouchsafed to keep and honour that Feast Instituted by him : And our Hereticks vouchsafe not to Pray and Sacrifice for the dead us'd and approv'd by him, *2 Mac. 12.* The Dedication also of Christian Churches is warranted thereby, with annual Memories thereof ; and proves, that such things may be instituted without any express Commandment in Scripture. To which Cartwright returns this Answer : That this Feast was unduely instituted and ungroundedly, may appear by conference of the Dedication of the first Temple under Solomon, and of the second, after the Captivity returned from Babylon ; In which Dedications seeing there was no yearly Remembrance by Solemnity of Feast, not so much as of one Day, it is evident, that the yearly Celebration of this Feast, for eight Days, was not compass'd by that Spirit that Solomon and the Captivity were directed by : Which Spirit, when it dwelt more plentifully in Solomon, and in the Prophets that stood at the Stern of the Captivity-dedication, than it did in Judas, it was in him so much the more presumptuous, as having a shorter Legg than they, he durst in that matter overstride them. And his rashness is so much the more aggravated,

aggravated, as each of them, for the Building of the whole Temple, with all the Implements and Furniture thereof, made no Feast to renew the annual Memory, where Judas, only for the renewment of the Altar, and of certain other decayed places of the Temple, instituted this great Solemnity. As for the presence of our Saviour at this Feast, he tells the Jesuits, they may as well prove the lawfulness of the Jewish Pentecost and other Jewish Feasts, because of Paul's presence for further spreading of the Gospel. Besides that the Text makes mention of a special ground of our Lord's presence at this Feast, scil. because it was in the Winter Season, hereby rendring the Reason, why our Lord walked in Solomon's Porch, which was a place adapted to safe and commodious Walking in that Season of Winter. Besides that, tho it were prov'd, that he was purposely present at that Season of the Feast, it would infer no Approbation thereof, for the Reason already given. Cartwright doth also here well mind the Jesuits, That 'tis one thing to tollerat a Custom or Determination of the Church, and another to approve of it. The same ground of our Lord's presence at that Solemnity is asserted by others, in special by Calvin, who tells us, that Christus pro more apparuit, ut in frequenti hominum conventu uberius esset prædicationis sue fructus. i.e. "That Christ appeared there among this frequent Convention" of People, for the more fruitful spreading of the Gospel.

As for the Feast of Purim, next instanced by him; 1. It cannot be made appear, that these days were Holy Days, Dedicated and intirely set apart for Religious Worship, so as the Worship respected the Observation of those days, as a part thereof, with an absolute cessation from the Work and Imployment of Mens ordinary Callings, except in such cases as God has allowed in all such Days, which is properly injoynd in the Fourth Command, with respect to the Days made relatively Holy by Gods Appointment. The Context will infer no such thing, since they are held out as Days of Civil Mirth and sending Portions, Est. 9. 17, 18. called Days of Feasting and Gladness, a good Day and of sending Portions one to another. v. 19. they made the fourteenth Day a Day of Gladness and Feasting, and a good Day. And v. 22. they make them days of Feasting and Joy, of sending Portions to one another and Gifts to the Poor; that Month being turned to them from Sorrow to Joy, and from Mourning to a good Day. Bishop Andrew's Reasons, to prove them Holy Days, our Querist may find fully confuted by the Author of the *Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies*, besides divers others. Learn'd Didoclarivus * has several things to this purpose, viz. That this fixed Season is termed Zemin, pointing at any determined time, and distinguish'd from Mogned, which has a more proper respect to a Festivty, that they are called days of Rest from Enemies, against whom they stood for their Life, and are therefore

therefore diversified according to the Deliverance of those in the Villages, and those in Susan, and that the Spirit of God expresseth not this Rest by Shabath, which word properly signifies a cessation from Work on a day relatively Holy, but makes use of the term *Nachu*, *quieverunt*, pointing at a simple Resting, from the *Radix Nuach* &c. 2ly, Tho' it were acknowledged, that such Days were Sacred Festivities, yet they had the direction of a *Mordecai*, a Man of God, and his Prophet and Mouth in this Case, which quite eximes this Instance from the Compass and Scope of what he intends. For his next Instance, of adding *Baptism* to *Circumcision*, 'tis so palpably absurd, this Ordinance having a Divine Institution so evident and express, in the Sense and Acknowledgment of all, that to Read it, is to refute it.

As for the adding the *Postcenium* to the *Pass ver*, if he mean it of our Lord's adding, the Case is the same with the preceeding; If of the Jews addition of such a *Postcenium*, either it was added as a part of the instituted Worship it self, and of the Institution; and if so, it is condemn'd with other such Inventions by clear Testimonies of Scripture, *Deut.* 4. 2, and 12. 32. *Ila.* 29. 13. applyed by our Lord to all humane Inventions in Worship, *Matth.* 15. 8, 9. *Mark* 7. 14. Or, if he say, it was added as a meer *Love Feast*, as the *Agapa* which the Apostle * Reprehends as they were then circumstantiated, in this case it comes not within the compass of our Question, nor Answers the Scope, as is evident.

When without any Restriction or Limitation he adds, *Which Rites, which were not of Divine, but Ecclesiastick Institution, our Saviour approved of, &c.* Calling the preceeding Instances in bulk not strictly of Divine, but of Ecclesiastick Institution, he is palpably absurd; 1. In making *Baptism* such a Constitution, and ranking it with the other in point of a Divine Warrant. 2ly, When he says, they were not strictly of a Divine Institution, he insinuates, they were in part, and even as Ecclesiastick Rites, as he terms them; and so his distinction is very bad, unless he say, that the Ecclesiastick Institution renders them of a Divine Right, in a remote or mediat Sense, because of a supposed Authority hereanent given to the Church, and that her Institution renders them Divine, as the Apostle *Paul* distinguisheth, not I. but the Lord, and again I, not the Lord, thus in the case of Marriage, 1 *Cor.* 7. 10, 12. distinguishing our Lord's immediat, and the Apostolick Institution: If thus, I say, he understands this Ecclesiastick Institution, he gives the same Authority to the Church in point of instituted Worship, and the Officers thereof, which Apostles had: A Popish Principle, disown'd by all the Protestant Churches.

But

But our bold Gentleman Querist not only will ascribe to the Church a Power to introduce and institute new Officers and Worship beyond the Divine Institution, but likewise to *lay aside somethings which are of Divine Institution*, and gives this first pertinent Instance of *Hezekiah's destroying the Brazen Serpent, which God commanded to be made, and we find no Order for destroying it, yet God was pleas'd with its being destroyed.* The Impertinence of which Instance evidently appears in that, 1. The abuse of this Monument to horrid Idolatry is held out as the ground of removing it, which will strick against the retaining of what is thus abus'd, and in case of such a scandal, tho' such Retention were otherwise lawful in it self; And the Instance is well improv'd against retaining of Holy Days, and such Popish Rites and Customs, as are signally thus abus'd, and the abolishing every thing out of Religious Worship, which neither the Law of God, nor Nature, has made necessary, yea the removal of every such thing as is the Occasion of Scandal and stumbling, and that either with respect to Friends or Enemies.

When he says, *it was a Divine Institution*, he either holds, that the *Institution*, with respect to its proper End, was still Vigent, or not: The first he will not say, without exposing himself, it being Notour, and universally acknowledg'd, that the Typical Use and Efficacie was at this time gone: If he assert the Second, then he must acknowledge, that the *Institution* was Obsolete, as other Symbolical Rites of the Jewish Pedagogie are now Ended and Obsolete, and the Institution thereof removed, because determined and limited to such a time. The like he will acknowledge of the Office of Prophecy and Miracles; And, consequently, the Brazen Serpent was in this respect, at that time, useless; And *Hezekiah's* calling it *Nehushtan*, Brass, or Brazen, in the breaking of it, was to import so much to the blinded Idolaters. 3^d, Granting, that, out of this case of Scandal and Idolatrous Abuse, it might have been lawfully preserv'd, yet, as it was no longer of such a Typical Use (else it had been necessarily preserv'd, not lawfully only), so this Abuse made the Removal Necessary: And in this respect, it comes under the same Notion with other Monuments of, and Incentives to Idolatry, and the Removal thereof had the same Divine Approbation and Command, as other things of this Nature, and is accordingly, in the Sacred Text, ranked therewith, and this Godly reforming King's Zeal equally commended in removing it with other Idolatrous Monuments, of the Removal whereof, by a Divine Command, no Man will doubt. Therefore, 'tis said, 2 Kings 18. 3. *He did that which was right in the sight of the Lord*: If Right in the sight of the Lord, then nothing in the point

of Reformation after mentioned by his own Authority, or of the Sanhedrim only, but what God commanded, and what he was Antecedently thereby obliged unto. Then in the 4. v. 'tis Evidenc'd and Instanc'd thus, *He remov'd the high places, and brake the images [or Statues] and cut down the groves, and brake in pieces the Brazen Serpent that Moses had made: For unto those days the children of Israel did burn incense to it; and he call'd it Nebushtan.* God's Command for removing all Monuments and Incentives to Idolatry, is very clear, *Numb. 32. 52. Deut. 7. 25, 26. Isa. 30. 22.* with many such like. So that our Querist speaks without Scripture, or rather is ignorant of it, when he tells us, that we never read, that *God gave any Order for destroying it*, since these and the like Orders did clearly reach this Destruction of it in the Case instanced. And he might as well say, *Hezekiah* had no previous Orders for breaking the Images and cutting down the Groves. For what he adds, *That notwithstanding God never gave any such order for destroying it, yet he was pleas'd with its being destroyed;* He speaks very bad Divinity or worse Sense. I would know of this Gentleman, whether God was pleas'd with destroying it, without, or according to his Order? I hope he will not say, God was pleas'd with breaking a standing Order of his. Upon what Ground then was he pleas'd? Meerly because *Hezekiah* brake it? If he say this, he crosses the Text, and the common Sense of all Men who read it. If he say, God was pleas'd upon the Grounds instanced, then, he was pleas'd upon the standing Order given for removing Monuments of, and Incentives to Idolatry in this Case: So that our Querist must either contradict the Text, or fall short of his Scope in this Instance.

His next Instance and Argument, to prove, the Churches Authority, 'to lay aside some things of Divine Institution, is taken from the *Passover*, 'which was to be eaten with their loyns girt, and the staff in their hand, a posture that suited perfectly with the Occasion of its Institution, as appears 'from *Exod. 12.* Yet the Church did alter that Posture, thus commanded, after they were in Possession of the promis'd Land, unto their 'ordinary Table-Posture, to wit, *Leaning*, which was common to them 'with other Eastern Nations, and did better agree to their prosperous 'Condition at that time, and our blessed Saviour himself did comply 'with that Alteration which the Church had made, and did Eat the 'Passover with his Disciples in that Posture. Answer: That this Circumstance was Temporary, suited only to that Exigence, and did not at all belong to the Essence of the Ordinance it self, is the Consistent Judgement of Protestant Interpreters. Upon that Clause of verse 11.

Thus you shall eat with your loyns girt, &c. Mr. Pool shews, That it was for this time, because their Circumstances requir'd it, that they being suddenly to take a great Journey, might be in a Travellers Habit. But, that these, and some other Circumstances, saith he, now enjoyn'd and us'd, were only Temporary, and not Perpetual and Obligatory, sufficiently appears from the Practice not only of the Jews in the following Ages, but also of Christ and of his Apostles. The Dutch Divines, on this Verse, Thus now shall ye eat, &c. shew, That it was at this time; for, afterward, these things, or Circumstances, were no more observ'd, no not by Christ himself, nor by his Apostles, referring to v. 7. And they shall take of the Blood, and strike it on the Two Side Posts, and on the Upper Door-Post of the Houses, wherein they shall eat it. Upon which Passage they observe, That of this Ceremony there is no mention made else-where, as neither of some other here following (scil. v. 11.) But they were only to be observ'd in this first Passover. Diodat, upon the place, tells us, That this Ceremonie was Singular and Peculiar, scil. the girding of their loins, consequently the rest of this nature, for that first Passover, as it appears by our Saviour's Celebration of it with his Apostles. The English Annotations upon the Passage shew, That this Gesture of Standing with the Staff in their hand, was a Gesture of Readiness for present passage, and that this Gesture is conceiv'd to be peculiar to the first Passover, because that only was Eaten in haste, and for that our Saviour celebrated the Passover with another Gesture. This Sense might be clear'd by many other Interpreters, if needful. 2ly, Suppose it were granted, that the Church made this Alteration, yet under that first Dispensation of the Covenant, the Church being under the Influence of God's Extraordinary Prophets, rais'd up for her Direction in Point of Worship in many Emergents, it may be rationally suppos'd, they were not without a Divine Direction in this point. However, the thing it self being, in the Judgement of Sound Divines, but a Circumstance suited to that first time of the Institution, it can plead nothing for the Churches Power, in point of the Alteration of the Substance or Parts of Worship. 3ly, How absurdly our Querist afterward pleads our blessed Saviour's Compliance with an Alteration made by the Church in Eating the Passover in the Table-posture, is obvious from what is said. We see in what is premis'd, that our Saviour's practising and eating thus, is by Protestant Divines laid down as a Ground, to prove, that the Standing Posture did not belong to the Essence of the Worship or Institution it self. Who will doubt, that our Saviour's Practice in this point is a leading Rule and Ground, who came to fulfil the Law, and exactly obey'd the Divine Institutions? Whereas this Querist brings him in (if we may express it with Reverence) truckling after Humane Alterations and Inventions, to which our Saviour was

was so Zealous an Enemy, that we find him Expounding the Law, and Vindicating it against the corrupt Glosses and Practices of the Pharisees, Inveighing against Humane Inventions in God's Worship, and in his Practice so great an enemy thereunto, that he would not homologate Superstitious Persons, in the use of the innocent Practice of *washing hands before meat*, because they had made it a Religious Ceremonie, *Luke 11. 38, 39, &c. Matth. 15. 2, &c. Mark 7. from v. 1. to v. 14.* The Evangelist *v. 3.* takes notice of a tradition of the Elders in this Point, making mention of some other Religious Ceremonies of their Church Representative, that the Pharisees charg'd the Disciples in crossing the Tradition of the Elders, in *eating with unwashen hands*, and shews that our blessed Lord among other things, charges them *v. 7, 8. with teaching for Doctrines the commandments of men, and laying aside the Commandments of God, to hold the Traditions of men, as the washing of pots and cups, and many other like things, saith he, ye do.*

His other Instances are as unfuteable to his Scope. For the *Diaconesses*, there is good Warrant from the Context, to suppose, that whatever Offices towards their Sex might be impos'd upon them, peculiar to the Circumstances of that Time and Place, such as *propter horam balnei*, and the like; yet they were in no Church Office properly so called, but were poor Eleemosyners and Objects of the Churches Alms and Charity, which, as in several other Circumstances, appears evidently to be heldout, *1 Tim. 5. 16.* where the Apostle enjoyns such as are able, *to relieve the Widows, that the Church might not be charg'd, and hindered from relieving them that were widows indeed.* As for the *Holy Kiss*, there is in such Precepts contain'd a Standing Moral Duty of Holiness and Sincerity, in all our Converse and Salutes, tho' that Circumstance of the *Kiss* among Men, in the Literal Sense, was proper to that time. As for not *Eating of Blood*, 'tis clear in the Context, *Acts 15.* that this Necessity and Expedience respected the present State of the Jews, of whom many had embrac'd the Gospel, but had not yet arriv'd at such a full Conviction (as was futeable and necessary, and afterward to be hop'd for) in point of the Abrogation of the *Mosaical* Ceremonies, and of the antient Oeconomie; Christians, therefore, were to beware of offending them (as we are, by vertue of our Lord's Precept, to beware of offending any of the little ones *), **Matth. 18. 6.* especially when the Temple of *Jerusalem* stood, to which the Ceremonies, as to the Main thereof, were annex'd, which, altho' dead, as some have distinguish'd, yet were not as yet buried, as they were to be Honourably in God's time. And this will no more prove the thing to be a standing Gospel Ordinance, because Injoyn'd
and

and practis'd by the Apostles, than Paul's purifying himself upon the Period of his *Nazarite Vow*, and attending with others in the like Case, according to the Law *Numb. 6. 18.* in Order to the Priest's offering of Sacrifices for them upon the Apostle *James's* Advice, will import that this Practice was a standing Gospel Duty; both the one and the other Practice being for the same End, as is clear in the History, and the Expediency thereof warranted by the same Rule. For the *Anoynting of the sick with Oyle*, 'tis so clearly found to be the Appendix of the Miraculous Gift of Healing now ceas'd * and own'd so by all Protestant Divines, that the Querist must foretake them, and go to the Popish Authors for a Patrocinny, if he esteem otherwise. So that, in none of these Instances there is the least shadow of a Warrant for the Alteration of Gospel Ordinances, since they are declar'd to be such as come not under that Character.

* Compare Mark 6. 12, 13. with James 5. 14.

CHAP. V.

Examining our Querist's Notions (in his IV. Chap.), touching the Succession to the Apostolick Office, and Exposing his Gross Ignorance and Impeachment thereof, in his Pleading for an Apostolick Succession: As likewise, his Ignorance and Foolish Conceits upon the Point of Ordination, as proper to Apostles, and in Opposition to the Authority of Presbyters therein.

HERE the I Query is, *Whether the Apostles were not to be succeeded to, as such? If he mean Successors to the Formal Office of the Apostolate; I Answer, with the Body of Protestant Divines, that they were not. Of this the Reasons are many and obvious: It shall suffice, that we here hint what is above touch'd, viz. That the Apostolick Office importeth an Universal Inspection over the whole Catholick Church planted, and to be planted, with Authority to deliver our Lord's Mind, as his immediately sent Ambassadors, touching the Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government thereof; so that, they were, every one of them apart, and all of them joynly, our Saviour's Living Oracles, and Infallible Inspectors thereof; upon which Ground, the Church is said to be built upon their Foundation, Eph. 2, 20. And therefore, neither their*
Work,

Work, their Authority, their Calling, nor the proper immediate End of both, nor their Qualifications, as such Officers, can be, without the highest Presumption, pretended to by any ordinary Church Officers.

In Explication of this Query, our Gentleman Querist further asks, *Whether Lay-Men and Women be not as effectually debarr'd from the Lord's Supper, which was given only to the Apostles, Church Officers, and Bishops of the Christian Church, as Bishops are debarr'd from being Successors to the Apostles, since Bishops of the Catholick Church believe themselves to be such Successors, from Christ's Promise, to be with them to the End of the World, which Promise was not restricted to the Apostles Persons?* This Promise, he thinks, proves as much the Apostles were to be succeeded to, as such, as the Command of our Saviour, *Drink ye all of this*, gives Christians an undoubted Right to be admitted to the Lord's Table. I have here fully express'd his Sense and Scope, tho' I have not follow'd his Words *κατα πάντα*, which, as there set down, are hardly reconcilable to good Sense and Syntax. Only I add (which, with him, affords Strength to his Query), *viz.* He tells us, *The Promise was not restricted to the Apostles Persons, since none but St. John outliv'd that Century, but to the Order, which was ταῖς γενήταις.* Where, on the by, I take notice, that he, or the after Arguer, at least, overthrows this long Life of St. John, in affirming, that all the Apostles did, very shortly outlive the Command and Promise, *Go ye therefore to Teach and Baptize, &c.* But, more directly, I Answer, the Absurdity of this Explication and Proof many ways appears: 1. It is uncontroversibly evident, that our Saviour, in this Administration, was properly the Minister, so to speak, and Exemplified the Authoris'd Administrator; the Apostles were Communicants, yet not properly, or only, as Apostles, but, as himself acknowledgeth, they represented the Ordinary Christians, or Communicants: So that, the Right of all Christians is herein evident, and, in that respect, the Apostles were succeeded to in this Right, but not as Apostles properly: From hence the Disparity appears evident, since Christians Right to the Sacrament is founded upon the Nature and Design of this Ordinance, which is the Seal of the Gospel Promises to all that have embrac'd Christ; and Successors to Apostles are as clearly excluded, by the Nature and Design of the Apostolick Office above express'd. 2^{ly}, The Disparity is evident by his own Confession, and, therein, the Inconsistency of his Query, *Our Saviour*, saith he, *gave it only to Church Officers or Apostles*, but, by his Confession, not as Apostles or Church Officers properly and formally, or in a restricted exclusive Sense, but as Christians, representing therein the Christians Right. For, he tells us, in the close of this

this Query, that our Saviour's Precept, [*Drink ye all of this,*] gives all Christians an undoubted Right to be admitted to the Lord's Table. But, in the Point of Succession, he pleads for it to the Apostolick Office properly and formally as such. And, to argue from Succession to Apostles in a general Christian Privilege, unto a Succession to their proper formal Office, he will acknowledge, is obviously absurd, and, consequently, his Method of Arguing, and Parallel Argument, comparing Christ's Promise to the Apostles, with the Institution and Command, as it toucheth the Sacrament: For, himself overthrows this Argument, and clears the Disparity; since, in Point of the Sacramental Precept, *Drink ye all of this,* he acknowledges, that not Apostles only, but all Christians, are concern'd; But the Promise, *I am with you to the end,* he restricts to the Apostolick Orders as the *ταῖς ἐκκλησίαις*. Finally, as for the Promise it self, the Author, whom he pretends to put his Queries to, hath discovered, how it is to be understood, with respect to the Successors in the Ordinary Ministry, *scil.* the Preachers of the Word, and Administrators of the Sacraments, with the Appendant Power of Discipline; who also hath clear'd the Absurdity of any higher Extension to a suppos'd Apostolick Office. And since himself grants, it could not be restricted to the Apostles Persons, but must respect their standing Successors, the Question still is, *Who properly these Successors are?* And it being evident, from what is above touch'd, and several other Reasons easily adduceable, that their proper formal Office, as such, could not be Succeeded unto, it doth as evidently follow, that the Promise could no more suppose the Continuance of their Office, than of their Persons. Moreover, if he will not juggle with his Commending Prefacer, he must hold, that, in the first Constitution of the Christian Church, there were such Church Officers, as *Prophets, Workers of Miracles, Healers* (for he holds, that these mention'd, 1 Cor. 12. 28, 29, 30. are of such Necessity to the Organick Body of the Church, as the Parts or Senses are to the Natural Body): And it being thus, I would know, whether our Querist will look upon these, as Successors of the Apostles, or not? I hope he will grant, that this Promise, *I am with you to the end of the World,* respecteth these Officers of the Christian Church, in its first Constitution; and since he cannot but grant (according to the Judgment of all Protestants, and the clear Evidence of the Thing it self), that these Offices are not now existent, but pass'd off, with that first Exigence and Infant State of the Christian Church, he must, consequently, acknowledge, that the Promise will not necessarily import the Continuance of all the New Testament Church Officers to the end, and, by further Consequence, that the Truth of this Promise is

very well consistent with, and accomplished in our Lord's presence with the Officers necessary for the Churches Subsistence and Edification in all times, tho' several of the first Officers be remov'd.

II. *Querie, Whether the Apostles were not to be Succeeded to in that piece of their Office and Commission, viz. to teach all Nations, many Nations in the World after their decease not being instructed in the Gospel? And the Presbyterians do hold that the Apostolick Office necessary for planting the Christian Faith and founding the Christian Church died with the Apostles, and was not necessary for the continuance and farther Propagation of the Faith.* Answer, This Querie is founded upon an ignorant mistake both of that primary Command, and the nature of the Apostolick Office therein imported, which he takes to be merely and simply a Preaching to the unconverted Nations, without respect unto the other necessary parts of their complex Office, as above hinted: But he should know, that this Preaching to the Nations, and forming them into Churches, did necessarily include the Apostolick delivering to them, by our Lord's immediat Commission, the Gospel Doctrine, and Rules touching the whole Scheme of the New Testament Ordinances, in point of Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government. Not only did the Command of Teaching all Nations import and enjoyn the forming them into Churches in all these points, and making them Disciples of Christ, and this by an Infalible Authority, but besides this, an Infalible Inspection and Superintendency over them, and the Duties of both Officers and Members when this was done; a Work, which he cannot but acknowledge, competent to no Church Officer, or Church either: Whatever may be suppos'd their Interest and Duty with respect to the Propagation of the Gospel, or delegating Ministers to this end, any such endeavour is *totò cælo* different from that Inspection and Authority of Apostles, both in respect of *Extent* and *Aubrity*, as is obvious to the meanest Reflection; For all Churches planted and to be planted were under their infalible Inspection and Direction, as Catholick Officers thereof in *actu exercito*. This Authority, we say, was peculiar to Apostles, and was not necessary to be continued, nor could. For the New Testament Ordinances being delivered, and compleated, and seal'd in our Saviour's Testament, this Canon being thus seal'd and compleated, the formed Churches are to obey this Pattern, the Foundation being laid, the Superstructure is to be advanc'd in God's ordinary Method of Administration of Ordinances by the Churches standing Guides and Rulers whom he has appointed: But no new Foundation is to be laid, nor new Ordinances to be deliver'd; *The Faith once delivered to the Saints is to be retain'd, and earnestly contended for, Jud. v. 3. and that*
which

which is receiv'd bel'd fast, Rev. 2. 3. No universal infallible Inspector is any more allow'd, whose Authority respects the laying a Foundation, which cannot be laid of new. 2^{ly}, This is further confirm'd, in that we find the Apostles, in their Travels to form and constitute Churches, fixing Officers therein, Church by Church; directing Officers and Members of form'd Churches in their several Duties, with respect to their case and circumstances, and by acknowledgment of our Prelatists, supposing them fix'd to their several Stations and Posts, whether Bishops or Presbyters. As for the Evangelist's Office, we make it appear to be Extraordinary, and that the Epistles Written to *Timothy* and *Titus* suppose this, and the Precepts contained in them direct mainly the Ordinary fix'd Officers, tho' the more immediat Address respect Evangelists as such. But there is not the least shaddow of substituting of Universal Inspectors of Officers and Churches to Succeed them, who were fix'd to no Post or Watch-tower, but all their Directions to Churches respect the Officers as specially related thereunto. Thus the Epistles to the *Asian Churches* suppose these Angels Relation to the Churches of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, &c. and respect their Duty, or point at their Sin, as fix'd in these Stations and Watch-towers. *Timothy* is directed touching the Officers of that Church of *Ephesus*, but there is no shaddow of a *Successive Superintendment* after him. And moreover, (which is an Argument *ad hominem*) Episcopalian themselves plead his fix'd Station there. Thus all the other prescribed Duties to Ministers respect their fixed Station as in such and such Posts, whatever general respect the Duties may have to Churches as such. 3^{ly}, As to what may be suppos'd the Duty of founded Churches under the New Testament, in this point of giving a Commission to Ministers to Preach to Infidels and Propagate the Gospel, we say, that upon this Hypothesis, 'tis evident from what is above touch'd, that the Authority of such Ministers having such a Commission, is still subaltern and under the Inspection of these Churches, from which they have their Commission: And supposing their endeavours so blessed of God as to have Churches form'd into an Organick Being, and their residence among them, they can, according to the Gospel Rules, have only a share of the Government, in Association with other Officers thereof, but have not, nor can have a Nomothetick Superiority over them, or of such a nature as was proper to Apostles, as is obvious to the meanest Reflection, far less over other Churches.

III. *Querie, Is the Effusion, or pouring forth of the Holy Ghost upon the Apostles to be reckon'd among the distinguishing marks of an Apostle? Since the Holy Ghost fell on others in this extraordinary way, enabling them to Work*

Miracles, speak with Tongues, utter Prophecies, Interpret, and heal the Sick, &c. which tended also to the Confirmation of the Gospel as well as those Gifts of the Apostles. This Querie he might have been satisfied by the Author he offers his Queries to, who distinguisheth the Gifts, *materially and simply considered, and formally with respect to the Apostolick Office, shewing, that, 1. There was a difference of the Degree and Extent: The Apostles had these Gifts more universally, and in a higher degree of Eminence, than was competent to others. as luculently appears in the full pouring out of the Spirit in the day of Pentecost, represented by the sign of the cloven Tongues of Fire, inabling them immediately to speak the universal Tongues of all Nations under Heaven, to the amazement of a Multitude of various Nations gather'd at Jerusalem. Paul shews, that his speaking with Tongues was beyond all other Gifts of that nature among the Corinthians; for several there had the Gift of Tongues, 1 Cor. 14. 18. I thank my God, I speak with Tongues more than you all.* Such were their other Gospel confirming Gifts, both as to conferring of Blessings and inflicting Judgments, such as raising the Dead; Thus the Apostle Peter raised *Tabitha* to Life again, *Acts* 9. 40, 41. The Apostle Paul, *Eutychus*, *Acts* 20. 9, 10. And in point of inflicting Judgments, we find, upon Peter's Threatning, Death inflicted, first upon *Ananias*, then upon *Sapphira* his Wife, to the amazement and great fear of all the Church, and of all that heard thereof, *Acts* 5. 1, 2, &c. The Apostle Paul we find smiting *Elymas* the Sorcerer with Blindness, for withstanding the Gospel, to the astonishment of *Sergius Paulus* the Deputy of *Cyprus*, and such as had an Influence upon his Faith, *Acts* 13. 9, 10, 11, 12. Such Gifts we do not Read were conferr'd upon Believers, tho' some extraordinary Gifts were. 'Tis true, some do include these last Instances in the Gift of Miracles more generally conferr'd, whereof notwithstanding, the Scripture is silent; and tho' admitted, this doth not impeach this Argument drawn from the universal Concurrence of all extraordinary Gifts in the Apostles alone, and the singularity of their Office, consequently. 2ly, The difference was pointed at with respect to the *immediat end* of these Gifts, which was *to Seal and Confirm their Apostolick Mission and Authority*, competent to no ordinary Church Officers, far less to Believers in the first Plantation of the Gospel. The proper and immediat end of these Gifts being to Seal the Apostolick Mission and Message. Thus was Peter's Mission Seal'd when sent to *Cornelius*, *Acts* 10. whereat the Jews wondred that came with him, when they saw the Holy Ghost in his Gifts of Tongues, and Prophesying, pour'd out upon the hearers. Here was, to use our Querist's expression, a Confirmation of

the Gospel; But I hope he will not be bold to say, (tho' indeed he words the *Querie* so, as to insinuate so much, when he tells us, That *the Spirit's extraordinary Assistance* afforded to others than Apostles, was for *Confirmation of the Gospel*, as well as what was done by the Apostles) that this Confirmation of the Gospel was the same as it respected the Preacher and the Hearers, or did relate to this proper immediat end instanced: For this Confirmation in respect of *Peter*, was to Seal his Apostolick Office competent only to himself with other Apostles; whereas, with respect to the Hearers, 'twas to influence their Faith and Conversion, and to confirm the Truth of the Gospel, rendring them faithful Followers of the Lamb, to engage them to a due Subjection to the Apostolick Ministry and Messages. We find afterwards the *Apostle Peter* * pleading this great Seal of his Message * *Act. 11*, and Ministry towards the Gentiles. So that the very nature of these miraculous Operations sealing thus the Apostles Authority, and as it were, derived from the same, distinguished the *Apostolick Official* actions therein, from those received effects and issues thereof.

Next, I may make this clear by a Counter-Querie; *Whether was our Saviour's Miracles one of the great Badges of his Mediatory Authority?* I suppose our Querist will not deny this, since the Gospel History produces these as the great Confirmation thereof, and our Saviour pleads this Argument against the Jews, *Joh. 5. 26. I have greater witness than that of John, for the Works which the Father hath given me to finish, the same Works that I do bear witness of me, that the Father has sent me.* And Chap. 15. 24. *If I had not done among them the Works which none other Man did they had not had Sin, but now they have seen and hated both me and the Father.* Now what says he to his Argument (shall I say a Counter-Argument to that of our Saviours) in this case? How could this be such a distinguishing Mark and Badge of his Mediatory Authority, since in his own time, and even during his Ministration upon Earth, others had this Gift; Apostles did Heal, cast out Devils, yea some that followed him not, as appears, *Mark 9. 38.* The only Answer is, that our Lord's Miracles were perform'd by his Original and Mediatory Authority; Yea moreover, in order to this great immediat end thereof, viz. for Confirming the same, distinguishing them from that Gift in all others. If our Querist acquiesce in this, (as needs he must, unless he will impeach our Saviour's Authority) he must, consequently, acknowledge his Argument nought, whereby he would prove this not to be a distinguishing Mark of an Apostle, because others had that Gift in some measure: So that, to save himself from this gross absurdity, and blasphemous Reflection upon our Saviour's

Saviour's Argument, and this Badge of his Mediatory Office and Mission, he must needs distinguish, with us, The *Spirits miraculous Gifts simply and materially considered*, from the same Gifts as peculiarly respecting both the Person sustaining such a peculiar Function, as likewise the *proper immediat end* thereof. Thus in the case instanced, we must distinguish these Gifts as relating to our Blessed Lord, the Fountain of all Gifts and Grace, upon whom the Spirit was pour'd out without measure, whose Mediatory incommunicable Authority and Prerogative was hereby confirmed as the *proper end* of these Gifts; and the same Gifts, as they did respect the Apostles, who had them in a measure suited to their state and condition, and for confirming their subaltern Apostolick Mission, which has a clear and proportion'd Application to the case of the Apostles and inferior Officers, with respect to *extraordinary and miraculous Gifts*.

In a word, 'tis from hence evident, that our Querist's insinuated Reason to inforce his Querie, *viz. That what others did by the Spirit's extraordinary Assistance and Influence, tenead to the Confirmation of the Gospel, as well as what was done by the Apostles, is pitifully dull, and has no Efficacy*, but to represent his mistake in confounding the *Confirmation of the Gospel simply and absolutely consider'd*, with the *Confirmation of the Gospel, as respecting Persons, sustaining such and such Functions* thus ratified, the *proper immediat end of this Confirmation*. Paul asserts the Gospel's Confirmation, in the Faith, and other Graces of the *Corinthians*,

* 2 Cor. 3. 2, 3.

† 1 Cor. 9. 2.

which confirmed them and others, that the Gospel Preached by Paul, and the other Apostles was the Testimony of

|| 1 Cor. 1. 6, 7.

Christ ||. But still this Confirmation properly respected the Apostles Authority, who were the Gospel's first Heraulds and Messengers, whereof the *Corinthians* eminent Gifts were a subservient Confirmation to this end, tho' the same Gospel was confirm'd both ways. Will our Querist deny, that the same Gospel Testimony was confirm'd by Christ's Miracles and glorious Operations of the Spirit in him, and also by the Spirit's Influence and Operations upon and by the Apostles? But will he therefore infer, that our Lord's Miracles were no Confirmations of his Mediatory Authority, and *toto calo* different from these wrought or performed by the Apostles, upon the ground mentioned; the one being to Confirm his *Mediatory and Original Power and Authority*, the other, his Apostles
deriv'd

deriv'd Authority, as is above express'd? Or, will he say, (to give another Instance) that when God gave of *Moses's* Spirit to his Assistants, the Elders, who were to be his Co-adjutors and Substitutes in the Government, and *Eldad* and *Medad* Prophesied with others *, as a Badge hereof, that this prov'd that * *Numb. 11.* *Moses's* Gifts, and his Authority thereby confirm'd, 25, 26. were not of a distinct nature, respecting their proper immediat end, from these conferr'd upon the Elders mentioned, his being to confirm his *Extraordinary*, theirs an *Ordinary Office*?

IV. Query, *Whether was the Holy Ghost given by the Successors of the Apostles by the Imposition of Hands?* Answer: That the Holy Ghost was given thus by Apostles (he must still understand it, as to his Special Extraordinary Operations), we read in Scripture; Thus by *Peter* and *John* in this manner, *Acts* 8. 14, 15, 16, 17. and by *Paul*, *Acts* 19. 6. upon whose Imposition of Hands, upon these Twelve mentioned, in that place, we find the *Holy Ghost* came on them, and they Spake with Tongues and Prophesied; which is also evident, and universally acknowledged in the preceding Instance. But, that the Holy Ghost was thus given by their Successors, we read not. And therefore, considering the Scriptures Silence herein, we, and this Querist, are not to be Wise above what is Written, nor implicitly to believe any Humane Testimony hereanent. And since these Extraordinary Influxes and Illapses, describ'd in Scripture, are therein clearly represented, as the great Seals of the Apostolick Office and Authority, and the Certainty of the Gospel Message; this End and Effect being reach'd, the Canon clos'd, the Christian Church, in all its Necessary Parts, form'd, and all Offices, and Gifts, and Operations of the Spirit, which are necessary for the Churches Edification, continuing, this Extraordinary Confirmation and Seal must needs be suppos'd obsolete and gone off, together with the other Extraordinary Offices and Operations necessary in the Churches Infant State, and first Plantation of the Gospel.

For what he adds, *That, in the Second and Third Century, Imposition of Hands, for giving the Holy Ghost after Baptism, was not believ'd to be an Extraordinary Part of the Apostolick Office.* I would know, what Gifts of the Holy Ghost, after Baptism, were to be conferr'd by this Imposition, Ordinary or Extraordinary? If Extraordinary be assented, he doth, in this, cross the Sense of all Protestant Divines, who hold the Conferring of these Extraordinary Gifts, by this Imposition, proper to Apostles, and to have expir'd with that First Age and Time of the Church. The Author, to whom he offers his Queries, gave him a full Account hereof, and the Sense of the University of *Saumur*, and of several

several others, in Special of *Turretin*, who impugns Confirmation from this Ground, "That the Spirit, in this Extraordinary Manner, being given to those Baptiz'd, in both these Scripture Instances, *Acts* 8. and in that Imposition of Hands by *Paul*, *Acts* 19. consequently they were made Partakers before of his common Operations. 2ly, He impugns it from this Ground, "That the Spirit is said *ἐκκλινεν, illabi, irruere*, an Expression pointing at the Gift of Prophecie, and such like Extraordinary Operations, and that therefore this is not to be understood of his Ordinary Sanctifying Influences. Thus also we are to understand that Passage, *Acts* 10. 44. 45. 46. Again, if our Querist hold, that the Ordinary Influences are hereby conferr'd, he incroaches upon the Rights and Privileges of the Sacrament of Baptism, making this Imposition of Hands a Sacrament, against the Sense of all Protestant Divines. Let our Querist read *Cartwright* against the *Rhemists* upon this Head. The Jesuits, upon that Passage, *Acts* 8. 17. do plead, with all their Might and Vigour, for the Sacrament of Confirmation, as a standing Ordinance, whom *Cartwright* at large confutes upon the Ground mentioned. Again, tho' it were suppos'd, that Imposition of Hands, for this End, is a standing Ordinance, and not to have ceas'd with the Apostles, how comes our Querist to assert *its descending to Bishops in after Ages*, and to an Office pretended Superior to Pastors? Since our Querist, and all his Party, will acknowledge, that the Pastor has an undoubted Right to Administer the Sacrament of Baptism, the first Seal of the Covenant, whereby Persons are Discipl'd and brought into that Covenant, have all the Blessings thereof Seal'd up unto them, how then can the Administration of this Adjutory suppos'd Seal be deny'd them? This Argument was press'd by the Author, to whom he offers his Query, who gave also the Sense of Antiquity upon this Point, which, had he pondered, it might have sav'd him the Labour thereof.

V. Query, *Whether the Commission, Mat. 20. 19. to Preach, or make all Nations Disciples, μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, was a distinguishing Mark of an Apostle? Or rather, is not that Commission continued to their Successors, whom he has promis'd to be with to the End of the World?* To this Query, the Answer is easy and ready, from what is above touch'd, and all Protestant Divines do hold, that this Command, complexly consider'd, was proper to Apostles; since it did import an Apostolick Immediat Commission, not only to call all Nations to Christ's Standard, but, by Infallible Authority, to deliver to them the Lord's Pattern, and Scheme of New Testament Ordinances, as to Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, and, upon Ground of this Immediat Commission and

Autho-

Authority, to Inspect and Govern them, when thus settled, according to Gospel Rules, as Catholick Officers of the Church Catholick, *in actu exercito*, and subject to no Churches Direction nor Inspection, being fix'd in no Post or Watch-Tower, as General Inspectors of the Duties both of Members and Officers, and our Lord's Living Oracles, Armed with Extraordinary Authority both to Confirm their Commission with Miracles, yea, and thereby to Coerce the Rebellious and Disobedient. Hence the Command, *Go Teach*, or, *Disciple all Nations*, respecting the Office, *Work and End above described*, neither did, nor could import an Office to be succeeded unto.

This being our Answer, let us hear how our Querist Impugns it, and would prove this Commission (he must understand it, as at first delivered to Apostles; For, otherwise, we hold the Preaching of the Gospel, with all the necessary Ordinances for the Churches Edification, as imported in this Commission, to be, by Vertue thereof, still in force) to be continued to the Apostles Successors. His first Reason, touching our Lord's promis'd Presence to the End, we have already discut'd, as has likewise the Author to whom his Queries are offered; And there's no need of a Repetition in this place. His next Reason is by way of Querie, *Whether after a Presbyterial Ordination, a Minister is tied to his Paroch, so as he may not, without a Call from Presbytery, Synod, or Assembly, go else-where? If to one Paroch he be confin'd, he may not preach out of it? If to one Nation, he cannot preach to another? If to Christians only he is tied to Preach, the Door is shut against his Preaching to Jews or Mahometans.* I Answer; All this he might have found, in a great measure, if not intirely remov'd by the Author of that Plea he mentions, who illustrates the Matter by a similitude of a Garison in a Warlick Besieged City, which hath General Commanders and Overseers of the whole Posts and Watch-Towers, where particular Guards and Sentinels are set and fix'd; These General Commanders are fix'd to no Posts, yet, the Sentinels have a Relation to the Garison as well as they, and are capable of a farther Extension or Change of their special Posts and Charges, but still according to the *Garison Laws*. Yea, supposing this Garison to be one of many in a like Posture, and under the Inspection of the General of an Army, these Sentinels have a Relation to the General and the Army, as Souldiers or Officers thereof, tho' their Actual Exercise of their Military Office and Trust be still regulated as to either Extension or Change from one Post, yea, or one Garison, to another, by the Military Laws and Discipline, and in this differs essentially from the Office of the Supreme Officers, or General Persons (as our Scottish Military Term runs) who has no such fix'd Relation. 2ty, This Scottish Gentleman, as

he is term'd, offering his Queries to the *Scottish Presbyterians*. might have consulted a Grave Divine, and, may I add, Gentleman of this Nation, whose Praise is in all the Churches, *scil.* the Reverend Mr. *Durham* in his *Dissertation anent a Ministers Relation to his Flock*. Some part whereof I shall here Excerpt. "1. There is a Catholick Unity of the whole Catholick Church Visible, which is one Body 1. Cor. 12. *of Jews and Gentiles, One house and Common wealth*, Eph. 2. 12, 19. *One Mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. into which Body we are entred by Baptism; Into this City Watchmen are set, and External Ordinances given to the same. 2ly, This one Church is divided into particular Churches, which are parts of this Whole. This arises from accidental Considerations, of Number of Professors, of Distance of Place, and the like; Which Sub-division, necessary for Edification, is, first, subject unto, and secondly, without prejudice of the General Catholick Unity premis'd. Believers are joyn'd to the Church as an Integral Whole, consisting of many parts, so that all the Congregations are still of that same Body. 3ly, Our Lord Jesus, the Owner of both Ministers and Church, has given Ministers principally for the Edification of his Catholick Church, without respect to this or that particular Congregation (which we are not to understand in an Absolute exclusive sense, but) in so far forth as this particular Relation to the particular Flöck, is Subservient to the former End, as it is Eph. 4. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 12. 28. It being one Church to which *Apostles, Prophets, Pastors and Teachers* are given, and they have all one Scope (understand in a general Sense) viz. *The perfecting of the Saints*, and one Commission, the Preaching of the Gospel. So that the Work of all Christ's Ministers in a general Sense, whether of Apostles or Ordinary Pastors (remark here his distinguishing still the Ordinary and Extraordinary Officers in this Point; and, in special, his Assertion of the Apostles Extraordinary Office) "is to treat with Sinners, to ingage them by Faith to Christ, as the Master from whom they treat, and to enter them into the Catholick Visible Church by Baptism, which, of its own Nature, hath a Respect to this Entry and Relation, &c. 4ly, Tho' Ministers be design'd principally for the Catholick Church, and their Commission would bear them to treat any where; yet are they not *Catholick Officers* of the Church, nor at their Arbitriment to treat where they will; but (according to the Order, which he hath settled) in particular Churches, as parts of that whole; this being our Lord's Method laid down for Edification. They are not *Catholick Officers*, there being great Odds betwixt Officers of the Catholick Church, and *Catholick Officers of the Catholick Church*; Such the Apostles and Evangelists were, such the Pope claims to be, that

that is, for having an immediat Access for Exercising this Trust equally to all. Officers of the Catholick Church, are such as are plac'd in it, for building up thereof, and have Commission and Reference to that End, yet is it to be execute according to the Rules laid down, that is as Christ's Call in an ordinary way, shall give them Access. But tho' they have a Power and Commission in *actu primo*, to be Ministers of the whole Church, and Watch-men of the City Indefinitely, yet *actu secundo*, they are specially delegated for such and such Congregations or Posts. And hence he, *scil.* the Pastor, is *actu primo*, a Minister of the same kind to all Churches, as being an Ambassador of Christ, for the Churches Edification; But *actu secundo*, and in respect of his special Delegation, he is peculiarly Minister of that Congregation, whereto particularly he is appointed. *5ly*, Notwithstanding of this particular Delegation, yet it is profitable, that a Minister Exercise Ministerial Acts upon Occasion, warrantable calling for the same in other Churches. And when called to it, they do it not only by vertue of their Gifts, but also Authoritatively by vertue of their Office and Commission as Ministers of Jesus Christ, their Ministerial Acts flowing from the premis'd general Respect to the whole Church, they not being as Mayors of several Towns, as Sherriffs of Countries, who cannot exerce Authority out of their own Bounds, but are to be look'd upon as Heraulds of one King, having Authority to charge in his Name where-ever it be within his Dominions, tho' for better Supply of Churches, some Pastors are design'd for one Corner of Christ's Kingdom, some for another. See Durham on the Revel, pag. 106, 107, 108, 109, &c.

This doth sufficiently remove our Querist's premis'd Quible, anent a Minister's Confinement, by his Presbyterial Ordination, to one Paroch till remov'd by a Call, with his Inquiry, *How he Preaches out of it? If to one Nation, why he Preaches in another?* His Relation, as we have heard, being to the Church Catholick Primarily, the Exercise of the Office in *actu exercito* (as the ordinary Distinction runs), tho' ordinarily restricted to such and such Persons and Posts, yet, upon the Churches due Call (the proper Ministerial Judge in this Matter), is capable of farther Extension or Alteration from one Post to another; And the Occasional Exercise, upon the Ministerial Call of other Pastors, has the same Authority, and the same general Ground, as is above specified: This Regulation of the Exercise, and a due Subjection thereof to such Regulation, our Querist must needs acknowledge, unless he overturn the Foundations of all Church-Government, and disown the Union and Authority of the Church-Representative. The same may be said with Respect to

the Exercise towards the *Jews, Mahometans*, and those that are without, the Extension and Regulation whereof falls under the same Consideration, and is to be Limited by the same Measures, as is also above hinted.

If these Restraints Bind not Absolutely, and are not in the Nature of the Office, but for maintaining Order, our Querist infers, " That the Universality of the Apostles Commission *to teach all Nations*, can be no Argument against their having Successors in that Branch of the Apostolick Office. I Answer, The contrary Conclusion rather follows. He has been told, that it is the Judgement of all Sound Divines, that the Universality of the Apostles Commission *to Teach and Disciple all Nations*, render'd them Infallible Catholick Officers in *actu exercitio*, of the Church Catholick, Infallible Universal Inspectors (as well as Founders) of all Churches and Church Judicatories, consequently their Authoritative Inspectors in the Exercise of their Office; So that the *Maintaining of Order* could never reach (as it doth ordinary Officers) the fixing of the Apostles to any Post, or Watch-Tower, as their peculiar Charge, beyond which Limits the Exercise could not be extended, but upon such Warrant and Order of the Church Representative, or such occasional Call as is mention'd; the Apostles being in this Point immediatly under the Spirit's Infallible Direction. Let our Querist consult *Acts* 10. 19. 11. 12. *Acts* 19. 21. *Acts* 20. 22. and this will be Evident beyond Exception. And if this Gentleman will shew us Successors of Apostles in such an Universal Commission, and the Spirit's immediat Infallible Direction of the Exercise thereof, he will be a great *Apollo* indeed; And if the thing be Impossible, he must acknowledge his Inference Futilous and unsound. Here it is pleasant to consider, how this Gentleman, in Impugning the Extraordinary Office of Apostles, both with Respect to *Miracles*, and *Extension of their Office*, hath wounded his Cause, and overthrown his own Principle, of making Bishops the proper Successors of Apostles. Before we heard him pleading, that the Gift of Miracles could be no *Criterion* of the Apostolick Office, since Ordinary Church Officers had this Gift, yea, and, in the Judgement of the Prefacer, the People also in the beginning of the Gospel, according to the Prophecy *Joel* 2. And here he will have the Universality of the Apostles Commission *to teach all Nations* to be no such *Criterion* neither, but that it is competent to Ministers or Pastors, who in this Respect, are Successors of Apostles in that Branch of their Office, the Restraint to a particular Flock or Post; being, according to him, not Essential to Ordination, or the Nature of the Ministerial Office, but for maintaining Order. To which Order, he will, no doubt, acknowledge

ledge Bishops to be Subject, as well as Pastors, and fix'd to their Posts, as well as they. Whence it necessarily follows, that, according to his Principles, Pastors are such Universal Officers as Apostles, and consequently, in the premis'd great Commission, their Successors. 'Tis certain, that, in the Scope and Series of his Querie, he asserts the premis'd Extension, as his Principle, as well as a Principle of Presbyterians.

VI. *Querie, Seeing it is evident from what has been already said of Christ's Promise, To be with his Apostles to the end of the World, that it belongs also to the ἡγούμενοι, the Rulers of the Christian Church, he desires to know, from clear Scripture, what part of the Apostolick Office does not appertain to their Successors? Or what part of it is excluded from a share of this Promise, which reaches to the end of the World?* 'Tis strange, that this Gentleman, who pretends to have Read the Author's Plea for Presbyterian Government, whom he mentions, and Commentators upon that Text, should propose such a Scruple, or desire clear Scripture for that, wherein the Scripture is so very clear and exprefs. He has been often told, and in this all Orthodox Divines are consentient, that the Apostolick Office properly and formally did consist in this, That by immediat Commission from our Lord, they were constituted Founders of the Christian Church, and as his Mouth and infallible Oracles, Authoris'd to deliver his Mind, to appoint the whole Scheme of the New Testament Ordinances, and to be infallible Inspectors of both Ministers and Members of the whole Church, with such extraordinary Gifts and miraculous Induements, both with respect to the Confirmation of Doctrine, and rebuking of the Obstinat, as is above expressed. In all which the Scripture is very clear. The Apostle Paul shews, that he (consequently other Apostles) *was neither an Apostle of Men, nor by Man*, Gal. 1: 1. and *vers. 12. That he receiv'd not the Gospel which he Preach'd of Man, neither was taught it, but by the Revelation of Jesus Christ.* Now here is one clear Scripture for an immediat Mission to the Apostolick Office, excluding all Church Judicatories; or interposing of the Church Representative for his Ordination: Here is also a clear Scripture for an immediat Revelation of the Doctrine by Jesus Christ himself, proving, consequently, the Spirit's infallible Direction in delivering it, which he must needs acknowledge the Priviledge of all the other Apostles: So that, these two parts of the Apostolick Office, he must confess, are competent to no Successors. And as for the Extent and Consequential Priviledges mentioned, besides our Lord's exprefs Commission, *to Disciple all Nations, and to Form them into Churches,* which clearly bears this Conclusion, we find it further fortified by that clear Text, *Rom. 1. 5. where, after the Apostle has, to this Scope, de-*
signed

signed himself a *Servant of Jesus Christ, called to be an Apostle* (I hope he will acknowledge, immediately called, as the other Apostles), he adds, *v. 5. By whom we have received Grace and Apostleship for Obedience to the Faith among all Nations.* Here such an *Immediate Call, and Infallible Universal Legation* asserted, and in order to the end premised, as doth clearly and infallibly exclude Successors to this Office, in a proper formal Sense, and the Privileges thereof, and, consequently, from its Continuance to the End, upon the Promise mentioned. That the Promise is *sure to the Church, as long as the Church continues on Earth*, our Querist tells us, is the *Unanimous Judgment of Commentators*; And he might also have seen in Commentators, as the Necessity of a standing Gospel Ministry, and all necessary Church-Offices and Ordinances for the Churches Edification here asserted, as made sure in this Promise, so, the premised Extraordinary Privileges, proper and peculiar to Apostles, excluded by them, from such a Continuance to the End, as is ascribed to the necessary Officers and Ordinances instanced. I would ask this Querist, whether this Promise, *to be with the Apostles to the end of the World*, will necessarily infer, that there must be such Messengers, as have Immediate Commission from Christ, by no Intervention of Church Judicatories, and are subject to none in the Exercise of their Office, and who are Taught the Gospel by Immediate Revelation, without all Means and Instruction of Men, with Infallibility in Teaching, and a Miraculous Power and Assistance to Confirm their Doctrine; Whether, I say, the Promise will include such standing Officers to the end of the World? If he assert this, he will expose himself to all Men of common Sense: If he assert, there are not, nor can be such Officers existent, then he must, as well as we, limit the Promise to Ordinary Successors, and of a standing Necessity.

He tells us, *If Presbyterians affirm, that the end of the World refers to the last Period of the Apostles Lives, and that he had no other Apostles, besides them, to be with, such a Gloss overthrows the Text.* I Answer, He should have known, that Presbyterians, with all Orthodox Commentators, do affirm, that the Promise reaches to *the end of the World*, with respect to the Apostles Successors in an ordinary standing Ministry, for dispensing of Gospel Ordinances, Word, Sacrament, and Church-Government: Notwithstanding whereof, they do still assert, that the Promise, with respect to the Apostolick Office, formally as such, and the Exercise of that Extraordinary Ministry committed to them, reached to the end of their Lives, and no further; since this Office, considered in a formal Sense, was to die with their Persons. So that, they do distinguish *Successors of Apostles* in general, or in a Gospel Ministry simply, and

and *Successors to the Apostolat* as such, or in a proper formal Sense. This Gloss is so far from destroying the Text, that it rather clears it: And our Querist's Sarcasm and Mock he would cast upon us, anent the *Gloss of Orleance*, is easily retorted upon himself, which I prove thus: That Gloss of any Text, which contradicts other plain Texts of Scripture, is absurd, and tends to overthrow the Text, because cross to the Scriptures *Truth and Harmony*, these two being inseparably conjoyned: But, the Querist's Gloss concerning the *standing Office of Apostolat to the end of the World*, as imported in that Promise, is cross to other Scriptures. The Minor I prove thus: That which is cross to other Scripture Accounts of the Apostolick Office, is cross to other Scriptures; But the premised Gloss is such, as is evident from what is said; *Ergo, &c.* Finally, 'tis noticeable, that our Querist, in his Zeal for Prelacy, will needs Identify the *ἡγεμονοι*, the Rulers mentioned in Scripture, with the *Bishops of the Christian Church*; Whereas, the Terms of *Rulers, Governours, Overseers, Bishops*, are found clearly applyed to *Pastors or Presbyters*, whereof the Author of the Plea, whom he mentions, exhibites several clear Instances, which our Superficial Querist, in this, as in other Points, it seems, has not read nor considered.

VII. Query, *Whether it be credible, that Paul acted as a single Person at the Ordination of Timothy, and not as an Apostle? Or, that he laid aside his Apostleship, and put himself on a level with meer Presbyters, to give an Example of Parity, and to shew after Ages the Authority of Presbyters acting in Parity, without any πρεσβυς, or President in Conferring Orders?* Answer: 'Tis evident, in the Mould of this Query, when he makes one and the same, Paul's acting as a single Presbyter in this Ordination, and laying aside his Apostleship, our Querist neither understands himself, nor the Point he speaks of: For, suppose our Principle to hold good, that there was here a Presbytery on a Level, and the Apostle here presiding, to give an Example of Presbyterian Parity, and the Presbytery's Authority in Ordination, What Man of common Sense would infer, that the Apostle, upon this Ground, laid aside his Apostleship, yea or even in this Act; To speak properly or strictly, the performing the Acts of an Inferiour Officer, and the laying aside the *Apostolick Office* therein, being *totò* different? Since his acting so, and thus giving Example of Presbyterian Authority in Ordination, was very well consistent with his Authority as Apostle, or his Apostolical Superintendency and Inspection over this, and all Presbyteries and Church Judicatories whatsoever, which he neither did nor could divest himself of. Or else our Querist will say,

that, when our Blessed Saviour girded himself with a Towel, and Washed the Disciples Feet *, Exemplifying and Enjoyning thus Ministerial and Christian Love and Humility, he laid aside his Mediatory Office and Authority. Our Lord so Expounded the Action and the Design thereof, *If I, your Lord, have washed your Feet, much more you ought to wash one anothers Feet.* So might the Apostle, in this Action, thus infer and conclude (yea, upon the matter, did so), *If I, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, admit you to an Authoritative Imposition of Hands with me, in this great Act of the Ordination, even of a Timothy an Evangelist, then you may conclude this Power of Ordination to be your standing Duty and Privilege, which no Usurping Ordinary Officer may take from you, or incroach upon; This being so clearly consonant to the Apostle's Account of the Pastoral Office in his Epistles.* 2ly, When he tells us of the *Apostle's giving an Example of Parity, and to shew after-Ages the Authority of Presbyters acting in Parity, without any πρῶτος, or President in Conferring Orders,* he discovers a Twofold Ignorance and Inadvertency, 1. In holding, that *Presbyters Parity, and, in Special, their acting with equal Authority in Conferring Orders, is either, of it self, or in their Sense, exclusive of a President:* What Presbyterian did ever assert this? The Author of the Plea gave him clear Evidences of the contrary. 2ly, In Identifying, and making one and the same a πρῶτος, or President of such a Nature, as he understands (scil. of the Episcopal Mould), with a meer President, or such an one simply considered. He might have found, that the Author mentioned by him, and peculiarly addressed in his VI. Chap. distinguished the Presbyterian President, chosen by the Votes of the Judicatory, and whose Office is, to gather the Votes and Moderat

* See Hierarchical Bishops Claim, Part 3^d Pag. 4, 5.

the Procedure, from either the πρῶτος ad vitam, or the πρῶτος whose Authority incroacheth upon the Decisive Suffrages of the Judicatory, or is imposed upon them, without their Votes or Consent *.

What he adds in this Query, *scil. If this was Paul's Practice, supposing he came where there was such a Colledge of Presbyters, without one over them,* discovers further his Ignorance of the Case, and of our Principles, in that he supposes us to hold, the Colledge of Presbyters, or Presbyterian Meetings, can be without a President; Whereas we hold the Office of a President, *Ordinis Causâ*, to be a necessary Constituent in all Judicatories, consequently Church Judicatories: Or if, by this Expression, *without one over them,* he intend the Episcopal πρῶτος of his Mould, he begs the Question; in supposing, that, sometimes, the Colledge of Presbyters, while Paul and other Apostles were overseeing them,

them, had such a President. He desires plain *Scripture Proofs from Assertors of such Positions, as above expressed.* As for his mistaken Positions, we are not concerned to offer a Scripture Proof: But for the College of Presbyters, or Pastors acting in Parity in Judicial Procedures, the Author of the *Plea* exhibited to him clear Proofs, both from the Authoritative Denomination of Pastors, who are termed *Rulers, Governours, Overseers, Bishops*; as likewise from this Ground, that they are found placed Church by Church, in order to the Government thereof: And, in Consequence hereof, the Exercise of their joynt Authority in Government stands clearly Exemplified and held out, both in such Scriptures, as injoyne their joynt Authority and Exercise of Power, and the Peoples Subjection and Obedience accordingly; as is likewise in the Scripture Instance of the Apostle *Paul's* injoyning the highest Jurisdictional Act of Excommunication to the Presbyters or Pastors of *Corinth*, and in this, as in the other Instances, without the least hint of any Superintending Superior Officers in these joynt Jurisdictional Acts. To which may be added the Apostle *Paul's* Injoyning, in his last Farewell to the Church of *Ephesus*, an Episcopal Inspection and Authority to the Pastors or Presbyters thereof, seconded by a like Command of the Apostle *Peter*, exclusive of the same premised Episcopal Superintendency over these Elders or Pastors, whom he exhorts to *Feed and Rule the Flock* joyntly, with a joynt Collegiat Episcopal Inspection over the same, *Act. 20. 28. 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3.* and this expressly exclusive of an Episcopal Lordship of any one over the rest. These Scripture Instances of Pastors Joynt Equal Authority in Government are so clear, that our Querist can desiderat no clearer Proof than has been already exhibited *.

* See Hier. Bishop. &c. Part 2, Pag. 22. Part 3. Pag. 44. with Pag. 50, 51. & alibi.

VIII. Query, *Whether the Presbytery, which Paul mentions, as concerned in Timothy's Ordination, consisted of mere Presbyters? Or, if the Persons, who accompanied Paul in his Return from Macedonia, through Asia, and whose Names we find, Act. 20. 4. were mere Presbyters?* Answer: What he means by *mere Presbyters*, is not so clear; If he means *Pastors Labouring in the Word and Doctrine*, such as the Apostles Constituted in every Church which they planted, we say, It did consist of such *Presbyters*, and the Author, whom he pretends to have read, gave him a full Account of the Sense of Protestant Divines to this purpose *, who do clear this Matter from the Scope and Contexture. That the Presbytery mentioned did consist of such Officers, may be further made appear, by reflecting upon the Grounds exhibited, *scil.* the Apostolical Com-

* See Hier. Bishop. &c. Part 3. Pag. 53. 54. 55. 56.

mands touching Presbyters joynt *Episcopal Authority in Government*, the Scripture Accounts of the Exercise thereof, the Injunction of Peoples Obedience, &c. So that the Affirmative Answer has clear Foundations. Those who, by Office, are Authorised to the *highest Acts of the Power of Order. Dispensing the Word and Sacraments*, had certainly an Interest in such a *Jurisdictional Act* as this; the first being (by Confession of Prelatists themselves, as well as in the Sense of all Sound Divines) a Badge of the highest Ministerial Authority*. Those who

* See Dr. Burnet, 4. Conference, Pag. 310. with Page 331. wherein the Bishop and Presbyter are acknowledged to be the same Office *Jure Divino*, and that such as are Impower'd for the *Sacramental Actions*, are of the highest Office in the Church. Bishop Jewell against Harding, Pag. 121. Cranmer, cited by Stillington, Iren Pag. 392. Dr. Morton, *Ant. Cathol. Lib.* 2. Pag. 118, 119, &c. assert the same Identity of the Office; consequently this Equal Interest in the Highest Acts of the Power of Order, which will necessarily infer the same Interest in the Power of Jurisdiction.

† Ch. 13.

have intrusted to them an *Episcopal Inspection over the Flocks*, to Feed and Rule them *Pedo & Pabulo*, must needs have an Essential Interest in Authorising and Solemn Admitting of Fellow-Labourers in the Lord's Vineyard. They, whose Authority reaches to Cast out and Excommunicate, and Unchurch the Scandalous, and are declared Judges in, and Administrators of the Churches Intrinsic Jurisdictional Power, have, without all peradventure, Authority in Admitting of Officers: But such Authority is ascribed to Pastors or Presbyters; Ergo, &c. Those who have Essential Interest in the Exercise of the Churches *Dogmatick, Critical, and Diatactick Authority*, and are found therein concerned, even in Association with Apostles, must needs be supposed to have an Interest and Authority in this Jurisdictional Act of Timothy's Ordination, which is included therein: But Pastors, or Presbyters, are found clothed with this Essential power and Interest above expressed, as is evident, *Act. 15. Ergo, &c.* And, in a Word, if Presbyters, thus Authorised, be found in Apostolick Churches, such as *Corinth, Ephesus, &c.* then certainly this Presbytery must be supposed of such a Nature, as were others of a like Jurisdictional Power. The Author of the *Jus Divin. Regim. Eccl.* has made the first evidently appear †. 2ly, That the Word here imports a *Consistorial Juridical Meeting*, is made good from Parallels, and cannot be supposed to import the Office, as some have suggested; so that there is a joynt Jurisdictional Power ascribed to the Collegiate Meeting as such, which clearly excludes all Prelatical Incroachments, or Singular Authority and Supereminent Power, there being no Hint of any peculiar Interest, beyond a Community, ascribed to any one Member of the Meeting; so that the joynt *Jurisdictional Authority of the Judicatory* is

clearly,

clearly asserted. Tho' even a *Paul* was present, and imposed Hands, *scil.* with a special respect to the Gifts, as is expressly asserted, yet the Ordination it self, and the Jurisdictional Authority therein Exercised, is distinguished from this, and ascribed to the Presbytery, or Consistorial Meeting, as such.

Our Querist further inquires, *If the Persons accompanying Paul, in his Return from Macedonia, through Asia, whose Names we find, Act. 20. 4. were mere Presbyters, Timothy being one of them, and some, not without reason, suppose, that Paul Ordained Timothy with their Concurrence and Consent.* I Answer, whether they were mere Presbyters, or not, is nothing to the point, unless he could make it appear, that they were Members of this Consistorial Meeting, whereof there is no shadow of proof offered from the Text, nor can be; And what Accounts are elsewhere given of them, points at their ordinary Office as Pastors, if we except *Timothy*, who is called *Evangelist*. For *Sopater*, he is thought to be that *Sopater*, *Rom. 16. 21.* *Tychicus* is called a *Beloved Brother and Faithful in the Lord*, *Eph. 6. 21.* (a Designation proper to the Faithful Pastor) a *Beloved Brother, Faithful Minister and Fellow-Servant in the Lord*, *Col. 4. 7.* and mentioned as sent to *Ephesus*, *2 Tim. 4. 12.* *Trophimus* is called an *Ephesian*, and mentioned as with *Paul* at *Jerusalem*, *Act. 21. 29.* mentioned as left sick at *Miletus*, *2 Tim. 4. 20.* These persons are here honourably mentioned for their Faithful Attendance on the Apostle, but, that they were Persons of Extraordinary Character, has no shadow of proof, far less, that they were Members Constituent of this Presbytery: And tho' this were supposed, it can nothing invalidate the proof of this Presbyteries Authority upon the Ground already assigned, to whom, as a Collegiate Meeting and Presbytery, this Jurisdictional Act is ascribed. For what he talks of their mere Consent and Concurrence, therein repeating the old Episcopal Cant anent *Paul's* sole Authority herein, exclusive of that of the Presbytery, he has been told by the Author of the *Plea*, that *Imposition of Hands* is an Authoritative Jurisdictional Act, and Infallible Badge of Authoritative Blessing, and therefore cannot import a mere Consent, or Consentient Concurrence, which is proper to the People, who can have no Interest in laying on Hands. The Author mentioned fortified this by the Judgment of Episcopals themselves, particularly *Dr. Forbes*, in his *Irenicum*.

Our Querist tells us next, *It could be no Presbytery Acting in Parity, if Paul was one of the Number, unless it was a College of Apostles.* This Evasion he might have found also remov'd by the Author of the *Plea*, from this Principle, that the presence of *Paul*, tho' supposed, rather Confirms than Invalidates the Presbyteries Authority and Acting in Parity;

and that upon these Grounds: 1. Because the Ordination it self ascribed to the Presbytery in the Texts collated, is distinguished from *the laying on of Paul's hands*, and from *the Gifts and Prophecy* simply considered, and pointed at as a Priviledge distinct therefrom *.

* See Hier. Neglect not the Gift, saith the Apostle, *given thee by Prophecie, with the Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*. So that, by Paul's Declarator, the Presbyteries joynt Jurisdictional Authority, and consequently the Equal Interest of all Members, as a Presbtery, in this Ordination, is asserted.

2ly, Because Paul's presence, or laying on of Hands, doth not inance or exclude the Presbyteries Authoritative Imposition of Hands, the acknowledged Badge of the Ordaining Power: So that, upon both Grounds, there is here an Example of a Presbyteries Acting in Parity, supposing still the Apostle Paul's standing Extraordinary Office in this Instance, and his Presence and Concurrence Cumulative unto, not Privative of, the Presbyteries Intrinsick Authority here asserted.

Our Querist will not have it *A Presbytery acting in Parity, unless it was a College of Apostles*. Upon this Suggestion the Author

* Hier. Bishop, &c. part. 3 pag. 61, 62.

of the Plea plied his Fellows, and consequently himself, with this Querie *, *That, if so, how could the Apostle ascribe the conferring of Gifts to the laying on of his hands solely, excluding his Fellow-Apostles, whose equal Interest and*

Authority herein none will call in question? For his next Objection, *How mere Presbyters could lay on hands upon an Evangelist?* The Author he mentions, told him, " That a Presbtery, with the great Apostle of the Gentiles, might ordain an Evangelist, and yet the Presbyteries Authority no whit thereby Infring'd, but rather Strengthened, since Paul, assuming their Authoritative Concurrence, did, *a fortiori*, shew, that much more the Power of Ordination is their Essential Priviledge,

* See Hier. Bishop, &c. Part. 1. p. 32. ' with Respect to Ordinary Officers, when the Office of Apostles and Evangelists is ceas'd *. Besides that some would be apt to tell him, that, tho' Timothy, in Respect of his Extraordinary Office of Visiting and Watering Churches upon the Apostles Direction, was

Major Singulis, above any single Pastor, yet he might be Minor Universis, and this Judicatorie and Church Representative of an higher Sphere and Authority: For, in Churches constituted, Timothy could not Ordain alone; nor perform other Jurisdictional Acts, excluding the Churches fix'd Pastors, and in that respect appears Inferiour. The Author of the Plea here pos'd him and his Fellows, By what Authority did the Prophets or Pastors at Antioch, even admitting some of them

were.

were Extraordinary Prophets, lay hands upon the great Apostle of the Gentiles, Paul?

Our Querist doth further Pose us with this Question, *If Presbyteries have power to Ordain Evangelists, why do they not send out such Evangelists to the unconverted Nations?* I Answer, he has not yet prov'd from this Text, that there is a standing Office of Evangelists, and consequently there is no Ground for to send such out in his Sense, if the Office is ceas'd: And for the Presbyterie's Interest in this Ordination, it is Answered already. We affirm the Evangelist's Office, properly taken, and in the Sense of Protestant Divines, supposes the Existence of the Apostolat; For from Apostles they had their Commission and Instructions to the Churches, and to them they were accountable. 2ly, Since the Evangelist's Office, according to him, is a standing Office, and respects a preaching to Infidels, why do not Prelats and Arch-Prelats, send out such Officers, with such a Trust and Authority, to convert Jews and Mahometans? Why do not these Succedaneous Apostles prosecute this Apostolick Work? We hear of no such Commissions given by these Fathers. If they have this Power, as his Principles oblige him to hold, why is it not reduc'd into Act? He knows the Maxim, *frustra est potentia*, &c. Let him Shield himself against this Retortion. 3ly, What if it be said, that *Timothy* receiv'd a mere Presbyterat by his Ordination, as *Honnieman* glosses the Text †, *Neglect not the † Survey, Part. Gift given thee by laying on of hands, whereby thou was Or-* 2. p. 217, 218. *dain'd, or made a Presbyter*, and that he was thereafter assum'd to the Evangelistick Office, as *Philip* who was at first only ordain'd a Deacon, and thereafter made Evangelist (as *Calvin* with other Judicious Divines understand that Passage of *Acts* 21. 8.)? Were this suppos'd, our Querist is soon thus Nonplus'd with his frivolous Notion. 4ly, As for that Instance wherewith he plies us, *viz. That no Order of Men can bestow any Powers they have not themselves, unless they have it only to give away, as the Electors of the Empire*, He could not readily couch in fewer words greater Absurdity. 1. Any Order of Men may have that Radically, and in Respect of Original Fountain Power, which they have not, in respect of the *Fermal, Legal Personal Exercise*? And thus the Electors constitute the Emperor, who being constituted, has a Personal Legal Authority and Exercise, which they have not in this Case. Thus the Army choosing a General. 2ly, When he says, *That they have not this Power themselves, unless they have it only to give away, as the Electors of the Empire*, he understands not that whereof he affirms; For the Original-Inherent Fountain Power, essential to the Community, can not be given away, but is still the same, else it could never be again put forth in another

another Election. Can a Cause in putting forth its Causality in the Production of its proper Effect, cease to be a Cause? This is sure as Absurd as what our Querist suggests of the Effect exceeding its Cause. And he tells us, 'tis an undoubted Maxim, *Frustra est potentia quæ non reducitur in Actum*; I should think he had better express'd it, *Quæ non potest reduci in Actum*, lest he reflect upon the Divine Omnipotency, which in innumerable Effects, *Non in Actum reducitur*, and also speak bad Sense in the Case of even created Powers.

For what he adds of *Timothy's* Authority, "To Receive or Reject Accusations against Presbyters, and to make use of such Discipline as might be necessary for the Government of the Church of *Ephesus*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 19. as being Presbyters Judge, to whom they were accountable: The Author of the *Plea* has fully confuted this, and told him, that nothing in this Epistle can prove either a Sole, Episcopal, or standing Authority in this Point. *Timothy* himself being ordain'd by a Presbytery, he could have no Power paramount to a Presbytery, and being shortly thereafter, and notwithstanding of the Prescriptions instanc'd, recall'd to prosecute his Evangelistick Employment else-where, it must necessarily be suppos'd, that the settled Judicatories and Consistorial Meetings of Pastors in that Church, had this Authority in reference to these Acts mentioned; Else they were left without a Government, and all Exercise of Jurisdictional Power, when *Timothy* was gone, which is clearly cross to the Scope of this Epistle, which is to fix a standing Mould of Government, and to instruct *Timothy* in the Nature and Exercise of Necessary Church-Officers, and thus, by necessary Consequence, in Order to this End, he should have been instructed in the Nature and Exercise of the Episcopal Office, had any such Officers been allow'd to succeed him, and propagat the Gospel Government.

IX. Query, *Whether it had been improper Speaking in St. Paul, supposing the Presbytery, 1 Tim. 4. 14. to be the College of Apostles, or, at least, a Quorum of them, (for, a College of Presbyters, strictly taken, it cou'd not be) he meant only his own Hands, as he says, 2 Tim. 1. 6. When he said in the other place, By the Hands of the Presbytery, meaning the Consent of the Apostolick Seniority or Presbytery.* This Query, set down here verbatim, in his Terms, is of so Enigmatick a Mould, that, I must confess, it passes much my Skill, to reconcile it to Sound Grammar or Sense. As far, as I apprehend, he inquires, If, supposing the Meeting, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. was a College, or Quorum of Apostles, *Paul* meant only his own Hands, in that place of 2 *Tim.* 1. 6. (where mention is made of the Gifts given by the Laying on of his Hands), becaule, what one did, was done by them all? Answer: I have already told him, that, if it were such a Meeting, *Paul* could not ascribe the Action to himself solely; nor

can any Solid Reason be assigned, why, in such a Case, the *Imposition of Hands* was *Paul's* Sole Act. If he hold, that, in this Meeting, or *Quorum*, of an Apostolick Senate, *Paul* only might, actually, impose Hands, the other Apostles imposing only by Consent, he contradicts himself in what he said above, of a Consent, as importing no Authority in Ordination, and thus robs the rest of his supposed *Quorum* of their Apostolick Authority. Or, if he hold that this Ritual of *Imposition of hands* might be intrusted to *Paul* by the rest of the Senate or College, who, notwithstanding, did Authoritatively concur in the thing it self, the intrusting of it to *Paul* importing so much; Then we infer that *Paul's* sole imposing of Hands, tho' admitted, might in our Principles, well consist with the Presbyteries Authoritative Concurrence in Ordination, tho' he only in their Name performed this Action or Ritual. If he retort, that the case is different, the Apostles, or a *Quorum* of them, having such Authority of intrusting this Ritual to one, which the Meeting of Presbyters have not, he begs the Question; Since the Scope and Circumstances of this Text, with other Scripture Grounds above touched, evince the contrary. For what he adds, *That we own him a Minister, who is Ordained by the least Number*; He should know, that, in Presbyterian Principles, Ordination is a proper Act of the Judicatory, as such, or a sufficient *Quorum* or Representative for the time, in case of the inevitable Hinderance of some of the Members. And for that which he adds, *of Ordination by one only*, we hold it not valid upon the forementioned ground, for one cannot be a Judicatory, nor his Sole Act a Juridical Act, such as this of Ordination essentially is, which is still to be understood with respect to God's ordinary fixed Rules: What the case of necessity pleads for shall be afterward touched. For his asserting, that *this could not be a College of Presbyters strictly taken*, 'tis among the rest of his *gratis dicta* and beggings of the Question.

X. Querie, *If it be certain that Paul might have Ordain'd Timothy alone, which he thinks none can doubt of, but that he cou'd have done it without the assistance of the Presbytery, supposing it to consist of Presbyters in the modern Sense of them, yet seeing the Apostle did not Authorise them to Ordain him of themselves, but did put his own Hands upon him; Will that ever prove that it was their Hands alone, or at all that made Timothy an Ecclesiastick?* To this part of the Querie, I Answer, 1. Whatever the Apostles Authority was in the Constitution of Churches, and in Directing and Authorizing the Duties of Officers and Members, when constituted, yet the Apostles neither had, nor Exercised any such Authority, as did or could inance and exclude the Jurisdictional Power and Authority of
Judi-

Judicatories, constituted according to Gospel Rules. For, 1. Their Power could not cross and contradict the Scope and Design of established Church Officers, Rulers and Governours of the Churches, who were called and Authorized to Exercise their Power given them by God, as well as the Apostles were to Exercise theirs, pursuant to the Lord's Command and Commission thereanent. To make which evident, I would ask our Querist, suppose Pastors constituted in a Church, whether did the Apostles Power reach to Discharge, Inhibite, or take from them the lawful Exercise of the Power of Order, Preaching the Word, Administration of Sacraments, or that of Jurisdiction necessarily connected therewith? Sure he must acknowledge they had no such Arbitrary Power, else he will fall into a twofold absurdity, in asserting, 1. That the Apostles had a Power paramount to their Master's Commission, which was to place such necessary Officers as the Churches Edification required, and a Power to rob Christ's Body of its necessary Parts for its preservation, together with the necessary means thereof. 2ly, That the Apostles might retract and contradict their Doctrine, injoyning to such Officers the Exercise of this Power, 1 Cor. 5. with 2 Cor. 2. Act. 20. 28. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3. Heb. 13. 7, 17. and the Peoples Subjection and Obedience accordingly contained in the premised and several parallel Scriptures. Hence 'tis evident beyond all Contradiction, that both Powers of Order and Jurisdiction are essentially included in the Pastoral Office.

In the next place, we find the same Apostle, in his last Farewell, injoyning an equal Episcopal Power, and the Exercise thereof to the Ministers of *Ephesus*, without respect to any Superintending Officer, asserting thus their joynt and standing Authority, as to the Exercise of Order and Jurisdiction. Moreover, we find him Reprehending the Ministers of the Church of *Corinth*, for not putting forth that great Jurisdictional Act of casting out the Incestuous Person, asserting thus their intrinsick Authority to Judge all within that Church, and Absolve the Penitent, and this notwithstanding his interposed Apostolical Authority and Concurrence for their Incouragement, so as the

* 1 Cor. 5. 3. other *, and therefore, by clear Parity of Reason,
 4, 5. 2 Cor. 2. the Apostle's Presence and laying on Hands, together
 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. with the Presbytery at *Timothie's* Ordination, was, in
 this case, as in the other, a Corroborating Seal of the
 Presbyterie's intrinsick Authority in this matter, but no whit derogatory thereunto. So that to our Querist's next Question, *If Paul's laying on Hands with the Presbytery be a proof that the Presbytery could Ordain without*

without Paul? I Answer, 'tis as good proof, that they could do it by an intrinsick Authority, tho' in this case *Paul* concurred, as the same Apostle's injoyning to the *Corinth* Church Officers the casting out of the Incestuous Person, is a proof of their Inherent intrinsick Authority hereanent, tho his Apostolical Authority and Command was in that case interposed, for their Incouragement, and to quicken them to their Duty, as well as to remove any Tergiversation or Excuse for the delay; which is convincingly clear in the Context.

Our Querist will not, at least cannot assert, that *Paul's* injoyning the Church at *Colosse* to say to *Archippus*, *Take heed to the Ministry which thou hast received in the Lord, that thou fulfill it* *, will infer that the Church, or Church-Officers had * *Col. 4. 17.* no such Authority to give this Injunction to *Archippus* in point of his Ministry, antecedaneous to that Apostolick Command. And his intrusting, in the Instance above adduced, the whole Jurisdictional care over the Church of *Ephesus* to its Officers joyntly, when they were never to see his Face more, is, no doubt, a Trust more Extensive, and clearly importing their inherent Authority as to Ordination and Jurisdiction, than Intrusting the Ordination of *Timothy* to that Presbytery, tho' the Apostle had not been present; And as for his Concurrence, we have given an account of it already.

As for his nauseating oft repeated Querie, *If he acted here as a single Presbyter?* I Answer, indeed in his sense of Acting so as to lay aside his Apostolick Authority, we say, he did not so Act, nor could. The Apostles were Eminenter Pastors or Presbyters, as well as Apostles; (This Gentleman might have Read both the Apostle *Peter* and *John*, terming themselves Elders or Presbyters, 1 *Pet. 5. 1. The Elders among you I Exhort, who am also an Elder*, or a Co-Presbyter, 2 *John 1. The Elder unto the Elect Lady. 3 John 1. The Elder unto the well beloved Gaius.*) I hope he will not say, that in either case they disowned their Apostleship: So that the performance of Acts proper to such Officers was consistent with their retaining their Apostolick Authority, which some way was Exercised in these Acts; as the Office of *Moses*, in performing any such Judicial Acts as were competent to their ordinary Judges. If by Acting as a mere Presbyter, our Querist do understand his performing in this case what is suitable to a Pastor or Presbyter, *scil.* a Concurring in laying on Hands in Ordination with a Presbytery, or even his presiding at a Meeting, we say, that in this respect he acted as a Presbyter or Pastor.

C H A P. VI.

Wherein are Examined and Confuted the Querists frivolous Answers, (Chap. V.) to some Presbyterian Arguments (especially that taken from Act. 20.) against Timothy's Episcopacy.

OUR Querist, in this Chapter, will needs level his Queries against Presbyterian Exceptions, as he calls them, whereby they oppose *Timothy's* Episcopacy ; But how slender and insignificant his own Exceptions and Queries are, shall luculently appear in this Examen of them, whereof the

First is, Whether Paul's Charge to the Elders of Ephesus proves that Timothy was not there, or that he was not a Bishop? If, because they are call'd Elders, they may as well infer (saith he) that the Apostles, who were also call'd Elders and Deacons too, were not Apostles. And to be sure, the biggest Order does not exclude, but rather include the Inferiour and Subordinate Orders. This Querie has Ignorance written in its Forehead. I know none (sure no Presbyterian, at least) who averr'd, that Timothy was not with Paul when he gave that Charge ; Nor know I any who infer it from the Denomination of Elders given to these Officers : Or if he means, that he was not at Ephesus, the Circumstances of the Context are clear, that he was with Paul, when he gave that Charge to these Elders : So that, neither Conclusion, of his not being a Bishop, or his not being with Paul, needs be inferred from the Denomination of Elders given to these Officers. 2ly, Our Inference from this Charge, scil. That Timothy was not a Bishop, and, in special, over the Church of Ephesus (for that's the Question) is from clear grounds made good by

*Presbyterian Divines, and have been exhibited at length by the Author of the Plea *, which if he had, as he pretends, Read and Considered, it might have saved him the Labour of these idle Queries. The Reasons are, 1. These*

Elders are clearly supposed Officers, having all of them a Relation to that Church. 2ly, They have a joynt Episcopal Inspection enjoined them, as the Bishops and Overseers thereof, instituted by the Holy Ghost ; Thus Acts 20.28. 3ly, This Command and Injunction

was

was in presence of *Timothy*, without the least hint of any Interest he had in them, or Inspection over them, as their Bishop, or of any Duty they did owe to him, as in that Capacity; Which no Man of common Sense can imagine the Apostle would in this case have omitted: Especially, since, in the *Fourth place*, this was *Paul's* last and farewell Charge: All which doth necessarily suppose this Church standing thus Governed, and these Officers Succeeding the Apostolate in what was necessary for the preservation thereof. To which may be added, that the hazard *Paul* warns them of, touching Error and Schism *, has no other Remedy by him opposed thereunto, than the same Officers or Bishops standing Inspection, and joint faithful performance of Duty, in Feeding and Ruling that Church †. As likewise, that what is enjoined them is fully correspondent to the same Office and Duty ascribed to Pastors elsewhere: Thus by the same Apostle, *1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 17.* Thus by the Apostle *Peter*, *1 Pet. 5. 2, 3.* The Author of the *Plea*, whom he mentions, had also told him, that, by consequence, the Angel of the Church of *Ephesus* appears, upon this ground, to be taken in a *Collective Sense*, not for a *single Bishop*, with such Power as is asserted by Episcopalians; Else there were no consistency of that passage with this Text, but a palpable Contradiction thereunto ||.

* *Acts 20.*
29, 30.

† *Compare*
Ver. 28. 29,
30, 31, 32.

|| See *Hier.*
Bishop. 1 Part.
Ch. 4. p. 79.

To return to our Querist, what pitiful Trifling doth he discover, in supposing, *That we exclude Timothy's Episcopacy, because these Officers are termed Elders*; The Author mentioned having offered to him the preceeding Grounds, and told him, that they are not only called Elders, but enjoined a *joynt Episcopal Power and Authority* over that Church, *ἐπίσκοπον* with *πρεσβυτερον*: So that he needs not, for Answer to his own sham Argument, tell us, that *Apostles are called Elders and Deacons*, and that the higher Order includes the Subordinate. But these Elders being also owned as set up by the Holy Ghost over this Church, and having an *Episcopal Authority* clearly ascribed to them, he must be interrogated, where the Lower, Subordinate, Inferiour Order (to use his Term) includes the Superior and Higher? And, 2^{ty}, Where finds he any that have drawn an Argument from the meer Denomination of *Elders* to exclude *Timothy's* Episcopacy, without respect to the premised Grounds assigned in the Context? For what he adds, *That this is sufficient to baffle our Argument, whose Strength lies in the different Acceptation of one Word, scil. Elder*; He has therein baffled, not the Presbyterians Argument, but, his own Reputation, and exposed his Ignorance of this Controversie, yea and

of that Authors Work he pretends to Answer. He tells us, that the Word *Elder* denotes *Presecture*; he should have said rather the Word *Bishop*, the Greek Term *ἐπίσκοπος* being a Comparative of *πρεσβυς*, importing a Senior in Age or Office, and, with *Beda*, *Sapientie maturitatem*. Whether it was in the 2d or 3d Centuries applyed to Presbyters distinct from Bishops, and Subject to them, is nothing to the purpose; Our Question here being, how the Term is to be understood in Scripture Language and Acceptation.

But our Querist will hint another Objection, viz. *That Paul Names not Timothy particularly in his Exhortation*. We say, he is Named neither particularly nor generally, directly nor indirectly in this Exhortation. But what Answers he to this Objection, Why, *It cannot be inferred he was not there, because not Named, seeing none of the rest are particularly Named, but included in the general Compellation*. The Term *There* seems obscure as is said: If he mean, that he was not with *Paul* when he gave this Exhortation, the Context is clear against him, which shews, that *Timothy*, with others, came with the Apostle into *Asia*, and was one of that Society and Company mentioned all along as attending him. If by *There* he mean *Ephesus*; We assert, in this Sense he was not there, being with *Paul* on his Journey when he came to *Miletus*; And there is not the least shadow of Argument can be drawn from the Context, that he was at *Ephesus*, or sent for with other Elders. As for his not being Named particularly in the Exhortation to the Elders, 'tis an Argument with more Nerves than this Querist can grapple with, and the Author of that *Plea*, which he pretends to have Read, gave him an account thereof, and the Sense of the Learned *Antonius*

* See Part 2. Chap. 2. Pag. 52. 53, &c. Compared with Pag. 35. *Sadeel*, and other Protestant Divines upon that Passage *. I shall here only resume what *Sadeel* offers. *When was there ever a Season so suitable, and fit to point at the Duty of this supposed Bishop towards his Diocese, and of the Pastors or Elders towards him, than when Paul gave his last Exhortation, discoursing so Divinely, and with such Weight and Zeal anent the case and hazard of the Flock, and their Duty thereanent, who were the Holy Ghost's Overseers, intrusted with the Care thereof?* From this judicious Argument, drawn from the Context, 'tis evident, that upon our Querist's and his Fellows Hypothesis, the Apostle in this case was not only concerned particularly to Name him, but to have enjoined the peculiar Duties of his eminent Station; So that they charge upon the Apostle an unfaithful deficiency in this Omission.

Our Querist tells us further, *That none present are Named particularly, but included in the general compellation*. Very true; Because, as he will easily

easily acknowledge, they were all on a level, and equally concerned in the Duties Exhorted to; But so was not *Timothy*, according to his Hypothesis. They are all Named *Bishops set up by the Holy Ghost*; But, I pray, is not *Timothy*, in his Sense and Pleading, the only proper supereminent Bishop, having a standing *Episcopal Authority* over them, to whom they were in such manner Subject, that the Episcopal Inspection over that Church was properly and solely *Timothy's Prerogative*, upon whom all these Elders had a precarious Dependence, and a derived Ministry from him, as their Head and Lord, the whole Authority as to Ordination and Jurisdiction being Properly, Inherently, and Originally his? Yea, doth not our Gentleman, in the III *Querie*, plead for the *Bishops Power* so proper to him, that any Delegation thereof to Presbyters is at his Option as to its time and nature? Now, upon this Ground and Principle, what greater Negligence, absurd Inconsiderateness, and Self-contradicting Inadvertency can readily be imagined, than that which he, and his Fellows, impute to the Holy Apostle, as is said, in giving the Name of *Bishops*, yea and injoyning the intire *Episcopal Inspection* over that Church, with all Authority included therein, to the Pastors and Ministers thereof, before their Bishop's Face, never owning him in the thing, no more than if not there at all, or as no such Relation were existent, to whom, according to this Opinion, the Exhortation ought to have been principally Directed? And if, as our Querist would suppose, he was with these Elders, and the Person principally concerned in these Duties, what account can our Querist, or any rational Man give of this *altum silentium*, this deep silence as to him, in this only and proper Season of such a Farewell Warning.

As for his other Evasions, they are as insignificant. It may be presumed, saith he, *Timothy was Instructed in all parts of his Office by Word of Mouth*. But, I pray, were not the Elders thus also Instructed? Or, will he say, that when the Apostles ordained Elders Church by Church, they Instructed them not in the Nature and Duties of their Office? Yet they are here again by the Apostle reminded thereof in this last parting Visite; And why not also *Timothy* of his Duty at this solemn Season? Was he of such Perfection as needed no renewed Warning and Excitement? 2ly, Notwithstanding that *Timothy* was, according to our Querist, *by Word of Mouth instructed in all parts of his Office*, yet he tells us, that *Epistles were Written to him*, and he will not doubt that this was further to remind, instruct, and excite him thereunto. Doth not the Apostle Peter Write, 2 Pet. 3. 1. to stir up Believers pure Minds by way of Remembrance? Saith not Jude, v. 5. I will put you in Remembrance, tho' you
once

once knew this, &c. Doth not the Apostle *John* Write to such as were Strong, and had overcome the Wicked one, for their further Instruction and Excitement to their Duty, 1 *John* 2. 13, 14? Why then was not this great Bishop, in this last farewell Exhortation, put in mind of his important Work and Office, but wholly left out in this warning?

The Gentleman tells us, in the next place; *That he is not excluded from his own Share in that Pathetick Exhortation to the Elders.* Indeed he is not excluded, but included in the General Duties, or rather the Pastoral Duties, generally considered; And so, I hope, he will acknowledge, were all other Officers present with the Apostle, who, he will acknowledge, had no Episcopal Relation to *Ephesus*: But, with respect to that Church, and as an Officer or Bishop thereof, he is no more included than others, providentially then present. I suppose our Gentleman *Querist* present, when a Prince directs Gentlemen of a Shire, or their Commissioners to a Parliament, not only in their General Duties, but as such Commissioners; Will his Concernment in the General Duties, prove his special Relation to that Shire, or his Interest as Commissioner therein, even when supposed he may be in the Capacity of Commissioner of some other Shire or County? But, 3^{ly}, Our *Querist* has pitifully forgot himself, and what he might have read in the Author of the *Plea*, who, with other Presbyterians, told him, that, according to Episcopal Principles, and Character of *Timothy*, these Substitutes and Elders, in this Farewell Sermon and Warning of the Apostle, ought to have had some special Instructions and Exhortations, respecting their many Important Duties towards their Head and Venerable Bishop now present, since he must acknowledge, that the Unity and Edification of the Church mentioned therein, did so much call for this. Or, will he say, that these Elders were so seen, as to need no Warning in this Matter, as well as in other Points of their Duty? When *Paul* enjoined them to take heed to themselves and the Flock, over which they were made Bishops by the Holy Ghost, he should, for Guarding against their Stumbling, and Judging themselves no Subaltern, but Absolute Bishops, and their being tempted thus to kick against their only proper Bishop's Authority, have told them, that the Holy Ghost had made them only Inferiour Substitutes under their present Bishop set over them, to whom they did owe Subjection and Obedience.

II. Query. *Whether Timothy's Travelling through the Churches, either in Company, or, as he was sent by Paul after his Settlement as Bishop of Ephesus, does prove that he was not Bishop there; or, Whether frequent Travels to different places to Preach the Gospel is a Demonstration, that the Person thus employ'd cannot be a Bishop of one particular Church?* It may seem strange, that

that our Querist presents this, upon pretended Reading the Book he mentions, wherein it is fully Answered to Dr. *Monro*, making the same Inquiry *. This Gentleman and he are therein told, 1. That it cannot be proved, that any fixed to a particular Station, had such a Planetary Motion, and Transient Employment, as that of *Timothy* is proven to have been. 2ly. That neither can it be made appear, that either *Timothy* or *Titus*, after this Employment, did constantly or ordinarily return to *Ephesus* or *Crete*, and not to the places of the Apostle's present Abode and Employment. He has been told, that this insinuate Answer (consequently this Query) is a Begging of the Question, since all the Ground of *Timothy's* pretended Instalment, as Bishop of *Ephesus*, is in the Charge given to him in the first Epistle, wherein this Transient Employment is clearly asserted. The same is made good with respect to *Titus's* pretended Episcopacy in *Crete*.

* See Part
2. Ch. 4. Pag.
120.

For what is pretended, in Illustration hereof, anent such Travels of a Pastor, the Author told them *, "That the Similitude halts; Since the Pastor's fixed Relation to his Charge is supposed and granted: But in the Case of the pretended Prelate 'tis begged. 2ly. The Pastor's Ordinary Attendance upon his Charge, in Consequence of his Relation thereunto, is also supposed and granted: Whereas, in the Case of *Timothy* and *Titus*, this fixed Instalment, and ordinary Attendance thereupon, is begged, not proved, an Occasional Transient Ministry and Employment being clearly asserted in the Text; So that this Transient Unfixed Ministry appears to have been the Ordinary Employment and Ministry both of *Timothy* and *Titus*."

* *Ibid*.

But our Querist asks, *What Argument can this be from such as assert; there were no Division of distinct paroches or Dioceses till 260 Years after Christi's Answer*, The Argument, or Answer appears to all considering Persons very good, even upon this Supposition, which needs not here be scanned. The Author of the *Plea* told him, that Ministers having a Relation to a presbyterian Church, such as *Corinth* or *Ephesus* are proven to be, i. e. having distinct Congregations, who could not meet all in one place for Worship, but in separat or distinct places, these Ministers serving *Indiscriminativ* or *per Vices* these several Flocks, doth no whit impeach their special fixed Relation to such a Church, within such a City or Precinct; As suppose the Ministers of *Edinburgh* did serve all the Congregations by Turns, or *Indiscriminativ*, this doth no whit impeach their special Pastoral Relation to the Church in that City: And the Case is the same, supposing two or more Pastors officiating in one Congregation.

gregation. For what he adds, *That the Concession mentioned makes equally for Diocesan, as for Parochial Divisions*; when he shall prove, that Diocesan Divisions have such a Respect and Subserviency to Presbyterial Unity, or the Unity and Edification of the Church, according to the Gospel Rules exhibited in the New Testament, as the Parochial, his Consequence shall be admitted; But, till this be proved, which will be *ad Calendas Græcas*, his Inference must stand among the rest of his absurd Conclusions.

III. Query. *Whether a Bishop, while at a Distance from his Paroch, or Diocess (these being indifferently used in the first Ages of Christianity), may not delegate some parts of his Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction to his Presbyters, for as long time as he may see it necessary or convenient?* Answer. His Query is *de subiecto non supponente*. We deny any such Diocesan Prelat's Office, or his Authority; And thus the Query is palpably Futile: For, what the Diocesan Prelat doth, or may do, according to Prelatical Principles or Constitutions, is not the Question; But, whether that Office it self, or supposed Deputation, is warranted by the Scripture Rules, in point of Church Government. 2^{ly}, If the Paroch and Diocess were all one, in the Sense and Language of the first Ages, when Churches came to be divided, either, in their Sense and Design, every Pastor, within his Precinct, was the *Diocesan Bishop*, standing in such Relation to his Flock, and this in Remembrance of the Pastoral Office, expressed in Scripture by the *Divine Bishop*; Or else the Bishops of the Diocesan Churches were to perform immediately all Ministerial Duties to them, as the Pastor to his Flock, since, otherwise, there could be no Ground of this Nominal Identity of the Name and Office imported in these Terms of *Paroch* and *Diocess*. And, in either Case, there could, in the Sense of these Dividers, be no Deputation of the Bishop's Jurisdiction to Presbyters, more than that of the Pastors to other Substitutes. 3^{ly}, The Deputation of any piece of that Authority to Substitutes, which Christ has given to Church Officers, is denied by the Author he cites; 1. Because such to whom God has given the Power or Office, he has also commanded and enjoined to them the *Exercise thereof*. Pastors are commanded to exercise all their Pastoral Authority given them of God, as they shall answer to him, this being the Talent whereof they are to give an Account. 2^{ly}, There can be no Deputation of the Work, to which a Man is called, to Substitute or Suffragan Officers, because God intrusts no Man with any piece of Stewardship in his Family, but what he must oversee and execute immediatly by himself, and is likewise disposed and enabled to manage, God conjoyning the Office, Gifts, and Call together, for every piece of his Work. All Church Of-

ficers are commanded *diligently* (and therefore *personally*) to attend upon the Work and Duties entrusted to them, *Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8.* *Whittaker* rebukes the Popish Adversary, in Answering that Argument of his, touching the Bishop's Qualification, that he be apt to Teach, scil. that he does it by his *Substitutes*, shewing them, that God commands all his Ministers, personally, to look to their Work, and not to commit it to *Substitutes*, because, otherwise, the personal Qualification, of being apt to Teach, were superfluous, if importing only a deputed, not a personal Care.

For what he adds of *Cyprian* his supposed Chastising of Presbyters, as he terms it, for Reconciling Lapsers without his Consent *, and, in his Exile, writing to them, to do his own and their Office; The Author, to whom he offers his Queries, made appear, from several Passages of *Cyprian*, that he neither could, nor would take any Sole and Arbitrary Power and Go-

* *Epist. 10.*
S. 1. Pag. 29.
&c.

vernment over Pastors and Presbyters. Let our Querist compare *Epist. 6, 18, 28, 78.* He also told him, that this supposed Power sets *Cyprian* by the Ears with himself. But what is this to the point in Question, viz. The Scripture proof (in which our Querist would seem very peremptory) of a warrantable Deputation of Church Officers Power? Let us hear the Mould of this Gentleman's Conclusion or Argument, If Bishops could delegate some of their Communicable Powers to their Presbyters, for Exigency of their Flocks in their absence, why might not Apostles have done the same? A mighty proof against Presbyterians, who disown the Office, and the Delegation, consequently, of Prelates pretended Power. Officers, such as Apostles, acknowledged on both sides of Divine Appointment, committed some piece of their Work to Inferiour Officers, and such Officers, as are, in themselves, acknowledged also, *utrinque*, of a Divine Warrant and Signature; Ergo, Prelates, about whose Office is the Question, have a Power to Substitute Officers to supply their Room, yea, and to give or substract from these Substitutes that Power, as they think fit. What Arguing, or rather Babling, is this? Again, Apostles, by Divine Instinct and Approbation, intrusted or recommitted several parts of their Work to Under Subaltern Officers; Ergo, Prelates, at their own Option or Judgment, may Substitute such Officers. When our Querist shall reconcile such Reasonings to Scripture, or the acknowledged Rules of Arguing, he shall be acknowledged an *Apollo* for his Skill. Finally, he should know, that even Apostles had no Arbitrary Power herein, but whatever Officers they committed any piece of their Work and Duties unto, were of Divine Appointment, as well as the Apostles themselves. Is not the Scripture express, that all Subaltern Officers were, by God, set in the Church, and Christ's Mediator

ry Donations thereunto, upon his Ascension into Heaven, 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12? Nay, doth not his Recommending Prefacer plead this? So that all these Officers are founded upon a Divine Warrant, which the Author he mentions did also plead.

But let us hear another Conclusion and Projection of our Querist, from the premised Ground. Here it is, *So Episcopal Acts done by a Company of Presbyters (whatever Instances may be brought of such doings) are not sufficient to prove any Intrinsic, Episcopal Powers to be lodged in them, for doing them in Opposition to, or exclusive of their Bishops.* Had he said, *in Opposition to, or exclusive of Apostolick Warrant,* (Apostles being the acknowledged Superiour Officers of a Divine Signature) he had concluded right: But, for his Conclusion, anent the Unwarrantableness of Presbyters or Pastors performing Acts of Government, by an Intrinsic Power, exclusive of Prelates, 'tis easy to make the contrary appear against him. The Instances mentioned by himself, of Presbyters Official and Associat Actings, and Exercise of Episcopal Power, are declared by the Apostles to be their Intrinsic Inherent Priviledge; *Ergo,* in Opposition to, and exclusive of the Power of Prelates paramount thereunto. The Antecedent is made good, in the adduced Instances, by that Author he names, *scil.* of the Church of *Corinth, Thessalonica, Ephesus, &c.* Wherein we find Pastors Intrinsic Authority and Government asserted, without any such precarious Dependence upon a Prelate, as he suggests. The Consequent is evident beyond all Contradiction. And this removes that which he adds, in point of Exception, in the close of this Query, *Unless, saith he, it could be proved, that they acted without a Delegation, which being a Negative, I think will be hard for the Abettors of Presbytery to prove.* I answer, if, in the Instances exhibited, this Inherent Intrinsic Authority be clear, sure the Negative Inference, or Conclusion, is equally evident, *viz.* *That, in this Exercise of their Authority, there was no Delegation from Prelates;* which clearly Razes the Foundation of this Query.

C H A P. VII.

Wherein are considered the Queries of the VI. Chapter, anent the Extent and Limits of the Apostles Commission, the Office of the Seventy Disciples, and Evangelists, the Succession of Bishops to Apostles; Exposing the Querist's Antiscriptural Inconsistent Notions; And, in special, in Point of a Lawful Succession and Derivation of the Ministerial Office from Apostles.

TH E Queries of this Chapter are entituled, *Such as occur'd to the Author, upon his reading Mr. Forrester's Plea for Presbytery; But upon a Review and comparing of Both, it will be Evident to the Judicious and Impartial, that a futeable Reading and Understanding of that Book he terms thus, would have sav'd him the Labour of these Queries, and cur'd his Ignorance and Mistakes he has therein discovered.*

I. *Querie, Whether Apostles did not in a great Measure, by Consent, limit, and confine their Extensive general Commission, Authorizing them to teach, and make Disciples of all Nations, by a voluntary Divison or Partition to each of themselves, of particular Countries and People? The Author he cites gave to this a clear Answer, That whatever adjuſted Measures of their Travels may be ſuppos'd, yet by vertue of their Commission (which the Apostles neither did, nor could, in the least, Limit or Retract), their Authority reached all Churches planted, and to be planted, to which they were as Apostles related, and Officers thereof in actu exercito. He might have read also in the Author an Illustration hereof by the Similitude of the Twelve Spies, whose Authority and Commission, immediately and formally, joyntly and apart, reach'd to a search of the whole Land; Shewing, that Dr. Monro had acknowledged, that the distinct Extent of places to which they went, did not alter or change their Rectoral Power and Jurisdiction, where-
 * See Part 2. page 111.
 with they were indued *. He also exhibited to our Querist the Judgement of the University of Leyden, of Saumer, and famous Protestant Divines, to the same Scope; And in two Points check'd what he here offers in this Querie, 1. That he will*

have the Apostles to *confine their extensive Commission*, and thus charges them with *Unfaithfulness in the Execution thereof*; it being beyond all peradventure, that they had no more power to *confine*, than to *shake off their Apostolick Commission*. 2ly. In asserting, that they *bestook themselves to particular Provinces*, he means, as fix'd Officers thereof, which the Au-

* See Hierarchical
Bishop's Claim, 2d.
part pag 89, 90,
91, 92, 93, &c.

thor he mentions, shewed him by a large Harmonie of Protestant Divines, was inconsistent with their Office, which, as is universally asserted, was capable of no Fixation to any particular Post or Watch-Tower*.

For what he adds of *Peter's being the Apostle of the Circumcision, Paul of the Gentiles or Uncircumcision*; 'Tis Answered, 1. Whatever concerted Division there was this way (which notwithstanding is *toto Cælo* different from that Fixation to particular Posts, or as fix'd Officers thereof, about which is our Question), we must understand, 1. That it was by Divine Warrant: Compare *Gal. 2.7.* with *Colos. 1.25.* And the Apostles, who followed the Spirit's Conduct in all their Motions, must necessarily be suppos'd to be herein directed by him. But next, 'tis certain that this did not impeach their *General Commission*, or in the least *Restrict or Limit* the same, so as to render them Apostles peculiarly, or only, and in an exclusive sense, of such places; which may be prov'd from several Grounds, with respect to the Apostles instanc'd. That *Extensive Commission* of the Apostle Paul, as it stands delineated *Acts 26. 16, 17, 18.* compared with *v. 19, 20.* and with *Rom. 1. 16.* where 'tis asserted, *That the Gospel preach'd by him is the power of God to Salvation, to every one that believeth, to the Jew first, and also to the Greek*, makes this evident. Hence we find him, in the Exercise of his Office, offering the Gospel Call first to the *Jews*, as is evident in several Instances in the *Acts* of the Apostles; And none will doubt, that herein he acted as an Apostle, and under that Relation to them. As for his calling himself *the Apostle of the Gentiles*, we must understand it not *Absolutely*, or in an exclusive Sense, which would jumble with the Scripture Accounts of his Office premis'd, but in a *Comparative Sense*, viz. That his Commission had a Special Respect unto them; which could not Restrict or Encroach upon his *General Apostolick Commission*, which he asserts to be the same with the *chiefest Apostles*. And none will doubt, that upon the Apostles Foundation, the whole Church, of Jews and Gentiles, is built, *Eph. 2. 20.* When the Apostle says, *1 Cor. 1. 17. Christ sent me not to baptise, but to preach the Gospel*, what Man of common Sense will understand this *Absolutely*, and in an exclusive Sense, as if he had not been sent to Baptise as well as to Preach the Gospel; which were cross to the Apostolick Commission,

mission, *Go teach all Nations, baptising them, &c.* But we are to understand it in the Comparative Sense above express'd, viz. That his Commission was mainly to Preach the Gospel. Hence 2^{ly}, every Apostle might exercise his Apostolick Authority in every place, as occasion offered, even without a particular Call from the Church, thus *Acts 10.* Peter has a Special Direction of the Spirit, to go to *Cæsarea*, where was a glorious Fruit among the Gentiles, tho' he ordinarily exercised his Apostleship with the Circumcision; And *Paul*, who chiefly exercised his Apostleship among the Gentiles, yet made the first Gospel-Offer, as is said, to the Jews and Circumcision, and this by vertue of his Apostolick Office and Commission. Hence 3^{ly}. The Author of the Plea told him *, *That no Apostle could in an exclusive Sense be term'd Apostle of any one Post, placing therein a Distinction betwixt them and the Ordinary Officers or Pastors, standing under such a fix'd Relation to a particular Church.* Nor could any one Apostle *ἀποστολικὸς*, or be guilty of Irregularity, if exercising the Apostolick Office where other Apostles were; else the Apostle *Paul* had been thus guilty (upon the Partition instanced by the Querist) when exercising his Office towards the Circumcision, and *Peter*, when preaching to the Gentiles. But our Querist will not disown it, that the Case is far otherwise with respect to Ministers fix'd in their Posts and Watch-Towers, and are declar'd subject to the Prophets, the Inspection of Judicatories, or such like Gospel Rules relating to Ministerial and Church Union and Communion, in the very Nature, Extent, and Exercise of their Office and Gifts, *1 Cor. 14.* from *v. 27.* to *v. 34.* But so was no Apostle, nor could be.

II. *Querie. Whether Paul was not to be blam'd for not meddling with any Church, which himself had not planted? And, if his practice stands not on Record, to shew Regularity and the due Observation of Order, agreed upon among Apostles, in Dividing the World into so many Districts? Answer: To this the Author told him (ubi supra), That no such pretended Division into Districts could Infringe, or Incroach upon the Apostles General Commission, expressed Matth. 28. a Retraction or Limitation whereof none can make appear, since their immediate Relation, in actu exercito, to the whole Catholick Church, planted and to be planted, stood intire, as founded upon this Commission. So that it lay not within the Compass of the Apostles Power, to impose upon themselves any such Orders or Limitations; as did impeach in any measure this General Commission, and the sureable Exercise of their Office founded thereupon; Wherein they were absolutely to follow the Spirit's Conduct, without presuming to prescribe unto him, and consequently to prescribe unto themselves*

themselves such Restrictions and Observation of Orders, as this Querist suggests.

Of this peculiar Conduct of the Spirit we have heard above, in several Scripture Instances : And a remarkable Instance we have of the Spirit's sometimes restraining their Inclination, with Respect to the Exercise of their Office in some Places, therein shewing how absolutely they were subject to his special and immediate Conduct in this Matter. Thus *Acts* 16. 6, 7. *When they had gone through Phrygia, and the Region of Galatia, and were forbidden of the Holy Ghost to preach the Word in Asia, after they were come to Mysia, they essayed to go into Bithynia: (N. B.) But the Spirit suffered them not.* And after an Account of Paul's Vision, in order to his going into Macedonia, *v. 9.* follows *v. 10.* *Immediately we endeavoured to go into Macedonia, assuredly gathering that the Lord had call'd us for to preach the Gospel unto them.* Here we see an Humane Judgement and Inclination of the Apostle, in point of the Exercise of his Office towards some Persons, and in some Places, *Over-ruled and better directed by the Spirit:* And what will our Querist say, in case of such concerted Orders as he mentions, directed by a like Humane Judgement, yet opposing, or inconsistent with such Over-ruling Direction, and Inhibition of the Spirit as is instanced? Has he not thus entangled himself in an inextricable Labyrinth, in setting the Apostles concerted Measures in Terms of Contradiction to the Spirit's Direction?

As for Paul's not meddling with Churches, which he had not planted, he should have pointed at the place where the Apostle asserts that his Apostolick Commission reach'd none else. Sure his Commission, as our Querist himself pleads, reach'd all the Gentiles: A pretty large District, no doubt; To whom, consequently, he asserts, that the Exercise of his Office did extend (and who will not doubt, both as to planting and watering of Gentile Churches). Now, will this Gentleman assert that none preached to the Gentiles, or planted Churches among them, but he? The Passage upon which he seems to lay the Foundation of his Assertion, *Rom.* 15. 19, 20. where the Apostle shews, that from Jerusalem round about to Illyricum he had fully preached the Gospel, adding *v. 20.* *Yea so have I striv'd to preach the Gospel, not where Christ was nam'd, lest I should build upon another Man's Foundation: v. 21.* *As it is written, to whom he was not spoken of, they shall see.* &c. This Passage, we say, can have no such Sense as he imagines, but stands in Contradiction to his Scope and Pleading, as is evident to any that ponders the Scope and Context. 1. As to the Scope and Context, the Apostle from *v. 17.* is commenting, upon several Grounds, his Apostolick Office, as 1. from its Effects, *v. 17, 18.* 2^d, From the Miraculous Signs attending and seal-

ing

ing his Ministry, from the multitude of Nations conquered thereby, all that were betwixt *Jerusalem* and *Dalmatia*, containing a Tract of 1400 Miles; And v. 20. in special from this, that as the Gathering of these Churches was Christ's Work as the efficient Cause and Author, so that the Lord had us'd therein his Ministry. *Pareus*, upon the Place, shews, that from the 14. to 22. the Apostle gives Account of his writing more largely to the *Romans*, notwithstanding of their abounding in Goodness and Knowledge, the Grounds whereof he takes, 1. From the End of his Writing, which was not only to Teach, but to Admonish them; Admonitions being Useful and Acceptable, even to those that are taught, v. 15. A second Reason is taken from his Office, because he had receiv'd *The Grace of Apostleship from God towards all Nations*, and consequently towards them; Which Argument the Apostle uses five times, *scil.* in the beginning, Chap. 1. v. 5, 6, and v. 14, 15. The Antecedent of the Argument he amplifies, 1. From the End of the Apostleship committed to him, which was to convert the Nations, and offer them an acceptable Sacrifice unto God, v. 16. 2ly, From the Efficacy of his Ministry, because he had been an Instrument of bringing many Nations to the Faith, which the Apostle presents with a premis'd *Prolepsis*, shewing that the Glory was Christ's and not his, v. 17, 18. Which he further Illustrats by representing the subservient Causes, and principal Efficient. *scil.* Christ himself, who acted by, and in him, by these mighty Signs; As likewise from the Circumstances of Places, and the large Tract of Ground mentioned; adding another Circumstance and Argument, taken from the Difficulty of the Work, that he had preach'd to People wholly ignorant of the Gospel; whereof he renders a Reason, v. 20. lest he should build upon another Foundation. This he further illustrats from the Testimony of *Isaiab*, Chap. 52. 15. as it is written, *To whom he was not spoken of, they shall see, &c.* *Peter Martyr* gives this account of this 20. v. *Annitens prædicare Evangelium ubi Christus non fuerat nominatus.* These things, saith he, are therefore commemorated, that the *Romans* might understand that *Paul* was dignified with the proper Character of Apostleship; For it was not the proper Work of Apostles, to succeed to the Labour of others, to whose Labours others were rather to succeed, for their Work was to propagat the Gospel, to plant new Churches, and ordain able Ministers in the Churches which they had planted, that the Truth might thus be quickly spread through the World. He calleth, saith he, another Foundation Churches planted by other Apostles, which is not to be ascrib'd to Ambition, but to his Apostolick Office rather, and his fervent Zeal for promoting the Gospel. When he saith, *I strive*, he insinuates, that sometime necessity urg'd him to go to *Jerusalem* (N. B.)

Antioch, Rome, and other Places, wherein other Apostles had preach'd. Our Querist will not say, that necessity urg'd him to break due Order of Church Government. But this Necessity was the urgency of his Zeal in following commanded Duty, like to that Pressure, or Constraint by the Spirit, as the Word will read, mentioned *Acts* 18. 5. parallel with that Constraint of Christ's Love, *2 Cor.* 5. 14. and his going bound in the Spirit to *Jerusalem* mention'd *Acts* 20. 22. Where none will doubt there was a famous Church planted. Upon *v.* 21. *As it is written, to whom he was not spoken of, they shall see, &c.* He shews that this is the Sense of the Place, The Apostle was thus hastening to preach the Gospel, because injoyn'd all Diligence by the Holy Ghost, that the Voice of the Gospel might be carried to Nations that had not seen nor heard, that therefore the Apostle shews, he was excited with such Fervencie to preach where Christ was not nam'd. Upon *v.* 22. *For which cause also I have been much hindred from coming to you,* he shews that the Apostle was rather instant to preach to them who had not heard, according to the Ministry committed to him before he preach'd to the *Romans*, whose Faith was published through the universal World; Adding, that, in *Ambrose's* Sense, the Apostle did strive to preach the Gospel where Christ was not nam'd, that he might prevent the false Apostles, who, if they had Pre-occupied these Places, and sown their Tares, their pestilent Errors, they had rendred and left a very difficult Husbandry and Labour to the Apostle, &c. Pool upon this Passage shews, that the Apostle was unwilling to build upon another Man's Foundation, and to derive the Glory to himself which would be due to others, *2 Cor.* 10. 15, 16. As likewise, that by him, as an Apostle of Christ, and in his Ministry, that Scripture *Isa.* 52. 15. might be fulfilled. Shewing, upon *v.* 22. that the Apostle therein obviats an Objection, *viz.* That it was not for want of Respect and Good will, that all this while he had not given them a Visite, but that he look'd upon the planting of Churches the more necessary Work than Watering. The same Sense of this Context, and in special of *v.* 22, 23, 24. wherein the Apostle shews *his Zeal and Desire to preach at Rome* (where was already the Foundation laid of a flourishing growing Church) is exhibited by other Commentators. *Diodat* upon *v.* 20. shews, that thus the Apostle makes his Zeal and Affection towards the *Roman* Church appear so much the more, *it having been settled and gathered together by others,* and yet (N. B.) he *servently desiring to visit it.* *Calvin* upon this *v.* 20. shews, That the Apostle herein not only shews himself a faithful Pastor, but likewise asserts his Apostolick Office, to render the same the more acceptable to the *Romans*, since the Office of Apostle was to sow the Gospel Seed where it had not been preach'd, according

according to the Command, *Mark 16. 15. Go Preach the Gospel to every Creature*; Which, saith he, we must diligently observe, lest we should draw to a common Example or Imitation what was peculiar to the Apostolick Order and Office: Apostles being Founders of Churches, Pastors are to preserve and amplify what they have Built. Upon *v. 21.* he shews, that the Prophet, in the Passage cited by the Apostle, is speaking of the spreading of the Kingdom of the Messiah through the World, which Command and Office was perform'd and manag'd by Apostles. Upon *v. 19.* where mention is made of *Paul's* fully Preaching through the places mentioned, he shews that the Word *παραπληρυναι* ordinarily Translated to *Fulfill*, signifies also, with the Greeks, to *Perfect* and *Supply*, expounding thus the Phrase, *Quod Evangelii predicationem quasi supplendo diffuderit*, &c. That in Preaching the Gospel he gave a spreading Supply, diffusing the Savour and Light thereof further, after others had begun to Preach.

From all which it is evident, 1. That the Apostle is here, in the Sense of Protestant Divines, asserting his Apostolical Authority and Office, with respect to the Preaching of the Gospel, and Founding of Gospel Churches through the World; Which one point sufficiently baffles his supposed Fixation to any one Post or District. 2ly, That he is therein asserting an Office which no ordinary Officer could Succeed to. 3ly, That in this his zealous Endeavour to spread the Gospel where it was not Heard, which was more properly his Work than to Build upon another Foundation, he was hindered from coming as yet to *Rome*, to which, notwithstanding, he intended to come, and to Exercise his Apostolick Office towards them, as being thereunto indebted by this his Office, according as he asserts, *Rom. 1. 14.* tho' the Church was already Planted and Flourishing there. 4ly, That the Apostle is so far from an absolute disowning a Preaching where Christ was Named, and Building upon a Foundation already laid, that he doth in this Context clearly insinuate the Contrary. 1. In that, tho' his main Ambition and Design was to Preach the Gospel where Christ was not Named, yet he shews, *v. 14.* that he began that large Course and Circuit of his Preaching from *Jerusalem*, and therein had Watered a Church Planted, yea and Flourishing (as is evident in the History of the *Acts*), the Apostle *James* ordinarily residing and Exercising his Ministry there. 2ly, In that he promises to come to *Rome*, *v. 24.* and that according to his earnest desire, *v. 23.* where there was a Church already Planted and Flourishing; And none will doubt the Apostle's Exercising his Office and Ministry when there. Finally, from hence the absurdity of this Querist's Notion is evident, who will

T

have

have the Apostle asserting his not Preaching where Christ was Named, &c. because confined and tied up to his District, and his exemplary regular Observation (forsooth) of Orders assigned to him, when the Apostles had made the Provincial Division of the World among them.

One thing I cannot but further notice in this his fancied Restriction of Apostles to their several Districts and Provinces, that, bringing, for illustrating Instances, Peter's being the Apostle of the Circumcision, Paul of the Uncircumcision, or Gentiles, he divides all the Districts into Two, and consequently, of necessity, must make the other Apostles blame-worthy for meddling with Churches which they themselves had not Planted, or Officiating beyond the limits of their District, and Building upon the Foundation laid by these two great Apostles; Or, else he must censure this Scripture division into the Two Districts, and assert a sub-division to salve this Inconveniency: In either of which how palpably he crosses the Scripture Account and Record in this point is evident. Besides, having told us of the two Provinces assigned to Peter and Paul, the one of the Circumcision, and the other of the Uncircumcision or Gentiles; And having told us, that they betook themselves to these particular Provinces, Provinces pretty large, no doubt; He tells us (for the third particular Province) that St. Thomas was Apostle of the Indies, or most Eastern Countries. But, I pray, were not these Indies and Eastern Countries Gentiles, and of the Uncircumcision, which was S. Paul's particular Province? How comes this Saint then thus to inroach upon his Fellow, unless, as I said, he can instruct, and that by Divine Warrant, the forementioned Sub-division? Shall I dismiss this Observe with a *Spectatum admissi risum teneatis*, &c.

III. Query, What was the Office of the 70 Disciples, whether extraordinary, or to be succeeded to? And, if they were to have Successors, who are their Successors? The Author of the Plea, as he terms him, gave a sufficient Answer to this Query in the beginning of his Examen of Dr. Scott, shewing, that, in the Judgment of several Divines, they were Evangelists, consequently such extraordinary Officers as Apostles themselves, and that therefore they could not be Succeeded to. Thus the Professors of Leyden, *Disp. 42. Thes. 23.* And for the expired Office of Evangelists, with an account of their Office, he may consult the *University of Saumer, Syntag. Thes. Theol. de diver. Minist. Evang. gradibus*, pag. 281. 282. besides many others commonly known. Beza [Annot. in Luc. 10.] takes them to have been installed in no Ministerial Office properly, but only sent, without any Mission as to Preaching of the Gospel, *tanquam Christi Apparitores*, to declare to the People his coming, and in special to Jerusalem, that our Lord might have the more Witnesses of his

his last Sermons and Passion, also of his Resurrection. The same seems to be the Sense of the Belgick Divines, who shew that after our Lord had chosen his Apostles, (*viz.* to their high extraordinary Function) he sent these 70 before him to warn the Jews of his coming, and to prepare them for the receiving of him and his Doctrine. *Ut nimirum, hi non tam prædicarent Evangelium, quod nondum erat impletum, quam ut præpararent quodammodo populum per generalem Annunciationem jam advenisse Messiam.* i. e. Not so much for this end to Preach the Gospel, which was not as yet fulfilled, as that they might some way by this general Annunciation give the People a preparative Warning that the Messiah was come. Thus Spalatensis, Lib. 1. C. 2. N. 3. This appointment is thus conceived to be in Christ's last Journey to Jerusalem; so that this transient Mission being thus taken to infer no formal Office, the Succession falls of course. 'Tis further observed, that after this transient Function, we do not Read they were afterward sent upon a Gospel Message with any new and extended Commission, as were the 12 Apostles, after the Lord's Resurrection. Calvin thus expresses his Sense of them, *Cæterum, faith he, nulla illis proprie commissa fuit Legatio, sed tantum Christus Apparitores præmisit, qui populi animos pararent ad excipiendam ejus Doctrinam.* i. e. No proper Gospel Legation was committed to them, but were sent as Christ's Forerunners to prepare the Peoples Hearts to receive his Doctrine. Not to stand further upon this, 'tis certain that in either in the one or other Acceptation of the 70, and upon either of the suppositions mentioned, the Principle of a Successive Ministry to them is sufficiently overthrown. So that what he further inquires, scil. If they have Successors, who are their Successors, and if Succeeded in the full extent of their Commission, why not Apostles also in the full extent of theirs, is easily Answered and satisfied in the account already exhibited. Whereas he desires plain Texts of Scripture in Answer to the Query; The Author mentioned hath exhibited to him plain Scripture proof of such a Nature of the Apostolick Office and Evangelistick (supposing the 70 to have been Evangelists) both with respect to the extent thereof, and otherwise, as could not be Succeeded to. And for the other Opinion of these 70 Disciples, *viz.* That they were installed in no formal Church Office, The Scripture Grounds instanced are left to the Querist's Consideration.

But our Querist, having so often renewed the Episcopal Notion and Cant, anent Succession to Apostles in the full Extent of their Commission, which he will needs, with his Fellows, appropriat to Prelates; Holding thus the Apostolick Office to be still continued in the Church: I will offer to him the Sense and Judgment of one Chief Patron of the

the Episcopal Cause, Dr. *Barrow*, Master of *Trinity College* in *Cambridge*, and Chaplain to King *Charles II.* in his Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy, published in the Year 1680, pag. 113. wherein, among other thing, he lays down this Assertion. "The Apostolick Office, as such, was Personal and Temporary, and therefore, according to its Nature and Design, not Successive or Communicable to others, in perpetual Descendants from them. It was, as such, in all Respects Extraordinary Conferred in a special manner, designed for special purposes, discharged by special Aids, indowed with special Priviledges, as was needful for the Propagation of Christianity, and founding of Churches. To that Office it was requisite, that the Person should have an immediat Designation and Commission from God, such as *St. Paul* doth so often insist upon, for asserting his Title to the Office; *Paul* an Apostle, not of Men, nor by Men, *Gal. 1. 1.* citing *Chrysostom* upon the place, who shews, "That this is a Property of the Apostles. Adding, "That Apostles were to Attest the Lord's Resurrection and Ascension, either immediatly, as the Twelve, or by evident Consequence, as *St. Paul*, &c. He adds, "That the Apostles were to be indowed with Miraculous Gifts and Graces, inabling to assure their Authority, and execute their Office; Hence *Paul* called the Signs and Wonders, and mighty Deeds, the Marks of an Apostle. He tells us also, "That, in *Chrysostom's* Opinion, 'twas proper to an Apostle, in a certain conspicuous manner, to impart Spiritual Gifts, as *St. Peter* and *St. John* did at *Samarria*, citing *Cyprian* on *Acts 8. 18.* Adding, "That it was a Priviledge of an Apostle, by vertue of his Commission from Christ, to Instruct all Nations. That he had Warrant and Right to Exercise his Function every where. His Charge was Universal and Indefinite. The whole World was his Province. He was not fixed to any one place, nor could be excluded from any; Citing *Chrysostom* on *John 21.* and *Cyriel* *γλαφ* in *Gen. 7.* calling the Apostle, "an Oecumenick Judge, and an Instructor of all the Subcelestial World. And, after several such Prerogatives rehearsed, he adds this Conclusion, "That such an Office, consisting of so many Extraordinary Priviledges and Miraculous Powers, requisite for the Foundation of the Church, and Diffussing of Christianity, was not designed to continue by Derivation, it containing diverse things, which, apparently, were not Communicated, and which no Man, without gross Imposture and Hypocrisie, (see how he lashes our Querist, and his Successive Bishops) "could challenge to himself. Neither, saith he, did the Apostles pretend to Communicate it. They did Appoint standing Pastors and Teachers in each Church, but did not Constitute Apostles equal to themselves in Authority, Priviledges or

or Gifts. To this Scope he citeth *Augustin, de Bapt. c. Donat. 2. 1.* Yea *Bellarmin* himself asserting, That *Bishops* have no part of the *Apostolick Authority*. Shewing afterward, in Opposition to the Pope's Pretensions, That *St. Peter's Apostolate* did naturally expire with his Person, as did that of the other Apostles.

Here our Querist may see, as in a Looking-Glass, not only the Assertion of the Extraordinary Function of Apostles, and a peremptory Denial of any Succession to them in Office; But likewise upon these very Grounds adduced by the Author of the *Plea*, with other Presbyterians. And this Testimony is the more considerable against him and his Fellows, in this point, that the Author appears as high a Prelatist as any, as is evident in his Discourse concerning the *Unity of the Church*, *Pag. 48.* wherein he accuses the *Recusants in England*, as the worst of *Schismaticks and Separatists*, and puts upon them the Imputation of most desperate Rebels against the Church. Many others might be added, which, for brevity, we omit.

IV. Query, *What was the Office of an Evangelist? Whether was it any particular distinct Office peculiar to them, who were designed Evangelists, or, was it any particular Employment, or Exercise of an Office, upon the doing of which, one had Right to the Title of an Evangelist? Or, was it the Writing the Gospel of our Blessed Saviour, that made one an Evangelist?* Answer: The Reading of the Author he mentions, might have saved him the Labour of this Query, as most of all the other Queries. But, for the Sense of Protestant Divines, as to this Office, I shall, instead of many, which may be instanced, exhibite to him the Judgment of two Protestant Universities. The first is that of *Leyden, Synops. Purior. Theol. Diss. 42. Thes. 23. Evangelistarum alii erant Scriptores Evangelici, de Vita & Mor- te, Dis- & Factis Salvatoris nostri Iesu Christi, &c.* "Of Evangelists, some were Writers of the Evangelical History, concerning the Life and Death, Doctrine and Acts of our Saviour; There are others, who were called by the Apostles to Preach the Gospel together with themselves, and therefore, as Fellow-Labourers, attended them, except when, for sometime, they were put upon the Oversight of certain Churches. Of this sort were *Barnabas, Silas, Timotheus, and Titus*, to which Number some do also joyn the Seventy Disciples. The University of *saumer, Syntag. Thes. de Divers. Minist. Evang. Gradibus, Pag. 181, 182. Thes. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15.* has given a large Account of their Judgment upon this point. *Evangelista dicuntur vel a Scripto, vel a Munere, &c.* "Evangelists are so called, either in respect of Writing, or Office; In respect of Writing, the four are thus named, two of whom were Apostles; But they appear not to be such as are termed by the Apostle,

' Apostle, Evangelists; *Eph. 4. 11.* For such were called Evangelists,
 ' with respect to a special Office and Function, which they exercis'd
 ' in the Church. Thus; *Acts 21.* Philip, who was of the Number of
 ' the Deacons, is called an Evangelist; For he is not so represented from
 ' his Writing of the Gospel, but from his Function and Office, concern-
 ' ing which Office, the Apostle says, *2 Tim. 4. 5.* Do the Work of an
 ' Evangelist. Adding; (*Thef. 11.*) " That, to the most of the Learned,
 ' the Evangelists appear to have been some special Attendants of the
 ' Apostles themselves, who were subservient to them in Preaching the
 ' Gospel, and in Framing and Establishing the Churches. Such was
 ' Mark, whom Paul and Barnabas assumed, when, by the Church of
 ' Antioch, sent to Preach the Gospel through Asia, who is therefore cal-
 ' led their Minister, *Acts 13. 5.* who is afterward said to have thus Mi-
 ' nistred to the Apostle Peter, in whose Name he also Salutes those, to
 ' whom he writes, *1 Pet. 5. 13.* Such afterward was Silas, (*Thef. 12.*)
 ' in Paul's second Journey through Asia, as we may see, *Acts 15. 14.* By
 ' whom he is judged to be termed Silvanus, in the Epistles to the *Corin-*
 ' *thians* and *Thessalonians*. Such also both Titus and Timothy are judged
 ' to have been, who, in Paul's Peregrinations and Journeys, were his
 ' Attendants and Assistants in Propagating the Gospel, as is evident in
 ' the Acts of the Apostles, and in the Epistles of Paul, chiefly *2 Cor. 1.*
 ' *19.* where the Apostle shews, that Christ was Preached among the *co-*
 ' *rinthians* by himself, and by Silvanus and Timothy, *Thef. 13.* These
 ' Evangelists were not fixed to any one Church, as Exercising a necessa-
 ' ry and ordinary Ministry therein, since, in diverse places, they atten-
 ' ded the Apostles, and journeyed with them, that, in the Gospel, they
 ' might Minister unto them, or else were sent by them, sometimes to one
 ' place, sometimes to another, according as the Profit and Edification of
 ' the Church did require. Thus Titus was left by Paul in Crete, to set in
 ' order things that were wanting, *Tit. 1. 5.* Thus Timothy was often-
 ' times sent by the Apostle Paul to diverse places, sometimes to Corinth,
 ' sometimes to Macedonia, to the various Churches planted by him,
 ' that he might Administer such things as were necessary for them, ac-
 ' cording to the Apostle's Command, and this by an Extraordinary Power,
 ' *Thef. 14.* In this respect, they appear to have been Superiour to Pro-
 ' phets; for these were, for the most part, fixed to some Church, &c.

I must confess, that, Reading the Mould of this Query, it appears to
 me, that the Gentleman seems very badly, if at all, to have understood
 the Principles he professes to own, or the Matter he speaks of. For, 1.
 He inquires, *If the Office of Evangelists, was a particular distinct Office pecu-*
liar to them thus design'd, or a particular Employment or Exercise of an Office;
which

which gave a Right to the Title of Evangelist. What an Enigma is here! If by an Office he mean the Office of an Evangelist, he inquires, if a Man, upon doing the Office of an Evangelist, and Employing and Exercising the same, was an Evangelist, or had a Title to it, which is all one, as if he inquired, if an Evangelist was an Evangelist. The Apostle Paul, in the place of Timothy cited by him, has given him a clear Answer to that Query, *Injoyning Timothy to do the Work of an Evangelist.* If, by any particular Employment or Exercise of an Office, he understand an Office distinct from that of an Evangelist, 'tis very odd, or rather bad Sense, to suppose, that the Exercise of one Office should give a Man a Right and Title to another distinct from it, especially since he acknowledges, in the same Query, the distinct Office of Evangelist from other Offices, as asserted by the Apostle, Eph. 4. 11. But, 2ly, If there was such a distinct Office in his Sense, he should have seen how to have accorded this with his Fellow Pleader Dr. Monro, who holds, [*Enquiry into the New Opinions, pag. 112.*] That the Term imports no peculiar Office, and that to be an Evangelist, is very agreeable to all the Subordinations of the Christian Hierarchy, that most of all the Primitive Bishops were Evangelists, and that any Bishop or Presbyter, converting Jews and Pagans, is as properly an Evangelist, as those so called in the Primitive Church. 3ly, The same Dr. Monro affirms, [*Ibid.*] That Evangelists had no Power to Confirm such as were Baptized; in this according with Dr. Scott, his Fellow Pleader, who, in Confirmation of his Assertion, offers this Proof, [*Christian Life, Part 2. Pag. 446.*] That Peter and John were sent to lay on Hands, Acts 8. 17. upon the Believing Samaritans, notwithstanding that Philip had Preached unto them, and Baptized them, whom Cyprian, saith he, holds to be an Evangelist; Overthrowing thus Timothy's Authority, in Confirming and Ordaining as Bishop of Ephesus, since he is expressly designed and owned by the Apostle as an Evangelist. 4ly, Whereas Timothy is enjoined to do the Work of an Evangelist, and did Ordain Elders at Ephesus, which seems to prove the Ordaining Power to be competent to Evangelists, (we say in Conjunction with Presbyters in the Church Constituted, and where Presbyters were existent, tho' Episcopalians ascribe it to the Evangelists in an Exclusive Sense) our Querist hath no other Shift, but this pitiful one, viz. That Timothy did this as vested with an higher Episcopal Power, in express Contradiction to the Text, wherein the Apostle, enjoining to do the Work of an Evangelist, addeth, *make full Proof of thy Ministry*, clearly asserting his Office and Ministry to have been Evangelistical, and including his whole Office with the Duties and Administration thereof within the Compass of that which is properly of this Nature; Not to insist upon his Contradicting therein the Pleadings of his

Fellows, several of whom hold the Evangelick Office a Superiour Accession to the Episcopal. *sly*, Whereas he tells us, *That Evangelists, as such, had no Power nor Authority to Confirm, as is clear, Act. 8. where the Evangelist Philip Preached and Baptized the Samaritans, yet the Apostles Peter and John were sent to lay Hands upon them, v. 17.* 'Tis strange, that he offers this Argument upon pretended Reading the Author men-

tioned, who, in his last Chapter * against Dr. Scott, had so fully examined this Notion, Impugning, at some length, the supposed Episcopal Priviledge, or Sacrament of Confirmation, exhibiting also the Sense of Protestant Divines in Opposition thereunto, together with their contrary Judgment and Sense of that Text in special.

* *Hierar-*
chical Bishops
Claim, Pages
117, 118, 119.

V. Query, *Whether any Regard be due, or Credit to be given to the Accounts of the early Writers among the Christians, such as Irenæus, Tertullian, and others, who deliver Unanimously, that the Bishops of such and such Churches Succeeded to the Apostles: Irenæus shewing that he could reckon those Bishops, who were constituted by the Apostles in several Churches, and their Successors to his time, Iren. cont. Hæres. Lib. 3. C. 3. & Tertullian de præscr. adv. Hæret. C. 32. who shews, that the Apostolick Churches could reckon the Succession and Order of Bishops, as the Church of Smyrna, from Polycarp plac'd by S. John the Apostle, and of Rome from Clement, who was likewise Ordain'd there by S. Peter, &c.* This Objection also, or Query, a little more Knowledge and Reading, and even of the Author he mentions, would have saved him the Labour of. Presbyterian Writers, Didoclave, *The Authors of the Jus Divin. Minist. Evang. Smectimm. Blondel, Salmasius*, with others, have fully refuted and baffled this Argument. A few things therefore shall be here resumed, 1. That these passages of *Irenæus* and *Tertullian* cannot prove, that by *Bishops* they meant the Hierarchical Bishop, and as some do express it the Bishop *Phrasi Pontificiâ*, and not *Phrasi Apostolicâ*. It being undeniable that the Names of Bishop and Presbyter were used indifferently in the Apostles Days, and many Years after; And therefore, *Irenæus* in his Epistle to *Victor*, cited by *Eusebius*, Lib. 1. C. 23. calls *Anicetus*, *Pius*, *Higinus*, *Telesphorus*, *Xistus*, Presbyters of the Church of Rome. *Tertullian* also insinuates the same in his *Apology*, Cap. 39.

And whereas the Querist alledges *Irenæus* to hold, *that he could Name the Bishops unto whom the Apostles committed the Charge of the Church; The same Author speaks the same very thing of Presbyters*, Lib. 4. Cap. 43. *Quapropter is qui in Ecclesia sunt, Presbyteris obedire oportet, his qui Successionem habent, ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum Episcopatus Successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.* i, e. There-
fore

fore he must obey these Presbyters which are in the Church, whose Succession from Apostles we have made appear, who, together with the Succession of Episcopacy, have, according to the Father's good pleasure, received the certain Gift and Evidence of Truth. In which Passage he clearly identifies the Office of Bishop and Presbyter. And Chap. 44. speaking of these Successors of Apostles, he describes them thus, *That together with the Order of Presbyterate they retain the sound Doctrine.* Again, 2^{ly}, Presbyterian Writers, and out of them the Author mentioned by him, did shew him, that, the first Apostolick Church being Governed by the common Council of Presbyters (to use *Jerom's* Phrase), the Line of Succession was drawn from the *πρωτοκλειστονδαις*, the first Ordain'd Minister; As among the *Athenians* there were nine *Archontes*, or *Chief-Rulers*, equal in Power and Authority, altho', to make the Enumeration of the Times more easie and compendious, the Succession of Governours in *Athens* was derived from one of them, who was the first *Archon*, or *Ruler*. Thus, tho' there were diverse Presbyters in every City, of equal Power and Authority, yet the Line and Succession was deduced from one, who was the first of those that were Ordained for the more expedite way of reckoning. Again, 3^{ly}, The Confusion and Contradiction in these Catalogues, and inextricable Intricacies therein, the Author of the *Plea* * did exhibite out of Presbyterian Writers. In special, the 7 *Prop.* of the *Append.* annex'd to that piece, Intituled, *Jus Div. Minist. Evang.* For further discovery whereof, the Querist may also Read *Junius, Controv. 3. Lib. 2. C. 5.* who shews, as several others, that these Catalogue-drawers spoke of the Scripture Church Officers after the Language of their own Times; For which the Querist may further Read *Whittaker, de Pontif. c. 2.* Finally, the Catalogues resolving into Apostles or Evangelists, as that of *Rome* into *Peter*, that of *Alexandria* into *Mark*, who were Officers extraordinary, and had an Universal Commission, and had no Successors in *idem Officium*, these supposed Bishops could not Succeed them in the same Line and Degree, as one Brother doth another in his Inheritance, but as Men of another Order, and in a different Line. And from the whole it is evident, that *Tertulian*, *Irenæus*, and others in making use of this Argument of Succession, against Hereticks, design only to shew a derivation of true Doctrine from the Apostles, against them, and that the Church had the *Traduces Apostolici Seminis*, a derivation of the Apostolick Doctrine, but never meant of a Succession of Men in the same Office every way.

* Hierarchical
Bishop's Claim,
Part 1. Pag.
18. 19.

For what he adds, That we cannot disclaim the Reasons for the Orthodox Faith against Hereticks brought from this very Topick, because of some difference among Authors, and in the Catalogues of them, both as to the Persons, and the precise time in which they flourished; 'Tis a very impertinent parallel: For, the Derivation of the Doctrine, being comprobat by its conformity to the Pattern in the Mount, is *toto cælo* different from this Official Personal Derivation, about which our Question is; So that, whatever mistake might be in the Denomination and Order of Persons, the conformity of the Doctrine delivered and handed down, and being the Tradux of the first Apostolick Semen (to use the then current Phrase), being evinced by a comparison with this first Pattern, is of it self a sufficient Confutation of Hereticks, to which the Succession is but an additional or accumulating Reason.

For what he adds further, That this Evasion may be made use of against some Books of Canonical Scripture, the Catalogues being different as to some of them, he understands not whereof he affirms: For besides that Learned Divines have exhibited a clear Harmony in all the Ancient Catalogues and Churches Records of the Canonical Books, the innate Impression of a Divine Inspiration in the Books themselves (acknowledged by all Protestants, and even by this Querist) doth sufficiently demonstrate both their Nature and Number.

What follows in this Query is grounded upon a gross mistake, viz. That we follow the Ancientest Copies, because of the greater Number, as the greater and more weighty Affair in point of the Authority of the Holy Scriptures: The true and solid ground being that already mentioned, which is drawn from the convincing Discoveries of a Divine Impression in the

Books themselves, and the Spirit's Inspiration shining therein, not meerly the Number of Copies, tho' this Number and Harmony has also its secondary Weight, since therein the Divine Providence is apparent in watching over these Sacred Records *.

* See this acknowledged even by Stapleton de Author. Script. Cont. Whit. Lib. 2.

Cap. 1. Salmero in Proleg. See Rivet. Cathol. Orthod. Quest. 3. Pag. 44. 45, &c. See Turretini Theol. Elenct. Loc. 2. Quest. 11. & 12. Chamleri Panst. Loc. de Canone, Lib. 12. Cap. 3. Willer's Synopsis Papisini, 1. General Controversie concerning the Scripture. Quest. 2. Pag. 20. 21, &c. Hutteri Loc. com. Controv. de Scriptura, Quest. 3. Pag. 35. 36, &c. Gerardi Loc. Theol. Loc. de Scriptura, Cap. 10. Pag. 36. 37, &c. Musculi, Loci comm. Loc. de Scriptura, Pag. 183. 184, &c.

For what he further adduces of the different Readings, to the same Scope, 'Tis Answered, that Divines have abundantly made appear, that there's no such difference of the Readings as can impeach the true Sense

Sense and Scope, but is easily adjusted and reconciled in a suitable collation of Copies. Let our Querist Read the Learned *Amandus Polanus*, his Defence of the Original Text, against *Bellarmin* and others, *Syntag. Lib. 1. C. 37, &c.* Also *River's Catholicus Orthodoxus* against *Balleus* the Jesuit, *Tract. 1. Quæst. 4. 5.* wherein this will be convincingly evident, besides several others which are well known.

V I. Query, *Whether that place in Ezra, Chap. 2. Vers. 61, 62. Where the Priests who sought their Register among those that were reckon'd by Genealogy, but they were not found; were therefore put from the Priesthood: Whether, saith he, this was a Nicety of Scrutiny peculiar to that old Oeconomy; or was it Typical and ceas'd; And not rather a Pattern for us, to teach us, that such Office-bearers in the Christian Church, tho' never so really and in fact Succeeding to the Apostles, without any real Flaw or Usurpation; yet, unless they can clearly derive their Succession from the Apostles, as their undoubted Successors, are not to be owned by the Church as their genuine Successors?* This large Query, which takes up the rest of this Chapter, has so much inadvertent Inconsistency ingraven upon it, that had this Querist, or his commending Prefacer, understood this point, they would certainly have been asham'd of it, as it stands here moulded and amplified. What our Protestant Divines have Answered to this Argument against Papists in point of the Derivation of a lawful Gospel Ministry from the Apostles, sufficiently shews the insignificancy of this Query.

I. 'Tis made appear, that an Institution of Christ, such as the Ministry, can receive no bad Tincture tho' passing through impure Channels; the Ministry it self being a standing Ordinance to continue to the End, *Eph. 4. 11, 12.* and having Christ's promised Presence accordingly, *Matth. 28. 20.* The fleeing Woman, whether by Heathenish or Antichristian Persecution, which represents the true Church, is still preserved under the same and not extinguished. Thus our Divines do Expone the Prophecy of the Witnesses, *Revel. 11.* pointing at the Existency and Continuance of a true Gospel Ministry, and consequently a true Succession from Apostles, while the Church was overspread with Antichristian Darkness and Defection.

2ly, They do in this Case distinguish betwixt the Churches true Ordinances, and what of Antichrist and other Corruptions have been introduced thereinto, as we are to distinguish between a Man and a Plague-fore that is upon him, between the Tares in the Field and the Wheat: The Antichrist sets himself in the Temple of God, but is no

part of this Temple, 2 *Thef.* 2. 4. And it is no more disparagement to a pure Ministry that it comes from Apostles through *Rome's* impure Channel, than it was a disparagement to Jesus Christ that he received his Humane Nature from *Adam*, through many unclean Channels, as *Thamar*, *Rabab*, *Bathsheba*, nor a disparagement to the Holy Scriptures of the Old Testament that the Christian Church received them from the Jews, who Crucified our Saviour. In a Word, that there is a true Succession of a pure Gospel Ministry from Christ and his Apostles, a Doctrinal especially, in the Church of Scotland, is made good by such as have cleared the Succession of our Church, such as *Usher*, *de Success. Eccl. Brit.* *White's way to the Church.* But this in general.

To come more closely to the Query it self, I find in it such odd complicated Notions, as would require a large Animadversion. 1. He inquires, *If this Scrutiny mentioned was a Nicety peculiar to that Oeconomy, or was it Tipocal, and as such fulfilled and ceased?* Wherein he foolishly supposes, that what was peculiar to that old Oeconomy, and thus supposed falling under Divine Institution, might be a *Nicety*, making thus the Divine Institution a *Nicety*. 2ly, Distinguishing that which is *fulfilled and ceased*, from what was *peculiar to that old Oeconomy*, he makes what was *peculiar to that old Oeconomy*, *not to be fulfilled and ceased*. Again, 3ly, He supposes that Office bearers in the Christian Church really, and in Fact, *Succeeding the Apostles, without Flaw or Usurpation*, may be, notwithstanding, such as cannot clearly derive their Succession from Apostles as their *undoubted Successors*; Than which, what can be said more inconsistently and absurdly. If they do really and in Fact succeed the Apostles without any *Usurpation*, it must certainly be in the Method instanced, and owned by all Protestant Divines; And if so, they can, upon these clear Grounds instanced, derive their Succession from Apostles, as their *undoubted Successors*. This he must needs acknowledge, or assert the Necessity of such a *Literal Nominal Succession* (so to speak) from one Person to another, from the very times and Persons of the Apostles, as will render him Ridiculous, as his Instance from that Passage of *Ezra* seems to insinuate. Which Conceit, by an exact parallel Reason, will oblige him to attempt a Deduction of an exact and personal Genealogie from *Adam* to prove himself of his Posterity, as one of our Country-Men is said to have done; or look upon himself as obliged to deduce an exact and personal Succession from one of the Sons of *Noah*, to prove his Descent from that Patriarch.

3ly, Whereas he adds, *That without this pretended Derivation of an undoubted Succession, he is no more obliged to believe a Minister to be such, than upon his own Affirmation, without any other Evidence*; Our Querist is now

run to the Extreme of a perfect Seeker and Enthusiast, or Anabaptistical Notion, denying the Existence of a Ministry intirely. For, 1st. I would gladly know, where is that Minister, that can deduce such a Personal Genealogie from the Apostles, such an uninterrupted Line of all previous Ordainers, as the Priests in that of *Exra* 2. were to find in the Register, their exact Succession down from Aaron from Father to Son? 2^{ly}, I would know, what Bishop, or Arch-Bishop, whom he holds Successors to the Apostles, can exhibite such Tables of their Genealogie, and exact Personal Succession of all Ordainers from the Apostles? If they cannot, then he overthrows his own Principle in owning them, or must say, he owns them upon their bare Affirmation, without any Evidence; Or, if he grant that their Succession stands intire, tho' no such *Personal Successive Evidence* can be produced, why are not Pastors in point of Succession to be owned without any such phantastick Proof, as he desiderates?

4^{ly}, Who can reconcile to sound Sense what he here asserts touching Succession to the Apostles *Really, and in Fact, without any Flaw or Usurpation*, yet such as cannot be clearly evidenc'd, and differs nothing from a bare Affirmation without Ground? How can a Succession be *Real, and in Fact, and without Flaw and Usurpation* (which certainly includes all that can make up a Right, and will clearly import the same) whereof there are no *Evidences producible*? Or, will he say, that his forementioned Evidences, both Lineal and Doctrinal (for his forementioned Expressions will include Both), from the Apostles, are not Real and Uncontrovertible, and therein contradict the Sense & Pleadings of the Protestant Churches, in point of a true Gospel Ministry, and, in correspondence to the Popish Pleaders, absolutely Nullify their Organick Being, and Lawful Ministry.

5^{ly}, Our Querist, further weaving out this Web of Absurdities, tells us, that, "By a clear Derivation of Succession from the Apostles, he means such a clearness as the length of time, from their Days, will allow of; considering intervening great Persecutions, Inundations of Barbarous Nations on the civiliz'd Parts of the World, such Troubles and Alterations as are great Enemies to Records; since the Writings of some are quite lost, and some little Fragments only of early Writers remain. But, good Master Querist, this is such a Clearness as is no Clearness, and a very rightly exemplified *Repugnantia in adjecto*, scil. a Clearness of Succession from Apostles, from such a Personal Series of *undoubted Successors*, as the Priests were to find in the Sacred Register to clear their Succession, and this necessary for all Ministers; and

yet

yet the Records and Writings clearing these Successions, except some little Fragments, quite lost.

But our Querist adds, *That if this be not allowed, scil. this clear Personal Succession mentioned. in all Church Officers and Ministers, we will open a door, to make holy Orders an useless Ceremonie, and to every gifted Brother to invade the Function of the Ministry: The Absurdity of which Consequence is evident from what is premis'd; since our Principle, touching a true Doctrinal Succession, and the just Rights of Ordination according to the Scripture Rules, sufficiently excludes such an Usurpation; Whereas his Principle mentioned, inferring the Obscurity and Loss of a true successive Gospel Ministry, opens a Door to such an Usurpation, and patroniseth the Seekers Principle.*

6ly, That our Querist may in this Point afford us Store of Contradictions, he tells us of an " Instance of such Practices (he means, of the Gifted Brother neither really such, or only reckon'd such by few or by many, invading the Sacred Function of the Ministry) " in our History, particularly that of the Famous Mr. Robert Bruce, citing *Spotswood's History*, who did officiat as a Lawful Pastor for no less time than ten Years before he was put in Orders, and this directly contrary to the Scripture, *Heb. 5. 4. No Man takes this Honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron*, and to our Saviour's *not glorifying himself to be made High-Priest*, contrary to our Blessed Saviour's choising a Select number of Men, *whom he also named Apostles, Luke 6. 13. To whom he committed the Keyes of the Kingdom of Heaven*, committing to them the *Ministry of Reconciliation*, and as having all Power in Heaven and Earth, giving them Commission, and promising his Presence with them, and their Lawful Successors, to the End of the World; pursuant to which Commission the Apostles ordain'd others, and gave Orders and Rules for preserving a regular Succession of true Office-bearers in the Church to the End of the World. *Quis talia fando, temperet a risu.* First, Here's an Instance of a Man for no less than ten Years usurping the Sacred Ministry without a Call, Impeaching, Contradicting and Counteracting our Saviour's Authority, and that of his Apostles in this Point, and in this practice overthrowing the Foundations of a true Gospel Ministry, &c. And yet a *Famous Man!* Can any Practice render a Man more *Infamous*? But, 2ly, this Instance, notwithstanding of what the Excommunicated Historian, *Spotswood*, suggests, among his other Misrepresentations of the State of our Church, is utterly unserviceable to our Querist's Design: For it is a mere Falsehood, that this truly famous and worthy Person did thus Officiat; For, before his Officiating mentioned, he had the Essentials of

of a Presbyterial Ordination, wanting only the Rituals of *Imposition of Hands*, which, at that time, was not judg'd necessary. Of this Matter we have considerable Evidences, when in the Year 1598. the Design was hatched of introducing Episcopacy, and thereupon the Ministers of *Edinburgh* being by the Commissioners of that Assembly, put to accept a part of the Town for their particular Flock, which Motion they accepted, the Design being laid to undermine Mr. *Bruce's* Ministry, he was ordained in particular to accept the Ceremonie of *Imposition of hands*, which he refused, (N. B.) if it was required as a Sign of Ordination: At last these Commissioners were brought to subscribe a Testimonie acknowledging him to have been a Lawful Pastor before. What Prevarication there was in the Case of these Commissioners afterwards, I need not stand to relate; However, the History informs us, that after Mr. *Pont's* Sermon, in order to the Admission of these Ministers to their several Districts, Mr. *Bruce* being urged with *Imposition of hands* (which he had declared before he would accept as a Ceremony of Entry to a particular Flock, or of Confirmation in his Calling, but not at all if it were required as a Sign of Ordination), and craving License of this Mr. *Pont* to make his Answer in the Pulpit, he prov'd before the People, *That he lacked nothing that was essential to a Lawful Calling in the Ministry*, to the Conviction of the People and Eldership. And these Commissioners themselves promised to subscribe a Testimony, that they acknowledged him to have been a Lawful Pastor before. Likewise in the Year 1597. the Brethren appointed out of every Presbytery of the Synod of *Fife*, convening at *St. Andrews*, in order to the returning of an Answer to the King's Questions, to be resolved at the General Assembly appointed to be holden at *Perth* upon the last of February 1596 (after the new Calculation 1597). To the sixth Question, which is, *Is he Lawful Pastor who wanteth Impositionem manuum?* They returned this Answer, *Imposition, or laying on of hands, is not Essential and Necessary, but Ceremonial and Indifferent in Admission of a Pastor.* See *Calderwood's History*, page 382, 423.

But not to dip further in this Question, how far and in what Respects, the Ritual of *Imposition of Hands* is requisite to a Lawful Ordination; In the third Place, if the Apostles, pursuant to their Master's Commission and Command did (according to our Querist) ordain others, and gave Orders and Rules for preserving a Regular Succession of true Office-bearers in the Church, I would fain know, how he can deny them such a Lawful Succession, who are ordained according to these Rules? And, if this Succession be Real, and without Flaw or Usurpation, as he expresses it, how can he, without Impeaching the Authority of the Apostles, decide-

rat,

rat, over and above this, that which he calls a *derived Succession from Apostles*, as their *undoubted Successors*, which he must needs mean of such a *Lineal, Personal, Uninterrupted Succession from Apostles*, as these *Priests Ezra 2.* were to produce in their *Genealogies from Aaron*? Nay, has he not acknowledg'd this impossible, upon Ground of the *Irremediable Defectiveness of Records*? So that, either he must acquiesce in our solid Ground premis'd, or fall into the Absurdity of quite loosing and Impeaching a Gospel Ministry, as is before observ'd.

What follows in this Querie, anent the Necessity of a Lawful Ordination, in Order to the Ends mentioned by him, is easily accorded: Only, in a Word or two, I must Animadvert, 1. That where he asserts the Necessity of the Succession of such a Ministry from Apostles, as has intrusted thereunto *the Word of Reconciliation, and of such Pastors or Ministers as are called to ratify the Covenant betwixt God and Man*, he should have pondered, what Successors Prelates are, who look upon the preaching of *the Word of Reconciliation, and therein the ratifying the Covenant betwixt God and Man*, as no part of their Office and Duty, in that Capacity; And if they do preach, it is but *Obiter* to the great and essential Actings of their supposed Grandure and State Employments; Upon which Ground Preaching Prelats in England, where his adored Hierarchy is in its Robes and Royalty, have been upbraided by their Fellows, and called *Preaching Coxcombs*. 2ly, His Assertion, anent *Sealing and Ratifying the Covenant, and consigning Men to everlasting Happiness or Misery*, had need to be limited and cautioned, with the necessary Caution of a *Ministerial Subaltern Authority*, lest our Lord's only *Sovereign and Absolute Authority* in this Point be incroached upon. 3ly, That *to usurp Power without a Mission from our Lord, is a great sin in the Usurper, and snare to the People*, is a Truth which casts a deep Charge upon Prelats, who are the *false Priests, the Shepherds and Thieves not entering in by the Door* mentioned by him, since their Authority and Mission, as in that Capacity, will never be found in the Scripture Records or Registers, as he speaks, but is many ways contrary thereunto, as the Author to whom he has offered his Queries, has clearly demonstrated unto him: So that, these Usurpers are, in their pretended Administrations (to return him his own Terms), *The withered hands through which no Spiritual Blessings can come.*

CHAP. VIII.

Wherein are Examined our Querist's ignorant Notions upon the Point of the Apocalyptic Angels, and his foolish and Antiscriptural Pleadings for the Acceptation of the Term Angel for a single Person.

OUR Querist, in the Title of this Chapter, gives us a right State of the Question, scil. *Whether these Angels are single Persons; Or, If they must be taken in a Collective Sense?* When I say a right State of the Question, I understand it with Respect to that Question precisely considered; Supposing, as shall hereafter appear, that whatever Resolution of this Question be given, 'tis utterly remote from clearing this other Question, *Whether these Angels were Diocesan Bishops; Yea, or not?* So that, whatever Notions or Ramblings he doth here offer, 'tis still *extra oleas*, and without the Limits of the true State of the Question, properly and complexly considered. But proceed we to his Queries.

I. *Query, Whether, according to Beza's Opinion, the Angels of the seven Churches mention'd in the Revelations of St. John, be seven $\pi\rho\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\sigma\varsigma$, or Presidents of those seven Churches? If so, it must be made appear, there were some number of Presbyters in each of these Churches, when the Epistles were written to them; Which if it cannot be made appear, it will marr the Scheme of Presbyterian Government, or else Beza's Opinion of a President must be rejected.* A poor mean Query, no doubt, this is. The Author of the Plea gave him a clear Answer thereunto, and did demonstrat from Scripture, that the Collective Sense of the word *Angel* stands upon the most probable Foundation *. 2^{ly}, He did also prove, (as Presbyterians generally) that the admitting of Beza's $\pi\rho\sigma\omega\tau\epsilon\sigma$, or President, doth nothing injure the Presbyterian Cause, nor help the Episcopal; the Admission of a President being very well consistent with the Principles of Presbyterian Government and Judicatories. 3^{ly}, Whereas he holds, we must make appear, there were some number of Presbyters in those Churches, he might have

* Hier. Bishop's
Claims, Part 1.
Page 70, 71, 72.

found, that Presbyterian Writers have afforded him a clear Scripture Proof of this; in special the Authors of *Jus Divin. Regim. Eccles.* have exhibited clear Proofs of such Presbyteries and Judicatories in the Apostolick Churches. Might he not have read in his New Testament, *That the Apostles ordain'd Elders, or Presbyters* *καὶ ἐκκλῆσιαν, Church by Church,* Acts 14. 23. That the Church of Corinth had Church Officers therein vested with Power of Excommunication, without the least shadow of an Episcopal Head, 1 Cor. 5. 5, 6, 7, 12, 13. 2 Cor. 2. 6, 7, 8. That the Church of Ephesus (the first here written to) had Elders or Presbyters settled therein, to whom the Apostle Paul intrusted the whole Government and Episcopal Power, in his last Farewell, Acts 20. 28. Whereas he affirms, *It would puzzle Presbyterians to prove there were some number of Presbyters in each of these Churches, when the Epistles were written to them;* Our Sagacious Gentleman should have been aware of the Baffling Rebound of a Counter-Query, to this purpose, *viz.* If it be so puzzling and insuperable a Difficulty, to prove Presbyters existent in these Churches, then his supposed Diocesan Prelate is a mere Chimera, and stands Naked, as a Relative without a Correlate, *scil.* having an *Episcopal Inspection* over a Diocess, without any Presbyters, over whom this Inspection is to be exercised; Or otherwise, to evite this, he must make him a mere *Parochial Pastor*, in which Case also, the Presbyterians have a clear Advantage against him, as is obvious to the meanest Reflection.

For what he adds, *That these Presidents appear not to have been so often changed, as now a days by Presbyterian Classical Constitution, or that they were changed at all, and that the Chief Assertors of Presbytery allow a constant Presidency in the first Ages;* He should know, that Presbyterian Government admits of no Change of Presidents which may be called too often; And

the Author of the Plea gave him an Account of the Sin and Danger of the fixed President *; And for Presbyterians Acknowledgment of constant fixed Presidents in the first Ages, he should know, that the making of Moderators fixed and constant, however it may be acknowledged as to Matter of Fact, is by Presbyterians held to be among the first Recesses from Divine Appointment, in special by Beza, who holds this fixed President to be *Episcopus Humanus*, distinct from the first Divine Bishop of God's Appointment. De Tripl. Episc.

* Hier. Bishop's Claim, Part 3. Pag. 4.

II. Query, *Whether the Affinity betwixt the Style of the Inspired Writers of the New Testament, and the Septuagint Translation of the Old, and in special the Septuagint Translation of Malachy, Chap. 2. v. 7. where the Word Messenger, representing the High-Priest, is by them termed ἄγγελος, or Angel, the same*

Same Term that John makes use of in designing the Ministers of the Asian Churches, be not a reasonable Ground to infer, that the Apocalyptic Angels were above single Presbyters, or any Society of them? Answer. There needs no other Resolution of this Query, than to send him to the Book he pretends to have read. Let him read again the Author's IV. Chap. against Dr. Monro, Pag. 142. where he will find this Doubt fully resolved. The Dr. pleading this Imitation in *John* of that Passage, *Mal. 2. 7.* He is Answered in the place mentioned, That the Term of *Messenger* and *Priest* hath, in that Text of *Malachy*, a Plural Signification, and that, consequently, our Exposition of the same Term *Angel* in a Collective Sense in these Epistles, and the Application of a Plural Signification to the single Term *Angel* or *Messenger* is Exemplified in that very Scripture, and cleared in the Collating of the two Passages together.

Further, the Dr. is told, in the next place, that the Application of the Term to the High-Priest solely, or in an Exclusive Sense, is most absurd, as being; 1. Cross to the Scope of the Prophet, which is to direct the Lord's Priests and Ministers in their Common Duties, to which they were called. 2ly, That this Application to one single High-Priest, will infer, that the great Commandment *to give Glory to God's Name*, as is enjoined, *v. 2.* was only applicable to the High-Priest, as solely therein concerned, and that he alone was *to have the Law of Truth in his Mouth*, and he alone concerned *to keep Knowledge*, *v. 6, 7.* where-as all the Priests were Teachers, and therein solemnly addressed the People, together with *Moses* himself, *Deut. 27. 9, 10.* and were sent *to Teach the People*, *2 Chron. 17. 8.* Besides, that this single Exposition will infer, that the High-Priest alone falls under the heavy Threatning, *v. 2.* of *having a Curse to be inflicted upon his Blessings*, which looks like an Ominous Thunder-Clap upon my Lord Bishop, whereof our Gentleman Querist should have been aware. Finally, the Author also told the Dr. that as the Term *Levi* represents, in this chap. the Multitude of *Levites*, so the Term *Angel*, whereby the Officers of every Church of *Asia* is represented, has *nothing peculiar in it*, beside what is applicable to every Minister of the Gospel, whose Angelical Frame, as well as Office and Authority, is hereby pointed out; and therefore cannot, in this place, indigitate an Officer Superiour to Pastors or Ministers.

As for the Denomination of *Stars* (which our Querist also pleads) to signify *Illuminating or cherishing Influences upon the Faithful, as the Sun and Stars do influence this Inferiour World, and that the Churches are termed Sockets or Lamps, where these Lights are set*; 'Tis a very poor and insignificant proof against Presbyterian Government, and for Prelacy; This being so notably applicable to the Influence of a Faithful Ministry upon the

People, over whom Ministers or Pastors are set, in their Exercise of the Power of Order and Jurisdiction, and the Administration of Gospel Ordinances among them: Whereas the Prelate's supposed Office, and not Cherishing, but Corrupting Influence, is mainly Conspicuous in the Parliament and State, wherein he acts the Spiritual Lord, and is the *Blazing Star*, rather than the True One, in the Church, or with respect to any Ministerial Duties.

III. Query. *Whether the Commendations given by the Holy Ghost to the Angels in some of these Churches, for their Faith, Patience, &c. and the Reproof of others, for suffering gross Heresies and Impieties in their Churches, does not make it more than probable, that the Word Angel is not to be taken in a Collective Sense?* Answer. The Author of the *Plea*, mentioned by him, made it appear, that the contrary Conclusion doth better follow, *viz.* That the Word Angel, upon this very Ground, is to be taken in a Collective Sense. Thus, Part 1. Pag. 75. wherein is made appear, (and thus before him, the Reverend Mr. *Durham*, with several others) that the taking of the Word for a single Person, casts a Blot upon several Passages of the Context. As, when it is said in the beginning of the Epistles, *I know thy Works*, this will infer, he knew the Works of one single Bishop only, and of no Ministers else; That one only Bishop Laboured at *Ephesus*, and none else, contrary to *Act. 20. 28.* where we find a Plurality of Bishops set over that Church, to Feed and Rule the same; That one only Bishop at *Ephesus* fell from his first Love, no Church Officers else (a pitiful Imputation upon *Timothy* the supposed Bishop of *Ephesus*). The same may be applied to other Instances, *I have a few things against thee, viz.* against One Bishop, but no Ministers else. Remember whence thou art fallen, *viz.* the Bishop only fallen, and none else. Repent and do the first Works, none concerned in either, but the Bishop solely, &c. If it be said, these Passages concern Bishops mainly, others in a Subordinate Sense; The Author of the *Plea* told the Episcopalians, that, in this Subterfuge, they beg the Question, yea, and ruine their Cause and Pleading, which, from a supposed Singularity of the Address, doth conclude the Singularity of the Person Addressed.

Moreover, the same Author told Dr. *Monro*, Pag. 143. pleading, "That the Faults of the Churches are imputed to the Angels, because of their Spiritual Power to Reform and Chastise Abuses, That, upon our Supposition of Plurality of Pastors addressed in the Angel, 'tis much more sutable to suppose a People's good or ill Frame to be influenced by the good or bad Carriage of their Pastors, who have an immediate Inspection over them, than to suppose, it flows meerly from the good or bad Carriage of one Prelate, set over their Clergy and them."

* themselves, this Inspection being the more remote; And that Experience has sometimes taught, that there has been some diligent Pastors with a thriving People in a Diocess, where a Bishop has been naught. The Dr. was also posed with this Question, "How several of these Evils, charged upon the Churches, could be the Objects of the Bishops supposed Spiritual Chastising Power, such as their Dead Frame, Faling from their first Love, &c. As also, "How the Warning of a Prison-Tryal, and of Sufferings, are solely applicable to one Person.

Our Querist adds, *That 'tis no more likely, that all the Christians in those Churches were to be equally blamed for the Faults reproved in the Epistles, than that, in a Corporation, where some have Deformities in their Bodies, all the Members of that Society should be equally Flat-Nosed, Crooked, Blind, Deaf, &c.* I shall be loath to say, that such an Illustration and Inference, will prove the Querist to have such like Deformities in his Soul Faculties: But sure, the Proof and Inference it self doth, *prima fronte*, appear very dull. For, 1. How will he prove, that the taking of the Term in a Collective Sense, or for the College of Pastors, will infer, that all the Members of these Churches were to be equally blamed for the Faults reproved in these Epistles. Here is a strange and remote Inference. *Ministers, in a Collective Sense of the Word Angel, are generally blamed, Ergo, all the Members of the Church are equally guilty;* what imaginable Twist of a Connection is here. So that this absurd Principle or Inference is his own, not ours. Again, 2ly, Taking the Term to import a single Person, his Absurdity follows, *viz.* That a Supposition of his being lyable to such like Faults or Deformities, as is instanced, will infer the whole Body and Incorporation to be reproved upon this Account. And, in a word, we find our Blessed Lord making a clear Distinction of the Sound and Unsound in these Reprehensions, consequently, not blaming *all*, or *equally*: Thus in the Passage cited by him, and his Fellows, *Rev. 2. 24. Unto you I say, and unto the rest in Thyatira, as many as have not this Doctrine, and which have not known the Depths of Satan, &c.* Thus, after the general Charge upon the Church of Sardis, *Chap. 3. 4. there's an Exception, Thou hast a few Names even in Sardis, which have not defiled their Garments, and they shall walk with me in White, &c.*

IV. Query. *Whether the Presbyterians Assertion of the Collective Sense of the Word Angel, will not prove too much, and be serviceable to the Independents against Presbyterian Government, from the Glosses put on these Texts by Presbyterians, scil. That they may hence argue for the Power of Lay-Men in the Church-Government, and the Independency of Parochial Churches, there*
appearing

appearing no Dependency among these Asian Churches, nor mutual Consent concerning their Government? Our Querist's whole Inferences here, are of the same insignificant Mould with such as we have heard: For, upon Supposition, that these Churches were Presbyterially Governed by a College of Presbyters, or Pastors, what Advantage, I pray, is given to such as plead, that the Members of the Church are the proper Subjects of Church-Government, & assert the Independency of Parochial Churches, or call it every singular Meeting in these Presbyterian Churches for Worship. No doubt, this *Presbyterial United Inspection* which we hold, and our Principle, that *Church-Officers are the proper Subject of Church-Government*, does stand in direct Opposition unto, and quite overturn the Independents Error in both these points. 2ly, As for the Presbyterial Association of Churches, and the Synodal Association of Presbyteries, our Querist might have found a full Scriptural Account and Proof thereof, exhibited by Presbyterian Writers, particularly in the Author of *Jus Div. Guber. Eccl. Chap. 14, 15*, and the same, with respect especially to Synods, asserted largely by the Learned University of Leyden, *Disp. 49. Synops. Pur. Theol.* and Mr. Gille^{sp}y's Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, and more briefly in the Assembly of Divines Advice in point of Church-Government, where he may find briefly, and from clear Scripture, the Divine Warrant asserted of Congregational, Classical and Synodal Assemblies.

3ly, Whereas he asserts an *Independency among these Churches*, and tells us that he is sure, *there are no Texts of Scripture can prove their Consent or Dependency*; 'Tis Answered, 1. His desire to shew Knowledge in this Controversie should have prompted him to take into Consideration and to have answered the several Texts of Scripture adduced to prove this Dependency. Again, if a Dependency of Gospel Churches in general be made good from parallel Texts, the Dependency of these seven Churches is therefrom clearly inferr'd, since it must be of necessity supposed, that all the Churches were by the Apostles settled not in a various, but uniform Mould of Government, the Rules thereof being, even in the acknowledgement of our Querist, one and the same, as respecting all Churches. Besides that this Dependency is clearly insinuated, not only in the Visional Representation of our Lord's *walking amidst these Candlesticks*, as the Lord of Order and Unity therein, and Overseeing them, holding and supporting the Stars and the whole Ministry by his right Hand of Power, which must needs import a subservient Unity in the Church Representative generally considered, the Church being as an Army with Banners, whereof this glorious Captain

of Salvation, his Churches Lawgiver, is the Political Head, and sure not of a shattered, but fitly compacted Body, *Isa.* 9. 6. *The Government is upon his Shoulders.* And this Political Body has (as the Natural to its Head) so Joynts and Bands uniting the same to him, *Col.* 2. 19. But likewise, and especially, that in the close of every Epistle, all the Churches are called, as concerned, to hear and improve the Directions, Exhortations, or Reprehensions in point of Discipline, or otherwise, offered to every particular Church, pointing at their Association in point of Government, tho' consisting of several Congregations ; As the Church of *Corinth*, having many Teachers and Meetings for Worship, (as is clear, *1 Cor.* 14. 34.) is, notwithstanding, Saluted as *One Church*, in respect of this Unity of Government, *Chap.* 1. 1, 2. and an Association of Teachers is clearly pointed at, *Ch.* 14. 31, 32, 33. Finally, I would gladly know of this Querist, how he will evite his absurdity of giving Advantage to Independents, by asserting these Churches to be Diocesan ; For if, as he is bold to assert, *there are no Texts of Scripture which will prove a Dependency among these Churches, or any mutual Consent concerning their Government,* (which Assertion, no doubt, he extends to others as well as to these Churches, else his Assertion hath no Sense nor Consonancy with respect to his Scope) what becomes of the Consent and Dependency of many Congregations upon one Diocesan, and the Unity of these Diocesan Churches under one Arch-Episcopacy, yea and the coalescing of all the Diocesan Churches into a National Church Unity under the Inspection and Authority of a Metropolitan, the Divine Warrant whereof he has already asserted from the Instance of the Jewish Oeconomy under the Influence and Inspection of one Supreme High Priest. So that our Gentleman Querist falls here, as in the preceeding Instance, by the rebound of his own Blow ; since it is beyond all peradventure that such *National Churches Unity* as he asserts under the *National Metropolitan*, is as much overthrown by the Independency of Dioceses, as the Independency of Parochial Churches.

V. *Querie, Whether there are not figurative Expressions in the Holy Scripture ? And, if when the Holy Spirit spake to the Angel of the Church of Thyatira, first, in the singular Number, Rev. 2. 18. and afterward, v. 24. he says You in the plural Number, there is not a known Figure made use of call'd an Apostrophe, as if a Master should Write to his Steward and principal Servant, be careful of my Affairs, and thereafter say to him and the rest of the Servants, but take care that you all avoid Idleness, Drunkenness, &c.* Answer : This Query, as most of the rest, discovers the Gentleman's supine Negligence in Reading the Book he mentions, (or rather that he

he has not at all Read this Passage of it) since he might have seen therein a clear Solution of what he here Offers, and that no such Apostrophe as he alleges, can be here admitted ; The Speech being palpably and evidently to the same Persons, when the Angel is plurally Addressed. As the Precept and Injunction is the very same, so the Persons to whom it is Addressed. *Fear none of these things which Thou shalt suffer ;* here the Particle [*Thou*] is a Relative pointing at the single Term *Angel* ; then it follows, *the Devil shall cast some of [You] into Prison that [Ye] may be tried. Be [Thou] faithful unto Death.* In which Sentence it is convincingly evident and obvious to every Reader, that the same Persons are Addressed and spoken to, both singly as *One* in the singular Term *Angel*, and plurally as *many*, or *more than one*, and that in reference to the same very individual purpose and Duty, the Speech continuing and running on both to the same Persons and the same Scope. The Book he mentions did exhibit to him in a clear parallel such a change of the Singular Term into a Plural, with respect to the same Persons, particularly, 1 *Tim.* 2. 15. *Notwithstanding [She] shall be saved in Child-bearing ;* [*She*] in the singular, then it follows, *If [They] continue in Faith, &c. They* in the plural, i. e. such Women in Child-bearing.

And whereas his Friend Dr. *Monro* would have the Words we insist upon in this Passage applicable to those mentioned in the latter end of *Vers.* 23. and not properly to the Angel of the Church of *Thyatira*, giving this Sense of the Words, *and all the Churches, viz. the Churches of Asia, shall know*, then *Vers.* 24. *but unto you, i. e. saith the Dr. the Churches of Asia.* The Author of the *Plea* told the Dr. that this is an offering Violence to the Text ; for after the Lord hath added a general Motive, *Vers.* 23. that by this stroke *on Jezebel all the Churches shall know that he is a searcher of the Reins and Hearts*, he returns to an express Application, and addresses again his Speech to *Thyatira*, 1. In general, by the discriminating Term, *ye*, but. 2ly. In express mentioning of *Thyatira*, restricting thus the Phrase and Address to that particular Church, to you and the rest in *Thyatira*, and not to you and all *Asia* *.

The Similitude us'd by our Querist baffles his Design ; For, should a Master say to his principal Servant, *Be thou careful, &c.* and then extend his Speech, *Take you all care, &c.* he palpably and in plain Terms without any Figure, 1. Addresses the single Steward, and then the other Servants : Whereas, there is here, by his Confession, a *Figurative Expression*, and use of a Metaphorical Term, *Angel*, which is, in the Text, clearly extended to a *Plurality*.

But

* See the Book mentioned, Part 2. pag. 140. 144.

But our Querist next tells us of the Copy in the King's Library at S. James's, wherein the Copulative Particle *et* is wanting. The Author of the *Plea* told Dr. Monro, that the Episcopal Translators had no Eyes to spy this Copy, but render the Text with the Conjunction *et*, according to the Current of all the Greek Copies, wherein this Particle is found, yea the whole Body of all Translators, who render the Text with a Conjunction, and without which the Text cannot be read consonantly to the Scope and Contexture; Since, after that our Lord, *Vers. 23.* has given this general Warning, *I will give unto every one of you according to your Works,* he adds, *But unto you and the rest in Thyatira, viz. You Ministers, and the People in that Church* contradistinct from others.

For what he adds, *of the Succession of Bishops in Ephesus from Timothy, and Irenæus's account of Polycarp's being made Bishop of Smyrna* 'tis spoken to above; And his nauseous Canting over again what he might have seen Answered to Dr. Scott, by the Author he mentions, discovers what a loose and negligent Disputer he is. He desires *such evidence for taking the Apocalyptic Angels in a Collective Sense, as he has offered for their being taken for single Persons.* He might have satisfied his Desire, in reading what he pretends to have read, and a clear proof of this point in the Author of the *Plea*, pag. 70. 71. And when he shall be pleased to look forward to pag. 72. he will find it made good, that his Party has no Advantage, tho' it were granted that the *Angel* is a single Person.

VI. Query. *Whether the Angel mentioned, Rev. 20. having the Key of the Bottomless Pit, is to be taken in a Collective Sense? If so, why one Key must have so many Angels to keep it? And whether the Angel, Rev. 10. and he before whose Feet John fell to Worship; Ch. 22. are to be understood Collectively? And if, in no other place of the Revelation, it is taken in a Collective Sense, he desires plain Proofs from Scripture, why the Seven Angels of the Seven Churches, should, each of them, be understood Collectively? He tells us, that, unless we can give some good Account of this Matter, 'tis a Begging of the Question.* This Query, at first view, appears so very mean and inconsiderable, that it apparently deserves little or no notice; Wherein it is very poorly supposed, that the *Collective Sense* of the Term *Angel*, in the Epistles written to the Churches, does oblige to understand the Term *Angel*, wherever mentioned in this Book, in the *same very Sense.* A very frivolous Supposition, and begging of the Question; Since the Term must needs be understood and expounded, according to the Scope and Circumstances of the place where it is used, as all Scripture Terms are, in the Sense of all Divines: And 'tis beyond all Debate,

that the Term *Angel*, in several places of this Book, denotes the Celestial Spirits, properly, literally, and ordinarily so termed. As for the Passages cited, had he read Commentators upon the Text, he might have found, that the *Angels*, *Ch.* 10. and 20. are fitly understood, according to the Circumstances of the Text, of our Blessed Lord Jesus, the Angel of the Covenant, and of no Created Angel. And tho' the literal, ordinary Sense of *Angel* were admitted, (which yet in these places cannot) he has therein no shadow of Advantage, as is evident from what is said. For the Angel mentioned, *Chap.* 22. 8. 'tis apparent from the Context, that he is a Created Angel, and as a Creature refusing Adoration, wherein there is no shadow of Ground for such a Collective Sense of the Term, as is to be understood of, and applicable unto the *Angels* of the Churches: Both Passages, wherein this *Angel* is mentioned, being collated, do point out one Celestial Individual Person, or Angel, speaking to another Person, such as *John*.

For what he adds, of the *precarious Foundation* for Presbytery, pleaded for by its Advocates, as of Divine Right, and here depending on the different Acceptation of a Word [*Thou*] or [*You*], 'tis but an Effort of this Person's Vanity, and a Discovery of his having neither read nor understood the Grounds which these Advocates plead upon, who, were they such Advocates for that Government, as he is found to be for Prelacy in these mean and Childish Queries, their Pleadings, no doubt, were little worth.

VII. Query. *Whether 'tis reasonable to say, that in all Asia, taken for the Lydian or Proconsular Asia, there were but Seven Paroch Churches, in the modern Sense of a Paroch? (He tells us, that Bishop Usher thinks Asia thus to be taken in the New Testament) The Apostles Labouring very much in that part of the World, and the Christian Faith prevailing very much therein; And it is expressly said, that Christ was heard of, and consequently preached in all Asia. And Paul had a great and effectual Door opened to him, which made him stay three Years in those places, where certainly he was not idle. Hence he concludes, that every unprejudiced Person will be apt to judge, that the seven Churches were seven Diocesan Parishes, or Bishopricks. A poor Foundation, no doubt, for such a Conclusion, which no Person can draw, who is not Tinctured with Episcopal Prejudice. For, 1. Supposing such a considerable Number, and such a Multitude of Professors, as he will place in each of these Churches, what Absurdity and Inconvenience can he imagine in this, that there were such a competent Number of Preaching, Teaching Officers Constituted therein, as might serve that Multitude, and have a joynt Collegiat Authority among them, and Presbyterial Inspection over them, such as we find in the Church of*

of

of *corinth*, where was a considerable Number of Teachers in the severa particular Congregations thereof, mentioned in the Plural, when the Apostle enjoyns, *Let your Women keep Silence, ὡς τὰς ἐκκλησίας, in the churches, 1 Cor. 14. 34.* Yet they are all Saluted as one Church in the beginning of the Epistle, as is touched above: So that these Teachers have a joynt Jurisdictional Authority and Power ascribed to them, without the least hint of a Superintending or Supereminent Prelate. Again, *2ly*, The Church of *Ephesus*, here first Addressed, he has been also told, had a Plurality and Multiplicity of Officers, to whom *Paul*, in his last Farewell, intrusted a joynt Episcopal Inspection over that Church.

For what he adds, *That we make the Number of Christians in these Churches very few*, 'tis but a Repetition of his Ignorant Mistake, since the Supposition of a Presbyterian Inspection rather supposes their greater, than smaller Number. He doubts, *If it be possible to reconcile such Inconsistencies.* The Inconsistency is but his own Fancy, and we Re-commit Fancied Inconsistencies to his own Fancy's Reconcilement, and the Adjusting of the Real Inconsistencies of his Queries to his more Sedate or Retracting Judgment.

CHAP. IX.

A Consideration and Answer of the Queries of the VIII Chap. Anent the Constitution of the Council of Jerusalem; The Office of Ruling Elders; The Right and Warrant of Presbyterian Church Judicatories, &c. Exposing the Querist's Ignorant and Antiscriptural Notions in these Points.

OUR Querist has Entituled this Chap. *Some farther Queries upon the Business in Hand.* What he means by *the Business in Hand*, is somewhat Mysterious; For, if this has Relation unto the *Business*, which he calls, in the Title of the preceeding Chap. *The Business of the Apocalyptic Angels*, he has, in this Chap. another *Business* in his Hand; These Queries being much, if not wholly, Extraneous to his Grand preceeding *Business*.

I. Query: How far any besides Apostles were concern'd in the first Council in Jerusalem, of which Luke gives us an Account, Acts 15. And whether Deacons did not Baptize? And, if it be granted, that they might, and did Baptize, but could not Administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, whether their Voting in the first Council, (if they had Suffrages there) does not advance them to an Equality with Presbyters, as well as presbyters Voting there, (if they did Vote) here raises them to an Equality with Bishops? This Query, which he imagines calculated so well for his Design of Advancing Bishops, and Depressing Presbyters, is nothing but a Farrago made up of Ignorant Mistakes. 1. That the Council of Jerusalem was made up of more than Apostles, *scil.* the Elders of the Churches, the Text is clear and express, and that in more places than one, *v.* 6. *The Apostles and Elders came together,* repeated a second and third time, *v.* 22, 23. As also, that they concurred *pari passu* with the Apostles, in the Debate and Disquisition, in the Sentence of the Council, and in the Decretal Epistle injoining the Churches Obedience. 2ly, For what he adds of *Deacons*, the Author of the Plea, with the Concurrence of all Sound Protestants, has asserted their having no Interest either in the Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism or the Lord's Supper; Their Work and Office, as is evident in the first Institution, consisting in *Serving of Tables*, and Administering the Churches Alms to the Poor.

What is pleaded from Philip's Practice, the same Author * discovered to be utterly unserviceable to this Design, he being an Evangelist, and no Deacon, when Administering that Ordinance; So that his Insinuation of a Grant or Concession, that Deacons did Baptize, but did not Administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is among the rest of his Ignorant Mistakes. 3ly, He demands express Texts of Scripture to make it appear, that mere Presbyters and Deacons did Vote in that Council: A Foolish Demand: For, 1. As for the Voting of Deacons, he can assign no Presbyterians who assert it; And for the Voting of Presbyters or Elders the Text is clear and express; And, for the Voting of Prelates of his Stamp and Mould, a Demand of Scripture Proof, express, or, by Consequence, hereant, must needs Baffle the Gentleman to an absolute Silence.

As for our Querist's Proof from Tertullian, *Lib. de Baptis. c.* 17. *That both Deacons and Presbyters did Baptize, in the Absence, and by the Allowance of the Bishop,* let him read the Learned River, *Cathol. Orthod. Tract. 2. Quæst. 22. Pag. 285.* where he will find this Testimony vindicated against his Fellow-Pleader for this Cause of Prelacy, *Ballew* the Jesuite, who shews, that, in that passage, he speaks of the *Humane species* introduced in

* Hier. Bishop's Claim, part 2. pag. 134.

in his time, and that *Tertullian, Apolog. C. 39.* shews, that these Presbidents were the *Probati quique seniores*. For what he adds of *Philip's Baptising, Acts 8.* as a proof of Deacons Power to Baptize, 'tis already Answered, and needs not be here repeated.

II. Qu. *What the Ruling Elder is? Whether a mere Lay-Man, or an Ecclesiastick? If he be no more than a Lay-Man, how he comes by a Decisive Vote in the Church Affairs?* He desires also to know the Character of the other Lay-Elders, and if they owe not their Original and Rise to Calvin, &c.

Ans. If he had understood the Matter he speaks of, and been, in any measure, seen in this Controversie, and what is pleaded by Presbyterian Writers in this point, he would have, no doubt, in stead of proposing this silly raw Query, concerned himself to Answer what is published and pleaded largely from Scripture and Divine Reason, for the Office and Divine Right of this Church Officer, in special by the Authors of that Elaborate Piece, entituled *Jus Divin. Regim. Eccl.* from Pag. 106. to 161. "Upon these three notable Texts of Scripture, viz. 'first, that of *Rom. 12. 8.* where they do at large make appear, that 'here there is One, who is an Officer, Ruling in Christ's Body the 'Church, mention being made of *One that Rules*; That his Office is not 'Extraordinary, but Ordinary, Standing and Perpetual; That he is an 'Officer distinct from all other Ordinary Officers of the Church; the Bishop, Elder, or Deacon; That God himself is the giver and the Author 'of this Office. Also from that place, *1 Cor. 12. 28.* where this Office is made appear, to be convincingly pointed at, in the Term of 'Governments, Governments, in the Abstract, being put for *Governours*, 'in the Concrete, and that by these Governments cannot be understood Governments in general; For that exists not, but in particular Kinds or Individuals: Nor can it be supposed here set down, 'where there is an Enumeration of Church Officers: Neither can 'they be Masters of Families, since all Families are not in the Church; 'Pagan Families are without: Nor can they be the Political Magistrate, who, as such, is no Church Officer, and for many other Reasons hinted by the Authors, *part 1. C. 2.* likewise, *part 2. Ch. 9:* Nor can they be the Prelatical Bishops, a pretended Order above 'Preaching Presbyters, since, in Scripture Language, the Bishop and 'Presbyter are all one Order, *Tit. 1. 5, 7.* Nor can they be the same with 'Helps, these two, *Helps, Governments*, being taken generally for two distinct Offices, and, in the Original Text, mentioned distinctly, and 'diversified by distinct Periods, *οὐκ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν, οὐκ ἐκκλησιαστικῶν*: Nor can they be 'the Teaching Elders, or Pastors, for that were to make a needless and 'absurd Tautology, the Teacher being formerly mentioned in the same 'Verse.

Verse. The Exceptions of the Prelatical Party against this Argument, are fully scanned by the Author. That Exception, that the Word *κυβερνηται* points at Governments in the Abstract, is thus Answered, That as the Terms, Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, are set down Concretely and not Abstractly, and are confessed to be three distinct Orders enumerated, so all the other five, tho' set down Abstractly, are (by a Metonymy of the Adjunct for the Subject) to be understood Concretely, *Helps for Helpers, Governments for Governours, &c.* Otherwise we shall here charge the Apostle with a needless impertinent Tautology, should we suppose, that, in this last Enumeration, by these Abstracts, he means common Gifts of the Holy Ghost, since, in this Chapter, he had already spoken of these Gifts Abstractly, v. 8, 9, 10. But here, v. 28, 29, 30. he speaks of Gifts, as in several distinct Subjects, for the Benefit of the Organical Body of the Church, and that in a Form of Enumeration; *First, Secondly, Thirdly*, and not stopping at *Thirdly*, but going on, in an enumerating way, to shew, that those that follow are distinct Officers. The third Text improved for the Divine Right of this Officer, is 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Let the Elders that Rule well, be accounted worthy of double Honour, especially they that Labour in the Word and Doctrine.* Here are Officers of the Church stiled *Elders*, invested with *Rule* therein, approved of God in their *Rule*, and yet distinct from all them that *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*. Here there is a *Genus* or General, under which several *Kinds* of Officers are comprehended, scil. *πρεσβυτεροι Elders*. 2ly, Here are two distinct *species* or *Kinds* of *Elders*, scil. *Those that Rule well*, there is one Kind; and, *Those that Labour in the Word* (as the Pastors) *and Doctrine* (as Doctors or Teachers), here is the other Kind. 3ly, Here are two Participles expressing these two *Species* or *Kinds* of *Elders*, *πρεσβυτες*, Ruling, and *κοιτωντες*, Labouring; *Those only Rule*, that's all their Work, and are therefore called Ruling-Elders, *non quia soli, sed quia solum praesunt*: But these not only Rule, but, over and besides, they *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*. 4ly, Here are two distinct Articles *α* and *ο*, distinctly annexed to these two Participles, *α* *πρεσβυτες*, and *ο* *κοιτωντες*. Finally, here is an eminent Discriptive Particle set between those two *Kinds* of *Elders*, to distinguish the One from the Other, viz. *καί*, especially they that *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*; intimating, that, as there were some Ruling Elders, that did *Labour in the Word and Doctrine*, so there were others that did *Rule*, and did not *Labour in the Word*. That the Term *καί* is a distinguishing Particle in the New Testament, distinguishing one thing or Person from another, is evident in many Parallels, as Gal. 6. 10. Phil. 4. 22. 1 Tim. 5. 8. 1 Tim. 4.

10. *Tit.* 1. 11. 2 *Tim.* 4. 13. 2 *Pet.* 2. 10. *Acts* 20. 38. and 26. 3. In all which places, the Particle *μάλιστα* is used as a Discretive Particle, to distinguish one thing from another.

But there needs no more Transcribing in this Point: Let our Querist, if he please, peruse for his better Instruction in this Subject, the Author forementioned, scil. *Jus Div. Reg. Eccles.* Mr. *Rutherford's Due Rights of Presbyteries*, chap. 7. §. 7. pag. 145, 146, 147. The *Vindication of the Presbyterian Government and Ministry*, published Anno 1650. by the Ministers of the Province of London, from page 30 to 48. not to mention several others. Where, besides an Answer to the Objections exhibited, in this and the former Authors; he may find the Consistent Judgment of Antiquity in this Point.

For the Story he adds, "Of Calvin's Banishment from *Geneve*, upon the account of the first Scheme of Government, till Ruling Elders were set up, that thereby the People, otherwise dissatisfied, might have a greater share in the Government: 'Tis among the rest of the atrocious Calumnies prompted by the Grand Accuser of the Brethren, to his Popish and other Agents and Instruments against that Worthy Divine, whose Judgement in this Point being founded upon Scripture, as is evident in his Sense of the Texts premised, 'tis evident that he herein acted upon Divine Warrant, and upon no such politick Grounds of Self-Interest, as this Gentleman suggests, which a little view of his Sense of the Texts premised will convincingly demonstrate. Upon that Eminent Passage, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Presbyteri qui bene præsumunt*, &c. he hath these words, *Colligere autem hinc licet*, &c. i. e. "We may hence conclude, that at that time there were two kinds of Prebysyers or Elders; because all were not ordained to preach: For the words do clearly hold out, that some had ruled Faithfully and Well, to whom, notwithstanding, the Function and Office of Teaching was not committed, and there were truly grave and approved Men chosen from among the People, who, together with Pastors, by common Counsel and Authority, did exercise Church Discipline, and were, to speake so, *Censors* of the Peoples carriage, and for correcting what was amiss. This Practice and Custom *Ambrose* complains to have worn out of use, by the negligence and sloath, or rather the pride of Doctors, while they will needs rule alone. Upon 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. on the Term *Gubernationes*, or Governments. *Gubernationes*, saith he, *interpretor seniores, qui præsidet erant Discipline*, &c. i. e. "Governments I expound to be Elders who were Presidents, or Inspectors of Discipline: For the first Church had its Senat, which kepted the People within the Limits of an Honest, or Gospel Walk, which the Apostle else-where shews, while he asserts a two-fold Or-

[der

'der of *Presbyters*, or *Elders*, 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. Upon *Rom.* 12. 8. He expounds the Term *πρωταρχος*, *he that rules*, to the same Scope with the former Passages, as pointing at the *Ruling Elder's Office*.

But our Querist will needs crave "Express Texts of Scripture for 'Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, or Com-missions of General Assemblies, as they are now in use among the 'Presbyterians in *Scotland*. Not to Re-examine here his Demand of Express Scripture, whereof above; we may send him again for the full Satisfaction of his Demand, to the Author mentioned, scil. *Jus Div. Reg Eccles.* where he may find the Divine Right of the Judicatories we own, fully cleared. For Parochial or Congregational Elderships, he will find, 1. that Passage improv'd *Mat.* 18. from v. 15. to 21. "Where 'there is an Allusion to the Jewish Ecclesiastick Courts, which were 'of such a Nature as that there was, 1. a great Sanhedrim distinct from 'the Civil (as is made good by Mr. Gillespie in the *Aaron's Rod*, *Lib.* 1. cap, '3. pag. 8. to 38.) 2ly, Betwixt this Sanhedrim and their Synagogue, 'there was a middle Ecclesiastick Court, called *πρεσβυτεριον*, *Luke* 22. 66. 'with *Acts* 22. 5. Finally, they had their lesser Judicatories in their 'Synagogues, or Congregational Meetings, which were not only for 'Prayer, and expounding and reading the Scripture, but also for pub- 'lick Censures, and correcting of Offences, as is evident by collating 'Acts 26. 11. with *Acts* 9. 1, 2. *Acts* 13. 15. with 18. 8, 17. *Mark* 5. 35, '36, 38. *Luke* 8. 31. and 13. 14. The Apostolick Practice is also here 'pleaded; as we find larger Churches planted and asserted, such as 'that at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* 8. 1. at *Antioch*, *Acts* 13. 1. *Ephesus*, *Revel.* 2. '1. *Corinth*, 1 *Cor.* 1. So likewise single Congregations term'd Church- 'es, or lesser Churches, 1 *Cor.* 14. 3, 4 *Rom.* 16. 5. 1 *Cor.* 16. 19. *Colos.* '4. 15. *Philem.* 2. which particular lesser Churches, or Congregations, 'had their Rulers or Elders, as is evident by collating *Acts* 14. 23. with 'Tit. 1. 5. *Rom.* 12. 8. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28.

For Presbyteries, the forecited Authors will give him a clear Proof, 1. "From the mention made of the plurality of Presbyters, as associat 'and assembled in Presbyterial Churches, which is evident by collating 'Acts 11. 27, 28, 30. with *Acts* 21. 17, 18. and *Acts* 20. 17, 18. 2ly, 'From the very name of the *Presbytery* extant in Scripture, and which 'clearly points at a plurality of Presbyters assembled in a Presbyterial Church, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. the word also points at a Jewish Presbytery, or 'such associat Judicial Meeting of Elders, *Luke* 22. 66. *Acts* 22. 5. 'Next, this is made good from the Pattern of diverse single Congrega- 'tions Presbyterially associat in one Church, instanced at large by the 'Authors forecited, in the Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Ephesus*, and 'Corinth,

Corinth; from page 192 to 209. and at large made good, besides other Proofs, unto Chapter 14. wherein also the Divine Right of Synods or Synodal Assemblies is largely made appear. From *Acts* 15. in which Meeting or Judicatorie they shew to have been put forth a Juridical Power, Dogmatick, Diatactick, and Critick; Dogmatick, in asserting a Divine Truth in opposition to a contrary Error; Diatactick, with respect to Order in the Church; Critick, in censuring the obstinat. In this Passage, the Occasion of this Synodal Meeting is evident, *scil.* False Doctrine preached by corrupt Teachers. Moreover, the Members of the Synod are here represented, *scil.* The Officers and Delegats of diverse presbyterial Churches, as, of the Presbyterial Church at *Jerusalem*, the *Apostles* and *Elders*; of the Presbyterial Church at *Antioch*, *Paul*, *Barnabas*, and Others, *Acts* 15. 2, 6, 12. and besides these, there were Brethren from other Churches present, as Members of the Synod, which appears, 1. Because it is called, the whole Multitude, *πᾶν τὸ πλῆθος*, the *Apostles* and *Elders* of the whole Church, v. 22. The *Apostles*, *Elders*, and Brethren, v. 23. which could not be the whole Companie of the Faithful, who could not meet in one privat House, but it was *Cætus Synodicus*, the Synodal Multitude, the Synodal Church, where were also *Judas* and *Silas*, who were Assistants to the *Apostles*. 2ly, Because the Brethren of *Antioch*, *Syria*, and *Cilicia* were troubled with this Question, v. 23, 24. Who therefore must be supposed to have sought for a Remedy, and for that end to have sent their Delegats to the Synod. Again, that the *Elders* did in all Points Act as Authoritatively as the *Apostles*, is made good, not only in their being sent as Delegats from the Church of *Antioch*, as well as *Paul* and *Barnabas*, but also because they are said to have been sent to the *Elders*, as well as to the *Apostles*, yea, and that, together with the *Apostles*, they were received by these *Elders*, that the *Elders*, together with the *Apostles* met to consider of the Question, that the *Elders*, together with the *Apostles*, assert and say, it seem'd good to the Holy Ghost and to us, and to us met together, or assembled with one accord, as must be supposed from v. 25 and the Decrees are said to be ordained by the *Elders* as well as the *Apostles* at *Jerusalem*, chap. 16. 4. This is clearly made good by several such Arguments in the Chapter forecited. Let our Querist peruse Mr. *Paget's* Defence of Church Government, Part 2. Mr. *Gillespie's* Vindication of Church Government, Part 2. Chap. 4. Profess. of *Leyden*, *Disp.* 49. with others.

For General or National Assemblies, he will easily grant that they have the same Warrant with Synodal, there being in this Case, (when a Church becomes National, or a Nation constitute in a visible Church State)

State) nothing but a *major & Minus*, or further Extension of the same essential Judicatories, consequently upon the same Scripture Ground and Basis with the former. The same may be said of *Commissions of Assemblies*, which are nothing else but a lesser Assembly with a deputed and limited Power, both as to the *Subject Matter*, and *Time* of their Actings, and are answerable to the Assembly in their Administrations. In a Word, this Querist, who is so peremptory in craving express Texts of Scripture for Kirk-Sessions, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies, should have considered what Answer he has to make to a Counter-Querie, "What Text, yea, and express Text of Scripture he has to produce, for Primats, Arch Bishops, Bishops, Chancellours, Commissaries, Prebends, Deans, and Chapters, Chanters, Arch-Deacons, and other Ecclesiastick Officers of that Hierarchie he fences for, and which he all along owns to have a Divine Right and Warrant. And whatever Answer he can produce, I am sure will weaken his Cause, and Arm the Presbyterians against him.

III. Querie, *Whether Popery and Presbytery do not joyn issue against Episcopacy?* Had he said, Whether Prelacy and Popery do not joyn Issue against Presbytery, and thus moulded his Querie, I should have as readily have given him the Affirmative Answer, as I am clear to give a Negative unto his premised Querie. He tells us, *No doubt there's Opposition made to it by Presbytery*; And when he considers this Point well, he'll find that it is a *Scripture Opposition*. But for the Opposition of Popery to it, the Author of the *Plea* made the contrary appear, and that both Papists and Prelatists do fight with the same pretended Scripture Weapons, and other Arguments for upholding the Hierarchie, instancing in the Pleading of *Ballaus* the Jesuite, in that place of *Rivet* formerly cited, to which may be added the many down-right Pleadings of the Pope's Agents for the Divine Right of Prelacy. In the Preface of that Piece entituled, *The Counter-Essay*, in Answer to the Pamphlet entituled, *An Essay concerning Church Government*, &c. There is a notable Instance of this adduced of *Nicholas le Maistre*, in the Dedicatorie Epistle prefix'd to his Book, Entituled, *The Restoration of the Antient Principality of Bishops*, printed at Paris Anno 1632. wherein he informs, "That the Majesty of the Pontifical and Episcopal Jurisdiction is so conjoyn'd and confederate together, that the Enemies cannot so guide their hands, but with the same Audacity wherewith they assaulted the Pope's Crown, they have likewise shak't the Bishops Miters, and as it were, with one Bloody Wound, pierc'd both their sides, &c. This Piece is dedicated to *Cardinal Richieu*.

But

But proceed we. Our Querist's great Argument is taken "from the Council of *Trent*, and in special from the Speech of *Laynez* the General of the *Jesuites*, a Partisan of the Court of *Rome*, *Lib. 7. Conc. Trid.* where we find his long Discourse against the Divine Right of Episcopacy; accorded by Writers in favours of the Papacy since that time, particularly *Bellarmin de Roman. Pont. Lib. 4.* So that allowing Episcopacy's Divine Right, and that Bishops have their Commission from Christ in respect to Order and Jurisdiction, and not from the Pope, doth quite subvert his usurped Headship over the Church, and Episcopacy appears a better Barrier against Popery than any other Church Government. To which I Answer, 1. With our Judicious Countrey Man Mr. *Jameson* (*Fundamentals of the Hierarchy, Pag. 104. 105.*) "That the declaring of Episcopacy's Divine Right at that Council, could not have in the least injur'd the Pope's boundless Authority and Supreamacy which he pretends over all Bishops, and his paramount Power had never been touch'd or hurt by such a Declaration, since his Infallibility was never question'd by the Bishops at that Council, nor did they in the least endeavour the removal of the insupportable Burdens and Slavery the Church groaned under. What diminishing then of the Pope's Power could have insued from this Declarature? for admit once his *Infallibility* and *Supreamacy* Zealously pleaded for by all his Agents, yea many Bishops themselves. his Miter stands fast, and even supported by Prelacy. saith not *Bellarmin, Lib. 1. de Pontif. Rom. cap. 10. Affirmant Catholicæ Petrum Apostolum fuisse totius Ecclesiæ Caput & principem loco Christi, ab ipso Christo institutum, & non est simplex Error, sed Hæresis, negare primum Petri a Christo institutum,* "That Peter being made Prince of the Apostles, 'tis Heresie to deny his Primacy Instituted by Christ. And saith not the same *Bellarmin, Lib. 1. cap. 9. Paulum Pontificis mentionem facere, cum ait Christum dedisse alios Apostolos, &c.* "That the Apostle *Paul* points out and makes mention of the Pope, when he saith that Christ gave some Apostles, since that chief Power was not only given to *Peter*, but also to the rest of the Apostles, and to the rest as his delegates. Doth he not here clearly assert the Divine Right of *Peter* as the only Supream Head, and the Divine Right of the other Apostles as Subordinat Bishops? and Subordinats are not inconsistent. Yea doth he not, *Lib. 2. cap. 12.* distinguish betwixt that which is absolutely to be believed *Jure Divino*, and that which belongs *ad fidem Catholicam*? so that with him it is not all one *aliquid esse de fide*, and *esse de Jure Divino*, which he even applies to the Pope's Supreamacy, and why not also to the Divine Warrant of Prelats? So that upon

this Principle and Distinction, it may stand upon the same basis with the Pope's Supreamacy. Upon this we may further mind our Querist of a remarkable Passage of the Learned Turretin, Part 3. Quæst. 21. Pag. 22. 23. *Quamvis, saith he, in Concilio Tridentino acriter diu disceptatum fuerit, quo immediato jure Episcopi sunt Superiores Presbyteris, Divino an Pontificio, certum est, paucis Italis Episcopis exceptis, qui linguam conductam pretio habentes, pugnabant pro jure pontificio, ne, si a Christo immediate dicerentur instituti, æquales fierent Romano Episcopo, omnium fere Episcoporum vocem fuisse, Episcopatum esse de Jure Divino. Quæ recepta est hodie sententia apud ipsos. i. e. "Altho' in the Council of Trent it was long debated, by what immediat Right the Bishops are Superior to Presbyters, whether Divine or Pontifical, 'tis certain, that a few Italian Bishops excepted, whose Tongue was hir'd to Plead for the Pontifical Right, lest, if it had been said, that Bishops were immediatly Instituted by Christ, they should be equal to the Roman Bishop, it was the Judgment of almost the whole Bishops, that Episcopacy is of Divine Right. Which to this Day is the common receiv'd Opinion among them. Bellarmin, Lib. de cler. cap. 14. asserts the Bishops Superiority over Presbyters by Divine Right, and that both as to the Power of Order and Jurisdiction. 2ly, Hence it appears how absurdly he asserts, that the Pope's usurped Headship over the church is subverted by the Assertion of the Bishops having a Commission from Christ, with respect to Order and Jurisdiction. For why, I pray, according to Bellarmin's Sense, may they not have this Commission Subaltern and Immediatly from the Pope, upon the supposal of the Pope's Headship and Supreamacy, and Divine Infallibility from Peter, as the Papists do generally maintain? And hence it appears, that he does Ignorantly oppose in the Popish Principles, their having a Commission from Christ, and having a Commission from the Pope? For we see that in the Principles and Pleading of the great Champion Bellarmin, both are compatible, it being the Pope's Prerogative as Christs Vicar, to give the immediat Institution unto, and Exercise a Supreamacy over all Subordinat Officers, tho' their Primary Warrant for their Office be supposed Divine, yet by the same Divine Warrant in their Principles, it stands in a Subserviencie and Subjection to the Pope's absolute Supreamacy, which we heard Bellarmin affirm, cannot be opposed nor contradicted without the stain of Heresie. Even as in Evangelistick Orthodox Principles, the Divine Right of Inferior Church Officers, could not impeach the Apostles Infalible Directing Power, and Supream Authority. 3ly, Whereas our Querist clamours against the Assertion of Prelacy's being a Stirrup to the Papacy, and a Limb of Antichrist, as an ignorant malicious Clamour, I shall here again resume (to shew that himself is the*

the Ignorant Clamourer) a passage of the Learned Mr. *Jameson*, in the place formerly cited. "The tendency and nature of Prelacy, *saith* he, and the Topicks, whereon it is founded, aiming no less at one Head over all, this Argument is not touch'd tho' it be granted, that by one Accident or other, the Humbling and Depressing of the Prelats proves the Pope's Exaltation. Adding in the *Second Place*, "That it is undeniable, that the Councils and other Cabals, which from time to time rais'd the Pope gradually to his pretended Height, were all consisting of, or, manag'd by Bishops ; and if any hapened to spurn at his rising, the Pope got still more than a Plurality to crush them. And indeed, it was impossible the Pope should have risen by any other means, the whole sway of Church Affairs, and the Guidance thereof being then in the hands of Bishops ; wherefore if the Pope was rais'd to the Despotick Sovereignty, whereby he might absolutely dispose of Church Affairs, and trample at pleasure on the fairest Miters, they only are to be blam'd, having themselves advanc'd him to this Transcendent Preeminency. Adding, *pag. 105.* "That the Opposition of some Bishops to his greatness, will no more prove, that Bishops had never been the Men, nor Episcopacy one of the means whereby the Papacy was brought into the World, than the attempt of some of *Alexander's Macedonian* Souldiers to ruine him, because vex'd with his Tyranny, or preferring of Strangers ; or the like attempt in the Souldiers of *Julius Caesar, Galba, Didius, Julianus, Maximinus*, and others, will prove that they had not contributed to the rising, and absolute Supreamacy of these Princes. Adding likewise, (wherein he baffles our Querist's bold Calumny, in asserting that "Presbytery has a greater affinity to Popery than Episcopacy,) that take a Gospel Ministry unconfounded with a Papal Hierarchy, and there is not the least colour or pretence for any Man's ascribing to it the first rise of Popery, since the Parity we plead for among Pastors of Flocks, secures a Gospel Ministry from any force or appearance of Reason in any such Assault, whereas the Topicks establishing Prelacy tend no less to assert a Papacy. Here we may subjoyn to this Scope, a Remarkable saying of the Learned Mr. *Boyd*, who, having asserted by many Scriptures, fortified by Citations of Fathers, *The Identity of the Angel, Bishop, and Presbyter* against Papists and others, who in this, he saith, were *Papizantes*, shuts up all with the saying of famous *Whitaker*, against *Sanders*, who mentioning *Jerom's* Reason for the bringing in of Bishops, viz for preventing of *Schism*, asserts that *this Remedy was worse than the Disease*. For which he offers this Ground, *Nam ut primo unus Presbyter reliquis praelatus est, & factus*
Epis-

Episcopus; ita postea unus Episcopus reliquis est prælatus. Sic ista consuetudo Papam cum sua Monarchia peperit, & paulatim in Ecclesiam invexit. i. e. "Because as at first one Presbyter was set over the rest, and made ' Bishop; so afterward one Bishop was set above his Fellows. Thus ' this custom brought forth the Pope with his Monarchy, and by ' degrees advanc'd him over the Church of God. To which the same Mr. Boyd subjoyns, as his own Judgment and Conclusion in this matter, *Nec ego sane video, si semel hoc remedium, ut ad Schismata vel tollenda & præcavenda necessarium admittamus & amplectamur, cur & quomodo gradus sistendus sit, donec ad unum summum Patriarcham seu Pontificem Oecumenicum, qui solus toti præsit Hierarchiæ Ecclesiasticæ, tandem deveniamus, atq; hoc Italus velit, & magno mercetur Abaddon ille Romanus, qui, cum suis affectis, eodem hoc utuntur Argumento ad Monarchiam suam in Ecclesia firmandam.* "Neither do I see, if we once admit and embrace this ' Remedy, either for preventing or removing Schisms, how and upon ' what ground we may make a stop, until at length we come to one ' chief Patriarch or Oecumenick Priest, who must alone be Head of ' the Ecclesiastick Hierarch, and this is that which the Italian, that ' Roman Abaddon, with his followers, would endeavour to purchase at ' the utmost rate, who use the same Argument for Establishing their ' Monarchy in the Church. Let our Querist exactly ponder this Testimony of two such famous Witnesses, and he may probably be brought to a sounder Judgment as to the Affinity of Prelacy and Popery, and the Issue of the Principles of both in the Papal Hierarchy.

IV. Query, *Whether it was not want of Opportunity, and the Circumstances of the Reformers, or any settled Principle against Episcopacy as an unlawful Government of the Church, that made any of the first Reformers establish any other Form of Government in the Churches, which they were instrumental in reforming from the Corruptions and Errors of Popery?* To this Querie I Answer, that it was a settled principle against Episcopacy as an unlawful Government, which they judg'd fit to be remov'd with other Corruptions of Doctrine and Worship, and no such Reason, as he pretends, which determin'd them to Establish presbyterian Government. Our Querist in this, as in other points, discovers he has not Read the Author of the *Plea*, who has given him a clear account of the Judgment of Protestant Universities, such as *Leyden* and *Saumer*, upon this point, together with Confessions of Reformed Churches, asserting the Principles of presbyterian Government in opposition to Hierarchical Episcopacy, as also a large account of the Judgment of famous Protestant Divines, asserting the Unwarrantableness of Prelacy. It were superfluous

fluuous to repeat or transcribe at length what our Querist might have Read to this Scope. Part 2. from pag. 37. to 59. wherein is presented the Judgment of famous *English* Divines, yea and of some Bishops themselves, to the same Scope. The *Leyden* Professors assert *Pastors, Doctors, Elders and Deacons* to be the only standing Church officers, disowning the Principle and Warrant of a Bishop, correlate ad *Presbyteros*, or set over Presbyters, which cuts the Wind-pipe, and ruins the grand Topick of Prelacy. Asserting the Authoritative Precedency of Bishops to be a humane Device, without Scripture Warrant, citing *Jerom*, and even such as *Lombard, Gratian, Cusanus*. See *Synop. pur. Theol. Diss.* 42. The University of *Saumer* prosecutes the same purpose at large, and asserts our Principles herein, *Syntag. Theol. de Divers. Ministr. Grad. De Episcopi & Presbyteri Discrim.* from *Theol.* 7. to 16. shewing, "That in the Apostolick Church no Pastor or Doctor, (which, together with the *Leyden* Professors, they assert to be the highest ordinary Officer) "had any Authority over his Fellow Presbyters. *in reliquos Sympresbyteros Auctoritatem aut potestatem, Imperium aut Jurisdictionem, sed par & equalis cura omnibus & singulis in totum gregem competeat*; They deny "all Authority, power, Jurisdiction, or Dominion of one Pastor or Doctor over another, but all Pastors and Doctors in the Apostolick times had the same and equal Care and Charge over the Flocks. Thus, *Theol.* 9. and again *Theol.* 14. They assert, that in the Apostolick times all Pastors and Doctors *pari Jure, pari Auctoritate ad Ecclesie clavum & gubernacula sedebant*, were set at the Churches Helm and Government, endued with the same Rights Power and Authority, citing these pregnant Passages of Scripture to this purpose, *Acts* 20. 28. *Phil.* 1. 1. *Theol.* 15. they argue upon *1 Tim.* 3. 2. "That *Paul* describing the Bishop, had he been distinct from the Presbyter or Pastor, the Apostle had not in that place omitted the Presbyter, but would have added, that the same things were requir'd in him, or if he would have had either more or fewer things requir'd of the Pastor, he had given such Admonitions, else he had been wanting in his Duty. Citing also to the same purpose, *Tit.* 1. 5.

The Author of the Plea afterward gives an account of the Judgment of Protestant Divines to the same Scope. Such as *Maccovius Protopseudos*, *Pontif. Socin.* Cap. 6. *Walleus de Funct. Eccles.* Pag. 147. *Arnoldus Lux in Tenebr.* on *Acts* 20. *Festus Homius Diss. Theol. adv. Pontif. Diss.* 25. *Musculus Loc. Com. de Offic. Ministr.* Pag. 360, 61, 62. *Junius Animad. in Bellar. de Concil.* Contr. 4. Cap. 15. *Gomarus Expl. in Epist. ad Galat.* Cap. 2. *Expl. in Epist. ad Phil.* cap. 1. & *Expl. in 1 Pet.* 5. *Consect.* 8. *Antonius Sadeel, Operum Theol.* Tom. 1. de *Legit. Vocat. Pastor.*

For Confessions of Reformed Churches, he may find therein cited the Confession of the French Church on this Head, which runs thus, *The Church must be Govern'd by that Policy which Christ has Ordain'd*, scil. by Pastors, Presbyters, Elders, Deacons; asserting that all true Pastors are indued with equal and the same Power under one Head and Bishop Christ Jesus. The Belgick Confession, Art: 30. asserts, that all Christ's Ministers of the Word, (I hope our Querist will not exclude Bishops from this Roll) have the same and equal Power and Authority, as being all Ministers of the only Universal Head and Bishop Christ. To the same Scope speaks the later Confession of Helvetia (See Harmony of Confessions, Chap. 11. pag. 232. and Chap. 18. pag. 236.) Thus also the Confession of Bohem, Chap. 9, &c. To this is added the Testimony of Bishops themselves. Bishop Jewel Defence of Apolog. cont. Hardin, edit. An. 1570. Chrysostom in 1 Tim. Hom. 11. Augustin, Quest. Vet. & N. Test. Quest. 101. Ambrose de Dignit. Sacerd. Bishop Pilkington on Revel. and in Treatise of Burning Paul's Church. Bishop Bilson Perpetual Govern. Chap. 2. Likewise several famous English Doctors, Fulk against the Rhenists, on Tit. 1. 5. Whitaker, Loc. cit. &c.

Now I dare pose our Querist, had the Reformers retain'd such a Love to Prelacy as he pretends, and remov'd it only from a Principle of Necessity, judging the Churches better Govern'd that retained it, would their eminent Doctors, their Universities, their Confessions, concerted by their Representatives, have thus disowned it, yea and upon such a clear and Scripture Conviction of its Unlawfulness as is instanced: Which will plead that they disown'd and remov'd it upon the same Scripture Warrant, as they disown'd and remov'd other Corruptions contrary thereunto?

For what he talks of Reformed Churches Apologies, for their necessary removal of Prelacy, and their asserting the Government of Episcopacy to be the best Form. As our Querist gives us here but his general blind Assertion, without condescending upon, or exhibiting any one of these pretended Apologies, so this premised clear and certain Account of their Confessions asserting the contrary, convinces his Assertion of Falshood and Forgery. For proof of this Assertion, he cites Calvin, Instit. Lib. 4. Cap. 4. but dares not point unto or condescend upon any Paragraph of that Chapter, in the least insinuating any such Necessity or Principle of Calvin, or any other Reformers, as he is bold to suggest. The Falshood of which Suggestion I will make good from that same Chapter, Sect. 2. wherein he asserts, *Pastors equal Power in Ordination, as having the same Official Power and Function*, which is the more considerable, comparing this with his Commentary on Phil.

Phil. 1. 1. where he asserts, that Pastors differ from Apostles and Evangelists, as being temporary and expir'd. He asserts, that there is One Episcopacy, which is Christ's alone, whereof every Minister of the Gospel has an intire and equal share. Thus *Seet. 3. & 14.* compared with *Comment. on Eph. 4. 11.* Further, he asserts, that the Commands and Injunctions to Timothy, Lay hands suddenly on no Man *, and * *1 Tim. 5: 22.* the other to Titus, I left thee in Crete to Ordain Elders †, are groundlessly pleaded to prove the Sole or Episcopal Authority of any One Church Officer in Ordination or Jurisdiction. † *Tit. 1. 5.* But this Authority, according to him, is in the Collegiat Meeting, and, as every Pastor de jure owes a Subjection to the Prophets or Ordinary Pastors in the Lord, so the first ~~expir'd~~ and fix'd Moderators were de facto thus Subject, and had no Juridical Official Preeminence over the Judicatories, whose Work was only to Moderate in the Meeting, and to gather the Votes. Thus *Cap. 4. Seet. 2.* at the end, compared with *Lib. 4. Cap. 3. Seet. 14. 15.* with his Comment on that passage cited, *The Spirits of the Prophets are Subject to the Prophets, &c.* and upon *Tit. 1. 5, 6.* In all which places Collated, we will find Calvin's Judgment in Opposition to Hierarchical Prelacy so clear, as none can without extream Impudence deny the same.

For the Judgment of the Church of Scotland in this point, and the Sense of our first Reformers, besides what is evident in our Books of Discipline exhibited in that Plea he mentions *, the Judgment and Actings of our Assemblies, when not violented in the use of their Gospel Liberty, and according to their first Original Mould, are a clear standing Discovery of this Churches Opposition to Prelacy. To which clear proofs we have an Additional Evidence and sufficient Conviction in *Beza's 79 Epistle Written to John Knox*, wherein he asserts, that "the Presbyterian Government which he brought into Scotland, is the right Order, and the true Government of the House of God; the Hedge and Wall of the Doctrine, without which it cannot be kept pure, the want of which Government is the Cause why the Gospel is Preach'd to many in Wrath. He asserts, that "all are to contend for this Government, who wish well to this Church, and to oppose the Introduction of Episcopacy opposite thereunto, which is the Relicks of Papacy, and will bring Epicurism into the Church, if admitted. When Mr. Knox was desired to Write to Calvin and Beza, about a certain emergent Debate and Difficulty, he told some Grandees who mov'd it, that "he came not here without their Judgment and Concurrence in that, as in other

* *Part 2. Chap. 1. pag. 5. 6.*

A a

points.

'points. I have heard, said he, the Judgment in this and all other
'things that I have affirmed within this Realm, of the most Godly
'and most Learned that he knew in Europe; I came not to this Realm
'without their Resolution, and for my Assurance, I have the Hand
'Writing of many. See *Hist. of the Reformation of the Church of*
Scotland, Lib. 4. pag. (*mibi*) 397.

We need not insist upon the other part of his Query, *Scil. Whether*
ever any Reformed Church in Christendom, except a party in Britain and
Ireland, did declare against Episcopacy as Unlawful in it self, and Antiebris-
tian, in Answer whereunto we have already given Account of the
Confessions of Reformed Churches, the Judgement of Protestant Universi-
ties together with the Sense of the most Eminent Lights of the Re-
formed Churches, declaring it unlawful, and in so far Antichristian, as
having *aliquid commune cum Antichristo*, as John Knox told King Ed-
ward when offered a Bishoprick in England. I will not also stand to
criticise upon his improper way of Speaking, when he mentions *the*
Reformed Churches in Christendom, and makes Exception of a party only
in Britain and Ireland, as declaring Prelacy unlawful. Is this Gentleman
such a *peregrinus domi*, as not to know that the Representatives of the
three Reformed Churches of Britain and Ireland, together with the
Parliaments of both Kingdoms, joyned themselves in a solemn Vow and
Covenant against Prelacy, and for maintaining the established Pres-
byterian Government of this Church in Opposition to it? Will he
call and own the Representatives of the Nations, with the Body of the
People concurring a Party Only? With what Sense and Reason, I
pray?

For what he inquires further, *If any of the Reformed Churches asserted,*
that it was necessary or lawful to separate from a Church merely because Governed
by Bishops: I Answer, the state and circumstances of the Churches of
Scotland and England being considered, the Question appears ground-
less, since in Scotland Prelacy was obtruded over the belly of this
Church, without the least shadow of her Consent in her lawful Judica-
tories, against a great Body of faithful Pastors contending for our
Reformation, and the Nation's Vows against Prelacy; and their
Concurrence therewith was demanded as an express Badge and Test
of disowning presbyterian Government, of renouncing their Oaths
and Vows, and recognoscing, and owning a wicked blasphemous Su-
premacy, upon the foot whereof this abjured Prelacy was erected. So
that 'tis evident, the Schism lay at the prelates Door, and their Associats
in this Wicked Course, who had thus offered Violence to this Church
both in point of Union and Purity, As for Presbyterians in England,
'tis

'tis well known, that they are barred from Communion by a *Wicked Sacramental Test*, the Terms also of Communion being made the owning of Popish, Scandalous, Superstitious Symbolical Ceremonies, besides, that Prelacy being by the Supreme Representatives of the Nation once removed, and Sworn against by all Ranks, this is a Case *totò cælo* distinct from that which he mentions, *scil. a withdrawing from a Church meerly because Governed by Bishops.*

V. *Querie, Whether Presbyterys being settled by Act of Parliament, upon the Foundation of the Inclinations of the People, be not as home a stroke at the Divine Right of Presbyterie, as the Acts of Parliament in time of Episcopacy, by which Cæsar seem'd to take more than his due in Church Affairs, and the Government of it, is to Primative Episcopacy, and the Intrinsic Power of the church?* To this first part of the *Querie*, which is the Source and Main, I Answer, *First*, That it is grounded upon a false Supposition, that the Parliament settled Presbyterian Government upon this Foundation. In the Claim of Right, Prelacy is declar'd *Scotland's Insupportable Grievance, a great Grievance and Trouble to this Nation*, and this, besides its *Contrariety to the Inclinations of the Generality of the People since the Reformation.* If our Parliament found it such an insupportable Grievance and Burden, it must needs be, that they acknowledg'd it such, upon such solid Grounds of Reason, and Law, as are of a standing Nature; For a thing to be a *Grievance, an Unsupportable Grievance* to a Nation, yea, and such in it self, and in its own Nature, is a Principle and Ground prior to that of a *Peoples Inclination*; And in this Case, the Inclination (besides that it is declared *General since the Reformation*, and thus is supposed grounded upon the *Gospel's Reforming Light*) is nothing else, than what the Law of God, of Nature, and Nations, the Love of true National and Christian Liberty prompts unto. *2ly*, Tho' Prelacy was secluded by such an Act, wherein the Ground of the *People's Inclination* is mentioned, as is above sens'd *July 22. 1689. Sess. 1. Act 3.* Yet in *June 1690. by Act 5. Sess. 2. Parl. 1.* King William and Queen Mary, Presbyterian Government was settled by a Special Act, wherein, tho' the *Inclinations of the People* are mentioned as one Ground, yet not that only, but other Grounds are mentioned for establishing of Presbtery, *viz.* "It's being agreeable to the Word of God, and most Conducive to the Advancement of true Piety and Godliness, and establishing Peace and Tranquillity within this Realm. Now, Mr. Querist, do you think these are moveable, and not fixed and unalterable Grounds, and unshaken Pillars, as long as the *Authority of God's Word, the solid Foundations of Piety, Truth and Godliness, the true Peace and Tranquillity of the Nation* founded thereupon, stand sure and immoveable, and while these March-stones

and Land-marks, which the God of Order and Peace has set, are not removed (and removed they cannot be without impeaching his Authority), Presbyterian Government, in the Sense of our Laws, stands fix'd, as the unmoved Rock, Outbraving all Waves of Times, Mutations, or unsettled Humours of Men, *without the Fear of God, and destitute of true Piety and Godliness, Enemies to the Nations Peace and Tranquillity*; So that, whosoever shall endeavour the change of our Church Government, are in the Construction of our Laws put under this Character, and consequently the Querist and his Complices in that wicked Design. And no doubt there has been greater, yea, far greater Severity in Execution of Laws in Vindication of the Nations Authority, than if his goodly *Fardel of Queries*, with other Pamphlets of this Nature, were upon this Ground condemn'd to the Fire. 3^{ly}, There's a great Difference betwixt the *proper genuine Ground of a Law*, and such a *Motive* as may encourage the Magistrat, together with other Motives, to exact it, and consequently to insert it into the Act it self. The proper Ground here is the bound Duty of the Civil Magistrat, to settle in his Dominions that *Frame of Government which Christ has instituted, for preserving Order and Peace, for promoting Piety in his Church*, and this in the Sense, Construction, and Scope of our Law, is *Presbytery*. That this is also most agreeable to the *Inclinations of the People*, is a Secondary Motive, and supervenient Incouragement to the Magistrat, to establish it by a Civil Sanction. But still the proper Foundation of this Civil Sanction it self, is in the Sense and Construction of our Parliament, and Laws of a higher Nature, *scil.* The establishing of that Government which Christ has instituted, and therein establishing *Solid Peace, Piety, and Order in the Church and Nation*; Which, as is said, are fix'd and unalterable Principles, subject to no such Mutation as this Querist suggests. Hence 4^{ly}. Our Submission to this Establishment, is both Consonant to our known Principle anent the *Divine Right of Presbytery*, and has this for an annex'd Incouragement, that the Representatives of our Nation, have declar'd the *Inclinations of the People* to be correspondent thereunto. And they must in all Reason be presum'd best to understand what are their General, True, and Well grounded Inclinations.

Hence it appears, that our Querist's *Parallel of this Case with that of King Charles's establishing of Prelacy*, and his *Parallel and Comparison of the State of Presbyterians now with Episcopal Conformers then* has no shadow of a Ground; which will further and evidently appear, if it be considered,

1. That King Charles established Prelacy upon the foot of his arrogated boundless Supremacy, as the Fountain of all Church Power, as Supreme Church-Officer and Head of this Church, arrogating to himself the

Church

Church Government, as his Ecclesiastick Government, and inherent Crown-Right. 2^{ly}, Hence all Church Government Intrinſick to a Church as ſuch, was raz'd to the Foundation (I mean ſtill as far as Legal Enactings could reach), and all Intrinſick Power of Judicatories taken expreſſy from the Office-Bearers of the Church, all Church Judicatories being raz'd in Anno 1662, till Authoriz'd by his Maſteſty and his Biſhops. The Diſpoſal of the Government being declar'd the Crown-Right, and inherent perpetual Prerogative, and then the Biſhops are reſtor'd to their Subaltern Power over all Church Diſcipline, ſo as the Meetings were to be made up of ſuch perſons only, as they judg'd of known Prudence and Loyalty, and the perſons found ſuch in their Lordſhips Judgement, our Laws do only allow to give them Advice, without the leaſt ſhadow either of power to chooſe Moderators (impoſed ſolely by the Biſhops) or of a Deciſive Vote or Suffrage in Government. And moreover, in this very power the Biſhops themſelves were but his Maſteſtie's Creatures, wholly at his Diſpoſal, either as to their Inveſtiture, their Acting, or laying them aſide from their Office. In the Act for the National Council, the conſtituent Members, the Matters to be treated of, the Authorizing the Conſtitutions as Church Canons, is ſolely at his Maſteſties Diſpoſal, the Work of this pretended National Council being declared this, ſcil. *Only to give his Maſteſtie Advice, and that upon ſuch points only as he offers and gives in to them*, without the leaſt ſhadow of any Inherent Deciſive Suffrage. Hence, by vertue of this monſtrous Supremacy in the Act for the High Commiſſion, his Maſteſtie in the Exerciſe of this his Eccleſiaſtick Government, puts Excommunication and Spiritual Cenſures, and conſequently the Power of Keys, into the hands of perſons meerly Civil. See 1 *Act* 2 *Seſſ. Parl. May 1662.* which enacts his Maſteſtie's Supremacy as an Inherent Right of the Crown, for diſpoſing of the External Government of the Church, and declares that whatever the King ſhall determine with Advice of the Biſhops, and ſuch of the Clergie as he ſhall nominat of the Church, ſhall be Valid and Effectual: Reſcinding all former Acts anent the Churches Intrinſick Authority, or giving any Church Power or Jurisdiction to her Office-Bearers, other than that which acknowledges a Dependance upon, and Subordination to the Sovereign Power of the King as Supreme, and is to be Regulat and Authorized in the Exerciſe thereof by the Biſhops, who (as his Maſteſtie's true Creatures) are declared accountable to him for their Adminiſtration. And in 4 *Act, Seſſ. 3.* of the ſame *Parl.* for the Conſtitution of a National Synod, the King is made Sovereignly and properly to conſtitute this Aſſembly, both as to the appointment of it's Members Conſtituent, and of its conſtant Preſident, the abſolute Regulation.

lation of things there to be proposed, declared to be only *such as he shall be pleased to signify*, the Decisions of which National Synod are declared only to be Valid, in so far, as consistent with his Majesty's Prerogative and Laws, and Strengthened by his Approbation and Ratification. Upon which, the Judicious Author of *Naphtali*, page 183, 184, 185, &c. infers and attests the World to consider, if he could have done more in the Constitution and Regulation of his Court of *Exchequer*; And if he hath not done all as to the Constitution of this Court immediately depending upon our Lord Jesus Christ, and his Sole Authority, which he himself hath done, or possibly could do, and that such Defining, that the Sole Power and Jurisdiction of Christ's Church doth not stand within the same, but is Fountained in, and derived from the King, and that all Church-Officers in all Church-Matters are accountable unto him, is to set the King upon our Lord Jesus his Throne, and is a high Derogation from, and Reflection upon him who has builded the Temple of the Lord, and bears the Glory, and sits and rules both as King and Priest upon his Throne, &c. The Author of the Case of Accomodation examined, infers from these and suchlike Acts, that there was not so much as a *Genus of a Church Government* then existent.

Now, this being clear, the Answer is Easie and Ready to our Querist's further Inquiry; *Whether the Episcopal Clergy, who in their Judgement thought these Acts of Parliament gave the King too much power in Spirituals, were not as safe to act Salvo Jure Ecclesiæ, as the Presbyterian Clergie now are, considering the forementioned Act settling Presbytery.* The Disparity, I say, is palpable, for 1. In respect, and upon account of the *Magistral's* acclaimed and legally established Power; For our Estates since the Revolution have never acclaimed such Authority, nay, have abolished that *Supremacy* which was the ruine of our Church, and in so far have Recognosed the Churches *intrinsic Power*. 2ly. They have settled Presbytery upon a Divine Ground of its *Conformity to the Word of God*, recognoscing therein, and in so far our Principle hereanent, whereas in King *Charles's* Acts the *Disposal of the Government* is declared his *Prerogative*. As for that pretended Limitation of *External Policy*, 'tis a meer blind and empty shamm Notion, as is well asserted and cleared, by the Author of *Naphtali*, in the place forecited; Since the Act doth grant to the King all the Power in and over, both Ecclesiastick Causes and Persons, that can be imagined, and opens a Door to the most superstitious Innovations in Worship, as well as in Government; And taking this Phrase as Sensed by the Current and Scope of these Acts, it must needs respect all External Ordinances, whereby our Lord exercises his External Government as political Head of his Church, in Contradistinction unto his Internal Influence upon

upon the Church Invisible. 3^{ly}, The Magistrate assumes no other Power over Judicatories, than Calling and Strengthening them by his Civil Authority and Inspection; Their choice of Moderators, whether of Supreme or Subordinate Judicatories, the Constituent Members thereof, their free Votes, their Decisive Suffrage being all regulated by Acts of our Church, and matters to be Treated on are at the Liberty of our Church according to Presbyterian Principles. Whereas all was contrary in time of Prelacy; 1. There were no National Assemblies through all the late Reigns. 2^{ly}, No Spiritual proper Power, or Freedom of Judicatories, either as to the Decisive Suffrage or Choice of Moderators, the Bishops Power absolutely swallowing up both, for their Negative Vote own'd by our Pamphleters, took absolutely away all Freedom in these Meetings competent to Church Judicatories, Presbyteries were not so much as daign'd with that Scripture Name, but by a New Stile termed *Exercises*. And all the pretended Authority in these Meetings of the Bishops themselves, who were their Heads and Lords, did absolutely terminate and center in the King, the Fountain and Center of all the Church Power, who by his own & his Parliament's express Declarature in the legal Declarature and Extension of the Supreamacy, was to Exercise the same according to his pleasure, and as his Majesty should think fit, with respect to all Church Meetings and Matters therein cognoscible, without the least hint of any other Rule he was to walk by *. Was ever such a Monster of Tyranny set up in a Christian Protestant Church? Finally, the Prelatick Clergy did formally own this Supreamacy, not only in their Oaths, which the Bishops exacted at their Ordinations, of Obedience to them as they were then Constituted and Authorized, as is said, but also in their Oath of Alleageance including a direct Acknowledgment of His Majestie's Power, as then Established by Law †.

I need not stand to Animadvert upon the bad and inconsistent way of expressing his Querie, he tells us, *That Cæsar only seemed to take more than his due in Church Affairs, and the Government of it*, which might be consistent with acclimating only what was really his Due, (since a just and real Claim may to some seem otherwise) and yet that the Episcopal Clergy in their Judgment, which no doubt our Gentleman has a Veneration for, thought these Acts of Parliament gave the King too much Power in Spirituals. Now here's a Scylla or Charybdis

* See Parl. 2: An. 1669 Act. 1. Asserting His Majestie's Supreamacy over all Persons and all Causes Ecclesiastical.

† See Act for taking the Oath of Alleageance, with the acknowledgement of His Majesties Prerogative. Act. 11. Parl. An. 1661.

Charybdis he is Shipwrack'd upon, or a *Dilemma* which in this point may be offered to him; Either King *Charles* really, and upon the matter, took too much in Spirituals (to use his Term) or not : If really and upon the matter and very Deed, how comes he to say that he *seem'd only* to take such Power ; and what can he say for the Episcopal Clergy their Recognoscing and Asserting this Power by their Oath, and how will he free them from the stain and blot of false Swearers? If apparent only, *scil.* to Ignorant or prejudicat Observers, what a Crack yea and Disloyal Byas was in the Episcopal Clergy's Intellectuals, and Fidelity to their Prince, if their Judgment led them to think *he took more Power in Spirituals than was his Due* ; yea, may I add, in their Consciences, who by Oath Recognosced this Power against their Light ?

But here comes a new sprung Query from the former, *Whether the Episcopal Clergy were more* *Erastian*, *who would not take the Test, without an authorized Explanation of it by the King and his Council, by which the Intrinsic Power of the Church is reserved intire to it, as it was practised in the first Three Centuries : Or the Presbyterians, who, when it was proposed in Parliament, that the Church might be declared Independent of the King and Government, and their Intrinsic Power exercised by themselves, their Friends in Parliament Voted against their having this Power, and the Committee of the General Assembly rejected the Overture made in favours of the Power and Rights of the Church?* Wherein our Querist, as he has (with his Prefacer) suggested, together with his other gross Errors and Mistakes, several gross Lies in Matter of Fact, concludes his Pamphlet with a Signal and Calumnious Representation of this Matter, as well as a Foolish and Impertinent Inference therefrom. First, As to Matter of Fact, 'tis false, that the Question was so stated in Parliament, as that a Vote passed upon't, altho' some persons (and these known to be no sincere Friends to Presbyterian Government) made such a Motion of that Parliamentary Declarature instanced. Our Querist, in telling us, *That our Friends in Parliament Voted against their having this Power*, would so impose upon Ignorant Persons, as to make them believe, that this Matter was formally stated, and a Vote past upon it in Parliament; Whereas, all that know our Affairs, do know, there was never such a thing, neither Question stated, nor Vote past.

Next, for the *Commission* of the General Assembly, they did not indeed, at that time, address for such an Act, being a Limited Court, and having no Instructions to that effect from their Constituents. Moreover, there might be other weighty Considerations, determining not to move in it at that time, both in respect of the bad and sinister Designs of such as might start such a Motion, and for other Reasons ;

Tons; So that this will fall utterly short of proving their *disowning the thing it self*. He is very dull, who cannot distinguish betwixt the *Lawfulness* of a practice in it self, and *Expediency* thereof *hic & nunc*; And who knows not, that Affirmatives bind not *ad semper*.

2ly, For what he asserts of the Business of the *Test*, it is utterly unserviceable and impertinent. For, 1. Granting that such a Declarator was made by King and Council, the Question is, whether it could comport with the Words of the Oath. Dr. *Sanderson's* Rule is, "That no Interpretation can be admitted, which cannot agree to the Words wherein it is conceived, in their proper, genuine, literal, grammatical Sense; That the Oath being *Stricti Juris*, the meaning is to be kept, when clear from the Words; but, if doubtful, none must indulge their Inclinations and Liberty of Glossing, and either give unto others, (*N. B.*) or take to themselves such a Sense as the Words will not bear. [*De Juram. Promissor. Prælect. 2.*] Again, 2ly, King Charles, in the whole Course of his Government, together with his Parliament, still owned the *Supremacy in Matters Spiritual*, as above represented by our Parliaments Acts, and, in this Respect and Consideration, as the *Chief Flower of his Crown and Prerogative Royal*. And all Royalists will owne it, that he neither could, nor must be presumed to have intended to part with, and give away his *Royal Prerogative*, and *Essential Flower of his Crown*, and, consequently, to give such a Declarator, as was contrary thereunto; Which were (to use his Father the Martyr's Dialect) *no less than a Betraying of his Trust committed to him by God in a Lineal Descent* *.

3ly, I would gladly know, where was that Scruple of his Loyal Episcopal Clergy, anent the Churches Intrinsic Power, in all the preceeding Establishments, and screwing up of the Supremacy, even to a *non ultra* of Arbitrary Tyranny, by so many Acts, and in their owning this by Oaths, before that time? And who, I pray, were so Zealous and forward in this Exaltation of the Supremacy, as their Lords, the Bishops, these Court Creatures, and Grand Tools of Arbitrary Government, and Lawless Supremacy? So that their former Practice renders this Scruple, tho' Matter of Fact were supposed true, a *Protestation contra Factum*, if, at least, they had not evidenced their Repentance for all former Compliances therewith; which they never so much as pretended. But the truth is, the Monstruous Absurdity of that Test, besides the palpable Contradictions therein, having amused and alarmed all Men, who had any Exercise of Conscience, so that several of their own Party choosed rather to abandon their Charges than imbrace it, some Impressions of Shame,

* See King Charles's Answers at his Arraignment before the High Court of Justice, so called.

and to guard their Reputation against that which all the Nation were crying out upon, put others of them to pretend Tenderneſs, and to plead for ſuch a Limitation and Explication, as is ſuggeſted, but ſuch, as, to all Men of Senſe and Ingenuity, both upon ground of their preceeding and after Practices, appeared a mere Sham and Counterfeit Cover of Fig Leaves, to hide the odious Nakedneſs of this wicked Teſt.

To clear this further, I would gladly know, what Retrenchments or Limitations were ever made in Parliament of that Supremacy, which had been, by ſeveral Acts, ſcrewed up to the higheſt Peg: And (which clears all that is premised to the utmoſt Conviction) was not this Tranſcendent Crown (adorned with theſe Flowers of an Abſolute Supremacy) ſet upon the Head of a Popiſh Prince, who thus became Head of their Prelatick Church, and conſequently the Pope? For, this Prince, in his Principles, owned him as the *Churches Head*. Was there any thing like a Reſtriction or Limitation to ſalve Proteſtant Principles, far leſs the Churches Intriſick Power? Nay, what will theſe Gentlemen, together with our Prefacer and Querist, ſay to that which their own *Stillingsfleet* has adduced, *Iren. p. 389. to 395.* wherein he makes appear, that, in the Reign of *Henry VIII.* The Arch-Biſhop of *Canterbury*, with the whole Body of the Biſhops then in Being, in Answer to ſome Questions propounded, gave under their Hand and Subſcriptions, *A Renunciation of all Eccleſiaſtick Authority proper to the Church, or Intriſick therein, aſcribing it intirely to the Chriſtian Magiſtrate, as his proper Eſſential Office.* An Aſſertion owned in after times by ſome of their Chief Doctors, and Advocates for Prelacy. *Hooker, Eccl. Pol. pag. 2, 19, 20.* being againſt all particular Forms of Church-Government, aſcribing its Determination to the Civil Magiſtrate. *Sutlive* alſo, in his Book *de Preſbyterio*, *Cb. 4. pag. 6. &c.* diſowning all Governing Power in the Church, but what is lodged in the Civil Magiſtrate. The ſame is owned by Biſhop *Whitgiſt*, in his ſecond Answer to *Cartwright*, who makes the Supreme Magiſtrate the Supreme Subject and Fountain of Church-Government, which was the generally owned Principle of all the Biſhops in his time. Nay, what will they ſay to the Aſſertion of their highly applauded and juſt Lord Advocate, (*Inſt. pag. 33.*) *That, ſince the Reformation, the King is come by our Law in place of the Pope.* So that, in this pretence of owning an Intriſick Power of the Church, they contradict and baffle the Judgment and Principles of the Biſhops in *England*, in the beginning of the Reformation; yea, and in after-times, Arch-Biſhop *Whitgiſt* his Judgment in this point, with his Fellows, who, in Defence of the *Anſ. to Cartwright. pag. 372.* compared with *pag. 433.* aſſerts the ſame thing; together

together with the other Episcopal Doctors instanced. And, in pretending such Intrinsick Authority, they have not only baffled their Advocates, but Treasonably impeached his *Majesties Supremacy and Popedom* asserted by the Laws. But this we may touch again. Not to speak of the Fundamental Laws thus incroached upon, when this Prince, with a bare-fac'd Design of overturning the Reformation, and establishing Popery, was cordially received and imbraced by them, did they not so cordially own him, as to pray for his Interest, as the Darling of Heaven? And do not all that party, to this day, own that Interest of his, in Opposition to protestant princes and princesses since established? And is not the Consequence hereupon clear, that they have discovered themselves to be stated Enemies to the Reformation of this Church, having listd themselves with that Party, who stand up and contend for a *French Tyranny* in our State, and Popery in Consequence thereof?

That pretended *Limitation and Reserve of the Churches Intrinsick Power, as practised in the first Three Centuries*, can no wise consist with the Extension of his Majesty's Prerogative and Supremacy, whereby he is declared to have Authority to determine all Church Meetings, and Matters therein cognosced upon, *as he shall think fit*; So that these Gentlemen, by pretence of such a Limitation, have put the Censure of false Swearing upon all that Swore and Recognosced, by Oath, his Majesty's Authority, at least before this Limitation, and must acknowledge, that therein a Government was Recognosced, opposite to the Churches Intrinsick power in these first Ages. Besides, several points of that Confession, Recognosced and Sworn to, are clearly repugnant unto their Principles, such as the 8. *Art.* of a fixed determined *Election*, in Opposition to their *Arminian* principle of *Conditional Election*. As likewise the 12. and 13. upon the same ground. Besides, whoever ponders what is contained in *Art.* 14. touching Good Works, will find their Principles, in point of Worship, clearly condemned, and their Doctrine, with respect to Humane Traditions in the point of the Sacraments, and otherways. And who knows not, that, in *Art.* 18. Ecclesiastical Discipline, rightly Ministred as God's Word prescribes, whereby Vice is repressed and Vertue nourished, being asserted as a necessary and true Mark of the Church of God, their Engagements and Oaths mentioned, and Extension of the Supremacy, so as to reach *the Disposall of the Government as his Majesty thinks fit*, is thereby clearly condemned, yea, and that Prelacy, in it self considered, which they own, as being cross to the Scripture Pattern in point of Government? So that, upon this very ground, their Hierarchy robbed their Church of *one Sound and Essential Mark of a true Church of Christ*, and stood opposite to the Churches

ches Frame of Government in the first Three Centuries; For they cannot make appear, that the Government, during these Centuries, did Coalesce unto such a *Metropolitick Headship*, as was then established. Yea, doth not J. S. with their other Advocates, plead, that all Dioceſan Bishops are on a Level? Nay, what will they say to *Art. 21.* condemning all Men's Inventions in Administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, such as Oyl, Salt, Spittle, and such like in Baptism? I would know, whether this *such like* doth not clearly include their Ceremony of the cross, practised in the English Church, which they so warmly Court, and the Kneeling Posture in the Celebration of the Lord's Supper be not also condemned, among these Inventions instanced, as opposite to the Table Posture in our Lord's Institution; Since the Article condemns, as a *Humane Invention*, what ever is opposite to the first Institution and Original Purity. Further, this Test obliges to the Maintainance of all his Majesty's Prerogatives then established, and this Oath they profess to Swear in the Genuine Sense and Meaning of the Words, wherein all Ecclesiastick Meetings, or Treating of any Point of Religion, without his Majesty's special express Licence and Command, by this Solemn Oath, is pronounced unlawful: So that no Sophistry imaginable can reconcile this with the Churches *Intrinsic Power*, and the Exercise thereof in the first Three Centuries. Nay, should the Prince embrace the grossest Heresies, and exercise the grossest Encroachments and Tyranny imaginable over the Church, the Church is left without all Help and Relief by any of the Means God has appointed for her Subsistence, and the Churches Practice, which the pretended *Limitation* pretends to approve of, is thus, in a plain Contradiction thereunto, disowned and condemned. So that, upon this, with many other Grounds adduceable, which, for brevity, must be omitted, that pretended *Limitation*, or *Explication*, rather lays open, than hides, the odious Nakedness of that wicked Engagement, which, to this day, stands upon Record, as a clear demonstrative Evidence of the Wickedness and Naughtiness of that Government, and, without Repentance, as an Indelible Blot of Ignominy upon the Imposers and Swearers of that wicked self-contradicting Oath. And thus we leave our Querist to his more serious and better digested Thoughts, upon this and the other Points discoursed.

A CONFUTATION

OF AN

Additional *PAMPHLET*;

ENTITLED,

*A Query turned to an Argument in
Favours of Episcopacy.*



L T H O' There's nothing of Substance or Nerves in this mean Discourse, but what may be found obviated and removed in the premised Reply to the Queries, (in special to these of the IV. Chap.) yet, for further clearing what has been offered, and lest the Author of this New Essay, who seems to be the same with the Querist, should boast of this supposed

Unanswerable Piece of Stuff, I shall offer this Review of it.

His Query, he tells us, *is founded upon one single Text of Scripture*, scil. *Mat. 28. 19, 20.* containing our Lord's Grand Commission to the Apostles, *Go ye therefore and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, 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 even to the end of the World.* Which he parallels with *John 20. 21, 22, 23.* and *2 Tim. 2. 2.* *Tit. 1. 5.* I shall not stand upon the particulars he holds to be contained in these Words, such as, *A Commission from our Lord to his Apostles, the manner how all Nations are to be Discipled, the Limitation whereby the Apostles were restricted in Teaching their Disciples, our Lord's promise to his Apostles, of being with them to the end of the World;* Upon which

which last, he mainly founds his Reasoning in this Pamphlet: Nor need I stand upon Examining his many impertinent Banterings, whereof there's good Store in this Goodly Piece.

What he says upon the first Point or Inference, *Pag. 4. That no Commission can be valid, which is not rightly handed down from the Apostles in a Channel, wherein none of the Essentials of Ordination have been omitted; Or, If an Immediate and Extraordinary Commission be pretended, it must be vouched by Miracles:* 'Tis spoken to above, and shall be further touched, when we shall examine what he further adds upon this Point. Here only 'tis observable, that, in Contradiction to himself, he after pleads for a Succession of the Apostles Commission and Office as Ordinary, altho' by his Confession thus vouched by Miracles.

Pag. 7. We find him holding, *That varying in Words in the Administration of Baptism, viz. in point of the Parents Obligation, tho' the Matter it self is kept and adhered to, is, in Presbyterians, a Breach of Regularity; With what Sense or Reason, let the Indifferent judge.*

Pag. 8. He tells us, *That Presbyterians, in their Administration of this Ordinance, not having that Power, put a Cheat, yea a great Cheat upon People, making them Disciples of a Party, and not at all of christ's School; That this is a lamentable Deceit, having such a Train of Dreadful Consequences, as 'tis all Mens Interest to eschew the same:* To which he adds the Service-Book Cant, *Good Lord deliver us.* This Reflection upon this National Church, and other Reformed Churches, in point of the Ministry thereof, and Ordinances Administred, is such, as the very Repetition sufficiently exposes the Author.

Pag. 9. Having told us, *That the Apostles, in Teaching, were to observe what the Lord commanded them, and not what ever they pleased;* He gives us thereupon this Modest and Wise Inlargement, *Observe, saith he, if thou can find any Command in all the New Testament for Preaching up Rebellion, as the Presbyterians and other Settaries did in King Charles 1st's time, of which Principles Penland-Hills and Bothwel-Bridge are not to be forgotten Evidences, besides all the other Calamities they occasioned in this Island by these Principles.* But besides that, in this foulson Imputation and Eructation of his Angry Ignorance, he neither hath nor can instance Principles maintained by Presbyterians, tending to a Rebellious Issue or Consequence, nor, upon solid Grounds, fasten this Imputation upon these Armed Appearances, he mentions, which has been demonstrated by Arguments, which all his Party are not able to Answer; He should, in Correspondence to what he asserts of our Lord's Limitation of the Apostles Commission, have given us an Account, where our Lord commanded his Apostles the Use of the Cross in Baptism, and the other

other Ceremonies of the Church of England, whereof he is so fond. For what he adds of our pronouncing all Reprobates, who are not of our Perswasian and Communion, he could not readily have forged a more gross notorious Lie.

He tells us, *Tho' a Man own the Articles of the creed, and the scriptures to be the Word of God, yet, if he joyn not himself to a Party, many of whose Principles are but of yesterday, he is not of Christ's Flock*, ascribing such an Assertion to the Presbyterians: And, saith he, see if you can find any Commandment to tell this to the World. But besides that the Imputation has but a rotten lying Basis, he should have guarded against the Retortions; and seen how to Answer this Query, *scil.* Where he finds a Command to tell the World, that all Presbyterians are Sectaries, and that, *tho' a Man believe the Holy Scriptures, adhere to the Apostolick Creed, endeavour to live up to the Scripture Rules, seek Peace with all Men and Holiness, &c.* (which he represents as the Grand Characteristick of the Person having a Right to this Administration), yet, if he joyn not himself to the Hierarchy, and do not owne all the Ceremonies thereof, he is none of Christ's Flock.

For what he adds, *That some are in hazard of Excommunication, for no other Reason, but that they believe a Superiority of Church-Officers to be of Christ's Appointment*; When he shall prove our disowning a Superiority of Church-Officers, or clear by any Instance this Matter of Fact, he shall then be acquitted of the Charge and Stain of a double and complicated Lie; but, in all Reason, not till then.

Page 10. *A Minister is alledged to have said at a communion, whoever profess and practise otherways than the church of Scotland at present, let him be accursed.* Upon which he cries out, *O Horrid! is this to Preach only what Christ commanded?* But why may not Presbyterians return and retort upon himself his Tragical Cant, *O Horrid!* in his condemning as Sectaries, not of Christ's True Body and Peculium, (to use his Term) all who are not, in point of Principles and Practice, of a Piece with the Church of England, in her Hierarchical Government and Ceremonial Worship, and thus not only the whole Church of Scotland, but most of the Reformed Churches in Europe. If, by our Profession, he meant our Churches Doctrine contained in our Confessions and Covenants, and by Practice, consequently, that which is correspondent thereunto, when he shall shew us, wherein this contradicts the Profession of the Reformed Churches, and their suitable Practice, his Resentment shall be accorded; Otherwise we look upon it as his other Eruptions of his by-assed Hierarchical Zeal.

Ibid. To shew we are all Pigs of one Sow, he instances our sending Ministers, upon a Petition given in to the General Assembly, to Plant and Preach in the North. Whether this Expression (which he will have excused because Proverbial) be more Swinish and Dirty, or his Inference impertinent, let others judge. If Persons of Note, and others, in the North, from an Afflicting Sense of the Penury of Pastors, and apparent Famine of the Word, Petitioned the Assembly for a suitable Supply, what Monstruous, Invidious Uncharitableness appears in this his Foulsome Reflection upon the Assemblies granting so just and necessary a Demand? He will have no Man authorized to Administer Sacraments, refuse to Initiate any who have a Right to Baptism, and can claim it. And I would gladly know, why his English Hierarchists refuse this Ordinance to such as would not have it Administred with their Sign of the Cross; And whether their admitting only such as will accept it with this Ceremony, be not a listing men into a Party, this being disowned by the Body of all Reformed Churches? And let him Answer his own Query (page preceeding) *Whether this be according to Christ's Institution, and the plain way of Christianity, or not?* And whether our ingaging Parents to Educate Children in the true Protestant Doctrine contained in our Confession and Catechisms, (the Word of God being primarily presented as the Fundamental Rule) a Confession and Catechisms so consonant to the Doctrine and Confessions of all Reformed Churches; Or his English Hierarchists tying up Parents to admit of the Symbolical Cross-Ceremony, and thus upon the matter to adhere to the Hierarchy with all its appendant Ceremonies, be most Consonant to Christ's Institution?

He hath told us well of a Limitation in Christ's Commission, whereby Apostles were in Teaching restricted to such things as the Lord had Commanded, and were not left at Liberty to Preach what they pleased; And, no doubt, by good consequence, not to add to his Institutions, since they were to teach to Observe (i. e. to receive as his Ordinances) only what he has Authorized and Commanded; And it being thus, I would gladly know of him, 1. Where finds he, Christ Instituted the Sign of the Cross in Baptism, which his Hierarchical Party has added thereunto as a significant Ceremony, and whether the addition of this Symbolical Ceremony be not an over-streach of Christ's Commission? 2ly, Whether the same ground and pretence of a Symbolical Illustration of this Mystery in that Gospel Ordinance will not as well plead for the Candle, Hards, Oyl, and the rest of these Popish Rites and Inventions? 3ly, Since his Fellow-Querist at least, if not himself also, pleads for a Power in the Church to superadd new parts of Worship to such as are Instituted, yea and

to alter instituted parts of Worship, I would know, how this new Arguer will record what he here asserts of the premised *Limitation in the Apostles Commission* with this Doctrine of the Querist: For, certainly, the Church, in this point, has no Power above that of the Apostles. If Christ's Institutions, his Commands delivered by his Apostles (which, he cannot deny, reached both Doctrine and Worship) were to be intirely received, yea and in an exclusive Sense, in opposition to all Humane Inventions in either, then surely the Church has no Authority whether to alter or add thereunto, and in owning such Addition or Alteration, he, or his Foreleader, the Querist, falls under the Imputation of impeaching Christ's Authority in this grand Commission.

But it may be our new Arguer will alledge, to Justifie the Church of England's making the Terms of Communion so narrow as to exclude such as own not the Hierarchy and Ceremonies, her present legal Constitution, which, upon the ground of Order and Unity, does necessarily call for, and injoin a Conformity to this her Establishment. And if so, 1. He baffles his own general Rule premised, which makes the preceeding Profession a ground of this Reception. 2ly, He Vindicates, by the same Principle, the Church of Scotland, in standing to her present Establishment in point of Reception to the Ministerial Fellowship, and, in point of Administration of the Sacrament of Baptism, our premised method of ingaging Parents who have this Ordinance of Baptism Administred to Children.

Come we now to his fourth Observation, the Basis of all that follows in point of Dispute, pag. 10. *The Promise*, Matth. 28. 20. he calls *vastly Comprehensive*, as no doubt it is, and tells us, *That it is given for the Apostles Incouragement in this great Undertaking of Discipleing the Nations, that therein he engages never to be absent from them in the right and lawful Exercise of that Commission given to them.* Now, since he professes to understand this Promise in its full comprehensive Sense as respecting the Apostolick Office of *Discipleing all Nations*, and their other Prerogatives necessarily included therein, such as *Infallibility in Doctrine, Universal Inspection over all the Churches planted and to be planted, the delivering of the Gospel Rules and the intire New Testament Pattern and Scheme of this Oeconomy in point of Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government*, together with their *immediat Mission and Commission* hereanent, he stands obliged, to make it appear, that this Promise will import a Succession and Continuance of this Office thus intirely and complexly considered, and not rather that it imports (tho' primarily and immediately the Lord's presence with the Apostles in the Execution of their formal Office as such), yet that, in its full Extent and Scope, it mainly points at this his

Presence with, and Assistance of a standing Ministry, and the Dispensing of Gospel Ordinances, *scil.* the Word, Sacraments, and Discipline, by ordinary Authorized Officers, without such Prerogatives as are above expressed. His Promise, (as is already hinted in the Answer to the 5 Query of the 4 chap.) is abundantly verified in his presence with such Successors, the Apostles still Living in their Living Doctrine, upon which the Church is built, and the Streams of a Gospel Ministry and Ministerial Authority drawn from this Fountain are still vigent and running in the due Exercise thereof. When the Apostle enjoins *Timothy* to keep that Command enjoined

* 1 Tim. 6. him * (which certainly imports such Directions as
14. Compared have Relation to Gospel Ordinances, and his Ministerial
with ver. 20. Authority thereanent) until the coming of our Lord, &c.

This can no ways conclude the Continuance or Succession of *Timothy's* peculiar Office, or his Work of Watering the Infalible Apostles Plantations, in the Sense, and for the end above expressed, since *Timothy* has no Warrant for Ordaining such Persons, but to commit to able faithful Teachers that Gospel taught to himself, 2 Tim. 2. 2.

But let us hear our Arguer's proofs for a standing Office of Apostolat drawn from this Promise, (for that this is his Scope is evident from the whole Series of his Reasoning.) First, he tells us, *The Apostles were Illiterat Men, and how could they manage their Work, and counter-reason Jews and Heathens without this Promised Assistance.* He adds, *ibid.* Or, *their Successors have gone so steadily and resolutely on with the Work intrusted to them by this Commission.* And what then, I pray? The Apostles had need of such Assistance in managing this their Work, therefore they must needs have Successors therein, and Authorized with the same Commission; What Consequence is this? Did God's promised Presence to *Moses* in Executing his Commission to *Pharaoh* import Successors in that Office or Work? Again, our new Arguer Answers and Confutes himself in his way of proposing this Reason. *How could illiterat Men, saith he, who received a Commission from Christ's own Mouth, have Out-reasoned Jews and Heathens, which is plain they did in the progress of their Work, without this Assistance.* Now, if their Commission was of this Nature, that it was from Christ's own Mouth, then, I hope, he will grant that it was immediat, and not by Men, as the Apostle phrases it, Gal. 1. 1. and he will not disown it, that all their supposed Successors have only a mediat Commission by Men; And the Consequence is evident, that they were Infalible in delivering this Commission; And if withal their Work was of this Nature in respect of Extent, that they

they were to Out-reason, and bring into Christ's School and Peculium both Jews and Gentiles, thus forming them into Churches, and Establishing (as Christ's first Infallible Messengers and Oracles) the Gospel Ordinances among them, and, by further necessary consequence, inspecting them all, as being in *actu exercito* their Catholick Officers; Then surely, in all the three respects their Office was Extraordinary, and such as could admit of no Succession in a proper formal Sense, so that the Promise, in this respect, could not include such Successors, who never were nor could be.

His second Reason is, *How could they, or their Successors, readily go on in the Work intrusted to them by their Commission, in spite of all Opposition, without this Presence; or how could the Church have subsisted so long as to this day when so encompassed with Enemies from without, and rent and torn by Hereticks, Schismaticks, and false Christians in her Bosom, had it not been for this Promise of her gracious Lord?* Here 'tis pleasant to see how our Arguer Equiparats Apostles and Successors, in point of Commission: But will he in good earnest assert that their Successors have the same immediate and extensive Commission with the Apostles, the same Infallibility in Doctrine, the same infallible Supreme Inspection over Churches of Jews and Gentiles, the same Work and Trust in delivering the Gospel Ordinances to Churches, and laying the Foundations thereof? If he say, they have, who will not deride him? If he assert (as needs he must, if he speak the Sense of Protestant Divines, yea of all serious considering Persons) that these Prerogatives were peculiar to Apostles, then he must of necessity limit the Promise, and diversifie the Accomplishment, as respecting Christ's first Messengers, and their Successors in an Ordinary Ministry, which our Lord has ingaged to preserve, and has preserved against all the attempts of Satan. 2ly, Our Arguer confirms this, in adding that *the Churches Subsistence, tho' encompassed with Enemies without, and rent by Hereticks, Schismaticks and false Christians in her Bosom, is owing to this Promise*: Hence he must grant that this Promise respects the Church in General, and therefore is not to be Limited, no not to real, far less to pretended Successors of Apostles. The Church is Founded on such a Rock against which *the Gates of Hell cannot prevail*, on the Rock Christ *, and in a secondary Sense, *is built on the Prophets and Apostles* †. The Rock supports that Foundation. I hope, he will not say, that any Successors of Apostles, with respect either to their Office, their Commission, or Duties of their Office are *this Foundation*. Again, 2ly, Will our Arguer be bold to say, that the Subsistence of the Church by this Promise, will necessarily

* Mat. 16. 18.

1 Cor. 10. 4.

† Ephes. 2. 20.

infer the continuance of the same *Method and Means or Instruments*, as were requisite for her first Being and Establishment. If his Answer be negative, then he loses his Argument and Medium of pleading for such a continuance of the Apostolick Office, as he alledges this Promise will import; For thus the promised Presence, and Support of the Church thereby, is accomplished, tho' the *Means and Instruments* are not the same every way, as at her first Plantation. If his Answer be Affirmative, that the *Means and Method and Instruments* are every way the same, then he runs into a twofold absurdity, 1. In asserting the necessary continuance of Infallible Universal Doctors; for he owns it in the same Page, *That the Commission of Apostles was Universal, with an immediat Commission*. Moreover, he thus must owne the necessity of the extraordinary Gifts, of Miracles, of Healings, of Tongues; For that such Gifts and Offices were vigent, yea and necessary, in the first Age of the Church, he can not deny, and that thereby the Lord made good his promised Presence in rendering them effectual for the Churches Subsistence, amidst the Opposition of such Enemies as he mentions. 2ly, He will contradict what he asserts of the Method and Means of the Churches Subsistence to this Day, while torn with *Hereticks, Schismaticks, false Christians, &c.* Now, unless he plead for the Papal Succession, and the Churches continual illustrious Visibility that way, he must owne it, with the Protestant Churches, that there has been a considerable and long Eclipse of the Churches Luster and Purity, and a long and great

Defection of her Officers, Stars falling from Heaven to Earth *, the third part of them drawn away by the Dragon's † Vers. 6. Tail, the Woman fleeing to the Wilderness, † the Gentiles || Chap. 11. 2. possessing the utter Court ||, Treading under Foot the Holy City; So that, under Antichrist's Rise and Reign, there being so great a Defection of her Officers turning Hereticks or Schismaticks, and thus infecting, even in his Sense, the true Church, this Promise will not reach either the Purity or Unanimity of all her Officers, and even in his Acceptation of Successive Bishops; And therefore, he must of necessity grant such a Limitation of the Promise as we plead for, and understand it as accomplished in the Churches Subsistence in her purer and better part, amidst the long and great Defection even of her Officers. So that all Successors of Apostles have not stood their Ground, neither have most of the Churches visible Members, tho' the true Church hath still subsisted in the Accomplishment of this Promise: Nor has she always had such Infallible Directors as have been guarded from all Error and Apostacy, according to her Priviledge in her first Constitution, under the Apostolick Inspection.

Pag. 12. Our Arguer tells us, that he will now proceed to his *Argument from this Promise*, so that what he hath above proposed appears to be his more general and remote Arguing. His Argument is thus; *Either this Commission granted to the Apostles was temporary, or to continue for ever to the end of the World.* This Dilemma is easily Answered as not just in the Division. This Commission, in divers respects, was both *Temporary* and likewise *to continue to the end.* *Temporary*, as immediately respecting the Apostles, their Office, Work and Commission, as such, in a formal Sense, wherein they could have no Successors, as is above made good. It was also *to continue to the End*, as virtually including a Gospel Commission and Legation in Administration of the Word, Sacraments, Discipline, by an ordinary standing Ministry. The Distinction is common, and universally Acknowledged by all Orthodox, betwixt *Successors of Apostles in general*, or in a Gospel Ministry simply and absolutely, and *Successors to the Apostolat and Apostolick Office* as such. And this sufficiently overthrows his horn'd Argument, the Horns whereof touch us not.

If the *Commission was only Temporary*, says our Arguer, *there will follow several Absurdities*, whereof he musters five: But from what is said it appears, that in these supposed Absurdities he but beats the Air, and has no Adversary, and that they can never by a thousand Degrees reach the Presbyterians, who assert not the Commission to be simply, absolutely, or in all respects Temporary.

The first is, *It would follow none but Apostles had a Right or Title to Act by virtue of it.* A pitiful Inference with respect to his Scope and Pleading against us; Since he cannot shew, when and where these first Apostles instituted others having a Commission of the same Nature and Extent with their own. Nay, who sees not this impossible upon the grounds already assigned. Again, If [*by Acting by virtue of this Commission*] he mean *Acting* in a general Sense or in a Gospel Legation, we assert, others had by virtue of this Commission Authority and Power to Act; Because this Fundamental primary Commission, given to Apostles, did virtually and necessarily include a standing Authorized Commission to Gospel Ministers, and the Preservation and Propagation of this Ministry unto the end, so that, Apostles, by virtue of this Commission, were Authorized to Ordain such Successors as were suited to this great Design of the Propagation of the Gospel, and of a Gospel Ministry; As *Moses's* first extraordinary Commission imported an Obligation to appoint ordinary Successors in the Levitical Ministry untill the end of that Oeconomy and first Dispensation of the Covenant.

Again, If, by [*a Right and Title to Act by virtue of this Commission*] he mean Acting in the Exercise of the Office of Apostolat as such; We say, none had Title thus to Act who were not thus Authorized, which himself must acknowledge or contradict his Assertion of their *immediat Commission, and Universal Legation*, which none could assume, or Act by virtue of it.

His second Absurdity is, *That thus the Promise is unintelligible, if not worse; How can he be with them (saith he) to the end of the World, since all of them died a few Years after that Promise was made?* But all that this will plead, is the necessity of Successors in a Teaching Gospel Ministry, and Administration of Gospel Ordinances, whereby the Church is Propagated and Preserved; And therein the Promise is abundantly Accomplished: But that it pleads for Successors in the *formal Office of Apostolat*, doth no way follow, nor can. Again, 'tis he, in this foolish Gloss, who makes the Promise unintelligible, who will needs have, by virtue thereof, *Infalible Universal Inspectors of the Church Catholick*, with the other Apostolick Gifts of Tongues, of Miracles, &c. to be of standing necessity and continuance to the end of Time, contrary to the Doctrine of all Reformed Churches, yea the Sense and Experience of all Men.

In a Word, I would know, how this Arguer understands that Passage Eph. 4. 11, 12. with 1 Cor. 12. 28. wherein we find *Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, Gifts of Tongues, Gifts of Healing given to the church*; And in Reason he cannot exclude them from their share in this Promise, and he knows that in Eph. 4. the great Work of the Ministry, the Scope and Intendment of the Gifts there enumerated, and the Edification of the Body of Christ hath this Term of its Duration fix'd, *till we all come, in the Unity of the Faith and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, to a perfect Man, &c. i.e. till the Day of Judgment when the Churches Warfare is ended.* And when he falls upon a sound Sense of this Passage and Accords it with the Promise, he will see the strength of his fancied Absurdity, or rather the weakness of this Argument; It being certain, that it is the Work of the Ministry, or the Edification of the Body of Christ simply and in it self considered, and as reached by a standing Gospel Ministry, not all the forementioned Offices, *Vers. 11.* which are said thus to continue and last. But, in his Principles, it is a pungent retortion, how our Lord's *promised Presence to the end* is verified with respect to Gifts and Offices long since removed: For such is the Nature of this pungent Query, *How can our Lord be said to be with those to the end of the World, who died all of them a few Years after that Promise was made?* Here, on the by, he must be told, that his Skill in Chronology

logy gets a pitiful blot in this Assertion ; For (not to enquire, how many Years the other Apostles survived this Promise, which certainly was for such a length of time as far outstretches his Expression of *few Years*, if we shall except the first Martyr Apostle, *James the Brother of John*, whom *Herod* killed with the sword) 'tis certain, and universally acknowledged, that the Apostle *John* did long survive all the rest, *a fortiori* the giving of this Promise.

The third Absurdity is, *That if this Commission was Temporary, and to continue no longer than the Death of the Apostles, then, for any thing we know from this Commission, none had Authority to teach, to Disciple any of whatever Nation.* But granting that such like Absurdity would follow upon the Assertion, *that the Commission was absolutely Temporary*, yet upon our Assertion that it was such as peculiarly respecting the *Apostolick Office*, and the Exercise thereof in a proper formal Sense, but not as virtually including a Successive standing Gospel Ministry, there is no apparent shadow of his fancied Absurdity. Any that but Reads the New Testament can inform him, that the Apostles did so execute this Commission, as having gathered Churches, to plant Officers, and Teachers therein, to Propagate a faithful Teaching Ministry, Exciting and Encouraging them to their Duty, concurring with them in Administration of Government, in their limited Precincts, and the Churches over which they were set, and injoyning accordingly the Peoples Obedience unto them. And he will not doubt that this the Apostles performed upon the Obligation of, and in Obedience to their Apostolick Commission, *to Disciple all Nations*, thus clearly holding out, that in this Method the Church and a true Gospel Ministry was to be preserved and propagated when they were gone.

The fourth Absurdity, which he inferrs upon his own chimerical fancied Answer of the premised Dilemma, is, *That thus it would follow that our blessed Saviour designed to have his Doctrine no more Taught or Propagated after the Apostles Death, or was indifferent how and by whom it was to be Propagated.* But who sees not the Absurdity of such an Inference upon our Assertion and Distinction premised, and that the Commission was Temporary as respecting the formal Office of Apostolat, the Scripture being so express as to their Substituting an inferior Teaching Ministry, and that our blessed Lord set in his Church Teachers, Pastors, and several other Officers who were not Apostles, but had an Office specifically distinct. Will he deny our Lord's Promise to such, or deny them their share and Interest in the Apostolick Commission to *Teach*, and *Disciple*, or *Baptise* ? If Apostles were by their Commission Authorized to institut a Teaching Ministry, and gave Rules for Propagation thereof

thereof by a Lawful Ordination, there was a sure Foundation laid for Propagating this great Mean of Edification. *How should that be done,* says our Pamphleter, *seeing he left no Rule nor Laws for doing of it,* he means upon Supposition of the Apostles Temporary Office as such. But I would ask him, Whether the Apostles left any Rules or Laws for a standing Ministry? If they did, which he must either acknowledge, or deny plain Scripture, then sure they did it by vertue of Christs Commission, *Go Teach, or, Disciple all Nations ;* Consequently his Commission reached this. But our Arguer must be posed upon it, Where are there Rules and Laws for Substituting such Apostles as themselves? And let him here take up his Shield, and beware of this Rebound of his own Weapon: Either Christ gave Laws and Rules for a standing postolat, of the same Nature with that of the first Apostles, or his Doctrine can be no more propagated after their Death: But, in all the New Testament Rules in reference to Ordination, and the Propagation of a Gospel Ministry, there's none to be found, that can reach or authorize the Office of Apostolat, as described in Scripture. either with respect to their Commission, Work, or Qualifications; *Ergo,* Our Saviour designed to have his Doctrine no more taught or propagated after them. Thus, *virus quod vomit ipse voret,* let our Pamphleter lick up his own Poyson.

The Fifth Absurdity is, *That thus Christianity must be extinguished, Christ, as the Churches Head, having given no Rules, for Constituting and Governing that Society, the Laws falling, the Society must ; Farewell all Teaching, all Discipling, after the Apostles Death, till there be a new Commission, yea, farewell Christianity, since there is no Rule whereby Persons may be made Christians.* Answer. These Consequences were good, if the Apostles had set down no Rules for Propagation of a Gospel Ministry, for Authorizing, Teaching and Ruling Officers: But, that such Consequences will follow, upon the Denial of the Continuance of the formal Office of Apostolat, and as imported in this Promise, is false and palpably Nonsensical. And, as, in the other Case, this Absurdity lights upon himself, who knits these Absurdities unto the Non-existence and Propagation of this formal Office of Apostolat, which is utterly repugnant to the Scripture Accounts of the Nature of this Office, as is above cleared. So that 'tis his own Foolish Notion, which dissolves the Sinews, and overthrows the Foundation of a Church, yea, of Christianity it self. Further, I would know of this Gentleman, whether he can or will deny, that, upon our true Hypothesis of such Successors of Apostles, as is instanced, all his Absurdities are easily evited, *viz.* That there is a Ministry propagated, together with the Laws and Rules of

of Church-Government, the Nerves also preserved of Church Societies, the Teaching Office propagated, and the great Mean of Faith thereby advanced.

For what he adds, *Pag. 15. Of our owning them as Officers, who are not called, or in Orders, proved by the repeated Instance of Mr. Bruce in Edinburgh,* 'tis already Answered. And he might have found, had he understood this Controversie, in what Sense our Divines do hold the Necessity of Ordination, and in what Cases Persons may officiat without it; Which will abundantly reach what he asserts of Mr. Calvin, even upon Hypothesis of the Truth of his Relation. But this we may touch again. *Jerom's Testimony, in Epist. ad Euagrium,* which he mentions *Pag. 17.* doth militat against himself, since *Jerom* therein makes Bishops, in the Scripture Accounts, the same with Pastors.

That we hold Christ's Commission absolutely Temporary, and to expire with the first Apostles, is among the rest of his *gratis dicta* and Untruths; As also, *that we have no due Esteem of Orders,* since we reverence Ordination as God's standing Ordinance. How far Necessity may justifie, in some Cases, the want of Ordination is already touched: But, that we turn this Necessity into *Common Practice*, is his bold and ungrounded Assertion, convicted of Falshood, both by our Principles and Practice.

Pag. 16. He tells us, he will endeavour to prove *our Saviour's Commission was not Temporary, but to continue to the end.* In what Sense it was to continue, we have already heard. But our Arguer would prove, it was to continue in the Sense that he has propounded, *viz.* That the Apostolick Office, in a proper formal Sense, was a standing Office. He tells us, *the Promise reaches their lawful Successors to the end of the World:* But who these lawful Successors are, is the point in Question. We say, *Ministers Labouring in the Word and Doctrine, Officers to whom are intrusted the Power of Order and Jurisdiction,* are such properly, and of a standing Nature and Continuance. He holds, *these Successors are Apostles endowed with the same and equal Power with themselves,* Or, *holding the same formal Office wherewith they were clothed.* And having built, as he imagines, the negative part of his Dilemma, *that the Office was not temporal,* for proof of the positive part, *that it was a standing Office to the end,* he argues thus,

Here is a Commission to the Apostles, and a Promise to be with them (Apostles) (for such they were to whom he spoke) to the end of the World, therefore there are to be, and must be Apostles to the end of the World, for him to be with. Ans. I deny his Consequence, as having no Twist of a Connection, which is sufficiently overthrown by the premised Distinction of the *Commission* and Office of *Apostles*, or the *Commission* as

respecting the Apostles in a proper formal Sense, with all Ingredients making up that formal Office, and the Office and Commission as respecting the standing necessary Duties of a standing Gospel Ministry. In the second Sense only, we acknowledge the promised presence to reach to the end; In the first Sense, to be terminated with the State and Condition of the Apostles. Next, our Answer may be fortified, and his Consequence infringed, from what himself must needs acknowledge. He tells us positively, *Pag. 17. There was to be a continued Succession of such Apostles, as Peter, James, John, &c.* Now, he will not disown it, that these, with their Fellow Apostles, had, first, an Immediate Commission, 2ly, To deliver the Gospel Oeconomy, Principles, and Rules to the Nations, 3ly, By a Paramount Authority to all Church Judicatories, to which must be joyned Infallibility in Doctrine, and the Exercise of Directive Power, the whole comprobated by the Gift of Miracles, Sealing the Spirit's Extraordinary Infallible Conduct. Finally, The Work intrusted to them, being to deliver unto the Churches the whole Scheme and Frame of the Gospel Oeconomy, there was necessarily added thereto and connected therewith, an Indefinite and Universal Inspecting Authority. Now; take this Consequence, with respect to the Apostolate, as thus in Scripture delineated, *viz.* That there must be standing Officers of this Nature to the end of the World, since the Falseness and Absurdity thereof is palpable, our Pamphletor must needs acknowledge, that, in this Arguing, there is neither *Vis Consequentiae*, nor *Consequentis*, *viz.* Here is a Commission to the Apostles, and a Promise to be with them to the end; Ergo, there must be a standing Office of Apostolate, as above described, to the end; Or such Apostles as were Peter, James, and John, who, he will not doubt, were of this Character. Now, if neither the Commission to the Apostles, nor the Promise of being with them to the end, will bear the weight of the Conclusion premised, he's obliged, of necessity, to limit and restrict the same, as is above explained.

For his next Conclusion added, *Ibid. That there must be in Christ's Church, to the end of the World, Men clothed with as much Power and Authority over Presbyters, as these first Men were, by virtue of their Commission; It differs only in Terms from the former, and receiveth the same Answer.* For what he adds further, *That Christ's Promise cannot be in vain, and that he could not promise to be with an Order of Men which was to fail;* 'Tis Answered, That, as our Lord could not promise his presence unto the end, with an Order of Men of such a standing Necessity, as the Churches Edification and preservation called for, if such an Order were to fail, the Failure whereof were inconsistent with such a Promise,

mise; and the Scope thereof; So this promised Presence to the end, might be very well consistent with the Failure, or Temporary State of such an Order of Men, as were not of this Nature and Necessity, but to pass off with the Churches first Exigence, as being suited to the instant Work of laying the Foundation thereof. Finally, Our Lord's Promise to the Apostles, as respecting their Office, may point at two things, 1. The Standing and Continuance, to the end of the World; of that Foundation of the Doctrine of the Gospel, which they were to lay. 2ly, The standing Nature and Necessity of a Gospel Ministry, whereof they were appointed to be, as Apostles, the Authorized Infal-
 lible Instituters and Inspectors.

Our Pamphleter cannot see a Middle (Pag. 17, 18.) between making the Commission and Promise Temporary, and to determine with the Lives of the first Apostles; Or to make both lasting, and to continue to the end. But, from what is premised of a twofold Respect, wherein the Office is both Temporary, and of a standing Necessity, this Middle is easily pointed at, and the Absurdity of his two Extremes is therein discovered. *Ibid.* He concludes, *That, since the Promise takes in their Successors, therefore, it must import Persons of the like Character with the first Apostles; Wherein he ignorantly confounds Successors of Apostles, simply and absolutely such, and Successors in the Apostolate, or by Persons of the like Character with the first Apostles, both which are of a signal Disparity: Can there not be Successors in a part, or with respect to the retrenched or limited Power of Apostles? Can he deny the Succession of the Jewish Priests, and other Ministers unto Moses, in point of a standing Ministry, tho' none of them were Successors to his formal Office, or Plenitude thereof? We are again told, that the Superintending the Affairs of the Church, and Conducting those Subordinate, is an Exigence of lasting Advantage to the Church. Ergo quid? There's a Superintendency of Superiour to Inferiour Judicatories, and a Subjection of the Spirit of the Prophets to the Prophets Exemplified in Scripture, 1 Cor. 14. with Act. 15. A Superintendency of Pastors over Inferiour Officers: But cannot this Man distinguish Superintendency, simply or absolutely considered, from that of Apostles, in its full Extent and Nature? Has he ever heard the Sophistry, (into which he here stumbles) of Arguing a *Dicto simpliciter ad Dictum secundum quid*, or a *genere ad speciem affirmativè*? Superattending Affairs of the Church, and Conducting these Subordinated, is necessary, and of lasting Advantage; Ergo, such Superintending and Conduct as was proper to Apostles as such.*

Pag. 19. Shew me, saith our Pamphleter, which Branch of their Power and Commission is excluded from a share of the Promise, or is secluded from the

Priviledge thereof, and I will own, that in that Branch of their Power, they are not succeeded. *Ans.* 1. Himself must acknowledge, some of their Priviledges could not be succeeded unto, unless he cross the Sense of all Men, *scil.* their Infallible, Universal Inspection, &c. And then it will suit his Consideration, to clear and instruct how this Infallible, Universal Inspection is excluded from the Promise of our Lord's Presence; Or, how it could be exercised and subsist without the same? 2ly, His Fundamental Gross Mistake is, that he distinguisheth not the Promise, as respecting the Apostles, to whom it was immediately given, and as it includes their Successors. The Promise respects Successors in this Commission of Teaching and Baptizing, Disciplining or Forming Church Members: Now, either he must say, that all who Teach and Baptize, are properly and formally Apostles, this being the Work to which Christ promises his Presence to the end; Or acknowledge, that the Promise cannot reach or infer the standing of that formal Office of Apostolate; or has any such Sense or Design. 3ly, The Promise, as is above hinted, in a twofold Sense, reaches Apostles, 1. As to the *standing Commission of a Gospel Ministry, & Legation* derived from them; A Ministry cloathed with Power of Order and Jurisdiction, whereof they were the first Founders and Instituters, and wherein, consequently, in this formal Sense, they could not be succeeded. 2ly, With respect to *their living Doctrine and Rules of Government*, delivered by them, in which Sense, the Church is built upon their Foundation, the New Jerusalem having their Names engraven upon it; In this Sense he is still with them, because with his Church founded by them, till we all come to the perfect Man, *Eph.* 4. 11. Finally, hence he ignorantly makes to be excluded, absolutely or wholly, from this Promise, or to have no Share in it, as he expresses it, that which is not of a standing Necessity to the end of Time. For, since our Lord authorized and established his Apostles, to be the Infallible first Founders of the Gospel Church, and Ordinances thereof, the Promise behoved, for their Incouragement, immediately to respect them in this Capacity, and by Consequence, and mediately, their Successors in a Gospel Ministry; So that *their Office*, as well as *their Work*, with respect to its *Efficacy, Fruits, and Effects*, doth in so far continue, and has the Lord's Presence allowed the same, as that of Moses in the Old Oeconomy, tho' the Office, in a proper formal Sense, has gone off. I suppose, such a Promise given to Moses, in the Administration of his Office, of giving the Law, instituting the Rules of Civil Government, and the standing Priesthood, or Jewish Ministry, directing the Worship, instituting the Rules thereof; *Go about this Work, I am with you all ways to the end* (say this is to be understood of the end of that

that Oeconomy); Will this Man's Wife Dilemma hold good, Either *Moses* was to be Succeeded to in this Work and formal Office, or, the Promise was not verified, and whatever part of his Work and Office is not Succeeded unto is excluded from a share in this Promise. He tells us that we retrench the Promise, and Pag. 20. do pretend the Apostolick Order is extinct, because they are dead to whom that Commission was first given. A foolish Calumny: We say, the Order or Office is ceased, because the immediat Commission, the Work and Qualifications of the Officers, together with the proper design of the Office it self is ceased, not meerly because the Persons are dead; And 'tis he, not Presbyterians who square Christ's Command by his Notions.

Pag. 21. He can find nothing in the New Testament shewing that Apostles were not to be Succeeded unto in the full Extent of their commission. He must then be plied with this Query, Where finds he the Apostles Ordaining Successors in the Churches with this same extensive Commission, or of such a Nature as themselves had? As for the filling up of Judas's vacancy by Matthias, he Confutes his own ground, Confessing it was to fulfill a Scripture Prophecy and make up the Number of Twelve. And thus we find the Reason offered by Peter, when this matter was moved among the Disciples; This Scripture, saith he, must needs have been fulfilled, which the Holy Ghost by the Mouth of David spake before concerning Judas, &c. *Acts*. 1. 16. 2ly. This Instance doth hereby reach him a further Blow, that, since, upon failure of One Apostle, there was to be such a supply, and the matter Recommended to God to make the choice, much more was the supply of all the Apostles necessary, supposing the standing necessity of their formal Office, and upon the prospect of their being all removed, these first Apostles should have seen to such Ordination of Substitut or Successive Apostles, as Matthias is supposed to be; For he tells us, this they did, least the College should fail, and that their Office was not to fail upon failure of One, or decease of all. Now, since the Apostles were all to fail by decease, whom did they Ordain, where, and how, to Succeed them in the formal Office of Apostolate? Let him Read his New Testament again, and shew Presbyterians this if he can. Nay, was not this Choice and Ordination of Matthias, as that of the other Apostles, immediately by God himself, and consequently, in the Sense of all sound Divines, Extraordinary, *Acts* 1. 24. they thus Address God, They Prayed and said, thou Lord which knowest the Hearts of all Men, shew whether of these thou hast chosen, Or, as the Words will Read, Ordain of these twain one whom thou hast Chosen. *Gr. Luk.* 10. 1. Let him point out unto us from Scripture, where, when, and how did the Apostles make such an Ad-

dress to God for Twelve Successors to be Ordained by him in the full Extent of their Office; And why Twelve, and no more? In what Seats and Chairs were these Twelve Succeeding Apostles fix'd? What Lines of Successions can this pretended Antiquary or his Fellows derive from them to legitimate a true Gospel Ministry?

He further tells us, *Ibid.* *That the Apostles, by their Commission, being oblig'd not to let this College of Apostles fail, and by virtue, no doubt, of the Commission by them receiv'd, which they consider'd to be of a lasting Nature, not to expire upon the failure of one, or decease of all, did therefore substitute Matthias to fill up the Vacancy, and this Succession by virtue of the Commission is to be understood in its full Extent, as the first Apostles were cloathed with it.* But this lasting Commission, which he will not have to expire, as respecting these Twelve in the full Extent of their Power, he after puts a fatal Stroke upon, telling us at the foot of the Page, *I don't mean by this that all who are right Successors to the Apostles must be Apostles and have all the Power any of the Apostles had, lodg'd in every individual Successor.* And notwithstanding of the Zealous Concern of the Apostles to keep up the Number of Twelve, yet making a sort of retractive Explication, he tells us, *that Dr. Scott in his Christian Life, hath shown convincingly (forsooth) that many more Apostles were Ordained by the first Apostles to continue in that Office in the Church.* The very Reading of this is sufficient to expose our Pamphleter. He says in the beginning of this Page, *Pray who told the Presbyterians Christ's first Apostles were not to be Succeeded to in the full Extent of that Commission given them in the Text.* I would fain know? Confident I am, not the N. Testament, &c. But I may confidently retort, Who Tempted the Ignorant and Inadvertent Novice to Write and Print Nonsense, and such a palpable Contradiction in one and the same Page? For, if all the Successors of the Apostles were to have their Commission in the full Extent, as he expresses it, as it was delivered to the first Apostles, how comes he to assert that *all the Successors of these first Apostles, have not all, or the same Power which the first Apostles had,* if the Commission and Power entrusted to the first Apostles be thus Limited, Restrained, and Restricted with respect to their Successors, yea and their right Successors (as he Phrases it) and these Succeedaneous Apostles, who in a greater Number were Ordained by them? How comes he to assert, *that the Apostles are Succeeded in the full Extent of the Commission given unto them,* which must needs, considering the Scripture Account of their Office, reach and extend unto the Teaching of all Nations with uncontrollable Power, to Superintend and Inspect the Churches infallibly, to confirm their Doctrine by Miracles, &c. For 'tis beyond all peradventure that the full Extent of the Apostles Power,

to which he holds the Bishops to Succeed, did necessarily include this. If any shall except that he Explains and Amplifies this Succession to all whose Office is contained *Eminenter* in that of the Apostles, so that with him even *Priests and Deacons Succeed them in a part of their Power*; I Answer, this will never help him out of the Briars; For to all Men of common Sense he is put under the same necessity of a proportioned Limitation of the Bishops Succession: For what Person in their right Wits will be bold to assert, that every Succeeding Bishop has by his Office an *infallible, uncontrollable Superintendency over the whole Catholick Church, both Officers and Members, and this to be comprobated and demonstrated by miraculous Gifts and Operations of the Spirit*, which (as he must needs acknowledge) was the Nature of the first Apostles Commission, to which Commission in the full Extent thereof he confidently asserts that every Bishop doth Succeed, and tells us, *he would fain know, who told the Presbyterians the contrary, and is sure the N. Testament doth not*. Besides, that his N. Testament has informed him, and Presbyterians can tell him, that in respect of this ordinary proportioned Ministerial Authority and Power within a certain Precinct, every faithful Pastor Succeeds the Apostles, and are consequently contained in this Commission. Besides, I would fain know, if this Man will deny that such as he calls *Right Successors to the Apostles* are within the Apostles Commission; And if he assert this, as needs he must, how comes he, Page preceding, to exclaim against that which he calls *a retrenching of the Apostles Commission*, as contrary to the express Words of our Saviour? Doth he not thus condemn himself in asserting that there are *Successors*, yea and *Right Successors*, whose Power, notwithstanding of their Interest in the Apostolick Commission is retrenched and limited?

Next, his Assertion immediately premised must needs have this ground that the Apostles Office, *Eminenter* included that of Bishops, Priests and Deacons; Now I pray, why not also the Office of Prophets, Workers of Miracles, Speakers with Tongues, Interpreters, these being Offices vident in the first Constitution of Churches; Why denies he them a Succession, as well as Deacons? If he say these Offices are ceased as peculiar to that time; From this necessary Concession I urge two things against him, 1. Since the Apostolick Office contained these *Eminenter*, therefore all such Offices are not continued, nor all such Offices generally, as were only needful for the Churches first Constitution; And then I fear, the Apostolick Office in its Nature and Extent, he will find reached by the same Consideration, and this grand Foundation of his Pamphlet tottering. 2ly, That the Promise is not impeached by this Discontinuance, altho' these Offices

were

were contained *Eminent* in that of the first Apostles, consequently, in his Sense and Pleading, included in their Commission, and therefore, by further necessary Consequence, come within the compass of this Promise: For he holds, *whatever was in the Apostles Commission was included therein*, Pag. 21. *Who told the Presbyterians*, saith he, *that Christ's first Apostles were not to be Succeeded to in the full Extent of that Commission, given them in the Text?* He is sure it is not to be found in the New Testament: The Commission, says he, *was not to expire, because of the Promise to be with them to the end.* We have told him that this discontinuance, notwithstanding of the Promise, is as sure, as that the New Testament doth utterly disown a renewed and Successive Institution of the Apostolick Office.

What he pleads, Pag. 22. *Of our Saviour's establishing a Holy Policy as our Mediatory King, his making it compleat; from which he infers the unalterableness of this Policy, since Officers were essential thereunto:* This is utterly remote from reaching the Conclusion of the fix'd standing Nature of the Apostolick Office, since the New Testament gives us an account of the Apostles forming Churches under the Inspection of Inferior Officers to themselves, gives an account also of the beautiful Subordination of Judicatories in Churches thus formed, and that the Apostles, even in their last Testamentary Charges to the Churches, intrusted the whole Power of Government to them, without the least hint of a Superinstitution of any Officers of an higher Order, or any to Succeed them in the Apostolat. *Acts 20, 25, 28, 29. with 32. 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3, 4. with 2 Pet. 1. 14, 15.*

Page 24. *From this Principle, that Jesus as a King, did institute all that was necessary and proper for forming his Divine Policy; He infers, That the Office of an Apostle must be a fix'd standing and perpetual Office.* A Consequence utterly remote from this Principle; For certainly it must be acknowledged, many things were necessary for the first forming of this Policy, which are not of a standing necessity when it is formed.

His Friend Dr. Monro has informed him *, *That several Apostolick Priviledges and Gifts were the Scaffoldings to be removed, when this house of God was built.* He will acknowledge the Gifts of Tongues, of Miracles, Healing, which are now ceased, and no more useful in the Church, were notwithstanding necessary and appointed by our God for the first forming of the Divine Policy. And to conclude, The Office of Apostolat in a proper formal Sense from our Lord's establishing a fixed Policy in his Church, as King and Head thereof, is a pitiful remote absurd Inference, arguing from the General of a fixed Policy,

* Enquiry
into the new O-
pinions page
97, 98.

Policy, to a Policy of this supposed special Nature, with such continuing infallible Inspectors as Apostles were, and is equally absurd, as if any should argue Successors to Moses and his continuing Office, in its Nature and Extent, upon this Ground, that he was employed by God to establish a fixed Policy in the Church of Israel.

Page 25. 'Tis objected, that the Apostles having Authority over Timothy and Titus, who were Bishops, that therefore the Offices of Apostles and Bishops were divers, and that of Apostles but Temporary. To this our Pamphleter Answers, That the Apostles, the first Bishops, were in this distinct from the second Bishops they ordained, in that several such being their Converts, they had a particular kind of Authority, which every individual Apostle in a more special manner exercised over these who were converted by their particular Ministry, which made up a Parental and Filial Relation between an Apostle and his Convert, which we may see 1 Cor. 4. 15. tho' they were truly assumed into the Apostolick College, and had as great power as the Apostles themselves. This Answer, considered with the other ensuing, appears pitifully shattered. 1. If these Bishops had as great power as the Apostles, then there was no subjection properly payable by such Bishops to the Apostles; So that, to assert an Equality of Power, and yet to own a Subjection and Authority of the One over the Other, is pitifully Nonsensical, and a Self-destroying Contradiction. 2ly, These Secondary Apostles, set over Flocks by the first, he must needs acknowledge, had a retrenched limited Authority, far different in point of Extent, as otherwise, from that of these first Apostles who set them up, and yet with him they are asserted to have as great power, i. e. the same extensive Power as Apostles. 3ly, He tells us, That the particular Apostles to whom they did owe their Conversion, might claim a filial Duty from them. What calls he a filial Duty, if not of a moral political Subjection, such as is that Deference which Timothy payed to the Apostle Paul, who, as a Son with a Father, served with him in the Work of the Gospel *, as the filial * Phil. 2. 22. Duty is natural from the Child to the Parent, founded upon a Natural Subjection. Now, if it be so, I would know, 1. How are these Secondary Apostles stated in the same Authority with the first? Sure he supposes all the Apostles were on a Level: And if so, no Apostles were *Primarii*, as he asserts page 27. nor could there be any shadow of Authority applicable to one over another, nor any filial Subjection and Deference, understood in a proper political Sense, or in point of Government, due from one to another. 2ly, I would know, how he comes to offer this in an Answer to the Objection, That Paul being in Office above Timothy and Titus, Apostles are above Bishops. Will he own it, that Timothy and Titus are in Scripture Accounts equal with A-

E e

pofiles

Apostles in Office, or of equal Power, as he expresses it? If so, what means, I pray, the Apostle Paul's writing Apostolical, may I call them Decretal, Epistles to both, directing Authoritatively their Motions hither and thither among the Churches, calling for their attendance when their transient Work was over in these Churches, where they did officiate when the Apostle wrote to them?

Page 27. *Peter, James, and John were Apostoli Primarii, adding Paul, because of his Rapture to the third Heavens.* How impertinent this is, is obvious to the meanest Reflection, there being, by his Confession (tho' in this inconsistent with himself), no Official Primacy or Precedency among Apostles. He tells us (*Ibid*) *That if from the Apostles Pre-eminency to Bishops, a Supra-Episcopal Patriarchal Power be pleaded, as soon as that is proven, he will own the Succession of a Patriarchat in the Commission and Promise.* And, no doubt, since 'tis easily proved, and universally acknowledged, that Apostles had an Apostolical Inspection over all the Bishops we read of in Scripture, his Principles lead him clearly to hold a *standing Patriarchat, or a Succession of Patriarchs*; But how many, and where to place them, what the Nature and Limits of their Inspection is, must be referred to his next Advise-ment in a new Pamphlet. When (page 28.) the Apostles travels up and down to make Profelyts, are objected against *Prelats Succession to them*: He Answers, *That others, besides the Apostles, endowed with the Charismata, did thus imploy themselves; That tho' the first Bishops, Timothy and Titus, had definite Flocks assigned them, yet they travelled into other Churches on urgent occasions, as also Polycarp Bishop of Smyrna; Which Custom continued for a while in the Church.* The impertinency of which Answer evidently appears; As if the Apostles Travels up and down had been merely to make Profelyts, their Work, as in that Capacity, being, not only to make them Profelyts, but as our Lord's Infalible Oracles, to deliver to them, when form'd into Churches, the whole Scheme of the Gospel Oeconomie, in point of Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government, and having thus form'd them into Organick Churches, to whom they preach'd the Gospel, to take Inspection of both Officers and Members, directing both the one and the other infallibly in their respective Duties. 2ly, When he tells us, *That all endowed with Charismata did thus imploy themselves*, he makes them all Apostles, understanding this profelyting Work as above explained; Or rather, 'tis thus evident, that this Duty and Work excludes them all from any such Office and Authority: For that the premised *profelyting Work* (so to call it) in its Nature and Extent above express'd, was peculiar to Apostles, no Body of common Sense or Ingenuity can deny. 3ly, That *Timothy and Titus*, whom he ranks among the first Bishops

Bishops after Apostles, travelled into several Countreys, the Scripture is clear and exprefs. But our Pamphleter here suggests two things, wherein the Scripture is against him, 1. *That they had definite Flocks assigned them*; Their Employment in *Ephesus* and *Crete* appearing evidently to be *Occasional*, and *Transient*; From both which places, they are found recalled, for further prosecuting their Evangelistick Employment *. So that he can exhibite no shadow of a Proof for their Installation in definite Posts, or having definite Flocks assigned them. 2^{ly}, He ignorantly supposes, that their Travels into other Countreys, were at *their own Arbitriment and Choice*; Whereas the Sacred Text is clear and exprefs, that they were therein subject to the Apostles Authorizing Direction and Inspection, both as to *Time* and *Place* of these Travels, and the *Work* they were to manage therein: Whereas the Apostles were, in their Travels, under the Spirit's *special immediate Inspection*. Finally, his principle, equiparating this *Travelling proselyting Work* with the *Promise*, must needs make it a *standing Work to continue to the end*; And therefore his acknowledging, that it continued only for a while in the Church, breaks his own Measure, and involves him in a Contradiction. So that this Objection has quite ruined his Pleading.

He tells us, (*Ibid.*) *The Dominium Ecclesiasticum was, in solidum, lodged in every Individual of the Apostles, and consequently in their Successors, the Bishops, who might devolve their Power to others, as they should think fit.* But, he might have read in his New Testament, that our Lord discharged a *Dominion* to his Apostles, and the Apostle Peter his injoyning the true Scripture Bishops, *not to be Lords over God's Heritage*, dischargeth the same Dominion to them, which his Master had to himself, and his Fellow-Apostles: And a little more Knowledge of the Protestant Doctrine, would have discovered to him, that the Church-Government, in the Sense and Judgment of the Protestant Churches, is, in its kind, and *toto genere*, distinct from a *Dominion*, properly so called; That none has Dominion in, and over the Church, but he who is her Head and Lord, which we have from his own Mouth, *One is your Master, even Christ*, saith he; and ye are all *Brethren* *. Knows not this Man, that the Apostle Paul disowns a *Dominion*, *Not that we have Dominion over your Faith* †. Again, 2^{ly}, Where has he learned, that the Apostles, or their Successors, in point of devolving their Power, less or more, upon others, or the installing of them into Church-Offices, had no Rule to walk by, but their own Pleasure, or think fit,

as he calls it ? What mean the Scripture Rules, touching the Ordination and Qualifications of Church-Officers, if this Lax Principle were to be admitted ? So that his Lawless Arbitrary Lord Prelates appear, upon this, as upon other Grounds, *Rabbies* of an Antiscriptural Mould.

But 'tis pleasant to see, how this Rambling Pamphleter involves himself in the next Page: For having told us again, *that the Bishops, or the Ap. Stles, might choose what Persons they would install in Church-Offices, or with how much Power, whether they would make that Man a Bishop, Priest, or Deacon. or but one of these, or all of them, or none of them ;* He notwithstanding acknowledges, *it was not in their Power, not to establish a Succession in the whole Power themselves had, and that, by the Tenor of their Commission, they stood thus obliged.* Now, if their Commission obliged them to leave Successors in their full Power, together with Inferiour Officers, I hope he will acknowledge, that the Commission was not so general and blind, as not to point at the *Qualifications and Character of the Persons* to be thus admitted, according to the several Cases and Circumstances of the Churches which they planted ; Nor can he deny an Obligation resulting therefrom, and that both with respect to the Persons, and the Nature of that Power wherewith they were to be intrusted. So that his *Arbitrary [think fit]*, which he makes the *Cynosura* in this weighty Point, deserves to be trampled under Foot.

Here again we have the old Cant and Mistake renewed, in *Confounding a Superiority among Church-Officers, with Superiority of Prelates over Pastors.* He tells us, *we hold, that every Minister of God's Word is a Bishop:* So the Scripture hath taught us, and him also, yea, and that they are the highest ordinary Officers succeeding Apostles, to whom they committed the Government, in their last Farewells to the Churches. To this he renews his blunt Supposition of the *Apostles superiority over Pastors, and their Ordaining such as themselves, and that, if we allow the Apostles immediate Successors to be Judges, as those of the Second and Third Centuries, they'll give it in favours of Episcopacy, against the Levelling Doctrine.* Thus Pag. 30. *Ans. 1.* I had thought, the Apostles immediate Successors were properly to be searched for, and found in the Scripture Tables ; Where, by his Confession, we have the full Scheme and Draught of the Apostles Constitution of Churches. *2ly,* All do know, that the Point of Succession, in the Second Age, is very dark, and an unsure Ground to build upon ; That, for the most part, this Age has a Cloud upon't, in point of Church Affairs, and, that the Records thereof are very lame, is acknowledged by the best Searchers. *3ly,* If this Testimony, he pretends, does strike against *Levelling Doctrine*, properly so called, it levels not against us, who owne no such Principles in

in point of Church-Government; But let his Darling *J. S.* look to it, who sets all Prelates on a Level, and all Pastors on a Level with the People in this point. Here is Levelling Doctrine with a Witness, and 'tis left to our Arguer's Advisement to ponder, how this consists with *Arch-Prelacy*, and *National Primacy*, owned by the Querist, and a Patriarchate, such as himself holds may be made good, yea, and after pleads for from the Old Testament Times. For what he boasts of the *Defence of the Principles of the Cyprianick Age*, 'tis easily Answered, by telling him, and that Pamphleter, that he has never touched the point in Controversie, which every Body knows, is anent the *Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles*, in point of Church-Government, and not, *what was the Principles or Practice of the Third Age*. So that, in that Voluminous Rambling Pamphlet, he but beats the Air, and, some will be apt to tell him, shews himself a Self-Contradicting Fool.

I shall not need to insist much upon that which our Arguer adds further, in magnifying this their pretended Champion *J. S. viz.* That *the Principles of the Cyprianick Age, and the Defence of them, is such a piece of Substantial Learning in this Controversie, and contains such Solid Reasonings, that 'tho' no wonder, if he and his Associates judge, that the Author has the better of it, since none of the Presbyterians have yet mustered up courage and Confidence enough even to pretend to Answer it.* What Substantial Learning in this Controversie appeareth in these two Pamphlets, *scil. The Principles of the Cyprianick Age, and the Defence of them by J. S.* or rather Superficial, Inconsistent, and Prelacy-destroying Notions, is, by this time, (as certainly from the beginning) obvious to the Judicious and Discerning, who have perused both; In the last whereof 'tis evident, that he has not so much as offered an Answer to the most part of the Reverend Mr. *Rule's* Confutation of the first, yea, and in all his Voluminous Inconsistent Discourses, has palpably declined the true State of the Controversie, and fled from the Scripture Bar, to appear before which his Antagonist had challenged him. So that his Pamphlets deserve no notice nor Answer from Presbyterians, and, when our Arguer hath impartially perused Mr. *Jameson's* late Confutation, he may probably change his Thoughts of *J. S's* Acquittances in this Controversie, and see him contradicting, and that oftner than once, himself, and his Fellow-Pleaders also. Of the last, one Instance we may here exhibite, in point of Dr. *Scott's* Pleadings, commended by our Arguer in this Page, as also above. The *Dr. holds* *, that the Seventy Disciples were a standing Order of Subordinate Officers to Apostles, making this one great Topick of Pleading for Episcopacy. In this point, his great

* *Christ. Life,*
Vol. 2 pag. 388.
and others.

Champion

Champion J. S. smites the Doctor on the Face reproachfully, and gives him the Lie asserting positively *,
 * *Cb. 6. § 5.* "That 'tis impossible to make it appear so much as probable, that St. Cyprian believed the Seventy, as making a distinct College from that of the Twelve, to have had any standing Office in the Christian Church, in which they were to have a constant Line of Successors. Yea and he peremptorily contends, "That the Commission, which is recorded, *Luke 10.* did constitute them only Temporary Missionaries, and that for an Errand which could not possibly be more than Temporary. How far he has herein also baffled our Arguer and Querist, is left to his Melancholick Reflections.

For what he adds, *Pag. 31. That the Encounterers with J. S. must get the Fathers taught to speak the Language of Geneva.* 'Tis Answered, If that which he calls the *Language of Geneva*, be, in this point, consonant to the Divine Oracles, he must acknowledge the Fathers obliged to speak that *Language*, or that they are to be disowned in speaking otherwise; And for this we can exhibite to him the Fathers Harmonious Submission and Acknowledgement, subscribed and attested in their Writings, as is already made appear.

Our Pamphleter will Answer (*Ibid*) that Argument, *That what was more than a Presbyter was in the Apostles Extraordinary*, whereof he exhibites four Instances. But, good Man, 'tis not Presbyterians only, whom he must, in this Point, enter the Lists with, and encounter, but *Chrysostom*, who has told him on *Rom. 1.* or *Tom. 8. p. 114.* "That the Apostleship was a Business or Office fraught with ten thousand good Things, both greater than all Privileges (he means common Privileges of Grace), and comprehensive of them: And

* *Treatise of the Pope's Supremacy page 113, 114.* their own Dr. Barrow *, who from this, and several other Fathers, such as *Cyril, Augustin, &c.* has made their peculiar extraordinary Prerogatives appear. In short, "The Apostles Rectoral Authority over the Church Universal, with respect to the founding and watering of Churches, and framing them according to the Gospel Rules, whereof they were the first and infallible Deliverers, establishing the Gospel Ordinances therein, inspecting and directing infallibly both Officers and Members in their respective Duties, is that wherein this Office did consist. But let us hear what he Answers to the four Instances of the Apostles incommunicable Prerogatives.

The first he mentions is the *Universality, Generality, and Indefiniteness of their Commission.* To which he Answers page 32. *That the Presbyterian Preacher by Imposition of Hands pleads he is a Minister of the Christian Church,*

Church, and pretends he has the Priviledge of preaching the Gospel, and administering the Sacraments, where ever he shall happen to be, tho' seemingly confined to a particular Flock. Answer, 1. In what sense Pastors are related to the Church Universal by Ordination, and how their Relation differs from that of Apostles, is cleared above. He has been told that Apostles were Officers *actu exercito* of the whole Church, and capable of no Fixation, which the ordinary Rules of Government require in Pastors. Their own Dr. Barrow has told him out of Chrysostom on John 21. *That the whole World was every one of the Apostles Province*; And out of Cyril on Gen. 7. *That the Apostle was an Oecumenick Judge, and an Instructor of all the Subcælestial World.* 2ly, He ignorantly cuts off this Generality, or Indefiniteness of Commission from its proper Work and Design, which was the first and Infallible Deliverie of the Gospel Rules, Doctrine and Ordinances to all the Churches, and Infallibly to Inspect and Superintend them. Their Doctor * has told him, * *Ubi Supra.* "That the Apostles were to govern all the Churches
 ' in an absolute manner, according to the Spirit's infallible Assistance,
 ' to which they might appeal, according to that of *Act. 15.* *It seemed*
 ' *good to the Holy Ghost, and to us*; And in vertue of the same Divine
 ' Assistance, were to found Churches, constitute Pastors, settle Orders,
 ' correct Offences, to perform all Acts of Sovereign Spiritual Power;
 ' in vertue of the same Divine Assistance, according to the Authority
 ' given them. But our Arguer will Answer the Objection taken from
 the Apostles being Officers in *actu exercito* of the Catholick Church,
 having a general and indefinite Commission, *tam in actu secundo quam primo*;
 Not so every Minister, or that, as to the *actus secundus*, a private
 Minister's Commission is under more than Canonical Confinement, be-
 cause that might be taken away, but this is necessary by the common
 principles of Government. This second part of the Objection I find so
 Mysterious, that I do not judge it noticeable, and therefore let us hear
 his Answer, which is this, *That the Commission is plainly indefinit, as it*
was given to the Apostles, and consequently whoever succeeds them, in whole,
or in part, must have their Commission of the same nature, as was that of Apo-
stles. But, is his Negation, and *petitio principii*, in opposition to the
 Sense of that Commission exhibited by Protestant Divines, yea by their
 own Doctor, a sufficient Answer? Is every Minister by his Ordinati-
 on obliged to Disciple all Nations, to found Churches therein through
 the World, to establish Gospel Ordinances among them, and infallibly
 Inspect and Govern them by immediat conduct of the Spirit? Has e-
 very Minister an immediat Access upon the Ground of this Conduct to
 Inspect, Direct, and Instruct, as his proper Charge, all the Gospel
 Churches

Churches where-ever he comes, with a Supereminent Power over all their Officers and Members, and without acknowledging any Authoritative Inspection of whatever Churches and Officers over him in this point? If he assert, that every Pastor has such a Charge and Commission, some will alledge he is not far from Bedlam.

Whereas he says, *The Commission was indefinite as respecting Apostles and their Successors, but by the Nature and common Principles of Government, prior to that Commission, and by Explanation of the Holy Ghost leading into all Truth, they have found it reasonable to have every one his own Province assigned, as Peter and Paul were to go to the Jews and Gentiles, Thomas to the Indies, &c.* 'Tis Answered, 1. How Ignorantly he equiparats the indefinite universal Commission of Apostles, and their Successors in an ordinary Ministry, is above cleared, and cross to the

* *De Pontif. Quæst. 2. cap. 15. § 2. with Quæst. 3. cap. 3. § 9.* Sense of sound Divines. *Whittaker* * holds such a Fixation cross to the Apostles Commission. *Non cuiquam Apostolorum commisit certam aliquam Ecclesiam, sed omnibus dixit, ite in universum mundum, & illi memores suæ legationis ita fecerunt. i. e.* "The Lord committed not to any of the

Apostles a particular Church, but he said to them all, 'Go ye into all the World; And the Apostles, mindful of the Nature of their Legation, did so. He after shews, "That their fixing in any Station of their proper Seats or Churches, would have crossed their Apostolick Obligation to follow the Spirit's Conduct, which they understood they behoved to follow. *Tilen* him-

† *De Pontif. Lib. 2. Cap. 4. Not. 6.* self acknowledges, "That such Fixation were to abstract from the Apostolick Dignity †. *Junius*, in this, places "the Distinction betwixt Apostles and their ordinary Successors ||. Their staying in some one place for a time, did no whit derogate from the Apostolick Universal Commission. Thus *Proless. Leid. Diss. 42. Thes. 21.* Thus *Thes. Salmur. de Divers. Ministr. Grad.*

Thes. 7. where 'tis observable, that both Universities do place "this unfixed Ministry among the special Marks of the Apostolate, that they were fixed to no certain place or Church, but were, according to the Spirit's Conduct, to Preach the Gospel, *ubique terrarum*, in all places, or every where: 2ly, He says, "Whoever succeeds them in whole or part, must have their Commission of the same Nature; And thus even Deacons, who, according to him, have their Share in the Apostolick Commission, have such an indefinite Ministry: And, according to his Principle, may also Preach; Than which, what can be more absurd? 3ly, In the Series

of this Answer, he makes the Apostles first Universal Commission to thwart with, and contradict the Nature and common Principles of Government. 4ly, Where finds he, that the Holy Ghost fixed Apostles afterward to particular Stations? This he must instruct, 1, With respect to every One of the Apostles: For, I hope, he will not say, that this Fixation, which he holds to be the Nature and common Principle of Government, and thus prior to the Apostolick Commission, respected some only, and not all and every one of the Apostles; Else he will assert, that some of the Apostles might overleap this Boundary, and were not under its Obligation. 2ly, He must needs acknowledge, that this Fixation, Limitation or Retraction of the general indefinite Commission, must be instructed by Scripture; For he calls it the Holy Ghost's Explanation of their Commission. Let us then see the Holy Ghost's Patent, and new restricted Commission in Scripture, wherein only the Holy Ghost speaks in this point, and his Assertion shall be admitted; Otherwise, he is Censurable, as intruding into what he has not seen *, and being, in this point, wise above what is written †; And indeed, in this point of Government, all that Set of Men are. For what he instances of Peter and Paul, 'tis answered above, and its utter Unserviceableness to him discovered, as also what he hints from Rom. 15. 20. But the best on't is, the Heteroclite Instance he exhibites of this Fixation of Apostles, in the Case of St. Thomas, who was sent to the Indies as his peculiar Post: And how does it appear, that the Holy Ghost directed and sent him there? Why, he reads it in Eusebius, Lib. 3. Cap. 1. But *altum silentium* there is, as to any Scripture Sound. He tells us, in Eusebius we have a particular Detail of the Provinces, to which the Apostles were fixed. But, Sir, a Detail on the Back of the Bible is no Scripture Detail, nor Proof of the Spirit's Explanation of his Commission, as you assert this Apostolical Fixation to be.

Come we to a second Badge of the Apostolick Office, viz. *The Gift of Tongues and Miracles*, acknowledged such by all our Divines according to Scripture, as is above made appear. Our Arguer tells us, *That, if this were found confined to Apostles, he would acknowledge it a relevant Objection.* But why not relevant, tho' not absolutely thus confined, since it will import an extraordinary Qualification, and a Badge of an extraordinary Office, or call it such a Qualification as none can succeed unto, and must, consequently, suppose some proportionable extraordinary Work and Duties, even of Apostles, to which it had a special respect? Upon both Grounds, it cannot, in his Sense, fall within the Compals of this Promise, *I am with you to the end.* So that, of necessity, he must, with us, limit the Promise, and diversifie its Accomplishment, with

respect to the Apostles and their Successors; Which cuts the Grand Topick and Wind-pipe of his Argument, who will have all Apostolick Gifts and Priviledges included in it, as of a standing necessity. He tells us indeed, (how consistently let others Judge) *That whatever we can shew the Apostles were not Succeeded in, that he will hold not to be reached by this Promise*; And thus, with him, a Divine Presence is denied to the Apostles Exercise of the Gift of Tongues, and Miracles; And what a gross Absurdity this is, appears to the meanest Reflection. Or if, to decline this Absurdity, he own it, that the Apostles had our Lord's special Presence in the Exercise of these extraordinary Gifts, he will assert it to be such a Presence and Assistance as falls not within the compass of this Promise, *Lo, I am with you always, &c.* And will he own it, or, if owning it, will he not expose himself to hissing, that when our Saviour gave this Promise, *Lo, I am with you always unto the End of the World*, he excluded from this promised Presence and Assistance the Exercise of these extraordinary Gifts mentioned? And how, I pray, was this consistent with that Incouragement of the *whole of their Work*, which the Lord designed in this Promise? It were superfluous here to shew the consentient Judgment of Divines in this point, that the Gift of Miracles, and the Sealing their Apostolick Doctrine and Commission thereby, is a proper Badge and Ingredient of the Apostolick Office. See *Prof. Leid. Disp. 42. Tb. 21. Profess. Salm. ubi supra, &c.*

Again, in the next place, whereas he will grant the Objection relevant, *If the Gifts mentioned were confin'd to Apostles*: I Answer, that, taking the Apostolick Office in *sensu formali*, these Gifts appear in several respects proper thereunto, and are thus acknowledged: So that the Objection will be found relevant by his own Confession. And

1. With respect to the *Extent and Fulness* of these Gifts; He will acknowledge that no inferior Officer had so many, and in such

Eminency, as the Apostles: Paul told the *Corinthians* *, *he spake with Tongues more than they all of that Church*, tho' most Eminent in these and other Gifts.

18.

† 2 Cor. 12.

12.

Apostle †. Now, if there were such Signs of Apostles, there behoved of necessity to be a relative Connexion betwixt the Sign and thing signified, and consequently somewhat therein peculiar to Apostles; Else how could they be Apostolick Signs? What Inferior Officers had such coercive Power over the

Obstinate,

Obstinate, as *Peter and Paul*, the one striking with Death *Ananias and Sapphira* *, the other *Elymas* with Blindness †? What Inferior Officers had such Miraculous Merciful Power, as the raising of the Dead, apparent in both these Apostles ‖? And he will not say that such Miraculous Power was peculiar to these two, which were repugnant to the general Commission, *Matth. 10. 8.* given to the Apostles, which in this point was never retracted, but rather enlarged. 2^{ly}, With respect to the immediat proper End to which these Gifts were proportioned, they were peculiar to the Apostolate: 1. They were to Seal their immediate Apostolick Commission, as *Moses's* Miracles had such an End to Seal his to *Pharaoh*. This our Saviour expressly declares, *Acts 1. 8.* *Ye shall receive Power, (scil. the Spirits miraculous Gifts) after that the Holy Ghost is come upon you;* Then follows the proper End of this Power and extraordinary Operations of the Spirit, *And ye shall be Witnesses unto me, both in Jerusalem, and in all Judea, and Samaria, and unto the uttermost parts of the Earth.* Behold what is Sealed by this Power, 1. The Apostolick Testimony, as *Eye and Ear-witnesses of Christ's Glory*, and, in special, of his Resurrection, *Acts 1. 22.* *1 John 1. 1, 2.* *The Life was manifested, we have seen, and bear Witness, &c. That which we have heard, and seen with our Eyes, our Hands have handled of the Word of Life.* 2 *Pet. 1. 16.* They were *Eye witnesses of his Majesty.* *1 Cor. 9. 1.* *Am I not an Apostle, have I not seen Jesus Christ our Lord.* See the same adduced, *Acts 5. 31, 32.* *Acts 10. 41, 42, 44, &c.* 2^{ly}, These Gifts were to Seal their Authority, to lay the Foundation of the Gospel Church, to deliver thereunto the Gospel Oeconomy, and a new Scheme of its Ordinances, of Doctrine, Worship, Discipline, and Government, different from the Old Oeconomy: A Work intrusted to no other, nor could be. Compare *1 Cor. 3. 8, 9, 10, 11.* *2 Cor. 3. 6, 7, 8, 9, &c.* *Eph. 2. 20.* *Heb. 7. 12.* *John 16. 13.*

But 'tis pleasant to see, how this *Mark* has so Mastered our new Arguer, that it forces him, in the next Words, to make such a broad Confession, as overthrows all his Pamphlet, telling us, (Page 34.) *That these Gifts were helps for Exercising, and Credentials and Evidences of their Commission, and that too, as the first Propagators of a positive Religion, and so not necessary to be devolved on their Successors with their Power and Supremacy, which they had by virtue of their Commission.* Here we have him overturning at one dash all he pleads for; Since, 1. These Gifts were helps for Exercising, Credentials and Evidences of their Commission, therefore of necessity they behoved to be such with respect to this

immediate proper End, peculiar to Apostles, and such *Seals and Credentials* as none else could pretend to ; For, the *Credentials* he makes relative to a *Work* which he acknowledges peculiar to them, besides that they were also *Credentials* of an *immediate Commission* proper only to themselves. 2ly, They must be such *Credentials* as could not be devolved upon Successors, and therefore neither their *Commission*, and *Office*, as such ; Or, if both were communicable, and to be devolved upon Successors, why not the *Badges and Seals* thereof? If their *Credentials* were thus to be Instructed, and they were not to be received but upon such *Credentials*, as Exercising such a new and special *Office*, therefore where these *Credentials* were wanting, none else could be received, as Cloathed with such Authority ; I speak still of the Apostolate in a *formal Sense*, as he understands it, abstracting from the Ordinary Ministry virtually included therein.

Again, I urge him thus, Either these *Seals and Credentials* were necessary to Seal their *Commission*, in an exclusive Sense as proper to them only, or they were necessary to Seal such an *Office* as was communicable to, and to be devolved upon others. If he say the first, we have what we would, and he has thus overthrown all his Pleading for a *communicated Commission and Office of Apostolate*, in its full Extent. If they were such *Credentials and Seals*, as respected a *communicable Successive Office*, and the necessary Appendices thereof, why, I pray, are they not communicated, why not propagated, as well as other necessary *Evidences and Credentials* to clear a Call to an *Ordinary Ministry*? 3ly, He calls them *Helps for Exercising that Commission*; And, no doubt, he will acknowledge them necessary *Helps* for performance of the Duties thereof ; Else to what End were they given ? And the thing it self is evident to any who considers the Design and End of the Apostles *Work and Office*, as above touched. Now then, if the *Office* it self, in its full Extent and Authority, be, as he holds, *Successive*, and to be transmitted to Posterity, how comes an *Office* to be thus devolved, and an Obligation to performance of the Duties thereof, without the necessary *Helps and Means of this Performance* ? Thus he makes the Holy God, *Pharaoh* like, to set Men to make Brick, and give no Straw. We all know, God has communicated necessary *Helps, Gifts and Graces* of the Spirit to all his own, has allowed also, and furnished his Church with all suitable Means and *Helps* for performance of the ordinary Functions of a Gospel Ministry ; Why then has he robb'd this high and necessary Function of its *suitable Helps* ?

He cannot except, that *these Helps were only necessary for that time*: For, 1. If the Office was such in its Nature as could not be Exercis'd without *these Helps*, according to Gods appointment of the *Means*, and *End*, then, say I, as the *Helps*, so the *Office it self* was only for *that time*, there being a necessary Connexion betwixt the Means and End, and both standing and falling together. 2^{ly}, That it was so, is evident; Or, let him tell me, how a Man can be obliged to bring in Nations and Tongues, and this by an immediate Commission and Ministry, with an immediate Furniture of all Gifts suitable to Preach to Heathens, without the Gift of Tongues, and the other Gifts mentioned? I grant, the Exercise of an ordinary Ministry requires it not; But I speak of the peculiar Office of Apostolate in his Sense.

Again, 4^{ly}, He calls *them the first Propagators of a positive Religion*; He must acknowledge them also Foundation-layers of a new Gospel Church, and of a new positive Religion, of a Scheme of Ordinances distinct from the Jewish Oeconomy, a new Building wherein Paul calls himself a *Master Builder* (*As a wise Master Builder*, saith he, *I have laid the Foundation*, 1 Cor. 3. 10.); So he will acknowledge were all the other Apostles in this glorious and new Fabrick and Temple of a Gospel Church. Now, this being their proper Office, to lay the Foundation of a new Gospel Oeconomy, to deliver, as God's infallible Oracles, the Frame and Rules of this new *Positive Religion*, and, as in that capacity, to Inspect and Govern this new Church; How absurd is he in making this Office Successive and Communicable, which has respect to a Work and Duties which all Men of common Sense must acknowledge Extraordinary, yea and himself, unless he will swallow such absurdities, as to assert that the Gospel Church may have its Foundation twice laid, may be formed again of new, and its Ordinances twice and of new delivered?

I need not further Animadvert upon what he asserts, (*Ibid.*) Of the Apostles devolving upon Successors *their Power and Supremacy over Churches*, making all so many Supremes over Churches. J. S. Laughs at Collateral Supremacy, consequently derides our Arguer's Notion. And if this Supremacy was not devolved, sure, neither was their Office, nor could be. But our Querist tells us, *He will put this Argument out of Doors*. I verily Judge, 'tis so brought within Doors, and even by himself, as all his Wit and Sophistry will never exclude it. But how puts he it out? Why, he tells us, *Others had the Gifts of Tongues, Healing, and Prophecyng*, Act. 2. 4. Mark 6. 17. Jam. 5. 14. Act. 21. 10. And therefore they were not peculiar to Apostles as such. **Ans. 1.** In what Sense they were peculiar to Apostles as such, we have

have heard, *scil.* with respect to their Extent, proper and immediate End. zly, Himself must acknowledge this, or contradict what he said immediately before, *scil.* That they were Credentials and Evidences of a Commission to be the first Propagators of a positive Religion. Pray, speak it out. Were these Gifts in any others such Credentials and Evidences of this Work and Office? Were any others than Apostles Authorized by an immediate Commission, to be the first Propagators of a Positive Religion? Were not these gifts in this Sense, peculiar to them as Badges of such an Office?

He tells us, *This makes no good Argument to prove the Apostles were not to be Succeeded to as such, in every thing which was peculiar to them as Apostles.* Was ever such palpable Contradiction uttered? Apostles were to be Succeeded to in every thing peculiar to them as Apostles, yet not in that which was a special Evidence and Credential of their Office and Commission! Let us ply our Pamphleter with this Argument. That which was properly the Evidence and Credentials of a Commission to be the first Propagators of a Positive Religion, was peculiar to Apostles as such, or as carrying and instructed with such a Commission: But so it is, that the Gifts mentioned were such Credentials and Evidences; Ergo. The Major is evident, since else he will say, that what is the Evidence and Credentials of a Commission, may be applicable to such as have not that Commission, and so cannot be true Credentials, and Evidences thereof, but fallacious and otherwise applicable. The Minor is his own Assertion. If any say, that such Arguing will absolutely deny these Gifts to others: *Ans.* We have shoven there is no need of an absolute denial; 'Tis enough that they be denied to others in that Nature, Extent, and Eminency, and with respect to such an immediat proper End thereof, as they were proper to Apostles, in which respects they were Credentials and Evidences as is above expressed. As the Apostles had Eminenter all the Inferior included in their high Apostolick Office, which no Inferior Officer had, nor could have, which very ground cuts off all pretences of a Succession thereunto; So, all such extraordinary Gifts, viz. Gifts of Prophecy-ing, Healing, Miracles, Gifts of Tongues, &c. as were in these first times divided among different Recipients, so as the Person who had one had not another, as appears in the Apostles Interrogators after reciting these Gifts, 1 Cor. 12. *Are all workers of Miracles, are all Prophets, have all the Gifts of Healing, &c.* were fully conjoyned and eminently shining in the Apostolick Office, and this for the great End and Design mentioned. Now, here is a palpable discriminating Mark and the March-stone set by the God of Order, betwixt the Apostolick and all Ordinary Offices, clearly excluding a Succession thereunto, and even such Officers

cers as had some extraordinary Gifts, and much more all pretended Successors in an ordinary Office with Gifts that are Ordinary. And, besides these instanced, 'tis evident that the Apostles were endowed with that special Gift of *conferring the Spirit* (I mean Ministerially) in his extraordinary Operations, and the evident Badges thereof; As likewise with such extraordinary miraculous Power of coërcing the Rebellious by stupendous Judgments, yea and even that of Death, and the equally Miraculous Merciful Power in raising the Dead, as is instanced in the two Apostles, *Peter and Paul*, which our Arguer cannot deny to be applicable to the other Apostles. With respect to the Merciful Application of this Power we find the Commission and Authority generally given, *Matth. 10. 8.* And the exhibited Instances do evince this Commission to reach the inflicting the Judgments mentioned, and such like, in the proper Exigences thereof in the Management and Exercise of the Apostolick Office. But this leads us to Examine what follows, wherein the matter will be more clear.

Follows a Third Mark instanced by him, scil. *The giving the Holy Ghost by imposition of Hands.* His Grand Episcopal Doctor has informed him, *That amongst other incommunicable Apostolick Priviledges, it was peculiar to Apostles in a certain conspicuous manner, to impart Spiritual Gifts, as Peter and John did at Samaria, citing Chrysostom on Acts 8. 18. who shews that this was the peculiar Gift and Priviledge of Apostles.* And Dr. Scott, the Episcopal Chifstain so much esteemed by him, pleads, *That tho' Philip who had Successfully Preached to the Samaritans, was indowed with the Gift of Miracles, yet these two Apostles, Peter and John, were sent to Seal and Confirm them.* I know the Doctor pleads an Episcopal Priviledge from this Instance, how impertinently is made appear by his Impugner. But the Apostolick Priviledge, (tho' falsely pretended by him as the Basis of the Episcopal) he neither did nor could deny, We might cite a multiplicity of Orthodox Divines asserting this Apostolick Perogative. Our Arguer's Answer is *That the Church Primitive believed that the Holy Ghost was conferr'd by Imposition of Bishop's Hands in Confirmation, citing generally Tertullian, Cyprian, Firmilian, and therefore believed not this to be an extraordinary part of the Apostolick Office.* But, 1. He pitifully mistakes the point in Question, not distinguishing the Spirit's ordinary and extraordinary Gifts. 2ly, The ordinary and extraordinary manner. 3ly, The ordinary and extraordinary Evidences of his Presence and Breachings; In the latter of which respects, this *giving of the Spirit by imposition of Hands* is asserted to be the proper Bedge of the Apostolick Office, as is evident in scripture Instances, *Acts 8. 17, 18.* God had confirmed with a gracious converting Seal of the Spirit,

by

by converting Influences and Graces, Philip's Ministry and Baptism, which our Pamphleter will not deny to be a Seal of the Spirit's gracious Influences, notwithstanding whereof, we are told, *Vers. 16. That the Holy Ghost was fallen as yet upon none of them*, scil. in that extraordinary manner; and with these extraordinary Evidences, which attended the Imposition of the Hands of the Apostles. The Learned Turretin shows that the Greek Term *ἐμπνέω*, signifying *Blas*, points at an extraordinary *Illapse*, by visible and extraordinary Gifts and Evidences. Therefore the Apostles, by Prayer and Imposition of Hands, obtained this, which had *visible Evidences apparent even to Simon Magus*. Thus *Acts 19. 6.* Persons Baptized, and having such an ordinary gracious confirming Seal, as he will acknowledge, yet the Holy Ghost came not upon them, in the Measure, Manner, and Evidences Instanced, till the Apostle Paul laid his Hands upon them, and then as the great Badge and Evidence of his Apostolick Authority and Priviledge in this point, 'tis said *that the Holy Ghost came upon them*, and that with this special Demonstration and Evidence, *that they spake with Tongues, and Prophesied.* 2ly, As for the Churches Belief in point of Confirmation, by laying on the Bishops Hands, we refer him to what is said by the Author of the Hierarchical Bishops Claim, *Part I. Pag. 113. 114, 115, &c.* And in Answer to the 4th Chapter of the Querist cited by him. Besides, giving, not granting, what he asserts in matter of Fact in point of common Influences, it touches not this Question, anent that Communication of the Spirit mentioned as *peculiar. to the Apostles*. And he can shew no suitable or pertinent Instance of such Communication of the Spirit in such extraordinary Manner and Evidences performed by an Officer inferior to Apostles. For his Instance of *Ananias* his laying of Hands upon Paul, it can in this Case break no square nor intringe God's ordinary Method with respect to Apostles; But, all the Circumstances considered, it rather confirms, than invalidates our Assertion, since the whole Context makes it evident that he was *immediatly and extraordinarily called of God thereunto*. And we all know, that God imposes positive Commands and Rules upon his Creatures or Church, but not upon himself who is infinitely above them. The whole Context makes it evident that he was *immediatly and extraordinarily called of God*. His being *extraordinarily Inspired* appears from what he says, *Vers. 17. Jesus that appeared to thee in the way, hath sent me unto thee, that thou mightest receive thy Sight and be filled with the Holy Ghost*, which he could not know but by *immediate Inspiration*; and therein also his extraordinary immediate Call is pointed at: So that this extraordinary Instance breaks not square, nor thwarts God's ordinary Method, in this first Constitution

Constitution of the Gospel Church, no more than such other extraordinary Instances of a like Nature. God immediatly called the Person, pointed him out to Paul in his praying Vision, *Vers. 12.* Judicious Calvin Judges it clear from the Context, that Ananias also Taught and Preached together with the Administration of Baptism. Our Arguer will not say, that therefore any Disciple, or Church Member may take upon him to Preach and Baptize without a Call. For what he adds, That no Presbyterian Preacher will say, he is Ordained without the Holy Ghost, and that there are different degrees of outward Evidences of one's having the Holy Ghost, which, with him, impeaches not the Spirit's being given in Ordination; He foolishly confounds different Degrees of outward Evidences, with different kinds, and the Ordinary, and Extraordinary Evidences: This amounts to a Specifical, or, if he will, Generical; not a gradual Difference only. Thus we have seen his foolish attempt to rob the Apostles of this their Third Prerogative.

Come we to the Fourth Mark of Infallibility in Teaching, which all Men have hitherto acknowledged peculiar to Apostles, competent to none but these first Heraulds and Ambassadors, these living Oracles of Christ, who were to be the first Propagators of a positive Religion, as he expresses it, or rather the Revealers of God's Mind to the Nations, as touching the Gospel Oeconomy, the whole Scheme of the Christian Religion and Doctrine. But this pitiful Arguer will needs rob them of this Prerogative, and take this Crown off their Head, making it competent to others than themselves; So that Protestant Churches have been far in the Mist, if this Man may be believed, when denying the Churches Infallibility, or even that of the Man with the Triple Crown, being so Ancient and Venerable a Bishop, Succeeding the Infallible Peter in a long Series. It were tedious to shew, how unanimous Protestant Divines are in asserting this Prerogative. His Dr. Barrow asserts "Apostles guidance by Infallible Assistance, to which they might appeal, It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us. Whence, saith he, their Writings have passed for Inspired, and therefore Canonical, or certain Rules of Faith and Practice, citing Acts 15. 28. *Profess. Salmur. de Divers. Grad. pag. 281.* after mentioning the Apostles immediate Vocation, make this the Second Prerogative, *Quod a Spiritu Sancto instructi & in omnem veritatem diducti sint, ut in docendo plane sint accuratissimi, alioqui irrita fuisset eorum missio & munus, si fidem illis derogare licitum fuisset.* That they were so Instructed and led by the Spirit of God into all Truth, that in Teaching they were Infallible, otherwise their Mission and Office had been in vain, had it been lawful to deny Faith unto them. Polanus makes this to be the

Fifth Mark, and Incommunicable Prerogative of Apostles, *Immunitas ab omni errore Doctrinae post acceptum die Pentecostes Spiritum Sanctum*, "Immunity from Error in Doctrine, after they had received the Holy Ghost, in the Day of Pentecost *." *Apostoli Lib. 1 cap. 28. erant Praecones Evangelii Universales, immediate a Christo vocati, qui Miraculis pollebant, & in Doctrina non errabant,* pag. 134^o

"The Apostles were Universal Heralds and Messengers of the Gospel, called immediately by Christ, having the Power of Miracles, and Infallibility in Doctrine. Thus Profess. Leid. Synop. Diss. 42. Thes. 21. Where we have asserted a whole Cluster of these Prerogatives disowned and denied by this Arguer; Such as their *Universal Legation, their Immediate Vocation, their Power of Miracles and Infallibility*. The Learned do know, that we might multiply the Testimonies of the most famous Protestant Divines upon this point of the Apostles extraordinary expired Prerogatives in this and the preceeding Instances, and therein expose this Pamphleter's Ignorance of the Protestant Doctrine; But we forbear.

But to shew the certainty of this Incommunicable Prerogative of Apostles, I will assume this Arguer's Concession and Principle, and therefrom inform him, and prove what he denies: He acknowledges, the Apostles were to be the first Propagators, he should say Deliverers or Authorized Institutors, of a positive Religion, before unknown to the World, and not acknowledged. Hence these things are clear. 1. This positive Religion had an Objective Infallible Certainty, obliging, upon its discovery, all to receive it, as being the Voice and Mind of the Eternal God, the Fountain and Center of all Truth. 2ly, Hence those intrusted with the first Delivery, in Order to this End, behoved to have a Divine and Infallible Assistance in its delivery, since God intrusted this to Men, and not to Angels; God's infinite Wisdom in proportioning Means to this End necessarily requiring this. 3ly, Hence those Credentials, or whatever Confirmations else of the Spirit's Assistance, respected these first Deliverers of the infallible Oracles properly, primarily, and immediately; For these Evidences or Credentials were to lead the People to two things, 1. The Objective Certainty of the Message and Divine Oracles themselves, then New to the generality of Mankind. 2ly, The Infallible Faithfulness of these first Messengers and Heralds, both being of an Infallible Connexion, and necessary to found the Faith of Believers and their certain Perswasion in the Reception of these first Messengers and their Message; So that, make a breach in the one, there is a breach made in the other, and the proper Design thereof lost. Hence, 4ly, This Man must acknowledge, that this Infallibility was proper and

and *peculiar* to them, as the first Propagators or Institutors of this Positive Religion, then new to the World, and that upon two grounds.

For, 1. The Foundation of Christian Belief being thus laid, all subsequent Teaching or Teachers were to be *Examined thereby*, so that no such Infallibility can be supposed necessary in them; For this were a palpable impeachment of the Canon, the infallible Rule and Foundation laid, if that which other Teachers by Office did deliver, had been absolutely and intirely to be received *de ipso* that they delivered it, rendering them thus *autonomous*, and the thing it self Authentick. Hence, 2ly, All Teachers, all their Gifts, were still *reduceable to this Rule*, and thereby *examinable*, and these first *infallible Oracles*, and *Deliverers*, the Holy Apostles, in case of Doubt and Difficulty as to the Truth of what was Taught, were to be consulted in order to a clear Decision, and, consequently, no such Inferior Teachers were infallible.

Finally, it hence inevitably follows, that all Confirmations, even Extraordinary, in after Teachers was still *Examinable by this Rule* of the Apostles infallible Doctrine first delivered, and are therefore infinitely short of proving them Infallible, and absolutely beyond Error in Teaching, so as were the Apostles; Since, 1. These Confirmations (suppose them even Miraculous) respected the *antecedent Doctrine delivered by the Apostles*, since they were still Examined by this Rule, and therefore could import no infallible Authority, such as was competent to the first Deliverers of the Canon and Divine Oracles. 2ly, This would impeach the Authority of the Canon it self; For, admit, that what they delivered was *eo ipso* to be received as Infallible, then upon the Hypothesis of their delivering what was beyond or cross to the first Canon, even that was also Canonical, and accordingly to be received. Hence, 3ly, The Design of the standing Canon is to be the Touchstone of all Teachers after the Apostles, both as to their *Authority and Doctrine*, and the Church is still allowed, yea and Commanded to *try the Spirits* by this unerring Rule, 1 John 4. 1, &c.

Hence our Arguer's Reasons to communicate this Infallibility to others than Apostles appears naught. *Miracles were wrought*, says he, *by infallible Guidance*; Else what would their Gifts of Tongues avail'd them or the Church, if they were not infallibly directed to speak right things in them, and preserved from speaking wrong? What would the Gift of Healing signify, if every one who had it were not directed by the Holy Spirit when to use it? Else these Gifts must have proven destructive to Christianity, had it not been for the direction of the Spirit, how, when, or upon whom to use them. But beside

that to be directed *when to use the Gifts aright*, and to be *absolutely*, and in every case *Infallible*, yea or even to be *Teachers by Office*, are *totò cælo* different, If the Spirit conferred subordinat Gifts for the end mentioned, the difference is yet further conspicuous, in that, 1. They were *appendant, subservient Gifts to the Apostolical*, and to confirm the *Canon established by infallible Apostles*, not to infer or commend their *Infallibility*, except in an *Objective Sense* (competent to all faithful Teachers, whom our Pamphleter will not call infallible), i. e. in so far as what they delivered was conformable to that Rule. And hence, 2ly, The Doctrine delivered by such was not to be received from them as *διδασκῆται*, such as were the Holy Men of God and first infallible Apostles, who, both as to *Matter and Manner* of what they delivered, were, as the Apostle Peter expresses it, *carried by the Holy Ghost*, *ὡς Πνεύματι & λόγῳ παραχρῆται*: So that the Doctrine delivered was *αὐτοῖς* as coming from them, cloathed with such Authority, and under such infallible Influence. But who will be bold to say that any inferior Teachers come under this Character, or that their special Gifts or Confirmations of the Doctrine were not still reduceable to the first Fundamental Rule? Our famous Countrey Man Dr. Strang impugns from this Principle, (with others) the Churches Infallibility, *Nullus Judex restrictus & allegatus ad legem aut normam a Superiore positam est absolutus & infallibilis*, That no Person or Judge restricted or tied to a Rule placed by his Superior is infallible, making these two incompatible. *De Interp. & Perf. Script. Lib. 1. Cap. 16. pag. 104.*

3ly, This is further evident from two clear grounds, 1. Even Miraculous Operations are not of themselves absolutely, and in every case, without other supposed grounds, an *Authentick Infallible Evidence* of the Truth of the Doctrine, or Veracity of the Teacher; Hence, *Matth. 7. 22, 23.* in the Great Day such will be banished from God's presence who will have it to say, *We have in thy Name done wonderful Works*, and *Matth. 24. 24.* *Deceivers will come with such Wonders, as to deceive, if possible, the very Elect.* 2ly, Hence, even upon supposal of Miraculous Operations competent to others than Apostles, the Doctrine was not Examenable by the Miracles, but the Miracles by the Doctrine. But so it was not in the case of Apostles, whose mighty Signs, as the Apostle Paul testifies, were *Apostolical Signs*, and proved them Authentick Deliverers of the Canon it self, immediately respecting this their Office and Authority, so that their Doctrine and Execution of their Apostolick Office was to be received upon account of this their Authority, and *eo ipso* that it was delivered by them in that Capacity, which can be said of no other Inferior Officers, compare *Eph. 2. 20.* with

with 2 *Pet.* 3. 2. & *Rev.* 21. 14. Again, 3^{ly}, This will be further evident, if we shall consider, that the Infallible Direction of the Spirit in Faithful Under-Officers, with respect to Miracles, and such like Confirmations of the Apostolick Doctrine, *hic & nunc*, or in such and such particular Cases and Instances, can no more evince and prove an *Absolute Universal Infallibility in Doctrine or Teaching*, or, to call it so, such as is *Personal*, and *absolutely exime them from all Possibility of Erring in Doctrine*, than the Lord's Gracious Assistance, his Sealing and Confirming Faithful Ministers Doctrine and Preaching of Jesus Christ in the Hearts of Hearers, (a Confirmation equal to, if not beyond any such Miraculous Confirmations) will prove them thus Infallible, or beyond the Reach of all Error, and bear the weight of such a Conclusion. I suppose, our Arguer will acknowledge, that these Aflatitious Motions of the Spirit, and Extraordinary Gifts, mentioned 1 *Cor.* 14. had a special Direction of the Spirit, and were for Confirming of the Doctrine of the Gospel, since all these various Gifts were given by *one and the same Spirit*, for this great End of Edification. See 1 *Cor.* 12. 11. Yet they were to be tryed by the Prophets, and subject to their Disquisition and Decision, *and the Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 32. The Prophets were to judge of the Conformity of the Doctrine, and Exercise of these Gifts, to the Canon and received Gospel Truths ; But so, I hope, he will acknowledge, was no Apostles Miraculous Operations or Doctrine thus subject or examinable ; Since he holds, they were the *Authentick first Deliverers*, or *Propagators of a Positive Religion*, and what they delivered was thus *Authentick and Infallible*. Besides that this Arguer will never prove, that all and every one, allowed such Assistances, were Teachers by Office, as is said.

What he adds, That unless, upon his Hypothesis of *Infallibility*, *these Gifts were destructive of Christianity*, does appear, from that which is premised, utterly impertinent and unserviceable to his Design ; Since (as is above cleared) these Miraculous Gifts in the Inferiour Teachers, were only Confirmations of the Canon delivered, and examinable thereby.

That all Miracles in themselves, and for themselves, are not absolutely to be credited and owned, or can simply and absolutely reach a Proof of the Infallibility of the Person who performs them, our Arguer might have seen judiciously made good by the Famous and Learned Mr. Pool, in his Treatise, Entituled, *The Nullity of the Romish Faith*, Pag. 205, 206, 207, &c. From several Important Grounds he shews, That, 1. Christ's Will was Compliant with his Father's Will ; He came to fulfill God's Word, not to destroy it ; But this was the express

press Will of God, that all Miracles should not be credited, as is evident, *Deut. 13.* where the Lord shews, *That the false Prophet, or Dreamer of Dreams, giving a Sign or Wonder, and the Wonder coming to pass whereof he speaks, saying, Let us go after other Gods, and serve them, thou shalt not hearken to the Words of that Prophet, for the Lord your God proves you, &c.* Whence, saith he, it follows, that, if it could be imagined without Blaphemy, Christ had delivered such a Doctrine as this, *Let us go after other Gods,* his Miracles had been disowned and rejected; And therefore Miracles of themselves are not to be credited. 2ly, Christ and his Apostles have foretold us, that Miracles should be done by the Teachers of false Doctrines, therefore Miracles in themselves are no sufficient Evidence. The Antecedent is proved from *2 Thes. 2. 9.* compared with *Rev. 13. 13, 14.* where we are taught, that *the Antichrist shall come with Power, and Signs and Lying Wonders; Lying Wonders,* because brought to Confirm his *Lying Doctrine.* And that he shall do *Great Wonders.* — And thus to deceive them that dwell on the Earth, by means of these Miracles. A Third Ground he offers, is, That our Saviour speaks of Miracles, as common to himself, and counterfeit Messias's, as is evident, *Matth. 24. 24.* where he shews, that *false Christs and false Prophets shall shew great Signs and Wonders.* And therefore he points out Miracles, as of themselves no sufficient *κρίτηριον* of Infallibility; But the Scripture Truth only is the sure *κρίτηριον*: And therefore, what Divines observe of the *Spirit's Testimony*, that it is always conjunct with the Testimony of Conscience, (and therefore it is not said *μυστηριον* but *συμμυστηριον*) the like we may discern in this, that, where Christ urgeth the Argument of Miracles, he doth it in *Conjunction with the Scripture*, as is evident in *John 5.* compared with *John 10. 25, 38.* where Christ pleads his Works only, as they are done *in his Father's Name, i. e.* Not only as he pretended his Father's Name, (for so did the false Christs, *Matth. 24.*) but he really acted them with his Commission, and in Conformity to his Will and Word. Whence he concludes, that the Scripture is the only *τεκμήριον*, and not Miracles in themselves, as this Argument of the Papists falsely supposeth; Charging thus the same false Popish Supposition upon our Arguer. Another Ground he urges against the Popish Adversary pleading *Infallibility from Miracles*, is this, That, if it were admitted, that Miracles could prove the Verity of a Doctrine, yet they do not necessarily prove the *Infallibility of him that doth these Works, or receives that Doctrine.* Observe this, saith he, for it strikes at the Root of this their last Pretence. And here is an Observe for our Arguer, for it strikes at the Root of this his Popish Notion, and strikes out the Bottom of it; Since he ascribes this Infallibility

lity of the Doctrine delivered, to the Workers of Miracles. But let us see, how the Learned Author illustrates and clears this Assertion. The Notes of a Man, *saiſt he*, may prove his Manhood, but they do not prove his Nobility, Wiſdom, Learning: Theſe muſt be proved *aliunde* from another Head. The Proteſtant Notes of a Church do prove the *Being* and *Truth* of our Church, but not its *Infallibility*, which muſt be fetched from another Topick; Which he illustrates thus. The Gift of Miracles was not peculiar to the Apoſtles, but was communicated by God to other Miniſters and Chriſtians in the Primitive Times: Either then they muſt ſay, that every ſuch Miniſter and Chriſtian, ſingly conſidered, was infallible, which no Man ever yet was ſo impudent to aſſert (I muſt add, unleſs it be our Arguer), or confeſs, that Miracles are no ſufficient Evidence of *Infallibility*. It was enough, that Miracles, *saiſt he*, did Confirm the Doctrines delivered, whether by Apoſtles, or other Miniſters, for the Confirmation of our Faith, &c. He adds further, That Miracles are ſo far from proving the Infallibility of the Perſons that do them, that they do not ſo much as prove (he means *in themſelves*, and *absolutely* conſidered, as he has before cautioned) the Verity of the Doctrines delivered by them; Shewing, That Miracles have been done (or, at leaſt, ſuch things as the ſtrickeſt Obſervation of common Prudence could not diſtinguiſh from *Miracles*) by Hereticks, yea by Pagans, &c. He after cautions this, That God's Providence is no way blemiſhed in permitting ſuch Miracles, this being an Act of his Wiſe Counſel and Righteous Judgment, that thoſe who will not be won by the Word, and the Glorious Miracles done in Confirmation of it, may be hardened by other Miracles, eſpecially God having forewarned the World of ſuch Impoſtors, &c.

We might add a Multiplicity of Proteſtant Divines, in Diſputing this Point of Miracles as a Note of the Church againſt the Popiſh Adverſary, which they induce in Proof of the Infallibility thereof. But this being notour to all that underſtand the Popiſh Controverſie, we need not inſiſt upon't. But, from what is ſaid, 'tis ſufficiently evident, that our Arguer, who in this point hath claſſed himſelf with the Popiſh Adverſary, is ſufficiently expoſed, and his Folly made appear; And that, in this Endeavour, to impeach this *ἐπιτιμία* and Prerogative of Apoſtles, he has diſcovered as well his Ignorance in the Proteſtant Doctrine, as his Popiſh Tincture.

For what he adds further of *Paul's Repreheſion of the Apoſtle Peter, and Paul and Barnabas quarrelling, and parting aſunder*, to prove, that the Apoſtles were not, in every thing, and at all Occaſions infallible, 'tis utterly unſerviceable to him, and impertinent; Since the Queſtion is

anent a *Doctrinal Infallibility, or in Teaching*, in delivering the Lord's Mind unto the Churches, whether by Word or Write : The Impeachment whereof by this Scribler, wounds *the Divine Canon and Apostolick Authority*, and reduces the Church to that Uncertainty,

* See 1 *Thes.* which he would fain improve against us upon this 4. 1, 2. with point *. But 'tis not of such *Practical and Absolutely* 2 *Thes.* 2. 15. *Sinless* Infallibility, in the whole Walk or Practice, as his Foolish Instances would suppose : And his Confounding the One with the Other, is among the rest of his Purblind Stumblings in this point. One thing I cannot but add, as a further Discovery of our Arguer's shallow Precipitancy in this Matter. These Miraculous Gifts mentioned, he will needs extend beyond Apostles, with a proportioned Infallibility, and he, together with the Querist, and other Associates, would needs have them vigent in the Church for a very considerable time, if not for some Ages. And he will not disowne it, that, consequently, they fall within the Compass of the Promise, which, with him, reaches an Assistance to the end of the World, and consequently the Existence, the standing Nature, and Continuance of that which is *the Object of this Assistance* : For this is the Grand Topick, upon which he pleads for the Continuance of the Apostolick Office, and that *in its full Extent*, as at first exercised. Now, I hope, he will acknowledge these extraordinary Gifts to have long since ceas'd, and, consequently, that the Promise will not prove the Continuance of all these Gifts, or Offices included therein ; Or, to avoid this, he must say, that these Miraculous Gifts, Operations, or Offices, had no Right to our Lord's promised Presence or Assistance : And thus, in either Case, he falls upon this *Scylla or Charybdis*, and impeaches the Grand Topick of his Arguing in this Pamphlet.

I find nothing further in this Pamphlet worth noticing ; Yet two things, that this Answer may be full, I shall further touch upon. 1. He will needs argue for Episcopacy, from *the Policy of the Church from the beginning of the World*, a Description whereof, no doubt, is a Task this Pasquiller could not manage. He tells us, (Pag. 36, 37.) of the Government of the Patriarchs, who were Independent Princes and Priests, by keeping Fellowship with whom, the Lord's People had Direction from God, how and when to Worship. Families were thus like a National Church, and the Patriarchs like the principal Bishop of such a Church, whose Dependents and Subjects all the rest were. After them, he tells us, that, in the Jewish Oeconomy, there was no appearance of Parity, there being One High Priest and Subordinate Priests ; Yet, in this Oeconomy, Eleazar the Son of Aaron was Chief over the Chief of the Levites, Numb. 3. 32. which is all one with President

over the Presidents, Overseer, or Bishop over the Bishops of the Levites. And, Nehem. II. 14. we find a Chief President Bishop, or Overseer of the Priests. So that here is, in the Old Testament, a perfect Pattern of the New Testament Hierarchy. Aaron as only Christ's Type, and Eleazar Arch-Bishop over Bishops, and under him Bishops of the Priests, and Bishops of the Levites, and under them the ordinary Priests and Levites. For what he talks of the Model of the Synagogue Worship, I need not notice, as not touching the point. 3ly, "Christ being to break down the Jewish Hedge, and to make up a Church of all Nations, he did it in a general easie Method, for all different sorts of People: Yet, coming to fulfill the Law, unless this Order of Jewish Officers be made appear to be Typical, he tells us, He cannot see what can be said against continuing of that comely Order; For a Law it was which established it, and also a part of that very Law, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill; And the Officers which Christ Ordained and Appointed, while on Earth, were made after this Model and Pattern, they not Acting in Parity. Or, if it must be Typical, and so fulfilled in and by Christ, then his copying after it must be the only true fulfilling of it, and certainly the most natural way of fulfilling of it. *Ans.* It were tedious to trace the many ignorant Inadvertencies apparent in this Gentleman's large Discourse to this Scope from Pag. 36. to 46. whereof we have recited the Summ. 1. For what he talks of the Patriarchal and Jewish Oeconomy, (tho' all that he says were admitted, which, notwithstanding, upon evident and obvious Grounds, were tedious here to recite) it never, by a thousand degrees, touches our Question, which is stated anent that Oeconomy appointed by our Saviour in the New Testament Church, which, he acknowledges, had its distinct and peculiar positive Rules and Institutions; So that this his shattered Discourse involves an Inconsistency; For he tells us, Page 42. That our Lord brake down the former Hedge, whereby the Jews were separated from other Nations, which, all do know, was the Hedge of their peculiar Oeconomy, as a Church and Nation governed by God's peculiar positive Laws, and therefore must needs be supposed to have set up another Oeconomy and Hedge of his own framing, else he left the Church open, without a Hedge, to the Invasion of her Enemies. 2ly, 'Tis evident, and acknowledged by the Learned, that the Sanhedrim acted in an Official Parity, and the High-Priest was no other than President, without any such Dominion as Prelates assume, and Prelatists pretend. Junius * shews, that, in the Sanhedrim, there was *par-consortium Ordinis & Potestatis, sed Ordini impari, qua familiarum, qua temporis respectu*; C.24. Not. 12, *penes Confessum Sacerdotum ex lege fuit Ordinaria Jurisdictio Ecclesiastica, i. e.* "The like Participation of Authority and Power,

' tho' in distinct Order, partly in respect of Families, partly in respect of Time, the Ordinary Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction and Authority was established in the Assembly of the Priests according to the Law. We

heard, that Bishop *Bilson* * states this Distinction betwixt Officers of the Jewish Oeconomy and the Christian Church, " That the Officers of the Sanctuary, the Rites and Ceremonies of the Sacrifices, from which all Tribes but the Levites were restrained, were not of one kind, and that therefore the Degrees of Administrators might be distinguished according to the Diversity of Offices and Services ; But, in the Church of Christ, the Word and Sacraments Concredited to all Ministers without Distinction, as they are of one kind, admitting of no Difference of Administration or Celebration, so neither do they require different Degrees of Ministers. As the first Testimony (to which many of a like Nature might be added) sets the Supreme Sanhedrim, or Jewish Ecclesiastick Judicatory on a Level, in Opposition to his fancied Hierarchical Mould and Degrees of Officers, ascribing an equal Share of a Jurisdictional Power to all the Members of that Oeconomy ; So the second, exhibited by this unexceptionable Prelate's Witness, does so state the Difference and Distinction betwixt the two Oeconomies of the Old and New Testament in this point, as quite overthrows his alike foolish and fancied Translation of the Jewish Orders of Officers into the Christian Church. 3ly, When he pleads, that our Lord came not to destroy, but fulfil the Law, in this Notion and Pleading, with respect to his Scope, he palpably contradicts himself, and is involved in inexplicable Inconsistencies : For he tells us, he cannot see how the Jewish ancient comely Order of Officers, supposed by him, can be made out to be Typical and removed ; And consequently, he holds it to be vigent and in force, as founded upon that standing Law which Christ came not to destroy. Yet he tells us also (Pag. 42, preceeding) That Christ broke down that Hedge of the Jewish Oeconomy, to make up his Church of all Nations. Hence, 2ly, He must hold, that, tho' our Lord destroyed nothing of the Law, yet some part thereof he came to remove, as fulfilled, scil. the Ceremonial Worship, and, by his Confession, upon the Matter, the Jewish Oeconomy of Government also, both being the Partition, or Middle-Wall, distinguishing the Jewish from the Christian Church, as under that first Dispensation of the Covenant, that National

* Numb. 23. 9. Church was thus also separated from the rest of the Nations * ; This Partition, or Middle-Wall, the Apostle tells us, Eph. 2. 14. Christ hath broken down, and to this end, by our Arguer's Acknowledgment, scil. to make way for a Gospel Church, uniting both Churches

Churches thus under a distinct Gospel Oeconomy and Ordinances. But behold his pitiful Prevarication and Inconsistency: For, notwithstanding this Acknowledgment, yet, in the Sense and Series of his Pleading, *Pag. 42. there being a Law establishing the Jewish Oeconomy, (which he must needs understand in the intire Mould and Extent thereof) 'tis a part of that very Law, which Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfil.* Let us view a little, how this Medium has involved him: *It was a Law which did establish it; Therefore Christ came not to destroy or remove that Establishment, because (forsooth) he came not to destroy the Law: And thus he fairly introduces into the New Testament Oeconomy not only his Typical High-Priest, but also all the Jewish Antiquated Worship, which God himself established by peremptory Positive Laws, peremptorily injoyning the Obedience thereof, and severely threatening the Transgression of the same. And these Laws, he cannot deny, that our Saviour, who came to fulfil all Righteousness, diligently obeyed in the Days of his Flesh, he being made under the Law *.* 3ly, * Gal. 4. 4. He says, if it must be Typical, then Christ's copying after it must be the only true fulfilling of it. He means the Jewish Oeconomy in point of Government, and herein he is so peremptory, that he adds, *That certainly this is the most natural way it could be fulfilled.* But I ask, 1. Since he acknowledges, *Pag. 42. That Christ broke down that Hedge once established by a Divine Law, whether did he, by this Practice, fulfil that Law?* He will not, at least cannot, say, he did not, or else, according to that Partition in the Text mentioned, he makes Christ to have come to destroy it, which will cross that which he immediately before asserted, *viz. That 'tis a part of that Law which he came not to destroy.* If he say, that Christ, in breaking down that Hedge, *scil. of the Jewish Oeconomy, fulfilled these Laws which did establish it, how can he say, that he fulfilled the same Law in copying after it, or in setting up a Government exactly the same, and parallel unto it?* 2ly, Since, in his Sense, Christ's copying after the Legal Oeconomy, is a fulfilling of these Laws, even supposing its Typical Nature, as he clearly asserts, *Pag. 42.* I would fain know, how he can prove the Removal of any piece of that Oeconomy, because Typical, or under that Notion, *since a copying after the Typical Ordinance is, in his Sense, the fulfilling that Law which did establish the same, yea, and it must be, saith he, the only true way of fulfilling it.* If the only true way, then there is no other way of fulfilling the same. He hath told us, *Pag. 43. That certainly it was the most natural way it could be fulfilled:* And, upon this Certainty, or certain Ground of our Pamphleter, the Apostle John must be corrected in telling us, *The Law came by Moses, but Grace and Truth by Jesus Christ, John*

1. 17. and the Apostle Paul, in saying, that the shadowing Ordinances are removed by the coming of Christ, who is the Body and Substance, Coloss. 2. 17. and the Typical Ordinances are abolished by him, 2 Cor. 3. 13. And grossly mistaken he was, when he told us, that the Priesthood being changed, there is made of necessity a Change also of the Law. Heb 7. 12. For this New Episcopal Proctor will inform them, that the only true and natural way of fulfilling, is our Lord's copying after these Ordinances, and instituting them of new.

I cannot stand to take notice, how impertinently, all along, 'tis a Parity only of Church-Officers, he would seem to impugn, to which he opposes his pretended Authorized Hierarchy, as if, forsooth, there could be no Imparity of Officers, unless his pretended Hierarchy take place; Whereas all do know, that the Imparity, both of Courts and Officers, which we do maintain, doth clearly exclude, and is opposite to his Hierarchy. In a word, the whole Jewish Oeconomy, in point of Worship and Government, is, by this new Judaizing Pamphleter, so clearly introduced into the New Testament Church, that nothing can be more plain. Which, besides what is said, has a new Confirmation from what he asserts, Pag. 44. where he tells us, *the Matter had been the more singular, had our Lord copied only the Jewish Oeconomy, in point of the Polity of the Christian Church; But, saith he, 'tis plain he copied other things also, instancing Baptism, the Postcænium, &c.* how appositely is touched above. But, here 'tis plain, he extends this Copying beyond the Government; And sure, if the only true way of fulfilling be such a Copying, he is consequent to his Principle, in extending this Copying to their Worship; And, of necessity, on the same Ground, he must extend it to the intire Frame of their Worship.

It were tedious here to trace and scan the many foolish inconsistent Notions contained in his shattered Discourses from Pag. 36. to 46. Not to insist upon his pitiful Prevarication, and Begging of the Question, while professing to plead, in all this Bustle anent pretended Ancient Government, merely against a Parity of Church-Officers, whereof above; 'Tis observable, 1. That, holding every Head of the Patriarchal Families to have represented the Lord, and to have interceded by Prayer and Sacrifices, he doth, in the Scope and Series of his Pleading, set every Prelate in this Representative Chair, as will after appear, asserting him to be the proper sole Pastor of the Dioc. 2ly, He holds, That all were in Communion with the Lord, while they kept Communion with this Prince-Priest, Primate, or Patriarch, and had immediate Direction where and how to Worship. Now, let any enquire, to what Scope and Purpose this is mentioned, and it must needs be acknowledged, that, in his Principles and Design, he asserts there is

no Communion with the *Λογος*, where this Patriarchal and Princely Prelatical Inspection is wanting, impeaching thus and denying the Ministry of the most Reformed Churches, yea and their Essence as such; Besides that, tho' not immediatly, the Worship is to be directed, yet in the Consequence of his Discourse, the Direction must still flow, and that infallibly from this Prince or Patriarch to all under his Inspection. Thus he is made a Pope to his Substitutes and Subjects. Besides that, this Patriarch or Priest being also a Prince, and having a Civil as well as Ecclesiastick Sovereignty, he must either own the warrantable Conjunction of both in his New Testament Patriarch, or his Discourse anent these instanced Prerogatives is *extra oleas*, and fruitless Talk, not to the purpose. 3ly, This Patriarch, he says, was like the principal Bishop of such a Church, whose Dependents or Subjects, all the rest of the Nation or Family were. Upon which, I would know, whether he makes these principal Bishops independent upon a Prince, or not. If not, then he contradicts his Assertion, *Pag. prec.* for he asserts, that these Ancient Patriarchs (to whom he assimilates his Patriarch Prelates, as exactly parallel) were Independent Princes, as well as Priests. If he assert them Dependent upon the Prince then he breaks his Parallel, and Argument deduceable therefrom, and can make no Sense of that Assertion which he has, *Pag. 37. viz.* That the Patriarch is like the principal Bishop of a Church, and, in his Sense, like the Metropolitick Head of a National Church, whose Dependents, yea, and Subjects, all the rest of the Nation are. Besides, in his Sense and Pleading, this principal Bishop standing in Relation to all Subordinate Bishops, as his Dependents and Subjects, he casts a shameful Blot upon their great Champion J. S. who sets all Prelates on a Level, in point of Episcopal Power and Authority, as being, within their District, subject to none but Christ, yea, and palpably contradicts himself, who gives the same account of Bishops, as shall be made immediatly appear. 4ly, He tells us, *Ibid.* That Aaron the High Priest's Office fail'd when Christ came, he being the Typical Representative of the *Λογος*, and Christ the only High Priest, Head, and Husband of his Church. Now, if his Office fail'd, then certainly his National, Prince-like, or Patriarchal Inspection fail'd, which he cannot deny to have been essentially included in his Office; So that he must acknowledge our Lord to have taken away, together with this obsolete Office of Aaron, that Metropolitick, Patriarchal, National Inspection of Prelats which he asserts: And here is a new Contradiction of our Pamphleter; For if Aaron's National Headship, to speak so, was properly Typical, and Representative of the *Λογος*, as he expresses it, he must confess that the *Λογος*, or Christ's coming in the Flesh has taken it away, and, together therewith,

with all pretences of a National Primacy, such as he asserts. Besides, if, as he asserts, Christ is *the only High Priest, Head, and Husband of the Church*, this *Only* must either be exclusive of a *Typical Head* alone, which he will not assert; For thus he will own the Popes pretence of being Christ's Vicar and Under-Head, tho' not properly Typical: And if he embrace the affirmative Answer, then he must acknowledge, that *Aarons Headship* is also excluded, as likewise the Episcopal Pre-eminence over a National Church, which he will needs draw from it, as upon the matter an Universal Primacy or Headship is. *sly*, He draws an Inference from what is premised anent the abolishing of *Aaron's Priesthood*, viz. *That there is now no lawful Pope, or single Oecumenick Universal Pastor, because the Unity of the Headship must resolve only in Christ alone.* Upon which, 1. It may be enquired what he means by the restrictive *Now*, when he tells us, *That Christ is Now the only High Priest, Head and Husband of his Church*: Sure, he will not deny, that our Redeemer was always *the only Head and Husband of his Church*, yea and always *the only High Priest of our Profession*, Heb. 3. 1. taking this Priesthood and Apostleship expressed in that place, as properly applicable unto him: And whatever subterfuge he may devise with respect to the Office of High Priest, he is cut off from all shadow of evasion in the Extension following, viz. *That our Lord is now the only Head and Husband of his Church whose Spouse and Body she is*, and therefore, putting this Relation also, which he expresses by the Epithets of *Head and Body, Husband and Spouse*, within the limits of his restrictive [*Now*], whereby he understands the New Testament times, in contradistinction to all the Ages preceeding, it follows evidently, that in his Sense the Church Universal (for he speaks of that Church which is *Christ's Spouse and Body*, and none will doubt that the Church Universal is) had in all these times a *Suffragan or Vicar-Head*, and a *Suffragan Vicar-Husband*, for which the Pope's Holiness owes him Thanks. In the second place, Let us ponder his Reason why there can be no Pope or single Oecumenick Pastor, because *the Unity of the Headship must resolve only in Christ, and that by Church Principles, and so consequently, he being our only Head, we can have no other Head Spiritual but him.* Upon this it may be enquired, whether an Organized National Church has not such an Unity as resolves only in Christ, consequently has him for its only Head. Sure, he cannot deny this, unless he impeach *Christ's Headship* over that Church, and deny him to be its only Head: And he can give no account of his denying to the Universal Church a *Visible Head*, upon this ground, *that Christ is her only Head*, unless he also apply the same ground to the Church National, which certainly has Christ for its

Head,

Head, and Spiritual Head, as he expressees it, as well as the Church Universal, every Organized National Church being of an Homogeneous Nature with the Church Universal. And who will assert that the Organiz'd Church National is not Christ's Spouse and Body, whereof he is Husband and Head, as well as the Church Universal, he being the Mystical Head to all the Members of his Mystical Body, and in a forensical Sense the Political Head to every Organized Visible Church, especially National, Exercising a visible Kingdom over the same, in the Ordinances of his Appointment. But now, if our Arguer shall grant, as needs he must, that the Unity of the Church National resolves only in Christ as her only Head, then he contradicts himself evidently, in assigning to her another *Suffragan Spiritual Head*, scil. His Metropolitan Patriarch or National Pope; And if he hold that both are compatible, he shews his Reason to be nought, in denying this Suffragan Head to the Church Universal upon this ground, that *her Unity resolves only in Christ*; Where, by the way, he must be minded that his Friend J. S. makes the Bishop the necessary visible Principle of Unity to his Diocese; And if the Nature of the Organized Diocesan, or National Church, doth necessarily require such a Foundation and Principle of Unity, why not also the Church Universal? both being in this respect of a Homogeneous and the same Nature, and consequently, what is necessary and essential to the one must also be to the other, in *esse talis*, and under that reduplication as a Church Visible and Organized. So that this Objection of the Presbyterians mentioned by him, scil. *If we have Bishops, why not Arch-bishops? If Arch-bishops, why not Patriarchs? And if Patriarchs, why not a Pope?* stands good and valid, and is not in the least infringed, but rather fortified, by this his silly Evasion. Here 'tis pleasant to notice, that our Arguer, having asserted that Christ is our only Head, expressees his Consequence thus, that *we can have no other Head Spiritual but him*. Here it may be enquired what he means by this Limitation of *Spiritual*? If he thus understand it, that Christ is the only Invisible, Supreme, Absolute Head of his Church, giving Life and Influences to all the Members of his Mystical Body, which seems to be his meaning by altering the frequent repeated Term of [Church] and substituting for it the Term [We], he may at his leisure consider, whether this ground be not clearly applicable to the Organized Church National, which, notwithstanding, with him, has a *Suffragan Visible Head*; So that he is in this still inconsistent with himself. If by a *Spiritual Head*, he mean such a One as distinguished from the Civil Magistrat, he baffles and affronts the whole frame of the late Prelacy in Scotland, and the present Prelacy in England, wherein the Supreme Magistrat is owned as the Supreme Ecclesiastick Head, and even the

the Primat himself, in the present Constitution of Prelacy in England, as of the late in Scotland, is declared but the Suffragan of this Civil or rather Ecclesiastico-Civil Head. But further, If by *Spiritual Head* he understand Christ's Headship, so as to exclude whatever Officers may challenge a Headship over the Church under the Denomination of *Spiritual*, he affronts and pulls the Mitre and Crosier from the National *Spiritual* Patriarch and Metropolitan of the *English* National Church, since he cannot deny, but owns it, that he has at least a kind of Suffragan *Spiritual* Headship over that Church, and in his Principles and Acknowledgment, as well as in matter of Fact, 'tis evident, he is the proper *Spiritual* Head or Primat to, and over all the *Spiritual* Lords thereof, who by this Denomination of *Spiritual*, are distinguished from the *Temporal* Lords; And, as has been made appear, the same pretended ground of his Headship to the *National Church*, will plead for a *Spiritual* Headship to the Universal.

But let us hear our Arguer's next Reason for denying the force of the premised Argument. Thus it is, *For this Head* (Christ, scil.) *to have one single Deputy, or Vicar, were to destroy the Commission he gave his Apostles, whereby every one of them was, and every one of their Successors succeeding in full Power, becomes each a Representative of the Lord independent of any other Head but Christ.* Here 'tis evident, that in one dash he has overturned and broken in pieces the whole frame both of the *Scottish* and *English* Hierarchy, in which he cannot but acknowledge there were in *Scotland*, and now are in *England*, Arch-bishops over Bishops, and both the one and other Subject to one Primat, who is a *Spiritual* Head to them all. But if every Bishop be Independent of any other Head but Christ, where is the instanced Dependence of the Bishops on Arch-bishops, and of these on the Metropolitan? Does not this Pamphleter deserve that Churches highest Censure for thus disjoyning that Venerable Body of the *English* Church, and cutting the Nerves and Sinews of its Ecclesiastical Unity. But again, in a further inconsistency, he has also destroyed that which he asserts (pag. 39, 40.) anent the supposed Hierarchy and Priesthood of Aaron, wherein there was one High Priest, and a Chief of the Chief of the Levites, which is all one saith he, as President over the Presidents, Overseer or Bishop over the Bishops of the Levites, &c. He tells us of Eleazar's being called Chief over the Chief of the Levites, Numb. 3. 32. whereby is meant his being Arch-bishop, Arch-president, or Overseer of the Bishops, Presidents, or Overseer of the Priests and Levites, (how truly this his Descant of the supposed Jewish Hierarchy is calculated, needs not be here inquired into, this being already touched in the account we have given of the equal Official Power of

of all the Members of the *Sanhedrim*, which will bear the same Conclusion as to the Inferior Courts). Having represented this Hierarchy of the Aaronical Order, he tells us, *That there is a perfect Pattern in the Old Testament of the New Testament Hierarchy, Aaron the Head as Representing Christ our only Spiritual Head, and under Aaron Eleazar his Son Arch-bishop, as above, and under him again the Bishop of the Priests, and the Bishop of Levites, and under them the ordinary Priests and Levites, &c.* Now, can there be a greater and more palpable Inconsistency and Contradiction imagined than this is; The Priesthood of Aaron and the Jewish Oeconomy had Presidents or Bishops above Bishops, Arches above Arches, and these steps and stairs of Official Superiority of Church Officers resolving and coalescing in one High Priest, or *Chief of all the Chiefs*, as he represents it; And this Old Testament Hierarchy a perfect Pattern of the New Testament Hierarchy, which is compleatly correspondent thereunto; And yet in this New Testament Hierarchy every Bishop is Representative of the *Λύγ*, and Independent of any other Head but Christ. Again, in the Old Testament Pattern, the Power of all Inferior Officers did resolve in the Supremacy of one High Priest, who, besides the Typical Priest, he tells us, *was Chief over the Chief of the Levites, and President over all the Presidents, which is a perfect pattern of the New Testament Hierarchy;* And yet in this New Testament Hierarchy there are Twelve Apostles of the same full Power, Independent one upon another, each a Representative of the *Λύγ*, as also every one of their Successors. Further, his great Reason for denying the premised Presbyterian Argument, *That the Episcopal Hierarchy must at last end in one Pope,* is this, *That the Church having but one Head, this Head can have no single Deputy, or Vicar.* But, I pray, had not this one Head a single Deputy in the Jewish Oeconomy? And hath he not made this Government a perfect Pattern of the New Testament Hierarchy? And thus, 1. He does evidently establish a New Testament Supreme President, a single Deputy, or Vicar of Christ. And, 2ly, He hath destroyed the Commission of the Twelve Apostles, which, he tells us, did import a Collateral Independent Power. It has been always judg'd as Monstrous, that One Body should have Two Heads, which has a just Application to the State of the Church; But this Man makes her such a Monster of Monsters, as has not only Twelve Heads, but as many Heads as there are Bishops, who are by him declared Independent of any other Head but Christ. Was ever such a farrago of Nonsensical Contradictions spoken or written? Our Pamphleter tells us, *That by this Reasoning Presbyterian's may see, whether he of the Church Principles, or they be narest Popery, and have solidest Reasons and Grounds to support Protestant Arguments against the Pope and the Church*

250 *A Confutation of an Additional Pamphlet; Entituled,*
of Rome's encroachments upon the Headship and Representation of Christ Jesus.
 But, without doubt, the Presbyterians have seen this Pamphleter by
 such Reasoning put in the Pope's Hand a Handle and Sword against
 the Protestant Churches, as is evident from what is premised. The
 Bishop of Rome can plead against him, that the New Testament Hie-
 rarchy must have a Supreme Head in correspondence to its perfect
 Pattern in the Old Testament Hierarchy, and that this our Pamph-
 leter's Principle and Acknowledgement is the same very Argument
 and Ground upon which Bellarmin and the other Popish pleaders do
 Argue the Advantage and Necessity of one Supreme Monarch over the
 New Testament Church. And for what he adds of every Bishop's
 Representation of the *Λογος*, and of every Bishop's Independency
 upon any Head but Christ, the Pope and his pleaders can easily baffle
 him, in shewing, that, 1. He herein has destroyed his own premised
 Principle of one Supreme Head. 2^{ly}, The Pope and his pleaders can
 pose him with this, Whether it doth look more like Order and Unity,
 yea and that Monarchical Order and Unity of Government represen-
 ted in the Records of the Old Testament Church, which he (together
 with the other Hierarchical pleaders) holds to be a perfect Pattern of
 the New Testament Hierarchy, that there be one Representative of the
Λογος Independent of any other Head but Christ, than that there be
 as many Hundreds, yea, possibly, Thousands, of Independent Represen-
 tatives of the *Λογος*, as there are Prelats or Bishops, and that thus the
 New Testament Church be cantonized and crumbled into as many
 Papacies as there are Prelacies? Nor can he evade, in alledging, that
 he means only one National Church in this point of Government, which he
 insinuates, Pag. 40. For, 1. He cannot deny, that the Church of
 the Jews, under the Old Testament Dispensation, was not meerly a Na-
 tional Church, but God's only Catholick Visible Church then existent,
 which is above made appear; Yea and our Pamphleter acknowledges,
 for he tells us, pag. 42. That the Church of the Jews under the Old
 Testament Dispensation was the Lord's only proper Peculium, and that if any
 other Nation reaped Benefit by their Oeconomy, it was by being first made a Jew,
 by some one kind of Profelytism, or other, allowed for that purpose. And if
 none could be allowed to enjoy Church Blessings or Priviledges but in
 this Method of being joyned to that Church, he must, of necessity, ac-
 knowledge, that it was then the only Catholick Church Visible, and that upon
 the same ground asserted Acts 2. 47. with respect to the New Testa-
 ment Church, viz. That the Lord added to the Church daily such as should
 be saved. Hence, 2^{ly}, When he tells us, That this Government of the
 Old Testament Church was a perfect Pattern of the New Testament Hierarchy,

to make the Pattern or Copy and the first Exemplar correspondent, he must necessarily extend this Correspondency and Similitude to the New Testament Church generally and universally consider'd, which clearly precludes any such Evasion.

Pag. 45. He is bold to tell us, *That Episcopacy is not disown'd by the Reformed Churches.* The Author of the *Plea* mentioned by the Querist (who, probably, is also the Author of this goodly Superstructure) gave an account of the Confessions of Reformed Churches disowning Prelacy. *It they approve of it, and are sorry they cannot have it,* as this Pamphleter is bold to assert, how come their Confessions, their Universities to appear against it, as is above made good ? That which he talks of *God's inspiring People with miraculous Gifts after Prelacy was established, and that none who had these Gifts are found to have given any Testimony against it,* is also Answered above. Here I only add, first, That who (and how long after the Apostolick Age) had such Gifts, is a point he can give us no account of. 2^{ly}, It is universally acknowledg'd, that the times immediatly Succeeding the Apostolick Age are most dark as to matter of Fact, both as to Persons Writing, and their Writings themselves; And, consequently, several such Testimonies might have been, tho' they have not come to our knowledge. The denial of matter of Fact because of the defect of History, is a Consequence derided by Protestant Divines Writing against Papists, who, in Defence of their Superstitions and Idolatries, make use of the same Topick, demanding Historical Instances when such and such Corruptions did first appear in the Church, and when, and by whom they were testified against. Whence they conclude, that they were from the beginning and are of Divine Appointment. And 'tis notourly known, that, in point of the Hierarchy, our Prelatists have borrowed this Notion, telling us ever and anone, " That we can give no account when the Hierarchy first had its rise after the Apostles, if Presbytery was the first Government. But in this point, among other Answers, our Divines have offered this to Papists, (which Answer hath the same force against Prelatists) " That to deny a Man to be Diseased because he cannot give account of the Method and way how he took it ; Or, a Man being found Wounded, thrown in a Ditch, or robbed, to be in such a case, or thus used, because he cannot give an account of the Persons who thus wronged him, as 'tis grossly Nonsensical and Impertinent; Of a like Nature is the denial of Corruptions condemned in the Word of God, to be such, because the Original and first Instruments of their Introduction are latent in History. Which leads to a third Answer, If we can make appear, from the Apostles Doctrine and Practice,

in framing the Gospel Church, that both the one and the other excludes Prelacy. and Reprobates this beloved Hierarchy, he must acknowledge, that this is the best, yea and the only true Testimony or Test wherein we are to acquiesce; The Apostles Doctrine, the Miraculous Confirmations thereof, their Authority apparent in both, being infinitely beyond any such Principles and Confirmations as he may pretend: And therefore, till his Hierarchical Party can Answer what is offered from these lively Oracles against Prelacy, this Notion falls of course.

Come we now to our Pamphleter's last Argument to support Prelacy, which he imagines to be Achillean; And yet 'tis nothing but an old Popish Cant, and rotten Notion, long since exploded and baffled by Protestant Divines. He tells us, (*Pag. 46.*) 'tis an Argument of a late Judicious and Learned Author, forsooth, of the Church of Scotland, to this effect. *Let us suppose Presbyterial Orders in themselves valid* (a Supposition he justly Questions), nevertheless, giving, and not granting that thus it is, what can this avail the present Presbyterians, since the first Presbyters of Presbyterian Principles, acting as Presbyters, after the Reformation, had their Orders, either from Bishops, and consequently must own the Bishop's Power to Ordain, or else deny their own Authority to Act as Presbyters; Or, they must say they had it by the Call and Suffrage of the People, and then it must be made appear that such a Power was left to, and lodged in the People, and they invested in that Power by Christ; Or, 3ly, If an inward Call and Impulse be pretended, he demands a Scripture instance of our Lord's designing and appointing such a Call, as also sufficient Vouchers from every individual pretenders to this inward Call. Now, to make it appear what pitiful Plagiary Popish Stuff this is, and that the Man is fighting with the Arguments of the Anti-Christian Rable, against the Reformation,

Let us hear what is returned to this Argument by Protestant Divines, in point of Popish Bishops ordaining the first Reformers. *Du Moulin*, in Answer to *Arnoux* the Jesuite alledging, "The Reformers had no Ministerial Succession or Dependence to instruct an ordinary Commission, no Witnesses of an Extraordinary Authority, no Miracles, &c. after discovery of the Pope, and Popish Clergy's Intrusion to God's Church, and horrid Corruption of a Gospel Ministry, having also, from the Nature and Design of a Gospel Ministry in it self considered, as well as from the Remains thereof continuing in the Popish Church, justified the Call of our Reformers to Preach the Gospel, and propagat the Truth thereof, asserting, in so far, their ordinary Call, who were Ordained by Popish Bishops; He adds, "That retaining

retaining that which was good in that Ordination, they, moreover, had this Extraordinary, that God imployed them contrary to their Intentions who Ordained them, as being contrary to the Intention of Jesus Christ, the first Author of that Vocation. And this extraordinary Commission, he tells us, is nothing but the antient ordinary Charge; That an ordinary Charge may have an extraordinary Commission; as *Jeremie, Ezekiel, John Baptist*, having an ordinary Charge as Levites and Priests, were by God imployed in extraordinary Commissions. He shews, That the Reformers observed what was good in their bad ordinary Vocation, not from the Prelates who had Consecrated them, but from Jesus Christ and the Apostles, from whom these Callings were first derived; As when Water of a clear Spring comes to us through an unclean Channel, then Infection comes only from the Channel, but the Water it self comes from the Spring and first Original thereof, which coming thick and troubled to us, our Labour is commendable if we endeavour to make it run clear. 'Tis one thing, saith he, to have a Vocation by the Means and Ministry of the Church of *Rome*, and another thing (*N. B.*) to have it from the Church of *Rome*, and from her Authority. The Authority of the Calling comes from Jesus Christ and his Apostles, not from polluted Hands through which it is past. Buckler of the Faith, pag. 357, 358, 359, &c.

Profeß. Leid. Diss. 42. Thes. 39. Having asserted above, that the Election and Ordination of Pastors is proper to the whole Presbytery, they add this Limitation, that they speak of a Church fully constituted. *Nam ubi ejusmodi nondum est Ecclesia, ibi Negotium illud aliter, pro re nata, geri potest:* "For, where such a constituted Church is not as yet existent, in that case, this Affair may be otherwise managed, when Occasion offers. *Thes. 40.* They shew what are the parts of the Divinely instituted Pastor's Office, whereof our Lord has prescribed the Rules, *Jeſu.* "The pure Preaching of the Word according to the Scripture, the Lawful Use of Sacraments, and right Exercise of Discipline, *Mat. 28. 20. and 18. 17.* *Thes. 41.* They assert, "That the Vocation of some first Reformers, who Reformed the Church from Antichristian Superstition and Idolatry, was partly Ordinary, and partly Extraordinary; Ordinary, in so far as they were Ordained either in the *Roman*, or some Reformed Church; Extraordinary, in so far as they applied an Extraordinary Remedy to an Extraordinary Evil, and were therefore indowed with Extraordinary Gifts for this Extraordinary Function. *Thes. 42.* "But, if some of them Preached the Gospel of Christ to an Opposing Reclaiming People in the beginning of

' of the Reformation, without the previous Call of some certain
 ' Church, they were, for this Work of the Sacred Ministry, acted by
 ' the same Spirit, as was *Apollo*, and those of *Cyprus* and *Cyrene*, who
 ' are said to have Preached the Myſteries of Chriſt in the Synagogues
 ' of the Jews, and unto the Gentiles, tho' we no where read of their
 ' being Ordained to that Office by either Jews or Gentiles, or Apoſtles
 ' or Evangeliſts. — Tho' (*Theſ.* 43.) they were, by Apoſtles Ap-
 ' probation, by *Barnabas*, and other Diſciples of Chriſt, Confirmed in
 ' their Office, as we read *Acts* 11. 23. and 18. 27. *Theſ.* 44. " Where
 ' there is no Church exiſtent, Men called by God to Preach the Goſpel,
 ' can have no Call from Men ignorant of God, but God muſt be obey-
 ' ed in his immediate Miſſion, from the common Obligation to pro-
 ' mote his Kingdom, until they be eſtabliſhed in their begun Function,
 ' both by Conſent of the Church begun by themſelves, as alſo of the
 ' Neighbouring Brotherhood, or even of thoſe who are more remote,
 ' diſtinguiſhing clearly this Miſſion, tho' ſo termed, from that of Apoſtles.
 ' *Theſ.* 47. They aſſert " the Ordination and Call valid of ſuch of the
 ' firſt Paſtors as were Ordained, whether by Biſhops or Preſbyters, and that
 ' becauſe the Name and Office of Biſhop and Preſbyter is, *re & nomine*,
 ' in Name and Thing the ſame. *Ibid.* " In caſe of thoſe Ordained in
 ' the Church of *Rome*, they propoſe three diſverſe Cauſes to be conſider-
 ' ed, 1. God the principal Cauſe, the two leſs principal Cauſes the
 ' *Romiſh* Church, and the Biſhop. Shewing; " That, in ſo far as they
 ' were Ordained, tho' in the Name of the Adulterous Spurious Church
 ' by ſome Biſhop, yet, according to Divine Rule, to Preach the Goſpel, and
 ' adminiſter Sacraments, that, in this Senſe, and thus far, the Ordination
 ' was pure; But, in ſo far as they were Ordained, according to the Sta-
 ' tutes of the pope of *Rome*, to Say Maſs, Preach Humane Traditions,
 ' &c. in this reſpect, the Call was impure and unlawful, like Water
 ' flowing through an impure Stream, contracting the Filth of an im-
 ' pure Channel. *Theſ.* 49. " There's a Twofold Perſonal Succeſſion of
 ' Ordinary Paſtors, either continued from a Primitive Ordination of
 ' true Anteceſſors, or interrupted, Antichriſt uſurping upon the
 ' Church, has, in moſt places, taken away this firſt Succeſſion, the po-
 ' ſterior may be aſcribed to ſome, who, altho' not immediately ſucceed;
 ' ing Orthodox Doctōrs of the firſt Ages, yet, in point of Reformation
 ' of Corruptions, and Rejection of theſe Mercenaries, by the Help of
 ' the Pious Magiſtrate, have ſucceeded theſe pure Primitive Doctōrs,
 ' as Faithful Subjects of the true King are intruſted with Inſtauration
 ' and Miniſtration of Government, after it is liberated from the Slavery
 ' of a Tyrant, and his Tyrannizing Officers; Or, as the Reſtored
 ' Health

Health of the Body, when the Disease is over, follows upon the prior Health existing before the Disease. *Thes.* 50. "Hence true Pastors are to be discerned from Hirelings, not by a Continuance of Personal Succession, but of the true Doctrine; And the Hirelings are understood to be such, not from the Interruption of a Personal Succession, but the Interruption of pure Preaching of the Gospel. Thus far we have hinted the Judgment of the Learned University in this point. How consonant to the preceeding Testimony, is obvious.

The University of *Saumer* exprels themselves fully to the same Scope, [*de Minist. Evang. Vocat.*] having distinguished betwixt the *private Charitative*, and *Publick Official Ministerial Teaching*, as likewise the *Ordinary* and *Extraordinary Office*, and *Mission proper and peculiar to the Apostles, Prophets and Evangelists*, to which none did, nor could succeed (in this one Sentence and Account of their Judgment, overturning the whole Foundation and Scope of this Pamphlet): Having thus, we say, distinguished the Extraordinary from the Ordinary Vocation and Mission, communicated by the Apostles to their Successors, whom they placed *κατα πολειν* in single Churches founded by them, and by whom the Church was to be governed and propagated to the end of the World, they offer this Reason, why the Apostolick Vocation and Mission could not be reiterated, because, that, after the Apostles, no new Doctrine, new Gospel, nor new Worship of God, is to be expected in the Christian Church, and what Corruption the Church has contracted, is to be Reformed by the Ordinary Ministry. And, having discoursed of the Qualifications of the Ordinary Ministry, they add this Caution, *Thes.* 18. "That this is not to be so understood, as if a Ministry, thus described, were so simply and absolutely necessary in all respects, that there could be no Faith in any Case, no Preaching of the Gospel, no Church of Christ, no Christian People, where Officers or Teachers are not Constituted in such Order and Method, by such who have been installed in that Office, by a continued uninterrupted Succession from the Times of the Apostles, since the Efficacy of the Word and Sacraments depends not upon the State and Condition of Administrators, but flows from the Spirit's Efficacy concurring with their own Instituted Power. *Thes.* 26. They thus Answer the Popish Objection against the Call of Ministers of the Reformed Churches, as being *Schismatical*, "That granting the first Reformers had been private Men, and not Ordained by Popish Prelates, and had been clothed with no Authority of Preaching, to which their own History repugns, yet the disturbed State and Condition of these Times, (wherein Sincere Preachers could not be got Constituted by *Romish Prelates*) and the Law of Charity, ingag-

ing to do our outmost for the Safety of our Neighbour, gave them Authority to Preach the Gospel purely, to refute the Popish Errors, recover Men from them, to Constitute Churches, Institute a Ministry, for the Churches Edification, and Propagation of the Doctrine, for Purging Ecclesiastick Discipline from Errors and Abuses, and recalling and Restoring it to the first Apostolick Frame, they being thereto empowered by the Church and People whom they had converted; Comparing thereafter this Perturbed State of the Church, to that of a Kingdom, wherein Traiterous Inferiour Magistrates conspire to Dethrone their Lawful Prince, drawing Cities and Provinces into their Conspiracy, in which case, the Faithful Subjects are empowered to invade, oppose, yea, to expel such Traiterous Rulers, and use their best Endeavours to extinguish this Conspiracy, and reduce the Subjects to their Duty, altho', in this, they go beyond the Legal Order of their Station in the Kingdom's settled State and Condition. From *Thef.* 32. &c. They defend further the Actings and Ministry of the first Reformers, such as *Luther in Germany, Zuinglius in Helvetia*, with several others, as those in *England*, "from the Function where- with they were Authorized in the *Roman Church*, which respected the Preaching of the Gospel, and Administration of Sacraments, so that, in their Endeavours of Reformation, they did prosecute the Right and proper Use and End of their Vocation, acting according to the Law of Charity, and of a good Conscience, which they could not have omitted, without sinning grievously against God, against their Neighbour, against the Flocks committed to them.

To the same purpose the Learned *Turretin* has many things, *Part 3. Loc. 18. Quest 25.* upon that point of the Lawful Call of our first Reformers. Having shown, *Thef.* 1. "how zealously the Popish Party argue the Schismatical and Unlawful Ministry of the Reformers, upon the Ground of separating from them, he answers, *Thef.* 2. "That this is a false and preposterous Digression from the true Controversie betwixt the Reformers and them, which is anent the Truth of the Doctrine, without discussing whereof, the Truth of the Calling cannot be understood; That an Enquiry into the Lawful Vocation is fruitless and useless, if the Truth of the Doctrine be clear and apparent, because Faith depends not upon the Vocation, but, on the contrary, the Vocation upon Faith; Faith is not therefore true, because such as Preach it are lawfully called, but, on the contrary, they are lawfully called, who retain and propose the true Doctrine, (which last we are to understand with such well cautioned Limitations, as appears in the Series of his handling this Question); *Thef.* 4. Answering that

Objection of the Popish Party, " That there's no Hope of Salvation in a False Church, and that the Church is False, if the Mission be False or Counterfeit. He distinguisheth " A Mission which is False in Essentials, and in respect of the Doctrines which are propounded, and a Mission which is Illegitimate in Accidentals, and in respect of Rites and Ceremonies which could not be observed in the perturbed State of the Church, but yet are such, as are not Essential, either to the Ministry, or Church it self, neither are necessary for the Salvation of those who believe. The first, *saieth he*, argues a False Church, but not the other; Because it may be found in a Church that is True; &c. (Censuring, thus, and condemning our Querist's Impeachment of the Famous Mr. Bruce his Ordination, because wanting the Rite and Ceremony of *Imposition of Hands*). He further, *Thes.* 6, 7, 8, &c. distinguisheth " The Truth of the Vocation of our Reformers, with respect to these who were Called and Ordained by the Church of *Rome*, and of these who were Called by the Congregation of the Faithful without Pastors. And, for the first, he tells us, " We are to consider the Primary Author of the Vocation and Office, which is God, and the Secondary Instruments, and, accordingly, the Twofold End of the One and the Other; God's End being to propagate his Truth; Man's End the propagating the Papal Doctrine, which is wicked. He also distinguisheth, *Thes.* 8. " A Call which is in its own Institution false, tending primarily to the Propagation of Idolatry and Impiety; Another Call which is Holy and Just in point of Institution, but degenerated by Mens Abuse and Corruption. The first, *he holds*, is to be rejected; The second to be retained, and the Abuses removed. To this purpose he cites, *Thes.* 10. a remarkable Sentence of *Augustin*, *Lib.* 3. *de Baptismo*, *Cap.* 10. *Lumen Lampadis, vel Solis, non inquinatur, etsi transcat per loca canosa; parum interest, utrum Aqua per Canalem Lapideum, an per Argenteum deferatur. i. e.* " That the Light of a Lamp, or Sun Rays are not defiled, tho' they shine and pierce through dirty places, and that it matters not, whether the Canale conveying the Water be of Silver or of Stone. Shewing also, *Chap.* 7. " That the Word of God may have its Efficacy, tho' Preached by wicked Men. He shews also, " That the Orthodox Church received some Bishops, who had been Ordained by the *Arrians* and *Nestorians*, and owned them for true Pastors, upon Confession of the Truth, and Acknowledgment of their Errors, without any new Ordination; Citing *Socrates*, *Lib.* 2. *C.* 12. *Sozom.* *Lib.* 3. *C.* 4. *Theodoret*, *Lib.* 2. *C.* 30. 31. He shews, " That, as Baptism may be legitimate, or true, in an Heretical Church, so there may be a Mission among such as are not the True Church, tho'

retaining something thereof; Because Ministerial Mission is not deriv-
 ed from the Church, as from its Fountain and Principle, but from
 God, and sometimes by the Ministry of Men that are wicked, as it
 is of no Moment or Concern to the Success of the Seed sown, or
 of the Plant, whether the Sowing or Plantation be by clean or for-
 did Hands, if so be the Seed or Plant be good in it self, and the
 Ground fertile. He asserts, "That, in the Church of the Jews,
 when become Idolatrous, there was a Call still remaining; Adding,
Thes. 12. "That the Right and Title of Calling Pastors properly be-
 longing to the Church, when she loses Pastors, she cannot fall from
 her Right and Title, but may Exercise this her Authority by her self,
 and such to whom she shall Entrust this Right and Authority, to
 which she is obliged, not only in point of Right and Authority, but
 likewise, in respect of her Office and Duty, lest there should be a Fai-
 lure of a Ministry which Christ has instituted, not for some time on-
 ly, but, to continue to the end of the World, as the Mean of Faith
 and Salvation, *Matth. 28. 20. Eph. 4. 11, 12.* "Hence, saith he, *Thes.*
13. the Church of Rome being corrupted, both as to Faith and Wor-
 ship, Teachers turned Wolves, and Tyrannizing over the Church,
 from whom no Reformation could be expected, the Faithful Godly
 had, in this Case, a Right to erect Societies, purely to Preach the
 Gospel, and reject the Popish Errors. Wherein, he tells us, the Call
 of God did appear, and that from a Twofold Ground, 1. Of ine-
 vitable Necessity, for preserving of Truth, and seeing to the Salvation
 of our selves and others, lest Truth should perish out of the World,
 which being defiled by innumerable Errors in the Roman Church,
 (yea and these Soul-destroying Errors) the Rectors and Governours
 of that Church pursuing also with Fire and Sword all such as oppo-
 sed them, so far were they from putting a Helping Hand to Reform
 them, the Voice and Call of God himself imposed this Necessity upon
 the Faithful; And besides the general Command to owne and confess
 the Truth, and oppose Lies and Errors, which obliges all Men, and
 that in all times and places, they were under the Obligation of that
 special Command, *Rev. 18.* to come out of Babylon, to come out
 from among the Wicked and Erroneous, and be separated from them,
2 Cor. 6. 17. 2ly, This Call, as it did flow from the great and standing
 Ground of Love and Charity, so it was comprobated by, and had
 the Character of the Eminent Gifts bestowed upon the Reformers;
 Such as their profound Erudition, piercing Judgment, ardent Zeal,
 their singular Integrity of Life, and innumerable other Gifts, shining
 in them beyond and before others, proving them to be Vessels chosen
 of

of God for this Extraordinary Work. To which he adds "The stupendous and admirable Success, which God gave to their Labours, amidst the Contradiction and Opposition, the Violence, the Fraud and Cruelty of innumerable Adversaries. Hence he affirms, "The Call of these Reformers was both Ordinary and Extraordinary in divers respects. Ordinary, 1. In respect of the Office, being the same which was instituted by Christ and his Apostles to endure to the end. 2ly, In respect of the Doctrine, being the same taught by the Apostles. 3ly, In respect of the perpetual and indispensible Right of professing Truth, and rejecting Error, to follow Jesus Christ the true Shepherd, and reject false Prophets; A Right competent both to Pastors and People. Yet also was it Extraordinary, with respect to the Manner and Rites then usual, as not proceeding in that Method. He also distinguisheth betwixt the Erecting of a *New Ministry*, and *Reforming of a Corrupt Ministry* already instituted; Asserting, that tho' the Church has no Right in the first, yet she hath in the second, because obliged to preserve a pure Ministry. Hence he shews, that the Call which our Reformers had in the Church of *Rome*, in respect of the *Ministry Ordaining*, was Antichristian, but Christian and Legitimate, in respect of *God the Author*; That the Church of God, while a Lawful Ministry is vigent, ought to make use of the same for the Call of Pastors in the ordinary Method, but in Case of the want of a Ministry, or the miserable Corruption thereof, she may chuse Ministers to her self for her own Edification, without the Intervention of a Ministry, both because she hath such a Right from God, as likewise, because she is obliged to preserve a Ministry, in all times and places, for the Instruction and Edification of the Faithful. Neither, saith he, can it be said, that God has not expressly excepted such Extraordinary Cases, to Legitimate the Communication of the Pastoral Office another way than by the ordinary Ministry, and that therefore this cannot lawfully be done, because that God having once instituted a Ministry in his Church, which ought to endure to the end of the World, he has given to his Church a sufficient Right for *preserving the same*, and for *Reforming and Raising it up again*, if it be Corrupt and Extinct; So that this needs no New Command: Likeas, the Command he has given to the Church, and to the Faithful, for preserving the Truth, obliges her to Reform her self, when she has made Defection from the Truth, the same Command comprehending both the *Conservation* and *Restauration* of Truth. As, in the Civil Society, saith he, 'tis absurd to question every Man's Vocation, to see to his Affairs and his Life, and flee what is noxious to his Health and Safety; So, in a Religious Society, 'tis alike absurd,

furd, to question the Right which the Faithful have, and their Vocation and Calling to profess the true Faith, to worship God purely, and reject what ever is inconsistent with Faith and pure Worship, and which stands in Oppp^sition to their Spiritual Life and Safety, since this Obligation, whereby every one is to promote his own Salvation, flows from the *Nature of the Thing it self*, and the *Command of God* imposing the same. See *Thes.* 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14, 15, 16, &c.

If it be objected, that the premised Acknowledgments of a Lawful Mission in the Church of Rome, for the Substantials thereof, will infer, that it is a true Church, even under the Pope's Authority and Influence, at least as to the Main, and that, therefore, there was no Ground of Separation from the same, which seems to impeach the Doctrine and Practice of our Reformers; Besides what may be Answered from the premised Accounts of this Matter, we may see this further cleared in what is offered by the Famous *Vectius, Deſper. Cauſa Papat. Lib. 2. Sect. 1. Cap. 6.* Where he thus shews the Conſequence to be foolish and absurd in this parallel Instance, *Sub Tyranno uſurpante aut abutente aliqua eſt vera Populi Politia, &c.* Ergo, *Tyrannis & Factio Tyrannica ſola eſt Legitima Politia. i. e.* "Under a Tyrant uſurping or abuſing his Power, there is ſomething of true Policy or Government remaining among the People, and the Exerciſe thereof among the Officers of State, ſomething of Juſtice in the Adminiſtration of Judges, therefore the Tyrant and the Tyrannical Faction is the only Lawful Policy, and Tyranny is Juſtice. Notwithſtanding he admits this Conſequence, in the Caſe of our Reformers. *In & ab illa Eccleſia habuerunt Vocationem, &c.* "In and by that Church (of Rome, ſcil.) they had their Vocation or Call, therefore there was therein remaining ſomething of a true Church, and of a Miniſtery, altho' polluted; As *Iſrael*, ſaith he, and *Judah* polluted with Idolatry, ſo that God called them *Ethiopianſ*, and People of *Gomorrah*, for their Abominations, yet had ſomething of a Church remaining, and, in reſpect of the Covenant, and the Confederate Ones among them, are called God's People, and their Children his Sons, *Ezek. 16. 21.* He alſo diſtinguiſheth, (in Correſpondence to what is above aſſerted) *Lib. 2. Sect. 2. Cap. 8.* betwixt the *True and Eſſential Acts* of Eccleſiaſtick Function, and the *Superadded Inventions of Men*, as we are to diſtinguiſh the parts of the Body from an adherent Diſeaſe, ſo the Vocation it ſelf, which is derived from Chriſt unto us, from the Papal Corruptions, as we are to diſtinguiſh the corrupt Exerciſe of the Will and Underſtanding, from the Vital or Eſſential Actings of both. See ſeveral uſeful Diſtinctions in this point in

Mr.

Mr. Rutherford's *Examen Arminianismi*, Pag. 65, 66, and in Mr. Brown's *Confutation of Velthoufius*, Pag. 149.

Our Famous and Learned Mr. Gillespie, in his Treatise of Miscellany Questions, Chap. 4. pag. 62, 63, 64. upon the point of the Necessity of Ordination, has several things worthy of Observation to this purpose. "He shews, that Ordination being one of the Ordinances of Christ, the Reformed Churches had Power to set it up, and restore it, by vertue of Christ's own Institution. And suppose, that Protestant Ministers, who first Ordain'd other Ministers, were themselves Ordain'd by such as had no Power to Ordain them; Nay, suppose the first Reforming Ministers to have been, at the beginning of the Reformation, no Ministers, but private Persons, not pretending to be Ordained; This impeaches not the necessity of Ordination, because in extraordinary Cases, when Ordination cannot be had, and there are none who have Commission and Authority from Christ to Ordain them, (he means a legal Authority and Commission, according to the common and ordinary Gospel Rules in a constituted Church) then and there an Inward Call from God enlarging the Heart, stirring up, and assisting, with the good Will and Assent of a People whom God makes willing, can make a Minister Authorized to Ministerial Acts. Suppose this to have been the Case at the first coming out from Popery, yet here was a Seed for more Churches and more Ministers. He tells us, that at the first Plantation of Churches, Ordination may be wanting, without making void the Ministry, because Ordination cannot be had; But in Constituted Churches, the want of Ordination doth make a Minister no Minister.

"Again, touching the Church of Rome, and the Ordination of the Reformers therein, he Homologats what is premised anent the Essentials of a Church, and of Ordination, where such Essentials are supposed. Because that *Antichrist sits in the Temple of God*, consequently there is a Temple supposed wherein he sits, 2 Thes. 2. 4. And God is supposed to have a People in Babylon, when he says, *Come out of her my People*, Rev. 18. 4. And one Thousand two Hundred and sixty Days wherein the Witnesses do Prophecy in Sackcloth, do certainly comprehend, as a part of this time, those Ages before the Reformation, and a Faithful Existent Successive Ministry therein. He also shews, that Papiists, as well as Protestants, hold the perpetuity of the true Church and Ministry, tho' not ever Visible or alike pure, and that upon Christ's Word, Matth. 28. 20. *Lo I am with you always, even to the end of the World*. Hence he concludes, that such as were Ordained by the Church

‘ Church of *Rome* before the Reformation, in so far as Ordained in the
 ‘ Name of Christ, by these who had been themselves Ordained, (N. B.)
 ‘ Presbyters as well as Bishops, and Authorized to Preach the Gospel
 ‘ and Administer the Sacraments, thus far they were true and lawful
 ‘ Ministers, truly and lawfully Ordained : But in so far as Ordained
 ‘ according to the Popish Canons for Teaching the Traditions of the
 ‘ Church of *Rome*, for Offering up the Body of Christ in the Mass, in
 ‘ this consideration their Calling and Ordination was impure and un-
 ‘ lawful, like pure Water flowing out of a clean Fountain, which con-
 ‘ tracts impurity from a filthy Channel through which it runs. We
 might multiply to a voluminous bulk the Testimonies of Protestant
 Divines asserting what is premised, and concurring in this Sense and
 Judgment, in point of a Ministerial Call ; But what is offered is sufficient
 for our purpose.

From what is above offered, the futility and unserviceableness of this
 grand Notion and Argument of our Pamphleter evidently appears.
 For clearing which, these things are obvious in this premised Sense of
 our Divines upon this point. 1. That the *Essentials of Ordination*, and of
 a Church, are distinguished from *Corruptions adhering thereunto*, and even
 with respect to Ordination in the Church of *Rome*. 2^{ly}, Hence the
 true and proper End of Ordination, and the Obligation, consequently,
 in point of Duty, resulting therefrom, is to be measured by God’s Insti-
 tution, which is prosecuted by the Person Ordained ; Notwithstand-
 ing that both the *Corruptions* adhering to this Ordination, as likewise the
corrupt Ordainers themselves, are in so far to be disowned, yet such
 Ministers are owned of God, as his true Pastors, in prosecuting the End
 of his Call. 3^{ly}, Whatever may be said as to a *Personal Succession*, or
 Series of Ordainers from Apostles, (which tho’ supposed, as the two
 Witnesses Prophecy during Antichrist’s Reign, is notwithstanding,
 as our Arguer acknowledges, hard to be traced) yet this *Personal Succe-*
ssion is, in the Sense of our Divines, neither *the only*, nor *main ground* of
 the lawful Vocation or Ordination ; But the true grounds are, 1. *God’s*
Appointment and Institution of a Ministry in it self considered. And,
 2^{ly}, The *Doctrinal Succession*, or the Official Propagation of the sincere
 Doctrine of the Gospel, by a faithful Gospel Ministry.

4^{ly}, We see, that as they hold a Distinction betwixt the Fountain
 and primary Author and Institution of a Gospel Ministry, and the
 impure Channel of either usurping Administrators, or adventitious
 Corruption introduced ; So they hold the Pastors or Presbyters, *i. e.*
 a Teaching Ministry to be the proper Administrators, by God’s Appoint-
 ment, of this Ordination, and therein Successors of Apostles and the
 first

first Apostolical Rulers, viz. in the Churches ordinary settled regular state, disowning, in so far, Prelats sole assumed Authority herein. 5ly, We see, that they distinguish a Church *already Constituted*, according to Gospel Rules, and a Church *in fieri* and to be constituted, or the Ordinary Case thereof and the Extraordinary; Asserting, that in the first Case, the ordinary appointed Method of a Call is to be observed, in the other Case not, but the defect of, or not following these Rules is made up and supplied by the Law of *inevitable Necessity*, which in many Cases overrules positive Statutes, in the Judgment of all the Orthodox, as is clear in our Lord's adduced Instance of *David's* eating the Shew-bread, and giving thereof to those that were with him *. And several such Instances may be adduced. * *Matth. 12. 3, 4. with Luke 6. 4.*

'Tis also evident, that in the premised Judgment of our Divines, this Defect is made up by the overruling Law of *Love and Charity*, binding to contribute our Help for our own and our Neighbour's Good, especially their Souls well, which is fitly Exemplified (as above) by the Case and Instance of Loyal Subjects, stepping beyond the Sphere of their legal Vocations in opposing traitorous Magistrats, and endeavouring the Restauration of the Laws, and the lawful Princes Authority inroached upon. 6ly, We see, they maintain a *Radical Power* in the Church of God and Society of the Faithful, in point of Ordination, and in order to the Retaining and Restauration of that Ordinance and others from Corruptions, and that, consequently, when there is an Interruption and Removal of a lawful Ministry and legal Ordainers, in that extraordinary Case, God's Church and People may Call them whom he has Gifted to Officiat, till a Gospel Ministry being obtained, the Call and Ordination may run in its ordinary Channel, as, in the instanced Case of a Nation's Rebellion in the point of Civil Government, is evident. The *Salus Populi* and preservation of Society being the Supreme and *standing Law*, which has its clear Application to the Church in Religious Respects. So that Ordination it self, however in the Churches ordinary settled State necessary, yet in the other Case may be wanting, and that warrantably, and is not so absolutely and in every Case necessary, or of such indispensable necessity, as this Arguer would suggest.

Moreover, we see, that as they distinguish Ordination *in its Essentials*, from its *accessory concomitant Rituals*, and the design of the Call it self, and of the Ordainers, so likewise they hold, that a Call may be, upon divers accounts, both Ordinary and Extraordinary: Ordinary in respect of Essentials, Extraordinary with respect to special Influences, a special

Special Work, singular Gifts, and correspondent Success, Sealing the Special Call and Commission of the Lord Jesus Christ the Great and Primary Ordainer.

From all which, our Pamphleter's supposed doughty Argument appears a meer nothing and empty vanity, and is easily retorted upon his pretended Judicious Episcopal Champion. For, suppose the first Presbyters to be Ordained by Bishops, (which, notwithstanding, cannot be admitted as to all) and that the Ordination was valid as to Essentials, Ordination it self being an Ordinance coming from Jesus Christ, which in so far is essentially Pure, this will no more plead for owning all the Corruptions and Usurpations of Prelacy, than the Ordination of several of our first Reformers in the Church of Rome, designed by Ordainers to support the Pope's blasphemous Headship, Hierarchy, and Idolatry, will bear the Conclusion and Inference of an Obligation upon them to have owned and asserted the same.

But our Arguer, *Pag. 47, 48.* assaults us with a doughty Argument of a tripartite Division of Absurdities (a dangerous Cerberus, no doubt): *Either the first Presbyters of Presbyterian Principles Ordained after the Reformation had their Orders from Bishops, and thus must own their ordaining Power. Or, 2ly, were impowr'd to Act as Presbyters by the Call and Suffrage of the People. Or, 3ly, By an inward Impulse, or inward Call. Upon the first he thus Argues; If they acted by the Ordination of Bishops, then, if the Bishops did not give these first Presbyters a Power of Ordaining other Presbyters by Presbyters alone without a Bishop, those first Presbyters had no such Power; for they could have no more, greater, or fuller Power than they received from their Authors; and if they had not that Power because they got it not from their Authors, they could not give it, because they had it not to give, &c.*

I Answer, 1. In the Sense of our Divines, these Prelats had an Ordaining Power as Presbyters, not as Prelats. **2ly,** That the Power and Authority it self is Christ's (the glorious Fountain of all Church Power), tho' coming through that impure Channel, and not properly the Prelates. Christ is the proper primary Ordainer, who confers the Power and Authority, for the Ends of this Institution intended by him; So that the Power or Authority received by the fit Recipient, is properly owing to him, and from him flows the Obligation to prosecute the Ends thereof: So that, there is no Relation, in this Case, of Subjection to the Instrument and Mean of conveyance, but in Subordination and Subserviency to his Authority and End, who is the first Institutioner.

But says our Arguer (presenting herein his formidable second Absurdity), *If this be not admitted, (scil. the receiving of the Power from the*

the Prelats, in his Sense) then these Ministers were impowered to Act by the Call and Suffrage of the People. I Answer, this his Division, and Discretive [If] has no place, admitting the *Essentials of Ordination*, in the Case instanced. 2ly, We see it maintained by our Divines, that there may be a Case, wherein the Call and Suffrage of the People may stand for an Ordination, and supply its room; And in the Case supposed by him, the Call and Suffrage of the People impowers for a due Improvement and Exercise of the Ordination for its proper Ends, in opposition to the Design and other Corruptions of the Prelatical Ordination.

But our Arguer hath a third [If], or Absurdity, which he presents to us upon the premised Supposition, telling us, *That if neither of the two be admitted, then such Presbyterian Ministers must betake them to an inward Impulse and Call.* But good Sir, what if all these be supposed in our first Reformers conjoyn'd, consequently in the Presbyterian Ministers instanced; What is then become of these your Disjunctive Branches? So that we assert, that our first Reformers Ordination was valid for substance, consequently that of Presbyterian Ministers by Prelats, likewise corroborated and fitted for its due Exercise and Design by the Peoples Call, whose Interest in this point is fully asserted by our Divines. See Mr. Gillespie's *Treatise of Miscellany Questions*, Chap. 2. pag. 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21. Where this is fully made appear, not only from Scripture, but also from the Judgment of Protestant Churches and Writers, and likewise from Antiquity, yea and the Confession of Adversaries themselves, and our difference from the Independents in this point cleared. Thus in the Case of our first Reformers; And for Presbyterian Ministers, he knows how our Presbyterian Church and State has owned and Authorized the Peoples Call. And if there be an Exception made as to some Ministers Relation before this was legally Authorized by our State; 'Tis easily Answered, that the Peoples cordial Submission to their Ministry, sufficiently supplies the room thereof. And for the *inward Impulse*, 'tis very well subservient to the other two, being all together, or in conjunction, a clear Badge of the Divine Call. And we find, that in the Churches disturbed oppressed Case, our Divines do hold the last two a sufficient Call to Officiat, distinguishing still the *Ecclesia constituta* and *constituenda*, her Ordinary and Extraordinary Case and State.

From what is premised, our Arguer's great Projection, and Strength of this his Argument *ab absurdis*, is sufficiently exposed, and the unserviceableness thereof to his design discovered. But to clear this Truth, and scann a little further this his supposed formidable Attack he hath

made upon Presbyterians ; Whereas he tells us, *That Ordaining Bishops gave Presbyters no Power to Ordain alone without them, so that Presbyters could not derive that to others which they had not themselves, and pretending to Ordain without a Power received so to do, the pretence is vain and sinful in the pretender, and useless in the supposed Receiver.* And in a further eruption of his ignorant Anger, he tells us of a damnable inconveniency this doth expose us unto, viz. *That this forgery in the pretended giver may come to cheat an otherwise Innocent Man, who thinks himself entituled hereby to Act as a Pastor.* The mischievous effects of which cheat, he tells us, are of dangerous Consequence to such as think they receive Sacraments from them. Adding, pag. 48. *That if all this Reasoning be sound, right and true, he would gladly know, how Presbyterians, at this time of day, have come either by any kind of Orders, or Power of conveying them.* And upon this he is bold to Challenge all who live in our Communion, to Examine whether they are thus in Communion with our blessed Lord, and if they find they are not, which upon too many and too strong Arguments, he tells us, he mightily Questions, then 'tis madness for them to continue therein any longer. Thus Pag. 49. In Answer to this, I shall not retaliat, in telling him, that this his bantering foolish Confidence, upon such silly grounds as we have heard, wants not some tincture of phrentick Humour ; Only I may be bold to begin with two little Criticisms further upon this his Argument and Discourse. 1. Whereas he founds this his premised Charge upon an *If*, scil. *If all his Reasoning be sound and true ;* He would mind the common Rule and Maxim. *Conditionalis nihil ponit in re ;* And if all his great Reasonings be found Unsound and Untrue, (and from what is said this is evident) then the Charge and Impuration upon Presbyterians, which we have heard, must needs come under the Censure of a most unaccountable Calumny, to give it no worse Name. 2ly, Whereas he calls his preceeding Arguments, and others which his Wisdom keeps up, *too strong Arguments*, I must mind him of another Maxim well suiting his judicious Consideration, that *Argumentum quod nimium probat nihil probat*, as indeed his premised Notions are found to level against the Protestant Doctrine, Churches, and Ministry, as well as that of the Church of Scotland, which in his *juvenile*, or rather *puerile confidence* he doth thus Attack and Reproach. But in the next place, I must again mind him, that 'tis long since he might have seen this Argument offered by Papists, and shot out of Popish Guns against the Reformation, and is alike successful with him and his Foreleaders in this Notion. 'Your Ministers, say the Popish Pleadars, were Ordained in the 'Catholick Church, had their Office from Bishops Authorized by the 'Popes Holiness, to be subservient to him as the Churches Head, to hold

'hold that Catholick Union, not to make a Breach, and set up a new
'Schismatical Heretical Church of their own forging : And since they
'never had such a Power, or of such a Nature, and for such an End,
'how could they Exercise such an Office, and give to others what
'they had not themselves? Now let our Arguer consider the Prote-
stant Answers above set down, and Answer himself. But, 2^{ly}, more
directly I Answer, as we must in general distinguish the *Conditio operis*,
and *intentio operantis*, the Condition of the Work, and Intention of the
Doer ; So, in this case, that which is the proper and genuine End of
Ordination it self, according to its native essential primary Institution,
and what may be the *personal Design of the Administrator*, or his corrupt
arrogated Authority therein. The Design of the Ordination of Pastors
is to set apart, and Authorize them to Preach the Gospel, Administrate
Sacraments, and in their Capacity to Exercise Church Discipline ;
The Power of Order and Jurisdiction being inseparably connected in
this Office. Hence, 3^{ly}, The Pastor receiving this Power to be de-
rived to Successors, he is necessarily supposed Cloathed with Ordaining
Authority and Power in Association with Fellow Pastors, the Consistorial
Meeting being, according to Scripture, the proper Subject of this
Power, so that they have this Authority from the Fountain of all
Power, Jesus Christ. When he says, *they got it not from their Authors*,
he speaks Ignorantly, this Authority having no Author but *Jesus Christ*,
the only Lord and Head of his Church, the only Master of the Family,
of whom the whole Family in Heaven and Earth is
*Named ** ; All Men, even Apostles, being, in Gospel * *Eph. 3. 15.*
Administrations, *Servants, Ministers, and Stewards* †, † *Mat. 23. 8.*
under this One Head of the Church, having a Subaltern I *Cor. 4. 1.*
Authority therein under him, and, in the Duties and with *Chap. 3.*
Exercise thereof, accordingly answerable to him. What 5.
he adds of a *conveyance by Suffrage of the People, or by in-*
ward Impulse, has been already touched, and in what case either the one
or the other is valid.

But here we may offer some Retortions to our Arguer upon this No-
tion. 1. Since his first Prelats, at, or before the Reformation, were
Ordained in the Manner, and for the End mentioned, suppose the
Popish Churches Accusation above touched, viz. *That these Bishops*
falsifie their Ordination, as to its Nature, End, and Design. Let him shew,
whether these Bishops, in the Exercise of their Authority in point of
Ordination, gave a Power which they had not from their Authors or
Popish Ordainers, and for an End not designed by them in their Or-
daining Protestant Ministers, and whether this pretence is not vain

and sinful in the Pretender, and useless to the supposed Receiver. Whatever way he acquit himself in this Retorsion, he will therein see the folly of his Objection. 2ly, He doth in this cross Bishop *Spotswood*, and that honest Set of Bishops introduced by King *James*. When some of our chief Prelats in King *James's* time were Ordained in *England*, that they might Consecrat the rest of their Tribe in this Nation, it may be inquired, whether, in his Principles, both the one and the other ought not to have been Ordained first Presbyters, having never been so before, since they were Ordained only by Pastors or Presbyters without Bishops, so that their Ordination, according to his Sense and Pleading, was null, because these Pastors could not give them that Ministerial Authority which they had not themselves; And thus, according to our Pasquiller's mighty Reasoning and angry Inference, their Pastoral Authority was sinful in the pretended Authorizer and Ordainer, and useless to the Receiver. And upon this ground, Bishop *Andrews* pressed, according to our Arguer's Principle, the Ordaining of them first Presbyters who were thus Consecrated in *England*; But Bishop *Spotswood*, and other *English* Prelats withstood the Motion, owning them to have been

Pastors before, consequently the validity of their Presbyterian Ordination*. Now, here is a hard Case for our Arguer; He must either Censure and Condemn Bishop *Spotswood*, and all these *English* Prelats, as crossing the Rules of Ordination in this point, or condemn and baffle

his own Notion and Argument. 3ly, What will he say of our Conforming Clergy in King *Charles II's* Reign, who were Ordained by Presbyters only? Were they lawful Pastors; And were all their previous, yea and subsequent Ministerial Acts lawful, or not? If he hold the first, he will own and assert the validity of Presbyterian Ordination, and condemn his own Argument. If he give the negative Answer, which he must needs do, if consistent with himself, he will nullifie all their Ministerial Acts, Preaching, Baptizing, &c. since he cannot say they were Reordained. At least, this will uncontrovertibly hold good with respect to all their Ministerial Acts before Prelacy's Establishment, and their Conformity thereunto. Yea, and supposing our Arguer to have been Baptized by one of such, or by a Presbyterian Minister, he must (in correspondence to his Principle and Medium) hold his Baptism to be Null, and that he stands obliged to be Re-baptized.

For what he adds of *Jerom*, in his Epistle to *Euagrius*, and from that other Passage, *Quid Aaron & Filii fuerunt in Templo, &c.* What *Aaron and his Sons were in the Temple, Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons in* the

the Church, assume to themselves, to evince his Suffrage for Prelacy, is sufficiently Answered by the Author whom the Querist mentions, and by several others; Jerom, in that very Epistle, evincing from Scripture the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter; So that he will make him palpably to contradict himself, in asserting this Distinction contrary to Scripture. And, for the Subordination of Church Officers exemplified in the Instance exhibited, it doth not, in the least, cross this his Judgment.

For what he adds of *Calvin, Inst. Lib. 4. C. 4.* there needs no more to evince his Forgery, than the reading of that fourth Book, and comparing *Chapp. 4. and 6.* together, with his Comment. upon *Phil. 1. 1. Tit. 1. 5, 6, 7. Acts 20. 28.* Wherein 'tis evident, that he holds, that the Ordinary Officers which Christ instituted, and the Apostolick Churches Practice Warrants, were *Bishops, Elders, and Deacons*, identifying the Bishop's and the Pastor's Office; And that *Evangelists were fixed in no Station.* Thus, on *Tit. 1. 5.* Which breaks the Force of the pretended Episcopal Instalment of *Timothy and Titus.* Moreover, he asserts, that there is *One Episcopacy*, which is Christ's alone, whereof every Minister of the Gospel hath an intire and equal Share. *Inst. Lib. 4. C. 3. § 14.* Thus also, on *Eph. 4. 11.* Further he maintains, *That, as every Pastor, de jure, owes a Subjection to the Prophets in the Lord, so the first προεσβιτες, or fixed Moderators, were, de facto, thus subject, and, by consequence, had no Juridical Official Pre-eminence over the Judicatories; That all Pastors have equal Right in Ordination, and have all one and the same Official Power and Function, to which they are called of God.* *Inst. Lib. 4. C. 4. § 2.* compared with Comment. on *Phil. 1. 1.* That Apostles, as well as Evangelists, Timothy and Titus, had a transient unfixed Ministry, whose Office lay in Founding and Watering Churches, and thus died with themselves, and could not incroach upon the Consistorial, and Decisive Authority of Pastors in Government. Comment. on *Tit. 1. 5, 6. 1 Cor. 12. 28, &c.* See the Counter-Essay, *Chap. 1. Pag. 1, 2, 3.* Now, whether Calvin, in the premised Doctrine and Assertions, has not condemned and sent a packing the Prelacy, which our Arguer and the Querist so zealously Fences for, yea, and razed the Ground of their Pleading, let the impartial and unprejudicated Reader judge.

Thus, Sir, having examined the *Queries*, and likewise this your Grand Argument for Prelacy, the Projection and Issue thereof, I must take leave to resume and summ up these Reflections upon the whole of that which I have debated and offered upon this Head, and therein give you a compendious further Account of the Weakness, yea, and Unfound-

270 *A Confutation of an Additional Pamphlet ; Entituled,*
soundness of this your Defence of the Hierarchy, and Attack upon
Presbyterians.

THE Occasion and Ground of offering these Queries, (if, at least, we may suppose you the Author thereof, as 'tis probably judged by all who have perused them) your commending Prefacer shews to be your reading Mr. Ferrester at St. Andrews his *Plea for Presbytery*, which Ground is also prefixed to the Account of the Titles of Chapters, and in special asserted in the Title of *Chap. VI.* And yet 'tis evident to any who but reads that Treatise, that you have never so much as perused, far less seriously pondered that Piece ; The greatest part, if not the whole of all that's offered in these Queries, or the Grand Argument founded thereupon, being fully cleared, discussed and answered in that Piece which you so villifie : So that the People in *that Countrey Place*, with whom your Prefacer tells us, *that Performance did take*, and whom it influenced to a Perswasion of what was contained therein, may truly wonder at this your silly Attack, as favouring more of procacious Vanity, than any Desire of Knowledge, and Love of Truth.

2ly, Your Prelatick Bigotry has so transported you, as to deny all lawful Ordination, and a true Gospel Ministry in the Reformed Churches, who disowne the present *English* Hierarchy, yea, and (in the Scope and Series of your Reasoning) the Liturgy and Ceremonial Worship thereof also ; For you term that Church emphatically, and in exclusive Sense, *The church*, putting the odious Name of *Sectaries* upon all who disowne either the one or the other. But, Sir, may you be informed, how, in this, you have involved your self, 1. You have stained your Loyalty, in casting a foull Blot upon King *James VI.* and the Two King *Charles's* ; For King *James*, in the Assembly at *Edinburgh 1590*, acknowledged in their presence, *That our Presbyterian Church was one of the best Reformed in the World* ; Yea, in the Preface to the latter Edition of his *ΒΑΣΙΛΙΚΗ ΔΕΡΟΝ*, he casts this Aspersion upon the *English* Prelacy, *That it savoured of the Romish Hierarchy* : Yea, he called their *Lyturgy an ill said Mass, wanting nothing but the Listings.* And for King *Charles I.* your selves acknowledge, that, having consented to the razing of Prelacy, and the full Establishment of Presbyterian Government in the Parliament *Anno 1641*, he professed to depart from the same a contented King from a contented People, promising, in verbo Principis, to maintain that Establishment. And, for King *Charles II.* 'tis notourly known, how that by solemn and reiterated Promises, yea, and by Oath, and that deliberately, he engaged Adherance to the Government of this Church, avowing, he did this from a Principle of Perswasion and Conscience,

science, and not upon any byass'd and extrinsick Ground. Now, what a Stain doth this your Principle of the Church of *England*, as the only True Organized Gospel Church, in point of *Worship and Government*, put upon these Princes; A Stain, I say, of unprecedented Falshood, Pusillanimity, Treacherous Dealing with God and Men, such as may stain and make their Memory unfavoury, which, sure, all your Party will profess to disowne and abhor, who do honour, even almost to a non *ultra* of Superstitious Fondness, the Memory of these Princes; Whereof, besides many other evident Testimonies, yea, and Recorded Testimonies, with respect to all the Three, let (in special) your Harrangues and Sermons on *January 30*, the Day of King *Charles's* Celebrated Martyrdom, bear Witness. 2ly, You have been told, how that the most Famous *English* Bishops, yea, and Reformed Bishops in *Henry the VIII's* Time, yea, and in the Days of Queen *Elizabeth*, and King *James*, do disowne the *Jus Divinum* of the *English* Hierarchy, affirming Church Government to be Mutable and Ambulatory, and to depend upon the Prince's Authority and Disposal. And 'tis known, that, until about the time of Bishop *Laud* his high flying Usurpations, the *Jus Divinum* was never so much as pretended, far less pleaded, as the Ground of Prelacy. I need not again refuse to you, what your own *Stillingsfleet* has asserted, *Iren.* Pag. 391. 392, &c. anent the Assertion and Principle of the Bishops in the Days of *Cranmer*, who, together with the Arch-Bishop, gave their subscribed Testimony to the King, in Answer to the 10th. and 11th. Questions, *That the Bishop and Priest were both One Office, in the beginning of Christ's Religion.* Asserting thus, (Mr. Querist, or Arguer, which you will) that your Religion and Principles, in this point, are another, and distinct, from that of our Lord Jesus. Need I tell you of *Jewel* Bishop of *Salisbury*, his peremptory owning the same Identity of the Bishop's and Pastor's Office, and that, by the Scriptures of God, the Bishop and Minister are all one, citing *Chrysostom*, *Jerom*, and others, as of the same Judgment. [Defence of his Apol. Pag. 121. compared with Pag. 448.] That *Hooker* also [Preface to his *Eccles. Pol.* pag. 2, 19, 20.] is against all particular Forms of Church Government, acknowledging, that nothing can be produced from Scripture, to evince the Divine Warrant of Diocesan Prelacy. So that your great Advocate *Hooker* has, at one dash, expunged, and sent a packing all your pretences for the Divine Right of Prelacy, and Pleadings from the Apostolick Office, as meer Antiscriptural Dotages and Fooleries. But more of your Party yet, you shall find, put this Censure upon your Pleadings. *Whitgift* [Def. of Apol. Pag. 372. compared with Pag. 433.] disownes the Churches Obligation to adhere to that same kind of External Government, that was used in the Apostles Times,

and that it ought to be one and the same through the World in all times and places. Thus the Venerable Arch-Bishop puts the Censure of a petulant Officious Schismatick upon you, who are bold to asperse as *Sectaries*, and none of *Christ's Peculium*, the Churches who disowne your English

Hierarchy in point of Government. Dr. Burnet. the present Bishop of Salisbury *, acknowledges the Pastor, as such, to be the highest Office in the Church, and that the Bishop and Presbyter are one and the same Office; And thus has pronounced your Que-

ries and Arguings from the Apostles, as a meer Dottage and Brain-sick Antiscriptural Notion: For, if the Pastor or Presbyter be the highest Office of the Church, you, nor no Man else, can doubt, he is the proper Successor of the Apostles; And what is then become of that high Class and Set of Succedaneous Prelates succeeding them in the full Plenitude of their Power, such as the Universality and Indefiniteness of their Commission, &c. which you assert? Shall I tell you further, that Bishop Lighton offered to the Dissenting Brethren at Passey, that all Church Affairs should be managed in Presbyteries and Synods, by the free Vote of Presbyters, or the Major part of them. So that, in your Principles, he was a false Priest, (to use your own Term)

* Query turn'd
to an Argument,
Pag. 38.

in thus laying an Ax to the Root of your Arbitrary Hierarchy. You make the Presbyterians * to joyn Issue with Papists, and to Patronize the Popish Cause, in denying the first Apostles to be succeeded in any Power they had above Presbyters. But, has

not your Bishop of Salisbury, with your other Advocates, denyed this, and censured your Folly in this Assertion? I may not here again, at large, resume what is animadverted upon your Assertion, anent the Council of Trent's disowning the Divine Right of Episcopacy: But, when you have understood better the State and Progress of that Council, and the Principles of the Popish Agents, both before, at that time, and since, you will embrace the contrary Perswasion, and see your Error. As for the Council it self, you will find, that, *Sess. 23. Ch. 4.* The Holy Synod declares, that, beside other Ecclesiastick Orders, Bishops, who succeed in the place of the Apostles, (remark, Sir, their owning your great Topick, and patronizing your Argument, and what Venerable patrons you have) belong principally to this Hierarchick Order, and are Ordained, as saith the Apostle, by the Holy Ghost, to Rule the Church of God, and are superiour to Presbyters. Yea further, you'll find them thus let flie their Thunder-bolt of their Anathema's against the contrary Doctrine. *If any say, there is no Hierarchy constituted by Divine Ordination in the Catholick Church, which consists of Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons, let him be Accursed. Again, If any say, that Bishops are not superiour to Presbyters, let him be Accursed.* Thus, *Can. 6. and 7.* Behold, Sir, what a mighty Guard surround you.

your Queries and Argument: And who dare stand before these terrible Thunder-Claps of a whole Council fortifying your Doctrine. *Bellarmin* is clear in this point *, affirming, *That the Bishop is* * *De Cler. C. 14.* *superiour to a Presbyter by Divine Right, both in respect of the Power of Order and Jurisdiction*; Ascribing the contrary Doctrine to *Aërius, Wicklef, the Lutherans and Calvinists*. So the *Romanists* generally; *Maldonat, Tolet, on Luke 10. Lorin, on Acts 2. 13. Baylins, Catech. Controv. Tract. 2. Quæst. 22. &c.* 3ly, What will you say to both your *Scottish and English Bishops*, who, in a baffling Contradiction to your bold Assertion, do owne the *Validity of Presbyterian Ordination*, which, in your perverse Humour, you are bold to call a meer Nullity, if not a Cheat? Shall I tell you, that your great admired Champion, *Bishop Andrews*, in his Answer to *Peter du Moulin's* second Letter, acknowledges *Churches that have only Presbyters to be true Churches*. And, by fair Consequence, (argues your own *J. S. Vindic. Ch. 9. § 60.*) he must owne the *Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations, and Acts of Jurisdiction*? Shall I add, that *Bishop Hall*, another of your great Champions, asserts the same *Validity*, in Answer to *Smeectimnius*? Shall I tell you of *Bishop Spotwood*, who, in his *Hist. Pag. 514.* shews, that, at the Consecration of our *Scott Bishops* in *England*, a Motion being made of their being first Ordained *Presbyters*, as having received no Ordination from a Bishop, the Motion was disowned and rejected by the *English Bishops and Clergy*, (except *Dr. Andrews*, who, in Contradiction to himself, moved this) and, by *Bishop Spotwood's* Insinuation, disowned also by himself and his Fraternity, who were to be then Consecrated? To these I may add *Downame, Sermon. Pag. 44, 45.* who owns, that Ordination by Ministers without the Bishop is of Force, the Church admitting the Party Ordained as a lawful Minister. The same Lawfulness of Ordination is owned by *Dr. Field, Lib. 5. Ch. 27. Pag. 498, 499, &c.* *Bishop Davenant* (saith *J. S. § 61. ubi supra*) peremptorily owns the *Validity of Presbyterian Ordinations*.

3ly, You have appeared fond of the Title, Name, and Thing of Priest and Sacrifice under the Gospel Dispensation. But you have been told, how that, therein, you are condemned by Famous Protestant, yea, and Episcopal Divines, and that *Fulk and Stillingfleet* condemn the Name of Priests appropriated to Ministers; The one upon *Acts 14. 23.* against the *Rhemists*; The other, *Iren. Part 2. Ch. 6. § 11. Willet, Synop. Papist. Cont. 13. Quæst. 2. Part 2.* condemneth Unmetaphorical Sacrifices, Priests, and High-Priests; Shewing, that all External Sacrifices are taken away by the Spiritual Worship, in our Saviour's Answer to the Woman of Samaria, *John 4.* And this against *Bellarmin's* Pleading, *de Missa, Lib. 1. Ch. 11. seu Lib. 5. de Eucharist.* Who is herein followed by your

Fore-leader also, *Dodwell*, in his 7. *Dissert.* on *Eyprian*, and his Book, Entituled, *One Priest and One Altar*, who is bold, yea impudent, to asperse as *Enthusiasts*, such as disown the Name and Thing of Priests and Sacrifices, in a proper or Unmetaphorical Sense. Herein also following the *Rhemists*, *Janſenius* in *Loc. Becan Manual. Lib. 1. Cap. 10*, Here I cannot omit, that this your Famed and Admired *Dodwell*, whom you are found, in several places of your Pamphlet, to drudge after, particularly in your Notion of the *High-Priesthood*, and that of Priests and Sacrifices under the Gospel Dispensation, doth palpably contradict you in the point of *Melchisedeck*: For *Dodwell* asserts, that the *High-priest*, the *Bishop*, being after the Order of *Melchisedeck*, the Sacrifice he offers is the same with that of *Melchisedeck*, *Bread and Wine*; Whereas you, or your *Querist* tells us, (*Ch. 2. Pag. 9.*) That *Melchisedeck* offered no Sacrifices, and that no Protestant Author, saith he, did, tho' the Papists generally affirm it. Thus, Mr. *Querist*, or Arguer, either in your Sense, and that of Protestant Divines, *Dodwell* is, in this point, a Papist, in affirming *Melchisedeck's* offering the Sacrifice of *Bread and Wine*; Or, in *Dodwell's* Sense and Scope, as above expressed, you, in denying this, are an *Enthusiast*. Thus I leave you to share this betwixt you.

4th, You would seem to appear for the Churches *Intrinsic Power*, and her Government, consequently, distinct from that of the Civil Magistrate. But you have been told, that your *English* Episcopal Hierarchicks, yea Bishops themselves, your great Patrons, are *Erastians* of the highest Stamp, as is evident from what is cited from *Hooker*, [*Eccles. Pol. Pref. Pag. 2, 19, &c.*] from *Bishop Whitgift* [*Def. Pag. 220.*]. To which may be added *Parker*, in his Account of the Government of the Christian Church, § 14. Who knows not, that Dr. *Burnet*, in his Defence of the Church and State of Scotland under King *Charles II.* his Reign, spends his whole second Conference upon the Defence of his Ecclesiastick Supremacy, which, all do know, was *Erastianism* of the highest Degree; And his Dedication is to the Duke of *Lauderdale*, owned by him as a Grand Patron of the then existent Government, being His Majesty's High Commissioner for Scotland, putting Presbyterians under no better Character, than that of Enemies of all Order and Authority. To these we may add *Sutlive*, [*Ans. to a certain Libel, Ch. 2.* and in his *Book de Presb. cap. 4, 5, 6.*] who asserts, that there is no other Governing Power in the Church, but what is lodged in, and derived from the Civil Magistrate. Bishop *Honnieman*, in his Survey of *Naphtali*, Part 2. Ch. 4. pleads also for the then existent Ecclesiastick Supremacy of King *Charles II.* Yea he spends a long-winded Discourse, endeavouring to prove the Absurdity of a distinct Ecclesiastick Government from
that

that of the Civil, and to load the Orthodox Opinion thereanent with Absurdities, calling it a *joynting of the supposed Discipline* (so he terms Church Government) *with the Government of the State*, or that which is Civil. For further Confirmation hereof, and to give you a vincting Proof and *Vidimus* of the *Erastian* Judgment, and Principles of our *Scottish* Prelates, take these two clear Proofs; The one is of Arch-Bishop Gladstones in the 1612, wherein he thus expresses himself, *Besides that no Estate may say, that they are your Majesties Creatures, as we may say; So there is none, whose standing is so slippery, when your Majesty shall frown, as we: For, at your Majesties Nod, we must either stand or fall.* To this purpose speaks Arch-Bishop Spotwood, when, in his violent Humour, he was persecuting and ejecting that Godly, Learned, and Venerable Minister, Mr. John Scrimzeour, who was called before their High Commission; Discourse being concerning his Majesties Prerogative, and Mr. Scrimzeour desiring the Arch-Bishop, with his Fellows, to be more favourable Interpreters of his Highness's Mind, than so to expose Ministers unto Contempt, and other Inconveniencies. *I tell you, Mr. John, said St. Andrews, the King is Pope now, and so shall be.* To which the Godly Man answered, *that is an evil Stile you give him.* And when Mr. Scrimzeour objected their making a Schism in this Church by their Course, and that the Church was, before that time, walking soundly in Truth. *I grant we were well, said St. Andrews, if it had pleased the King, who must be obeyed. And when it shall please his Majesty, I shall return to my former Course.* To which Mr. Scrimzeour rejoyned, *If we were well before, the Change must be evil.* [See Calderwood's Hist. Pag. 645, compared with 747.] Add to this what is before cited of the Assertion of King Charles II. his Advocate Sir George Mackenzie, viz: *That his Majesty is in place of the Pope.* [Inst. Pag. 33.] From hence let it be remarked, 1. That it cannot be denyed, that the Arch-Bishops did, in this point, speak the Sense and Judgment of all their Fraternity; So that this sound Divinity must needs be judged the Perswasion of the whole Episcopal Church. 2ly, That, in the first Sentence, they so assert themselves his Majesty's Creatures, as are no other Set of Men, excluding, no doubt, Pastors and Ministers of the Gospel, who, in respect of their Office, they neither did, nor could assert, that it was at his Majesty's Option, to make or unmake the same; So that, in this singular exclusive Sense, they owned their Episcopal Office, as such, to be a Creature of his Majesty's Creation, which, as he made it at his pleasure, so he might unmake it, or nod it down, when he pleased, as the Bishop expresses it. 3ly, 'Tis evident, that, in the point Unity, or Schism, the making, or unmaking of such an Officer as the Prelate, they

assert his Majesty's pleasure to be the great Rule or Cynosura, ascribing unto him a *Papal Absoluteness* in this point; For Spot/wood asserts that he had been satisfied with the Churches Presbyterial Unity without Bishops, if so it had pleased his Majesty, but that he must be obeyed in the Episcopal Establishment, yea, and that he will return to the former Course, if so his Majesty Pleases. So that the intire and primary Rule is here his Majesty's Pleasure. Was ever such Slavish and Traiterous giving up the Keyes of Ministerial Authority to an Arbitrary Power owned in a Christian Church, till these Court-Creatures exemplified this horrid Wickedness? Add to all, that both the Bishops and the Advocate owned the King to have a *Papal Authority* over the Church, which Episcopalians themselves will not deny to be Arbitrary and Lawless. May I then plie our Prelatists with this Argument upon what is premised: That Office in the Church which is meerly of the Magistrate's Creation, to make or unmake it at his pleasure, has no Divine Warrant, nor Foundation in the Word of God: But such is the Office of the Bishop and Arch-Bishop, by the Confession of Bishops themselves, and that both of old and of late. For the Assumption, beside what is said above, we have a renewed Proof in the Instances exhibited; Especially since the Lord Advocate could not but know the Sense and Intendment of our Laws in this point, being also such as Prelates had a main Hand in Enacting them, who therefore, in this point, speaks the Sense both of the Law and Clergy at that time. I may argue thus further: They who, in their Office, are Servants of Men, have no Divine Office, and such as is of God: But such is the Office of Prelacy, by their Confession; *Ergo*. The Major is evident from these Scriptures, *Gal. 1. 1.* compared with *1 Cor. 7. 23.* *Paul an Apostle not of Men, neither by Man, but by Jesus Christ, &c.* Here, in this Negative Description, he shews, that the Ministerial Office, in it self, is not of Men, or of Man's Creation, or Appointment; In the next Negative Character, he points at his immediate Mission as an Apostle, that he was not an Apostle in the ordinary Method of Ordination; And in the positive part of the Character, *scil.* *By Jesus Christ*, he points out our Blessed Lord as Political Head of his Church, to be the only Instituter and Authorizer of a Gospel Ministry. So that, in the Apostle's Sense, they are no true Church Officers, whose Office is not Authorized in his Holy Testament; But such are not our Spurious Prelates, by their own Confession, being the Magistrate's Creatures, and appearing evidently the Servants of Men, in the Nature and End of their Office, contrary to that of *1 Cor. 7. 23.*

sly, Having told you of your Antiscriptural Principle, in disowning
 a Lawful Ordination in the Reformed Churches, who are not of the
 English

English Mould, and how that herein you are oppos'd not only by Presbyterians, but the Men of your own Kidney and Gang; I must here renew the same Discovery to you of their Regrate, who have been and are Sons of that Church, of her remaining Popish Corruptions. A more copious and renewed Discovery, by several Instances hereof, may, no doubt, surprize you, and put you to sad Reflectings upon that which you assert *Pag. 8. Query turn'd to an Argument, viz. That such as are Initiated into this church of Scotland in her present Constitution, are only made Disciples of a Party, and not at all of Christ's School.* Whereupon you cry out a Tragical *Alas!* and *Ob!* how lamentable a Deceit this is: Yea, you add, *That it is every Man's Interest, to be careful of these Dangerous Mistakes, attended with a Train of such dismal Consequences;* From which to shield your self, you add the Service-Book Orizon, and Threed-bare Cant of *Good Lord deliver us!* Really, Sir, altho' I have no Respect to your Service-Book Battalogies, I am some way inclined, from the Consideration of what's premis'd, thus far to Eccho this Prayer, *From such Phantastick Antiscriptural Bigotry and gross Calumnies cast upon God's true Churches, Good Lord deliver us.* But to let pass such Retaliation, I will offer to you Testimonies from your own Set of Men, making it appear, that the Church of England is so far from having arrived at that Gospel Purity and Perfection which you suggest, that, on the contrary, her Lukewarmness in point of Reformation, her making no Advances therein, but retaining the Dregs of Popish Corruption upon politick Grounds, has been the Subject Matter of the Regrate and heavy Complaints, even of those who are her Sons and abide in her Communion, especially her rigid Cruelty towards many hundreds of Godly and Learned Ministers and Professors, who have Thirsted for a through Reformation, and appeared against these Corruptions. Upon the point of the Liturgy and English Reformation, Fuller in his Church History shews, "That the Reformers permitted 'ignorant People to retain some fond Customs, that they might 'remove the most dangerous and destructive Superstitions, as Mothers 'to get Children to part with Knives are content to let them play with 'Rattles. This Man, Sir, was no Presbyterian, yet he puts your Liturgy and Ceremonies among the less dangerous Superstitions, holding them still Superstitions, Toys for Children in Knowledge to play with; and, as Calvin terms them, *Tolerabiles ineptiae*, tolerable fooleries. But Remark what he adds further in point of the early and constant Opposition to the Corruptions adhering to that Church: "The Non-conformity (saith he) Conceiv'd in the days of King Edward, was

BORN

' Born in the days of Queen Mary, Nursed in the days of Queen Elizabeth, a tall Stripling in the days of King James, and towards the end of King Charles grown up to the full stature of a Man. He shews, That severall Rites and Ceremonies of the Church of England were offensive to the Conscience of Bishop Hooper the Martyr. That in the Year 1564 began the Name of Puritans, for such as dissented from the Unscriptural Discipline of the Church (here, and in what ensues, both Discipline and Worship appeared to be dissented from, as Unsound and Unscriptural). Accordingly in the Year 1572, he shews, ' That Presbyteries began to be Erected first at Wansworth, and after at London. That in the Year 1580, there was a Conference about the Common Prayer Book, in order to which sixty Ministers of the Presbyterian party met at Cokfield in Suffolk, and by the Year 1582, their plat Form of Church Discipline appeared. They Petitioned the Lords of Privy Council, confessing their Zeal for the necessary Reformation of many things in the Church according to the Word of God, who thereupon Solicited the Arch-bishop for favour to them. That in the Year 1585 the Parliament began to correct Ecclesiastick Abuses, but the Queen would let nothing of Moment be altered in Church Discipline. In the Year 1587, The House of Commons presented a Petition to the House of Lords, That among other Violences, Ministers might not be troubled for omission of some Rites prescribed in the Book of Common Prayer, and the Lord Gray wondered that her Majesty in this matter made choise to confer with Enemies to the Reformation, because it touched her Free-holds. In the Year 1588, a Synod at Coventry, Decreed against the Sign of the Cross in Baptism (N. B.) against the Calling of Bishops and the lawfulness of their Courts, and for Teaching the Restauration of Discipline as Occasion shall serve. In the Year 1589, Famous Mr. Cartwright had 39 Articles of Nonconformity before her Majesties Commissioners Objected against him, and he with his Brethren were sent unto the Fleet. About this time also King James Wrote from Scotland unto the Queen to stay the hard Usage of the Ministers of the Evangel for their diversity from the Bishops. That after this there were Meetings held by the Presbyterian Ministers at London, at Cambridge, at Northampton, and at Kettering. That Mr. Perkins whom all Men held for a Prophet, was concurring in this Cause. That Mr. Udal a Learned Man blameless in Life, powerful in Praying, no less profitable than painful in Preaching, was condemn'd to die for being the Author of a Book, entituled, A Demonstration of the Discipline which Christ hath prescribed in his Word; And the Sword

' Sword of Justice being drawn was not put up before others were
' Executed, In the Year 1603, there was a Petition signed by 750
' Preachers, desiring a Reformation of Ceremonies and Abuses in the
' Church, upon which followed the Conference at *Hampton Court*, at
' which King *James* Threatned the Nonconformists with hurrying them
' out of the Land, tho' (saith my Author) he once professed, to a
' National Assembly of the Church of *Scotland*, "He praised God he
' was King in so sincere a Church, a Church sincerer than the Church
' of *England*, whose Service was an ill said Mass in *English*. "Bishop
' *Burnet* in his Printed Letters shews, that in his Travels he had Op-
' portunity at *Zurick* to Read a Volume of the Letters that passed be-
' tween *Bullinger* and the *English* Reformers, by which it appears, that
' the Bishops preserved the things then contested rather in compliance
' with the Queen's Inclinations, than out of any likeing they had
' themselves unto them. Behold from the Pen of one of the present
' Bishops this broad Confession, that the Bishops then were Self-convict
' and Self-condemned in Acting thus against their Conscience, which
' testified against their Practice and for the Nonconformists, and that
' they were a Set of meer Men-pleasers, in so far at least. And what
thinks our Querist and Arguer of these Venerable Fathers and Infallible
Succedaneous Apostles, who thus stood *Antipods* and cross to the Apostle
Paul's Principles and Practice, who asserts, *That if he pleased Men he*
were not the Servant of Christ? But to evince this further, and how
Bishops themselves stood affected to the Ceremonies, Bishop *Jewel* in a
Letter, *Febr. 8. 1566.* Wishe, "That all the Remnants of Popery
' might be thrown out of the Churches, and out of the minds of the
' People, and laments the Queen's fixedness unto them, that she
' would suffer no change to be made. *Sands* Writes, *Contenditur de*
vestibus Papisticis, utendis, vel non utendis, dabit Deus his quoq; finem. He
Prays that God may put an end to this Contest about popish Gar-
ments. *Horn* Writes, "That he Hopes that the Act concerning
' Habits would be repealed at the next Session of Parliament, if the
' Popish party did not hinder it. *Grindel* Writes, "That the Queen
' continued inflexible in this matter. And *Cox* the Bishop of *Ely*
laments "The Aversion that they found in the Parliament unto all
' Propositions that were made for Reformation of a Abuses. The
same Dr. *Burnet*, in the History of the Reformation, gives account of
Queen *Elizabeth's* fixed Disposition to "Magnificence and external
' Ornaments in Religion. He shews, That there were comparatively
' few of the Popish Clergy who had left their Benefices on the ac-
' count of Religion (so well they were pleased with that half Re-
formation).

mation). He mentions "The jugglings of the greatest part of the Clergy, who retained their Affections to the old Superstitions, that those in King *Edward's* time had. Likewise he shews, That Queen *Elizabeth* regreted that King *Edward* had stripped Religion too much of external Ornaments. That had not Queen *Elizabeth* lived so long, and a New Set of better Men grown up in the room of the Old, had a Prince of another Religion Succeeded before that time, they had probably turned about to the old Superstitions, as nimbly as they had done before in Queen *Mary's* Days. Thus Bishop *Burnet*. *Cambden* in his History gives account of the steps Queen *Elizabeth* took of the Reformation, and how many Popish Rites she still retained through her fondness for them. A Friend of *Hooker* in his Letter to him, about Writing his Ecclesiastical Policy, hath these Words, "It may be remembered that at the first, the greatest part of the Learned of the Land were either eagerly affected or favourably enclined to that way [of Nonconformity]; The Books then Written favoured for the most part of the Disciplinary Stile, it sounded every where in the Pulpits, and in the common phrase of Mens Speech; And the contrary Party began to fear they had taken a wrong course. Dr. *Pilkington* shews, "That he disliked their being so like the Papists in their Liturgy, and that it was their fault generally that they differed not from them in all their Ministry. Bishop *Bilson* asserts, "That the Reformed Churches can by no means digest a Dram of the Popish Ceremonies, so far are they from admitting the full Dose of their Heresies; In this distinguishing them from the Church of *England*. Dr. *Humphrey* Wrote, "That we ought to refuse to conform ourselves unto the Enemies of God in any of their Ceremonies, and that he wished and hoped for the utter Abolishing of all the Monuments of Popish Superstition, which, saith he, yet remaineth in our Church. Dr. *Fulk* Wrote, "If a Man mislike their Form of Divine Service as not sufficiently differing from the Papists, he shews his greatest Zeal and Detestation of their Idolatry and Blasphemy: We abhor, saith he, whatever hath but a shew of Popery. Dr. *More* Writes thus, with Application to that state of the Church of *England*, "It is an Antichristian use of Church Government to direct it to the upholding of scandalous Ceremonies and insnaring Inventions of Men. To the same scope discourseth Mr. *Chillingworth*, inveighing against "That Churches imperious Imposings upon Nonconformists. See several Citations to this purpose in a piece, Entitled, *Ελευθερία*, Or, *The Idea of Reformation in England*. Printed at London in the Year 1698. from pag. 42. to 63, &c. *Peter Heylyn* a bitter Enemy of Presbyterians; and

and a Zealous Church-of-England Man, shews, " That altho' by Calvin's means some Reformation had been made in the second Liturgy in King Edward's time, it was returned back into the first Form under Queen Elizabeth, and by such compliances the Book was made so passable among the Papists, that they repaired to the Parish Churches without scruple. Yea moreover he shews, That what was done in the Form of their Devotions, did so far satisfie the Pope then being, that he shewed himself willing to confirm all by his Papal Power; And that *Parpalio* was instructed to offer in the Name of his Holiness, That the English Liturgy should be confirmed. He shews further, " That things abolished by King Edward VI. and revived by Queen Mary, were by Queen Elizabeth retained as formerly in her Father's time. My Author also mentions " A Challenge published by Nonconformists, wherein they call their conforming Adversaries, or any of the Learned of them, to bring any sufficient Sentence out of the Holy Scripture pleading for, and commending the present Liturgy, asserting that Episcopacy is *Jure Divino*, or pleading for Adoration towards the Altar, Bowing at the Name of Jesus, Signing with the Sign of the Cross, Wearing of the Surplice, Kneeling at the Sacrament, or for the Exercise of Church Power by Lay Chancellors, upon which they offer to submit and subscribe. I cannot stand to resumethe many Instances of Heterodoxy in Doctrine, as well as Superstition in Worship, owned by the Sons of that Church, as they are called. Any who desires a full account hereof may peruse Mr. Baillie's *Laudensium Autocatacrisis*, wherein he has, from their own avow'd Writings, convinced that party of Popery, Arminianism, and Tyranny. My Author presently in view mentions the Church of Durham as described by Fuller, wherein there was an Image of the Trinity, and Anthems of the three Kings of Colen, and a consecrated Knife to cut the Bread at the Communion, and abundance more of such Trinkets. He mentions their horrid Principles in point of passive Obedience tending to enslave Mankind to an Arbitrary French Tyranny. Instancing several passages of Manwayring, Heylyn, Parker, who in a Treatise of Religion and Loyalty, Published 1684, hath vented this horrid Blasphemy, It is but a crude expression to affirm that Kings are Supreme Governours under Christ, they are and ever were so under God, but so as to be Superior (*horresco referens*!) to Christ, as Christ is Head of the Church within their Dominions. Dr. Scott in his Book called *The Christian Life*, Part 3. chap. 9. pag. 89. ridicules the Doctrine of Regeneration and Conversion as meer fanstical Delusion; As likewise Spiritual Desertion; He ridicules and mocks at leaning and rolling on Jesus Christ, that great and principal Gospel Duty so much

commended in Scripture. And *pag. 5.* He ridicules the Doctrine of absolute Election and Reprobation, as imputing unto God a meer Willfulness and Ostentation of his Sovereignty, &c. I might mention here the Regrate of the Learned Mr. Edwards in his *πολυπειρία σοφία*, of some English Doctors their Ridiculing the History of the Creation as a piece of Allegorick Stuff, suited only to the dull conceptions of the Thick-skull'd Israelites.

I need not insist in mentioning the barbarous Tyranny that has been exercised by that Church upon many Hundred Godly Ministers and Professors, for Nonconformity to their Ceremonies and Liturgy, and the great Regrates and Complaints hereof by Persons of the best Note and Character in England, such as Sir Francis Walsingham and others, among whom Bishop Morton is mentioned, who told the Nonconformists "His Sense of this, and that they had suffered what was next to Death, and too many have suffered even unto Death in Prisons, where severals caught their Death, and others Died. Of whom, *saieth he*, shall their Deaths be required? My Author mentions the Instance of one Mr. John Heyden, a Devonshire Minister, who, for a Sermon Preached against Setting up of Images, and Bowing at the Name of Jesus, was apprehended like a Traitor, manac'd like a Felon, brought before Dr. Harsnet the then Bishop, and committed close Prisoner to the common Goal above thirteen Weeks, &c.

One Passage further (tho' an Instance not of this Nature) I cannot but Remark, which my Author hath, *pag. 78.* When an English Parliament was bringing in a Bill against Pluralities, that *Eternal scandal of Christianity*, Arch-bishop Whitegift Writes to the Queen with as much distress as if they were all going to be Martyr'd at the Stake. "The woful and distressed estate, *saieth he*, whereunto we are like to fall forces us with Grief of Heart, in most Humble manner to crave Your Majesties Sovereign Protection. We beseech Your Highness favourable beholding of our present state, and what it will be in time, if the Bill against Pluralities should take place. Behold the great Metropolitan with all his Fraternity crying out Grief and Sorrow and their Interest ruined upon the surmise of the Establishment of a Preaching Gospel Ministry through the Nation. What worthy Patrons and Patriots were these to Head a Gospel Church!

My Author mentions also the horrid Persecution and many other Miseries attending the Impositions of that Parliament in King Charles II. his Reign, called the Priest-ridden Parliament, that Enacting their horrid Laws for Ceremonies, *The Magna Charta* of the Nation was torn to pieces,

pieces, Millions of Perjuries filled the Land, most brutish Men were hired to do the most brutish of things ; Convictions were made and Penalties were laid not only without Juries, but also without any hearing of the Accused ; Estates were seiz'd and Embazl'd ; Houses were broken up and disturbed ; Families scattered and ruined ; The Prisons were filled with the most Serious Christians, and Reverent Ministers of the Gospel sent unto the Stocks and Houses of Correction all over the Kingdom, for nothing else but because their Consciences could not conform to the Sinful Ceremonies. He mentions a conformable Son of the Church one Mr. *Snowden*, who Laments " The Sufferings of the Church by these offensive Rites and Ceremonies, which, he affirms, have fretted out her Bowels, have been the constant Troublers of *Israel*, and if not cast over Board with *Jonas* will at one time or other sink the Ship. He mentions also the Sarcasm of a Papist, one *Edward Weston*, wherein he makes " Religion in England as acting the Ape of the Catholick ; Adding the saying of one, " That the *English* seemed so hastily to have chased the Pope away, that they forced him to leave his Cloathes behind for others to put on. A passage not unlike to this, but to a far other Scope we have in a Sermon of Mr. *Rutherfords* before the Parliament of England, who told them, " That the *Babylonish* Whore, or Antichrist, when banished from England left Love-tokens behind, *scil.* Prelacy and the Service Book, that he might have an errand back again to the House. My Author mentions also another saying of a conformable Writer, *scil.* The Author of a Plea for Abatement, who expresses his Wonder, " That in the Reformation of Religion in England there should be so great a falli out of Darknes unto marvelous Light upon the first dawning of that Day, and that, notwithstanding all the Prayers and Tears of oppressed Consciences, and the outmost endeavours of our Learned Fathers, it could not for more than these hundred Years, be carried one step further towards Perfection. My Author cites further Bishop *Davenant*, and Bishop *Taylor* ; The first condemning " The imposing of Ceremonies, upon this ground, that God would not have abolished the Ceremonial Law Instituted by himself, that a new One may be invented by Men ; The other upon this ground, " That the Symbolical Rite of Humane Invention doth signifie what it does not effect, when introduced in the Solemn Service of God, is like those vain Imaginations and Representations forbidden in the second Commandment ; That the very suspicion is more against Edification, than their Use can pretend unto. But

no more Transcribing. Several other Testimonies of Men of the same Character may be seen in this piece *.

* See Pag. 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, &c. One Passage I cannot but here Reflect upon of our Famous Mr. *Henderson* in his Conference with King *Charles I.* at *Newcastle*, who says of the *English Reformation*, "That tho' *Henry VIII.* the Father stirred the Humours of the Diseased Church, yet neither the Son nor Daughter (scil. King *Edward* and Queen *Elizabeth*) had perfectly purged them out, and that the *Laodicean* Lukewarmness of Reformation in that Church had been matter of unspeakable Grief to other Reformed Churches who had attained to greater Purity. Now, Mr. *Arguer*, may you not, if Reflecting seriously upon the Premises, be ashamed of your setting this Church (by Confession of her own Sons and Children, stained with such gross Corruptions, and that both with respect to her Hierarchy and Worship) as a Sample and Pattern to other Reformed Churches, and making her such a purified and perfect Piece, that whatever Churches come not up to this Pattern are in your esteem no better than *Sectaries*? Do you not see your self in this Condemned, not only by the Nonconformists, or Presbyterians, but the Conformable Divines, yea Bishops of that Church, who disallow, yea, in a great measure, Lament these things as Corruptions, which you so magnifie, yea Idolize? Your tattle of *Calvin's* banishment from *Geneve*, when you understand the History better of that time, you will find, is a gross untruth, and that it was the Unclean Lecherous Bishop, not *Calvin*, who was then banished the City. But to proceed;

6ly, You talk bigly of *Succession of Bishops from Apostles*, yea and in a direct Line and Series. The Querist, Chap. 6. Quest 6. would needs have the Exactness of the Priest's Register, *Ezra 2.* to be the standing Pattern for clearing Bishops Succession from Apostles, which you exactly accord in this new Essay. Yea you are positive and peremptory in asserting Prelates Succession, even in the Plenitude of Apostolick Power. But upon this point you must be again put in mind, that, 1. This assertion of an Apostolick Succession, as you delineat the same, is so palpably Foolish and Nonsensical, that it is derided by Men of Judgment, even of the Episcopal Perswasion and Office. I may, amongst many, give you a remarkable Instance in *Stillingfleet*, who mocks at and derides this pretence of an unquestionable Line of Succession of the Bishops of several Churches, and the large Diagrams made of the Apostolick Churches with every ones Name set down in his Order, as if the Writer, saith he, had been * *Iren. Part. 2.* *Clarenceaux* to the Apostles themselves *. Thus he. Not Chap. 6. to resume again at large, how pitifully you are herein involved

involved, and repugnant to your self, in asserting this *Lineal Succession*, by clear Accounts and Discoveries equivalent to the Register you mention, as necessary to found a clear Episcopal Call to that which you owne *the Plenitude of the Apostolick Power*, which you must needs extend to the *Bishops of all Churches*; And yet you assert, that *several Writings are lost, and only some little Fragments of other early Writers remain*, which may clear this Episcopal Register; So that you have left the greatest part of all your Bishops as much in the dark, in point of the Episcopal Call, as those in *Ezr. 2. 61, 62. who sought the Register among those reckoned by Genealogy, but they were not found, who therefore were as polluted put from the Priesthood*; So must your Bishops be, by this your wise Calculation. And you have deposed and cashiered them all from their Episcopal Priesthood, who cannot reckon their Genealogy in the same manner, as in the Text which you cite, and produce their Tables of Succession from Apostles. Are not their Lordships highly obliged to such a witty Proctor and Advocate for their Cause?

I may again here put you in mind of what the same *Stillingfleet* has at large asserted and prosecuted against this your Notion *,

1. That Personal Succession might be without Superiority of Order, as you do plead, who will have *Bishops succeed Apostles as such, and in the Plenitude of their Power*, forsooth. 2ly; That the Names of Bishop and Presbyter were common, after the Distinction betwixt them

* Part 2.
Cb. 6. Pag.
299, 300,
301, &c.

was introduced. And, 3ly. That the Church did not owne Episcopacy as a *Divine Institution*, but *Ecclesiastical*; And those who seem to speak most of it, (saith he) do mean no more. *Stillingfleet*, prosecuting at large these points, judges, that he has for ever invalidated the *Testimony of Antiquity*, in this Matter; And it had become your Wit and Reverence to have considered what is offered in this point, and answered the same, before you had offered to publick this your pitiful Notion anent the *Episcopal Line, and Tables of Succession from Apostles*, and so confidently asserted *Prelates Succession* to them, as such, and in the *Plenitude of their power*. For, if *Stillingfleet* has made good these three points, in the place cited, (and I know none of your Party, who has disproved what he has asserted) all that you offered upon this Head will appear meer ignorant Tattle. 2ly, *Eusebins* himself, whose Records are the Fountain and Head of all your supposed Proofs, acknowledges it a hard Matter to know who succeeded the Apostles in the Churches they planted; Asserting, that our best and only Clearness is to be found in the *Writings of Paul*. And, if the prime Historian doth thus give it over, pray, whence have you your Clearness more than he? And, if

he

he will have the first Draught of these Lines of Succession from the Writings of Paul, sure I am, your Prelatical Genealogy and Lines are entirely cut off; And you would do well to remember, what Impudatation *Stillingfleet* puts upon this your Antiscriptural Deduction of your Hierarchical Prelate's Lines of Succession from Apostles, viz. *That it is a making the Tradition of the Church our Rule to interpret Scripture by; An excellent way, saith he, to find out the Truth, doubtless, to bend the Rule to the crooked Stick, and make the Scripture serve its Servant, &c.* 3ly, Your unrestricted, yea, and positively and frequently repeated Assertion, of Bishops Succession to Apostles, as such, and in the Plenitude and full Extent of their Power, has exposed you to the condemning Censure of the most eminent Advocates for Prelacy, who caution their Assertion of this Succession with the Limiting Term of Ordinary, expressing this Succession only to what was Ordinary in the Apostles Power or Authority. I will produce against you Three Witnesses, and thus one more than what will amount to a Judicial Proof and Testimony.

* Survey of *Naphtali. Part* 1. Bishop *Honnieman* *, speaking of Successors to Apostles, calls it a Succession in that Plenitude of ORDINARY Church Power, which was not to cease, till the end of the World. And again, *The Question is, saith he, who are the Successors of the Apostles in this ORDINARY Church Power.*

Thus clearly leaving out and excluding that which in their Power was Extraordinary, and could not be succeeded to. The second Witness I produce, is your Famed Bishop *Hall*, who, in his Book, Entituled, *Episcopacy by Divine Right* †, tells us, *That the ORDINARY Power which the Apostles had, they traduced it to their Successors; Distinguishing it*

thus from a Power Extraordinary; wherewith the Apostles were clothed, and which he asserts was capable of no such Traduction, or Succession thereunto. The third Witness I produce, is *Dr. Hammond*. as he is cited by your Learned Friend *J. S.* who, speaking of Bishops Succession to Apostles, asserts, *That they are compleat Heirs of all the ORDINARY Power which they received from Christ; Thus distinguishing it from the Extraordinary, to which the Bishops could not be Heirs.* Thus you see a whole Triumvirate of your Party, and these of most eminent Note, condemning the whole Scope of your Pamphlet.

7ly, Whereas you, or your Querist, *Ch. 6.* (as is evident in the Scope of the I. Query) will needs have the Apostles betaking themselves to particular Provinces, as their proper peculiar Charges and Districts, upon a voluntary Division and Partition; Upon which Ground he will needs have the Apostle Paul not to have medled with any Church which he himself had not planted; Assert-

Asserting, that his Practice stands upon Record to shew his Regularity, forsooth, and due Observation of the Orders agreed upon among the Apostles, concerning the Division of the World into so many Districts, which you also plead and harp upon. Pag. 33. of your Arguing Pamphlet, repeating your ignorant Mistake of Thomas his Assignment to the Indies, as asserted by Eusebius *; Upon which Ground also you insinuate, *That any other Apostle had been to blame, if intermeddling with the Churches of his planting, without his Consent, after the Provincial Division of the World among them:* You should have considered what your great Doctor and Bishop, *Stillingsfleet*, has produced against this supposed Division *; Wherein, having supposed and proved, that such Division could not be before their Commission to Preach to all Nations, which will readily be granted, he adduces Eight important Grounds and Reasons to prove it could not be after that commission; Arguing from their Sense of the very Nature of Christ's Kingdom, expressed *Acts* 1. 6. leading them to suppose Christ would erect his Kingdom after another manner; From their staying at *Jerusalem*, after endowed with the Holy Ghost †, † *Luke* 24. 49. and not betaking themselves each one to a separate Province; And yet, after the Persecution raised at *Jerusalem*, when most of the Church were dispersed abroad, the Apostles are found remaining still at *Jerusalem*, *Acts* 8. 1, 14. "Would they have been, saith he, so long absent from their Charge, if any such Distribution had been made among themselves. He further argues against this Division from this Ground, "That the Apostles going to particular places from *Jerusalem* was occasional; That the first Departure of any of the Apostles from *Jerusalem* was that of Peter and John, who were sent by common Order of the Apostles to *Samaria*, after they heard, that, by Philip's Preaching, they had received the Word of God †. And that there is not the least mention of any peculiar Province of theirs which they were sent to. So Peter's going from *Joppa* to *Cæsarea* was occasioned by *Cornelius* his sending for him †. † *Acts* 8. 14. † *Acts* 10. 5, 32. He further argues from this, "That we frequently read of many of the Apostles being together in one place; 1. The whole Twelve at *Jerusalem*; After that, Peter and John together at *Samaria*; About four Years after Paul's Conversion, we meet with James and Peter together at *Jerusalem*; Fourteen Years after

* *Lib.* 3. c. 1.

* *Iren. Part*
2. *Ch.* 5. *Pag.*
233, 234, 235
236.

* after this, we find *James, Peter and John* there *.
 * *Gal. 1. 18, 19.* ' Is it any ways probable, *saith he*, if all these had their
Gal. 2. 1, 9. distinct *Provinces* assigned them, they should be so often
 found together at *Jerusalem*, which certainly must be-
 long but to the Province of one of them. He likewise argues from
 this Ground, " That it was a considerable time, yea long, before they
 thought it to be their Duty to Preach unto the Gentiles. Peter
 must have a Vision first, before he will go to *Corne-
 lius* †. And, as yet, they retained that Perswasion,
 that it is unlawful for a Jew to keep Company, or come unto
 one that is of another Nation †. Nay more, *saith he*, Peter
 is accused for this very Action before the Apostles at
 † *Acts 10. 11.* *Jerusalem* †; this being laid as the Ground of their
 † *Acts 10. 28.* Quarrel, That he went in to men *Uncircumcised*, and did
 † *Acts 11. 2, 3.* eat with them. And it cannot be imagined, but that some of them
 judged it unlawful to go to their own Provinces, which certainly must
 be of the Gentiles most of them. He adds further, " That Peter's Pro-
 vince so much spoken of, *viz.* That of the Circumcision, fell not to
 his Share, till near twenty years after this time. He further argues
 from that Ground which we have before offered against this Division,
scil. " In point of that supposed Division of the two Districts (too
 large, no doubt) " of the Jews and Gentiles betwixt Peter and Paul ;
 Which *Stillingsfleet* tells us, cannot be understood exclusively of others ;
 For, " what Work then (*saith he*) had the rest of the Apostles to do ?
 Neither, taking them Distributively, was Paul excluded from Preach-
 ing to the Jews, or Peter to the Gentiles: We see Paul was at first
 chosen, *saith he*, to be a Vessel to bear Christ's Name be-
 fore the Gentiles and Kings, and the Children of Israel †,
 † *Acts 9. 15.* and, accordingly, he is found presently Preaching Christ
 † *Acts 9. 20, 22.* in the Synagogues †; And, in all places, he first Preach-
 ed to the Jews in the Synagogues, and when they would not
 † *Acts 13. 5, 14.* hearken, he turned to the Gentiles †. And after the Meet-
 compar'd with ing spoken of *Acts 15.* he is found entering into the sy-
 46. nagogue, and Preaching to the Jews at *Ephesus*; And
 therefore he thought not himself excluded from Preach-
 ing to the Jews, because they were St. Peter's Province. Neither did
 Peter think himself excluded from the Gentiles, he be-
 † *Acts 10. 28.* ing the first that opened the Door of Faith unto them †,
 by Preaching to them. And in the Council at *Jerusa-
 lem*, he owne himself as the Apostle of the Gentiles, God made choice
 among

among us, that the Gentiles by my mouth should bear the Word of the Gospel and believe *. From all which this * *Acts* 15. 7. Learned Author draws forth this Conclusion, "That the pretended Division of Provinces among the Apostles is only the wind-egg of a working Fancy, that wants a shell of Reason to cover it. Mr. Querist, or Arguer, This is a rude Character put upon this Grand Topick of your Reasoning for prelacy, which you see your own *Stillingfleet* has crushed all to pieces, asserting it a meer Irrational Antiscriptural Fancy. And whereas you may alledge, that *Stillingfleet* only disputes against that which he calls *An Early Division of Provinces*, not excluding the *Division after mentioned in History*, which you seem to insinuate in the close of your Query; Remark what he after subjoyns in the close of this Section *, "As for that Division of Provinces, saith he, * *Pag.* 237. mentioned in Ecclesiastical Writers *, tho, as to some * *Citing* few, they generally agree; As that *Thomas* went to *Euseb. Lib.* 3. *Parthia*, (not to the *Indies*, as you suggest, and in *C. 1.* *Stillingfleet's* Judgment, ignorantly) "Andrew to *Scythia*, John to the *Lesser Asia*, &c. Yet, as to the most, they are at a Loss, where to find their Provinces, and contradict one another in reference to them; And many of them seem to have their first Original from the Fables of *Dorotheus*, *Nicephorus*, and such Writers. And, § 3. in the beginning, resuming what he has proved, he expresses it thus, "Having shewed, that the Apostles observed no set Order for distributing Provinces; Wherein he peremptorily asserts, that neither *early* nor *late*, the Apostles made any such Distribution, denying the thing absolutely.

8ly, You commend J. S. with high Elogies, as having presented such a Learned Master-Piece, that Presbyterians had not mustered Strength to encounter him. But what if it shall be found, that J. S. and you have mutually Brow-beat and buffeted one another? Of this I shall exhibite unto you these three or four Instances: 1. 'Tis evident, that J. S. sets all Bishops on a Level, as of equal, independent Power and Authority; And thus has palpably contradicted and run down your Diagram of the Hierarchy, which you draw from the Old Testament Oeconomy, and these *Arches* above *Arches*, issuing all in a Supreme Priest, or President. You are clear and positive, "That the Jewish Oeconomy, Exemplifying the New Testament Church Government, will infer, that, as there was One High-Priest in the Jewish Church, so every National Christian Church ought to have a Metropolitan, or Arch-Bishop, to whom the rest of the Bishops and Clergy

‘Clergy in his Province ought to be in some Subjection; Yea, and
 ‘he to continue their Superiour for Life. You tell us,
 * *Ch. 2. Quer.* your Querist at least *, ‘That, in the Jewish Oeco-
 4. *Pag. 7, 8.* ‘conomy, we have an Account of Episcopacy and
 ‘Archiepiscopacy, of Presidents over Presidents,
 † *Query turn’d* ‘called by the Septuagint [Bishops,] &c. Of
 into an Argu- ‘an Arch-Presidency, not only over the Priests, but
 ment, P. 36, 37. ‘over the Overseers of Priests; Which, in your new
 goodly Piece †, you do clearly homologate.

Now, Sir, if you can reconcile these two, *All Bishops of equal Authority, and upon a level, and yet Subject unto Arch-bishops and Metropolitans,* so as you suppose the Priests and Levites were to their Superiour Arch-Priests, or Presidents, and all of them to the Metropolitans High-priest, or Patriarch, you will be indeed an Apollo for your Skill; Tho’ I must add, that J. S. and you are so kind one to another, as to agree in contradicting your selves, as well as each other, in this point; You in asserting all Bishops to Succeed to the Apostles in the Plenitude of their Power, the Apostles being, by your Confession, of equal Authority, and consequently, their Successors in this full extent of their Power; And J. S. in maintaining avowedly, yea and from the supposed Principles of the Cyprianic Age, the late Scottish, and present English Hierarchy, whereof all do know, that the one did, and the other doth consist of Bishops Subject to Arch-bishops, the Authority of them all resolving in a Metropolitans Head, or Patriarchal Primacy. Here, on the by, I cannot but notice (tho’ this is touched above) these blown and vain Elogies you put upon J. S’s first and second Pieces of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, containing, you say, such substantial Learning, that you of the Church Principles must needs think he has the better of it, since no Presbyterians have had Confidence to Answer; And you Counsel the Undertaker of the Answer to put on compleat Armour, and get the Fathers taught to speak the Language of Geneva, unless for the sake of the bare Word Answer in a Title Page, which, you say, has done good Service before now without regard to what follows in the Book. What Advantage this your Champion has of Presbyterians, either in the first, or the late Voluminous Pamphlet, has from the beginning, and now especially, appeared to the Judicious and Impartial, i. e. That it is a nonentity and none at all; Yea rather, that he has in these Endeavours ruined the Episcopal Cause; So that Presbyterians do entertain with the same pity these blusterings of your Angry Ignorance, as they do your pitiful Paralogism in this your Pamphlet. And for Answering only by a Word on the Title Page, I think you have it
 fully

fitly Exemplified in this your Champion's Answer, who is known to have passed over *sicco pede* the most of all that the Reverend Mr. R. offered against him. And of this there are store of Instances further which might be exhibited. May I Instance One for All (to pass the Surveyer of *Naphthali*, whose Answer suits your Description exactly) you cannot but know, how that the Confuter of Mr. *Burnet's* seven Dialogues betwixt the Conformists and Nonconformists, challenged him to a formal Dispute, offering upon his stating the Questions in Controversie, and drawing forth Propositions and Arguments thereupon, either to give him the Hand, or shew the Reasons of his Dissent without Passion or Partiality. What Man, pretending to be a Scholar, and to enquire for Truth in a Debate, would have declined so fair an offer? But behold, in stead of the Answer, comes out four new Dialogues or Conferences, quite passing over the main and substance of the Dispute, and like a *Fuge-bellum* (to use our *Scots* Term) renewing the Dialogue Method, wherein he knew he had none to Encounter him; And yet the vain Title Page of this blustering Pamphlet, bears *A Vindication of what was Confuted, and an Examination of his Adversarie's Book*. I must give you another Note on the by, on that which you have * anent * *Query turn'd to an Argument, Pag. 37.* Arch bishop *Usher* his account of *Aaron the High Priest, who was Representative of the Loyd*, upon whom you put this true Elogy, that he was a great and good Man, understanding his Greatness and Goodness as Reciprocal; But you must understand that this truly good Man, has stobbed your Prelatical bad Cause under the fifth Rib. Amongst many Instances easily adduceable, we offer this, *scil.* That † he pleads for † *Reduction &c. page 61.* this as the *Ancient Form of Church Government*, which he calls the *Ancient kind of Presbyterian Government*, (complaining of the disuse thereof in England) *scil.* *That every Pastor have a Right to Rule the Church* (from whence the Name of Rector was also given at first unto him), and to Administer the Discipline of Christ, as well as to dispense the Doctrine and Sacraments; Owning also their decisive Votes and Suffrages. So that he appears one of the standing, and, to use your Term, Great and Good Witnessees against the Hierarchical Prelates Sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction. But to return, after this little digression:

A second Instance I offer of your contradicting *J. S.* and he You, is in the point of the *Israelitish Church*, which you assert (your Querist at least *, with whom you will not profess to justify) to be but a *Provincial Church*; For having told us, *That the Lord did choose Jerusalem to place his Name*

* Chap. 2. page 7.

ibero, and that there was there one Temple and one Altar ; The Inference he thus draws from it, Which makes that Nation but one Province; Which doth Exemplifie, with him, the Arch-bishop's Superiority over the rest of the Bishops and Clergy in his Province. But so it is that

* Chap 9. S. J. S. * asserts, *The Church of the Jews to be [a National Church]*, calling it expressly so. By the Principles, saith he, of that Age, scil. the Cyprianic, every particular Bishop was the same unto his own Church that Aaron was to the [NATIONAL CHURCH of the Jews]. Now, how do these two stand Antipods ? You own it only for a Province, or Provincial Church, subject in so far to a National ; He owns it as a National Church, without any state of Subserviency.

A third Instance I offer is in the point of the Seventy Disciples ; These you will needs have a standing Inferior Order of Officers to the Apostles, which your Querist at least clearly insinuates, Chap. 6. Quest. 3. and several such Insinuations are clearly held out through both the Pamphlets ; Particularly in your Query turn'd into an Argument, pag. 20. you assert this, telling us, *That Christ Commissioned first Apostles, and then the Seventy, or Seventy two : Whereas 'tis evident that your great Champion J. S. affirms, That the Seventy had no standing Mission or Office, but such as was transient only and passed off with that exigent **. Thus he asserts, *'Tis impossible to make it appear so much as probable that S. Cyprian believed the Seventy, as making a distinct Colledge from that of the Twelve, to have had any standing Office in the Christian Church, in which they were to have a constant Line of Successors.* This Judgment of his so much admired Saint he clearly Homologats, yea he contends, *That the Commission Recorded Luke 10. did constitute them only*

* Chap. 6. S. 5. Vindication, &c. *See christi- an Life, Part 2. pag. 388.* [TEMPORARY MISSIONARS] and that for an errand which could not possibly be [more than Temporary]. Thus not only contradicting you, but overthrowing also Dr. Scott's grand Argument for the Divine Right of Episcopacy *.

Shall I add a fourth Instance. Your so much admired Champion J. S. contends *tanquam pro aris & focis*, that he and his Fellow Pleaders disowne the Bishops Sole Power, citing a Number of Episcopal Writers to this purpose, how consistently, 'tis not my Work here to enquire ; But so it is, that you have all along pleaded in this your mighty Argument, that Bishops succeed the Apostles in the full Extent and Plenitude of their Power, which to all Men of common Sense, doth import an Assertion of this their Sole Power. Now, Sir, if J. S. has, in these Pieces of his, discovered, in your Judgment, such Substantial Learning

In this Controversie, and such Solid Reasonings for that which you call your Church Principles as had frighted Presbyterians from an Encounter with him; How comes it, that your Substantial Learning and his, your Church Principles and his, and that in so considerable Points of this Controversie, have so palpably crossed and contradicted each other? Have you not thus encouraged the Presbyterians, while seeing you of the Church Principles, in this your Opposition to them, acting the Midianites, and killing one another with your own Weapons?

In the 9th. Place, I will give you a little renewed touch upon this your Grand Argument for Episcopacy, which I will make appear to have impeached the Apostolick Authority, in stead of strengthening it as a Foundation of Prelacy. Thus then I argue: That Doctrine, or Argument, which impeaches and strikes against the Apostles Acting in Faith, in the Important and Great Duties of their Office, doth impeach and strike against their Authority and Power: But the Doctrine delivered in this your Pamphlet, and Scope of your Argument, doth thus impeach the Apostles Acting in Faith, in the Important and Great Duties of their Office; Ergo, It strikes against their Authority and Power. Here the Assumption only is to be made good, which I prove thus. That Doctrine, or Argument, which strikes against the Efficacy and Truth of the Promise, upon which their Acting in Faith, in the forementioned Duties, must be founded, does strike against their Acting in Faith, in the foresaid Exercise, &c. But the premised Argument and Doctrine strikes against the Efficacy and Truth of the Promise, in the premised respects; Ergo. The Assumption is proved thus: The great Promise founding their Faith, is that of *Matth. 28. 20. I am with you allways to the end, &c.* But the premised Argument and Doctrine robs this Promise of all Efficacy, with respect to the premised Actings; Ergo. The Assumption I prove thus: That Doctrine, or Argument, which asserts, that nothing falls within the Compass of that promise, but that wherein the Apostles were to be succeeded to the end of time, robs this Promise of any Efficacy, with respect to such Actings of the Apostolick Power, as were not to continue till the end of time: But the premised Argument and Doctrine does thus rob the Promise, or retrench the same; Ergo. The Major is evident of it self; For, if the Promise reach only that wherein the Apostles were to be succeeded, it can have no Efficacious Influence upon that wherein they were not to be succeeded. The Assumption is cleaaly proven from the Series and Scope of the whole Pamphlet. If, according to this Argument and Doctrine, the Commission granted to the Apostles, in its full Extent, had nothing in it of a *Temporary Nature*, but what was to continue for ever, then it inevitably

inevitably follows, that the *Promise* and *Commission* being correspondent, what was *Temporary*, and to expire, and not to continue thus for ever, could not fall within the *Compass* of that *Promise*: But that the *Commission* was of this Nature, is thus proved,

* *Page* 13. 1. By your *Dilemma* *, *Either this Commission granted to the Apostles was Temporary, or to continue to the end of the World.* And this *Commission* which you extend to the *Apostolick Office*, in the full *Extent* and *Exercise* thereof, you expressly hold to continue for ever, and to the end of the *World*; Whereupon it evidently follows, that what ever *Apostolick Gifts*, or *Acting* of their *Power*, can be made appear to have expired, and to be *Temporary*, are, by you, clearly excluded from the *Commission*, and, consequently, from the *Promise*, which you tell us, *in terminis*,

† *pag.* 19. reaches a *Continuance* for ever, and to the end of the *World*. Again †, you have this Assertion, *You desire to be shew'd, which Branch of their Power is secluded from its share of the Promise, and when that is shewn, you will owne it, that, in that Branch of their Power, they are not succeeded; And if no Branch of their Power be excluded from a share of the Promise, then the whole is to descend, [entire in the Succession] as well as it was in the first Apostles; And seeing Christ gave it entire to them, and their Successors, you conclude. Successors have it entire in as ample a manner as the Apostles themselves had it; Adding emphatically, And thus to continue to the end of the World; Adding, that the not allowing the full Power that the Apostles were clothed with, is a retrenching of Christ's Commission and Promise.* Hence it appears, even to a *Demonstration*, that whatever *Actings* and *Exercise* of *Apostolical Power*, can be made appear not to have been deriv'd in a *Succession*, and to continue to the end, are thus clearly excluded from the *Promise*, yea, and *Commission* also. And it being evident beyond all peradventure, that the *Apostles Infallibility in Doctrine*, their *Gifts of Tongues*, of *Miracles*, &c. are long since expired, and not succeeded unto, it follows inevitably, that, in your *Principles*, the *Exercise* of these *Gifts* falls not within the *Commission*, nor are reach'd by the *Promise*; And if neither within the *Compass* of the *Commission* nor *Promise*, the *Apostles*, in the *Exercise* of these *Gifts*, could not *Act* in *Faith*; So that, *a primo ad ultimum*, 'tis evident, that in the *Scope* and *Series* of this Pamphlet, you have equally impeach'd both the *Apostles Authority*, and their *Acting* in *Faith*, in the great *Duties* of their *Apostolick Office*. I may not insist, in shewing, that ever and anone, even almost to a *Battology*, you tell us, that *Apostles were succeeded unto [as such]*, and in *[the full Extent of their Power]*.

Power]. Now, Sir, this [*as such*] will, no doubt, include all that is imported in their Office, in a *formal proper Sense*, consequently, their *Apostolick Gifts of Tongues, of Miracles, giving the Spirit in his extraordinary Gifts by laying on of Hands, their Infallibility, and the like Official Attings mentioned*; All which you will have them succeeded unto. Now, Sir, if one shall thus assault you upon this your Principle; Apostles, *as such*, spoke with Variety of Strange Tongues, as the Spirit gave Utterance, and by his immediate Influence; Apostles, *as such*, miraculously healed Diseases; yea, raised the Dead, inflicted Judgments upon the Obstinate; *As such*, conferred the Spirit in the manner instanced; Therefore they are therein succeeded, yea, and *to the End*, upon the Ground of our Lord's Promise; And such Gifts are still vident and existent in the Church; I fear you must travel to *Utopia* in quest of these Venerable Successors, and Apostolick Gifts; For they are not, for a considerable Number of Centuries, to be found in the Churches Horizon; So that this your retorted Notion must needs stop your Mouth, and pose you into a Silence. But further, Sir, you may see your self involved in a new Inconveniency, and Shipwrack'd on this Rock of an absurd Inconsistency. You tell us of the *Continuance of the Gift of Miracles, for a considerable time in the Church, and do make it* (as likewise your admired *J. S.*) *a mighty Argument for God's owning Prelacy; Likewise the giving the Spirit, by laying on of Hands*; For neither the *Gift of Tongues and Miracles, Infallibility in Doctrine, nor giving the Spirit by laying on of Hands*, you will admit to be peculiar to Apostles, but all these you do affirm to be derived into a Succession. Now, Sir, here is a Succession Apostolical (for 'tis uncontrovertibly clear, that what Gifts or Offices were not peculiar to Apostles, were thus derived, in your Sense and Pleading, and in special with respect to the Instances exhibited), but such as falls not within the Compass of the Promise; For 'tis notour to all. (yea, and by your own Acknowledgment) that these Gifts are not now vident. So that you have thus, with your own Hand, razed the Foundation of your Argument, which runs upon this Topick, and reciprocal Position and Principle, *That wherein Apostles were succeeded unto, is contained in the Promise; And whatever is contained in the Promise, therein the Apostles were to be succeeded unto*; And, in your Sense, both are of an inseparable Connection, and of a continued Co-existence, because, upon this supposed Nature and Extent of the Promise, you plead for the standing Office of Apostolate; So that, with you, admit once a Succession, the Promise will infer the standing and Continuance of that which is thus succeeded unto, *to the end*. What say you then to a Succession

Temporary

Temporary and dying out so many Centuries before the end, and thus falling within the Compass of the Promise, because derived into a Succession, and yet not falling within the Compass thereof, but excluded, because *Temporary* and dying out before the end; For that the Promise reaches a continuance *to the End*, is the great ground of your Pleading. Here is then a Succession contained both in the Apostolick Commission and Promise, and yet *Temporary* and falling short by far of the Extent of the Promise, which reaches *to the End*. So that you must either say, the Promise in its intire Extent reaches not *to the End*, but includes likewise such Priviledges and Offices as are *Temporary* and expired, wherein you entirely ruine your Pleading for a standing Apostolat upon the ground of this Promise; Or, you must say, that there are Apostolick Priviledges, Gifts and Offices, wherein Apostles were Succeeded, which notwithstanding are not reached by this Promise; Wherein also you are inconsistent with your self, having clearly disowned such an Assertion. This Charge will be evident if it be further pondered, that, 1. You cannot deny that all Church Offices and Officers were contained *Eminenter* in that of the Apostolick, as the Fountain, and so to speak, the Primary Pattern of all derived Succeeding Functions, Gifts, and Offices; The Scripture accounts of the *Time and Nature* of the Apostles Office and Call importing so much. And next, that your self do own it, that the very Office of *Diaconat* has its share in this Succession, consequently in the Promise, and that it is upon this ground of a standing continuance; And 'tis beyond all peradventure that, in the Series and Scope of your Arguing, you make the Succession, with respect to the Gift or Office, and the promised Presence, to run intirely parallel in point of Extent and Duration. But not to pursue further these your inconsistent roveries, and having thus, I hope, convincingly discovered the unsoundness and Popish tincture and ruinous Foundation of the Queries, and overturned the tottering Superstructure of your doughty Argument founded thereupon, and upon clear and important grounds, the danger and absurd tendency of both, I leave you to your better digested, and then I am sure they will be retracting, Thoughts and Reflections upon what you have been bold to offer upon this point, when I have plyed you and your Litigious Pamphleting Tribe with the Counter-Queries ensuing.

Q U E R I E S OFFERED TO THE P R E L A T I S T S O F S C O T L A N D.

I. Q U E R I E.



INCE, in the Sense of both *Scottish* and *English* Advocates for Prelacy, (both Bishops and others of eminent Note) there is no fix'd Mould of Church Government exhibited in Scripture, but that of its own Nature it is so versatile and ambiguous, that the Supreme Magistrat may so dispose of it, as is most suitable to the Ends of Civil Policy, which is convincingly evident from the Instances above adduc'd ; Whether our present Episcopal Clergy, in owning the forementioned Pleadings and Principles, the Doctrine and Practice of our *Scottish* Bishops, both in the Reigns of King *James*, and the two *Charles's*, and, in special, the Constitution of the late Prelacy in *Scotland*, have not thrown up the Principle of a *Jus Divinum* of Prelacy pretended to ? And, consequently, whether they have not, in their present Pleadings upon this pretended ground, contradicted their chief Patrons and Masters ? And whether they ought not, upon the premised Principle of these Masters and Patrons, anent the Supreme Magistrat's

P p

Sovereign

Sovereign Right to dispose of the Forms of Church Government, to submit to the present Establishment of our Church by this Authority, and whether, in opposing the same, they are not liable to the Charge of Seditious Turbulency? We have heard of their Arch-bishops, *Spotswood* in *Scotland*, *Whitegift* in *England*, their great and just Lord Advocat, with several others of their chief Pleaders, asserting, that *All Ecclesiastick Authority is Fountained in, and derived from the Supreme Magistrat, and absolutely at his disposal, no less than [a Papal Authority]* herein being expressly owned and recognised by them, as is evident in the Instances above adduc'd.

II. *Quer.* Whether the Spirit of God, appropriating in Scripture the Term of *Bishop*, or *Επισκοπος*, to Presbyters, or Pastors, Labouring in the Word and Doctrine, thus pointing at the Nature of their Work and Office, *Tit. 1. 5. 7. Acts 20. 28. 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3.* doth not thus effectually rebuke the Appropriating of this Title and Epithete, consequently the Work therein imported, to the Diocesan Bishop, as the Characteristick of his Office? Whether this be not as arrant and Sacrilegious a robbing Pastors of their Scriptural Designation, as if the Term of *Pastor* or *Presbyter* were appropriated as peculiar to a Diocesan Prelat only? The Query is further fortified by this ground, that this Term of *Επισκοπος*, or *Bishop*, hath, as much and alike as the Word *Pastor*, the Flock for its immediat Object and Correlat, as is evident in the Scriptures cited; Whereas the Diocesan *Επισκοπος* Feeds not immediatly the Flock, as the Apostle *Peter* enjoyns, *1 Pet. 5. 2, 3.* but pretends immediatly to Rule and Oversee the Pastors themselves.

III. *Quer.* Since the Bishop is supposed by our Prelatists the proper immediat Subject of Church Government, has the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction so Monopoliz'd and Centred in him, that Presbyters or Pastors have no Power or Interest therein, but in so far as he intrusts them with it, and may revoke it at pleasure, whether this be not contrary to the Scripture account of the Pastor or Presbyter's Office, wherein the Episcopal Authority, or (to speak more properly) the Authority and Exercise of Church Government, is ascribed to Pastors joynly in their fixed Colleges, or Juridical Courts, without the least hint of this precarious Dependence upon the Over-ruling Prelat therein, *1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. Acts 20. 28. 1 Cor. 5. 4, 5, &c.* Yea and the Reciprocal Obedience of the People to Pastors thus Authorized, is enjoyned accordingly, without the least hint of this Absolute Over-ruling Power in any standing Superior Ordinary Officer, *1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 17.* with 24.

IV. *Quer.* Whether that place, *1 Tim. 5. 17.* Let the Elders that Rule well be counted worthy of double Honour, especially they who Labour in the Word

Word and Doctrine, will not plead, that the Person Intrusted with the *Ministry of Reconciliation*, the Preaching the Word, and the Administration of the Sacraments, is, under this Notion, and upon ground of this Authority, an *Officer of the highest Charter in the Church*; Since this is held out to be a higher Degree of Ministerial Official Authority, than *Ruling* simply considered, yea and *Ruling well*? And consequently, whether the Prelates pretended higher Authority over the Pastor Authorized as is said, yea and under this Notion as a *Ruler*, be not an Antiscriptural Usurpation?

V. *Quer.* Whether the joynt collegiat Interest of the Presbyters of the Church of *Corinth* in the highest Censure of Excommunication be not clearly imported in that place, *1 Cor. 5. 4, 5, 6, &c.* The Apostle *Paul* reprehending their not Anticipating his Direction in putting forth this Censure; Yea and asserting their essential Interest therein, and their Intrinsick Power to Judge all within that Church, thus, *v. 12, 13. Do not ye Judge them that are within? therefore put away from among your selves that wicked Person.* And if this highest Act of Jurisdiction be ascribed to the College of Pastors or Presbyters in their Juridical Meeting, why not also all Jurisdictional, all Inferior or Subservient Acts; And whether consequently, the Prelat's arrogating this to himself, as his essential proper Interest, be not an Impeachment of this their Authority, and the Apostolick Prescription asserting so much?

VI. *Quer.* Whether Pastors concurrence with Apostles in the first Christian Council, *Acts 15.* and that in both the *Disquisition, the Sentence, and Decretal Epistle*, expressing a *Dogmatick, Critick, and Diatactick Power*, in all which they appear joyned with them, and in the whole procedure, will not evince their essential Interest in Church Judicatories and Councils, and their Authority in all Juridical Acts of the above-mentioned Extension; And consequently whether Prelats invading their *Decisive Suffrage*, by their *Negative Voice* in Church Judicatories, be not therein Condemned?

VII. *Quer.* Whether *Timothy's* Ordination by a Presbytery be not asserted, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* Neglect not the Gift which was given thee by *Prophecy*, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, the word *Presbytery* importing a Juridical Associat Court in other places of the New Testament, thus *Luke 22. 66.* and *Acts 22. 5.* So that we have it thrice represented in this Signification, but never as importing and signifying the Office of a Presbyter; Besides that *Paul's* laying on of Hands, in order to Gifts, mentioned *2 Tim. 1. 6.* is clearly distinguished from that Act of Authoritative Imposition of Hands ascribed to the Presbytery. Moreover, the Gift, and the Prophecy being represented in

distinct Clauses, and as distinct Priviledges, from the *Presbyteries Imposition*; And *Paul's Imposition* being expressly referred to the *Gifts*; And finally the *Imposition of Hands* being, in the Scripture accounts, a Badge of *Authoritative Blessings*, no other End of the *Presbyteries Imposition* can be here adduced, consent being proper to the People, who in no Reason can be supposed to share in this *Imposition*, which in the Scripture accounts, and in the Sense of all the Orthodox, imports a Juridical Forensical Act. And if Ordination, (as is evident in this Instance) and the highest Censure (as appears in the preceeding) be ascribed to a Presbytery, where is the Prelatist's Sole Authority herein?

VIII. *Quer.* Whether the Authoritative Epithets of *Rulers, Governors, Bishops, or Overseers, Pastors, Watchers over Souls* as they that must give account, and several such like ascribed to Presbyters, import not their essential Interest in Government? Consequently, whether that Sole Power in Ordination and Jurisdiction assumed by Prelats, and ascribed to them by Prelatists, be not an Impeachment of the Scripture Assertion hereof? Since, 1. They thus arrogate a greater Power than was assumed by Apostles, and contradict their Practice in the Instances above adduced, wherein they assumed Pastors to an Authoritative concurrence in Government with themselves. 2ly, They thus Impeach that Forensical Collegiat Decision in Judicatories (constituted of such Officers) and their Authority therein, whereof the Scripture exhibits plenty of Instances. Thus, *Matth. 18. Scandals must be delated to the Juridical Ecclesia, or Court, tell the Church.* This also is made good by the Instance adduced of the *Presbyteries Forensical Juridical Act in Timothy's Ordination*, and by that Instance of the *Corinth Church Officers Meeting to Punish and Censure the Incestuous*; By the Apostles assertion and account of the first Solemn Council's Act and Sentence, *Acts 15. viz. It seemed good to the Holy Ghost, and to us, yea and to us met with one accord*; Wherein without any Discriminating Terms the Authority is joyntly ascribed to the whole Members of the Meeting, and their Jurisdictional Concurrence asserted.

IX. *Quer.* Whether that Text, *1 Cor. 14. 29. The Spirits of the Prophets are subject to the Prophets*, pleads not for the due Subjection of all Church Officers to Church Judicatories, to their Authoritative Advice, Instructions, Ministerial Commands, yea Censures, in case of what is amiss in either their Life, or Doctrine, Conversation, or Government? Consequently, whether Prelats are not Heteroclyts and stand in opposition to this Rule, 1. By their *Negative Voice* in Judicatories, 2ly, Their *Absolute Authority* over the very Meeting thereof, which

which must necessarily have the Prelats Authorizing Call interposed, without which, in their Principles and Pleading, they are not lawful Judicatories; And, 3ly, In that they are *Essential Presidents* therein, either immediately by their personal Presence, or Authorized Deputs? All these our prelats and Prelatists do own, and were practised in the late Edition of our *Scottish Hierarchy*, Mr. *Sharp* being declared in the Act for our National Synod the *Essential President thereof*; So were the Bishops in all their Synods, and therefore excoemed from all Subjection to, and Censure by Church Judicatories, as to either their Life or Doctrine; And thus were no true Sons or Ministers of this Church, but usurping Sons of *Belial*, opposing the Scripture Rules of Government.

X. *Quer.* Since it is uncontrovertibly clear, that the Bishop is owned, by our present Pleaders especially, as a Church Officer of Divine Appointment, superiour to, and specifically distinct from the Pastor, having, 1. A distinct Work, *viz.* to Govern a Diocese; 2ly, An *Official Interest in the Parliament* as a Member, and a remote Capacity for other Civil Employments and State Offices; 3ly, A distinct Ordination or Consecration to his Office; 4ly, Distinct Qualifications in Consequence of the whole; Whether he ought not to have stood distinguished by some special Note and Character in the *Apostles Recitation of Ordinary Church Officers*, and in the Scripture Accounts of their Gifts and Duties frequently therein mentioned, such as are exhibited, 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11, 12. *Rom.* 12. 7, 8, &c. And since, in these Texts, there is no mention of any Name or Epithet, Qualifications, Mission or Office, Work or Duties, of any Ordinary Church Officer superiour to the Pastor, whether the prelate's Office, as above described, is not sent a packing, and expunged from the Scripture Roll? The Scripture not hinting, in the least, the premised Accounts or Characters ascribable to any Ordinary Officer superiour to the Pastor, or Minister of the Word, who have Ordination and Jurisdiction ascribed to them, and all Acts of Government in a perfect Parity, 1 *Thes.* 5. 12. with 17. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. 1 *Cor.* 5. 13. 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 3 *John* 9.

XI. *Quer.* Whether the Preaching of the Gospel be not the indispensable necessary Duty of all Church Officers called thereunto, and gifted accordingly, and the great End of the Ordination of such to this important Duty, which necessarily includes Diligence therein? To this we find *Timothy*, our Prelatists supposed Bishop, zealously excited by the Apostle Paul, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1, 2. *I charge thee therefore before God and the Lord Jesus Christ, who shall judge the Quick and the Dead, at his Appearing,*
and

and his Kingdom ; Here's a weighty and alarming Charge, exciting, no doubt, to a Duty of the highest Importance ; Let us hear it, *v. 2. Preach the Word, be instant in Season, and out of Season ; Reprove, Rebuke, Exhort with all Long-suffering and Doctrine.* The Apostle Paul, another great Bishop in our Prelatists Esteem, who had * *2 Cor. 11. 28.* the Care of all the Churches coming upon him *, (and therein a Laborious Ruling Work) yet pronounces a *Woe* upon himself, if not Preaching the Gospel, *1 Cor. 9. 16.* and tells us of an Official Necessity herein laid upon him. When the Apostles (*Acts 6:*) are exciting the Church to the Choice of the Deacons, for Administring to the Poor, they do it upon this Ground, *v. 2. It is not Reason, that we should leave the Word of God, (i. e. the Preaching of the Word) and serve Tables.* And after they have discovered the Character of the Persons who are to be Deacons, who were to be appointed to take this diverting Care from the Apostles, they again inforce the premised Ground, and their standing necessary Duty, in *v. 4. But we will give our selves continually to Prayer, and to the Ministry of the Word.* The Apostle Peter, when our Lord, for his Encouragement, after his Threelfold Denial of his Master, gave this Threelfold Renovation of his Apostolick Mission, *John 21, 15, 16, 17.* had it delivered in these Terms, *Feed my Lambs ; A Second Time, Feed my Sheep ; And a Third Time, Feed my Sheep.* Accordingly the great Character of the Apostolick Bishop, *1 Tim. 3. 2.* is this, that *he be διδασκτικός apt to Teach.* *δεῖ ἔν τὸν ἐπίσκοπον ἀνεπίληπτον εἶναι, μιας γυναίκας ἄνδρα, ἡρόδων, σώφρονα, κόσμιον, φιλόξενον, διδασκτικόν.* And it being thus, I enquire, Whether the Office of the Prelate impeaches not this grand Apostolick Constitution ? Since the Bishop, *qua talis*, is bound to Preach to no Flock, nor is he, in his Episcopal Office, in the least judged defective, if wholly silent ; For which, we can appeal to the Knowledge and Conscience of all our Adversaries. The Person who was a Minister, under that Relation, to a Flock, when made a Prelate, is, *eo ipso*, loosed from that Relation, and the Duties thereof. 'Tis true, he may Preach, if he please, and at the Church where he resides ; But this is only *per accidens*, and out of Courtesie, but from no Necessity or Obligation of his Episcopal Function, which, as is said, has a special Relation to State Offices and Employments, which *this fallen Star* to an Earthly State, (as Bishop Couper, when a dying, is said to have called himself, pointing to the Ground) must properly and mainly look to. To this purpose, the Passage in History is notour of Queen Elizabeth, who, having Authorized by her Patent one of the Eminent Preachers to be a Prelate (I suppose Bishop *Bilson*) is said to have made this Regrate,

Regrate, *Alake for Pity, I have created a Bishop, but killed a good Preacher.* And there want not Witnesſes who can teſtifie, that Mr. Roſs, the late Biſhop of St. Andrews, uſed, in thir Terms, to expreſs his State and Function before he was made Biſhop, *When I was a Preacher*, intimating, he was no more ſuch in that Epiſcopal Station, to which his Practice was correſpondent, having Preached but once a Year, while in that Station. I need not reſume how that Preaching Prelates in England, have been by their Fellows derided as *Preaching Coxcombs*. To this Query I ſhall add another to enforce the former.

XII. *Quer.* Whether the Commiſſion to Preach the Goſpel, does not neceſſarily tie the Perſon clothed therewith, according to Scripture Rules, to a conſtant aſſiduous performance, and is of ſuch a Nature as cannot be removed or ſtopt, except either in the caſe of Phyſical and inevitable Impediments, ſuch as Imprisonment, Banishment, Sickneſs, and the like, or the Removal of the Office and Exerciſe by lawful Depoſition, or Church Cenures? And, conſequently, whether the laying aſide this Exerciſe and important Duty be not, 1. An Impeachment of the nobleſt and higheſt Exerciſe of Miniſterial Authority? 2^{ly}, A ſtopping, in ſo far, the great Deſign of the Conversion of Souls; Conſequently, a ſtanding in Oppoſition to the Glory of Chriſt therein? And, 3^{ly}, Whether the Reaſon pleaded for laying aſide this Exerciſe, taken from the pretended Advancement to a higher Sphere in the Miniſtery, and of a new Burden of Government, be not moſt abſurd, as impeaching both the Preſcription and Practice of the Apoſtles, who being, by Confeſſion of Prelatiſts, Church Officers of the higheſt Sphere, and having this great Work and Burden upon them, the Planting and Governing of all the Churches, did, notwithstanding, ply this Work ſtill with moſt indefatigable Diligence, as the main Duty of their Commiſſion? When the Apoſtle ſays, 1 Cor. 1.17. *Chriſt ſent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Goſpel*, tho' the Meaning is not excluſive of Baptiſm, yet he doth thus, with a ſignal Emphaſis, exalt this Work of Preaching to the higheſt Sphere of Miniſterial Duties, aſſerting it to be the main point of our Lord's Commiſſion to his Ambaſſadours, as is evident in the Original Patent and Commiſſion it ſelf, *Matth. 28. 19*, 20.

XIII. *Quer.* Since, in Epiſcopal Principles, the Biſhop is the Principle of Unity to the Dioceſs, is the primary, immediate, yea the proper ſole Paſtor thereof, with reſpect to all Acts of the Power of Order and Jurisdiction, having a Cenſorial, yea Majeſtical Regal Power over the ſame; So that his Epiſcopal Licentia (aſcribed to him by J. S.) is abſolute, and all Official Actings of any ſuppoſed Officers are precarious, depending

pending entirely upon this his *Licentia*, or absolute *Liberum Arbitrium* (another of his Prerogatives asserted by the same J. S.) ; Upon which Ground he owne it, that this Majestical Prince, or Absolute Pope, is not so much as concerned to seek their Advice in the Actings of his Power, and may, with his **NEGATIVE**, crush their most Unanimous supposed Votes ; Besides, that no Judicatory, or Meeting of Church Officers, can, without his interposed Authority, according to these Principles, be lawful, or exist : *Queritur*, Whether this be not such a Despotick, Nomotheick, Architectonick Power and Dominion, as is discharged to all Church Officers, and is, *to genere*, contrary to the very Nature of Church Government, which is Ministerial, not Magisterial, a Stewardship only, and not a Dominion ; And whether such a Power and Dominion doth not thus contradict these Scriptures, *Matth. 26. 24, 25, 26.* Ye know that the Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion over them, and they that are great exercise Authority upon them ; But it shall not be so among you, (there shall be none exercising an Arbitrary Power) but whosoever will be great among you, let him be your Minister, and whosoever will be chief among you, let him be your Servant. Here it is obvious to the meanest Reflection, that our Saviour has, in this Prohibition, sent a packing, and banished out of his Church, the Episcopal Absolute *Licentia* and *Liberum Arbitrium* asserted by J. S. and condemns as gross Antiscriptural Usurpers, Prelats, who arrogate this to themselves. Accordingly we find the great Apostle of the Gentiles disowning such a Dominion, 2 Cor. 1. 24. Yea we find the Apostle Peter, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. injoyning an equal Episcopal Care and Authority to the Pastors of the Flock, discharging expressly Dominion or Lordship in any of them over the rest. The Elders which are among you I exhort, who am also an Elder and a Witness of the Sufferings of Christ, &c. v. 2. Feed the Flock of God which is among you, taking the Oversight thereof, or Exercising an Episcopal Power, not by Constraint, but willingly, &c. v. 3. Neither as being Lords over God's Heritage, but Examples to the Flock.

See the true Scriptural Episcopacy set in Terms of Contradiction to Dominion or Lordship, and much more to such a screwed up Absolute Dominion, as J. S. together with our Episcopalians assert and ascribe to the Prelate. Upon this Ground, Diotrephes his Love of
 * 3 Epist. v. 9. Pre-eminence is condemned by the Apostle John *. Besides that the Work of all Church Officers, in universal, even including Apostles, is asserted to be a Ministry, or Ministerial Service, opposite to Lordship, Ephes. 4. 11, 12. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and some Evangelists, and some Pastors and Teachers ; For the perfecting of the Saints [for the Work of the Ministry],
 for

for the Edifying the Body of Christ. Accordingly the great Apostle of the Gentiles expresses thus his Work and Authority, 2 Cor. 4. 5. *We Preach not our selves, but Christ Jesus the Lord, and our selves your Servants for Jesus sake ; Calling it a Ministry, v. 1. and Stewardship, 1 Cor. 4. 1. Owning himself a Fellow-Servant with other Ministers, Colos. 1. 7. As you also learned of Epaphras our dear Fellow-Servant, who is for you a Faithful Minister of Christ. Thus, Ch. 4. v. 7. He calls Tychicus (another Faithful Minister) a Beloved Brother, and Fellow-Servant in the Lord : Designing them also Fellow-Labourers, Phil. 4. 3. Brethren and Fellow-Souldiers, Ch. 2, 25, Where was here the Episcopal Dominion, Absolute Licentia, and Liberum Arbitrium ?*

XIV. *Quer.* Whether that Passage, *Matth. 18. 15, 16, 17, 18.* Where our Lord enjoyns the Offending Brother to be first privately Admonished, and if Contumacious and Refractory to the Admonition, that the Admonisher take with him *one or two more*, that in the Mouth of two or three Witnesses every Word may be established, and if he neglect to hear them, the Admonishers are enjoyned to tell it unto the Church, *scil:* the Congregation, or Embodied Court of Officers, who have the Binding and Loosing Power, and upon neglecting to hear the Church, he is to be looked on as a Heathen and Publican : Whether, I say, this doth not evidently describe such a Gradation and Nature of Church Government and Censures, as ascends from the lesser to the greater Number, and this in point of Juridical Procedure and Authority therein ; Importing, consequently, a Subordination of the lesser to the greater Societies ; As also Appeals from the one to the other ? Since there is here an Allusion, even in the Judgment of our Episcopalians, unto the Jewish Courts, and the Subordination of these lesser Courts to the great Sanhedrim. Such Subordination also being clearly held out, *Acts 15.* of the Brethren and Presbytery of Antioch to the great Council of Apostles, and other Ministers in Jerusalem. As is also evident in other parallel Instances above exhibited, wherein the clear Plat-Form of Presbyteries and Synods is represented, and the Subordination of the lesser to the greater Societies and Courts. And this being clearly supposed and imported in this Text with Parallels ; It is further demanded, Whether the Episcopal Authority, as owned by our Prelatists, doth not stand clearly cross to this Order ? 1. As impeaching the Decisive Authority of Judicatories, clearly supposed in this Text. 2ly, Inverting the Order and Method here assigned in point of Juridical Procedure and Censures, which is from the lesser to the great Number, as is said ; Whereas, in the Episcopal Principles, 'tis from the great, or greatest Number, to One single

Person, in whom this Power and Authority is monopolized, and who (as *J. S.* expresses it) is the Center of Unity, and of all Ecclesiastick Authority and Judgment in the Church, over which he is set.

XV. *Quer.* Whether the Pastoral Relation and Office imports not an Obligation to perform all Pastoral Duties to the People, to whom the Pastor stands thus related? And it being evident, that, in Episcopal Principles, the Bishop is the proper immediate Pastor of, and stands in that Relation unto the whole Diocese, having the Pastoral Authority intirely monopolized in him; *Quaritur*, Whether the Bishop assumes not thus such an Office, as is in this point, contrary to the Word of God? Since, 1. 'Tis impossible he can perform all Ministerial Pastoral Duties, such as *Preaching, Conference, Examination, Visits, &c.* to his whole Diocese, which may consist of many Hundred Parishes, or Flocks, wherein Hundreds of Faithful Pastors may find Work enough. And 'tis equally certain, that the Holy God imposes not upon any Church Officer a Work or Duties which cannot possibly be performed, this being inconsistent with his Spotless Justice. 2ly, It is as clearly evident, that the Scripture allows no Deputation of the Pastoral Work and Duties (to which the Man of God is called) unto Deputies and Suffragans; God entrusting no Man with any piece of Stewardship in his Family, but what he must oversee and perform immediately by himself, and is likewise disposed and enabled to manage and overtake; Which is evident in this, that God conjoyns the Office, Gifts and Call, together, for every piece of his Work, which the Man entrusted therewith, and called thereunto, must himself immediately perform, and not entrust it to others for him, this being the Talent, of

the Improvement whereof he is to give an Account to the great Master and Lord of the Vineyard*. He will once say to all the Stewards, Give Account of thy Stewardship †, give Account of thy personal Management and Faithfulness in the Trust committed to thee. And will it be a sufficient Answer, think we, that the Steward committed the Management of this Work to Deputies or Suffragans? Remarkable it is, that the Apostle, *Rom. 12. 6, 7, &c.* describing the various Gifts and Offices in Christ's Mystical Body, enjoyns all a Diligent, Personal, and Immediate Waiting upon, and Attending their several Employments and Duties. "The Famous and Learned Whittaker derides the Popish Adversary in expounding that Text, 1 *Tim. 3. 2.* wherein it is required of the Bishop, that he be *didaxinos*, apt to Teach, scil. That he Teaches by Suffragans. Thus *Turrian*, (with others) shewing, That we must understand it of a Personal Care and Ability, and not a Deputed Care. *Quis enim hoc prestare*

* *Matth. 25.*

15, 16, 19.

† *Luke 16. 2.*

præstare non possent, saith he, Who is he who may not perform this ? Which he clears further from 2 *Tim. 2. 2.* where the Apostle enjoyns *Timothy to commit what he had heard of him to Faithful Men who shall be able to Teach others also*, or *τις ικανὸς διδάσκει καὶ ἄλλους*. Shewing also, that the old Interpreter translates *διδασκῶν* a Doctor, or Teacher. And a Doctor, saith he, or Teacher, must be supposed to have a Personal Ability to Teach. He cites also *Occumenius* and *Chrysostom* expounding thus the premised Scripture, yea, even some of the School Men, such as *Cajetan*, *Catharinus* and *Aquinas*, who, to this purpose, applies that Passage of *Jeremy 3. 15.* *I will give Pastors according to mine Heart, which shall Feed you with Knowledge and Understanding.* So that, upon the whole, 'tis evident, that, in this point, the Bishop assumes an Office and Work, which, according to the Scripture Rules, he has no Call unto, nor can possibly perform.

XVI. *Quer.* Whether Prelates sitting in Parliament, as Constituent Members, yea, and as One of the Estates thereof, as likewise their Official Actings in Councils, and other Civil Judicatories, their holding State Offices, and being employed in Secular Affairs, be not cross unto, and clearly condemned by several clear Scripture Rules ?

As, 1. By our Saviour's discharging Civil Dominion to all Church Officers: *The Princes of the Gentiles*, says he, *exercise Dominion, but it shall not be so among you*, *Matth. 20. 25*, &c. i. e. I discharge you, and all my Ministers Civil Rule, or Dominion. This will be conspicuous, if we consider, that, upon the One Hand, the Prelates do owne Name and Thing of Lordship ; And tho' they will needs be distinguished from the Temporal, by this Designation of *Lords Spiritual*, yet it is beyond all peradventure, that, in Parliament and Council, they Act the Temporal Lords, in Official Consulting and Determining in State Affairs, and that of the highest Nature, as Peers of the Kingdom, (being, in England, Members of the Higher House, or House of Peers ; And we know, that, in this Nation, the Parliament Riding of the Two Arches is before all the Nobility, and of the other Bishops, before the Viscounts) ; And, upon the Other Hand, the Civil Power and Government is, in the Nature thereof, a Dominion, so declared by the Apostle, *Rom. 13. 1.* *Let every Soul be subject to the higher Powers,* ἡς οὐκ ἐστὶν ὑπερέχουσας, *Potestatibus Dominatibus, or Dominantibus ; So Tremellius ; Or, Potestatibus Supereminentibus, so Beza.* The Evidence of the premised Text forces Bishop *Honniceman* to acknowledge, That our Lord had therein prohibited Worldly Pomp and Civil Greatness to Church Rulers * ; And if the premised Instances will not inter this, and prove

* Survey of Napb. Part 2. Pag. 197, 198.

such a civil Greatness and Pomp, and be not such a prohibited fastuous Worldly Greatness, surely nothing is.

2ly This is contrary to that *High Importance* of the Work of the Ministry, asserted in Scripture, and, in Consequence hereof, the continual Attendance thereupon, which is called for. This is such, that even Paul, the great Apostle of the Gentiles, found himself scarce sufficient for; 2 Cor. 2. 16. *Who is sufficient*, saith he, *for these things*. But it seems Prelates are beyond his Sufficiency, who are sufficient to perform all the Ministerial Duties to their Diocess, and to manage the highest State Affairs also; Or rather are such Spurious Amphibions as are wholly Insufficient, as having neither a Call nor Ability for the one nor the other. Again, This Ministerial Work the Apostle holds out to be of such a Nature, as will take up entirely the Man of God his Time, Endeavours, Studies, Exercise of Gifts and Grace. Of this, among others, we have a notable Proof, 1 Tim. 4. 15. after the Apostle has exhorted Timothy not to neglect the Gift which was in him, given him by Prophecy, with the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery; He adds this weighty Exhortation, v. 15. *Meditate upon these things, give thy self wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all. Give thy self wholly to them.* ἐν ταῖς τοῖς, in eis insiste, So Tremellius; In his Esto, So Beza. Which is confirmed by the Exhortation following, v. 16. *Take heed unto thy self, and unto thy Doctrine: continue in them; For in doing this, thou shalt both save thy self, and them that hear thee.* What place is here left for State Offices, and Employments? The Apostle, when thus enjoining the Bishop, Timothy, stood in need of our Spiritual Lords Advise-ment, that these peremptory Exhortations might have been better cautioned and limited, with respect to their necessary State Employments, and to save their Lordships Interest in Parliamentary and State Consultations, the main Trust of their Episcopal Peerage.

3ly, The premised State-medlings appear cross to the Nature of Christ's Kingdom, which, by his own express Declarator and Assertion, John 18. 36. *Is not of this World*, i. e. The Authority and Power thereof not having for its Object, nor exercised about Things of this World. 'Tis wholly Spiritual as to its Laws, Means of Propagation, immediate Scope and End; And being, in all these Respects, distinguished from Worldly Power, Greatness, and Authority, (as is acknowledged by all the Orthodox) 'tis beyond all peradventure, that, as the Kingdom it self, so the Offices thereof are not of this World, but, in all the premised Respects, are of another Nature.

4ly, This Civil Authority, and Worldly Pomp of Prelates stands evidently cross to the Apostles Exhortation and Illustrating Motive,
2 Tim.

2 Tim. 2. 3, 4. *Thou therefore endure hardness as a good Soldier of Jesus Christ. No Man that Warreth entangleth himself with the affairs of this Life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a Soldier.* Behold the Bishop Timothy in his Ministerial Office standing in a Relation to Christ the Mediator of the Covenant, warring a good Warfare under this glorious Captain of Salvation, 1 Tim. 1. 18. accordingly enjoined the enduring of hardness, joyning Faith and Patience in all the laborious Duties and Difficulties of this Ministry, and in a special manner excited to beware of that which may indispose him for, and weaken his Heart and Hands in this Work, scil. *The entangling himself with the affairs of this Life*; And the whole pressed with this great Motive, that he may please this glorious Captain, who hath Chosen him to be a Soldier. Here also the great Apostle of the Gentiles, in the premised Admonition to the Bishop Timothy, stood in need of our State-Prelates cautionary Advertisement; But the Scripture Canon being herein silent has put to silence these State-Meddlers, and forever stopt their Mouths.

Finally, The premised Civil Offices of Prelats stand clearly cross to the exemplary Recorded Practice of our Saviour the Head of his Church, in whom is concentrated all Ecclesiastick Authority, from whom, consequently, all lawful Authority is derived. For we find, Luke 12. 13, 14. that he did peremptorily refuse so much as *to give an Advice in a Civil Affair*, and that even to part a Strife betwixt contending Brethren, Vers. 13. *One of the Company said unto him, Master, speak to my Brother that he divide the Inheritance with me.* Now remark our Lord's return, Vers. 14. *And he said unto him, Man, who made me a Judge or a Divider over you?* Behold the enforcing Ground of the Refusal, *Who made me a Judge?* As much as to say, I disown all Judging in Civil Affairs. And if the Glorious Head did thus disown it, how dar his professed Members and Officers own it, and counteract his Authority therein? Are not these *the Servants of Men, not of Christ*, 1 Cor. 7. 23. Gal. 1. 10. who dar thus usurp upon his Authority? Upon this Ground, in the Judgment of the Orthodox, our Saviour refused to pass the Sentence of Moses's Law, Lev. 20. 10. upon the Woman taken in Adultery, as we have the History Recorded, John 8. When these Adversaries posed him with Moses's Command in the passage premised, asking him, *What sayest thou?* Vers. 5. We find our Lord slighted the Motion, and when he had, by a Conviction, chas'd these Adversaries away, and asked the Woman, *Hath no Man condemned thee?* Vers. 10. Upon her Answer, *No Man, Lord*, Vers. 11. *Jesus said unto her, neither do I condemn thee. Go and sin no more.* Now let our Prelats,
or

or their Advocats, reconcile, if they can, their Official State Employment and Civil Grandure with the premised Scriptures; And it this be impossible, as to all unprejudic'd serious Persons it evidently appears, then let them be looked upon (as indeed they are) in so far *the Servants of Men*, Officers of the Kingdoms of this World, not of Christ's Church. 'Tis known how this Practice and Medling was condemned by the Ancients. Whosoever shall peruse the Canons called Apostolick, and even *Balsamon's* Comment upon them, viz. the 6. 83. Also the seventh of the Council of *Chalcedon*, with several others, will find this evident beyond exception.

XVII. *Quer.* Whether the premised accounts of the Apostolick Office and Ingredients thereof, *scil.* their *immediat Call*, their *proper Work and Duties* as such, which was to plant Churches through the World, to deliver the Gospel, Doctrine and Rules unto them, *Infallibly* to Inspect and Govern them, as being endow'd with *Infallibility in Doctrine*, with *Extraordinary miraculous Gifts* abovementioned, did not render their Office *Extraordinary* in a proper formal Sense, and such as could not be Succeeded unto; Since neither their *Work*, their *Gifts*, nor the *proper immediat End* thereof could be derived unto Successors on?

XVIII. *Quer.* Whether the Supposition and Principle of Prelats Succeeding Apostles, as such, and in the full extent of their Power, will not infer the Obligations of Apostles to have Planted and Ordained Officers to Succeed them of *alike Nature with themselves*? And whether this supposed Obligation, be not impeached both by their fixing Presbyters or Pastors in the Churches which they planted, as their immediat Successors in their Ministerial Power, as also in committing to them the *Ordinary Power* of Government in their last Farewells to the Churches, without any hint of the Superinstitution of Officers of a Higher Order? *Acts* 20, 28, 29, with 25. *1 Pet.* 5. 2, 3. compared with *2 Pet.* 1. 14. *Acts* 14. 23.

XIX. *Quer.* Whether the supposed Prelatical Succession will not only infer, that the Apostolick Office in a formal Sense was Ordinary, but likewise will impeach the Apostles of Unfaithfulness, in straitning their Apostolick Inspection, consequently limiting their Extensive Commission, by fixing in particular Posts; Their Work being *infallibly to Inspect all the Churches*, as Catholick Officers thereof; To Plant and Water them through all places, whether they were directed by the Spirit's immediat Influence? The Query is enforced further, upon this Ground, That Prelats are supposed to be fixed in their particular Posts, and so fixed, that their *State*, and *Relation*, as likewise their *Gifts*, and
Work

Work is wholly different from, and opposite to the premised accounts of that of the Apostles.

XX. *Quer.* Whether the Apostles instituting Deacons in the Church of Jerusalem, not immediately, or Arbitrarily, but upon the Peoples Choise, *Acts 6. 3.* Wherefore, Brethren, look you out among you seven Men of honest Report, full of the Holy Ghost and Wisdom, whom we may appoint over this business; To which Command we find the correspondent practice, *Verf. 5.* And the saying pleased the whole multitude, and they chose Stephen, a Man full of Faith and of the Holy Ghost, and Philip, &c. will not infer Church Members Interest in the Call and Choise of Pastors? Since if this Trust of distributing the Peoples Alms might be committed to none but upon their Consent and Choise, the Argument appears to run *a fortiori*, thus, Therefore People have a far greater Interest as to their Consent and Choise of the Pastor, to whom they are, in a Ministerial Sense, to entrust their Souls conduct to another World, which is of infinite more Worth than all this Earths Treasures; Reserving still the Ordination and Institution to the Church Officers and Guides, as is evident in the Context, *Verf. 6.* Whom they set before the Apostles; and when they had Prayed they laid their Hands on them. The Argument seems further thus strengthened, That if for this mean Employment, the Apostles would not set apart, nor institute the Men, without the Peoples Choice and Consent, far less can it be supposed, that they did institute the highest Ordinary Officer, the Pastor, to Officiat in that eminent Office without the same Consent and Call. Besides what is effectually pleaded from that passage of *Acts 14.* Wherein we Read that the Elders, or Ministers, who were Ordained κατ' ἐκκλησίαν, or Church by Church, were thus Ordained, and set apart to their Office, as is imported in the Term χειροτονισαντες, importing a Hand-suffrage, or Consent thereby expressed; And that this Ordination was to be performed in the Church, and therefore necessarily with the Peoples Consent and Choise. Besides what we Read *Acts 1.* that the two Candidats for the Apostolat were Chosen, not by the Apostles alone, but with Consent and Appointment of the Church, *Verf. 23.* And if a Congregational Church and Elderthip be of Divine Right, as is above cleared, this Call must needs be their Priviledge. And moreover the Spiritual near Relation betwixt the Minister and his Flock, importing peculiar Reciprocal Duties must needs suppose a voluntary Consent and Call. And moreover, the Judgment of Discretion, the Spiritual discerning and trying of the Spirits enjoyned to the People of God, must in a special manner be allowed in this case; That Christ's Sheep

Sheep admit not the hireling and stranger in stead of the true Shepherd, John 10. 8, 13, 14, 27. Upon the whole, the renewed Enquiry is made, Whether Episcopal Government denying this Privilege to the People, and obtruding pretended Pastors without their Consent and Choise, (supposing them willing to submit to a Faithful Ministry) be not an Impeachment of this Privilege of the Church and People of God, and a contradiction of the premised Scriptures asserting the same?

XXI. *Quer.* Whether the passages above mentioned, 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8. as explained and improv'd above, and by Willet, Whittaker, and other Protestant Divines, will infer the Divine Right of the Ruling Elder? And consequently, Whether Prelats disowning this Divine Right, involves them not in the great Guilt of opposing a Church Officer of God's Appointment, and renders their pretended Judicatories Maim'd, Mank, and Defective, as excluding, and being destitute of a necessary Member thereof?

XXII. *Quer.* Whether, upon the premised account of the late Prelacy in Scotland, as being Framed and so Constituted, that it was declared entirely and absolutely at the Magistrats disposal, as is evident Parl. K. Charles II. Sess. 2. Act 1. Besides several other Instances adduced, and the premised acknowledgments of Prelats themselves, it doth not evidently follow, that the Government was entirely of the Erastian Mould, and consequently stands condemned by the many clear Scripture Grounds and Arguments adduced by Protestant Divines against that Method of Government? Such as that, 1. The Scripture holds out a clear Distinction of the Civil and Ecclesiastick Sanhedrim under the Old Testament, made good at large by our Divines, particularly by Mr. Gillespy in the Aaron's Rod, from Exod. 24. compared with Numb. 10, 11. Deut. 17. 8, 9, 10. 1 Chron. 23. 4. and 26. 29. compared with 2 Chron. 19. 8, 10, 11. So that their Church Government was not of such a Mixture and confused Nature as to coalesce and be resolv'd into the Civil Headship and Sovereignty of their Kings, Empowering them to Act the Civil Pope over the same; But that their Ecclesiastick Sanhedrim had its distinct Ecclesiastick Members from the Civil, as likewise distinct Objects of Power, *scil.* Matters Ecclesiastick, and by consequence also a Decisive distinct Suffrage, and under a distinct Ecclesiastick Moderator or President. 2ly, That this Fountaining of the Church Government in the Civil is cross to the Distinction of the Gospel Church Government from that of the Magistrat, held out in the New Testament; Since, 1, Christ's

I. Christ's Visible Church being his Visible Kingdom as Mediator, its Officers, Laws, and Censures must fall within the Compass of his Mediatory Appointment and Inspection, as Political Head of this Kingdom, Stated and Moulded in such a Distinction, *Matth. 16. 19, 28, 29. John. 18. 36. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11, 12. 2ly*, The Gospel Church was compleated as to Rulers and Ruled when no Magistrat was so much as a Member of her. Yea and *3ly*, The Precepts anent the Exercise of this Power are enjoyned to the Church, and to these Officers *as such*, with the same Freedom, and Independency upon the Civil Government, as at the first, without the least hint of a Restriction or Limitation in case of the Magistrat's becoming Christian; The Grounds in pressing the Exercise of this Power being *moral* and *perpetual*, respecting the Church as in that capacity. So that this Erastian Government encroaches upon Christ's Prerogative over his Church, the Power ascribed, in the late Prelacy, to the King, *scil. To dispose of all Church Meetings and Matters as his Majesty thought fit*, being certainly *Architeconick*, and *Magisterial*, and such a *Dominion* over her as is the incommunicable Prerogative of her glorious Head, to whom alone appertain these high Titles and Prerogatives, *That he is given to be Head over all things unto the Church, Eph. 1. 21, 22. That all Judgment is committed to him over her, John. 5. 22. That he is the Governour over his Church, by way of Eminency, Matth. 2. 6. The great Shepherd of the Sheep, Heb. 13. 20. The Shepherd and Bishop of Souls, 1 Pet. 2. 25. That One Master over all Church Officers, who are but Brethren, Matth. 23. 8, 10. That he is the only Lawgiver, or Statute-maker, to whom alone belong Imperial Acts of Power, Jam. 4. 12. Isa. 33. 22. Acts 1. 2. Gal. 6. 2.* A third Ground is, That this Erastian Government makes the Magistrat, as such, the proper immediat Subject of the Keyes, which is clearly cross to the Scripture accounts of our Lord's Donation thereof to Church Officers of his Appointment: Besides many other obvious Encroachments upon the Churches Priviledges; Such as denying the Church a Liberty to Exercise her Power and Key of Censure without the Magistrat, contrary to all the New Testament Instances of this her Independent Authority, inverting the very Nature of her Government, which is a Ministerial Stewardship, not a Dominion, such as is the Power of the Civil Magistrat; Giving also to the Magistrat, as such, (for King Charles his Ecclesiastick Government was Enacted as his perpetual Crown Right, and thus Recognosced by Prelatists) the Proper, Sole, Decisive Suffrage in all Causes Ecclesiastical.

XXIII. *Quer.* Since it is apparent, from the Principles and Practice of our Dissident Prelatists, especially in several late Pamphlets published since the Revolution, that they disown the Confessions of this Reformed Church; What Assurance can the People of God have of their Orthodoxy and Soundness in the Faith; Since they have exhibited no new Confessions whereby this may be known, but, on the contrary, have Publish'd and own'd Principles cross to the Confessions of the Reformed Churches? The Author of the *Apology for M. Antonia Burignon*, Defends these two blasphemous Opinions, 1. *That Christ had a sinful Will.* 2. *That God is Ignorant of all the Actions that Men do by their choice and freewill.* Besides the other horrid Errors Defended in that Apology. From which none of the Prelatick Clergy have, to this Day, declared their Dissent, and therefore may be looked upon as Homologating this their Brother's mischievous Principles and Design. The Author of the *Case of the Episcopal Clergy* calls our Reformation a Lamentable Schism. Dr. Scott, in his Book called the *Christian Life*, Part 3. Chap. 9. Mocks at Conversion and Regeneration as fancies and effects of a distempered Blood. He calls absolute Election and Reprobation a meer Willfulness in God, &c. He calls the acknowledgment of a Desertion that is Spiritual a blasphemous Interpretation of Scripture.

Several such Queries might be adduc'd; But when our Prelatists shall give a satisfying Answer to these premised, then, and not before, shall the Government they contend for be acquitted of this Charge of Contrariety to the Scripture Standard and Rules in this point. And what Imputation this puts upon their present Principles and Practice in opposition to this Reformed Church, is remitted to their Impartial and Serious Consideration.

CON-

CONSIDERATIONS

CONCERNING

CHURCH-GOVERNMENT.

Offered to their Thoughts who are Serious in enquiring into this Point.

CONSIDERATION I.



*M*R. *Stillingfleet's* Notion, touching the Indifferency of Forms of Church Government, has been justly exploded and disown'd by severals who have Written upon this Subject, both before and since his Book appeared, which are well known. *First*, Christ's Political Headship over *his Church Visible*, doth clearly evince this point of the Scriptures

Affertion of a *Distinct Species of Government*; In that, 1. It follows, that all Ordinances of *Doctrine and Worship*, consequently of *Government*, must fall under his Appointment, his Commands and Regulations thereanent, and wherein the Scriptures give a distinct Sound: Thus Administrations relating to the *Key of Order* are clearly expressed, such as *Prayer and Thanksgiving*, 1 Tim. 2. 1, 2. 1 Cor. 14. 14. *Singing Psalms, Reading, Preaching the Word*, 2 Tim. 4. 2. Col. 3. 16. Ephes. 5. 19. 1 Cor. 14. 15, 16. Thus the *Administration of the Sacraments, Baptism and the Lords Supper*, Matth. 28. 18, 19. 1 Cor. 11. 23. Thus, as the Administrations relating to the *Key of Order*, so such as

have a respect to *Jurisdiction* fall under clear Institutions, viz. *Ordination*, Tit. 1. 5. 1 Tim. 5. 14. The *Dogmatick Power*, in Ministerial Judging of Doctrine stands clearly Exemplified Acts 15. Thus also the *Critick Power*, in the rebuke of the Scandalous and receiving the Penitent, Matth. 18. 15, 16. 1 Thes. 5. 14. compared with Matth. 16. 19. Joh. 20. 21. Thus also the *Diatactick Power*, respecting *Rituals* and *Alterable Circumstances*, is asserted, and Rules laid down respecting its Exercise, 1 Cor. 14. And as the *Administrations* and *Ordinances*, so the *Administrators*, *Officers* and *Courts* have their clear Warrant; Such as the *Pastoral Office*, 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13, &c. Together with his Duty of *Preaching the Word*, *Catechizing*, 2 Tim. 4. 1. Heb. 5. 12. *Administering Sacraments*, Matth. 28. 1 Cor. 11. *Blessing the People*, 2 Cor. 13. *Caring for the Poor*, Acts. 6. The *Doctrinal Office of Teaching*, 1 Cor. 12. 28. The *Ruling Elders and Deacons Office*, Rom. 12. 7, 8. 1 Tim. 3. 8. Acts 6. 2, 3. Likewise the several sorts of *Assemblies* are clearly pointed at in Scripture, such as the *Congregational Assembly*, Heb. 13. 17. 1 Thes. 5. 12, 13. *Classical Assemblies*, 1 Tim. 4. 14. The *Synodical Assemblies*, Acts 15. 2, 6, 22, 23. Wherein the *Diatactick, Critick and Dogmatick Power* is clearly Exemplified. See *Jus Divin. Reg. Eccl. The Scheme and Account of Church Government exhibited by the Assembly of Divines*, &c. 2ly, Whatever Government of the Church is pretended to must be either consonant or dissonant to the premised Institutions; For no Man of Sense will say, that all *Forms* are, or can be: Neither can there be existent any *Individuum vagum*, in this point especially; Else *Anarchy* in Church Government, in the one extreme, and the *Papal Monarchy* in the other, might both have a Scripture Warrant: The Warrantableness of the last (being forced by this Argument) one of our late Prelats did acknowledge, but was afterwards thereof ashamed. 3ly, Whatever Reasons do conclude the Perfection of *Christ's Kingly Office*, and the Exercise thereof, as respecting the Institution of such Ordinances as have a Relation to the Power of Order, will necessarily, and by inevitable consequence, conclude the Perfection of his Institutions in point of *Jurisdiction and Government*. Our Saviour is in this External and Political Sense called the Churches King, Psal. 2. And what King is there without a fixed Government, and Laws regulating the same? In this Sense (scil. External and Political) he is called the Churches Head, Law-giver, and Statute-maker, Ephes. 1. 22. Col. 2. 19. Ephes. 5. 23. with 30. Isa. 33. 22. And in this Sense the Churches Government is said to be upon his Shoulder, Isa. 9. 6. That is, Supported and Exercised by him; Thus he is Represented, Rev. 1. *Walking amidst the Churches with his Kingly Robe* and

and Girdle, and holding the Stars, that is, the Officers (consequently their Official Exercise of Government) in his Right Hand. 4ly, Hence all Actings of an Ecclesiastick Judiciary Power must be in his Name and Authority as Mediator, Head and King of his Church, which is his External, Visible Kingdom. What grosser Implicantia in Adjecto, than to say, there be Officers of State which Act not in the King's Name and Authority? And this Connection is clearly fortify'd by Scripture. All Actings of the Power of Order are in his Name, such as Preaching and Baptizing: Thus also in his Name Discipline is exercised, the Exercise of both Keyes being by him entrusted to his Ministers, in order to the Retaining and Remitting of Sins, John 20. 21, 22, 23. with Matth. 18. 18. The Incestuous was to be cast out by Excommunication in his Name, 1 Cor. 5. And if every Officer's Mission and Official Actings must be in his Name, sure they must be instructed (as every Magistrates Actings in a Kingdom) by the Laws, that is, the Word and Testament of this great Lawgiver. All who Anticipate this Call in point of Official Actings, are, by our Lord's own Assertion, (John 10.) Thieves and Robbers, and Running Unsent, cannot expect his promised Blessing. Finally, all Officers and Offices in his House, are given by him, and by his Mediatory Authority settled in his Church, Ephes. 4. 8, 11. 1 Cor. 12. 28. they are his Stewards and Embassadors, Luke 12. 25. with 12. 42. Hence this Donation and Mission must needs be instructed in his Testament; And therefore, by necessary Consequence, it must give a distinct Sound as to the Nature of their Office and Official Actings. The Perfection of our Saviour's Offices, as Mediator of the Covenant, doth further evince this: His Prophetical excludes all superadded Revelations; His Priestly all Meritorious Satisfactions and Intercessions, because of the Perfection of both for their proper ends; And why shall not the Exercise of his Kingly Office, with respect to the Officers, Censures, Laws and Government of his Kingdom, be judged of the same Perfection and Exclusive Nature?

A Second Ground evincing this point, is taken from the Scriptures Perfection hereanent, and that Judiciary Jurisdictional Power expressed Acts 15: Where we find put forth such a Diatractick, Critick and Dogmatick Authority as is said, and such as did Bind the whole Church. And certainly, whatever is written, is written for our Learning, to instruct our Faith and Practice in every point of Duty. This is further clear, if we shall consider a Twofold General, Extensive and Genuine Aspect of the Scriptures in this point. 1. That clause, for our Learning and Instruction, *ἵνα τὴν ἡμετέραν διδασκαλίαν προσπαύσῃ*, Rom. 15. 4. must relate not only to the Factum, or the Practice it self, but likewise and mainly

to the *Jus*, or the *Reasons* and *Grounds* of this Apostolick Government. For, as this is the most proper and profitable Instruction, so the Grounds thereof appear evidently to oblige us, whether we consider the Apostles *immediate infallible Direction* from Christ, in point of Church Government, the receiving the *Keyes* immediately from him, *Matth.* 16. 19. *Joh.* 20. 21. or their *immediate Promise of his presence with them*, and their *successors*, to the end of the *World*, in the Exercise of a necessary Official Power, for the Churches Preservation and Edification, together with the Down-pouring of the Spirit, to lead them into all Truth, *John* 14. 6. with 16. 14, 15. compared with *Acts* 2. This if we deny, and that such Apostolick Patterns amount not to an Obligatory Rule, we will impeach the Authority of other *Acts of Religion* received from them, and bottom'd chiefly on this Foundation of their Practice, and the Apostolick Churches Reception and Improvement accordingly; Such as receiving the *Lord's supper on the Lord's Day*, and such like. 2^{ly}, This Efficacy of the Divinely Inspired Scriptures reaches not only the *private Christian's* perfect Instruction in point of Christian Duties, but likewise in special the *Man of God*, the Minister of God, or Church Officer, in point of his *Official Actions*, and *Governing Duties as in that Capacity*: The Scripture then setting down all necessary Officers, together with their *Gifts and Duties*, and to this end, that they may be fully instructed therein, sure, there must be a Species of Government set down with respect to this end, else the Scripture falls short of this end, and the Perfection thereof is impeached. How far the Obligation of a Divine Example and Scripture Pattern is to be extended, cannot be here enlarged upon, only this is accorded by all Sound Divines, That Scripture Examples are Obligatory, the Reason and Scope whereof are of a Moral Nature, as much concerning one Christian Church as another, one Time as another: Such is the Example of the Church Officers of Corinth, in Excommunicating the Incestuous, lest he should Leaven the whole Lump, and that his *Flesh or Corruption* might be destroyed, and the Spirit saved, 1 Cor. 5. 5, 6. And none can deny the Scripture Instances of this *Judiciary Exercise* of the fore-mentioned Courts and Church *Judicatories*, to have a Moral standing End, since they are clearly held out to have a respect, as Means, unto the Churches Edification, until Christ's coming to Judgment, till which time, this *Judiciary Power* of the ordinary necessary Church Officers, and their Commission, ceases not, *Ephes.* 4. 11, 12. These instanced Grounds of his promised presence, the Authorizing of all Church Officers by his Laws, their derived Commission and Instructions from him, the Necessity of their Acting upon Ground of his Word, without which, they Act not in Faith, but sine Titulo, do clearly conclude

conclude our Lord's Authorizing Influences in this point, and evince, that the denying thereof removes the Foundation of other Ordinances, as well as that of Government.

CONSIDERATION II.

THE Office of the *Diocesan Prelate*, which enhanfeth all Ecclesiastick Authority in the Diocess, in the Person of the Prelate, to be by him derived to Pastors, who are not properly the Subjects of Church Government, according to this Frame, is, as in many other respects, so, in this point, contrary to the Scriptures, in that the Scriptures do clearly hold out Pastors *immediate Essential Interest in Government*, as is evident. 1. In the Scriptures *Designations, Names and Epithets* holding out *the Nature of the Pastoral Office*; Such as that of ἡγούμενος, importing a Leader, Conductor, Captain or Governour, Heb. 13. 7, 17, that of ποιμήν, 1 Tim. 5. 17. and ποιμαίνων, importing also Rule and Authority, Rom. 12. 8. that of ἐπισκοπός importing also Authority, Acts 20. 28. Phil. 1. 1. Several other Instances might be given, as that of πρεσβύτερος, that of ποιμαίνω, &c. Hence the Consequence is clear, that a Government impeaching this Authority, must needs be cross to the Scripture Rules. This Argument is at large insisted upon from these Titles and Epithets by Protestant Divines; Particularly the Learned Turretin, de Potest. Eccl. Loco XVIII. Quest. 29. Thes. 9. proves this Pastoral Essential Interest in Government, Quia Tituli quibus Pastores insigniuntur hanc Potestatem notant cum vocantur ποιμένες, 1 Tim. 5. 17. ποιμαίνων, 1 Thes. 5. 17. ἡγούμενος, Heb. 13. 17. ἐπισκοπός, Acts 20. 28. ἐπίσκοπος, 1 Cor. 4. 12. Tit. 1. 7. κυβερνήτης, 1 Cor. 12. 28. And downward he shews that this Power, Tum temporis exercebatur a Rectoribus, quæ non fuit tantum circa Prædicationem Verbi, sed etiam circa Disciplinam, ut Exempla varia docent, &c. i. e. "That, at this time, this Power was exercised by Church Governours, which not only respected the Preaching of the Word, but also Government and Discipline, as the various Examples do shew. 2ly, The Scriptures hold out Pastors Exercise of this Official Essential Government, without the least shadow of a precarious Dependence upon a Prelate: This is clear 1 Thes. 5. 12. Where it is evident, that the πρεσβύτεροι jointly Laboured, and were accordingly to be obeyed by Church Members, for this their Works sake, both in Preaching and Ruling, especially since (v. 14.) they are exhorted Authoritatively to warn the Unruly; So that a joint Exercise of Preaching, Ruling, and Censuring, is ascribed to the Pastors of this Church, without the least hint of a Prelate's Superintendency. Thus, Heb. 13, with 7. and 15.

v. we find, that Pastors have a *Joint Rule* ascribed to them over that Church, and that in the Capacity of *Preachers of the Word*, and such as immediately *Watch for Souls*, who are again, as such, Teachers and Rulers, (v. 24.) distinguished from the Saints and Church Members. And, in 1 Tim. 5. 17. the *higher Honour* above Ruling (which Episcopalsians ascribe to the Bishop) is, with the Emphasis of a *μάλιστα*, or *Especially*, ascribed to the *Labourer in the Word and Doctrine*; The Discriminating and Exalting Nature of which Term appears in several parallel Texts, as Gal. 6. 10. *Let us do Good to all Men, μάλιστα, Especially to them who are of the Household of Faith.* 1 Tim. 4. 10. *We trust in the living God who is the Saviour of all Men, μάλιστα, Especially of those that believe.* This *Essential Interest* of the Pastor in Government, as the highest ordinary Church Officer, is asserted by the current of protestant Divines, particularly the Professors of *Leiden*, *Disput. 42. Thes. 26.* After they have asserted the Pastor to be the highest ordinary Officer, (Thes. 20.) they assign his proper Work and Duties, such as *Preaching of the Word, Administration of the Sacraments*, the fourth and last they assign to be, *Populum freno Disciplina Ecclesiastica intra limites obedientie Deo secundum verbum ipsius debite continere. i. e.* "To keep the People within the Limits of that Obedience which is due to God according to his Word by the Exercise of Ecclesiastical Discipline: *Matth. 18. 17. Acts. 20. 28. Ephes. 4. 1, 12.* Thus also by many others, which were needless to rehearse.

The Scripture Instances of this immediate Exercise of the Pastor's *Jurisdictional Power*, without a precarious Dependence upon a Prelate, are very clear and pregnant, and accordingly improven by Presbyterian Writers, yea, and by the Current of Protestant Divines. The first I shall mention is that fore-cited place, *Acts 15.* Where it is evident, that the Elders or Pastors concurred in all that *Distastick, Critick, and Dogmatick* Procedure with the Apostles themselves, who Acted therein not as Apostles, but as Elders, and as *ἐννομοκράτορες*, as the Apostle Peter terms himself, 1 Pet. 5. *ὁ ἐννομοκράτορ*. And, in the stating of the Question in the Debate and Conference upon the point, the *Judiciary Decision and Sentence*, in the *Decretal Epistle* enjoining the Churches Obedience, we find the Elders or Pastors, and that as met together, *pari passu* concurring with the Apostles. The Second Instance is in that 1 Tim. 4. 14. Where we find the highest Action of *Jurisdictional Authority*, the Ordination even of an Evangelist, Timothy, appropriated to a Presbytery, or Consistorial Meeting of Pastors, clearly pointing at their *Essential Judiciary Power and Interest in Government*. The Exceptions of Prelatists to this Passage have been fully scann'd and baff'd by Presbyterians. That Exception

tion from *Paul's laying on of Hands*, 2 Tim. 1. 6. hath no shadow of Strength: For, admitting *Paul's* presence at this Ordination (which, notwithstanding, the different Particles, *κατα* in the first Text, and *δια* in the other, render, at least, debateable), our Argument is rather strengthened than weakened; Since neither the great Apostle of the Gentiles his *laying on Hands*, nor the previous Prophecies anent *Timothy's* Gifts and Success, did swallow up, or exclude the Presbyteries Power; but even this Evangelist must pass through the Door of *their* Authoritative Ordination, or *laying on of Hands*; Ergo, by an Argument *a maiore ad minus*, that Authority much more belongs to them now, in reference to Ordinary Church Officers, when the Office of Apostles and Evangelists is ceased. That other Exception, that the Term [*Presbytery*] denotes the Office, not a *Judicatory*, has been also frequently exposed, and the contrary Sense evinced by the Current of Interpreters upon the place; *Vatablus*, *Estius*, *Bulinger*, *Paræus*, *Diodat*, *Belgick Divines*, *English Annotations*, who oppose the Fourth Council of Carthage to this Exposition, and the Practice of the Reformed Churches to this day. Likeways *Pools* 2d. Part, *Menchæus Terinus*, *Beza*, &c. Yea, even some Episcopalians, *Arch-Bishop of Spalato*, *de Rep. Eccles. Hooker*, *Eccles. Pol. Camero*, who, in the Knowledge of the Greek, was *Nemini Secundus*, on *Matth. 18. 5.* taxeth that Acceptation which interprets this Term of the Office, as, First, Imputing to the Holy Ghost harsh and improper Language. such as that of an Office *laying on of Hands*, must needs appear. Secondly, Because the Word *πρεσβυτεριον* never signifies the Office, where it occurs in the New Testament, citing the Parallels, *Luke 22. 66.* *Acts 22. 5.* The Office being likewise signified by the Word *πρεσβυτεριον*, but here the Word signifies an Imbodied Court. Thirdly, Because *Timothy's* Authority was greater, than that it could be called a Presbyterate. Certainly, when we ponder the Apostle's planting Pastors, *Church by Church*, as the highest ordinary Officers, without the least hint of a Super-Institution of Officers of a higher Order in these Churches, either before or after this Plantation, the Denominations given these Officers importing *their Power and Authority*, the Exemplifying Instances of the Exercise thereof, yea, and the commanded Exercise of the same in the Apostle's last Farewells to the Churches, as properly and essentially inherent in their Office *, and without such a precarious Dependence as is alledged, the Official Jurisdictional Authority of Pastors in this Consistorial Meeting is most evidently evinced. A Third Instance of Pastors inherent Official Authority in Government, exclusive of a precarious Dependence

* *Acts 20. 28.*
1 Cor. 5. 1 Pet.
5. 1 Thes. 5. 12,
13. Heb. 7. 17.

upon Officers of a higher Order, is in that pregnant Passage, *1 Cor. 5.* Where the Power and Authority of *Excommunication* is found competent to Presbyters or Pastors of that Church, and the Exercise thereof enjoined. That this Church was a *Presbyterial Church*, under the Inspection of a *Presbyterial Associated Ministry*, has been made good from the Multitude of Believers in that Church, *Acts 18. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.* The plenty of Preachers therein, (*ibidem*) *1 Cor. 3. 10. 1 Cor. 5. 14.* From the Subordination of Prophets to Prophets, as to a Judicial Cognizance upon their Exercises, *1 Cor. 14. 29.* From the intimated plurality of Churches in that City, which, notwithstanding, are pointed out in the Inscription as *one Church* in respect of Government. For, whereas, *1 Cor. 1. 2.* the Apostle salutes the Church of God at Corinth, yet, notwithstanding, *Chap. 14. 34.* he saith, *Let your Women (of that Church of Corinth, scil.) keep Silence, ἐν κυριακαῖς*, that is, the particular Churches under the Associated Government of that One Church. The Exception from Paul's supposed Superintending Authority, and previous Judging in this point, has no shadow of Strength against this Argument: Since, First, The Apostle blames these Church Officers, that they had not, before this Discovery of his Mind, *past this Sentence*, and that they saved him not the Labour of this Prescription of their Duty. Secondly, He writes to them to put forth *this Censure*, as an Act of their Authority as Officers of that Church, not to declare or witness what he had done before. Thirdly, *v. 12.* He thus expostulates, *Do not ye Judge them that are within?* A convincing Proof of their Power to Judge and Censure all Scandalous Persons within that Church, by an Intrinsic Authority proper to them as Officers thereof. Fourthly, He calls the Sentence, (*2 Cor. 2. 6.*) a Sentence, or Punishment inflicted of many, *viz.* the Church Officers of Corinth, not a Declaration of his previously past Sentence. To assert, that Paul's Apostolick Direction and Inspection in this Matter, is a standing Pattern of Prelatical Church Government, would plead for a standing Patriarchal Primacy over the whole Church, since his Inspection reached all the Churches of the Gentiles, and will make his Apostolick Judging and Direction (when thus improved) to nullifie the clearly supposed Duties of either Church Officers or Members, as they are reached and fall within the Compass of such Directions. Some Episcopalians will have the Censuring Power here ascribed to the People, denying any Concern of Church Officers to be intimated in this Text (a pitiful self-destroying Shift no doubt). Sometimes this Authority is by them ascribed to Paul solely; Thus *Incidit in Scyllam cupiens vitare Charybdim*. Sometimes the Exemplifying Obliging Influence of this Instance is denied: Shifts not worth the noticing. Here then the high Jurisdictional Power of Ordination and Excommunication, like the

Zenith and *Nadir* of Government, is found ascribed to Pastors, as inherent standing Priviledges and Duties of their Office, without the Superintendency of Officers of a higher Order. Whence the Argument is clear. *Major Proposition.* These whom the Apostles placed as chief in the first Constitution of the Churches, in order to the standing Government thereof, and left as their immediate Successors in their last Farewells to the Churches, such have no superiour Officers to them in this standing Exercise of Government, by Divine or Apostolick Warrant: *Minor.* But thus they placed Pastors, Labouring and Feeding immediately in the Word, Doctrine and Government, as their immediate Successors in this Ordinance and Exercise of Government; And to these they committed the Churches in their last Farewells, as is said. *Conclusion.* Ergo the Pastor has no ordinary superiour Officer to him in the Churches standing Government, by Divine or Apostolick Warrant. The *Major* is of Undoubted Truth, And the Assumption no less evident from what is said on these Texts so often recited, *Acts* 20. 17, 18, 28. *1 Pet.* 5. 2, 3, 4. *1 Thes.* 5. 12, 13. The Clearness of this Truth forced from the *Episcopal Dialogue*, the present Bishop of *Salisbury* *, this broad Confession and yielding of his Episcopal Cause, viz. Since the Sacramental Actions are the highest of Sacred Performances (he might have added the Offering, as Embassadours for Christ, and in his stead, the Word of Reconciliation) he cannot but acknowledge, that such as are impowered for them, must be of the highest Office in the Church.

* Confer. 4.
Pag. 310. 311.

CONSIDERATION III.

THE Grand City of Refuge and Fort-Royal of Episcopalians against what has been offered, viz. Timothy and Titus's supposed Episcopacy over Ephesus and Crete, appears, when it is tried, to be a Bowing Wall and Tottering Fence; And that upon these Grounds, 1. That both the one and the other were Evangelists, and held an Extraordinary Office, now past off with that first Exigence of the Church. It were easy to produce a Cloud of Witnesses of Famous Protestant Divines to Patronize this Assertion; Whoever shall read Commentaries upon that Passage, [Do the Work of an Evangelist] will find this evident. Judicious Calvin's Sense of the Office of an Evangelist, is, That Inter Apostolos & Doctores Pastores medii erant; Munus enim obibat Apostolis proximum, ut passim Evangelium predicarent, ne praferrentur certae stationi. i. e. "That the Evangelists were of a middle Function between Apostles and Doctors, Exercising an Office next to that of Apostles, which was to Preach the Gospel every where; So that

* Calvin on
Acts 21. 7. cit-
ing the Paral-
lel, Ephes. 4.
11.

† Part I Loc.
com. de Eccles.
Pag. 89.

ed on Apostles
are the Pastors

† Lib. 7. Cap.
11. de Minist.
Eccles. Pag. 437.

|| synop. Pur.
Theolog. Diss. 42.

* Thes. 19.

† Thes. 20.

|| Thes. 23.

nostri Iesu Christi.

i. e. "Some of the Evangelists were Writers of the History of the Gospel, concerning the Life and Death, the Words and Acts of our Saviour Jesus Christ. None will say Timothy was one of such, or that the Term can be there so understood: Then, for the other sort, thus they proceed; *Alii ab Apostolis ad Evangelium una cum ipsis predicandum vocati, ideoque ipsos ut $\alpha\nu\alpha\gamma\alpha\gamma\iota\sigma\tau\alpha\iota$ comitabantur, nisi cum ipsis ad Tempus (N. B.) certis quibusdam Ecclesiis præsicerentur, quales erant Barnabas, Syllas, Timotheus & Titus, quibus nonnulli Septuaginta Discipulos annumerandos existimant.* i. e. "Others were called by the Apostles, to Preach the Gospel together with them, who therefore did as Fellow-Labourers attend them, except when for a time they were set over some particular Churches, such as were Barnabas, Syllas, Timotheus and Titus; To whom some do think, that the Seventy Disciples may be added. Asserting thus clearly the Evangelists Planetary Function and Motion, like that of Apostles, without a fixed Presidency over any particular Church; And that their Superintendency over any one Church was Transient, Temporary, or for some time only. Hence, in Contradistinction to this Function *, they describe the Pastors to be *Verbi Divini Dispensatores*

they were not set over any fixed Station or Post. Thus he *. *Aleingius* †, describing the Ordinary and Extraordinary Church Officers in the Old and the New Testament, tells us, that, in Nova Testamento, the Temporarii were *Apostoli, Prophetæ, qui interpretabantur Scripturas, --- & Evangelistæ, Comites Apostolorum in plantandis Ecclesiis; perpetui, Pastores & Doctores, &c.* i. e. In the New Testament, the Temporary Officers were Apostles, Prophets, who did interpret the Scriptures, (he understands by Extraordinary Influences) and Evangelists who attend

in the planting of Churches; The perpetual Officers are the Pastors and Teachers. &c. Amongst many others easily ad-duceable, such as *Amandus Polanus* †, Two Universities, it is hoped, will make up Two Famous Witnesses to attest this Truth; First, That of Leiden ||: After they have asserted * the Extraordinary Offices of Apostles and Evangelists, from Ephes. 4. Asserting the Pastor and Doctor's Office to be the highest of Ordinary standing Functions in the Church †; Thereafter they thus describe the Evangelist's Office ||: *Evangelistarum alii erant Scriptores Historiæ Evangelicæ, de Vita & Morte, Diâis & Factis Salvatoris*

Evangelicæ, de Vita & Morte, Diâis & Factis Salvatoris

Dispensatores certis Ecclesiis (N. B.) docendis ac regendis ab Apostolis & Evangelistis præfecti, quorum Officium describitur, Act. 20. 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1. 1 Pet. 5. i. e. " That the Pastors were Dispensers, or Preachers of the Word of God, set over some particular Churches by Apostles and Evangelists, for Teaching and Governing the same, whose Office is described, Acts 20. (as above). Thus asserting, 1. The Identity of the Bishop and Pastor's Office. 2ly, Pastors Equal Official Interest in Government, as well as in Preaching the Word. 3ly, Their being assigned to fixed Stations and Posts; In this, distinguishing them from Evangelists, who had no such fixed Station.

The second Witness I offer is the University of *Sau-mer* *: Having † proposed the Objection upon *Jerom's* Testimony on *Chap. 1. of the Epistle of Titus, viz. That upon occasion of that Schism of one Person's saying, I am of Paul, and another, I am of Apollo, It was Decreed that an Episcopal Inspector should be set up||, Responderi possunt (say they) duo; primum, Titum & Timotheum extra Ordinem (N. B.) a Paulo constitutos esse ad Ecclesiarum illarum constitutionem & ordinationem, ut etiam fieri solet in civili politica, ubi præter & supra Magistratus Ordinarios quibus demandatum est oppidorum municipiorum vel Provinciæ Ordinarium Regimen, constituitur aliquis ad tempus (N. B.) cum majore & eminentiore potestate iuxta rationem diaphoram uti de Tito Apostolus hic loquitur. i. e. " Two things may be Answered; The 1. That Timothy and Titus were by Paul extraordinarily appointed, for the Ordering and Constituting these Churches, as the case is usual in Civil Policy, where, over and above the Ordinary Magistrats, to whom is committed the ordinary Government of the Towns and Cities, or of the Province, there is some one Person set apart and Authorized for a time for the right Ordering of somethings that are wanting, as the Apostle here speaks concerning Titus. Hence they draw this Inference, Si quid Ergo illi habuerunt autoritatis & prærogativæ supra reliquos Ecclesiæ Presbyteros, id non habuerunt (N. B.) ex Jure Ordinario, utq; illud perpetuum esset in Ecclesia; Sed habuerunt (N. B.) tanquam Evangelistæ, sive singulares Apostoli Pauli Administræ, a quo hic & illuc extra ordinem mittebantur, ad Ecclesiarum statum bene & firmiter constituendum, donec rebus Ecclesiæ bene constitutis, postmodum communem Presbyterorum concilio regerentur deinceps Ecclesiæ. i. e. " If therefore they had any Authority and Prerogative above the Ordinary Pastors of the Church, they had it not by an Ordinary Right, that it might be perpetual and continued in the Church, but this they had as Evangelists, or as special Helpers of the Apostle Paul, by whom they were Extraordi- narily*

* *Synt. Thes. Theol. in Academ. Salm. De Episcop. Pres. Dis- crim. pag. 322.*

† *Thes. 29.*

|| *Thes. 30.*

‘narily sent, sometimes to one place, sometimes to another, in order to
 ‘a right and firm Constitution of the state of the Churches, until the
 ‘Affairs of the Church being well settled, the Churches might be
 ‘thereafter Governed by the common counsel of the Presbyters.
 Here the Extraordinary Function of the Evangelists as distinct from
 Presbyters or Pastors, with whom the Ordinary Power of Govern-
 ment is lodged, is so clearly asserted, confirmed and illustrated, that to
 Comment further upon these words were to shew the Sun with a
 Candle. In the following *Theses* containing their second Answer, the
 Presbyterian Principle and Answer is asserted anent the Temporary
 Presidency of these Evangelists, and that it was of such a Nature as
 did not encroach upon the Official Collegiat Authority of Pastors in
 Government: That they were left in these Churches, not with an
 Arbitrary, or Prelatical Power, *ut omnia pro arbitrio & libitu procura-*
rent. i. e. To do all things at their own pleasure; Or with the *Liberum*
Arbitrium or *Licentia* of *J. 8's* Cyprianic Bishop. *Thes. 32.* They put
 the Question to the Patrons of Prelacy (*ab Episcoporum Patronis querere*
quis possit) upon Supposition of those Evangelist's Sole Episcopal
 Power and Government, *Quid opus erat Collegium Presbyterorum adungere?*
 What need was there of a College of Presbyters adjoynd to them,
 whose Counsel or Consent they might use or slight at their pleasure?
 For thus (say they) such a Person were not a Pastor or true Bishop,
 but a Sole or Absolutely Domineering Lord, *Non Pastor & Episcopus,*
sed Dominus & autokratōr in Ecclesia constitutus esset. These words also
 need no Explication to infer therefrom the Reverend Universities
 Presbyterian Judgment and Principles in this point.

The Famous and Learned *Rivet* Answering *Balleus* the Jesuit, using
 the same Argument for Prelacy, from *Timothy* and *Titus's* Pre-eminency
 over Pastors, and inferring therefrom the Bishops

* *Cath. Orth. Tract. 2. Quest. 22. pag. 282, 283.* Power over them in Government *, thus proposes the
 Protestant Churches Reply. *Satis etiam ipsorum dignita-*
tem supra Episcopos ab iis institutos apparere, sed auctoritatem
qua præ cæteris pollabant, non tanquam Pastores, aut particula-
ris alicujus urbis Episcopi habebant, sed quod præterea

Evangelistæ adjutores & operis Apostolici socii essent: Sic qui per delegatio-
 nem (N. B.) Extraordinariam, munus ad primam Ecclesie foundationem
 institutum obirent. Extraordinaria autem & ad certum tempus limitata mu-
 nera, in neminem per successionem transferuntur. i. e. “That tho’ their
 ‘Dignity above the Pastors or Bishops, instituted by them be evident,
 ‘yet that Authority which they had above others, they had it not as
 ‘Pastors, or Bishops, of any particular City, but because they were
 ‘also

also Evangelists, Coadjutors and Associates with the Apostles in their Work: Thus by an Extraordinary Delegation, they Exercised a Function, appointed for laying the first Foundation of the Church. But so it is that such Functions as are Extraordinary and Limited to a certain time, can be devolved upon none by Succession. Here is the Solid Answer and the Foundation thereof offered by Presbyterians, so clearly asserted, as there needs no Explication to discover the Nerves thereof. *Timothy's* Extraordinary Function as Evangelist is laid as a Foundation to infer the Absurdity of a supposed Succession therein; And it is remarkable that this great Divine proposes this, as the Protestants Answer to Papists, with whom he is here dealing, and the Sense of the Protestant Churches in this point. Thereafter he shews, that no such Mandats were given to either of them, as to receiving Accusations against Elders or Presbyters, and correcting Defects, as did encroach upon the Collegiat Authority of Pastors, *Quo Presbyterii corpus excludatur* —; Or, whereby the Body of Presbyters is excluded; Which he compares to such a fallacy, as if, from the Command given to *Joshua* *, Not ** Chap. I. to turn aside from the Word of God to the right or left Hand,* ver. 7. 8. one should conclude, that this Duty belonged only to him. *Itaq; non sequitur, (saith he) Timotheo & Tito hoc mandat; Ergo Soli Timotheo & Tito.* "Such things were enjoined to them respecting Government; Therefore to them alone, secluding Pastors; He holds, with Presbyterians, to be an Unsound, Absurd consequence.

The second Ground which I offer, to Raze this Refuge and Subterfuge of Episcopalians, taken from *Timothy's* supposed Episcopacy, shall be offered from the many Circumstances of the Sacred Text, and the Nature of these Epistles themselves. First, This supposed Episcopacy is confuted from several pregnant Passages in these Epistles: As, 1. That their Transient, Occasional Employment in these Churches is clearly asserted in both the Epistles; Which doth contradict a fixed Instalment, 1 *Tim.* 1. 3. *I besought thee (saith the Apostle) to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou might charge some that they teach no other Doctrine, &c.* Had the Apostle Installed him as Bishop there, he would not have pointed out thus an Occasional Transient Ground of his abode at *Ephesus*; Nor would there have been any need to beseech him to abide at that Season, but the Apostle would have laid as severe a Charge upon him to prosecute the Duties of his fixed Station in that Post, as he doth in point of his Preaching the Gospel, 2 *Epistle*, Chap. 4. v. 1. And none can deny that this Passage and Preface in the first Epistle, was the proper place for pointing at his fixed Instalment, if

any such had been. The same *transient Occasion* we find asserted as to *Titus*, in opposition to a supposed *fixed Instalment* as Bishop of *Crete*, *Chap. 1. 5.* For this cause lest I thee in *Crete*, that thou shouldst set in Order the things that are wanting, &c. Which needs no further Commentary beyond the first Instance. 2. We find them expressly recalled, by the Apostle, from this *Transient Employment* in both these Epistles; Thus *2 Tim. 4. 9.* *Timothy* is enjoyned to come shortly to the Apostle, *ver. 21.* Thus also *Titus*, *Chap. 3. 12.* is enjoyned to come to the Apostle to *Nicopolis* with all diligence, when *Artemas* or *Tychicus* are sent to him. This Reason is the more forcible, in that neither of them is found to have ever returned to these places again, but either to the places of the Apostles present abode, or Employment. 3. In these Epistles themselves the Office of the Bishop and Presbyter is clearly Identified, and no Rules propounded anent the Ordination or Qualifications of any Officer above the Pastor; Which were a very gross Contradiction of the Tenor and Scope of these Epistles, if the establishing of a Prelatical Hierarchy, or fixed Superintendency over these Churches, in the Person of *Timothy* or *Titus*, had been therein design'd or intended. Again, the Apostle holds out the Scope of those Directions to be this, That *Timothy* might know how to behave himself in the House of God, in general, *1 Tim. 3. 15.* not at *Ephesus* only; as his fixed Post: So that these Directions, thus Moulded, must needs respect all his other Evangelistick Actings elsewhere. *Timothy* is likewise said to have his Gift and Office by the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery, *1 Tim. 4. 14.* And therefore he had no Prelatical Dominion over them. He is also (as we have heard) told, that the Labourer in the Word and Doctrine has the higher Ecclesiastick or Official Honour above the Ruler only, tho' he Rule well, *1 Tim. 5. 17.* which clearly prefers the Preaching Pastor above the Ruling Prelat, who under that Reduplication, as Prelat, has Ruling only for his Work, and has no Obligation on him to Feed any Flock by Doctrine; And what he may do this way is only *ex abundanti*, and but Obiter to the supposed Actings of his Episcopal Grandeur; Whereas *Timothy* is enjoyned to Preach the Word, to be instant in Season and out of Season, *2 Tim. 4. 1.* to Reprove, Rebuke and Exhort with all long-suffering and Doctrine. As the Apostle Paul (another high pretended Prelatical Bishop) who had the care of all the Churches upon him, and therein a Laborious Ruling Work, yet pronounced a Wo upon himself if he Preached not the Gospel, *1 Cor. 9. 16.* Again *Timothy* is enjoyned to commit to a Plurality of Successors called Faithful Men, not to one Prelat, what he had heard of Paul, *2 Tim. 2. 2.* And is likewise enjoyn'd to give attendance to his Ministerial

Ministerial Work, in that place, scil. *Reading, Exhortation and Doctrine*, with this express Limitation, *till the Apostle came unto him*, 1 Tim. 3. 14. And when he came, we find him sent to *Acbaia*, the Apostle staying at *Ephesus* and *Asia*, Acts 19. 22. to the 40. Whence he returned to *Macedonia*, and through it to *Asia*, accompanied with *Timothy* and others, but never to *Ephesus* again, tho' to many other Churches to Strengthen them, such as *Macedonia*, *Thessalonica*, &c.

Secondly, As this groundless Fancy of *Timothy's* Prelatical Instalment, is thus convict of Falshood from the subject Matter of these Epistles, so from many other Circumstances and Passages in the Sacred Text, pointing at their Continual, Unfixed, Planetary Motion. When *Paul* came to *Ephesus* from *Macedonia*, as *Timothy* was sent thence to *Acbaia* (as is said) Acts 19. 22. So after *Paul* came from *Ephesus* to *Macedonia* again, he is with him, and not at *Ephesus*, Acts 20. 4. After which he is never found to have either Written or have come to *Ephesus*, but is sent to *Corinth*, 1 Cor. 16. 10. 2 Cor. 1. 19. To *Philippi*, Phil. 2. 19. To *Thessalonica*, 1 Thes. 3. 2, 6. In which Passage we find him returning to the Apostle with an account of that Churches State. He joyns with *Paul* in his second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, Written at *Philippi*, which was sent, as also the first, from the same place. So in the Epistle Written to the *Philippians* from *Rome*, and in the first to *Thessalonica* from *Athens*, as likewise in the Second. He is at *Rome* when the Epistle to the *Colossians* is Written, at *Corinth* when that to the *Romans*, Rom. 16. 21, &c. In the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, Written long after his supposed Instalment, there is no Word of him either as at *Rome* or at *Ephesus* with *Paul*, whence that Epistle to *Ephesus* was Written. *Tychicus*, he is told, was sent to *Ephesus*, 2 Tim. 4. 12. about the same Evangelistick Employment as himself, and he is mentioned as sent to them, *Ephes.* 6. 21, 22. The same is made good of *Titus*; He is at *Jerusalem* before he came to *Crete*, Gal. 2. 1. Then sent for to *Nicopolis*, Tit. 3. 12. Then to *Corinth*, then expected at *Troas*, 2 Cor. 2. 12, 13. He meets with *Paul* at *Macedonia*, 2 Cor. 7. 6. Whence again he is sent to *Corinth*, 2 Cor. 8. 6. After, he is found at *Rome*, near *Paul's* Death, and goes thence, not to *Crete*, but to *Dalmatia*, 2 Tim. 4. 10. And after this the Scripture is silent of him. This Planetary, Unfixed, Evangelistick Negotiation, Presbyterian Writers have thus clearly Demonstrated, 1. From their various Journeys instanced. 2ly, From the Order of them. 3ly, From the time spent in them. 4ly, From the clearly insinuated Nature of the Employment it self, which was a transient negotiating of the Affairs of the Church in this Traveling posture. To all this might be added, that neither in the Pre-

factory Salutation in the Epistle to the *Ephesians*, nor in the Body of the Epistle, or the Valedictory *Clausula*, there is the least hint of *Timothy* the supposed Bishop of that Church, notwithstanding of the Apostle's pointing at the Nature and Scope of a Gospel Ministry, Chap. 4. If Episcopalians deny the Strength of this Argument, they must beware of infringing the Protestant Argument against a Pope, or Bishop of *Rome*, from the silence of both in the Epistle to the *Romans*. To which may be added that absurd Consequence following on this Opinion, *viz.* The Staging *Timothy* as an Apostate, and *Falling from his first Love*, as the Angel of *Ephesus* is Charged, *Rev.* 2. 4.

CONSIDERATION IV.

THERE is a pitiful Evasion some of the Episcopalians make use of against what is alledg'd of Pastors immediat Essential Interest in Government; *viz.* That the Term *ἐπισκοπος* in *Acts* 20. (consequently in other parallel places) denotes not Authority, but only Inspection. Concerning which it is offered, 1. That this baffles all that the Episcopal Party have offered from the Import and Nature of the Term as used in the Scripture, who hold that Bishops have this Term ascribed to them as the proper *ἐπισκοπος* of their * *Christ*. Life, Office; Particularly, Dr. *Scott* * pleads it from 1 *Tim.* 3. Part 2. Chap. 2ly, The distinguishing of Inspection from Authority 7. pag. 138. is a Distinction pitifully dull, infringing the common Rule, *Subordinata non pugnant*; As if all Authority of 139. Magistrats were not, in the very Nature and Notion of it, an Inspection, and in so far an Episcopacy. Who knows not, that Greek Authors put this Designation upon Civil Rulers, even the greatest, and that the L X X. do thus express, by this Term, the Office of Civil Rulers? Thus *Numb.* 31. 14. *Judges* 9. 28, &c. 3ly, This very Designation is in Scripture made use of to represent the unquestionable Supreme Authority of our Saviour, 1 *Pet.* 2. last v. And the Authority and Charge of his Apostles, *Acts* 1. 20. In both which places the Episcopal Translators make use of the word *Bishop* and *Bishoprick*, no doubt with a design to Advance the Episcopal Cause: And are not these Bishops [*ἐπισκοποι*] in *Philip.* 1. Judged by the generality of all Interpreters, to be the proper, immediat, not the precarious, Subaltern, Rulers and Governours of that Church? The Strength of Presbyterians Pleading from that Passage, *Acts* 20. where an Episcopal Name, and consequently Authority, is ascribed to Pastors, is improved by most Famous Protestant Divines: I might mention

mention *Junius* * improving the Terms *ἐπισκοπὴν* and *προαίρεσιν* in opposition to *Bellarmin's* Notion of a Prelatical Hierarchy therein included; Shewing, that both Terms are appropriated to Presbyters, pointing at their Essential Authority. *Antonius Sadael* † Answering one of the *Sorbon* Doctors about *Timothy's* Episcopacy, he thus, among other Reasons, improves this Text of *Acts* 20. *Ecquando potius elucere debuit Splendor Episcopatus Ephesinx, quam cum Paulus tam piè de Ecclesie Salute diserebat, & tam Sanctè præfatus omnes cohortabatur ad intercludendum lupis viam, &c.* That, *Paul* at this time Exhorting so piously all the Pastors and Governours of the Church to withstand the Wolves, now, if ever, was the proper Season of pointing at the Splendor and Authority of the Bishop of *Ephesus*, had any such been constituted or allowed. Upon this, with other such like Grounds, *viz.* That of *Timothy's* Evangelistick Office, he calls that Opinion of his Episcopacy over *Ephesus*, *Commentum illud de Timothei Episcopatu*, that Fable of *Timothy's* Episcopacy. The same Ground to this Scope is improven by *Musculus* ||, *Walleus* *, and many others Writing on this Subject. 4ly, Protestant Writers take Notice of the Term *προαίρεσιν* in *Acts* 20. Where a Pastoral Feeding. *scil. Pædo & Pabulo*, by Discipline and Doctrine, is ascribed to these Elders, and doth include and evidently import such a Shepherdly Rule as is ascribed to the Civil Magistrat, *Isa.* 44. 28. The Term *προαίρεσιν* is ascribed to Ministers, *Ephes.* 4. 11. To our Lord Jesus, denoting his Authority Pastoral, *John* 10. 11.

* *Animadv. in Bellarm. ad Controu. 4. de Conf. Cap. 15. Par. 9. Art. 7.*
† *Operum Theologorum, Tom. 1. de Legit. Voc. Pass.*

|| *Loc. Com. de Off. Minist.*
* *De Funct. Eccl. Pag. 470.*

CONSIDERATION V.

Upon the Point of Antiquity : And, first, touching *Eusebius's* History.

THE Defectiveness and Maim'dness of this History is generally acknowledg'd by all the Sound and Orthodox. The Author himself, *Lib. 3. Cap. 4.* asserts the Difficulty to find out who Succeeded the Apostles in the Churches, unless it be those mentioned in the Writings of *Paul*. So that the Author himself renounces all certainty in this point, but what is drawn from Scripture : And no wonder, the Man coming at 300 Years distance after the Apostolick times, and grounding only upon the Hypothesis of an uncertain

Clement, and the as uncertain Commentaries of *Hegesippus*. Upon this Ground (as is touch'd in the 1st. Part) *Stillingfleet* himself * “ derides *Eusebius*’s accounts in this point, as *
 * *Irenic.* ‘ making the Tradition of the Church our Rule to In-
 pag. 296, 297. ‘ terpret Scripture by ; A bending of the Rule to the
 ‘ crooked Stick ; A making the Judge stand to the Opinion of his
 ‘ Lacquey, what Sentence he shall pass upon the Cause in Questi-
 ‘ on. 2ly, Not only he, but other Famous Divines have made good
 gross Errors and Defects in his History : *Didacrus*, *Reft. Instruend.*
Hierarch. Bish. have exhibited Testimonies to this
 † *Prolegom.* purpose. *Scalliger* † tells us, “ That *Intervallum illud*,
 in *Echron. Eusebii.* ‘ *ab ultimo capite Actorum*, &c. The Interval from the
 ‘ last Chapter of the *Acts* of the Apostles, until the
 ‘ midst of the Reign of *Trajan*, in which *Tract Quadra-*
 ‘ *tus* and *Ignatius* Flourished, may be call’d, with *Varro*, *ἄσυνον*, or ob-
 ‘ scure ; Wherein nothing that is certain of the Affairs of Christians is
 ‘ come to our Hands, except some few things which Heathen Writers
 ‘ catch up *obiter*. *Tilen* himself, a great Pleader for
 ‖ *Cont. 3. Cap.* the Episcopal Cause, yet acknowledges ‖, “ That
 2. *Not. 39.* ‘ the History of these times hath great Blanks and Gaps,
 ‘ which the spurious *Clemens* and other Writers of the same Stamp fil-
 ‘ led up with petty Fables drawn from their own Brain.
 * *Cap. 3. Not. 6.* He tells us also *, “ That from the end of the *Acts* of the
 ‘ Apostles to the times of *Trajan*. *vix aliquid certi exstat*, i. e. There is
 ‘ scarce any thing extant in History that is certain, and that thereafter,
 ‘ *quidlibet audendi & confingendi arrepta occasio a male feriatis hominibus*, &c.
 ‘ Nothing being certain in these times, Unsound, Unworthy Persons
 ‘ took the boldness and had occasion to feign what they pleased.
Meredith Haumer, an English Doctor of Divinity, who, Anno 1619, Tran-
 slated *Eusebius*, *Socrates* and *Evagrius*’s Histories, in his Preface to the
 Reader, Charges *Eusebius* with Crookedness of Style, with Imperfect
 Allegations, and tells us, he is sure, no Reader is so Foolish as to Build upon
 the Antiquity and Authority of these Histories. Much more might be
 added, but let the reference to the Authors mention’d suffice in this
 point.

Secondly, For Ignatius’s Epistles.

THIS Point of these Epistles has been largely scann’d. We may, for Brevity, refer the Reader to that which is clearly made good in three distinct Sections in the *Nazianzenian Querela* Part 2. Wherein, in the first Hypothesis, it is made good, that *Ignatius* is at best inter-
 polated,

polated, Sect. 2. And the Exception of Dr. Pearson and others removed. In the second Hypothesis, Sect. 3. It is made appear, that the *Antiquity of the true Ignatius could not secure him from all Lapses or Escapes, nor serve to prove that there were no Declension in his time.* In the third Hypothesis, Sect. 4. It is made appear, that *there is no real Disagreement, but a true Concord betwixt the Doctrine of Ignatius, and that of the present Presbyterians.* In which Author it is also made appear, that not only *Daly*, but *Monsieur L'Arroque's Vindication*, has fully removed what has been alledged by Doctor Pearson. *Stillingfleet* professes, *Pag. 309,* "That in all the 35 Testimonies produced out of *Ignatius* for Episcopacy, he can meet but with one which has the least semblance of Truth, scil. *Epist. ad Ephes, Pag. 19. Vossii*, the Sense whereof he notwithstanding undertakes to shew that it is mistaken. I need not insist in shewing what *Rivet* in the *Critica Sacra, Videlius* and others have Animadverted upon these Epistles. *Stillingfleet, Pag. 298.* accounts, together with *Scaliger*, "The time wherein *Ignatius* began to Flourish, *A mere chaos of time*, filled up with rude Conceptions of *Papias, Hermes* and others, who, like *Hannibal*, when they could not find a way through, would make one either by force or fraud. He charges the very Story of *Ignatius* as none of the most probable, and his going so long a Journey to *Rome* to be Martyred there, as apparently fictitious, since the *Presides Provinciarum* Execute the Laws against Christians at their own Tribunals: Especially his many and strange Excursions by the way, he shews to be a piece of Story contradicting his own accounts of the Souldiers cruelty to him; Telling us further, that these fabulous Narrations, through the Defect of sufficient Records, make it evident, *How incompetent a Judge Antiquity is to the certainty of things done in Apostolick times.*

Others add further Evidences, viz. "That *Trajan* could not be supposed to be at pains to guard him so long a Journey thither, as from *Antioch* to *Rome*, after his Condemnation there, since there were such Spectacles enough to entertain the People with at *Rome*. And if the terrifying of the *Roman* Christians by the Death of such a Famous Bishop be alledged; It is easily thus retorted, that the Empe-
rour could not but suppose, that the Resolution of such an one as *Ignatius* would rather encourage, than weaken their Confidence. Among other Fabulous Passages ascrib'd to *Ignatius*, that mentioned by *Socrates, Lib. 6. Cap. 8.* is remarkable; Who shews, *That the beginning of the Antiphones was reported to have come from Ignatius, which, they said, he had revealed to him by Quires of Angels, that used to descend and Sing the Praises of the Holy Trinity.* It were tedious to shew the
large

large and clear Testimonies brought from *Clemens Romanus* for the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, and Presbyteries Divine Authority in Government, in Opposition to what is alledg'd of *Ignatius*. He shews, how unworthy a thing it was to hear, "How the Ancient and Firm Church of *Corinth*, for the sake of one or two Persons, should raise a Sedition against the Presbyters; And pleads, that the Flock of Christ may enjoy its Peace with the Presbyters which are set over it; That the Apostles, foreseeing there would be great Contentions about the Name of Episcopacy, Ordained their first Fruits to be Bishops and Deacons of those that should believe. And the self same Bishops he calls Presbyters in several places. See *Epist. Græc. Lat. Pag. 54, 55, 56, 57, &c.* Thus, 69, 73. If the not citing of the Passages immediately from the Authors be alledg'd, as some have done in the point of *Ignatius's* Epistles; It may be asked, how many Transcripts have come from *Ignatius's* Autograph? And through how many Hundreds of Years? And what greater Certainty there is of their being suited to the Autographs, than that the present Citations are correspondent to the present existent or best Copies? Upon a Review of two Copies now by me, (having a considerable time since taken some View of *Ignatius*) I find that which is imputed to him truly such. It were superfluous to cite all the Passages which a View of the Copies of *Videllius*, *Vossius*, and even that per *Martialem Meibœum* will exhibite. That the Bishop is possessed of all Principality and Authority, as much as is possible for Man to be possessed of, *Is qui omni Principatu & Potestate superior est.* Thus my Author, out of the Greek which runs thus, ἰσχυρὸς ἐστὶν ἐπισκοπὸς ἀλλ' ἢ πάντες ἀρχὴς καὶ ἐξουσίας ἐπέκεινα πάντων κρατῶν ὡς οὐκ ἐστιν ἀνδρῶν κρατεῖν, &c. This Passage in the Epistle to the *Trallians*, Doctor Scott has cited, Pag. 407. Which he represents thus, *What is the Bishop but he who hath all Authority and Power.* Yet the Apostle Paul tells us, *Rom. 13. 1.* Let every Soul (the Bishop not excepted, unless we will deny him a Soul) be subject unto the higher Powers. How is the Bishop then possessed of all Principality and Authority beyond all? The same Apostle, *1 Cor. 3. 5.* saith, *Who is Paul, who is Apollo, but Ministers by whom ye believed.* Here Paul's humble Language is far from the Elated Stile of the supposed *Ignatius*; And shall we doubt which of the two spoke right, and is to be believed? The fore-cited Doctor cites likewise the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, *Ibidem*, wherein Obedience to the Bishop is enjoined, and opposing or contradicting him in any thing discharged, *ἵνα οὐκ ἐστὶ καὶ ὑμεῖς ὑπακούετε τῷ ἐπισκοπῷ υἱοῦ, καὶ καὶ μὴδὲν αὐτῷ ἀντιτάττετε, deest itaque & vos obedire Episcopo, & in nulli illi refragari:* Which none will deny to be cross to that limited Obedience which the Scripture enjoyns

enjoyns to be given by Children to Parents, who are commanded to obey them *in the Lord only* *. He cites * *Eph. 6. 1.* also the Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, wherein it is affirmed, that such as belong to Christ, are united to the Bishop, such as are not, are cursed, *οὐκ ἔστιν ἔτι μετὰ τῷ ἑκτοντῷ ἐκείνῳ, &c.* Quorquet *sunt Christi, sunt partium Episcopi*, saith the Translator. What Censure this puts upon the Reformed Churches not united to the Bishop, is evident enough. In the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, cited also by the Doctor, he commands Obedience to the Bishop and to the Presbytery. As likewise, in the Epistle to the *Trallians*, he enjoyns Subjection to the Presbytery, as to the Apostles of Jesus Christ, and calls the Presbytery *κυριότατοι θεοῦ καὶ συνάκτου ἀποστόλων χριστοῦ*. Which Passages contradict the Episcopal Sense of the former, or impute a Contradiction to Ignatius. All which, with many other things, which might be adduced, *viz.* Scaliger's Objection against the bringing of Ignatius to Rome out of Syria; That the *Provincialis Magistratus de Christiano supplicium sumebat*; Answering the Objection, *Si quis dixerit fuisse Civem Romanum*; To which he gives this Return, *Civem Romanum bestiis ejicere non licebat*; These, I say, with many such Testimonies which might be adduced, do sufficiently overthrow this Argument from Ignatius's Epistles.

Thirdly, For the supposed Catalogues of Bishops from Apostles and Evangelists;

THEY are found so shatter'd and inconsistent one with another, and their Expression of Bishops, of such a dubious Signification, that no Man of Sense can lay weight upon them; As hath been sufficiently evinc'd by Presbyterian Writers, *Didoclave*, Pag. 119, 120, 121, hath, from several Learned Authors, discovered the utter Insufficiency of Eusebius's Relation hereanent. Speaking of Eusebius he saith, *Catalogus Eusebii Episcoporum seriem nobis exhibet, non tamen Episcoporum Judicium & Principium, qui singularem habet Potestatem & Majoritatem Potestatis directivæ, & Correctivæ in Presbyteros & Gregem; Quod erat probandum. Episcopi Vocabulum audio, sed Officium & Potestatem Directivam & Correctivam non audio. Equivocatio est in nomine Episcopi. Detur fuisse Episcopos quos recenset Eusebius, peculiariter & Autonomastice sic dictos fuisse non sequitur. Detur Autonomastice sic dictos, non sequitur Episcopos Judices fuisse cum & Presides etiam Autonomastice & peculiariter dicti sunt Episcopi.* Which is in sum, "That there is an Equivocation in the Name of Bishop in these Catalogues, and no such Directive and Corrective Power over Pastors and Flocks ascribed unto them, as

these Catalogues are adduced to prove. That granting they were Bishops whom Eusebius names, it will not prove they were Bishops in a Prelatical Sense, or properly and peculiarly so called; Yea, granting they had been thus called, it will not infer, that they were such Bishops as are Judges in a peculiar Sense, since Presidents have such a Name peculiarly attributed unto them. He afterwards adds, Pag. 122. *De Lino, Cleto, Anacleto, Clemente, qui in Catalogo Romanorum Episcoporum post Petrum numerantur, tanta est sententiarum varietas, quis, cui, & quo ordine successerit, ut conciliari nullo modo possit. Cleti nusquam, neque Irenæus, neque Eusebius meminerunt.* "That there can be no Reconciliation of the different Judgments concerning these Persons who are rehearsed in the Catalogues of the Roman Bishops after Peter. That Cletus is made mention of by neither Irenæus nor Eusebius.

Thereafter he shews the Cause of the Error, from the
 * *Contr. Lib. 3.* Learned Francisus Junius *, *Errori causam præbuit quod*
Cap. 5. Not. 18. *Episcopus non unus primum in Ecclesiis erat, sed multi simul*
præerant, qui Episcopi sive Presbyteri ab Apostolis dicti sunt,
&c. "That the Cause of this Error in the inconsistent Catalogues of Bishops, was, that there was not one only Bishop of the Churches, but many at once preceeding, called by the Apostles Bishops or Presbyters; Whose Times of Death or Martyrdom being kept in the Churches Records, and publick mention made thereof for up-stirring of others, these Catalogue Drawers put them, in order to the filling up of their Tables of Bishops, into their Rolls as Succedaneous, &c. The Learned Bucer, in his Dissertation on Church Government, challenges any to make appear, that any one of the pretended Bishops of Rome, in this shattered Catalogue thereof, did preside over the Church of Rome, *instar Episcopi* *Διακρίτους* *appellati*, or called so by way of Eminency, or in a Prelatical Discriminating Judicial Sense.

Didoclaræ has three Observes on this point of the Succession of Bishops in the Writings of the Ancients. *Primo, A Majoribus absque delectu & examine multa acceperunt, &c.* "That the Ancients, without Examination or Tryal, having, from their Progenitors, received Fabulous Stories, delivered to Posterity such things, as can neither be reconciled to Scripture nor with themselves. *Secundo, Ut Tabulas Successionum ab ipsis Apostolorum temporibus deducerent & retrociora secula ad sua conformarent, &c.* "That they might fill up their Tables of Bishops, and conform the First Ages to their own, they culled out the most Famous Ministers for Zeal, Piety, &c. and put them into their Catalogues. *Tertio, Quem seligerunt & Catalogo inscripserunt, peculiariter*

peculiariter & Autonomastice, secundum morem sui seculi Episcopum nominarunt.
 &c. "Whom they thus put in, they called them Bishops, in Con-
 formity to their own Times, tho' they were meer Presbyters.
 This he proves afterward from some Passages of
Irenæus *. The Remarkable Query of *Josephus Scaliger*,
 touching the supposed Succession of the Bishops of Je-
 rusalem [*Ubi fuerat Ecclesia Hierosolymitana?*] deserves
 our Consideration: "The City being raz'd to the Foun-
 dation, and no Vestige of it appearing, certainly it could not sub-
 sist at Jerusalem. *Aratrum illi impressum*, saith he, à *Mufoneo Tyrrenho*
Præfetto Munitionum, &c. "That a Plough being drawn over the
 place of the City by this *Mufoneus*, not only was there no City exi-
 stent there, but after it was thus plowed up, *Nemini licuerat illi solo*
vel casam superstruere, "None might so much as build a Cottage there.
 Yet, notwithstanding, *Ensebius* numbers Bishops until that Subversion
 of it which it suffered by *Hadrian*. The same Diversity appears in the
 pretended Succession of Bishops in the Church of *Antioch*, as in that
 of *Rome*, some placing *Evedius*, some *Ignatius*, as the first Bishop;
 Whereas they were both Collegues in that Church, and because of
 their Moral Eminency, thus placed by the Catalogue Drawers.
Blondel shews, that tho' the first Churches were govern'd by the
 common Council of Presbyters, yet the Line of Succession was drawn
 from the *πρωτοεπισκοπος* the first Ordained Minister, as among the *Atheni-
 ans*, tho' there were Nine *Archontes* or Chief Rulers in *Athens*, yet the
 Succession of Governours was drawn from the first *Archon* or Ruler,
 not to impeach the Authority of the rest, *Sed ut compendiosior ac minus*
impedita esset temporum enumeratio, saith the Author, to make the Reckoning
 the more compendious. In the fore-cited Appendix, there is a large Ac-
 count given of this confused, contradictory Mould of the Catalogues.
Clemens is asserted by some to be first Bishop of *Rome* after *Peter*, some
 say, that he was the third. *Titus* is made Bishop of *Crete* likewise by
 some, and Arch-Bishop by others, Bishop of *Dalmatia* by a third sort.
Timothy and *John* are made Bishops of *Ephesus* at the same time. *Poly-
 carp* by some is made first Bishop of *Smyrna*, by others made to succeed
 one *Bucalus*, some alledging also, that *Aristo* was first, &c. In a word,
 the Catalogues resolving into Apostles or Evangelists, who could not
 be succeeded properly in *idem officium*, this pretended Draught of
 Succession is nothing else, but (as the Poet expresseth it) *humano*
capiti cervicem pingere equinam.

* *Lib. 4.*
Cap. 44. and
Lib. 3. Cap. 2.

Fourthly, For the suppos'd Condemnation of Aërius upon the Ground of his Judgment, as to the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter.

THIS Notion and Fancy has been abundantly expos'd and disprov'd by Presbyterian Writers. The Learned Dr. Reynolds, in his Epistle to Sir Francis Knolls, hath made it appear, out of Chrysostom, Hierom, Ambrose, Augustin, Theodoret, Primasius, Sedulius, Theophylact, that Bishops and Presbyters are all one in Scripture, and that Aërius could no more be justly condemn'd for Heresie, on this Ground of holding Bishops and Presbyters to be all one, than all these

Fathers, with whom agree, saith he, Oecumenius and Anselm, &c. Any that will read Didoclave *, will find this purpose largely prosecuted, and this pitifull Objection baffled. The Learn'd Whittaker †, tells us, that *Censit sane cum Aërio Hieronymus, quo minus curandum est toties nobis obijci Aërium ab insulsis hominibus: Si fuit in hac re Hereticus Aërius socium Hereseos Hieronymum habuit, nec illum modo, sed alios etiam veteres Patres, Græcos pariter & Latinos.* "That Jerom was of the same Mind with Aërius, and therefore 'it matters not, that Ignorant Blockish Men do object Aërius: If, upon 'this Ground, he was an Heretick, he had Jerom also an Associate in 'this Heresie, and not Jerom only, but other Ancient Fathers both

* Lib. 1. de
Sacr. Hom. Orig.
& continentia
Cap. 5.

† Consult. Art.
14.

'Greek and Latine. Nay even Michael Medina * affirms that not only St. Jerom, but also Ambrose, Sedulius, Primasius, Chrysostom, Theodoret, Oecumenius, Theophylact, were of Aërius's Judgment in this point. Likewise Cassander †, affirms, that *Convenit inter omnes in Aetate Apostolorum inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nullum discrimen fuisse*; After he had said, that it is debated betwixt the Theologues and Canonists, *An Episcopatus inter Ordines Ecclesiasticos ponenda sit*: "That it is agreed amongst all, both 'Theologues and Canonists, and the Ancient Fathers, that, in the 'Apostles Age, there was no Difference betwixt Bishops and Presbyters. As for that Censure of Heresie, which is pretended to have been put upon him upon this Account, we will find the Learn'd

* Tract. 2.
Quæst. 22.

make it appear, particularly the Famous Rivetus, in his *Catholicus Orthodoxus*, in his Reply to Balleus the Jesuite, objecting this *, that Aërius was condemn'd by them, not as if he had maintain'd any Error in this

this point, but as impeaching and brangling the Ecclesiastical Union then establish'd; Which is made good upon these Grounds: Because, *First*, The same Opinion was not branded for Heresie in *Jerom* and others, while continuing in this Union: And next, because *Augustin*, who reckons up this Heresie of *Aërius*, as he found it in *Epiphanius*, himself acknowledging, *He knew not how far the Name of Heretick did reach*; Yet doth acknowledge *, *That there is no Difference by Divine Institution betwixt Bishop and Presbyter*. It is also observed by Judicious Mr. *Durham* on the Rev. †, in his Digression upon this Head of the Identity of Angel, Bishop and Presbyter, "That who considers the Rolls of Heresies set down by these Fathers, will find, that often such are reckoned amongst Hereticks, who rather ought to be accounted Schismatics; And that even *Estius* * acknowledges, That none of the Fathers condemned him, for denying the Distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter to be *Jure Divino*. So much shall suffice for Information anent *Aërius*.

* *Epist.* 19.

† *Pag.* 226,

227.

* *Lib.* 4.

Pag. 35.

* *De Gest.*

Scot. Lib. 2.

† *Scoto-chro-*

nic. Lib. 3.

Cap. 8.

|| *Sect.* 3.

Let me add in a word, that Doctor *Blondel* hath made appear, that, in the first purer Age, the Church was governed by Presbyters without Bishops; Wherein also he hath made appear the Consent of the Learned. For this Church of *Scotland*, we have the Testimony of *Joannes Major* *, of *Ferdon* †, likewise of *Blondel* ||, and others, all shewing, that this Nation having heard the Christian Faith Preached to them, Anno 97, till about the Year 430, when the Bishop of *Rome* sent *Palladius* as our first Bishop, the Church gathered therein was Governed only by Presbyters without Bishops: So that we had our Union to the See of *Rome* together with Prelacy.

In a Word, the incurable Wound in this Argument from Antiquity will evidently appear if reduc'd into form, thus. *The Major Proposition*. If Diocesan Bishops, by the Testimonies of Ancient Fathers, did exist in the Primitive Times, and Catalogues of them are, by these Ancients, drawn from Apostles and Evangelists, Then I must believe these Bishops to be of Divine Institution. The first Proposition taken for granted by our Episcopal Pleaders, is palpably false, and hath no twist of a Connexion. 1. It makes Human Practice the infallible Comment in this case, and consequently the infallible Comment of Succeeding Ages is brought in to Determine every Scripture Truth, and Duty

therein held out. *2ly*, Thus there is a higher Rule and Tribunal than the Scripture set up, and our Faith made to stand in Man's
 * 1 Cor. 2. 5. *Wisdom, not in God's* *: The Scriptures are made of a private Interpretation, as if the Propheſie had come by the will of Man, contrary to that we have, 2 Pet. 1. 20, 21. The Practice of ſuppoſed Biſhops Succeſſors of *Timothy* and *Titus* in this point of their Official Power and its Nature and Exerciſe, is ſuch as I muſt believe the Scriptures relating to the Office of *Timothy* and *Titus* to have no diſcrepant Senſe from this ſuppoſed Practice of theſe Biſhops: Thus the Cuſtom and Practice of fallible Men becomes to me the *ſorti* the *Ratio a priori*, the chief Ground why I believe theſe Scriptures to have ſuch a Senſe, and no other; Thus I give Men a Dominion over my Faith, which even the Apoſtle *Paul* diſowns, 2 Cor. 1. 24. *Ὁς ἔστι νεκρούς ὑψῆς ἢ αἰσῶς, ἀλλὰ οὐκ ἐστὶν ἡμεῖς ἡμεῖς ὑψῆς*; Since thus my Faith is removed from the Baſis of a *Divine Teſtimony*, wherein it muſt ultimately reſolve, if it be a *Divine Faith*, and not a mere *Human Credulity*; And it is fixed upon the rotten Foundation of a *Human Practice*, and Teſtimony of fallible Men, a Principle diſowned by all Proteſtant Churches: *The Minor Propoſition*. Now come we to the Aſſumption of the Argument, *viz.* That ſuch *Diocesan Biſhops*, by the Teſtimony of the Ancient Fathers, did exiſt in all the Churches from the times of Apoſtles and Evangeliſts: And here I demand how the Univerſal Judgment and Practice of the Ancient Church, and of this true Succeſſion is made appear? Since, 1. Many of the Ancients Wrote nothing; Many of their Writings are loſt; Many alſo going under their Name are Counterfeit. How ſhall I know that the Teſtimonies of theſe who have Written are not contradicted in this point, by ſuch Men of their times, who either have not Written, or whoſe Writings are periſhed? *2ly*, There are many things which the Ancients ſpeak of as derived from the Apoſtles, and, as far as the Knowledge thereof is come to us, have had an Univerſal Conſent, which are, notwithstanding, acknowledged to be contrary to the Word of God and the Apoſtolick Doctrine, whereof *Presbyterian Writers* have exhibited many Inſtances, ſuch as that of the *Millenary Error*, which *Juſtin Martyr* holds to be ſuch an Apoſtolick Tradition, as they are no Chriſtians that diſown it. *Lactantius* alſo calls it the *Doctrine of the Holy Prophets*, and *Chriſtian Wiſdom*, which Chriſtians follow. *Baſil* reckons up as Apoſtolick Traditions, Signing with the Croſs, Praying to the Eaſt, Anointing with Oyl, Praying

Praying in the standing posture from Easter to Whitsuntide *: Epiphanius imputes to Arius as great Heresies, that he held it unlawful to offer and Pray for the Dead; That he held that Saints departed were not to be Invoked, &c. Upon this point of Antiquity, the Query is considerable which is by some propounded from Israel's Practice in setting up the Golden Calf, under pretence of Worshipping Jehova: Viz. Upon the supposition of this Practice continued and Universally owned, whether the Pleadings of such Practisers from an Ancient Church Custom (That the second Command doth not strike against the same, but that this constant Practice doth evince the contrary) had been found and solid Pleading? If the Answer be Negative, as needs it must, unless we make the mere Practice of Men the leading Rule, or *Regula Regularum*, then 'tis infallibly clear, that whatever Practices of the Church can be alledg'd, tho' never so Universal, cannot at all of themselves lead and ground our Faith and Perswasion, being but Human Witnesses, or *Testes Facti*, at most, but not *Judices veri & recti*, Attestors of matters of Fact, but not Judges of what is Right and Equal therein,

* See Appendix de Jur. Divin. Ministr. Evangel.

Augustin, *Lib. de Unitate Ecclesiæ*, Cap. 3. *Non audiamus Hæc dico, Hæc dicis, sed audiamus Hæc dicit Dominus: Sunt certi Libri Dominici quorum autoritari utriq; consentimus, utriq; credimus, utriq; servimus; Ibi quæramus Ecclesiam, ibi discutiamus causam nostram: Auferantur illa de medio quæ adversus nos invicem non ex Divinis Canonicis Libris, sed aliunde recitamus, quia nolo humanis documentis, sed Divinis Oraculis sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari. Ipse Dominus Jesus Discipulos Testimoniis Legis & Prophetarum confirmandos esse magis Judicavit. Hæc sunt Causæ nostræ Documenta, hæc Fundamenta, hæc Firmamenta. Cap. 10. Nec Catholicis Episcopis consentiendum est sibi forte falluntur, ut contra Canonicas Dei Scripturas aliquid sentiunt. Ibid. Cap. 16. Ecclesiam suam demonstrent si possunt non in Sermonibus & rumoribus Asporum, non in Conciliis Episcoporum suorum, non in literis quorumlibet Disputatorum, ———, sed in præscripto Legis. i. e. "Let us not hear, These things I say, or you say; But let us hear, These things saith the Lord. There are truly Canonical Books to whose Authority we both Consent, we both Believe, we are both Subject, there let us enquire for the Church, there let us discuss our Cause. Let such things be taken out of the way which we produce against one another, not from the Divine Canonical Books, but from other grounds. For I will not have the Holy Church to be pointed out by Human Instructions, but by Divine Oracles. The Lord Jesus Christ himself Judged*

‘Judged fit to confirm his Disciples rather by the Testimonies of the
‘Law and Prophets. These are the Instructions, Foundations, and
‘Confirmations of our Cause. — Neither must we consent to
‘Catholick Bishops if somewhere perhaps they are deceived, and hold
‘any Opinion contrair to the Canonical Scriptures of God. — Let
‘them demonstrat their Church if they can, not in the Discourses and
‘Rumors of the *Africans*, not in the Councils of their Bishops, not in
‘the Letters of whatever Disputants, but in the Prescript of the
‘Law.

A
R E V I E W
 OF SOME
E X C E P T I O N S
 UPON THE
Considerations Premis'd.



HA V I N G seen some Exceptions and Animadversions upon the Considerations premis'd, (altho' upon perusal they appear of no Importance) yet, for further Confirmation of the Truths asserted, I have thought fit to offer this ensuing Review and Confutation of the same.

Upon the first Consideration it is Excepted, That Christ's Political Headship will not infer a Determination of the Government, more than God's Political Headship over all Rationals, will infer a particular Form of Civil Government over all the World. 2ly, The validity of the particular Induction is Quarrell'd. Again, granting this, 'Tis deny'd this will amount to prescribe particular Form of Government, since nothing but a peremptory Institution can infer it ; That a lawful Derivation of Power from the Head is enough to make the Administrations valid, whether the Governours Act in Parity or Imparity, &c. That general Rules will exclude Anarchy and Papal Monarchy ; That Christ's Kingly Office will not necessarily infer the regulating all Cases ; That Officers may Act in his Name by vertue of a common Power, and cast themselves into particular Societies, and maintain useful Government whatever

A Review of some Exceptions

344

be the particular Species ; That tho' Christ's Prophetical and Priestly Offices exclude new Revelations and meritorious Satisfactions, yet his Kingly Office excludes not Superadded Laws and Measures of Government ; That Apostolical Patterns amount not to an Obligatory Rule ; That bare Examples are of no such force as a formal Institution.

The Insufficiency of which Quibblings evidently appears, 1. The Author discovers gross Ignorance of the Nature of Christ's Political Headship over his Church, as distinguished from God's general Dominion over the World, and Christ's Dominion as God ; The one amounting to a special Revelation of his mind, and such a Theocracy, or rather Christocracy, and Headship over his Church, as renders it his Body Political, as renders the same under his special Inspection, both as to Worship and Doctrine in point of Duty (as is acknowledged by this Pasquiller) ; The other importing only a general Dominion, an Absolute Disposing Power without any such Revelation, and consequently superintending Headship. If over the Common-Wealth of Israel there was a special Theocracy amounting to a Determination of the Doctrine, Worship, and Government of that Church ; Why is there not in Christ's Headship over the New Testament Church a special Christocracy amounting to the same Determination ? Amongst many Scriptures convincing this Pasquiller's Folly in this point, I shall Instance, 1. That of the Psalmist, *He sheweth his Word unto Jacob, his Statutes, and his Judgments unto Israel ; He hath not dealt so with any Nation, and as for his Judgments they have not known them*, Psal. 147. 19, 20. Here the Church of God is expressly distinguished, in point of Christ's Regal Power, the Headship and Influences thereof, from the rest of the Nations destitute of such Revelations of his mind, consequently of such a Political Headship and Government. For he will not deny, that this Revelation amounted to the Determination of their Churches Government, as well as its Doctrine and Worship, and that this Determination of the Government did flow from Christ's special Political Headship over that Church. And the Scripture hath further assured him and us, that our Lord's Faithfulness, as Head of the Gospel Church, is beyond that of Moses, in the Determination of the Doctrine, Worship and Government thereof. The other Text I offer is that of *Ephes. 1. 22, 23.* Where the Apostle speaking of Christ's Donative Kingdom, thus expresseth it, *And gave him to be Head over all things to the Church ; which is his Body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all.* Where there is a clear Distinction stated betwixt his general Sovereignty over all Creatures, and his special Kingly Relation and Headship to his Church, which is here Emphatically called *His Body*, as the

Correlat

Correlat of this Headship and special Kingly Sovereignty. He is Head over all things, but not of all things, as if these All were Members of his Mystical Body, and Subjects of his Mediatory Kingdom; Else Devils were, over whom he Exercises Sovereignty. But the Church only is His Body, yea and is His Fulness, compleating him in this Mystical Forensical Sense. Here is an Assertion both of his Relation to the Church, Visible and Invisible. To this Body he is a Head, in respect of his Rule and Government, visibly by his own Officers dispensing the Word, and Censures, *1 Cor.* 5. 4. and inwardly by the powerful Operation of his Spirit, *John* 16. 13, 14. Here is implied an Oneness of Nature betwixt him and his Church. Here is also a strict Union betwixt him and his Church, such as is betwixt the Head and the Members in the Natural Body, the tie of which Union, as to the Visible Church, (his Visible, Political and Ministerial Body, *1 Cor.* 10. 16, 17.) is the Bond of the Covenant of Grace, wherein they are Externally, *Psal.* 50. 5. together with a Profession of Faith, *Acts* 8. 37. But as to the Invisible Church of real Believers, they are enliven'd in the Inner Man with that same Spirit poured forth on Christ, *Rom.* 8. 9. and by Faith and Love really and strictly United to him, *Colos.* 1. 4. *Ephes.* 6. 24. Hence, upon ground of this Special Union to his Church, as the only proper Political Head thereof, there is an Influence of common Gifts from his Spirit upon the Church Visible, *Eph.* 4. 7. and an Influence of Spiritual Life and of Saving Grace to the Church Invisible, or such as really Believe, *Colos.* 2. 19. Thus Mr. *Ferguson* upon the place, with our Divines generally. Besides, when the Psalmist in the place forecited distinguished God's Israel from the Nations, and when the Church asserts God to be their King and Lawgiver, or Statute-maker, *Isa.* 33. 22. who will doubt but the Inference was good, that therefore this King and Statute-maker had established their fixed Form of Government, and that upon this very ground of his standing under such a Relation to them. And this Objector may Conjecture what the People of God, or the Prophets, would have Answered to his Senseless sham Notion or Objection, *God is King and Supreme over all the Nations, therefore he has no more established a fixed Government among you than among them.* Would they not have told him, that God's general Sovereignty and Government over the Nations, or his Providential Disposal is far distinct from the special Revelations of his Mind wherewith his Church is Priviledg'd, and that Relation wherein she stands unto him. And in a word, this his Quibble Confutes it self; For he acknowledges, at least will here suppose it, that there is a fix'd Species of Church Government determin'd in

Scripture. Thus in his 1. §. Now, I pray, upon supposal of the Scripture Determination, from what Topick can he, or any Man else infer this Determination or *Scripture Revelation*, if not from that of *Christ's Kingly Office and Political Headship over his Church*? As he will grant, all the Laws in a Kingdom, establishing and fixing the Government, flow from the King's Authority, and is the Exercise of his Sovereignty; Thus our Lord's *Kingly Sovereignty*, upon the one Hand, acknowledg'd by him, and, on the other hand, the *fixing of a Species*, suppos'd also by him, must needs be of an inseparable Connexion, since he can fetch this Determination from no other Fountain or Principle.

For his *Quarrelling the Induction instanc'd*; He, first, pitifully mistakes and overlooks the Scope of this Induction of Particulars; The strength of the Argument lying thus *a fortiori*, *That if such a Wise, Provident, Careful, peculiar Head over his Church* (as the Scripture points out our Saviour to be) hath in the Exercise of this his Headship and Sovereignty, been so punctual and accurat in all the particulars instanc'd, much more must it be suppos'd, that he would not omit to Determine what Special Government should have place in his Church, since no imaginable ground can be adduc'd of his Condescendence in the particulars instanc'd, which will not equally conclude the fixing of a Species of Government. For if it be said, that this is remitted to the Prudence of Church Governours; The Refortion is ready, Why not also the premis'd Determinations wherein the Scripture gives so clear a Sound? And if this Determination was to prevent the hazard of remitting these particulars instanc'd to Mens Invention, their changeling Will and shallow Wit, why shall it not be thought, that our blessed Lord was careful to prevent the like hazard in point of the Government of his House, which all will grant to be a point of very high Concernment? Again, the Objector, tho' for very shame he dares not quarrel the Divine Warrant of all the particulars instanc'd, yet he will needs shew his Teeth in some pitiful Quibbles as to some of them. He tells us, *That there is nothing in Tit. 1. 5. or 1 Tim. 4. 14. containing an Institution of Ordination, nothing but an Exercise of Dogmatick Power in Acts 15. nothing of Diatattick, 1 Cor. 14. no Institution touching Catechising or Blessing the People, 2 Cor. 12. 2 Tim. 4. 1. Heb. 5. 12. nothing of Ruling Elders and Deacons, Rom. 12. 7, 8. 1 Tim. 3. 8, &c.* He tells us, *this Proof may be justly challeng'd, and what then is become of this Argument?* 'Tis Answered, The same is become of this Argument that the Scripture Light has afforded, unless his bare denial without shadow of a Reason can be suppos'd to infringe this Scripture Proof. Nay in this denial he has wounded his Episcopal Cause

Cause to Death : For who knows not, that he, with his Fellows, conclude the Episcopal Power in Ordination from *Tit. 1. 5.* with *1 Tim. 4. 14.* *2 Tim. 1. 6.* And if there be, as he asserts, therein no Warrant or Institution of Ordination, the Episcopal Ordination inferr'd therefrom falls to the ground. And if there be, as he also acknowledges, in the Texts cited, the Exercise of the *Dogmatick* and *Diatæctick* Power, how can he deny a Divine Warrant to *this Exemplified Exercise* ? And doth he not thus overthrow all his Episcopal Arguments taken from the Practice of the Apostolick Church ?

Whereas he tells us, *That tho' all the premis'd Instances were granted, they cannot amount to the Determination of a Species; because there is no peremptory Institution.* I would gladly know, what this Man calls a *peremptory Institution* ? Does he not know, that a *Divine Right*, in the Sense of sound Divines, is for Substance equivalent to a *Divine Institution*, and may be either instructed by that which is *Consonant to the true Light of Nature*, or *Natural Reason*, or the remains of pure Natures Light, mentioned *Rom. 2. 14, 15.* with *Chap. 1. 18, 19, 20. &c.* Or by *Obligatory Scripture Examples*; There being several Commands for such Imitation, *Eph. 5. 1, 2, and 4. 32.* *1 Cor. 4. 16, 17.* *Heb. 6. 12, &c.* Moreover such Examples are binding, which are of a *moral Nature*, and upon Moral Grounds, *1 Cor. 11. 1.* *Phil. 4. 8, 9.* which we are commanded to imitat, as *1 Job. 2. 6.* *Eph. 5. 1, 2.* *Phil. 4. 9, &c.* and whose *Ground, Reason, Scape, and End* are Obligatory, and of a Moral Nature, as much concerning one Christian as another, one Church as another, such as are these instanced. There is also a *Divine Right* by *Divine Approbation*, as when God commends a Practice, as he commends what is Right in the Churches of *Asia*, consequently discommending what is opposite thereunto, adding Promises and Threatnings. There is also a *Divine Right* evident in *Divine Acts*; Thus whatever points of Religion are erected in the Church by God, and are recorded in Scripture, they are *Jure Divino*; Thus the Lord's Day Sabbath is *Jure Divino*, he having therein perfected his Spiritual Creation of the new World by his Resurrection and Apparition to his Disciples on that Day, and miraculous Blessing and Sanctifying that Day, pouring out the Gifts of the Holy Ghost, *Acts 2.* All which were seconded with *Apostolical Practice*, in the Primitive Churches, *Acts 20. 7.* *1 Cor. 16. 1, 2, &c.* There is also a *Divine Right* by *Divine Precepts and Commands*; And these either *immediat*, as those which God himself propounds and urges, as the Ten Commandments, and other Injunctions positively laid down; And these are either *Explicit*, or expressly in plain Terms propounded, as is the Letter of the Commands

of the Decalogue, and the Commands of Christ, *Feed my Lambs*, Joh. 21. *Do this in Remembrance of Me*, Matth. 26, Or *implicit*, which are either comprehensively contained under the express Terms, as is evident in the general Precepts of the Decalogue, wherein particular Duties and Sins are comprehended under general Heads; Or such as may be deduced from the express Commands by clear Consequence, as Ministers Preaching and Baptizing has its Divine Warrant clearly deduc'd from the Command given hereafter to Apostles, *Go Teach all Nations*, &c. Now whether the exhibited Instances amount not to the Determination of a *Divine Right* upon the Scripture Grounds mentioned, is left to the Consideration of the Judicious and Impartial: For, not to insist upon this, how far the *Light of Nature* will go as to the necessity of Officers and Administrators of a Government, the advantage and necessity of Judicial Decisions by Plurality of Votes, the Subordination of the lesser to the greater Courts or Societies; We have in the premis'd Accounts, 1. *Apostolical Practice*, and *Recommending approv'd Examples* in order to our Imitation in the points instanced, *scil.* The several Actings and Exercise of the Key of Order and Jurisdiction. In the next place, we have in the Instances exhibited, besides the *Apostles Practice*, their *Positive Institutions*, in Ordaining and Instituting such and such Officers, as *Pastors, Teachers, Elders and Deacons*, as may be seen, *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. *1 Cor.* 12. 28. *Eph.* 4. 11, 12.

2. We have the Apostles Institutions concerning the *Qualifications of these Officers*, as is evident in *Paul's* Epistles to *Timothy* and *Titus*.

3. We find these Officers enjoy'd their several pieces of Work and Duties, some to *Rule*, some to *Teach* also, some to take *Care of the Poor*.

4. These Officers are enjoy'd a diligent Attendance upon their Work in their own Persons without Substituting others in their place, *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. *The Minister is to wait on his Ministry, He that Teacheth on Teaching, he that giveth is to do it with Simplicity, and he that Ruleth is to Rule with Diligence.* 5. In matters of Discipline and Jurisdiction, we find them commanded to Act jointly, or with joynt Collegiat Authority. Thus the Officers of the Church of *Corinth* are enjoy'd to meet together, to deliver the incestuous Person unto Satan, *1 Cor.* 5. 4, 5. and the Officers of the Church of *Thessalonica* are commanded jointly and Authoritatively to warn the unruly. Here is then a Scene of all the Church Officers of Divine Warrant; Here is an account of their several respective Duties; A Command of their diligent Attendance; A Command of their Acting jointly in matters of Government, which, no doubt, amounts to the determining the Species thereof. Besides it may be enquir'd, Whether this Pasquiller makes one and the same
that

that which he calls a *peremptory Institution*, and *Divine Right*? If they be one and the same, so that nothing is of *Divine Right* which wants this *peremptory Institution*; What *peremptory Institution* can he produce for all the Offices of the Hierarchy, which he owns? Hath he not thus robb'd them of a *Divine Right*? Or, if a *Divine Right* can be instructed, without that which he calls a *peremptory Institution*, then he must acknowledge his Reason nought, whereby he denies the *Determination of a Species* from the premised Grounds, *scil.* Because there is no such *peremptory Institution*.

Whereas he tells us, *that there might be a lawful Derivation of Power from the Head, to make Administrations valid, whether the Governours act in Parity or Imparity.* He first discovers gross Ignorance of the State of the Question, which is not anent *Parity or Imparity* of Church Officers simply considered, but *Parity or Imparity* in the Pastoral Office. And if the Scripture hold out a *Parity* therein, he must acknowledge there can be no lawful derived *Imparity*. And if this Glorious Head *has set in his Church* the Officers mentioned, he has certainly done it *as King*, and for the great End of his *Churches Union and Edification*. Besides, I would gladly know of this *pasquiller*, from what Ground is the Lawfulness of these Officers, and their Official Actings deduc'd, if not from this *Scriptural Derivation of Power from Christ the Head*? And if so, then, by inevitable Consequence, and by the Rule of Contraries, where such a Divine or Scripture Derivation of Power from the Head cannot be instructed, the Office and Official Actings of such pretended Officers is unlawful, and an Impeachment of the Mediator's Authority. This sufficiently removes what he after adds, *viz. That Christ's Kingly Office infers not the Regulating of all Cases.* For it is enough, if in so far it regulate Cases, as not to impeach the Species of Government instituted, *scil.* the Officers, together with their Duties, and the Courts of his Appointment: For he will not say, that, even upon the Hypothesis of a fixed Species of Government, there was a Necessity of the Scriptures particular or explicate Determination of all Circumstantiate Cases in the Exercise thereof, these being left to the Prudentials of Church Governours, who are to act therein according to the general Rules of Decency and Order, with Subserviency to the Ends of Government. This also confutes what he further adds, *viz. That Officers, by vertue of a common Power, may cast themselves into particular Societies, and maintain useful Government, whatever be the Species; Which is nothing but his ignorant Petitio Principii, and contradicts what he asserts anent the Exclusion of Anarchy and Papal Monarchy by the Scripture Rules,* (for this he must of necessity be supposed to hold, or he speaks

Nonsense, in asserting the one and the other to be inconsistent with Church Societies and Government) since, if the Government be such as excludes these mentioned, it must certainly exclude them, as inconsistent with the Scripture Rules prescribed; For he will grant, that, upon the Hypothesis of a Divine Warrant and Institution, even the Papal Monarchy and Hierarchy were lawful. Moreover, he has been told in the 4. Reason upon this 1. Consid. *That all Actings of an Ecclesiastick Judiciary Power are in Scripture held out to be in Christ's Name and Authority, as Mediator, whose Mission therefore in Official Actings must be instructed (as every Magistrate's Actings in a Kingdom) by the Laws, i. e. the Word and Testament of this great Lawgiver.*

That Christ's Prophetical and Priestly Offices exclude new Revelations and Meritorious Satisfactions, yet his Kingly Office excludes not superadded Laws and Measures of Government, (as he is bold to assert) cannot but sound harshly in any Christian Ear. For what Ground can he, or any Rational Man offer to prove the Exclusion of these Revelations and Satisfactions mentioned upon the Ground of Christ's Prophetical and Priestly Offices, which will not equally prove the Exclusion of *superadded Laws and Measures of Government* by his Kingly Office, if we shall but suppose, as necessarily we must, that they are equal in Perfection, and exactly commensurated to their proper ends ? So that the superadding of Humane Inventions, as an Eikment and Amendment of the Exercise of his Kingly Office, is the same wicked Usurpation, as the Addition of new Revelations and Meritorious Satisfactions is upon his Prophetical and Priestly Offices. His Instance of the Colony in Darien their Liberty to choise any Government in the King's Name, is pitifully impertinent, and touches not the point in Question, which is anent the Churches Liberty to set up whatever Form of Government she thinks fit, and to act therein in Christ's Name; But it is easily acknowledged, that no Colony had Power to set up a Government opposite to the King's Laws, nor Officers not Authorized thereby.

His Talk of the Lord's lodging in the Church a Power for her Preservation, and inferring, that the Governours she authorizes by vertue of that Power, may be justly said to be given by Christ, is palpably impertinent. As if the Suitableness, forsooth, of this Power to her Preservation, were at the Churches Option, and to be judged by her solely without respect to the Lord's instituted and appointed Means; But the Scripture has taught him, that Christ has set in his Church his own Officers for that end, 1 Cor. 12. 28. And 'tis such Officers only, as can plead an Interest in Christ's Donation, who do Exercise their Office in his Name, and not in the Name of the Church. Whereas he adds, *Do they not subsist by a Power derived from him ?* He makes what-
ever

ever Officers the Church shall devise, to subsist by such a Power, and thus may plead for Patriarchs, Cardinals, yea Popes themselves. For what he adds of *Stillingfleet's Answer* to the second Argument adduced, he should know, that *Stillingfleet's Arguments* or *Answers* in that, as also in other points of his *Irenicum*, have been removed by Mr. Rule, as also by the Author of the Apologetical Relation.

He tells us, *the Church may have the Critick, Dogmatick, and Diatactick Power, whatever be the particular Form of her Government.* What can be more impertinent? For the Passage which he would Answer, and which he calls *the second main Argument*, from *Acts 15.* was adduced not only to instruct the Divine Warrant of the Power it self, but the proper Subject of the Power, and the Divinely Instituted Officers cloathed therewith, scil. Apostles, with Elders, or Presbyters in a Collegiate Meeting, which is clearly everfive of this Power monopoliz'd in a Prelate. Moreover, when he tells us, *the Church may have these Powers, whatever be the particular Form of Government*, he contradicts what he before asserted, that *the Church Government is of such a Nature, as excludes some Forms*, scil. Anarchy and Monarchy; So that, in his own Sense and Pleading, the Church excludes or excludes these Powers, if owning some Forms.

For his Quibble upon that Passage of *Rom. 15. 4.* that *the Improvement of it will hazard Presbytery, and plead for the Old Testament Hierarchy*, he is as pur-blind and insignificant, as in his other silly Exceptions, since the Paper, he would Animadvert upon, told him, that *this Passage may be extended unto the Practice and the Jus of this Apostolick Government*, which is the most proper and profitable Instruction can be drawn from that Instance. And afterward the premised Caution is set down anent the Cases wherein, or how far, *the Obligation of a Divine Example is extended, and that such Scripture Examples only are Obligatory, the Reason and Scope whereof are of a Moral Nature, as much concerning one Christian Church as another, one time as another, &c.* So that the Text and Assertion thereupon being thus limited, and solidly explained, his Quibble appears lighter than Vanity. Who will grant, saith our Objector, that bare Examples are of as great Force as formal Institution? But has he had his Eyes in his Head? Did the Paper plead bare Examples, and not as above caution'd. For his farther Quibbling upon *the Apostolick Churches Reception and Improvement*, adduc'd in the Paper, together with *Apostolick Patterns*, as amounting to an Obligatory Rule, toge-
that *this is an Episcopal Argument*; He shews the same Inadvertency in reading that Paper: For the Argument runs thus, *The Apostles Authority being pleaded, as being sealed by the Spirit, and that their Patterns*

Patterns amount to an Obligatory Rule, the Denial and Impeachment of the Obligatory Force thereof strikes against other Acts of Religion chiefly founded on this their Practice, and the Apostolick Churches Reception. Is any thing more evident, that the Foundation is here laid upon the Apostolick Practice properly and immediately; But will this, by the most remote Consequence, make the Churches Practice the Rule for understanding of, or a Comment on that of the Apostles? The Paper further had told him, that *the premis'd Scripture Instances and Examples are declared sufficient to make the Man of God, i.e. the Minister of God, perfect, and througly to furnish him for every good Work,* all Official Actings and Governing Duties as in that Capacity: But this our Pasquiller had no Eyes to see.

Upon the *second Consideration*, our pitiful Animadverter appears so mastered and overcome, that he has no Refuge, but that of Lies, in denying the Bishop's sole Power, wherein he has been sufficiently expos'd and chastis'd. He tells us here, *'tis enough to show the Question is mis-stated:* And 'tis a sufficient Answer to the whole of his Animadversion, to assert what is already made good, that, in the Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianick Age, mention'd by him, he ownes the sole Power, as has been convincingly made appear. And if in his IV. Ch. he has contrary Assertions, all the Advantage he has, is the proving himself a Self-Contradictor.

He asks, *if all the Dependencies enumerated, 1 Chron. 24. were precarious Dependencies?* And cites a Passage of the *Altare Damascenum*, Pag. 211. touching the Parisians, asserting a proportional and immediate Dependence of Bishops and Priests upon Christ, as, in France, Inferiour Judges, tho' subject to the Parliaments, have their Authority immediately from the King. But this is enough to confound and defeat what he alledges; For himself distinguisheth a due Subordination from a precarious Dependence. Now if the Author be found in his Principles and Pleading, to owne this precarious Dependence of Pastors upon the Prelate, (which our *Momus* here professes to disowne) as 'tis evident he hath done in that Pamphlet, ascribing to the Bishop such a *Liberum Arbitrium* and *Licentia*, as leaves to Pastors not the least Grain of Authority, but what he is pleased to allow, and may resume at his pleasure, then he cannot but acknowledge, that his Instances condemn himself.

To the first Argument taken from the Scripture Denominations of Pastors, *scil.* that they are called *ἡγούμενοι, pastores, &c.* importing an Essential Interest in Government, and to the second, taken from the Exercise of this Official Power, pointed at 1 *Thef.* 5. 12, 14. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17. 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. All that he has to Answer, is, That this is consistent with their

their standing in a due Subordination to a Bishop; And this can no more impeach an orderly Subordination of Rulers, than the Ruling Elders Subordination to the Pastors. But, 1. He has been told, That the Passages import Pastors Essential Interest in Government, and their standing in an Immediate Subordination, as Ordinary Officers of the highest Rank, to the expired Office of Apostolate. And next, that this Essential Interest in Government, yea, and the Exercise thereof, is, in these Texts, pointed out, without the least shadow of a Dependence upon any Ordinary Officers of an higher Order: So that what he talks of this Subordination to the Bishop, is a meer *Petitio Principii*, and a Supposition standing in Contradiction to the Text cited. 2^{ly}, His hiding himself under the Covert of this general Subordination, is but his Cover of Fig-leaves already exposed. 3^{ly}, His Answer censures the Apostles, who, in all these Power-importing Epithets, and commanded Exercise of this Authority and Power, do not, in the least, hint a Dependence upon any Ordinary Officer of an higher Order, which certainly ought to have been supposed, in the Texts instanced, and some Discriminating Cautions added, had that supposed Office of the Prelate been lawful or allowed.

For his Quibble about the Ruling-Elder, 'tis pitifully dull: For the Question here is, *Whether these Ruling and Teaching Elders by Office, do, in the premised Scripture Accounts, or any where else, stand in Subordination to a Prelate?* The Negative whereof is invincibly made good, which is no way impeached by the supposed Divine Right of the Ruling-Elders Subordinate Office. He tells us, *he will defend the Episcopal Sense of that Passage, 1 Tim. 5. 17, viz. That these who do faithfully discharge the Office of Church Governours, and in special these who are very painful in Preaching, &c. be suitably provided for as to their Maintenance.* But this Evasion of his Episcopal Masters, *Sutlive, Tilen, Bishop Bilson, Bishop Hall* and others, he might have found fully confuted by Presbyterians. [See *Altare Damascenum*, Cap. 12. Pag. 919, 920, 924. Mr. Gillespy's *Affert.* of the Govern. of the Church of Scotland, Part 1. Ch. 7. Pag. 50, 51. *Jus Div'n. Regim. Eccles.* Pag. 151, 152, &c. Cartwright against the Rhemists, in loc.] In a word, this Gloss allows a double Honour to Ministers that Labour not so much as others in the Word; And shall we think, that Laborious Paul intended to encourage idle Drons, lazies, seldom Preachers? Besides, that this Gloss, supposing both Branches are to be understood of Preachers, (for he ownes no Inferiour Governours) these Words [in the Word and Doctrine] should either have been quite omitted, or should have been inserted immediately after them that Rule well. Cartwright hath also here

Y y

told

told him, *That this Gloss of making one kind of Church Officers here to be noted, causes the Apostles Speech not to rise but to fall, not to go forward but to go backward; For to Teach Worthily and Singularly [καλῶς] is more than to Teach Painfully: For the first doth note all that may be required in a worthy Teacher, where the latter notes one Vertue only of Pains-taking.* But of this above. Our pasquiller further tells us, *That nothing can be gained by this Text, unless it could be proved, that the Words, by no means, can allow a Subordination among Elders who Labour in the Word and Doctrine.* But he has been told, that the Words do clearly exclude such a Subordination, and that the Clause of *Labouring in the Word and Doctrine*, should either have been totally omitted, or added to both Branches, had such a Subordination been supposed. Moreover, he pitifully snakes away from what is pleaded from that Text, wherein 'tis alledged, that *the Labouring in the Word and Doctrine*, is set in a higher Class above that of Ruling, opposite to the Episcopal Frame, which sets the Office of Ruling above Preaching.

In proof of Pastors immediate Exercise of the Jurisdictional Power, that Passage, *Acts 15.* is cited, wherein pastors concurred in the *Didactic, Critick and Dogmatick* Procedure with the Apostles themselves, who acted not as Apostles, but as Elders, and *ἐπισκοποῦντες*. To this all that our Animadverter can repon, is, *That they laid not aside their Apostolical Character.* But who ever said that they absolutely laid aside their Character, altho' in this Instance, they acted as Elders? Nay, has he not been told, *That their stating the Question, debating it in the ordinary way of Disputation, besides the Concurrence of Inferiour Officers instanced, doth clearly point at their not acting as Apostles in this Instance.* But, says our Pasquiller, *when was there a time more fit to put forth their Authority, than when such a weighty Controversie was to be determined?* I Answer by a Counter-Query, *When was a fitter time for asserting Pastors joyn't Essential Interest in Government, than in this Determination?* And next, his Question puts a Censure upon the Apostles, and impeaches their Infallibility; Upon which Ground he will easily acknowledge, that any one of the Apostles might have determined this Controversie: Why then did they put such a Restraint upon their Authority?

For what he adds, that *this will bring in the Laity pari passu into Government with Rulers;* 'Tis easily Answered, That the Context clearly distinguishes the Church Rulers from the Body of the People in this point. Let him consider *v. 2.* with *6.* wherein this will be evident,

His Equiparating *St. Cyprian's calling Presbyters Compresbyteri, with Peter's calling himself ἐπισκοπος*, paralleling the one and the other in

in point of a Divine Office, has sufficiently expos'd him in this point. The Word *συμπρεσβυτερος*, as expounded by H. Stephanus *, imports, *Qui sum & ipse Presbyter*. Thus also the *Tigurin*, as our *English* Translation, *Who am also an Elder*. H. Stephanus will also have the Sense of *συμπρεσβυτερος*, *Qui & ipse Seniorum & Presbyterorum Collegio est*, he who is of the Assembly or Colledge of Elders, commonly called the Presbytery; Which *Beza* insinuates, by rendering it, *Ego una Presbyter*, who am together with you a Presbyter; Which *Hierom* probably intended by the Word *compresbyter*. See this last Acceptation largely pleaded for by Mr. Gill *ssy*, *Miscellany Questions*, Chap. 8. Pag. 106, 107.

* *Thef. Ling.*
Græc. Tom. 3.
Pag. 545.

To that Instance of *1 Tim. 4. 14.* where the highest Action of Jurisdictional Authority, *scil.* Ordination, is ascribed to a Presbytery; We have our Pasquiller, 1. Offering a Quibble about Ruling-Elders, as not there; Or if they were, he charges our Practice as impeaching this Rule. *Ans.* As for the Divine Right of this Officer, and his Interest in Government, it is above made appear; and his Quibble this way is a meer Diversion from the point: For, if this Collegiate Meeting of Elders or Presbyters be found the Subject of Ordaining Power, and clothed with this Authority, as is clearly evinced in the Contexture, whether a Ruling Elder be supposed a Member or not, the Episcopal Pre-eminence and Usurpation is palpably overturned; The Bishop ascribing this Ordaining Power to himself Solely, excluding Presbyters. And for the practice of our Church in this point, 'tis very easily accorded with our Principles anent the Office of Ruling Elders; since they do concur in the Presbytery's Disquisition anent the Legitimacy of the Call, yea, and in the Presbytery's Détermination in point of the Ministerial Mission, wherein the Essence of Ordination properly consists, and in all these points as Ruling Officers; Altho' not in the Ritual of Imposition, which the Practice of this Church has, of a considerable time, reserved to Pastors. In the 1. Book of Discip. Head 4. It is said, *Albeit the Apostles used Imposition of Hands, yet seeing the Miracle is ceased, the using the Ceremony we judge not necessary*. 'Tis true, it was afterward admitted into Practice, as in the 2. Book of Discip. Ch. 3. where we are told, that the Ceremonies of Ordination are Fasting, Earnest Prayers, and the Imposition of the Hands of the Eldership: But, for the Ground of our Churches present Practice, the performance of this Ceremony seems to be appropriated to the Pastoral Office; because it has been looked upon as a Rite appendant unto the Solemn and Publick Prayer for, and Blessing of the Person set apart to the Office; which

which Performances, as the Word of Exhortation, being peculiar to the Pastoral Office, it has therefore been judged meet, that this Appendant Rite, in that Solemnity, should be also performed only by the Pastors. 2^{ly} For his next Quibble about the Members Constituent, as not being *Ordinary Pastors*; 'Tis Answered, if Pastors be found in Scripture the highest Ordinary Officers settled by the Apostles in the Churches, and such Rulers and Governours therein, as is instanced, there's no imaginable Ground to deny this *Presbytery* to have been made up of such; Nor is there any shadow in the Text to prove, that this *Presbytery* was made up of Officers of any higher Order.

For what he adds of *Timothy's Evangelistick Office*, which they could not confer, he might have seen this solidly removed by Presbyterian Writers. In a word, besides that some would tell him, *that tho' an Evangelist were Major Singulis, yet he was Minor Universis*, inferiour to a Consistorial Meeting or Judicatory; But especially, that the great Apostle of the Gentiles his Concurrence did sufficiently impower this *Presbytery* for such an A&A. He has been moreover told, *That the Argument runs the stronger for Presbyterian Government, and the Presbytery's Power with respect to Ordination of Ordinary Officers; Since they concurred Authoritatively with the Apostle Paul in the Ordination of an Evangelist.* Our Pasquiller next objects *the Apostle Paul's presence, and Imposition of Hands, together with the Presbytery, as Exemplifying the Bishop's Imposition, forsooth, with concurrent Presbyters.* And whereas the distinct Particles of *καὶ* and *διὰ* were alledged to prove the Distinction betwixt the *Presbytery's* Imposition, and that of *Paul*; He tells us, that *διὰ* imports *Per, or By*, and *καὶ* *With*; The one pointing at the Principal, the other the Subordinate Cause. This Quibble he might have seen frequently exposed, as cross to the Context; For, in the place where the *διὰ* is expressed, there's no such thing as an Intimation of the Apostle Paul's Principality in this Action; But these two grand Privileges are presented to *Timothy* for his Incouragement, 1. *The Gift given by Prophecy.* 2^{ly}, *The Laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*, and these in distinct *Commās*, as the Variation of the Term from *διὰ* to *μετὰ* makes appear: And no Sense can be made of this *Imposition of the Hands of the Presbytery*, absolutely thus presented, as such a distinct Privilege, without the least hint of the Apostles Superintendency, if not to hold out the *Presbytery's* Authority herein.

In the next place, our Pasquiller will needs Embrace the Reading which Interprets *τὸ πρεσβυτερίον* of the Office, not of a Consistorial Meeting; An Answer so frequently exposed, that I need not insist upon it. Their own *Camero*, a better Grecian than the Animadverter or any of his

his Party, has convincingly baffled this Answer, as contrary, not only to the ordinary Acceptation of the Word, but to the Scripture parallels where this Word is used. The Paper had said, that it is thrice in the New Testament found only, and in the other two places it points at a *Consistorial Meeting*; And all that the Pasquiller can Object, is a *contrary Acceptation in Eusebius*; A worthy Acceptation, no doubt, to oppose to that of the Scripture, and so many Learn'd Divines, Grecians and Interpreters, upon this Text, as are already exhibited. For *Calvin's* Judgment upon the place, it is already accounted for; Nor can he, or any else, make appear, that *Calvin* ever retracted his Sense thereof expressed in his Commentary, especially considering his clear Assertion of Presbyterian Government, both in his Institutions and Commentaries.

Come we to the Instance of the Church of *Corinth*, from which the Paper pleads an Official Authority in Government, applicable to Pastors, exclusive of a precarious Dependence upon a Prelat; And 'tis pleasant to see how this Instance has baffled our Pasquiller. 1. He denies *this Church* to have any ordinary fixed Governours set over her; An Answer so palpably Antiscriptural, that to recite it, is to refute it. The Authors of the *Jus Div. Reg. Eccl.* pag. 206, 207. have convincingly made appear, — *That as there was a multitude of Believers, so there were plenty of Ministers in that Church.* The Text in the Paper cited to prove this, our Pasquiller dare not meddle with; Only he quibbles upon that, *1 Cor. 14.* where is pointed out a *Subordination of Prophets to Prophets*, as to a Judicial Cognizance upon their Exercises. He tells us, *These being Extraordinary Persons, it was not Organized after the manner it was to continue.* But what pitiful Trifling is this? If there be here exemplified a Subordination of Prophets to Prophets, in point of Judicial Cognizance, even supposing the Officers extraordinarily Gifted, doth not the Instance plead the more strongly for such a Subordination and Mould of Government, in case of the ordinary Officers endowed with ordinary Gifts? Besides that he should have considered what is offered by Mr. *Rutherford* from the Scope and Context, to prove these *Prophets* ordinary Officers. *vid. Due Right of Presbytery.* For his denying the Term *ἐκκλησίαις*, *1 Cor. 14. 34.* to import Churches with Ecclesiastick Discipline, because *Acts 19. 41.* the Term *ἐκκλησίαι* signifies a tumultuous Meeting of Heathens; 'Tis so Nonsensical, that he is sufficiently expos'd in the repetition of it. In a Word, after his pitiful Apology, That he will say at present but little to this Instance, as not having Leisure, forsooth, for it; All that he can further add, is, *That they were no fix'd Officers of that Church*: The repetition whereof

is a sufficient Confutation, since, 1. The Apostle calls himself a *Master Builder*, who had laid the Foundation, yea had stay'd with them one year and an half, *Act. 18. 11.* compared with *1 Cor. 3. 10.* And was there no Superstructure of Inferior Officers all that time? Did not the Apostle Ordain Elders, *Church by Church*, where the Gospel was received? *Act. 14. 22.* 2ly, From whence did flow their *Carnal crying up of their several Teachers*, some doting upon one, some upon another, and some upon a third, if this be not supposed, that they had plenty of Preachers? And, 2ly, Saith not the Apostle, *1 Cor. 3. 15.* *Tho' you have ten thousand Instructors in Christ, you have not many Fathers?* &c. But what needs more? The very Scope and Contexture of that, *1 Cor. 5.* compared with the parallel, *2 Cor. 2.* does so clearly conclude fix'd Officers with a Jurisdictional Authority over that Church, that his denial thereof convinces him of an Obstinat withstanding of Scripture Truth.

For that Passage of the Bishop of Salisbury, acknowledging the Pastoral Office to be the highest Office in the Church, as being empowered for the highest Actions of Sacred Performances; Our Pasquiller had done well to have let it alone: For his Answer is pitifully Nonsensical, telling us, *That tho' the Sacramental Actions be the highest Performances, yet by no Logick it will follow, that all empowered for them must be of the highest Office in the Church; some may be empowered as Supreme, others as Subordinat.* Wherein, 1. He gives the Bishop the lie in his Argument and Reasoning; For the Bishop from this Topick, of being empower'd for the highest Performances, infers this necessary Conclusion, that therefore such must be of the highest Office. And sure this is a good Conclusion upon all grounds of Reason or Logick, else the Pasquiller will impeach such an Argument brought in Proof of the Apostles highest Office, as being empower'd for such Actions as were the highest of Sacred Performances in that State of the Church. And who knows not that the Supreme Kingly Office is thus distinguished from the Inferior Office of Subordinat Magistrats? 2ly, The Bishops Inference is, that such are of the highest Office; and if Cloathed with the highest Office, where is there ground for Subordination and Degrees in this Office? Will he thus make Officers higher than the Highest? If the performance of Duties of the highest Nature, doth necessarily import a Correspondent Authority of such a Nature, sure there is no place left for Subordination or Degrees. Moreover, will our Pasquiller deny, that the High Priests Office had a respect to Sacred Performances of the highest Nature in the Jewish Oeconomy; And should one have thus Argued for the High Priest's Authority, He that is empower'd for Sacred Actions of the highest Nature, is of the highest

highest Office of the Church; What would any Rational Person have thought of his Return and Answer to the Argument; Tho' he was empower'd for the highest Performances, yet he was not of the highest Office; since there may be Subordination of Administrators in the highest Office, wherein some may be Supreme, others Subordinat? But, again, we are told by the Author of the *Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, That Parity consists in indivisibili; and for a suppos'd Assertion of the contrary, he inveighs against the Reverend Mr. Rule. But here our Animadverter cuts out a Parity into Subordinat steps, dividing the highest Office into Supreme and Subordinat: And surely our Animadverters Logick is, in that point, of a piece with the above-named Authors Divinity discover'd in his Pamphlets, i. e. both of a Linisie Woolsie Versatile Frame and Colour.

Upon the *Third Consideration* he passes over all that is said, till he come to the Passage anent *Rivet*; And upon this, he asks, *Who empower'd Rivet to represent the Protestant Churches?* To which we Answer, The same Truth that empower'd him to all his other Protestant Defences, avow'd and own'd hitherto by the Protestant Churches. Our Momus might have found, that the Author of *Rectius Instruendum*, *Hierarchical Bishops Claim*, with many others, have made appear the Testimony of Protestant Churches against Prelacy by their Confessions, yea, of Bishops themselves, and of the most famous Divines of the Church of England. And for the Churches of Britain and Ireland, which he after talks of, he knows they joyn'd in a Covenant against Prelacy, and therefore disown'd it.

Timothy's Authority, received by *Imposition of the Hands of the Presbytery*, is a good Argument to prove he had no Authority over them, upon the same Ground and Topick which proves that a Church Officer has no Dominion over a Church Judicatory Authorizing him; which ground stands Fortified by this sure Principle, *That the Authority of all Church Judicatories is Ministerial*, and therefore there is no Dominion over them properly competent to any Officer. The Superintending Inspection and Authority, even of Apostles, being Ministerial, and not a Dominion, which is disown'd by them *. Besides, * 2 Cor. i. 24. what inconvenience can our Pasquiller find in this 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3. Assertion, *That Timothy was first Ordained a Presbyter* 1 Cor. 4. 1. *by the Presbytery, and after Ordain'd an Evangelist by the Apostle Paul?* And it passes the power of all our Prelatists to make appear, that the *Imposition of Paul's hands and the Presbyteries* were at one and the same time. Yea, their own Honnyman pleads, that *Timothy* received only a *Presbyterat* by this *Imposition of hands*; For thus he expounds the

Text, 1 Tim. 4. 14. *Neglect not the Gift given thee by the*
 † Survey Part *Imposition of hands, whereby thou was Ordain'd and made a*
 2. pag. 217, *Presbyter* †. Yea, even admitting he was Ordain'd an
 218. *Evangelist, and the Actions of the Apostles and the Pres-*
byteries Imposition to be contemporary, the Presbyteries

Act needs be extended no further than the Ordaining him a *Presbyter*, and what was more, *scil.* the Ordination to the Office of an *Evangelist*, might proceed from the Apostle; So that what was *Ordinary* in his Office, is ascribable to the *Presbytery*, what was *Extraordinary*, to the Apostle. Yea, if it were said, that even the *Presbytery* Ordained and sent forth an *Evangelist*, what absurdity is it if it be asserted, that in so far (as is above hinted) they were above him? Tho' an *Evangelist* be greater than a single *Presbyter*, this proves not, that even in that Capacity, he is greater than the whole *Presbytery*. One of

* *Miscel. Quest.* the House of Lords (saith our Learn'd Mr. Gillespie *
 Cb. 8. pag. 103. handling this point) is greater than one of the House of Commons, but he is not therefore greater than the House of Commons. When a King and his People is compared together, we use to say, that he is *Major Singulis, Minor Universis*. This removes and sufficiently baffles his Quibble anent the Election of the High Priest, and of Kings in Elective Kingdoms; For the same Rule premis'd holds in both Cases: Besides, that the High Priest had no Prelatical Dominion over the Sanhedrin when Constituted. And he foolishly equiparats such a pretended Election with that of Kings in Elective Kingdoms; Since the High Priests Election was properly by God himself, and, by his Original Authority, fix'd to the Family of *Aaron*, and the first Born of his Sons. He has also been told, that, in Elective Kingdoms, the Radical Elective Power and Authority over the Elected still continues; Else it could never be put forth in case of a new Election.

To save *Timothy*, the suppos'd Bishop of *Ephesus*, from being Stag'd as an *Apostat*, Rev. 2. our Animadverter offers this Defence, *That it is certain Timothy might have been Bishop of Ephesus a good many Years, and yet have died a good many Years before St. John wrote the Revelation.* A pitiful Apology; *John* Wrote the *Revelation* in *Domitian's* time, computed about 97. after *Christ's* Birth, and some do judge that *John* Wrote his Gospel after the *Revelation*, considering withal *Timothy's* Youth when the Apostle *Paul* Wrote his first Epistle to him, there will be no great probability of his being Dead at that time. But to let this pass, our Animadverter hath expos'd himself, in telling us he might have died before that time. For, 1. The strength of our Argument lies in this, That the Bishop of *Ephesus* being stag'd for such an

Apostat,

Apostat, and *Timothy* being by them suppos'd Bishop, if he was alive and Bishop when this was Written, he is stag'd as such an Apostat; And for any thing that we or they know, he was then alive, and actually Bishop; And if alive, this Consequence clearly follows. So that, they supposing *that he was not alive, nor Bishop at that time*, which is the only Defence, and their part of the Question; It lies upon the Affirmers to make it good, that *he was remov'd, and another Bishop in his place at that time*. And in this we deal in the same Method with him, as Protestants do with Papists. When we Impugn the several Corruptions of the Church of Rome, they make this Defence, "Who and where were the Witnesses that Testified against them, when they first appeared? Name your Author, say they. To which the Protestant Answer is, That there might have been such, tho' the knowledge thereof is not come to our Hand, and that it lies upon them as the Affirmers to prove no such Testimonies were given, and that it is bad Arguing from *the Defect of the History, to deny the Truth of the thing*. Thus *Pool* in his Dialogues, with our Divines generally; And the Case is here the same, we Asserting *Timothy* might have been alive, and, in their Principles, *Bishop at that time*; They Affirming *he was not* (for this they must say, or they say nothing), are obliged to make it appear. 2ly, Whereas he says, *'Tis certain Timothy might have been Bishop, and yet have died before that time*; He has made a pitiful and shameful Blunder; Since, as is said, the only Defence is, that *de facto* he was dead, and not Bishop: And he infers this only from the possibility, or *He cries out a little before, O brave Logick!* when the Paper infer'd that *Timothy* could not be Cloathed with Authority above the Presbytery, because Ordain'd by them. And what Logick or Inference is his, in Arguing from the Uncertainty of a *may be*, or *might be*, to a Certainty of *was*? The Royal Martyr King *Charles*, in his Conference with *Mr. Henderson*, who had Objected the Churches Desertion after the Apostolick times, tells him, that he was Taught that *a posse ad esse was no good Argument*. How many Instances might we give, and *ad hominem*, of this pitiful Paralogism? This *Momus* might have lived, and never Written what is here Written; He might have liv'd, and Written, or Printed Nonsense, &c. Ergo, *de facto* it is thus.

Where is *Timothy* is enjoyn'd, 2 Tim. 2. 2. To commit what he had heard from the Apostle to a Plurality of Faithful Men, who shall be able to Teach others: This *Momus* tells us, *There is nothing like an Insinuation of Successors can be squeez'd from the Text*. Now, to discover how these *Midianites* Brow-beat and Buffet one another, let us hear how

† Enquiry into
the new Opinions,
Pag 109.

Dr. Munro Argues from this place *, "In these
Apostolical Injunctions, *saith he*, address'd particular-
ly and Personally to *Timothy*, are contain'd the
Nature, Extent and Authority of his Episcopal Power

and Jurisdiction, his Relation to the Church of *Epheſus*, and the
perpetuity of that Power committed to him in the Church, which
he is commanded to commit to Faithful Men, 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. who shall
be able to Teach others also. So, this Power, which was Personally
lodg'd in him, was not Temporary or Transient, but Successive and
perpetual, and deriv'd unto others *in solidum*, as he receiv'd it him-
self. So that one of two he must grant, Either their Doctor; for
whom that Party has such a Veneration, was a wrester of this Scripture,
Squeezing that out of it which never was in it; Or he has given an
Impertinent and Scripture-wresting Defence and Answer. Let him
chuse him which, and reckon upon his Advantage. The Character
of these, to whom *Timothy* is to commit what he had heard of *Paul*, we
find thus expressed, *That they are Faithful Men, able to Teach others*; And,
since our Pasquiller is so earnest to have his Prelats out of that Roll,

† De Ecclef.
Contr. 2. Cap. 2.

he has clearly enough insinuated, that, as in that Capacity,
they are neither *Faithful Men* nor *Teachers*. Whittaker †
Pleads against the Popish Adversary from this Text,
2 *Tim.* 2. 2. that the Apostle enjoyns *Timothy* to com-
mit what he had heard of him to Faithful Men, who were *inavoi-
ctépes διδάſται*, able to Teach others, pleading thus, That the Bishop must
be a *Teacher*; As also from the Description of the Bishop, 1 *Tim.* 3. 2.
wherein it is a special Qualification of the Bishop, that he be *διδασκων*,
apt to Teach, asserting clearly, that, in both places, the Apostle speaks of,
and describes the Bishop properly so called.

The Paper had adduc'd the Testimony of Protestant Divines and
Universities in proof of this point, *That Timothy was an Evangelist
and an Extraordinary Officer*. To this he repones, 1. *That the Author
holds 'tis not enough that famous Divines assert such and such a point, but Reasons
hinc inde must be weigh'd in the Ballance of the Sanctuary, that*

|| Hier. Bishops
claim, Part 3.
Pag. 5.

thus he Answers a Passage of Bishop Honnieman ||. What
a pitiful *Momus* is this? 1. 'Tis evident that the famous
Cloud of Protestant Divines and Universities have, not
only asserted this, but, upon such Scripture* grounds as clearly
evinced it, and which he cannot Answer. Again, 2. Whereas he says,
*That the Author rejected the Testimonies of Fathers, and why may not he,
Transmarine Divines?* It is Answered, 1. He never rejected Testimo-
nies of Fathers or others, when Fortified by solid Scripture. Grounds.

2. 'Tis

2. 'Tis not Transmarine Divines only, but even the *British*, who assert this.

For that Exception against the *Saumer University*, viz. *That some Members are suppos'd to own Opinions not sound*; 'Tis utterly impertinent. He enquires *Whether the Author will Subscribe to every thing Published by these Professors*. 'Tis Answered, The Author pleaded not simply and absolutely the Sentiments of the University, as an infallible Rule, but as that which has its own secondary Strength or Weight in the Confirmation of a Scripture-Truth, especially their Judgment being founded upon Scripture; Which will no more oblige to Subscribe to every Tenet of every one of these Divines, than his Citations of, and Veneration for the Principles or Testimonies of the Fathers, will oblige to such an absolute Submission. Should this *Momus* plead the Authority of the *Oxford University's* Judgment against the Covenant, sure he would take it for a very impertinent Answer, *That some of these Doctors maintain'd some Errors*; Even upon the Hypothesis that this were clear and evident. And whereas he alledges *the opposit Opinion of Oxford and Cambridge in this point*; 'Tis Answered, Their most famous Doctors have disowned Prelacy; *Whittaker*, a famous Professor in *Cambridge*, whom *Bucer* boasted of as his Master [*Resp. ad Campiani Rationes*], affirming that *Presbyter and Bishop are all one Jure Divino*. And whereas *Duraeus* the Jesuit, against whom he also Writes, did Affirm, *they were Jure Divino different*; He tells him, *that what he affirms is such, as all Men see to be evidently false*; Citing *Jerom's* Testimony, who, he tells his Adversary, confirm'd by Scripture, *the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter*. And for the other University, *Dr. Holand* the King's Professor in *Oxford*, at an Act *July 9, 1608*, concluded against *Mr. Lane's* Question, *An Episcopatus sit ordo distinctus a Presbyteratu*, and said, *that the Affirmative was most false, against the Scriptures, Fathers, the Doctrine of the Church of England* (let our *Momus* Remark this), *yea the very Schoolmen themselves*, *Lombard, Thomas, Bonaventure, &c.* The same we have heard of *Arch-bishop Whitgift* against *Cartwright*; Of *Bishop Jewel*, in the Defence of his *Apolo-*

* Part 2. Ch. 9.
Div. I.

logy *, who cites, against the *Jure-Divinoship of Prelacy*, and to prove that *Bishop and Presbyter are one Jure Divino*, *Hierom, Augustin, Chrysostom*, closing up his Answer with these words, "All these and many more Holy Fathers, together with the Apostle *St. Paul*, for thus saying, must, by *Hardings* Advice, be held for Hereticks. We have heard also of *Bishop Morton*, in his *Catholic Apology*, Part. 1. Ch. 33. who asserts, "That there is

'no difference, by Divine Right, between the Bishop and Presbyter. Citing also *Medina, Anselm, Sedulius, Erasmus, and Alphonsus à Castro*, who sayeth that *Jerom* was also of Opinion, "That Bishop and Presbyter are of the same Order and Authority. To whom may be added Bishop *Bilson* in his Book against Seminaryes *, who affirms out of *Jerom*, "That the Church at first was Govern'd by the common Council of Presbyters; And therefore Bishops must understand, 'that they be greater than Ministers rather by Custom, than the 'Lord's Appointment, and the Bishops came in after the Apostles 'times. To these many others might be added, such as Dr. *Reynolds*, in his Epistle to Sir *Francis Knols*, who proves this Identity from *Chrysostom, Hierom, Ambrose, Augustin, Theodoret, Primasius, Sedulius, Theophylact*, with whom agree, saith he, *Oecumenius* and *Anselm* Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, &c. So that 'tis evident, especially from what is above offered, that our High-Flown *Jure-Divino* Gentlemen are but of a late Edition. Here then is the Presbyterian Judgment, in point of the Presbyterian as of the Highest Order, asserted, not only by the University-Doctors, but by Scriptures, Fathers, yea the Authority of the Church of England.

But our *Momus* will have the Term Evangelist to import no peculiar Office, but to be competent to Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon. This absurd Assertion he might have seen sufficiently expos'd by the Author of the *Hierarchical Bishops Claim*, against Dr. *Monro*. And he must Tatle over again what the Doctor has said. But let us hear his odd Proof. He tells us, he will make it appear from the Definition assign'd by that Author, scil. That they were to Water the Apostles Plantations, bring Commissions from the Apostles to the Churches, and Reports of the Churches state to the Apostles. But he should have known, That, 1. He did make it appear, both from the Scripture accounts of these Officers, and the Sense of Protestant Divines and Universities, that they could be fixed to no particular Post or Station; Which clearly excludes their Episcopal Function. 2. That the Scripture designs a special Office of Evangelist properly and specifically distinct from other Offices, and this even in the Sense of Sound Divines; Since, 1. *Timothy* is enjoyn'd to do the Work or Duties competent to that Relation, Do the Work of an Evangelist: Which must needs import a peculiar Duty suited to a peculiar Function; And has the same Sense in order to such a Scope, as if the Apostle had said, Do the Work of a Bishop (will our *Momus* make the Work and Office of a Bishop competent to Deacons?), Do the Work of a Parent, &c. 2. In the Apostles Recitation and Scale of distinct

distinct Offices appointed of God, he sets down that of Evangelist, as peculiarly distinct from others, *Eph. 4. 11. He gave some, Apostles: and some, Prophets: and some, Evangelists: and some, Pastors and Teachers.* What Confusion were this, if the Term *Evangelist* imported no peculiar Office, but were such a Versatile Ambiguous Term, as is competent to any of these Offices? Nay, 3^{ly}, Upon this Ground he might make every one of these Offices instanced, as likewise *1 Cor. 12. 28.* such *Individuum Vagum's*, may I say, or *Versatile Amphibions*, as afford no distinct Sense, and leaves the Church at an Uncertainty what to make of them.

For what he adds of *Philip the Deacon*, who is call'd an Evangelist, he but Tatles over again what is already expos'd. *Calvin* tells him, "*Philip* was no Deacon at *Jerusalem*, when thus term'd, else we will charge upon him an Unfaithful Breach of his Trust, in leaving his Station there; The Text therefore points at his being afterward assum'd to the Office of an Evangelist. But our Animadverter reads not of any peculiar Ordination to make him an Evangelist, or to fix any other in that Station. I Answer, he reads not this as to other Extraordinary Offices; He reads of no peculiar Ordination of Healers, Workers of Miracles, of Prophets, which he holds to be Extraordinary Officers, and to be pointed at *1 Cor. 14.* Shall I add, he reads no peculiar Ordination of *Titus*, of the seven *Asian Angels* to their Episcopacy, whom, notwithstanding, he holds to have been install'd in that Office. And whatever Evasion he can invent in this Case, will discover the Folly and Naughtiness of this his Notion.

To the many clear Arguments taken from the Epistles themselves, to prove that *Timothy* and *Titus* could not be Bishops set over these Churches, our Pasquiller can repone nothing but this poor General, viz. That these three Epistles were written after the time accounted for by *Luke* in the *Acts*; Citing *Dr. Pearson's Dissertation de Successione Episcop. Rom.* and his *Annales Paulini*, who shews, that, "before the first Epistle was written, *Paul* was going to *Macedonia*, and left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*, *1 Tim. 1. 3.* *Luke* accounts only for *St. Paul's* being thrice at *Macedonia*, but it could be at none of these three times, that he left *Timothy* at *Ephesus*; For, the first time he took *Timothy* with him, as appears, *Acts 16. 1.* The second time he sent *Timothy* before him, *Acts 19. 22.* The third time *Timothy* was in his Return, *Acts 20. 4.* Also it is clear concerning *Titus*, that *Paul*, before he wrote his Epistle, had left *Titus* in *Crete*, *Tit. 1. 5.* but *Paul* never set Foot on *Cretish* Ground, during all that time *Luke* accounts for in the *Acts*; Hence *Paul* was liberated from his Bonds at *Rome*, mentioned

cited *Acts* 28. and again travers'd the World before he wrote these Epistles. 'Tis Answered, For the Chronological Account, and the Time and Date of these Epistles, there wants not Difficulty. We shall not here need to resume the Historical Account of the Date and Time of *Timothy* and *Titus* their Evangelistick Travels, before and after these Epistles written to them, exhibited by the Learn'd Authors of the *Jus Divin. Minist. Evang.* But for this Account and Calculation of Dr. *Pearson*, our *Momus* will not find so exactly to quadrate as he imagines. Who desires the exact Disquisition on this point (which were tedious and impertinent here to insert) may read Mr. *Pool* his Collection of the Sense of Criticks and Interpreters, in his Preface to both these Epistles, and especially the exact Discussion of this Question offer'd by the Famous and Learn'd *Hermannus Witsius*, in his *Meletemata Leidenfis*, Sect. 12. de *Vinculis Pauli apud Romam*. Wherein, having set down the Judgment of *Ludovicus Capellus* and Dr. *Pearson*, anent the *Epocha* of the second Epistle of *Timothy*, which is mainly contraverted; And having stated the Question, Whether it is to be referred to *Paul's* first or second Imprisonment at *Rome*; And having presented the Assertion of *Pearson* and *Capellus*, "That this Epistle was written by *Paul* a little before his Martyrdom, and in his last Imprisonment, and that it is the last of all the Epistles; Together with their Reasons and Arguments: He afterward presents the contrary Judgment of several of the Learn'd, such as *Hammond*, *Lightfoot*, *Cave*, besides others of the *Romish* Communion, such as *Baronius*, *Estius*, *Salmaro*, together with their contrary Reasons; Yea, and Answers to the Reasons of *Capellus* and *Pearson*. See Pag. 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191. And coming to give his own Judgment, Pag. 192. he asserts "this Epistle to have been written in the time of *Paul's* first Imprisonment at *Rome*. His Judgment also of the Time and Date of the first Epistle may be seen *ibid.* Sect. 9: Pag. 141. This Learn'd Author holds it not improbable, that the Apostle *Paul* wrote the Epistle to *Titus*, as also that to the *Galatians*, during his Abode at *Ephesus*.

In the next place, this Hypothesis, which our *Pasquiller* will have so fix'd, viz. That these Epistles were not written, till after *Paul's* Liberation from his first Imprisonment at *Rome*, is so far from helping him, that it quite dashes and affronts his Cause and Design; For, 1. By this Hypothesis, there was a Church planted at *Ephesus*, furnish'd with Elders, to whom the Authoritative Inspection thereof was committed, and that for many Years before the pretended Episcopacy of *Timothy* could take place: For *Paul* testifies, he had Labour'd three Years among them, *Acts* 20. 31, Thereafter he was two Years Prisoner at *Cæsarea*, and

and two Years at Rome ; And how long after was the Commencement of *Timothy's* Inspection, and, in our Episcopalian Sense, Episcopacy over that Church, is hard to determine. 2ly, When *Paul* took his Farewell of the Elders of *Ephesus*, *Acts* 20. *Timothy*, according to this Hypothesis, could not be Ordain'd Bishop there, nor the first Epistle as yet written unto him ; Nevertheless, the Apostle, when he expected to have seen them no more, he committed the whole Charge, Oversight and Government of that Church to the Elders, without the least Insinuation, that their Constitution was imperfect, and afterwards to be changed, and a Bishop set over them. So that this Evasion of our Animadverter appears utterly insignificant, and his great Doctor and he, in this Critical Travel, have made but a Journey to *Utopia*, and have run to catch a Nothing, yea, and have thus discover'd the Strength of the Presbyterian Cause, this Church being (as they must needs acknowledge) under the Inspection of such Bishops, as *Paul* gave his last Charge unto ; And these were the College of Presbyters exercising such a joyn't Authority over that Church, as is above express'd. And what a gross Imputation is it upon the Apostles Infallibility and Faithfulness, yea the Spirit's special Influence and Conduct in this Matter of so high Importance, to say, that the Apostle after retracted this his Solemn Charge, in setting a Prelate over them, who had all this Episcopal Authority, ascribed here to the Elders, Monopoliz'd in himself ? Yea, says not the Apostle, that *the Holy Ghost had made these Elders Bishops over that Church* ; And when, and how, I pray, did the Holy Ghost retract this his Commission ? We see into what inextricable Absurdities these Men involve themselves, in withstanding Scripture Truths. And 'tis evident to Conviction, that this silly Project will never help him, or his Doctor, out of the Briers. Nay, he has herein presented to the Presbyterians a ridiculous Pageant, *scil.* his admir'd Dr. *Pearson* combating his no less admir'd Dr. *Hammond*, and that in a point wherein Presbyterians are little or nothing concern'd ; But of such Concernment in his Principles, that the one must needs be suppos'd to have asserted and supported, the other to have betray'd his Episcopal Cause. And let the Choice be referr'd to our Pamphleter's Melancholick Reflection : To clear this further, let us hear what *J. S.* has in his Third Letter to Mr. *Mel-* * Pag. 8, 9.
drum *, " It is certain, *saieth he*, there was all along a *J.* 24.
 ' College of Presbyters at *Ephesus*, even before a Bishop
 ' was set over them : We read of them, *Acts* 20. and, as I have already
 ' insinuated,

‘insinuated, (And the Learn’d Dr. Pearson hath to
 † *Annal. Pauli.* Demonstration prov’d†) “it was after *Paul’s* Liberation
 Pag. 22. and ‘from his first Imprisonment, that *Timothy* was made
Dissert. de Suc- ‘Bishop. Now if Dr. Pearson and he acknowledge, that
cess. Epi. Rom. the Apostle, *Acts* 20. set a College of Presbyters with
 Episcopal Authority over that Church, yea, and such as
 continued all that Decurse of Time accounted for by *Luke* in the *Acts*,
 the Argument adduc’d appears strong and invincible; Yea, and
 over and above, the Inference is thus strengthened of the Absurdity
 instanced, *scil.* of making *that Church* to have had but a *Mank Constituti-*
on all that time, impeaching thus the Apostles last Charge to them, as
 is said.

He tells us, *That, upon Supposition, the Epistles were written after Luke’s*
History, There is no need of a particular Answer to what’s pleaded from the
Epistles themselves. Nay, very much need upon his Principles, tho’
 there’s no Inconsistency in our Principles betwixt these Epistles and
Paul’s last Charge; But his Hypothesis, as is said, casts a pitiful Im-
 putation upon the Apostles Farewell Sermon, *Acts* 20. making him so
 Inadvertent, as, 1. To commit an Episcopal Power over that Church
 to a College of Elders, when never to see their Face more, and then
 to retract it, and set up a new Form of Government. Again, in the
 next place, If the Argument pleaded from the Epistles themselves, will
 impeach their Episcopal Authority, as certainly they do, to any Ra-
 tional Consideration, then these Epistles, being written after the Hi-
 story of the *Acts*, confirms these Presbyterian Arguments, shewing the
 sweet Harmony betwixt *Paul’s* last Farewell Sermon, yea, and his
 other Doctrine, in Opposition to Prelacy, and that which is deliver’d
 in these Epistles. For we find the Apostle injoyning the Juris-
 dictional Act of the highest Nature to pastors, 1 *Cor.* 5. such as *Excom-*
munication; We find him ascribing the Power of Ordination to a *Pres-*
bytery, tho’ himself was present in the Action, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 2 *Tim.* 1. 6.
 Identifying (*Phil.* 1. 1. *Tit.* 1. 5.) the Office of *Bishop* and *Presbyter*;
 Discharging *Dominion* in the Church, 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. much more a *Civil*
Peerage to any Church Officer; Ascribing to himself a *Ministry* and
Service only, not *Lordship*, 1 *Cor.* 4. 1. Pronouncing a *Woe* upon him-
 self, if not Preaching the Gospel, 1 *Cor.* 9. 16. Enjyning the same *Di-*
ligence to *Timothy*, 2 *Tim.* 4. 1. Preferring *Labouring in the Word* to *Ruling*,
 1 *Tim.* 5. 17. Enjyning the *Minister of Christ* not to be entangled with
Worldly Affairs, 2 *Tim.* 2. 4. And if, in these Respects, the Apostle
 has exploded the Diocesan Prelate, ’tis beyond all peradventure, he
 never install’d *Timothy* or *Titus* in such an Office, whether the
 Epistles

Epistles to them were written before, or after his Farewell Exhortation, *Acts 20.*

The Argument taken from the Occasional Employment of Timothy and Titus in these places, is, in the Paper, joyn'd with that other taken from the Recalling of them both to attend the Apostle further in their Evangelistick Employments. And what says our Animadverter to this? Why, the Word Translated, *I besought thee*, will as naturally bear to be Translated, *I encourag'd thee to abide, &c.* And what then, I pray? If he both besought and encourag'd, sure both the one and the other must respect the Matter and Scope of the Epistle, and must be understood in a Sense correspondent thereunto; So that our *Momus* is never a whit the nearer by this Whimsy. But besides this, it seems the Episcopal English Translators were short of him in the Knowledge of the Greek Term. Who knows not, that the Term *ἑκκαλέω* properly and primarily signifies *Rogo, Precor*; The simple Verb *καλέω*, importing *Voco, Accerso, Imploro*. Thus Schrevelius. *Pasor* renders the Term *ἑκκαλέω*, *Precor, Rogo, Rom. 15. 30. ἑκκαλέω δὲ ὑμᾶς ἀδελφοί, Precor autem vos Fratres*, rendered in our Translation, *Now I beseech you Brethren. Rom. 12. 1. ἑκκαλέω ὑμᾶς, Exhortor igitur vos*; Where our Translation reads, *I beseech you therefore. Mark 7. 22. ἑκκαλέουν αὐτόν, Et precantur eum*; Our Translation renders it, *And they beseech him, &c.* Sicut te sum precatus, ut permaneres Ephesi, cum profisciscerer in Macedoniam. So Beza. Thus Valla, Piscator, Erasmus and Danæus. Tremellius renders the Ancient Syriack Translation, *Petieram abs te cum profisciscerer in Macedoniam ut remaneres Ephesi, &c.* All which, with several other Accounts, which might be added, of this Term, discovers our *Momus's* silly ignorant Evasion in this point.

But 'tis further pleaded; that both are found recall'd from these Posts. So, says our Pasquiller, were the Elders of Ephesus call'd to meet Paul. A pitiful Evasion. 1. They are clearly own'd as fix'd Officers of that Church. The Apostle sent to Ephesus, and call'd the Elders of the Church, *scil.* of Ephesus, as some Translations render it. Nay, so our Pasquiller supposes them. But Timothy or Titus, on the contrary, appear to be left in these places on a Transient Occasion, which Transient Occasion is express'd in the beginning of the Epistles themselves. 2. The Text is also clear, as to their various Planetary Motions, in Attendance upon the Apostle, to many other places; But no shadow of this appears in the Case of these Elders.

'Tis further pleaded in the Paper, That the Office of Bishop and Presbyter is Identified in these Epistles themselves. Nothing like it, says our Animadverter. Then there's nothing like *Titus 1: 5, 6.* where the Apostle, having

having describ'd the Elder, v. 6. adds this Reason of his Qualifications, v. 7. *For a Bishop must be blameless as the Steward of God, &c.* If this be not like it, yea, and the thing it self, the Apostle spake bad Sense, and in this Causal *propter*, or *for*, Reason'd with a meer Paralogism, in saying the Elder must be so and so qualified, because a Bishop of another distinct superior Office must. Moreover, 1 *Tim.* 3. the Apostle, in describing the Bishop, describes entirely the Gospel Minister by his Qualifications suitable to him as such. If this be not like an Identifying, there was never Likeness of one thing with another. Sure *Chrysostom* and *Jerom* saw something like this, who assert from these, and the parallel Texts, the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter; Yea, and the other Greek and Latine Fathers mention'd. But these Men, so they may make silly Shifts to uphold their Hierarchy, care not what Reflections they put upon the Scriptures, and the Holy Apostles.

But let us hear our Animadverter's Reason for denying this Identity. 'Tis this, *They were written to as Bishops, and distinct Rules laid down, as touching their Behaviour towards Presbyters and Deacons.* But, 1. That they were written to as fix'd Bishops in these Posts, is his *Petitio Principii* and groundless Supposition. 2. If the Apostle gave distinct Rules as to their Behaviour to Presbyters and Deacons, why did not the Apostle give distinct Rules as to the Office of Bishop and Presbyter, as well as that of the Presbyter and Deacon? If these Rules were address'd to them with such Distinction, as not only to import their distinct Office, but likewise, to this Scope, to describe and diversifie these Inferior Officers, *scil.* Presbyters and Deacons, who are distinctly describ'd, why are not the same Rules laid down, to distinguish and diversifie the Bishop and Presbyter? 3^{ly}, I inforce the Argument thus; To what Scope is it, that the Apostle lays down, or delivers these Rules, touching the Offices of Presbyters and Deacons? Sure, our Pasquiller must confess, it was in order to *Timothy* and *Titus*, and the Churches Instruction, touching a Succession of these necessary Church Officers; And if so, why did not the same Necessity, the same Use and End of the Episcopal Office, (suppos'd by our Pasquiller and his Fellows) draw from the Apostle an Account and Description thereof? Was the Apostle so concern'd for the Meanest Office, and not for the Highest Office of the Bishop? And behov'd *Timothy* and *Titus* to be inform'd touching the Meanest Office, and yet had no need of Information aient the Highest?

Other Grounds are produc'd in the 3^d. *Confid.* besides their Planetary Motion and Attendance upon the Apostle, *scil.* "The time spent in their Journeys, the Order of them, the insinuated Nature of their Employment,

' Employment, and that neither in the Salutation or Conclusion of the
' Epistle to the *Ephesians*, nor the Apostles Recitation of Church Offi-
' cers, Ch. 4. there is the least hint of *Timothy's* Episcopacy, &c. To
all which, our Pasquiller Answers *Silence*.

Upon the *Fourth Consideration*, the Animadverter tells us, *he is not*
therein concern'd, since he pleads not for the Prelate's Sole Power in Ordina-
tion or Jurisdiction; And therein gives over his Concern in the Defence
of a Prelate's Superintendency own'd in this Name of *Bishop*, and
pleaded for by Prelatists. But upon this Consideration, he tells us,
He will discover some Trips. What are these? 1. He knows no *Episcopal*
Writer, who pleads from the Import of the Term for his Superior Order.
Then he knows not Doctor *Scott*, who pleads this directly: In stating
the Question, he tells us, that the two *Rival Forms* are the *Presbyterian*
and *Episcopal*. The *Episcopal* he thus describes, *viz, That which is*
plac'd in a Superior Order of Men [called Bishops] to whom the Orders of
Presbyters and Deacons are subject. Nay, Bishop *Honnyman* pleads the
very Name, as importing this *Superiority*. And why, I pray, is the
Name, by all of them, made use of as peculiar to a Prelate, and
to express his Superior Office?

The second Trip our *Momus* will discover is this, *That, in this*
Consideration, the distinguishing of Inspection from Authority, is said to infringe
the common Rule [Subordinata non pugnans]. Yea, he is bold to say,
the Author understood not distinctly what he was saying, Inspection being one
thing, and Authority another. But tho' it were granted, that, in some
Cases, there might be a Distinction admitted, which this Pasquiller
has not prov'd, the Question is, *If the Inspection denoted in the Scripture*
Term Episcopus admits of such a Distinction? For this is the thing pointed
at in the Consideration; And if he acknowledge the Import of *In-*
spection therein held out, will not also import *Authority*, he has robb'd
his Lord Bishop thereof, and thus, in stead of helping, has wounded
and stricken off the Mitre. For *Walo Meßalinus* his distinguishing
Inspection and Authority, 'tis nothing to the purpose, as is already clear'd.

Upon the *Fifth Consideration* upon the Point of *Antiquity*, and first anent
Eusebius's History, he tells us, "That *Eusebius* only
' shews *, that it is not easie to tell, whom St. Peter * *Lib. 3.*
' and St. Paul Ordain'd to be Bishops over every parti- *Cap. 4.*
' cular Church, yet he says not, that he can name none,
' but, on the contrary, he actually deduces the Succession of Bishops
' in the Four great Sees, *Rome, Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem,*
' from the Days of the Apostles to his own, asserting the Episcopacy
' of *Timothy* and *Titus* over *Ephesus* and *Crete*. A pitiful Shift and Dis-

guise, no doubt, this is: (For besides that he can never make appear, that the Bishops mention'd in *Eusebius* were *Diocesans* of his *Cut*, wherein he is oppos'd both by *Fathers* and *Famous Protestant Divines*, as is above clear'd) *Eusebius*, in the *Pream* of his *History*, asserts, "That he had no *Tracts* of any clear *History* going before him; Yea more, "That except what's to be found in the *Writings* of *Paul*, there's no *Certainty* as to *Apostles* first *Successors*. And for his *Catalogues* of *Bishops*, 'tis so often expos'd, that there needs no new *Discovery* here. But let us hear *Eusebius* himself speak it out, and give our *Pasquiller* the *Lie*, "Ὅσοι ὃ τῶν, καὶ τινες γήσιοι ζηλωταὶ γενόμενοι πρὸς αὐτῶν ἰσχυρίσας ἱκανοὶ ποιμαίνειν ἐδοκίμασθαι ἐκκλησίας, ἡ ῥάδιον ἔπειν. Μὴ ὅτι γὰρ ὅσος ἂν τις ἐξ τῶν πάλαι φωνῶν ἀνέλεξαιτο. i. e. "It is so hard a

Matter to find out who succeeded the *Apostles* in the *Churches* planted by them, unless it be those mentioned in the *Writings* of *Paul*. 2ly, Several *Hints* are added in the *5th*. *Consid.* of what has been produc'd by the *Learn'd* to invalidate the *Credit* of this *History* of *Eusebius*, and, in special, that *Scaliger*, in the place cited, asserts, (which we see *Eusebius* himself durst not disowne) "That no *Certainty* can be had touching the *Affairs* of *Christians* from the *End* of the *Age* of the *Apostles* to the *Midst* of the *Reign* of *Trajan*.

And, in the *Books* refer'd to, he is told, that the * *Animadvers.* same *Scaliger*, in his *Thef. Temp.* * sets down the *Testimonies* of the *Ancients* concerning his *Errors* and *Pag.* 2, 68.

Arrianism, wherein some affirm that he died. Several things also are censur'd by the *Learn'd Scaliger* in *Elencho Tribensii*, such as "his *Fabulous Account* of *Christ's* *Epistle* to *Agbarus*, his ascribing to *Philo* the *Jew* his writing that of *Christian Monks*, which *Philo* wrote of the *Esseans*, a *Sect* among the *Jews*, which *Scaliger* shews to be false out of *Philo* himself; *Ibid.* *Scaliger* has also observ'd his gross *Errors* in the *Computation* of *Times*. His *Ignorance* also is observ'd, in asserting the *Cephas* reprehended by *Paul* not to be the *Apostle Peter*, but one of the *Seventy Disciples*. His *Presiding* also in the *Council* of *Tyre* against *Arbanasius*, and standing upon the *Arrian Side*, is Recorded as a *Proof* of his *Unsoundness* in the *Faith*. Besides, his *Proof* of *Peter's* *Crucifixion* at *Rome* by a *Tomb-Proof*, is among the rest of his gross *Historical Errors*. Now, if our *Momus* intended a *Defence* of *Eusebius's* *History*, why has he offered no shadow of an *Answer* to so many clear *Grounds*, tending to invalidate the same?

But, to proceed, our *Momus* imputes a *Chronological Blunder* to the *Author*, in asserting, that *Eusebius* was at 300 *Years* *Distance* from the *Apostolick Times*. But, 1. (not to mention the same Account given by

by the Learn'd *Didoclaue*, who could have taught this *Momus*, in this, or in any point of Divinity) He should have look'd better about him, before he imputed this, unto that Paper, or the Author, since therein he has cast an Aspersions of the same suppos'd Ignorance upon their own *Stillingfleet*, who, in his *Len. Pag.* 296, 297. having observ'd, "That Antiquity is most Defective, where 'tis most Useful, viz. in the Time immediately after the Apostles; Adds these Words, as the Reason of his Assertion, "For who dare, with Confidence, believe the Conjectures of *Eusebius*, at 300 Years Distance from the Apostolick Times, &c. Asserting, "That the Relations and Authority of *Eusebius* are equally Questionable with these of the Uncertain *Clement*, and Commentaries of *Hegesippus*. But, 2ly, Our *Momus* giving this Reason, *scil.* That *Eusebius* was born within 180 Years, and wrote his History within 210 Years after the Death of John, discovers his being fitter for Fishing silly Blunders, and seeking a Knot in the Rush; that he may seem to say something, and such like Diversions from the point, than even a true Historical Debate upon this Head: And his Criticism will appear a meer Trifling, when 'tis considered, that the Current of that *Confid.* clearly insinuates a Commensement from the Apostolick Times, or the Scripture Records, from which, to the Time of *Eusebius*'s writing his History, there will be found few Years wanting of the 300. Knows not this *Momus* that even in the Scripture Accounts and Computation of Times, there is often observ'd a *Rotundatio Numeri*, as might be clear'd by undeniable Instances, if needful.

He sees no Reason for calling *Clement* or *Hegesippus* Uncertain. But he should have given Account of his Certainty, and Answer'd *Scaliger* upon this Head. Does he think, that his bare Assertions or Denials will pass current in this point? Besides, that *Eusebius* himself doth, in this, baffle him, who shews, in the beginning of his History, "That, in that Work, he was entring into a Dark Desert, wherein he had no Footsteps of any going before him, but only *quædam membra*, some little Occasions or petty Narrations, which every one, in their own Times, had left and delivered. If he had the Conduct of clear and uncontroverted Authors, such as *Clement* and *Hegesippus*, why complains he thus, for want of a suitable Historical Conduct?

For that Vindication of *Eusebius* which he talks of, I may mind him of, and allude unto a Passage of the Royal Martyr King *Charles*, who, in his Answer to Mr. *Henderfon*'s Alledging, "That the Assembly of Divines at *Westminster* had, from Scripture, clear'd a Presbyterian Frame of Government in the Church at *Jerusalem*, &c. Rejoys thus, "I am glad they

they could do more than *Eusebius* could; So I am glad, that his New Vindicators, at 1200 or 1400 Years Distance, have seen more clearly into these first Times, than their prime Historian *Eusebius*. But *Eusebius's* positive Assertion above set down, fully precludes this pitiful Evasion. And what are these Monuments, I pray, of these first Times, which the Famous and Learn'd *Scaliger*, and other Learn'd Searchers, could never reach? Who knows not, that there are as great Cheats in point of *Supposititious Monuments of Antiquity*, as in any thing else? Witness, among many other Instances, the Forg'd Writings (these Divine Works, say the Jesuites of *Rhemes*, upon *Act. 17.*) of *Dionysius the Areopagite, de Ecclesiastica & Cœlesti Hierarchia. De Divinis Nominibus.* — 'Whom *Cartwright* rebukes, shewing, that none of the Ancient Fathers, Greek or Latine, mention him; So that it appears written some Hundred Years after his Death. Take unto you, says he, a Bastard born after Chaster and Purer Times. A Censure which may be justly put upon much of our Episcopalian new found Antiquity.

For what he adds of *Tilen's Retraction*, it can no more prejudice the Truth at first asserted by him, than the Retraction of any other Apollate, or prejudice the other Solid Truths asserted in his *Syntagma*.

For *Merideth Hammer's* Translation of *Eusebius*; as it has had the Testimony of the Learn'd, and his Knowledge of the Greek, as likewise that of *Didoclavius*, is so notour, as to scorn the silly Cavils of this Animadverter and his Associates; So this *Momus* hath not so much as offer'd an Answer to the Accusations of *Eusebius's* History instanced. And for the Greek Blunder he imputes to that Author, this Man may be silent, considering his wise Criticism upon the Word *ἡγουμένη* above examin'd.

Upon the point of *Ignatius's* Epistles, we are told, 1. That tho' these Epistles were granted to be spurious, yet Episcopacy stands good upon the Testimonies of Cyprian, Origen, Pontius, Dionysius Alexandrinus, &c. I had thought Episcopacy had pretended to stand good upon a Scripture Testimony; And he should know, we lay not the stress of this point upon the Testimony of any Human Writings, neither doth our Charge of Forgery upon *Eusebius* or *Ignatius* suppose any such thing, but therein we only use an Argument *ad Hominem*. 2ly, His general Citation will Weigh little with such as consider, 1. That the Question in point of Fact is anent Prelats Sole Power in Ordination and Jurisdiction, which his Testimonies will not amount to, tho' produc'd. 2. That many Fathers, Greek and Latine, hold the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, and thus stand in Terms of Contradiction to him and his

his Associates in this point, else Bishop Jewel, Whittaker, &c. were be-
guil'd and Impostors.

In the next place, our *Momus* is bold to vilifie Mr. *Jameson's* Performances, who in several Sections of his *Nanzianzen Querela* had made appear, 1. That *Ignatius* is Interpolated. 2. The invalidity of Dr *Pearson* and others Exceptions to this point. 3. That his Antiquity could not secure him from Error. 4. That there is no Disagreement betwixt his Doctrine complexly taken, and that of Presbyterians. In all this, says our *Momus*, *he has perform'd nothing*, What? Nothing in all these points? Has he Examined them? Nay, this was too hard Work. What then excepts he? Why, Mr. *Jameson* has produc'd no Sentence unworthy of *Ignatius*. Said you so? Then you approve all he has cited, pag. 115. viz. That whatever the Bishop approves of is acceptable to God. Thus in *Epist. ad Smyrn.* cited from the Greek. In *Epist. ad Polycarp.* He pledges his Soul for such as obey the Bishop: My Soul for such, saith he, And in the same Epistle, The Bishop must not be resisted that we may obey God, he must be receiv'd as the Lord. In *Epist. ad Magnes.* As Christ did nothing without the Father, so do you nothing without the Bishop. Again, the Spirit Preach'd to him, see you do nothing without the Bishop. In *Epist. ad Trallen.* He boasts of his Knowledge of Heavenly things, the Orders of Angels, their Constitutions, Principalities, things visible and invisible. Is not this unworthy of *Ignatius*, to set the Bishop in place of God, and render him Infallible. Dare this *Momus* deny, that the impuring of such absolute Infallibility to the Pope of Rome is Condemn'd by all the Protestant Churches, as a blasphemous Usurpation. Can any Rational Man impute to the Humble Simplicity of this early Martyr such vain boastings of Knowledge, even of that which is not Revealed, such as the Order of Angels, &c. Mr. *Jameson* justly Charges these Epistles with "a furious Zeal of enslaving all Christians under an illimited blind Obedience to all Church Men. How secure (saith he) had *Basilides* and *Martial*, two Spanish Laps'd Bishops been, had their Flocks believ'd this *Ignatian* Doctrine, whom *Cyprian*, when Consulted by their Flocks, whether they might desert them, and Chuse new Bishops, resolved in the Affirmative, and Admonished to Chuse other Pastors. Had they believed *Ignatius*, it had been the blackest Impiety thus to separat. Mr. *Jameson* proves, in the place cited, that "the Antiquity of *Ignatius* could not secure him from Error. Our *Momus* tells us, That Mr. *Jameson* proves this oddly from this ground, that he was fallible in matters of Opinion, and therefore might have been actually deceiv'd in matter of Fact. But any that but Reads his 3. Sect. will see this Man's pitiful Forgery. Mr. *Jameson* says, "His Antiquity

Antiquity could not secure him from Lapses and Mistakes, which shakes our Prelatists proofs for Episcopacy from his Epistles; And this he proves, 1. From the early aberrations of Churches in the Apostles times. 2. From this ground, that when Apostles the Infallible Guides were gone, the grand Enemy early sow'd his Tares. 3. He cites, in proof of this, Papias Bishop of Hieropolis, in Antiquity and Authority little Inferior to Ignatius, whose Weakness of Judgment Eusebius himself Censures in point of the Error of Christ's Personal Reign 1000 Years after the Resurrection *. Likewise the Antients conceit of Angels carnal knowledge of Women, earnestly contended for by Justin Martyr, who liv'd not many years after Ignatius, *Apol. ad Senat.* Hence he infers, "Since they swerv'd in matters of Speculation, they were no less capable of straying in things belonging to Practice: For there is no more security, saith he, promised to the Church from the one, than from the other. And of this early practical Declension he gives Instances, such as, "The mixing of the Sacramental Wine with Water, the Observation of Easter, &c. Hence our Animadverters foolish Cavil appears, 1. Mr. Jameson lays not the Consequence only on a *might be*, but proves a real Declension in point of Fact, which demonstratively proves the Consequence. 2. Whereas our Momus tells us, *That this will shake the Foundation of all Historical Certainty*; If he acknowledge an early aberration of the Antients both in point of Principle and Practice. (as needs he must, unless he so expose his Ignorance, as to render himself ridiculous) how secures he these Foundations? And does he think that all Foundations are shaken, because in point both of Principle and Practice, yea and in point of History, many Antients have been deceiv'd, yea and cross and contradict one another. We say then, our belief of all Humane History is Humane, and in so far true as there are other Correspondent Grounds besides the meer History to found our Perswasion. But, says our Momus, *This would shake the Faith of the genuine Canonical Books.* Not at all, since they depend upon a Higher and Nobler Ground than Church History, or any such Accounts, as is acknowledged by all Protestants.

For Mr. Jameson's Reconciliation of Ignatius's Epistles, with the Principles of Presbytery, and his Assertion, that "there is no real Disagreement, but a true Concord betwixt Ignatius's Doctrine in point of Government, and that of Presbyterians (he means Ignatius being exprels for the Reciprocation of a Bishop and a Pastor of one Congregation), We do refer him to Mr. Jameson's Proofs, pag. 136, &c.

Etc. Our *Momus* refers us to the *Vind. Prin. of Cypr. Age*, Chap. 5. And I refer him to Mr. *Jameſon's* Confutation. For what he alledges of *Daille*, that which Mr. *Jameſon* aſſerts is, "That this Learned Author defended what is aſſerted of the ſpurious Tincture of theſe Epistles againſt Dr. *Pearſon's* firſt Attempt; Dr. *Pearſon's* next Attempt being after that Learn'd Author's Death: For that which our *Momus* cites in reference to *L'Arroque*, from *Monsieur le Clerc*, wherein 'tis alledg'd that the not Publishing that Author's Reply to Dr. *Pearſon* was from an evidence of the Doctors unanſwerable Acquittance, forſooth; I Answer, 1. The account which Mr. *Jameſon* has given, ſufficiently precludes this Exception, wherein he ſhews that *L'Arroque's* Son, in his Life, prefix'd to his *Adverſaria Sacra*, gives this Account, "That *L'Arroque*, in favours of *Daille*, had fortunatly Defended his Judgment, but theſe Observations being again Affaulted by *Beverege*, the Author had prepar'd an Antwer, which, ſaith he, we have by us almoſt perfected, which through the Importunity of ſome Friends was ſuddenly turn'd another way. And who theſe Friends were, we are inform'd by a Man of the Episcopical Perſwaſion, viz. *Joſeph Walker* Tranſlater of *L'Arroque's* Hiſtory of the Eucharift, who deſcribing his Life, prefix'd to his Tranſlation, tells us, "That at the Requeſt of ſome Perſons favouring Episcopacy, he did not Finish this his ſecond Piece. From which account Mr. *Jameſon* well infers, "That the Iſſue of this Debate concerning *Ignatius's* Epistles was neither Advantageous nor Honourable to the Favourers of Episcopacy, ſeing therein they ſaw the utter Ruine of their Cauſe by ſo formidable an Adverſary, unleſs the Storm were diverted by powerful Charms and Solicitations. And who will doubt, that *L'Arroque's* Son, Writing his Father's Life, together with the Episcopical Tranſlator mentioned, muſt needs be ſuppos'd to give the moſt ingenuous account in this matter, and far preferable to that of *Monsieur Le Clerc*. Nay, the very account given by our *Momus* makes this evident; For therein it is acknowledg'd, That *L'Arroque* himſelf, with ſeveral others, had been no ways ſatisfied with Dr. *Pearſon's* acquittances in this point.

In the Considerations a Paſſage is cited of *Stillingfleet*, who holds, "That of the 35 Testimonies produc'd out of *Ignatius* for Episcopacy, he meets but with one that has the leaſt Semblance of Truth. This, ſays our Animadverter, is not faithfully cited. Why ſo? *Stillingfleet* ſays, "He finds but one that has the leaſt Semblance of Chriſt's Inſtitution for Episcopacy. And what is the difference, I pray, betwixt the Semblance of Truth in point of Episcopacy (for 'tis that the Doctor is ſpeaking of) and of Chriſt's Inſtitution? Moreover,

in these Considerations, he is told, that *Stillingfleet* proves this to be but a meer Semblance, a shadow without Substance. For what he adds of Dr. Pearson's *Vindiciæ* of Ignatius's Epistles, which, he says, remov'd all *Stillingfleet's* doubts concerning them, and that *Rivet* and *Videliæ* wrote before the genuine Epistles of Ignatius were Publish'd ; 'Tis Answered, he should have considered the successful Attack which Mr. *Jameson* has made upon these suppos'd genuine Epistles, before he had made this boast, who shews them even as thus Publish'd to be still Interpolated: Of which Judgment are also *Blondel* and *Salmasius*, with others of the Learned. He should have Considered and Answered what he has offered against Dr. Pearson's Defences of the strange and unaccountable Sentences in these Epistles, wherein he shews, how the Doctor is inevitably involv'd in Absurdities, in Defending such Paradoxes as are contain'd in these Epistles.

Our Animadverter falls next upon *Stillingfleet's* account of Ignatius's Journey to Rome as fictitious, and his asserting the improbability of sending for Ignatius from Antioch to Rome. To which he Answers, they could do things more surprizing. They could do, therefore they did ; What Consequence is this ? *Stillingfleet* Argues from the palpable Improbability and Uselessness of such sending. To that point of what is related of Ignatius's Excursions in his Journey, contradicted by the Martyr's account of the cruelty of the Soldiers that guarded him, (a very considerable Objection) he can Answer nothing, and in so far appears Convi&t by this truly unanswerable account of this matter.

For that Passage about the Antiphones, our *Momus* has sufficiently expos'd himself in asserting the Truth of that Fable, scil. Of the Quires of Angels descending and revealing the same to Ignatius. What Antiscriptural Forgeries may not have such a Defence ? But says our *Momus*, This will not impeach the validity of his Epistles. But if such a fabulous Account came from so early a Writer, it Confirms, as an Accessory Argument, the evident Interpolation of his Epistles.

To *Clemens* his Testimony of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, our *Momus* can Answer nothing ; Yet he will not seem altogether without an Apology, citing a Passage ed. Catoler. τῷ δὲ Ἀρχιερεὶ ἱερεῖς καταρτίται, &c. i. e. Summo quippe sacerdoti sua munera tributa sunt, Sacerdotibus locus proprius assignatus est, & Levitis sua Ministeria incumbunt. Laicus præceptis laicis constringitur. The unserviceableness of which Citation evidently appears, if it be Considered, 1. That all along, this early Writer is pressing Unity. 2. He frequently calls to the Divine

Divine Command and Institution in point of Obedience, as is evident
 S. 37. 3. In this S. 40. he enjoyns, *Omnia rite & ordine facere, quæ Dominus peragere nos jussit*, ταῦτα τάδε ποιῆν ὀφειλομένοι, &c. And in the same S. *Domini enim mandata sequentes non aberrant*, τοῖς δὲ νομίμῳ τῷ Θεῷ ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκπορεύεσθαι ἐκ διαμαρτυρίας. Adding that Passage, *Summo quoq; Sacerdoti*, &c. And S. 41. enjoyning all to keep their Order and Station, he presses an Argument alluding to the Jewish Oeconomy, *Non in omni loco offeruntur sacrificia perpetua & diurna*, 'Οὐ πανταχῇ προσερχομεθα θυσίας &c. *vel pro gratiarum actione, vel pro peccatis & delictis, sed Hierosolymis tantum; neq; illic in quovis loco fit oblatio, sed in atrio Templi ad Altare, diligenter prius inspecto sacrificio a summo Sacerdote.* Now who of common Sense does not see, that in this Discourse, *Clement* is Arguing only by a meer Allusion to the Jewish Oeconomy? Our *Momus* himself must acknowledge this, else he will set a High Priest over the Catholick Church, and assign one place for Solemn Worship; Yea assert gratulatory and expiatory Sacrifices, properly so called in the New Testament Church. Which is in the 4th place convincingly evident from what he has, S. 42. where he sets down the New Testament Oeconomy and Order, 'Οἱ Ἀπόστολοι ἡμῶν ἐνυγγελισθῆσαν, &c. *Apostoli nobis a Christo evangelizaverunt, Jesus Christus a Deo.* *Missus enim est Christus a Deo, & Apostoli a Christo, & factum est utrumq; decenter ex voluntate ejus.* *Mandata quippe accipientes, & per resurrectionem Domini nostri Jesu Christi plena certitudine imbuti, Deiq; verito confirmati cum certa Spiritus Sancti fiducia egressi sunt, annunciantes regni Dei Adventum.* Wherein he shews, that the Apostles, endowed with the Spirit of Christ, Preached the Kingdom of God, being thus Fortified by God's Command and Word, and that with a full certainty, &c. Then shewing, how the Apostles manag'd this great Trust and Commission in the Constitution of the Gospel Church, he thus expresses it, καὶ χώρας ἐν ᾗ πολεῖς κηρύτταντες, ἀρχὰς αὐτῶν συνιστάμενοι τῷ Πνεύματι, ἐκ ἐποικόνων καὶ διακόνων ἡμῶν μεμβρόνῃς πιστέων. *Per regiones igitur & urbes verbum prædicantes, Primitias eorum, Spiritu probantes, Episcopos & Diaconos eorum qui credituri erant, constituerunt.* Adding, *Neque hoc quidem novum institutum fuit, multis enim retro seculis de Episcopis & Diaconis scriptum est, γέγενετο περ ἐποικόνων καὶ διακόνων* &c. *Sic enim alicubi dicit Scriptura, Constituum Episcopos eorum in justitia, & Diaconos eorum in fide.* Alluding to Isa. 60. 17. *I will make your Officers Peace and your Exactors Righteousness;* That the Apostles, in spreading the Gospel through the Nations, did Constitute Bishops and Deacons over Believers, not hinting, in the least, any subdivision, as our *Momus* pretends; Applying also to this Gospel Institution the Prophecy of *Isaiah* now rehearsed; Which is

aliud est Episcopus, quam is qui omni Principatu & Potestate Superior est, & quoad homini licet, pro viribus imitator Christi Dei factus. Wherein we may see, That in stead of *Principatum & potestatem intra omnes*, and *quoad licet obtinere homini*, it is rendred, *qui omni Principatu & potestate Superior est, Who is above all Principality and Power, who has an Excellency beyond all Principality and Power; Or, as it is rendred by the Learn'd Authors of the Appendix to the Jus Div. Minist. Evang. Pag. 111.*

“Who is possessed of all Principality and Authority beyond all, as much as is possible for Men to be possessed of. To give a further Conviction of this, Bishop Hall, in his *Episcopacy by Divine Right* *, tells us, “That this blessed Saint Ignatius, *Pag. 145, whereas other Fathers compare the Bishops to the Apostles, he advances his Pattern higher, requiring Obedience to Bishops as to Christ. The Bishop, saith Ignatius, bears Resemblance of God the Father of all things, the Priests are as the Bench of his Apostles (here the Bishop is set pretty High, even above Apostles). He adds, And lest any Man should construe these words to sound only of a generality of Reverend respects, without yielding of any Power of Command, soon after he speaks Home; “For what other, saith Ignatius, is a Bishop, than he that is Superior to all Principality and Power, and as far as a Man's Power may reach, made an Imitator of the Christ of God. Here indeed he speaks Home, but so as in Correspondence to the other Expositions to confound the Animadverter's Gloss, who will have this Sentence to import no more, *but that a Bishop is a Supreme Ecclesiastick Governour*; For he sets the Bishop above *all Principality and Authority, beyond all as much as is possible for Men to be possess'd of.* And here, besides his crossing Bishop Hall and the other Expositors mention'd, I do again pose this Pasquiller upon it, how this is reconcilable with *Rom. 13. Let every Soul be subject to the higher Powers?* For, if the Bishop be possess'd of *all Principality and Power, and Superior to all Principality and Power, and as far as a Man's Power may reach, made an Imitator of Christ,* as Bishop Hall with his other Friends have rendred the words, how is he Subject to the *higher Principalities and Powers*, according to the Apostles Command? If Superior to them all, how is he Subject to them? I had thought the Pope's pretences this way had been long since expos'd by the Protestant Churches. Besides that this Man doth thus put a pitiful dash upon his Loyal Clergy's pretences of Veneration for the Supreme Magistrat's Authority, and pleadings even for his Ecclesiastick Supremacy, yea and for Absolute Passive Obedience to him.

But let us take even his own Translation, we will see, it will confound him; For if the Bishop is such an one *qui omnem Principatum & potestatem intra omnes obtinet*, this *omnem Principatum & potestatem intra omnes*, these Universals, I say, do so palpably exclude that Principality of the Civil Magistrat asserted by the Apostle, as nothing can be plainer. And besides, the other Clauses of his Translation are so far from helping him, that they do further Defeat his Design. The Passage is *quoad licet obtinere homini, qui pro viribus Imitator Christi Dei est factus*, as much as a Man can obtain, who is made an Imitator of Christ. For will he deny a lawful Imitation of Christ to the Supreme Christian Magistrat, how then is this his Principality Monopoliz'd in the Bishop? Again, if it be such a Power and Principality as states the Man in the Case of a suitable Imitation of Christ, he must acknowledge that this *all of Principality and Power* must fall to the Ground; For our blessed Lord own'd a Subjection to the Magistrat, pay'd Tribute to *Cæsar*, enjoyn'd a due Subjection and Obedience unto him; And therefore, by clear Consequence, the Person that arrogates to himself a Principality and Power among all, or above all, can be no Imitator of Christ, but a perverse Opposer both of his Doctrine and Practice.

For what he adds of Mr. Melvin's saying, that every Pastor is Supreme Ecclesiastick Magistrat in his own Paroch, and that this is equally absurd with what is ascribed to Ignatius; What will not perverse Impudence dare to aver? Because a Pastor is Supreme Ecclesiastick Governour in his Paroch, is he possess'd of all Principality and Power, and that among all, or above all? Doth not Mr. Melvin hold the Pastor to be such a Minister as Paul owns, *scil.* who is Subject to the Presbytery, and other Church Judicatories, who has no Negative over the Session, far less over the Diocese, and therefore is infinitely short of that *all of Principality* ascribed to the Bishop, by this spurious Ignatius.

But he tells us, *Who Quarrels at this saying, may Quarrel with Deut. 17. 12. which Ignatius perhaps had in view, or Matth. 10. 40: Heb. 13. 17.* What perverse Ignorance of Scripture is this? Because God enjoyn'd *heark'ning unto the Priest*, and threatens *presumptuous disobeying the Priest and the Judge* (he will acknowledge in their lawful Commands, they being tied to God's Law, God rebuking them by *Malachy* when perverters of it. *Chap. 2.*); and because our blessed Lord shews that *they who receive the Apostles, in delivering his Message, receive him*, Matth. 10. 40. and enjoyns *Obedience to such as Watch for Souls, as they that must give account*, does he ascribe this Transcendent Universal Principality to them instanced in the Passage of Ignatius? Will any in their right Wits assert this? Nay doth not the Lord in that first
Passage

Passage enjoyn the same Obedience to the Judge, owning his Civil Principality? How then is the Priest Possessor of all Principality? For what he adds, *That this Saying of Ignatius overthrows the Author of Nanzianzen's* *ni Querela his Third Hypothesis.* There needs no more than the reading of it to confute this silly Cavil.

To Dr. Scott's Citation of the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, wherein Obedience to the Bishop is enjoyn'd, and opposing him in any thing discharg'd; Which is cross to that limited Obedience enjoyn'd to be given by Children to Parents, who are commanded to obey them in the Lord only; He Answers, *there's no more Absurdity in this, than there is in 1 Pet. 2. 13, 14.* Was ever such Impudent Perversion of the Scripture own'd? The Apostle saith, *Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man, for the Lord's sake, (i. e.) upon Ground of God's Command and Authority, consequently in a due Subserviency to his Reveal'd Will) whether it be unto the King as supreme, or unto Governours, as unto them that are sent by him, for the punishment of evil Doers, or for the praise of them that do well, v. 14.* Adding, *v. 15, 16. That this is the Will of God, and that, in this Obedience, we are the Servants of God.* Is there not here such a palpable Restriction and Limitation of Obedience, as stands in clear Contradiction to that absolute and blind Obedience enjoyn'd to the Bishop? Our Pasquiller, in owning this absolute Obedience to the Bishop, and such as intirely excludes the disobeying him in any thing, has set up a good Number of Infallible Popes, and stamp'd a *Jus Divinum* upon Bishop Laud's Book of Sports, his owning and contending for Pictures of the God-Head, and his other Superstitious Mandates, &c.

The Passage in *Epist. ad Philad.* is also cited in the premis'd Consideration, wherein 'tis affirm'd, "That such as belong to Christ, are joyn'd or united to the Bishop, and such as are not, are curs'd; From which it is inferr'd, "That this thunders a Curse or Anathema upon the Reform'd Churches not united to the Bishop. What says our Pasquiller to this? "Is this Ignatius's Fault, says he, that they are not constituted according to his Rule? Are all Reform'd Churches exactly constituted according to the Rules laid down in Scripture? He asks, "What we think of the Church of England, and must we lay aside Scripture, to complement the Church of Rome? &c. Was ever such Ignorance or Impertinency uttered or written? Who sees not, that the Question is not anent the Constitution of Reform'd Churches according to Ignatius's Rules? Or, Whether all Reform'd Churches are all exactly fram'd according to Scripture Rules? But, in this Case, the Question is, "Whether such Churches, as are not united to the Bishop, are disjoyn'd from, or not united to Christ the Head.

'Head, and consequently no Churches, but under the Curse? For this is the Inference drawn from that Passage of the Epistle to the *Philadelphians*, wherein it is asserted, "That such as belong to Christ, are united to the Bishop, and such as are not, are Accurs'd. So that this silly Evasion will not help our Pasquiller out of the Briars, but he is toss'd upon the Horns of this *Dilemma*, viz. Either he must owne this Consequence, and cast this formidable Blot upon so many Reform'd Churches, yea, and contradict many, if not most, of his Episcopal Pleaders, and himself to the boot, in owning the valid Ordination of Reform'd Churches, who disowne Prelates: Or, he must disowne this Assertion of the suppos'd *Ignatius*. And where is then his Defence? And how is he thus sav'd from another Contradiction, in asserting, *That there is nothing in these Epistles unworthy of Ignatius*.

He hath been further told, that, in the Epistle to the *Magnesians*, and to the *Trallians*, there are several Passages contradicting the Episcopal Sense thereof, and of the other Epistles, since therein *Obedience is enjoyn'd to the Presbytery, together with the Bishop*. So that either the Episcopalians must associate the Presbytery together with the Bishop in point of Government, or impute a Contradiction to *Ignatius*. What says our Pasquiller to this? Just nothing. Yet he is bold to assert, *he is not at leisure to expose the Reasonings of that Paper on this point*.

Come we to the Third Point, of the Catalogues of Bishops, the shattered and inconsistent Mould whereof is made appear. To this our *Momus* excepts, 1. Out of King *Charles's* Reply at the Isle of *Wight*, in *An. 1648*. "That this will no more discredit the Account it self, than the Difference of Historiographers, in reciting the Succession of the *Babylonian*, or *Persian* Kings, will invalidate the Truth of the Succession in these Monarchies. All Men believe, there were Kings in these Countries, and Consuls in *Rome*, tho' there be some Difference in the Relation, with respect to Persons Succeeding. But how oft has this Exception been bask'd? Might he not have read what the Divines return'd to this Exception? viz. "That granting a Succession of Men to Feed and Govern these Churches, while they continued Churches; cannot be denied, that the Apostles and Evangelists, who had Planted and Watered these Churches, (tho' Extraordinary and Temporary Officers) were by Ecclesiastical Writers, in compliance with the Language and Usage of their own Times, called Bishops; And so were Eminent Men of chief Note, presiding in Presbyteries of Cities or Churches, call'd by such Writers as wrote after the Division and Distinction of the Names of Bishop and Presbyter: But that these first and ancientest Presbyters were Bishops,

Bishops in the proper Sense, *scil.* Invested with Power over Presbyters and People, to whom (as distinct from Presbyters) did belong the Power of Ordination, giving Rules and Censures, can never be prov'd by Authentick Testimonies. Whence they infer, "That, granting there could be a Proof of the Succession of Bishops from the Primitive Times [*Seriatim*], yet if these, from whom it is drawn, and through whom it is deriv'd, be found either more than Bishops, as Apostles and Extraordinary Persons, or less than Bishops, as merely first Presbyters, having not one of the three Essentials to Episcopal Government in their own Hand, all that's prov'd by this Succession, is the Homonymy and Equivocal Acceptation of the Word [*Episcopus*]. In this one Account, our pitiful *Momus* might have seen all that he alledges on this Head fully remov'd; Since 'tis evident, 1. (and even from *Eusebius* his Accounts) That there's an utter Darkness upon the first Successors of Apostles or Evangelists; So that, in point of History, the clear Account of Succession is intirely cut off from its true Source, and thus the pretended Spring from the Fountain: 2^{ly}, That the Scripture Church Officers, from whom the Succession is drawn, are, in the Scripture Accounts, found such as could not be succeeded to *in idem Officium*; So that the pretended Successors, in so far as superior to the Pastor, could derive no Succession from them, whose Office, in a formal Sense, died with themselves. 3^{ly}, 'Tis evidently made appear, that there is an *Homonymy* in the Word *Bishop*, and that the giving Persons such a Name, will not prove, that all Persons thus nam'd were Diocesans, or holding such an Office.

For what he adds of the distinct Accounts of the Four Great Sees, exhibited by *Eusebius*, and that there's no plausible Objection against the Succession from St. Mark, is so often and fully refuted, that his Confidence herein is most unaccountable. He should have, at least, consider'd what their own *Stillingfleet* has made appear *, who, as is above touch'd, impugns this pretended Succession from several Grounds, as that such Succession, tho' Personal, will not prove the Superiority of Order; That the Names of Bishop and Presbyter were common; Neither did the Church owne the Divine Institution of Prelacy, &c. Sure, our Pasquiller will acknowledge, that, if these be made good, all that he has said, or can say upon this Head, is utterly fruitless; And he should have considered and answered this Learn'd Author's Prosecution and Proof of all these three Points, before he had vented this ignorant Confidence in an Assertion so often expos'd, and particularly what he has made appear with respect to the Churches of *Alexandria* and *Jerusalem*.

* *Iren. Pag.*
299, 300, &c.

Our Pasquiller tells us, *No Man makes any plausible Objection against the Deduction of the Succession from St. Mark in Alexandria.* He did well to add this prudent Caution, *scilicet as far as I know.* But has he not known, that, in this, and such other places, the Succession was drawn from the *επροχειρονοηθείς*, or the first Ordain'd Minister, according to *Blondel*, and other Learn'd Divines. Has he not heard, that the Account we have of this Succession, is, that *a Marco Evangelista Presbyteri unum ex se electum, &c.* The Presbyters chus'd one from among themselves, set him up in the higher place, and call'd him Bishop, according to *Ferom's* Account. That therefore this Choice was after *Mark*, and excluding him who was an Evangelist; And that he is clearly excluded by this Expression, *Presbyteri a Marco unum ex se electum;* And therefore this was a meer Presidency and flowing from their Choice, and utterly Heterogeneous to the Authority of *Mark* the Evangelist. Besides, that, *Ferom* drawing his Proofs for *Presbyteri Divine Rights* of Governing in common from *Acts 20. Phil. 1. 1 Pet. 5.* and from *John* the last of the Apostles, and asserting, that the *Episcopacy* prevalent in his time came in by Custom and Degrees, he must needs hold, that these Bishops of *Alexandria* behov'd to be set up long after *Mark*, who died before *Peter* and *Paul*, according to the Calculation, even of

the Author of the Three Dialogues. He should have known, that *Eusebius* * places not *Mark* the first Bishop of *Alexandria*, whom he calls the Evangelist and *Paul's* Interpreter, but *Anianus* he places as the first Bishop, *Primus post Marcum Apostolum & Evangelistam Anianus Alexandrinæ Parochiæ Administrationem suscepit Vir pius & per omnia celebris, i. e.* After *Mark* the Apostle and Evangelist, *Anianus* a Pious and every way Famous Man was the first that did undertake the Government of the Parish or Flock at *Alexandria*. Where 'tis observable, that *Eusebius* calls *Mark* an Evangelist and Apostle. And the Histories make mention of his performing the Work of an Evangelist, in going through *Ægypt*,

† *De Pontif. Lybia, Pentapolis, and other Countreys.* Tilen himself *Lib. 1. C. 24.* acknowledges †, "That there is nothing, that's clear or certain, can be drawn either from Scripture or the Fathers, who flourish'd before the Council of *Nice*, concerning the Beginnings of the Church of *Alexandria*."

For what he adds of the Church of *Antioch*, that, whether *Evodius* or *Ignatius* was first, is of no Consequence, if there was a singular Succession. But has he not been told, that there's no Shadow of a singular Succession of Prelates in his Sense; And granting there were singular Persons, the Succession was deduc'd, as *Blondel* makes appear, from the first Ordain'd

tain'd Minister, as among the Athenians, tho' there were Nine Archons, or Chief-Rulers, of equal Authority, yet the Succession of Governours in Athens was deriv'd from the first Archon, to make the Reckoning the more compendious. Nor will his bare Denial, that Evodius and Ignatius might be Collegues, stand good against contrary Evidences produc'd by the Learn'd.

For what he talks of the Succession of the Bishops of Rome, by the Testimony of Irenæus *. It is answered, 1. If our Pasquiller suppose a Succession from Peter, he should know, that Peter's being ever at Rome, is denied by Famous Protestant Divines. When he shall read what's discours'd upon this Head by Amyrald, and several others, he may see his Error. 2ly, Irenæus's Accounts of the Succession, do shame him; For Irenæus plainly ascribes the same Succession to Presbyters; *Cum autem ad eam iterum Traditionem quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per Successiones Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, provocamus eos qui adversantur Traditioni; Dicent se non solum Presbyteris, sed etiam Apostolis existentes sapientiores, &c.* Attributing thus the keeping of the Tradition of Apostolical Doctrine to the Succession of Presbyters. And more fully afterwards †, *Quapropter eis qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui Successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus, qui cum Episcopatus Successione Charisma Veritatis certum, secundum placitum Patris acciperunt.* In which place, he not only asserts the Succession of Presbyters to the Apostles, but likewise attributes the Successio Episcopatus, the Succession of Episcopacy it self, to these very Presbyters. The common Evasion of the then Community of Names, their own Stillingsfleet thus answers, "That, upon the Supposition of such Arguers for Episcopal Succession, not only Apostles being dead, but likewise Presbyters being thus subject to Bishops existent, at least, in some of these Churches constituted so, whence comes the Community of Names still, that those who are said to succeed the Apostles, are call'd Bishops in one place, and not Bishops, but Presbyters, in another, yea, and the very Succession of Episcopacy attributed to Presbyters; Can we possibly conceive, saith he, that these Testimonies of Irenæus can determine the point of Succession, so as to make clear to us what that Power was, which those Persons enjoy'd, whom he sometimes calls Bishops, and sometimes Presbyters. Adding, that Irenæus is not alone in this Account of Presbyters Succession to Apostles, but likewise Cyprian, citing several Passages of his Epistles to this Scope. See Pag. 307, 308, &c.

For what he adds of *James's Episcopacy in Jerusalem*, 'tis very insignificant, 1. To Scaliger's Objection drawn from the Razing of the City against the Succession of Bishops therein, he tells us, they might have been call'd so, tho' not Residing in the City. But how comes it, that there is not the least Shadow of Limitation or Restriction in these suppos'd Catalogues, with respect to a City Existent, and Non-existent, or Raz'd, and the Scatterings of the Church and People of God thereupon? Besides, that he should have consider'd, that, as to these Bishops of *Jerusalem*, their own *Stillfleet* says, "it will bear an Inquiry, where 'their Seat was, till the time of *Hadrian*. 'Tis true, Bishops might have been so call'd after the Cities Destruction, but that, in all that Decurse of Time after the Destruction of the City, until *Hadrian's* Time, there is not the least Account of their Seat or Cathedral elsewhere, is very odd and unaccountable. *Stillfleet* had objected, "That it seems 'strange, that fifteen Bishops of the Circumcision are crowded in so 'narrow a Room, in respect of the Time of their Ruling; To which our *Pasquiller* returns, "That, by this Calculation, more than 18. 'Months will be allow'd to every one of them; That old Men are 'Mortal; That diverse Bishops of *Rome* had not liv'd many Days. Which Shift rather increases, than dispels this Cloud and Doubt: For, how improbable is it, that, of this Number of fifteen succeeding Bishops, every one was so old, or liv'd and rul'd so short a time as he pretends? But to let this pass; He tells us, "It is plain from Scripture, illuminated, forsooth, by very Ancient Authors, who liv'd in 'the Second Century, that *James* was Bishop at *Jerusalem*, that *Simeon* 'was also Bishop of it, after its Destruction by *Titus*; That there is 'no Absurdity in being so many, as *Eusebius* says there were. He might have seen this phantastick Conceit baffled by the

* Pag. 144. Learn'd *Didoclarivius* *, *Eusebius cum Jacobum Episcopum nominat*, saith he, & *Thronum ei tribuit, secundum morem sui seculi loquitur*, &c. i. e. " *Eusebius*, in calling *James* a Bishop, and 'ascribing a Throne to him, speaks after the Custom of his own Time; 'The Apostles were not solicitous about Thrones and Inthronizations, 'as the Glossator feigns. *Eusebius* reports of *Simeon* the Son of *Cleophas*, 'that, after the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, the Apostles, and remain- 'ing Disciples of the Lord, gather'd together from all places, together 'with the Kinsmen of our Lord according to the Flesh, and with una- 'nimous Sentence, judged him worthy to succeed to *James*, in the Seat 'of the Church of *Jerusalem*. And this, says *Eusebius*, 'is reported, *Rumor est* †. What, saith our Author, 'should he have patch'd up Tables of the Succession
: of

† Lib. 3. C. II.

of Bishops out of meer Rumors or Reports, since, in the Sacred Tables, we read not of the least hint of his Episcopacy? Let meer Rumors be slighted, and let us spend our Hours better, than in confuting them. He adds, "That if *James* was Ordain'd Bishop immediately after the Lord's Death, and presided as Bishop Thirty Years, and if *Simeon* succeeded not before the Destruction of *Jerusalem*, the Episcopal Seat was void and empty for the space of Ten Years. Was this Election of such Consequence, that Apostles must be convey'd from the remotest Regions to *Jerusalem* about it? Did they place any in the Room of an Apostle, but such as was an Apostle? And shall we think, that they had a Respect to Flesh and Blood, in the bestowing of Bishopricks? Yea, and thus obliquely, and upon the Matter, censure the Counsel of the Lord, who had not chosen *Simeon* an Apostle?

Our Pamphleter slights what is offered by *Didoclarivus*, *Bucer*, *Blondel*, *Junius*, &c. affirming confidently that in the Catalogues Bishops of the same Order are meant Cloathed with the same Superiority over Presbyters, and is bold to call the Sentiments of the Authors mentioned groundless Fancies, which will no doubt pass current with such as will take his petulant Confidence and groundless Assertions or Negations for Proof, but with none else.

Remarkable is also that Passage of their own *Stillington* *, "That the thing enquir'd for in this point, is * *Pag. 300,*
 a Succession of Apostolick Power, which cannot be prov'd 301, &c.
 by a List and Catalogue of Names in Apostolick Churches, without any evidence of what Power they had. They apparently fail of proving the thing in Question, which is not, Whether there might not be found out a List of Persons in many Churches deriv'd from the Apostles times; But, Whether those Persons did enjoy, by way of Peculiarity and Appropriation to themselves, that Power which the Apostles had over many Churches, while they liv'd? Now this the meer Succession will never prove. And having clear'd this from what has been said of the deriv'd Succession of Governours at *Athens* from the chief Archon of the nine Archontes, tho' equal in Power; He adds for a second Illustration, "That the Succession is not so evident and convincing in all places as to demonstrat the thing intended. 'Tis not enough, saith he, to shew a List of some Persons in the Churches of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch*, *Rome*, and *Alexandria*, altho' none of these be unquestionable, but it should be produc'd at *Philippi*, *Corinth*, *Cæsarea*, and in all the seven Churches of *Asia*, likewise in *Crete*, some Succeeding *Titus*, and not think, Men will be satisfied with the naming of a Bishop

**Adv. Heres. Lib. 3. Cap. 3.* 'Bishop of Gortina so long after him. He proves in the next place, and even from Irenæus *, "That the Succession pleaded by Writers of the Primitive Church, was not a Succession of Persons in Apostolick Power. He also at large baffles what is represented of the Succession of the Bishops of Ephesus from Timothy by Leontius.

Come we to the Consideration of Aërius, wherein our Pasquiller tells us, he is little concern'd: And as little am I in his pitiful Whifflings upon this Head. He tells us, it is no great matter whether he was condemn'd as Heretick or Schismatick. Said you so? If he was Condemn'd meerly as a Schismatick, then with our Pasquiller its no matter, or a point of no Consideration, whether this Principle of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, was own'd or disown'd, not only by all the Fathers of that Age, but likewise the foregoing cited in the Paper as owning this Identity. Is not this Pasquiller a fine Proctor for the Episcopal Cause, who thus has given *manus victas* to Presbyterians, telling us, it is to him no matter of Consequence whether Hierarchick Prelacy was accus'd or condemn'd by Antient Fathers? He has been then, by his Confession, pleading for a Fable or Falshood, and so his Fellows in their Pamphlets.

But he tells us that the Age wherein Aërius liv'd, scil. the fourth Century allows him not to be reckon'd on. What? Was that Century so degenerat, which was next to the Third, so pure and Apostolick an Age, the great Cyprianick Age, set by J. S. for a Pattern to all the Churches? Were Augustin and others in that Age meer Dunces? But what says he to the Fathers cited and referred to by the Authors mentioned? Why, little stress, says he, was to be laid on these Authors (scil. Dr. Reynolds, Whittaker, Didoclave, &c.) There's all the Reason in the World to believe, saith he, the Fathers of the first Three Centuries were against Aërius: What pitiful prevarication is this? 1. All the Fathers of the first Three Centuries were against these Authors, and against Cassander's Assertion, *Convenit inter omnes Apostolorum aetate inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nullum fuisse discrimen*. Yet not a jot he can Answer to the Citations of the Fathers offered by the Authors mention'd, who in all Reason may be suppoed much better seen in the Fathers than this Pasquiller. Again, 2. If all the Fathers of the first Three Centuries were against Aërius, and condemn'd his Judgment of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, how comes he to make it such a matter of Indifference, whether the Fathers of his Age condemn'd him or no? Were they such Dunces and Ignoramus's as knew nothing of the pure Cyprianic Age? Are the Monuments thereof come so fresh and entire to our Hand after so long a decurse of Centuries,

Centuries, and was that first Age immediately preceeding absolutely Ignorant thereof? Or were they so Malicious as to oppose themselves to the joynt Sentiments of their immediat Forefathers, and that in a point so convincingly clear in our Episcopalian Judgment? He is told that *Augustin* imputed Heresy to *Aerius*. O! says our *Pasquiller*, Mr. *Jamison* asserts *Augustin* understood not Greek, and it cannot be prov'd *Epiphanius* was Translated into Latin in his time. That he was not Translated our *Pasquiller* is oblig'd to make appear; But this is a Trifle not worth noticing.

To the Passage of *Augustin*, Epist. 19. the last of these directed to *Jerom*, when pressing *Jerom* a Presbyter to use freedom with him who was a Bishop, and to Correct him when he was wrong he urgeth it thus, *Quoniam enim secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit, &c.* Our *Pasquiller* tells us, No Man alive can squeeze any such thing from his Words, as the denial of a difference, by Divine Institution, between Bishop and Presbyter. But there needs no squeezing to infer this, which is obvious to any of common Sense, to any School Boy who can construe or Expound a Sentence of plain Latin, *Quamvis secundum honorum vocabula, &c.* Wherein 'tis convincingly evident, he ascribes the difference betwixt *Jerom* and him, first to a meer Nominal Distinction, 2^{ly}, To the Churches Use and Custom. Yea 3^{ly}, To such an Use and Custom, which obtain'd and had then prevail'd; Thus distinguishing it clearly from a prior Practice, and consequently, Principle, of the Church. For he says, *Quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit*, shewing clearly that sometimes such Difference was not in Custom, nor admitted into the Church. It is an observe of Judicious Mr. *Durham*, Discoursing upon this Passage of *Augustin*, in his Dissertation concerning the Identity of Angel, Bishop, and Presbyter, on Revel. 3. pag. 227. "That with *Augustin*, and almost all the Fathers, *Usus*, or *consuetudo Ecclesiæ* is ever taken when given as a ground of any Practice, as contradistinguish'd from Divine Institution. Which he clears from the known Testimony of *Jerom*, *Episcopi noverint se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Dominicæ veritate Presbyteris esse majores. i. e.* "That Bishops are above Presbyters rather by custom, than by any verity of Divine Disposition or Appointment. Which is in this evident, that after this Digression, in his Coment on Tit. 1. 5, 7. when he returns to the Text he useth this Transition, *videamus igitur qualis Presbyter, sive Episcopus, Ordinandus sit*; Asserting clearly the Identity of both, yea and a Scripture Identity, as founded upon this Text and other Parallels cited by him. It is also of Weight which the same Judicious Author has adduc'd upon this Passage

Passage of *Augustin* against *Bellarmin's* Gloss, who will needs Identify the "Use of the Church and Divine Institution, that such a Sense will cross *Augustin's* Scope, which is to shew that tho' he was call'd a Bishop and *Jerom* a Presbyter, yet indeed there was no difference, but such as Use and Custom had brought into the Church; Intending thus to lessen that distance of Superiority that seem'd to be between them because of these Titles. Whereas, if we expound Custom or Use otherwise, *Augustin* rather had thus asserted and agreg'd the Distance that was between him and *Jerom*, than any ways diminished the same.

To what is said of *Blondel*, he can only Answer by a simple denial. He is bold to affirm, *That what Blondel has upon this Head is only from Ferdinand Major*. But his naked Affirmation is no proof, and is easily Confuted by the Reading of *Blondel*. He admires what is said in the premis'd Consideration anent the receiving of the Christian Faith in Scotland, so early, scil. *An. 97*. ('t may be for this he has Read 79.) He enquires what Author asserts so early a Reception. This is a point needs not be much insisted upon. Our *Buchanan* in the Life of *Donald I.* tells us, *Donaldus Regum Scotorum primus Christianos ritus receperat*. i. e. *Donald I.* King of Scots did first receive the Christian Religion: This *Donald* did Reign about the beginning of the Third Century. *Spotswood* saith, "The Christian Faith was first publicly received in *Anno 203*. Which was the fourth of *Donald's* Reign. But he adds, "Yet was not that the first time wherein Christ was here made known. — And in the same *Pag. 2*. "I verily think that under *Domitians* Persecution some of *John's* Disciples first Preached the Gospel in this Kingdom. — Sure not long after the Ascension of our Lord, at least when the Apostle *St. John* yet liv'd, the Faith of Christ was known and embraced in divers places of this Kingdom. Thus he. Now *Domitian* was advanc'd to the Imperial Dignity about *An. Christ. 83*. (according to some Chronologers) and his Persecution began *An. 93*. And *John's* Death is reckon'd about *An. 99*. So that, according to *Spotswood*, the Gospel was Preached in Scotland before *An. 99*. How long before he does not determine. Several other Chronological Accounts of this early Reception might be here Recited; But what is said is sufficient.

Come we now to the *Sylogism* representing the Method and Nerves of our Episcopal Arguings; Which is thus, "If Diocesan Bishops by Testimony of Ancient Fathers did exist in the Primitive Times, and Catalogues of them are drawn by these Ancient Fathers from Apo- files

'files and Evangelists; Then I must believe these Bishops to be of
 'Divine Institution: But such Diocesan Bishops, by Testimony of
 'Ancient Fathers, did exist in the Primitive Times, or in the Churches,
 'and Catalogues of them are drawn by these Fathers from Apostles
 'and Evangelists; Ergo, I must believe Diocesan Bishops to be of
 'Divine Institution. Our Animadverter tells us, that *it is pretty good*
upon the matter. And why not also in *Form*, according to their Prin-
 ciples? Which is easily made appear, had he offer'd any Exception
 to the Form or Mould of the Argument. Well, what says he to
 what is offer'd against the *Major* or *Minor* and Assumption, to disco-
 ver the Unsoundness of both? Just nothing. But least he should
 seem to give it quite over, he tells us, *he will frame it a little otherwise.*
 But such a Frame he puts it into, as does in a great measure, if not
 entirely, overturns its Nature and Scope. Well, thus it is in his Mould.
 "If it was the universal and firm Belief of all the Christians who liv'd
 'in the Apostolick Age, and the two Ages next to it, that Diocesan
 'Episcopacy was Instituted by the Apostles, then I have good Reason
 'to believe that Diocesan Episcopacy is of Apostolick Institution: But
 'it was the universal and firm Belief, &c. Ergo, Wherein we see,
 1. That our Animadverter has fled from the true *Medium* of the Syllogism,
the Matter whereof he dares not Quarrel, nor *Form* either. For, therein
 the Stress and Foundation of our Perswasion and Certainty anent this
 Belief and Practice of the Apostolick, and the Two next succeeding
 Ages, is laid upon *the Testimony of the Ancient Fathers*, as the Arguings
 of all his Tribe do import, and upon the Catalogues of Bishops drawn
 by these Fathers from Apostles and Evangelists. For this is properly
 the point, when we speak of the Scope of the Catalogues adduc'd to
 prove this. And he cannot call it into Question, yea positively owns
 it, that the Catalogues of Succession are the great Argument and
Medium made use of to this end. But so it is, that, in this new Syllogism,
 in stead of this *Medium* drawn from *the Episcopal Lines of Succession* and
the Testimony premis'd, he Substitutes the certainty of this matter of
 Fact, scil. *the universal and firm Belief of all the Christians who liv'd in*
the Apostolick Age, and the two subsequent; putting that which is the
 Scope intended by *the Catalogues*, or the proper immediat Inference
 therefrom, in place of *the Medium* it self; It being evident, that the
Catalogues and Testimonies mention'd are adduc'd to prove this point of
 Fact, scil. *this universal and firm Belief of all Christians in the Apostolick*
and two Ages Succeeding in point of Diocesan Episcopacy; Which here he
 assumes as *the Medium*. Besides, if these deduc'd *Lines of Succession* will
 prove this universal Belief and Reception, why has he laid aside this
 D d d *Medium,*

Medium, and in place thereof substituted this point of Fact, *scil.* the universal Belief and Reception mentioned? Again, in the next place, this Argument, as thus Moulded, reflects upon the Animadverter himself, who grants that several Churches in the Apostolick Times were not Moulded Episcopally, and in special that of *Ephesus*.

But to come more closely to this Syllogism, 'tis easy to make appear, that therein he is still in the Briars, and cannot in the least eschew the Impugnation of the first. Against the *Major* thereof it is Objected, that therein the Humane Practice of the Church is made the infallible Comment, as to Scripture accounts of Church Government, that thus this Practice is set up as the *Stori*, the *ratio a priori*, the chief Ground why I believe these Scriptures to have such a Sense, and no other; That thus *our Faith is made to stand in Mans Wisdom*, and the Scriptures made of a *private Interpretation*; That by this Principle *Men have a Dominion over our Faith*, which is remov'd thus from its true Basis and Foundation of a *Divine to a Humane Testimony*. Now if these Grounds hold good against the *Major* of the first Argument, 'tis beyond all peradventure that they do equally level against the *Major* of this new Syllogism; For here the suppos'd Practice and Belief of the first Christians is laid down as the sole and proper Reason and Ground of our Faith and Belief in this point; It being incontravertibly clear that the Question here is not about a *meer point of Fact*, or of what the Church did hold and Believe in point of Church Government, but anent the *Jus* and *Divine Right of Church Government*, or what the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles was in this matter. To make this further evident, together with this Man's pitiful Trifling in this matter, I would ask, what our Animadverter holds to be the Foundation of this Belief, which he calls *the firm Belief of the Apostolick Age*, or what it is that with him Fortifies this *Firmness*, and renders it such? Sure he will not say, that it is thus firm or stable merely because a *resolute or fix'd Perswasion*, or thus in a *subjective Sense*, without respect to a *suitable Object and Ground*, yea a *Divine Ground*. This he must of necessity admit, if he assert it to be a *Divine Belief*; For all Hereticks hold Subjectively (or in that Sense) a *firm Belief* of their Errors: And supposing the Errors instanced to have been of an universal Spread, the Belief had been, as *Extensively great*, so *Subjectively firm*; And therefore, of necessity, he must fetch this *Firmness* from a *Scripture Ground*. And thus our Vagrant being reduc'd to the true hold, the Question is, *Whether the Churches meer Assertion will clear and demonstrat the firmness of this Belief? Or, if it must be made appear by a comparisen thereof with the*

Scripture

Scripture Rule? Whether we must, for the certainty of our Perswasion, in point of the *Divine Right* of Prelacy, rest upon the *Churches meer Assertion* hereof, or search further for a *Scripture certainty*? If he assert this last (as needs he must, unless he disown Protestant Principles) then, 1. His *Medium* is weak, by his own Confession, in deriving this *Firmness* from the meer Belief and Practice of the Church, as is said. And, 2ly, He thus, of necessity, will be lead in to the *Scripture Bar and Decision* in this point; For there only can we find the solid Ground of a *Divine Belief*, as is said. But in the next place, if he found this *Firmness of Belief* upon the Churches meer Practice, he will fall clearly into the Popish Camp, in holding the *Churches Infallibility*, not only in this, but other points of our Belief, and all the Absurdities attending that Principle will light upon him, who thus will make the *Scripture serve its Servant*, as *Stillingfleet* phrases it, and bend the Rule to the crooked Stick.

But let us hear how our Animadverter attempts to prove the Major, wherein we will see, how a Popish Notion has drench'd him in the Mire. If, saith he, the *Universal and firm Belief of all Christians in the Apostolick and the two next Ages*, be the best Reason we have for believing, that such a Gospel or such an Epistle belongs to the Canon of the Scripture, then it cannot but be a good Reason for believing the *Apostolick Institution of Diocesan Episcopacy*: That the *Universal and firm Belief of the aforesaid Christians is the best Reason we have for believing such a Gospel or such an Epistle to belong to the Canon of the Scriptures*, he says, must be acknowledg'd by the Author of the Considerations, unless he can produce better. This Popish Ground is above Convicted of Falshood. Has this Man ever Read or understood Protestant Principles and Pleadings against Papists, who utters such Stuff as this? We see where these Gentlemens Principles lead them, and Popery and Prelacy in their Pleadings must still strick Hands. Shortly, the Churches Reception and Assertion is neither the only, nor the best Ground of our Belief in this point, as is above clear'd; But such intrinsick innate evidences as are engraven upon the Canon, and all the Divinely Inspired Writings, are the proper and genuine Foundation and Ground of our Faith in the Judgment of all the Reformed Churches. *Augustin* (of whom we shall after have Discourse with our Animadverter) would have Taught him sounder Divinity, as in many other places, so in *Confess. Lib. 1. Cap. 5. Persuasi mihi, O Domine Deus, non eos qui crederent Libris tuis, quos tanta in omnibus fere gentibus Autoritate fundasti, esse culpandos, sed eos qui non crederint; Nec audiendos esse si qui forte mihi dicerent, unde scis illos libros unius veracissimi Dei Spiritu esse humano generi Ministratos? Id ipsum*

enim maxime credendum erat. i. e. "Thou hast perswaded me, O Lord God, that not those who believe these Books of thine, which with so great Authority thou hast in all Nations Founded and Fortified, are to be reprehended, but such as would not believe the same; And that they are not to be heard who possibly might say to me, from whence know you that those Books are given to Mankind, by the Spirit of the only and most true God? For this is it which above all things is to be believed. Where 'tis evident that *Augustin* puts this among the *prima credibilia*, or first Principles of Divinity, that the Sacred Books are of a Divine Inspiration. Even

* *De Ver. Dei* Bellarmin himself * opposes this to Anabaptists Lies, *Lib. I. Cap. II.* *At Sacris Scripturis quæ Prophetis & Apostolicis literis continentur nihil est notius, nihil certius, ut stultissimum esse necesse sit qui illis fidem esse*

habendam neget, i. e. "That nothing can be more clear, notour or certain than the Holy Scriptures contain'd in the Writings of Prophets and Apostles, so that to deny Faith to them is the greatest Folly. Which he after proves in reciting the ordinary Arguments, to this Scope, such as, "The Truth of Prophecies, the wonderful Harmony of the Writers tho' at so great a distance of time and place, the Divine Defence and Protection from Man's Profanation thereof, &c. And (as above) this Animadverter may be pos'd upon it, *Whether these foremention'd Evidences of the Divine Authority of the Canon do not oblige the Church to a Reception and Recommendation of these Sacred Writings as Divinely Inspir'd?* Sure he cannot deny this Obligation; And hence it inevitably follows, that the Ground of our Belief is of an higher Nature than the Churches meer Reception, which is but a secondary Ground, and founded upon the first. The Scripture commends it self to all, obliges all to whom this Divine Revelation comes, to a suitable Belief and Reception, and the Ground is the same upon the Evidences mention'd, both with respect to the Churches Reception and Recommendation, and the Reception and Belief of all her Members; Else he must fall into this Absurdity as to assert that the Church believes the Canon because she receives it, and receives it, because she believes it. But of this above.

He says, *This is a good Argument, unless a difference can be assign'd betwixt the two Instances.* Indeed the difference is easily assign'd: In the one Case, the Essential intrinsic Evidences of a Divine Inspiration and Authority are evident and acknowledg'd by all Protestants, and consequently the Churches inviolable Obligation of the Reception mention'd: In the other Case, both this Reception and Obligation are at least,

least, debated and contraverted, as he must needs acknowledge.

But, says our Animadverter, *the Ground holds good, unless we can shew, that Diocesan Episcopacy was not so universally receiv'd, or firmly believ'd to be of Apostolical Institution, as that such a Gospel or such an Epistle belongs to the Canon.* But he should have understood better the Method and Nature of Arguing, than thus to Blunder; For, the Affirmative, touching this Universal Reception of Episcopacy, as of Divine Institution, being his, it lies upon him to prove and make good this Assertion; Yea, and not only this Universal Reception, in point of Fact in the Ages mention'd, but likewise the Reception upon an *Apostolick Warrant and Institution*; For, upon such Warrant, the Church receives the Divine Oracles, and he has already equiparated the Reception in both Cases, in respect of the Ground thereof. Now, when our Animadverter has made good this Affirmative, I can assure him, Presbyterians will give him the Hand, and yield the Cause to him. But 'tis strange, how this Man seeks such a Proof. Knows he not the large Proofs exhibited of Ancient Fathers, owning Presbyters and Bishops to be one and the same? And that *Eusebim* has no Proofs, in point of the first Derivations of Church Government, from Apostles, but what are to be clear'd in the Writings of *Paul*, no Primary Lines of Succession, but such as are drawn from him? And since *Eusebim*, the prime Historian, takes this Measure, why stands he not to it? Why debates he not the Matter from his and other Apostolick Sacred Records?

He says, his Reasoning is founded upon this uncontraverted Supposition, *That the Consistent Testimony of innumerable competent Witnesses, is a solid Foundation of our Belief of a Matter of Fact, a Supposition which our Saviour and all his Apostles proceeded upon, and without which, no reveal'd positive Religion can be handed down, or subsist.* But, 1. He has been told, that this is not a *meer Matter of Fact*, or absolutely such, but if it must be so call'd, it is a *Divine Fact*, scil. a Question anent the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, in point of Government, and the Apostolick Churches Reception and Practice accordingly, which all must acknowledge, must be clear'd from the Divine Records, since it is this Rule, not the Churches meer Practice, which can clear this point. 2. He falsely supposes (as is hinted) the same Universality and Certainty of the Churches Reception of a reveal'd Religion, or the Divine Records, and of Diocesan Prelacy, which he shall never be able to prove, upon Grounds often assign'd. Our Animadverter shews but the Confidence of a Fool, in talking of *innumerable competent Witnesses* in point of Diocesan Episcopacy, when there are exhibited so many contrary Witnesses,

Witnesses, as to this point of *Fact*, besides the Scriptures contrary Testimony, which he will acknowledge to be the main. 3^{ly}, He shews gross Inadvertency in two points. 1. In asserting, *there is no other Ground of Handing down a Reveal'd or Positive Religion, but by such Consistent Testimonies as he mentions*, and that, *without this, no Positive Religion can subsist*; For, since the Authority of a *Positive or Reveal'd Religion*, depends upon a *Divine Revelation*, it is the *Revelation it self*, comprobated by *innate Evidences thereof*, that grounds its Authority, or makes Faith to it, in an Objective Sense, and obliges the Reception, whatever be the *Method or Instruments of Conveyance*, more or fewer; And 'tis the *Divine Breathings*, which makes this Objective Certainty *effectual*, whatever way it be handed down. Cannot this Man distinguish betwixt the *Medium* and *Motive* of Christian Belief, or Reception of a *Divine Revelation*? 2^{ly}, The same Inadvertency appears, in asserting, *that our Saviour and his Apostles pleaded upon this Ground of an Handing down by Harmonious Witnesses*, if he mean the *Ground of the Authority and Veracity of their Testimony*; It being evident, that our Saviour pleaded the *Scripture Records*, *Search the Scriptures, for in them ye think ye have Eternal Life, and these are they that testify of me*. He pleaded the *Writings of Moses and of the Prophets*, *Had ye believ'd Moses, says he, you would have believ'd me, for he wrote of me*. Beginning at *Moses and all the Prophets*, he expounded unto the *Disciples the things concerning himself*, &c. So did his Apostles, in Proof of his Mediatorial Authority, Appeal to the *Scriptures*, the standing and infallible Record: The Apostle Paul open'd and alledg'd from the *Scriptures* Christ's Authority. He describes the *Gospel*, Rom. 1. 1, 2. *That which God had promis'd before by his Prophets in the Holy Scriptures, concerning his Son Jesus Christ our Lord*, &c. We read, that the Bereans *search'd Paul's Doctrine by the Scriptures*; And we never find our Lord and his Apostles Appealing to Tradition, or such a *Handing-down* as he alledges, as the *Ground of the Veracity of their Doctrine*, and of the *Obligation of a Reception*, altho' this is suppos'd, but still as a *Mean*, not the *Motive of Belief*, as is said.

Finally, he foolishly asserts, that, *if we quite this way of Handing down by Tradition, we must betake our selves to immediate Revelation*. For, if we suppose, (as needs we must, unless we withstand clear Scripture Light, and the Sentiments of all Protestant Churches) that the *Canon*, by its *Innate and Essential Light*, commends it self, this is that Rule, that directs all Revelation, and whereby we are to try the *Spirits*, and all pretended Revelations. In *Josias's Days* we find, that the *Sacred Records* had been of a long time hid and obscur'd, suppose it had been

been for so long a time, that a Traditional Handing down, or Conveyance, had been, if not quite lost, yet much obscur'd and contradicted, (for he will not deny the Possibility of some *Traditional Imposition* being found there, in stead of the True Canon) the Practice also of the whole Church, for so considerable a Tract of Time, going cross to it, pray, what commended the Reception again of the Canon, and of these Sacred Records? Was it not the Divine Impression of the Canon it self, or these Essential Marks and Evidences demonstrating its Divine Authority? 'Tis true, it was found in the Temple, as a Record there, and this might have its own Secondary Force; But who will disowne it, that it was the Divine Authority it self, with *Infalible Objective Evidences*, and these blest'd with *Saving Divine Influences*, that touch'd *Josias's* tender Heart, when he heard it read, and engag'd him, and the People of God, to a due Reception? But I need not any further pursue the Popish Antiscriptural Rovings of our *Momus*. He tells us, *that, by this time, the Unsuccessful Attempt appears upon the Major of the Argument*; And by this time, say I, the Successful Attempt, which he can no otherwise Answer, than by such Fopperies as we have heard.

He tells us, *the Attempt is made against the Minor*. What the *Minor* is, we have heard, and how attempted, as likewise what the *Minor* is he has offered. Against it, it has been asserted, that this Universal Practice is at best Uncertain, that many of the Ancients wrote nothing, many Writings are perish'd, many are supposititious and counterfeit; Upon all which the Demand is made, "How it is prov'd and made appear, that such of the Ancients as have not written, or whose Writings are lost, have not contradicted such as have written?" Again, 'tis alledg'd, "That many things had a Traditional Conveyance, as from Apostles, and have had an Universal Consent, as far as History can reach, which, notwithstanding, are found Spurious, and, even in the Acknowledgment of Prelates themselves, cross to the Canon, whereof Instances are already exhibited. To this our Animadverter Answers, 1. *That we are not to regard what Testimonies might have been possible, but such as are actually handed down to us*. The Impertinency of which Answer appears, when it is considered, 1. That 'tis not merely a Possibility of Testimonies the Argument is founded upon, and therefore by his *Minor* impugned, but *Actual, Real*, and, as far as Traditional Conveyance can reach, *clear Testimonies*, in point of Belief and Doctrine, which the uncontraverted Canon reprobates, and are now universally acknowledg'd Errors. 2ly, These not only probable, but actually handed down Testimonies, opposite to that Prelacy he maintains, sufficiently overthrow his absolute universal Affirmative, *scil.*
Thas.

That Diocesan Episcopacy was the universal firm Belief, yea and Practice, of all Christians, who liv'd in the Apostolick Age, and the two Ages ensuing; Which is here the more insignificant, in that he offers not, in the least, to disprove these opposite Testimonies produced. Who knows not, that even one or two contrary Instances, will overturn such an absolute unrestricted Affirmative Proposition? Should he affirm, that all Christians, without Exception, are of the Episcopal Perswasion, or that all Ministers in all Churches are, that all Inhabitants of Scotland are Jacobites, or the like, who would not smile at such a lax Affirmative, contradicted by so many contrary Instances? 3ly, The great Topick of his Answer lies in this Certainty of a Traditional Conveyance; And Instances are exhibited of a Traditional Conveyance, of several Errors opposite to the Canon: Now, he opposes to Testimonies, which are suppos'd meerly possible, such as are actually handed down to us; And since, according to his Hypothesis and Division, he puts such Testimonies as are actually handed down, under the Character of such as we are to regard and receive, distinguishing them from such as are meerly possible, he is dash'd upon this Charybdis or Scylla, either to acknowledge these Errors thus conveyed for Truths, and thus cross the Sense of all the Orthodox, or acknowledge his Self-contradicting Folly, in holding, that we must regard such points, as are thus actually handed down by Tradition. The second Answer is, That, suppose some Fathers err'd in Matters of Opinion, it will not follow, that they therefore err'd in Matters of Fact. This is spoken to elsewhere. But shortly, he still begs it, that all the Fathers, and all Christians universally, in the first Three Ages, own'd Episcopacy. So that the Question here is not, whether they might err in such point of Fact, but whether there were ever existent such a Fact, i. e. Whether such an universal Testimony for the Existence and Reception of Diocesan Episcopacy from Apostles, had ever a Being? Which he, nor none else, can never make appear, as is above made good.

Whereas he tells us, that, suppose the Millenary Opinion was an Error, or that Justin Martyr maintain'd it, will we therefore distrust his Testimony, as to who was his Father or Mother, who was Emperor in his Days, &c. He presents but a silly and pitiful Evasion. For, 1. He wilfully or ignorantly mistakes and mis-states this point, which is not meerly anent a Matter of Fact, and upon his meer Assertion, but such a Principle as had an universal Reception at that time, as far as History can lead us, from whence is deduc'd the Uncertainty of a Traditional Conveyance from Apostles, and an Historical universal Reception thereupon, (as a Ground of a Divine Faith) simply, and in it self considered, without any other

other Ground of Assurance. To clear this further, I argue thus, Either *Justin, Lactantius*, and others instanced by Presbyterians, deliver'd what was Truth, in asserting the *universal Reception of this Millenary Error as from Apostles*, or not: If this Matter of Fact was true, then there was an universal Reception of an Error, by Traditional Conveyance as from Apostles; And he cannot make appear a Contradiction to it, in the Times or Ages accounted for by these Fathers. If they were in a Mistake or Error, not only as to the Point it self, but as to the *Traditional Conveyance and Universal Reception*, then 'tis evident, they did mistake in this Point of Fact, and, by further Consequence, neither their Accounts, nor such like, are, in point of Prelacy, to be receiv'd as certain. And for the Relations instanced by him, as to publick Concerns, there are other Grounds of the Certainty of this Historical Belief, beyond the meer Assertion of any one of these Authors. And 'tis a silly and most unaccountable Inference, *They could not mistake in some Points of Fact, Ergo, they were beyond possibility of mistaking in any.* Which is a pitiful Sophism, in Arguing a Particulari to an Universal Conclusion. This Animadverter cannot mistake in the Relation, who was his Father or Mother, (to use his own *Simile*) *Ergo*, he is beyond the Reach of Mistake, in any point of History, or Matter of Fact.

What if Epiphanius, says he, or some others, might mistake concerning a little Rite or Ceremony, will it follow, that all Christians, who liv'd in the Apostolick and the two Ages ensuing, were mistaken in a point of so great Consequence as this, what Form of Ecclesiastick Government had the Apostolick Sanction? But, 1. It is strange Confidence, shall I say Impudence, in this Man, to assert, that all Christians through the World embrac'd Diocesane Prelacy as of Apostolick Sanction. What says he to *Eusebius* his Uncertainty in this point? To the Assertions of so many Fathers, both Greek and Latine, in point of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter? To what is offered against the Catalogue Proofs? &c. So that, tho' his Comparative Argument were admitted upon Truth of his Hypothesis, the Hypothesis it self being palpably false, it falls to the Ground. 2ly, The Question is not merely anent *Epiphanius's* Mistake, solely considered, or anent a meer Rite, as is above clear'd; But anent the Impeachment of a weighty point of Truth by an Antiscriptural Error universally receiv'd by the Church in these times, as handed down from Apostles, which evidently overthrows the Ground of that Certainty assign'd by him in point of Prelacy.

The Assumption of his Argument has been denied, and Reasons offer'd of the Denial, wherein he has been interrogated, how this

universal Reception of Diocesan Prelacy is made appear since several Records are lost, others are Supposititious, and contrary Assertions of Ancient Fathers can be produc'd, that palpable Errors had such a Traditional Conveyance, as he asserts, &c. And since the Assumption, or this very point of Fact, *scil.* *That there was such an universal Reception of Diocesan Prelacy*, as he asserts, and lays down as the *Medium* of his Argument or Answer, is not only denied, but the Denial also fortified by contrary Reasons and Instances, why offers he not a Proof of this denied Proposition? When he tells us, that *tho'* Epiphanius might be mistaken, will it follow, that all Christians, who liv'd in the Apostolick and the two Ages following, could be mistaken in a Matter of so great Consequence, as that of the Church Government, which had the Apostolick Sanction; What a silly Defence makes he, who, instead of a proof of the Assumption, which is denied, yea and impugn'd, Quibbles only at the Major, and takes the Truth of the Assumption for granted, *scil.* *the universal Reception* instanced. In short, the Assumption of his Argument is denied, and all his Proof is, the renewed Assertion of it. What ridiculous Pageantry is this? I remember, when at Schools, a certain simple Youth, being enjoyn'd to impugn a *These*, he offer'd a Syllogism against it, the Major or Minor whereof being denied by the Defendent, in stead of prosecuting the Argument, he stood silent: And being desir'd by the Presiding Master, to prosecute the Argument, and prove the Proposition denied, he gave this Return, *Probari meum Argumentum habemus*; Which, we need not doubt, was eccho'd by the hearty Laughter of all the Hearers. To our *Momus* I may say, *Mutato nomine, de te* ———.

Thus we see how he has expos'd himself, in his Pretensions of an Answer to this Argument, which has quite ruin'd his Cause and Pleading, and that the Strength of this Truth is such, that the Argument fram'd by his best Skill to his Advantage, is, notwithstanding, upon the Matter, of such Efficacy and Nerves, as he can make no Reply, but such as doth more confirm it. It is also obvious, that he neither answers to all the Instances exhibited of the early Reception of Errors, the instanc'd *general Reception*, which he, begging the Question, asserts to be the Errors of some Fathers only. Nor can he answer to that Query, upon the Instance of all Israel, together with Aaron, their setting up and worshipping the Golden Calf, *scil.* Whether, upon Supposition of the Continuance and universal Practice of this Idolatry, would this plead for the Lawfulness of the thing itself? If he hold to his *Medium* of the Churches universal Reception of a Practice or Principle, as from God, or of Divine Warrant and Authority, he must owne, that such a Practice

Alice will infer the Lawfulness; For he knows, that *Aaron*, with all *Israel*, own'd this Worship as to *Jehovah*, consequently, under the Notion of his Warrant. Nor can he evade, in asserting, that the Command did clearly strike against this Practice; For, in the Series of his Reasoning upon the Testimonies of *Augustin* after adduc'd, he holds, that, if the Sense of any Precept or Command be neither so clear nor full, as to determine what is Sin or Duty in the Case, the Churches universal Practice casts the Ballances, and determines the Sense accordingly. And he will not doubt, that, when this Feast was proclaim'd to *Jehovah*, the Second Command was understood to be of no such Import, as to strike against that manner of Adoring the True God, *scil.* by visible Representations, which the *Romanists* maintain to this day, yea and alledge the Churches Practice for it. But, on the other hand, if he deny, that this Practice and Reception will infer the Lawfulness of the Thing, then his *Medium*, by his Confession, falls to the Ground.

To the Testimonies of *Augustin*, in point of the Scriptures being the proper Judge or Rule in the Matter of Church Government, and all other Questions of Religion, he answers, "That, when *Augustin* expresses himself zealously for the Authority of Scripture, he means no more, than that the Scripture is the great Rule of Faith, and no other Arguments are needful for determining a Controversie, when it can be clear'd from the Scripture. But, 1. He, in a great measure, passes over, if not mutilates and perverts, the Scope and Purport of these Testimonies; For, in the Passages cited, *Augustin* is speaking to that Question, *where and how we shall search for and discover the true Church*, her State and Frame, and, by clear Consequence, her true Government; And, in this point, sends us to the Scriptures intirely, and in an Exclusive Sense, in Opposition to all Dictates and Writings of even the best of Men. *Nolo Humanis Documentis, sed Divinis Oraculis, Sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari, &c.* He will not have the Church pointed out by Humane Dictates, (as *J. S.* has done in a Voluminous Pamphlet of near 70 Sheets from the Writings of *Cyprian*) but by the Divine Oracles. 2^{ly}, If the Scripture be the great Rule in Religious Controversies, why flees he from this Rule? Why has he not discuss'd, yea, and not so much as offer'd an Answer to many Scripture Arguments against that Prelacy he contends for? Doth he not thus impeach *Augustin's* Sense and Pleading, yea, and the Scriptures also, in declining this true Debate? 3^{ly}, Whether thinks he, the Scripture gives a certain Sound in this Controversie, so as to determine in favours of Prelacy, or not? If not, what means all his Party's Scripture

Arguments from *Timothy* and *Titus*, the *Asian Angels*, the *Apostolick Episcopacy* ? &c. Nay will he not thus contradict *J. S.* (shall I say himself) who holds the Validity of these Arguments, and that *Paul* constituted *Timothy* Bishop of *Ephesus*, and that the Apostolick Churches were generally thus constituted ? Again, if the Scripture gives a certain Sound in this point, yea, and determines in favours of Episcopacy. 1. Why has he not offer'd a formal Answer to the Arguments adduc'd, and such others as are presented by Presbyterians, and drawn forth Scripture Arguments for Prelacy, upon the pretended *Mediums* premis'd, that they might be fairly and formally scann'd ? If (as he asserts) no other Arguments are, in *Augustin's* Sense, needful, when the Controversie can be clear'd from Scripture, then he must acknowledge, all his Humane Arguments, upon this Hypothesis, are needless and superfluous. 2ly, Why asserts he, that the Scripture is not so full, nor so plain in this point, as his Discretive Assertion insinuates, while he tells us, that *the Churches Suffrage is not excluded in points wherein the Scripture is neither so full nor so plain* ? Again, our Animadverter acknowledges this Matter of Church Government is of great Weight and Consequence ; Moreover, he will not disowne it, that there is much, yea very much spoken in Scripture upon this Head ; Yea, have not their present Pleaders asserted, that, in the Old Testament Oeconomy, we have a standing Scheme and Pattern for the New ? Has not *Mr. Dodwell*, *Dr. Monro*, with others, pleaded from this very Ground ? So that, according to them, the New Testament Scheme of Government is as clearly set down as the Old, yea, is nothing else but the Old made New under the Gospel Dispensation ; Wherein *Dodwell*, with others, is express. So that, upon this Ground, he must either acknowledge the Scriptures distinct Sound, and Determination of this Controversie, or (besides his contradicting these his Fellow-Pleaders) impeach its Perspicuity and Perfection, which, by the Assertion of Scripture it self, is not only sufficient for the private Christian's Direction in every point of Truth and Duty, but also, *to make the Man of God*, the Minister of God, perfect, and to furnish him thoroughly for every part of his Duty as in that Capacity. Again, I leave it to all Men of Sense and Ingenuity, to judge of the Soundness and Consistency of this Assertion, " The Scripture speaks of Church Government, of the Officers thereof, their Duties, Qualifications, exemplifying also its Courts of Judicatory, and that not obiter, but with a direct and palpable Design of Describing the same, and Instructing Christians, yea and Ministers hereanent, and yet, notwithstanding, in this Account, 'tis neither so full, nor so plain, but that

the

the Churches Practice must be Consulted, to make up this Defectiveness, and clear this Obscurity. If this be not in the Sense of all Protestant Churches an Impeachment of the Scriptures Perfection and Perspicuity, surely never any thing was such. This will be further evident, when 'tis considered, that the Question is not of Circumstantial, but of the Frame or Species it self. *Augustin, de Unit. Eccl. & Epist. contra Petilianum Donatistam Epist.* asserts, "That we must search the Church not in our own Dictates or Words, but the Lords, and adds this Reason, *Quia est veritas & optime novit corpus suum; novit enim Dominus qui sunt ejus. In verbis nostris Ecclesiam queri nolumus.*" Our Lord being the Truth and Life knows best who are the true Members of his Body; And, by clear consequence, he must also know best, and also has reveal'd what the Frame of that Political Body is in point of Government. But our Animadverter contradicts him, and that thrice, 1. He will have the Church, i. e. her true Frame and Government, to be sought from the Church her self, and her own Decision to be the Judge in this point. 2ly, He asserts these *Verba Domini* which *Augustin* Appeals to; and sets in contradistinction to all Humane Writings, to be so lame and obscure, that *Verba nostra*, our own Words, the Churches Sense and Practice must give them their due Sense and Authoritative Meaning; For he tells us expressly, that the Scripture accounts are Illuminated by the Churches Practice, and that *Augustin* lays the great, yea the main stress thereupon. 3ly, He contradicts *Augustin* also in this his Reason, *novit Dominus corpus suum, & qui sunt sui*, The Lord knows who are his Body and who are his; But he will have the *corpus suum* the Body of Christ, to know better and more distinctly than himself, who are his true Body and Church, or what is the Nature of her Unity, and her true Frame of Government; For this is the point *Augustin* is there Discoursing against the Donatists, viz. *How the true Church is to be discern'd*. When he shews how the true Church is to be demonstrated, to be pointed out, or made Conspicuous, as his word imports, he expressly opposes the Divine Oracles to all Humane Testimonies. Yea moreover he affirms, *Nec Catholicis Episcopis consentiendum, si contra Canonicas Scripturas aliquid sentiunt*, that we must not consent to Catholick Bishops, when their Judgment is cross to Scriptures, clearly supposing the thing possible. So that tho' all should thus Consent, in *Augustin's* Sense, their Testimony is to be rejected, which I prove thus. If their intire Harmonious Consent be, in *Augustin's* Sense, still a Humane Testimony, then it cannot of it self, or for it self, be admitted: But so it is, that such supposed Testimonies even of all Bishops, are, in his Sense, still a Humane Testimony;

Testimony; For he opposes it to a *Divine, Nolo humanis documentis*, saith he, *sed Divinis Oraculis sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari*. 2ly, Otherwise his Opposition and Antithesis were impertinent, if the *Humana Documenta*, or Humane Instructions and the *Divine Oracles* were all one, But so it is, that, in this point, *Augustin* excludes all *Humane Testimonies*, as such (consequently, tho' never so full, Harmonious, or Universal), making the Sacred Oracles the only *Documenta, Fundamenta, Firmamenta*, the only solid Foundations, and firm Basis of our Faith in this and all other points of Religion, as he expresses it.

This sufficiently discovers the Impertinency of what he adds, *viz.* *That Augustin thought not of excluding the unanimous Suffrage of the Primitive Church in matters wherein Scripture is not so full and plain.* Wherein 'tis noticeable, that, 1. His way of Expression is very bad, and reflecting upon God's Wisdom and the Scriptures Perfection. When he says that in this point it is not so full and plain, he supposes the Scripture to treat of a Subject (and such as Church Government) but not with that fullness and plainness that is necessary. For what can he make the Scope of this treating, if not to point out the thing it self? And if (as he asserts) it be not so fully and plainly as to reach this end, till the Churches Practice give a distinct Sound, and help in this Acquittance and Design, how absurd is this Imputation, and what a grossly Wicked Inference this will bear, is obvious to the meanest Reflection. 2ly, The excluding the Churches Suffrage from the Authority of a *Divine Oracle*, or as being *arbitrariis* and of it self to be believed, is very well consistent with giving a due Deference to her Decision, in a secondary Sense; But this is still to be understood with a just respect to the *Divine Rule*; For 'tis upon this Ground we hear the Church, and no absolute Obedience to, or Belief of her Dictates, is due, but in such a Subordination in the consentient Judgment of all Protestant Churches; Else we equal her Decision with the *Divine Oracles*, and the Judgment of Discretion, our acting in Faith in obeying the Churches Dictates, the trial of the Spirits, enjoined to all Church Members, fall to the ground. And sure, *Augustin* understood this Deference in no other Sense, nor could he, unless we will involve him in a palpable Contradiction. 3ly, Whereas he tells us, *That Augustin never thought of excluding the unanimous Suffrage of the Primitive Church, in matters where the Scripture is either not so full, or so plain*, besides that he ignorantly Confounds the not excluding, or giving a due Subordinat Deference to that Suffrage of the Church which he mentions, and the making this Suffrage the leading Rule and Principle of our Faith

Faith and Practice in these points about which is our Question, which, he cannot but acknowledge, are in themselves distinguishable, as is evident in *Augustin's* Appeal to Scripture in this Case; Before this Answer can signifie any thing to his Scope, he is oblig'd to make this unanimous Suffrage of the Apostolick and Succeeding Ages, in point of Diocesane Prelacy, appear, which he will no doubt perform *ad Kalendas Græcas*; And there being no such Suffrage produceable as will clear this point in his Favours, he must acknowledge the Scripture must be appeal'd to for a Decision, yea and upon *Augustin's* premised Principles and Grounds adduc'd; Or absurdly assert an absolute Impossibility of this Decision.

What is said is sufficient to discover the utter unserviceableness of our Animadverter's Quibblings upon this Head. But that I may not leave it thus, and to expose him further, I shall here, 1. Give some further account of *Augustin's* Sentiments in this point, which will be found such, as will intirely exclude his Evasion and Subterfuge. 2ly, I shall make appear, that in these Citations of *Augustin*, offered by him, he has, 1. Abused and wrested what he cites. 2ly, Imbark'd therein in a Popish design of drawing *Augustin* to Patronize unwritten Traditions, and equal them to Scripture.

For the first, anent *Augustin's* absolute Appeal to Scripture as the proper Supreme Judge, in all points of Religion, from which he will not dare to exclude Church Government, and that in an exclusive Sense to all Humane Testimonies or the Churches Practice; The Testimonies are many; Take these few. *Tom. 6. Lib. 5. de Hæres. Cap. 6.* speaking to an Arrian, *Vade interpella Judicem: habes Judicem ordinarium; & ubi, inquis, istum inveniam? Audi Prophetam dicentem, Isa. 33. Dominus Judex noster, Dominus Legisfer noster; sic est in Cælo, ut non deferat Terram, i. e. "Go and Appeal to the Judge: You have an ordinary Judge; But where, say you, shall I find him; Hear the Prophet saying, The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver; He is so in Heaven, that he has not left the Earth. Eod. Tom, cont. Maxim. Arrian. Epist. Lib. 3. Cap. 14. Nunc nec ego Nicænum, nec tu debes Ariminense tanquam præjudicaturus præferre Concilium, &c. "Neither ought I in anticipating Judgment to alledge the Council of Nice, nor you the Council of Ariminum; Neither am I oblig'd by the Authority of the one, nor you by that of the other; Let one point with the other, one Cause with the other, one Argument and Reason with another be compar'd and concerted by Scripture Authority, the common Judge and Witness to them both, and not peculiar to either. Thus *Tom. 1. Lib. de Unit, Eccl. Cap. 3. Non audiamus hæc dico, hæc dicis. sed audiamus**

audiamus hæc dicit Dominus, i. e. "Let us not hear, This I say, This you say, but, Thus saith the Lord. Eod. Lib. Cap. 4. *Quia cum Donatistis nobis Quæstio est non de Capite, sed de Corpore, &c.* "Because our Controversie with the Donatists is not concerning the Head, but the Body, that is, not concerning Christ himself but his Church; Let the Head himself, concerning whom we agree, shew us his Body, about which is our Debate; that by his own Words our Debate may be ended. Eod. Lib. Cap. 5. *Quæq; aperta & manifesta deligamus, quæ si in Sacris Scripturis non invenirentur, nullo modo esset, unde aperirentur clausa, & illustrarentur obscura, i. e.* "Let us pitch upon such things as are clear and evident, which if they were not found in the Holy Scriptures, there is no way left to open what is shut, or illustrat what is obscure. Eod. Tom. Lib. 5. de Nuptiis & Concupiscentia, Cap. 33. *Ista Controversia Judicem requirit, &c. i. e.* "This Controversie requires a Judge, let Christ therefore Judge, and together with him the Apostle, because in the Apostle Christ speaks, &c. Citing the Words of Christ and the Apostle. It. Tom. 8. in Ps. 57. *Auferantur de medio Charitæ nostræ, procedat in medium Codex Dei, &c. i. e.* "Let our Writings be taken out of the way, and let the Book of God be produced; Hear Christ saying, Hear the Truth speaking, &c. Eod. Tom. Lib. de Grat. & Lib. Arbit. Cap. 18. *Sedeat inter nos Judex Apostolus Joannes, i. e.* "Let the Apostle John sit as Judge betwixt us; Citing his Words in his first Epistle. *Contra Literas Petiliani, Lib. 3. Cap. 6. Sive de Christo, sive de ejus Ecclesia, &c.* "Whether we Debate concerning Christ, or his Church, or whatever other point belong to our Faith or Practice, we are not comparable to him who said, *Alitro* we, yea much more, tho' an Angel from Heaven should Preach contrary to what we have received in the Law or the Gospel in the Holy Scriptures, let him be accurs'd.

In which Passages, and many such, which were superfluous here to Cite, 'tis evident, that, 1. *Augustin* makes an absolute Appeal to the Scriptures in all Controversies about Religion. 2ly, That he disowns even the Decision of Councils, as giving an absolute or infallible Judgment therein; And that, even upon Supposition of the Churches Universal Practice, or Decision in Councils, the Scripture Authority is still Supereminent thereunto, the Decision whereof is solely and absolutely to be rested in. 3ly, That as the true Church, so the true Churches Unity, is only to be sought in and from the Divine Oracles, where the true Principles and Foundation thereof is only to be found; That in all Debates concerning the Frame of Christ's Tabernacle, the Nature and Complexion (so to speak) of his Mystical Body, we must

must hear his own Voice in the Lively Oracles, who is the Churches Head, and thereby only be Determined. Finally, whereas our Animadverter asserts *Augustin's* resting upon the Churches Suffrage, in matters wherein the Scripture is not so full, or plain; If these matters do touch Religion, *Augustin* asserts the Scriptures therein to be so full and distinct, that no Decision or Practice of the Church, without the verge thereof, can, as a Divine Law, challenge our Obedience, or oblige the Conscience. So that, if our Animadverter mean, by this *Unanimous Suffrage of the Primitive Church*, such as can finally Determine in this important Controversie of Church Government, which is evidently his Scope, he is rebuked by *Augustin* and Scripture both.

To come to the next point of his wresting *Augustin's* Words, and imbarcking in the Popish Design instanced; He cites *Lib. 4. de Bapt. contra Donat. Cap. 23.* alledging that he founds Infant Baptism on the constant Practice of the Catholick Church. *Quod traditum tenet Universitas Ecclesie, cum parvuli Infantes Baptizantur, &c.* And then he adds, *Cap. 24. Si quisquam in hac re Authoritatem Divinam querit, quanquam quod Univerſa tenet Ecclesia — non nisi Authoritate Apostolica traditum creditur;* Where *Augustin*, says our Animadverter, plainly lays the great stress of the Baptism of Infants upon the constant Practice of the Church; Which he also asserts in his Controversie with the Donatists *, where *Augustin* * *Lib. 5. de Bapt. cont. Donat. Cap. 23.* asserts the Apostles Commanded nothing, but the Churches Custom concerning the Baptism of Hereticks and Schismaticks, as many other things, took its Original *ab Apostolorum Traditione, sicut ut multa quæ Univerſa tenet Ecclesia.* Thus *Lib. 2. de Bapt. cont. Donat. Cap. 17.* Where *Augustin* is said to hold *Saluberrimam consuetudinem* in point of Baptism of Infants, *quam consuetudinem credo ex Apostolica Traditione venientem.* That *Cap. 9.* he maintains *Universal Custom* as of force to support such a Cause; And that the same he Grounds upon in his Book *de Unico Baptismate. Hoc a Majoribus traditum nos accipimus, hoc in Catholica Ecclesia quæ toto orbe diffunditur contra omnes falsitatis nebulas custodimus.*

To make good, upon what our Animadverter here asserts and infers from these Passages, his imbarcking with the Papists, in advancing Traditions and the Churches Custom to an equal Authority with Scriptures in Decision of Religious Matters, let us hear the Jesuits of *Rhemes* pleading upon that Passage, *2 Thes. 2. 15. Brethren stand fast and hold the Traditions which you have been taught.* They do, together with our Animadverter, alledge the Authority of the Fathers, such as

Chrysostom, Basil, Irenæus, &c. But passing these, which the Judicious *Cartwright*, in his Reply, calls *Words and Wind*, a *Childish crackling of Paper Shor*, and in his Confutation makes appear to be so ; Let us hear how, together with our Animadverter, they plead from *Augustin*. Take their words thus. " *St. Augustin* esteemeth the Apostolick Tradition so much, that he plainly affirmeth in sundry places, not only the Observation of certain Festivities, Fasts, Ceremonies, and whatsoever Solemnity is used in the Catholick Church, to be Holy, Profitable, and Apostolick, tho' they be not Written at all in the Scripture ; But he often also Writes that many of the Articles of our Religion, and points of high Importance, are not so much to be proved by Scripture, as by Tradition, namely avouching (*N. B.*) that in no wise we could believe that Children in their Infancy should be Baptized, if it were not of Apostolick Tradition. *De Gen. ad Lit. Lib. 10. Cap. 23.* " Tradition caused him to believe that the Baptized of Hereticks should not be Rebaptized, notwithstanding (*N. B.*) *St. Cyprian's* Authority, and the manifold Scriptures alledg'd by him, tho' they seem never so pregnant. *De Bapt. Lib. 2. Cap. 7.* " By Tradition only, he and others condemn'd *Helvidius* the Heretick, for denying the perpetual Virginity of our Lady ; And without this the Scripture is never so plain, no *Arrian*, no *Macedonian*, no *Eutychian*, no *Pelagian*, no *Zuinglian* will yield.

In Answer to this, *Cartwright*, having told the Jesuites, that *Augustin* affirms whatever concerns Faith and Manners is plainly contain'd in the Scriptures, citing him, *De Doct. Christ. Lib. 2. Cap. 9.* tells them further, (and together with them our Animadverter) that *Augustin de Genes. ad Lit. Lib. 10. & de Baptis. Lib. 2. Cap. 7.* is shamefully abused by them ; For he speaks there, saith he, of Apostolical Tradition, but not of Apostolical Tradition unwritten. And when themselves are constrain'd to confess that the Word of Tradition contains as well written, as unwritten Doctrines, it is too Childish to conclude from the General to the Special Affirmatively, as to say, It is proved by Apostolical Tradition ; Ergo, by unwritten Verities, or by unwritten Verities only. And that it may be evident (*N. B.*) that *Augustin* stood upon better Ground for the Baptism of Young Infants than upon unwritten Traditions, let the Reader consider what he Writes in these Words, *Lest I should seem to handle this matter with Humane Reason, I bring forth certain Instructions out of the Gospel.* And in another place he alleges this Sentence to prove Children's Baptism, *Unless a Man be renewed of Water and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the Kingdom of God.* Citing *Lib. 2. de Bapt. Cap. 7. Lib. 2. Cap. 14.* " And this, saith he, is evident by his

his Words which the Jesuites alledge; For when he saith, *It were not to be believ'd unless it were Apostolical*, if it should be restrain'd to *unwritten Traditions*, it should thereof follow, that we may believe nothing but *unwritten Verities*, which is absurd. Besides that of this point in the next words he gives a *Reason out of the Scriptures*. And where they pretend that upon ground of *unwritten Verities only* he refuses the Opinion of Rebaptizing those which were Baptized by Heretical Ministers, they do extremely wrong him, as one who in diverse places affirmeth, *That it was contrary to the Scriptures what Cyprian did, with his Council, determine in that behalf*. For besides the Churches Custom, and the strength of General Councils, he saith, that there were both many and great *Testimonies of Scripture*, and also evident Reasons. Also that it is against the *Commandment of God* that they are Rebaptized who have been Baptized by Hereticks; And what Commandment that is, he shews by Name, *The Testimonies of the Scriptures, which do not only Teach, but plainly Teach that they should not be Rebaptized* *. And † he cites this **Lib. de Bapt. Cap. 4.* Scripture to prove it, *John 13. 10. He who is washed, needs no more to be washed*: So that under the word of † *Cap. 14. Tradition, Augustin* must needs understand the Scriptures.

And when he denies (N. B.) that such things are Written in the Scripture; his meaning must needs be, that there is no particular and expresse Case, wherein it is *namely* said, that an Infant was Baptized, or that a Christian Baptized by an Heretick was not to be Rebaptized.

Let us next hear Dr. Fulk to the same purpose defending *Augustin* upon this Text: The Jesuites alledging, he had asserted, *That many Articles of our Religion are not so much to be prov'd by Scripture, as by Tradition*, he answereth thus, "That some Articles are prov'd both by Scripture, and also by Tradition, it is no hurt, for that only is a true Tradition (N. B.) that hath the Testimony of the Scripture to warrant it. Nay, say you: He avoucheth that in no wise we could believe, that Children in their Infancy should be Baptized. Verily if he did so avouch, he was in a great Error. For we have as good Arguments out of the Scriptures, that Infants are to be Baptized, as old Folks. But you do *impudently belie him*, for he has no such words or meaning. For he saith, *The Custom of our Mother the Church in Baptizing of Infants is not to be despis'd, nor by any means to be accounted superfluous, neither to be credited at all if it were not an Apostolick Tradition*. For even that Age hath a great weight or Testimony which first merited to *Shed Blood for Christ*, How prove you that by *Apostolick Tradition* or

delivery, he meaneth here an *unwritten Tradition*? He is so far from denying that this Custom hath Testimony in the Scripture, that he presently alledges an Argument out of the Scriptures to confirm it. They that may shed their Blood for Christ may be Baptized: Infants, as the Scripture testifieth, did shed their Blood for Christ; Therefore they may be Baptized. And *de Bapt. cont. Donat. Lib. 4. Cap. 24.* He proves the Baptism of Infants, not only by the Custom of the Church observ'd ever since the Apostles, but also by the Institution of Circumcision out of the Scriptures. So likewise that such as were Baptized by Hereticks, were not to be Rebaptized, he proves by the saying of *John. Cap. 13.* *He that is once washed, needs no more to be washed.* *De Bapt. Lib. 2. Cap. 14.* And by Example of them that were Circumcised in the Ten Tribes, where *Jeroboam's Calves* were Worshipped. Again he saith, *That evil Men have Baptism, and do give and receive Baptism, tho' they be not chang'd into better Men, we have prov'd, as I think, sufficiently, both out of the Canonical Scriptures, and out of Cyprian's own Writings.* *De Bapt. Lib. 6. Cap. 3.* Therefore this point of Religion has sufficient Warrant out of the Scriptures.

To this account of *Augustin* offered by the Learn'd *Cartwright*, and by this Learn'd Episcopal Doctor, I will add a remarkable Passage from the Professors of *Leiden*, *Disp. 4. de S. Scrip. Perf. Thes. 24.* *"In censu Traditionum quæ in Sacris Literis inveniuntur, eîsq; insunt per æquipollentiam analogicam, contra quam Pontificii arbitrantur, præter Articulos Symboli Apostolici, hæc Axiomata colligenda censemus. Infantes Christianorum esse Baptizandos. Cœnam Domini mulieribus quoq; esse impertinendam. Baptismum non esse iterandum, &c. i. e.* That they reckon in the number and account of such Traditions as are found in Holy Scriptures, according to Analogical equivalency, (or according to the Analogy of Faith are deducible therefrom) against what the Papists hold, besides the Articles of the Apostolick Creed, these Axiomes, or Principles, *That the Infants of Christians are to be Baptized, That Women have a Right to participat of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper. That Jesus Christ is coessential with the Father. That there are only two Sacraments of the New Testament, Baptism and the Lord's Supper. That Baptism (N. B.) is not to be reiterated. That the Apostles, by Inspiration of the Spirit, set apart the Lord's Day to be Sanctified in place of the Jewish Sabbath which was kept even to their times. And several such like, all which, say they, are by some of the Fathers call'd improperly Traditions Apostolical, viz. by Origen, in Cap. 6. ad Rom. by Augustin, Lib. 4. de Bapt. cont. Donat. Cap. 23, (Here's the very place*

place cited by our Animadverter) "by Theodoret, *Lib. i. C. 8, Hist. Eccl.* by Epiphanius, *Heref. 69. adv. Arrian.* and by others.

Wherein 'tis evident, 1. That, according to the Sense and Judgment of the Learn'd Professors, several important Scripture-Truths, in the Writings and Usage of the Fathers, come under the Denomination and Character of *Apostolick Traditions*, which is convincingly evident in the Instances exhibited by them; For who will doubt, that *Womens Right to the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper*, that there are but two Sacraments of the New Testament, *Baptism and the Lord's Supper*, that our Blessed Lord is Co-essential with the Father, (not *quod esset*, but *quiescit*;) are important Scripture-Truths, clearly deduceable therefrom, anent which the Scripture gives a distinct Sound, not an ambiguous and obscure, as this Animadverter is bold to assert. 2ly, That, in special, they consequently hold this considerable Point, *The Administration of Baptism to Infants*, as likewise the *Non-Reiteration of Baptism*, to be maintain'd by *Augustin*, upon Scripture Warrant, as the proper Foundation thereof, and that they are founded upon such *Apostolical Tradition*, as is the same with, and equivalent unto *Apostolical Doctrine*; Therein baffling what this Animadverter holds of *Augustin's* deducing the Warrant of this merely from the Practice of the Church, *Lib. 4. C. 23. de Bapt. cont. Donat. & C. 24. & Lib. 5. C. 23. &c.* compar'd with what he cites *de Unico Bapt. cont. Peril. C. 9.* Wherein he is bold to assert, that *Augustin*, having found nothing in Scripture to clear this point, laid the great Stress, yea, the main Stress of this Practice on the Custom and Tradition of the Church. In Answer to which, I offer, 1. Our Animadverter must acknowledge, that *Augustin* either believ'd the Divine Authority of this Ordinance, as Administred to Infants, or not. If he believ'd its Divine Warrant, then he made not the Churches Custom the sole or proper Ground of this Administration. If he say, *Augustin* did not believe this Divine Warrant, 'tis above made appear, that he did, and that; consequently, his Citations are extra olea, and do but amount to prove, that, in this Point, *Augustin* gave only a due subservient Deference to the Churches Practice or Custom. 2ly, 'Tis also made appear, that he grossly mistakes *Augustin's* Expression of *Tradition*, as if importing, in his Sense, a meer Church Practice or Custom, which, according to *Augustin*, includes *Apostolical Tradition*, or such a Practice, as deriv'd its Original from them. Nor need we wonder, that *Augustin*, with others of the Ancients, uses such Expressions, if we shall Reflect upon what we heard *Cartwright* observe, that the Apostle, *2 Thes. 2. 15.* makes mention of *Doctrines or Ordinances delivered, whether by Word, or by Epistle*, under this Denomination and Character of *Traditions*.

Yea who knows not, that the Doctrine of Christianity it self, may, in a good and sound Sense, be call'd a Tradition. See this prov'd at some length by the Author of the Sermon upon 2 *Thes.* 2. 15. anent

the Scriptures Sufficiency as a Rule of Christian Faith, without the Supplement of Unwritten Traditions *. This is convincingly made good in the very Citations offered by our Animadverter; For *Augustin* †, even as his Testimony is represented by him, holds, that *Consuetudo illa quæ opponeretur Cypriano, (nim. à Stephano) &c. ab eorum (Apostolorum) Traditione exordium sumpsisse credenda est; Sicut sunt multa quæ universa tenet Ecclesia, & ab hac, ab Apo-*

stolis recepta, bene creduntur, quanquam scripta non reperiantur. i. e. That such a Practice had its Rise and Original from the Apostolick Tradition, as are many things which the Universal Church doth hold, and by the Church are rightly believ'd to be receiv'd from Apostles, altho' they are not found written. Wherein it is evident, that *Augustin* speaks of a Practice or Custom founded upon Apostolick Warrant, and such as is, consequently, the Ground of a Solid or Divine Faith, as the doubled Expression of *Credenda* and *Creduntur* does, in this Case, make evident; For none will say, that *Augustin* held the Inventions of Men to be the Ground or Object of the Churches Belief in Matters of Religion. And as for that Clause, *Quanquam scripta non reperiantur*, 'tis evident, as we heard Judicious Cartwright observe, that *Augustin*, by the Term [*Scripta*), intends only *What is expressly written*, and that with an Application to the present Circumstantiate Case; So that, according to *Augustin*, this Practice, tho' not expressly commanded, or in so many Letters and Syllables asserted, (which may be said of many Scripture-Truths) yet he holds to be by just Analogy and Consequence deducible from that which is written, as is evident from the Series and Scope of this, and the other Testimonies of *Augustin*, above set down. And hence it is, that, in the next Passage cited by our Animadverter, *scil. Lib. 2. de Bapt. contra Donat. C. 17.* speaking of this Famous Custom own'd by the Church in point of Baptism, he adds, *Quam Consuetudinem credo ex Apostolica Traditione venientem, sicut multa non inveniuntur in Literis eorum, neque in Conciliis posterorum, & tamen quæ per universam custodiuntur Ecclesiam, non nisi ab ipsis tradita & commendata creduntur.* Where 'tis evident, that *Augustin* speaks of this Practice, as proceeding from the Apostles; And 'tis observable, that his Expressions of *Tradita* and *Commendata* have here a Signal Emphasis, pointing at the Apostles Delivering, yea, and Approving the Thing it self, and that the Church receiv'd and believ'd the same accordingly,

and upon this sole Warrant ; Which is further confirm'd by what our Animadverter acknowledges, that *Augustin*, in this point, argues, and that frequently, from *Scripture Simblance and Analogies* ; Which doth convincingly demonstrate, that *Augustin*, by *Apostolical Tradition*, understands what has a Foundation in Scripture, and by good Consequence, and according to the Analogy of Faith, is deduceable therefrom.

But our Animadverter adds, that *he laid the main Stress on the constant Custom and Tradition of the Church*, making *Augustin* thus to set this Custom or Tradition of the Church, as a Topick and Ground of Argument of a more solid, and of an higher Nature, than that of the Scripture Analogy, how absurdly and cross to *Augustin's* Scope, is obvious to the meanest Reflection. He acknowledges, that *Augustin holds no other Arguments are needful to determine a Controversie, when it can be clear'd from Scripture*, and therefore *Augustin's* Scripture Grounds instanced do evince, that his Judgment was, that the Churches Custom was not, in this point, to be rested in, as the only or main Ground of this Practice, or for clearing the Divine Warrant thereof, since such an Exaltation of the Churches Custom or Practice will contradict his frequent Appeal to Scripture in points of Religion, and that in an exclusive Sense to the greatest Humane Testimonies. 3^{ly}, I would know, whether our Animadverter holds, that all great and weighty points of Religion can be clear'd from Scripture, and that *Augustin* judg'd thus ? If he deny this, I appeal to all Protestants, whether he has not impeach'd the Scriptures Perfection, and imbrac'd the Popish Doctrine in point of Traditions. If he hold, that all weighty Religious Matters, as he words it, are determinable by Scripture, and that not only upon the Matter, but in *Augustin's* Sense, he contradicts himself, in asserting, that *Augustin* laid the Stress, yea, the main and great Stress, and that in weighty Matters, upon the Churches Tradition ;

For thus he interprets what he cites from *Augustin* *,
 that *Augustin* confesses, he is put to conjecturing for finding
 a plausible colour in Scripture for Baptism of Infants, (which
 he cannot but acknowledge an important point in Reli-
 gion) and therefore lays the great Stress on the Practice of the Church. He
 hath told us further, that *Augustin* argues from Scripture Similes and
 Analogies, but frequently lays the main Stress on the Custom and Tradi-
 tion of the Church. Now, how do these quadrate, All necessary or
 weighty points of Religion are determinable by Scripture, in *Augustin's* Sense
 and Pleading, and yet there are weighty and great points of Religion, for de-
 termining whereof, *Augustin* laid the great and main Stress, or Foundation

* Lib. 4. de
 Bapt. contra
 Donat. C. 24.

of his Belief, upon the Churches Custom and Practice? And, in the Series of our Animadverter's Discourse upon this point, 'tis evident, that he applies not this to the Case of Baptism only, but to many other Principles and Practices of Religion, which he will needs have to be thus founded, in *Augustin's* Sense. Now, since he acknowledges, that *Augustin* reasons this, and such like points from Scripture, he must either say, that such Inferences were solid to conclude the point, and that therefore, there being a *Divine Warrant* for the Practice, there was no need of that drawing the Ground thereof from the Churches Custom, as a proper Argument, and in *eodem genere causa* with that of the Scripture Evidence, or that *Augustin* distrusted his own Reasoning, as not solid and sufficient to infer the Conclusion, which who will be bold to assert of such a Judicious Father. So that 'tis evident, that our Animadverter, in the Series of this Reasoning, is so in the Briars, that he must needs father a Contradiction upon *Augustin*, if not himself also. 4ly. When he will needs have the Churches Practice and Custom to be, in *Augustin's* Sense, the directing Rule, in points wherein the Scripture speaks not so fully and plainly, I would gladly know, to whom he ascribes the Judgment of *this Fulness and Plainness*. If to the Church, or her Custom and Practice, here is an absolute Infallibility ascrib'd to her, and her Custom shall over-rule whatever, in point of Scripture-Truth, she shall judge upon this Ground regulable; And how this crosses the Sense of all Reform'd Churches, as well as of *Augustin*, is obvious from what is said. If he hold, that *this Plainness* or *Fulness* is to be judg'd by Scripture Analogy, or that of Faith, then down falls Custom as the Rule, and is, in this point, of no Avail. And that *Augustin* judg'd thus, is evident from the Testimonies adduc'd. Besides, that if the Churches universal Custom and Practice is made the Rule to determine, the Rule is more dark than what is to be enquir'd for, especially since it will be granted, that this Rule must be full, adequate, and commensurate to every point of Difficulty, wherein it may be pretended, that the Scripture is not full or clear: And who would be bold to assert, that there is such an universal Custom or Practice produceable or existent? So that, in this Case, the Labyrinth is inextricable, and there's no clew to winde out of it.

Several other things in his Citations would require a large Animadversion, but what is said, is sufficient to evince the Unserviceableness of what our *Momus* has offered; For what he cites on *Cap. 9. Lib. 2. de Bapt. contra Donat.* That the Churches Practice and Custom was, in this point, oppos'd to such as would introduce a Novelty, we have heard how *Augustin* understands this Custom, as founded upon the Apostolick Tradition

tion mention'd, which, with him, is all one with *Apostolick Doctrine*. And 'tis remarkable, that, in the Passage cited by him, *Augustin* says, that *Consuetudinis Robore tenebatur Orbis Terrarum, i. e.* The World was held by the Strength of a Custom or Practice, and that this was oppos'd to Novellists, *Quia non poterant apprehendere Veritatem*: And if this was presented as a plausible Argument to such Obstinate *Ignoramus's*, or as suiting their present Case and Circumstances, it will, by no Consequence, infer, that this was the only or main Argument ad-duceable. And for *Augustin's* pleading, in the same Chap. against Rebaptization, *Hoc à Majoribus traditum nos accepimus, hoc in Catholica Ecclesia, quæ toto Orbe diffunditur, contra omnes Falsitatis Nebulas custodimus, i. e.* This we have received from our Progenitors, this the Catholick Church holds, &c. His Scripture-Proof, in this point, above instanced, doth evince, that *Augustin* made this neither the only nor main Topick of his Reasoning.

But now, our Animadverter will apply the Testimonies of *Augustin* to the point of Episcopacy; For which he cites two further Proofs: The first is *Cap. 18. contra Crescent. Grammat.* where he mentions ——— *Post Episcopos ab ipsis Apostolorum sedibus inconcussam seriem usque in hæc tempora, &c. i. e.* The unshaken Series of Bishops from the Sees of the Apostles to his own times. And *contra Literas Petilianæ, Lib. 2. C. 51.* If all through the World were such as you accuse, *Cathedra tibi quid fecit Ecclesia Romanæ, in qua Petrus sedit, & in qua hodie Anastasius sedet; vel Ecclesiæ Hierosolymitanæ in qua Jacobus sedit, &c. i. e.* What hath the Chair done unto you of the Church of Rome, in which Peter did sit, and in which this day *Anastasius* doth sit; Or of the Church of Jerusalem in which James did sit, &c. 'Tis Answered, 1. This point of Succession of Bishops from Apostles has been above fully clear'd, and the utter Unserviceableness thereof to the Episcopal Design convincingly made appear; So that we need not here insist upon it. Nor need we, in Answer to the premis'd Citations, insist in telling him, that, 1. As these shattered Catalogues are found Contradictory one to another, and the Ambiguity of the Term Bishop, is such as casts an indissolvable Cloud upon them, so 'tis evident, that this Argument from Succession, is, by *Augustin*, and others pleading thereupon, made use of, to prove, against Heterodox Persons, the *Traduces Apostolici Seminis*, or a Derivation of a true Doctrine from Apostles, not a Series or Succession of such Prelates, as our Episcopalsians pretend. Which, in the second place,

is made good from this, that the *Lines of Succession* are drawn from Apostles, and the Apostolick Office being such as admitted no Successor, the Stream (as is above clear'd) is cut off from the Fountain. Nor will this Man be bold to say, that *Augustin* believ'd these pretended Succeeding Bishops were Apostles, in a proper formal Sense. And 'tis above also clear'd, that, in the Usage and Language of the Fathers, the Denomination of *Bishops* was put upon *Apostles*, with respect to such places as they are found, for some time, to have resided in. To all which may be added, that whatever *Augustin* might apprehend from some Historical or Traditional Conveyance anent *Peter's* Seat at *Rome*, yet the Judgment of several Learn'd Divines ought to preponderate with us, who have made appear, that he was never at *Rome*, which has no small Strength from this Scripture-Argument, that, in the Epistle to the *Romans*, there is not the least hint of his Seat at *Rome*, nor of his Episcopacy over that Church. Nor can it be clear'd, who were his immediate Successors. And, in a word, as the same may be said of the suppos'd Episcopacy of *James* in the Church of *Jerusalem*, and others mention'd by *Augustin*, (of which above) the Design of our *Momus*, in these Citations, is intirely baffled and excluded, if we but reflect upon what *Augustin* asserts *Epist. 19. ad Hieron. viz.* That *Episcopatus* was *major Presbyterio secundum Honorum Vocabula, quæ Ecclesiæ Usus obtinuit*, making the Distinction Nominal rather than Real, and such as took its Rise from a Custom which had obtain'd; So that, upon both Grounds, (unless we will fasten upon *Augustin* such a Contradiction and Nonsense, as no Man having the common Use of Reason could express) we must needs suppose, that *Augustin*, speaking of this Series of Bishops from the Apostles mentioned, could neither mean nor intend a Succession of the Apostolick Office properly such, nor of such *Diocesan Prelates*, as this Man and his Party do plead for.

Thus have we seen the bold, but foolish fruitless Attempts of this Pasquiller, and his Fellows, against that Truth which this True Reform'd Church ownes, and the solid Scripture Foundations in point of Government, upon which she is establish'd. But what Discoveries and Defences of Truth will silence the Enmity of Man's Corrupt Nature, which will incessantly spawn against it, until Faith's Sight of the Beauty and Glory of Christ, the Eternal Word and Wisdom of the Father, Antidote this Poyson.

of the Old Serpent? However, *Wisdom has always been, and will be justified of all her Children*, and the Purity and Power of Gospel Ordinances of God's Appointment will commend his Work, his Worship, his Authoriz'd and Instituted Ministry, to such as have their Senses exercis'd to discern and approve things truly Excellent. Such will grow up to him in all things, who is *the Head and Saviour of the Body*, while Obstinate Adversaries will find more and more accomplished that Expostulatory Threatning, which the Lord Jesus from Heaven darted down upon a Perverse Persecuting *Saul*, while continuing in his Rage against the Church of God, *It is hard for thee to Kick against the Pricks.*

*Calcitrat in Stimulos quoties Furibundus Asellus,
Illæsis Stimulis, toties sua Vulnere sentit.*

Let us therefore look to our Exalted Triumphant Lord, who will Reign till all his Enemies are made his Footstool, and whose Truth will finally Triumph, and render Eternally Victorious all serious Asserters thereof. The Power is his, the Glory, and the Victory. Let us, together with pleading with our Mother, cry unto him, her Glorious Head and Husband, intreating, that he arise and plead his own Cause, and hasten, in its time, his Final Victory over the Detestable Antichristian Hierarchy, and when the Vial is poured out which will light upon the Seat of the Beast, and the Papacy it self is extinct, the Litigious Contentings for Prelatical Hierarchy will fall of course, and be at an end. We know 'tis now near (O very near!) the Dawning and Breaking up of the Eternal Day, and the Accomplishment of the Churches Warfare: Blessed therefore is that Servant, who shall be found Vigilant and Sedulous in the Lord's Work when he comes, delighting in the serious Study of Conformity unto him, rather than in tossing the Dust of Disputes and Debates. *Even so come Lord Jesus.*

1914
The American Medical Association
has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of
the report of the Committee on the
Organization of the Medical Profession
and to express its appreciation of the
care and attention given to the
subject by the members of the
Committee.

The Association is deeply indebted to the
Committee for the valuable
information and suggestions
contained in the report.

The Association is also indebted to the
members of the Committee for the
valuable information and suggestions
contained in the report.

The Association is also indebted to the
members of the Committee for the
valuable information and suggestions
contained in the report.

O R,

A Confutation of J. S's Vindication of the (pretended) Principles of the Cyprianic Age ; [Thos. Forrester]

Exposing his Fruitless Attempts upon *Presbyterian Government* therein, and his alike Fruitless Pleadings for the *Hierarchie* upon the same Ground, Dissolving also the Chief Sinews, and Overturning the Scope of that Voluminous Pamphlet ;

In Exhibiting a View of the Churches Defection in the *Third Age*, and the considerable Advances of the *Mystery of Iniquity* therein, and in Special with Respect to *Church-Government* ; Discovering also his Unsuccessful pleading, whether from the Practice of that *Age*, in point of *Episcopacy*, simply Considered, or the Reception thereof under the Notion of a Divine Institution ; Assigning signal Differences betwixt the *Cyprianic Bishop* pleaded for by this Pamphleter, and the truly *Apostolick Bishop* Represented in Scripture: His Impeaching the Doctrine of the Reform'd Churches, in the Scope and Series of his Pleading, evidently made Appear ; As also, his Declining the true State of this Controversie : His several Attacks upon the Rev. Mr. Rule, and the Author of *The Hierarchical Bishops Claim*, Repell'd : Unsound and Inconsistent Principles in the whole detected ; Besides several other Things tending to clear the Truth in this Debate, Advanc'd.

To which is Annex'd an *APPENDIX* containing a Scripture Assertion of *Presbyterian* Principles, both in Point of Government and Worship.

Ezek. 20. 18. But I said unto their Children in the Wilderness, Walk you not in the Statutes of your Fathers, neither Observe their Judgments, nor Defile your selves with their Idols v. 19. I am the Lord your God : walk in my Statutes, keep my Judgments, and do them.
Ephes 2. 20. And are built upon the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner stone :

Auferantur illa de medio quæ adversus nos invicem non ex Divinis Canonicis Libris, sed aliunde recitantur, quia nolo humanis Documentis, sed Divinis Oraculis Sanctam Ecclesiam demonstrari. Augustin. de Unit. Eccl. cap. 3.
Si solus Christus est audiendus, non debemus attendere quid alius ante nos faciendum putaverat ; Sed quid qui ante omnes est Christus prior fecerit ; Non enim hominis consuetudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei veritatem. Cyprian, Epist. 63.



TO THE

Candid Intelligent Reader.

AS the State and Condition of the Church of GOD is in Time still Militant, and that against Enemies without and within, who act against her under various Disguises ; So none are more dangerous than such Enemies, as Malign and Oppose her Cause and Testimony, under the Pretence of Friendship, and appearing for her true Interest. 'Tis, no doubt, a great Demonstration of the Desperat Wickedness and Deceit of Man's Heart, that Truth has at all times been oppos'd by such as pretend to appear for it. The great Apostle of the Gentiles was thus Contradicted by such as Transformed themselves into Apostles of Christ, and impudently averr'd they were Appearing for GOD's Antient Institutions, against him and other Apostles as Innovators. Nay, our Blessed Saviour himself was by the Pharisees (these antient aspiring Rabbies) Oppos'd, as an Innovator and Transgressor of Moses's Law. And under this Covert of Advancing some Signal Truths, has Satan, in all Ages, Oppos'd the Divine Institutions, in that long Tract and Train of Mischievous Errors and Heresies broach'd against the Fundamental Truths of the Gospel : As that Prince of Darkeness is Transform'd into an Angel of Light, so he has infus'd his Transforming Subtilty into his Agents and Instruments.

And no doubt, it is a signal Piece of this Policy, that Antiquity and Prescription of Time, the Consent and Authority of Venerable Antients, has been made use of as an Argument to Oppose and Asperse GOD's Truth and Way : Hence our Lord had the Traditional Authority of the Antients Oppos'd unto his Doctrine and Disciples. His Followers were traduc'd as Ignorant of GOD's Antient Law and Statutes,

Statutes, and the Gospel Church had the Imputation of a New Sect put upon it. Thus Tradition and Antient Fathers (as a Learn'd Divine well observ'd) has proven an old Plea for Superstitious Inventions, although this Plea has been frequently expos'd, as by our Lord and his Apostles, in opposing the Holy Scriptures thereunto, so by the current of all the Orthodox, in all Ages, upon the same Ground.

And this, no doubt, hath in nothing more appear'd than in the present Debate about Church Government. It is a wonder to see, how Copious and Voluminous our Episcopal Pleaders are in their Allegations of the pretended Principles and Practice of the Antient Church in this Point, and how slender and slow in the true Scripture Debate; How Industrious in the Search and Collection of Humane Testimonies, to fetch therefrom some apparent Patronage to the Hierarchy, how slack and averse in Searching the lively Oracles, the true and first Antiquity, and thus from hearing the Voice and Testimony of GOD, of Christ the great Testator, the only Judge in this Debate. And sure, whatever has been the Popish Policy in this Point, 'tis strange and unaccountable Perverseness, that profess'd Protestants, pretending to Disown this Popish Method and Device, and to accord with us in this Principle, That the Spirit of GOD speaking in Scripture is the only Infallible Judge in Points of Religion, should, in an Evident Self-contradiction, Embark in this Design, and Plead in such a Method.

'Tis in this Case, no doubt, evident, that one Error and Snare is productive of, and leads into another. For, the sense of Texts brought against our Adversaries in this Debate, they will needs have to be Clear'd and Determin'd by the suppos'd Principles and Practice of the Antients; And however in plain Terms they are loath to speak it out, yet in the Series and Scope of their Pleading, it is written as with a Sun beam, whereof we have a clear Proof in the Acquittance and Practice of this Adversary with whom we deal.

He at first Assaulted the Rev. Mr. Rule with a Pamphlet anent the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with a Design to fasten upon him a Mistake anent an Assertion about the then existent Prelacy

(a Digladiation, no doubt, de lana caprina): Mr. Rule in his Review of this Pamphlet peremptorily told him, that he might have fallen into a Mistake in this point of Fact, and thereupon challeng'd him to a Scripture Dispute, Appealing unto the lively Oracles, as the only Rule, shewing him that the Antient Fathers themselves appeal'd to GOD speaking in his Word, as the only Judge in Points of Religion, disowning any other Judge or Rule in such Matters : And would not any ingenuous Person enquiring for Truth have Answered this Challenge ? But behold this pitiful Lucifugus presents a new Pamphlet of near 70 Sheets, and all to prove this great Point, forsooth, That there was real Episcopacy in the Third, or Cyprianic Age, yea, and in his vain glorious Humour, glorying in his shame, he is bold, on this very ground, to boast of an absolute Victory over all Presbyterians, and to have for ever silenc'd them and stop'd their Mouths. But he has besides the obvious folly of this his Method of Pleading generally considered, so lost his Labour, and, I may truly say, befool'd and confuted himself in his absurd and inconsistent Ramblings through the whole of this Pamphlet, as the very Reading may to any Intelligent Person discover it to be such a Farrago of Self-confuting Incongruities as may save the Labour of a direct and formal Confutation. I need not here anticipate the subsequent Discoveries, those especially made by the Learn'd Mr. Jameson; Only let the Reader take in view this short Touch and Specimen of the Man's Genius and mighty Acquittances in this Controversie.

1. He will needs set his pretended Cyprianic Bishop, a Pattern to all Reform'd Churches, yet in the Series of his Pleading has made him such a versatile Proteus, and speaks with such confus'd Uncertainty, yea and palpable Contradiction about the Nature of his Office and Power, as none can see the Pattern they are to Imitate.

Again, he will needs have the Cyprianic Bishop the same with our Scottish and English Prelacy, and professeth to intend this as his Scope in his whole Debate; Yet in his Description and Discourses anent the one and the other, he has fixed betwixt them so many and palpable Differences, as Blots his Pleading with Contradictions as palpable as were ever exemplified or extant in Print. Amongst many Instances, let

the Reader take this one in View. He sets all his Cyprianic Bishops on a Level, yea, and makes them absolute Cæsars in their District; whereas all do know, and himself acknowledges, that the present English Hierarchie is (as our late Scottish was) of such a Nature and Mould as therein the Bishops are Suffragans to the Archbishop, and he Subject to the Metropolitan.

In the Third Place, He will needs have the Cyprianic the same with the Apostolick Bishop, wherein he has in two Points put a foul Imputation upon the Apostles, 1. In Speaking so ambiguously, and giving no certain Character of this Bishop, he thus charges the Apostles Doctrine in this Point with as dark ambiguous Uncertainty as the Delphic Oracles; for (as is said) he makes this pretended Apostolic Bishop of such a Chimerical Changeling Shape and Colour, as he may either appear in the highest Sphere of Absolute Dominion, or Crumble and Descend into the lowest Step of a Mean Præses, with some small Imparity, even the very Atome of it. 2ly, As he has thus Impeach'd the Apostles Veracity in the Truth and Certainty of their Doctrine, in making it such an Ambiguous Mute, as is Instanced, so likeways their Authority, in making their Doctrine intirely Regulable by the Churches Practice; for (as is said) he presents the Practice of the Third Age as the great Rule and Standard for deciding the Debate anent the Apostles Doctrine in Point of Episcopacy, Suspending thus, both the Sense, and Authority thereof, upon this Practice.

Ineed not here further Anticipat the Discoveries of this Man's Inconsistent Folly, in Point of a Visible Principle of Church Unity ascrib'd by him to every Bishop within his Diocese or District; and how that thereby he hath clearly Embrac'd the Popish Notion, whereby Bellarmin and others do plead for such a Visible Principle of Unity, as competent to the Church Universal. Mr. Rule had sufficiently expos'd him in this Point, and his Endeavours to Extricate himself have more and more Entangl'd him, as Mr. Jameson has Luculently made appear. Nor need we here to notice his inconsistent Inadvertency, in his alledging against Presbyterians the Practice and Principles of the First Ages generally, whereas the profess'd Scope of his
Testimo-

Testimonies in the whole of his Arguing, is palpably Confined to the Cyprianic or Third Age.

To these, and several such like Discoveries of his Inconsistencies and Unsoundness, easily adducible, and more fully laid open in the ensuing Debate, I cannot but further add this convincing Instance of the Man's procacious Vanity. He appears a great Nomenclator of Writers, and would be thought vastly seen in all who have written in this Controversie; You shall find a vast Number of Writers on both Sides Recited, so that this vain Pleader would make us Believe, nothing has Escap'd his Search, but that he has Swallowed whole Libraries, yet notwithstanding this Vapour, he has not so much as Touch'd one Scripture Medium agitated by either Party in this Controversie. So that for any Thing this Man, in all this Voluminous Nothing, has Offered, or has Amounted to, Presbyterians have taken the Garland from his Hierarchic Pleaders in Point of the true Scripture Debate, and he has left his Episcopal Cause Groveling in the Dust.

To this Purpose his Inconsistent Folly further appears, in that he casts Supercilious Scorn upon his Antagonist, as a meer Novice, and not seen in Antiquity. He tells us that the R. Mr. Rule had not seen his Divus Cyprianus before he wrote at first against him, yea, and that he had not fully Read him thereafter. Besides he will needs exhibit a Specimen of T. F.'s Skill in Antiquity, and thinks he has sufficiently expos'd him in this Imputation. But is it not a far greater shame to him, to shew himself such an Ignoramus in the true Scripture Antiquity, that of all the Scripture Arguments pleaded for Presbyterian Government, which, if valid, entirely overthrow his Cyprianic Bishop, and condemn him as a Plant not of GOD's Plantation, and therefore to be Rooted up, he has not dar'd to Scan so much as one? Is it not a shameful Imputation he has brought himself under, that coming forth as an Olympic Invincible Champion against Presbyterians, and presenting so many Sheets upon this Controversie, he has never so much as stated the true Question, but made an Ignorant Fruitless Traverse, a long Days Journey out of the Limits and true Measures thereof? Did ever any but such a Person at Thrafo, or Therfites as J. S. pretend to have come off Victorious and Triumph'd in any Debate

bate and Controversie without so much as Offering the State thereof, yea or one Argument laying Level to the true Point Controverted? May I add, that his Boastings have so much of Banter Intermix'd, as justly Entitles him to Solomon's Character of the Fool, That he Rages and is Confident. But in the Issue it is evident that the Truth of GOD in this Point, against which this Railer hath made a wide Mouth, has Despis'd and Laugh'd him to Scorn.

As for this Appearance, the Reader may take this Account: I had upon the first View of this Pamphlet (which made a great Noise, and had no few Eugene's among our Episcopalians) written the greatest part of what is here Offer'd, but laid it aside, partly because I truly judg'd that this Performance of such a vain-glorious Trifler, made up of meer Traverses, out of the true State and Limits of this Controversie, would to the Judicious and Impartial appear to be amongst such Writings and Assaults of the Truth, quæ ipse exolescunt, worthy to be answered only by an unconcerned Silence; and partly because I was otherways, and, I doubt not, much better Employ'd in Prosecuting more important Studies; as also, because I understood that Mr. Jameson, who has now sufficiently Expos'd this Pamphleter, had undertaken a Review and Confutation thereof: And having now seen his Performance, tho' for my own part I judg it sufficient and Convincing, yet perceiving that the Method which he and I have Trac'd is somewhat divers, tho' tending to the same Scope as to the Main, and that what I have Offer'd in these Sheets may, through the Lord's Blessing, Influence a further Confirmation of the Truth of GOD against this Adversary, I have yielded to the Importunity of Friends in offering them to publick View. I doubt not, they will appear to the Judicious far from being so Polish'd both as to Matter and Stile as were desirable, yet since there are presented therein such Discoveries of Truth, as may tend to Confirm the sober and serious Enquirers, I am hopeful that to all such this Performance will be acceptable, and such of the Learn'd and Judicious as do own the Cause of GOD will, as to the Main, approve of this poor Endeavour, and pitie what Weakness and Infirmities do appear therein; Tho' the Truth

it self here Asserted is found, as is said, succesfully to Speak with the Enemy in the Gate.

I must here, together with Mr. Jameſon, to prevent the Miſtakes of J. S. or any other in this Appearance, ſhew the Reader, that I act upon no ſuch publick Injunſtion or Command, as J. S. had ſuppos'd the Rev. Mr. Rule to have acted from; Nor did I ever judg myſelf capable thereof; So that what Inadvertencies or Weakneſſes do appear in this Performance, and wherein the Cauſe or Truth of GOD may be in any Meaſure Obſcur'd or Wrong'd, it lyes at my Door al-lenarly; But the final Eternal Triumph of the Cauſe is certain.

I muſt alſo here Advertise the Reader, that partly through very ſore Bodily Pains and Sickneſs, wherewith it hath pleaſed the Holy One to exerciſe me, partly through my great Diſtance from the Preſs, being Indispos'd for ſuch a full Review and Collating of theſe Sheets, as were requiſite, there is a Repetition and apparent Coincidence of ſeveral Paſſages obvious in this Impreſſion, for Remedy whereof I had put Pen to Paper, and Endeavour'd a more Concife Account of ſuch Paſſages that they might have appear'd in ſomewhat better Dig'eſted Method, but the Haſte of the Preſs not at all admitting this Correſtion, I muſt leave them as they ſtand to the Judicious and Candid Reader's favourable Conſtruction and Acceptance upon this Apology, which I doubt not will Satisfy ſuch. As for the Cavillations of Adverſaries I value them not. Likewiſe I do not doubt that ordinary Readers may Reap ſome Advantage in having their Memory thus Reſreſh'd with ſuch Rehearſal and Recapitulation, as in a more ſevere Cenſure might be judg'd Superfluous. The Appendix, which I have Offer'd at the Cloſe, contains alſo ſomethings before Touch'd, but the Deſign thereof being to Reſent to ordinary Readers (for whoſe Advantage this is mainly, if not only, intended) a joyn't and intire View of Preſbyterian Principles, for this End 'tis judg'd more Expedient that the Representation be thus full, than if theſe Paſſages were paſſed over with a meer Reference; Beſides that it may be rationally preſum'd, that ſeveral Perſons will be inclin'd to read the Appendix, who will not have

so much Concern, or, may be, Leisure to read the Debate and Treatise premis'd. But if any shall judg otherways, I must again beg their Charitable Construction of this my Design.

I shall not any further Detain the Reader from the Perusal of what is here Offer'd to his Thoughts and Consideration, earnestly Wishing, that the Divine Presence and Blessing may attend all the serious Searchers for Truth, and any little Help this may Afford in such Worthy and Necessary Endeavours, may be thus shined upon; That the Lord may so effectually plead his own Cause, as the Enemies of Truth and Godliness may be more and more ashamed of their Opposition thereunto, and that the Great Shepherd of the Sheep, the Glorious Head and Saviour of the Body, that Eternal Truth, the Word and Wisdom of the Father, in whom are hid all the Treasures of Wisdom and Knowledge, and with whom is the Residue of the Spirit, may so Excite and Influence many Faithful Labourers in his Vineyard, and Asserters of his Truth, as the Mouths of Perverse Disputers may be stop'd, having found that the Shout of such a Glorious King is amongst His Servants, Friends and Followers, that He is a Wall of Fire about them, and the Glory in the midst of them, so that no Weapon form'd against them shall Prosper, every Tongue rising in Judgment against Him shall meet with a due Condemnation. This is the Hope of all the Prisoners of Hope, whereas the Expectation of the Wicked shall Perish.

CONTENTS

Of the Confutation of J. S's. Vindication of the (pretended) Principles of the Cyprianic Age.

CHAP. I.

Containing some Animadversions in Proof of the Unsoundness, and Inconsistency of his Principles and Reasoning.

THe Odd and Unaccountable Method of J. S's Arguing noted; That he is obliged, not only to Maintain *the Matter of Fact* in point of Episcopacy, but *the Jus* in point of Right.

Pages 1, 2

His Foolish Banter and Vanity, in pretending to Assault Mr. Rule, as a proclaim'd Champion of Presbytrie, noted.

2, 3

As also his inconsistent Folly, in pretending to plead for the Constitution of the Churches of the *first Ages*; His Dispute being confin'd to that of the *Cyprianic*.

3

He disowns the Scripture as the only Judge of Controversies.

4

His insolent Boldness in Charging *Notorious Falschood* upon Presbyterians, noted and Confuted.

4, 5

The *Altare Damascenum*, and our first Reformers Vindicated.

5

His Elogies of the third Age recited. Found for most part better applied to the Second; But beyond all Controversie, properly applicable to the First; And therein his inconsistent Folly noted.

6, 7

This clear'd at large, in the Application of all his Seven Instances to the first Apostolick Age; And his Concernment therein made appear, to have stated the Question upon the Principles and Practice of that Age.

Pages 7, 8, 9, 10, 11

His pretences, with respect to his Scope will prove the Churches Infallible and actual Retention of Divine Institutions, in opposition to Divine Records of her palpable Backsliding.

11, 12

His Pleading for *safe Handing down* of *Events by Tradition*, and Pleading for the Credibility thereof, from the certain Knowledge of our Reformation, made appear to be Foolish and Impertinent.

13

The Existence of Prelacy in the *Cyprianic* Age, well enough consistent with what we ascribe to the first Presidents.

13, 14

Our Reformers Address'd to the Queen Regent *Anno* 1557, vindicated from his Imputations.

14, 15, 16

His Foolish Quibble anent the *Sole Power*, and *Parity of Power*, canvass'd.

16, 17, 18

- Mr. Rule Vindicated in this Point. Page 18 proves from Cyprian's Ep. 40. Page 31
 As also in point of *Fabianus* as Ordaining Mr. Rule's large Animadversions upon it, to which J. S. can return no Answer. 31, 32
Novatianus a Presbyter. 18, 19
 Mr. Dodwell's Foolish Exposition of 1 Pet. His leaping over from Mr. Rule's p. 62, to p. 68. noted. *Ibid.*
 5. 2. noted. As also J. S's. high Elogie of 19 The Passage of *Cornelius* receiving Persons about whom he called the Presbytrie, without asking the Peoples consent, pertinently discontended upon by Mr. Rule, and J. S's. Cavils noted. 32, 33
 Mr Rule's Just Charge upon J. S. in beginning at the third, waving the first Age. 20 Mr. Rule's Reflections upon what J. S. had adduc'd anent Prelates prerogative in delegating their Power to some Presbyters, not to others, and particularly in the case of *Rogatianus*, and *Numidicus*, vindicated from his Cavils. 33, 34, 35
 His Assertion, That Episcopal Government was Instituted by Apostles, in duly constituted Churches, in part of the First, and through the Second and Third Centuries, Scann'd and Confuted. 20, 21 In these Cavils, J. S. is palpably Non-sensical, and in the Biars of Self-inconsistency 35, 36
 His Acknowledgement, That the Elders of *Ephesus* warn'd by the Apostle, Acts 20. 30. were not Diocesan Bishops, improven against him 22 His foolish Sarcastism in point of a Passage of *Eusebius* his suppos'd mentioning of *Sozomen*. noted. *Ibid.*
 His alleging, he Pleads not for the Sole Power of Bishops in Point of either Ordination or Jurisdiction, a Contradiction to what he clearly elsewhere asserts. 22, 23 His alleging Mr Rule's Appeal to *Cyprian* in point of Episcopal Debate, false and groundless. 37
 Mr Rule's Assertion anent the Fathers, sometimes overlash in their Expressions anent Schism, vindicated from J. S's Imputation. 23, 24 His groundless Censure of Mr. Rule in recommending Books. *Ibid.*
 Mr Rule's Inference upon J. S's Assertion of the Parity of all Bishops, vindicated. *Ibid.* J. S. Asserts, That the evincing of proper Prelacy in the Cyprianic Age, is a Foundation which being laid, he may have occasion to run it up to the Apostolick Constitution of Church Government, how impertinently at large made appear. 38, 39
 As likewise his two Testimonies from *Firmilian*. 25 J. S. Gives over the Convincing of his Antagonist, if this his Defence will not do it; Wherein his Inconsistency is made appear, in pretending to run up Episcopacy in the Cyprianic Age to the Source of an Apostolick Constitution. 39, 40
 His passing *Sicco pede* over several Testimonies of the Fathers Cited by Mr. Rule, 25, 26, 27 That several Writers for Presbyterian Government, acknowledge some Excessive Power of a Moderator to have crept in before the End of the first Centurie, impertinently alleg'd by J. S. As also the Acknowledgement that a Moderator was still judg'd Essential to Church Government *Ordinis causa*. 41, 42
Jerom's Testimonie in that Passage, *Alexandria à Marco Evangelista — Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum*, &c. Vindicated from J. S's Exceptions. 26, 27, 28 The absolute Parity of Pastors asserted by all Presbyterians. *Ibid.*
 Several Citations of the Fathers offer'd by Mr. Rule against the Prelates Sole Power of Ordination, pass'd over by J. S's. without a Reply. 28 A remarkable Passage of the Famous Mr. *Dickson* upon *Mat. 21. 25. 26.* in Point of the
 Mr. Rule's Instance of the Ordination of *Aurelius*. vindicated. 29
 As also his Citation from *Cyprian*, and his Assertion anent the Apostolick Canons. 30
 His Inference also, in point of Presbyters concurring with Bishops in Ordination, which is made good against J. S. 30, 31
 The Bishop's Power to settle Presbyters without consent of People or Clergy, J. S.

the constant Moderator.

pages 42, 43

J. S. Disowns his Pleading for the Sole Power of the Dioceſan Prelat, and therein has not touch'd Mr. Rule's State of the Controverſie.

Ibid.

That his Pleadings upon this Ground are meerly uſeleſs, as declining the Defence of the Authority aſſum'd by Prelates, and not amounting to prove the Cyprianic Biſhop to be our Dioceſan, made appear by ſome adduc'd Reaſons.

43, 44

The State of the Queſtion which he offers, *Whether the Church ſhould be Govern'd by Paſtors acting in Parity, having equal Power without the Superiority of one Paſtor over other Paſtors*, made appear to be, (1.) Imperfect, (2.) Obſcure. And (3.) Repugnant to his own Pleading.

44

His further Inconſiſtency noted.

44, 45

The Excluſion of Sole Power, pleads not for his State of the Queſtion, ſcil. Parity, or Imparity.

Ibid.

His further Inconſiſtency in this point noted

45, 46

His Impertinency and Weakneſs in Citation of Authors, made appear in ſeveral pregnant Inſtances.

46, 47, 48, 49

His dangerous and incoherent Principles in this Voluminous Pamphlet, convincingly made appear in many clear Inſtances.

49, 50, 51, 52

Mr. Rule's Inference upon his Explication of the Chief Power, viz. That it is much the ſame with Sole Power, in the Senſe of J. S. and that it hence follows, *That Presbyters muſt follow the Biſhops Light, ſince they cannot do except he pleaſe*, made appear to be ſolid, and J. S's Cavils thereupon Confuted.

52, 53

J. S's Inconſiſtency noted, in holding Cyprian not to plead for a Divine Right of Preſlacy, as having no occaſion, ſince no Man doubted of it, and yet pretending to offer a Summary of Cyprian's direct pleading for't.

53, 54, 55

He fooliſhly ſtrains the places of Cyprian and others adduced by him, to prove the Divine Right of the Biſhop's Office, as intended to prove an Office ſpecifically diſtinct from the Office of a Presbyter, and a Presbyter as ſubordinat by Divine Inſtitution.

55, 56

Some remarkable Teſtimonies adduc'd to evince the contrary, and that the Diſtinction betwixt Biſhop and Presbyter is held to be founded upon Eccleſiaſtick Conſtitution only, but no Divine Right.

57, 58, 59

This further clear'd from the Ancients dichotomizing Church-Officers, into Biſhops and Deacons, acknowledg'd by J. S. himſelf.

59, 60

A large Account and Recitation of J. S's groſs Contradiſtions in his Pleadings, from

Pag. 60, to 66

CHAP. II.

An Account of the Chriſtian Churches declining and Eclipse in point of Gospel Purity, and of the prevalent Errours of the chief Doctors in the Third Age, of Cyprian in ſpecial, as they are Represented by the Centuriators and others.

THE further the Church Advanced in Time from the Apoſtolick Age, the more Corruption ſhe contracted according to the Centuriators.

Page 66

The Errours of Origen firſt inſtanced. Several groſs Errours anent Chriſt's God-Head, his glorious Satisfaction, the Holy Ghoſt's Influence upon the Saints: the Creation of

the World and Period of it Recited.

page 67

Concerning Angels in General, and in Special their Fall, yea the Religious Invocation of Angels.

67, 68

Concerning the Fall of Angels, the Errours alſo of Juſtin, Clemens, and Methodius Recited.

Ibid.

Origen's dreadful Error, that the Devil may

may

may be saved in after future Ages, with several others Recited. page 68

His Error concerning Man's first Creation, together with *Proclus* and *Aglaophon*; as also his Error concerning Free-will and Original Sin. 69

Concerning Man's Ability to keep the whole Law, and Justification by legal works, *Pag.* 69, 70. As also of *Methodius*.

Concerning the Expiation of Sin by Punishments. Ibid.

The Doctors of this Age according to the Centuriators, in the point of Good-Works, departed from the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles, yea and signally depraved the Doctrine of Repentance. 71

Instances Exhibited, several gross Assertions of *Origen*, attributing our Deliverance from Sin to the merit of Works, asserting Conversion to be our own Work and Act; And that in our Humiliation we make Satisfaction to God. Ibid.

His Dreams concerning Baptism after this Life. 72

His Formula of the Invocation of Saints. Ibid.

The Historians ascribe to the Doctors of this Age, Errors concerning the Church, an instance given in *Origen*. 72, 73

Origen prefers Martyrdom to Baptism; His Erroneous depressing of Marriage, and extolling of Virginity: As also his gross Error in point of the Resurrection. Ibid.

His Errors concerning the place of Souls Departed, wherein the Historians reprehend scattered Hints and Seeds of Purgatory: As also in point of the last Judgment, the Happiness and Rewards of the Just, and Punishments of the Damned. 74, 75

The second Instance Exhibited is of *Tertullian*, and *Cyprian's* great Veneration for him, and owning him as his Master. 75

His Error concerning God, that he had a Body, Refuted by *Augustin*. Ibid.

His Error concerning Christ and the blessed Trinity, concerning the Holy Ghost, and concerning the Fall of Angels (the same with that of *Origen*) and anent the remanent freedom of Man's will after the Fall. 76, 77

Concerning Godly Persons procreated by

the Godly, the Saints of the Old Testament, that they were Righteous by the Law of Nature. page 77. As also his gross Errors in point of Repentance.

His gross Errors concerning Baptism and the Eucharist. 78

Concerning the *Roman* Primacy, concerning Baptism, Marriage. 78, 79

His ascribing Merit to several things indifferent; Ascribing also to the Blessed before the Resurrection, that they are in a place only above Hell. His Error concerning the Voluptuous Life of the Godly upon Earth for a thousand years. Ibid.

The Centuriators Offer an Abridgment of his Errors, de *Tertulliani* *Navis*: As also of *Dionysius*. Ibid.

The third Instance, and which is in stead of many against *J. S.* is that of *Cyprian*, the Historians relate his gross Errors. He holds that Christ satisfied only for Original Sin, and we our selves for Actual; In the point of our Lord's Names of Jesus and Christ, he imbraces the Heresie of *Marcus* and the *Colarbasii*. 80

His Errors concerning the Creation, the Fall of Angels, the power of Free-will, (wherein he followed his Erroneous Master) the possibility of fulfilling the Law. Ibid.

His Errors concerning Satisfaction for our Sin by Repentance. *Pag.* 81. And the Error also of *Tertullian*, & by the Centuriators, imputed to most Writers of this Age. Ibid.

He affirms that Eternal Punishments succeeded not to the Temporal of the *Sodomites*, in express contradiction to the Apostle *Jude*, who shews that these *Sodomites* suffer the vengeance of eternal Fire, Ibid.

His Errors concerning Baptism, the Sacrifice and Eucharist, the Invocation of Saints. 81, 82

The Centuriators impute also an Error in this point of the Invocation, &c. to the other Doctors of this Age. Ibid.

His Errors concerning the Church, & the *Roman* Primacy; Concerning Martyrdom, that Immortality is purchased by it: As also concerning Marriage and Virginity. 82, 83

His Homologating the foulsome Popish Error, concerning Commands and Councils of *Perfection*. *Ibid.* As also his Error concerning

ning Repentance.

Abrahamus Scultetus a famed Episcopal Divine, imputes to *Cyprian*, in his Book Entituled *Medulla Theologia Patrum*, a considerable number of gross Errors, to the num-

ber of Thirteen, Recited pages 84, 85
A summary Account of the many gross Errors prevalent in the first Ages, as Represented by the Centuriators. 86

C H A P. III.

Wherein is demonstrated and made appear the Absurd and Fruitless Endeavour of this Pamphleter, to prove, from the Writings or Practice of Cyprian, or the Contemporaries alledged by him, an Universal Reception of the Diocesan Form and Mould of Church Government, in the whole Christian Churches through the World.

THat the Undertaker of such a Work, or Design, must have an exact Knowledge of the State and Government of all Churches planted and propagated in that Age, and accordingly Exhibit Authentick Records hereanent.

An Account of the large Spread of the Christian Church in that Age; And first through *Asia*, pag 87, 88. As Represented by *Eusebius* and *Vincentius*.

In *Africk*.

88, 89

In *Europe*.

89, 90

That it is incumbent upon this Pamphleter, to prove such a Prelacy Existing in all these Churches, as is commensurated to the whole Extent of his Description of the *Cyprianic* Bishop, which is Exhibited 90, 91

The Admission of a Diocesan Prelacy in the Church, over which *Cyprian*, and others mentioned in his Epistles did preside, is absolutely short of proving this Universal Reception in all the Churches. This made good by Reasons.

Ibid.

Mr. *Clarkson's* Description of the primitive Episcopacy, stands in Terms of contradiction to such an Assertion, especially in point of his described Multiplicity of Bishops.

91, 92

As also upon ground of the many important Duties Bishops are found obliged to perform to their Flocks personally and immediately, invincibly demonstrating they could not be Diocesans.

93, 94

Whereof seven Instances are Exhibited.

That there were Christian Churches settled in places of the World, page 94
whereof hath not come to our Times or Ears, far less publick Tables of Succession of Bishops or Pastors, invincibly overthrows *J. S's* Scope and Hypothesis.

Ibid.

This Improven in several subordinat Arguments.

94, 95

J. S's Hypothesis further overthrown by exhibited Instances, during this Age, or before it, of *Existent Apostolick Churches without Diocesan Bishops*.

96

The first Instance Exhibited in the Church of *Scotland*, which is cleared in point of History, in several considerations. 96, 97, 98

The Opposition of Diocesan Prelates to the rising Light of the Reformation, noted.

99

Their Influence upon the corruption of our Doctrine, and Government, and Worship of this Church.

Ibid.

A pregnant Testimony of Doctor *Burnet* in his *Memoirs* of the Dukes of *Hamilton* Exhibited to this Scope.

Ibid.

The Instance Exhibited of the Church of *Alexandria*, of the Churches in *Africk*, and several other Churches.

100, 101, 102

Instances of this nature in the beginning of the Fourth Age, and this point further cleared from the Multiplicity of Bishops, and the smallness of their Charge or Pa-

[† †]

roches

roches, whereof Instances are Exhibited of Paroches, and that according to Ignatius, from History. page 102

A Remarkable Instance of the Gothic Churches, planted and constituted for a long time without a Bishop, and of Carthage rejecting a Bishop when offered. 101, 102

Also the Instance Exhibited of the Church of Antioch, thus by Doctor Burnet's Observation on the first Apostolick Canon, who owns the first Bishops to be meer Pastors

The Objection, That some of the Instances adduced, are without the Limits of the Cyprianick Age, Answered: And the Answer confirmed by Bishop Burnet's instanced Assertion, and fortified by the Testimonies of Bishop Morton, Bishop Jewel, Stillingfleet, &c. 103

C H A P. IV.

Wherein is made appear that the Existence of Episcopal Government in the Cyprianic or Third Age, tho' supposed, is absolutely short of proving either a Divine or Apostolick Right, and the Obligation of the Gospel Churches, to be conformed to that Episcopal Pattern. Wherein is also made appear, that J. S. is involv'd in Unextricable Absurdities, whether he argue from the Principles and Practice of the Third Age, simply and absolutely considered; Or from the Reception of Episcopal Government therein, under the Notion of an Apostolical or Divine Right. This Pamphleter's absurd Extension of Episcopal Jurisdiction, and Depression of the Pastoral Office is noted. The Difference also is stated in several Instances, betwixt the Cyprianic Bishop described by him, and the truly Apostolick and Scripture Bishop. 'Tis also made appear that he hath Impeached the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches in two signal Points, scil. The Perfection of the Scripture, and Fallibility of the Church.

S E C T. I.

Wherein is Evinc'd J. S's absurd Arguing, Whether from the meer Practice of the Church, or the Reception of Prelacie, under the Notion of Apostolical Right; And that either, or both Grounds are utterly Unserviceable, to Support his Conclusion, and the Scope intended by him.

THat the Scope intended by J. S. in this Pamphlet is to prove a Divine Right of Prelacy, a Consequence clearly drawn from the Title Page, and other Passages of his Pamphlet: Hence it is made appear, that if he disown this, his Design is unacceptable and Nonsensical.

The Sum and Scope of his Arguing reduc'd to a Syllogism; The Major Proposition thus Represented, *If in the Third or Cyprianic Age, the Episcopal Government did obtain, and was received in all the Churches, as delivered from the Apostles, or of Apostolick Origin, then it is to be Received, and acknowledged*

ledged in all the Churches of Christ as a Divine Right. The Minor, But this Government was thus Universally received, &c. Ergo, &c. Page 105

The Minor Proposition being in the former Chapter discussed, here the Major is denied and Impugned; And first, Upon the Hypothesis of his Arguing from the meer Practice of the Church, *Ibidem*. His Arguing, if suppos'd upon this Hypothesis, impugned by several important Grounds. 106, 107, &c.

Viz. That this will make the Churches Practice our Rule in every Controversie *Ibid*

That thus, he will Contradict himself and his fellow Pleaders 108, 109

That upon the Hypothesis that Presbyterian Scripture Arguments are Sound, yea are offered, he appears a Lucifugus from Scripture Light in opposing the Churches meer Practice thereunto. 109

Yea, and obliges himself to own the Errors abounding in these Ages. 109, 110

The Objection taken from the Distinction in point of Extent, betwixt the Reception of these Errors, and that of Episcopal Government, Answer'd. *Ibid.*

An anticipating Objection, *That he Pleads not this Reception, or Practice, simply, but as flowing from Apostolick Institution*, Answer'd and Overthrown by several Grounds. 111

A Distinction of Doctor Monro, touching the Errors of the Fathers in point of Doctrine, and their Delivering to Posterity what is False in point of Fact, Scann'd and Overthrown by several Grounds. 112, 113

The other Branch of the Dilemma, that he Argues not meerly from the suppos'd Practice of the Third Century, but the Conformitie thereof to the Divine Pattern, Prosecuted. 113

Several Grounds adduc'd to Overthrow his Pleading upon this Ground, and the preceeding Arguments further improv'd. 114, 115, 116

His Inconsistency and declining the true Debate, and state of the Question with Mr. Rule made thus further appear. Page 116

That he appears thus, a pitiful Pleader upon *Humane Conjectures*, while standing mute to *Scripture Arguments* brought to Overthrow them, Illustrated and Confirm'd by a Similitude. 116, 117

This Confirm'd by a remarkable Testimony of *Sullingsfleet*, who derides a pretence of Pleading a *Jus Divinum* in point of Prelacy, when Men leave the Scriptures. *Ibidem*.

He Argues against this Pleading from Antiquity, and the Humane Practice of the Church, 1. From the Defectiveness. 2. The Ambiguity. 3. The Partiality. 4. The Repugnance of the Records of Succeeding Ages, which should inform us what the Apostolick Practice was. 118

His three Grounds adduc'd upon the point of Ambiguity. *Ibid.*

The Argument adduc'd upon this Head by *J. S.* *viz.* That the *Cyprianic* Bishop may be Traced by Succession from the Apostles, expos'd upon several important Grounds. 118, 119, 120

This pretence and Argument nought in the Sense of Famous English Divines, such as *Doctor Raynold's*, *Bishop Jewel*, *Whitaker*, who hold the Identity of *Bishop and Presbyter*, and make appear this to be own'd by the Current of all the Antient Fathers. 120, 121

The impossible task assign'd to *J. S.* in order to the Proof of a deriv'd Succession of his Diocesan Prelate from the Apostles, *scil:* that this must be perform'd, 1. By united and Harmonious Testimonies. *Secondly*, He must prove, that whatever the Antients spoke of Bishops, is intended of his Hierarchical Diocesan Bishop. *Thirdly*, That these Diocesans came by an uninterrupted Line from the Apostles. 122

S E C T. II.

The Scripture Account of the Myſterie of Iniquity working in the times of the Apoſtles, improv'd to the ſame Scope, with the preceeding Grounds.

That Presbyterian Divines Plead this Argument againſt Prelacy, acknowledged by J S. *Page 123* Several Conſiderations drawn from the premis'd Scriptures further to clear this Point. *126, 127*

That this Myſtery is that of the papal Primacy, and that the Seeds and Foundations thereof were laid, yea, and Acting in the Apoſtles times, clear'd from ſeveral Scriptures. *123, 124* In Special, it appears that this Myſtery of Iniquity behoved to be well Advanc'd in the Third or Cyprianic Age. *127*

The Senſe and Interpretation of Proteſtant Divines in this Point. *124, 125* That this Myſtery of Iniquity, this Acting growing Monſter, in the Senſe of Proteſtant Divines, hath a ſpecial reſpect to the Government of the Church. *127, 128*

S E C T. III.

The Churches Doctrine and Worſhip, being corrupted conſiderably in the Third Age, the Application is made of this Apoſtacy accounted for, unto the Seeds ſown of Antichriſtian Apoſtacy in that Age, and in Special, it is made appear, that the True Apoſtolick Church Government was ſignally deprav'd therein.

A Limitation and Caution prefix'd, that there were Seeds ſown of Antichriſtian Errours in that Age, though not of ſo full a Growth and Extenſion, as after appear'd. *Page 128* Monack Superſtitious vows of ſingle life, and the Popiſh Diſtinctions of Counſels of Perfection, beyond the Ordinary Rule of Commanded Obedience, inſtanc'd in Cyprian himſelf *Pages 131, 132*

The Firſt Inſtance given in the Point of the Popiſh fundamental Error of Juſtification by Good Works, Inſtanc'd in the Aſſertions of Origen and Tertullian. *Ibidem,* The Seventh and Eighth, in point of the Popiſh Doctrine of Purgatory and Invocation of Saints, the Seeds whereof made appear to be apparent in this Age. *132, 133*

That Origen holds the Apoſtle Paul to Exclude from Juſtification Works of the Law, intending the Law Ceremonial, not Moral, Homologating thus the Popiſh Diſtinction. *Ibidem.* IXly. ſeveral Popiſh Errours alſo touching Baptiſm, were ſpringing up in this Age, *Ibid.*

The Second Inſtance in the Point of the Doctrine of Free-Will, the ſignal Pillar of the Popiſh Doctrine of Merits, Inſtanc'd in Tertullian, Cyprian. *129, 130* The Tenth and Eleventh Inſtances in Point of the Euchariſt, and the Number of Sacraments. *134*

The Third and Fourth Inſtances in Point of the Tutelary Angels, and the Popiſh vilifying and Diſparaging of Marriage. *Ibid.* This laſt Inſtance fortified by J S's Confeſſion, yea, bold Affirmation in point of the Sacrament of Confirmation as diſtinct from Baptiſm. *Ibid.*

The fifth and ſixth Inſtances in point of The Exhibited Inſtances do include the begun Corruption in Point of Worſhip, thereupon a Tranſition made to the Seed ſown of

of Antichristian Dominion in point of Government. *page 135*

The first Instance in the point of the Primacy of the Roman Church. *135, 136*

A Caution as to Limitations and Distinctions made use of by some of the Orthodox, to defend the more innocent Intention of these Fathers in this point. *Ibid.*

That this doth no whit Impeach the Scope of the Instances adduced, made appear, and even from the Pleadings of J. S. *Ibid.*

This further cleared from the hinted gross Ignorance of the Fathers in point of the Mystery of Iniquity. *136, 137*

A second Instance, and thereby an Argument *ad hominem* offered against J. S. from that Absolute, Unrestricted, Arbitrary Power and Dominion in the House of God, and over Pastors ascribed by him to the Cyprianic Bishop. *Ibid.*

This fortified first by the Scripture prohibitions of unlawful Dominion, and condemning Preheminence and Lordship in any Church Officers. *Ib.*

Next, the Charge instructed against J. S. in point of Fact, in four important Instances of this Dominion ascribed by him to the Hierarchical Prelat. *137, 138, 139*

A modest Ironie in noticing J. S.'s asserting no Superior to Prelats on Earth, thus exceeding One Superior in Heaven. *Ibid.*

His pitiful Inadvertency noted in this Extension of the Prelats Power, *First*, in fastening a Rebuke upon our late Scottish Prelats, who were declared Accountable to his Majesty, as their Head and Lord in all Ecclesiastical Administrations. *Secondly*, In setting such Unaccountableness upon every Mitre, he has dissolv'd the Frame and Union both of the English and Scottish Hierarchy. *page 139*
The Objection that he speaks of Prelats within their District, Answered. *139, 140*
J. S.'s pretence of Prelats Succession to Apostles in *this their paramount Power*, improv'd to this Scope against him. *140, 141*

This principal pretence Impugned from several Grounds; Such as 1. The Authoritative Denomination of Pastors Exhibited in Scripture. 2. The Exercise of their Essential Authority therein Exemplified, *pages 142, 143.* 3ly. From the notable Instance of the Authority in point of Excommunication ascribed to the Presbyters and Pastors of the Church of Corinth, *1 Cor. 5.* *143*

A Syllogism from the whole offered to J. S. *144*

Doctor Burnet present Bishop of Salisbury his ingenuous Confession anent the Authority of Pastors in Government, which cuts the Sinews of J. S.'s Pleadings for the Hierarchical Bishops Authority in this Pamphlet. *144, 145.*

S E C T IV,

The Argument taken from the Mystery of Iniquity, Acting and Working since the Apostles times, until the Antichrist arose to his full Power, further improv'd against J. S. from an Instituted Comparison betwixt his Hierarchical Prelat, and the Apostolick Bishop, the same with the Pastor, evincing in Ten or Eleven Instances, the Opposition of the one to the other.

THe first Instance of the Opposition and Difference is in point of Inauguration and Election of the Apostolick Bishop by the Presbytery and the people; The Cyprianic not so.

The Second Instance, that the Apostolick Bishop is described with a special respect to the people and Flock, whom he is to

feed Actually and Immediately, whereas the Cyprianic Bishop is Pastor *Passorum*, and has no personal inspection over any Flock, understanding the Cyprianic Bishop, in the Exercise of that Dominion ascribed to him by J. S. to be one and the same with our Hierarchical, English and Scottish Prelats. *146,*

147.
The

[+ + +]

The Third Instance respects in special the *Architeſtonic, Nomothetic, and Deſpotick Power* and Dominion aſcribed by J. S. to the *Cyprianic* Biſhop, and made appear to be contrary to the Scripture pages 147, 148

The Fourth Instance, that the Apoſtolick Biſhop had adjoyned to him in Government the Ruling Elder: The Warrants of his Office cleared from Scripture. The *Cyprianic* Biſhop diſowns this Officer. 149, 150, 151

The Fifth Instance, that the Apoſtolick Biſhop in Eccleſiaſtick Courts and Judicatories, Exercised only the Paſtors part in Government concurring in Conſultation and Deciſive Votes: The Hierarchical Biſhop own'd no ſuch Concurrence and Authority of fellow Paſtors. 151, 152, 153

The Sixth Instance, the Apoſtle *Paul's* Biſhop is one Name and Thing with the Paſtor. The *Cyprianic* is diſtinct both in Name and Office, and pretended correspondent Duties. 153, 154

The Seventh Instance, the *Cyprianic* Biſhop owns Ordination of Paſtors to be his Incommunicable Prerogative, & is Inaugurated by Prelats of the ſame paramount Authority with himſelf. The Apoſtolick Biſhop owns Ordination to be competent to a Presbytery. Ibid.

The Eighth Instance, the Apoſtolick Biſhop owns the Preaching of the Goſpel to be his main Work, and the official Actings therein, to be above that of Ruling. The *Cyprianic* Biſhops Work and Office ſtands in Ruling, as diſtinct from, and Supereminent to the Paſtoral Teaching Office. 154, 155

The Ninth Instance, the *Cyprianic* Biſhop obtruded by J. S. pretends to Succeed the Apoſtles in his Supreme, Singular, Eccleſiaſtick Authority over Paſtors, in this Oppoſite to the Scripture Biſhop. 155

The Tenth Instance, the Scripture Biſhop is ſubject to the Judicial Cogniſance of his fellow Teachers, or Prophets, both as to his Life and Doctrines. The *Cyprianic* Biſhop of J. S's Character, hath a Peerleſs, Supreme, Singular, Unconſequential Authority over all Paſtors of the Dioceſe. 156.

A Suppoſition made of a Prelate with ſuch pretended Power over the Conſiſtorial Meetings of Prophets coming to *Corinth*, and the Caſe repreſented to the Apoſtle *Paul*, and thereupon an Inquiry made, *what his Deciſion of the Queſtion would have been*; Whether, if we believe his Doctrines, he would not have condemn'd him as an arrant Uſurper? page 156

J. S's Reflections challeng'd upon the premis'd Account of the Third Age, with a Re-capitulation of his Elogies thereof, and in point of Fact a renewed Diſcovery is made how the Advantages and Grounds of Integrity aſſigned by him, reach'd his Concluſion of their *exact Conformity to the Divine Rule*, and in ſpecial in point of Church Government. 156, 157, 158, 159

An Inference thereupon, that J. S. muſt either Impeach the genuine Senſe of Scriptures adduc'd, making it regulable by the Principles and Practice of the Third Age, (overthrowing thus the Scriptures Authority and Infallibility) or acknowledge the Inſufficiency of his pretended Characters of that Age, to reach his Concluſion of the ſuppos'd Integrity thereof in point of Government, conſequently the unſoundneſs of his whole Pamphlet. 159, 160

Finally, The Scripture Biſhop's Power is Spiritual, abſolutely excluſive of Civil Rule. The Prelats whom J. S. pleads for not ſo, they being Spiritual Lords and Peers in Parliament. 160

This Instance enforc'd from the Senſe of the Antients and *Cyprian* himſelf, in this point. 161, 162

The whole Sum'd up in a Queſtion, whether we ſhall obtemper and liſten to *Paul*, and other Apoſtles Deſcription of the Biſhop, or J. S's Accounts of the *Cyprianic* Biſhop. *Ibid.* To which another is added, Whether J. S. has not, in preſenting for a Pattern to the Churches, in ſtead of the truly Divine Biſhop, a Prelat of ſuch a monſtrous Shape, prov'd himſelf an ignorant Impoſtor. 162, 163

S E C T. V.

Wherein is made appear, that J. S. has, in this Pamphlet, oppos'd himself unto the Doctrine of the Reform'd Churches, in two Eminent Points of the Orthodox Faith, scil. The Fallibility of the Church in any Age after the times of the Apostles, and the Perfection of the Holy Scriptures, in all things to be Believed and Practis'd in point of Religion.

THE Churches Infallibility in any Age after the Apostles, disown'd by our Confession of Faith, and that J. S. ascribes an Infallibility to the Third Age.

pages 163, 164
An important Testimony of Turretin to this purpose, wherein this Truth is asserted and fortified by solid Grounds, drawn from the Holy Scriptures, and confirmed by the Judgment of the Orthodox in point of Antiquity, against the Popish Adversary. 164, 165, 166

And by a special Testimony of Cyprian.

Ibid.
J. S. Is found to accord with Bellarmine and other Popish Agents, in this Pleading, clear'd in a signal Instance. 167

Some pregnant Testimonies of Famous Protestant Divines on this Head, drawn out and improv'd against J. S. such as, Doctor Strang, who reasons this point from Scripture and Antiquity, *The University of Saumer, Professors of Leiden, Marefius, Rivetus, Chamierus.* 167, 168, 169, 170

An Application made upon these Testimonies, in opposition to J. S's Principles, and that the Fictitious Ground of the Churches Infallibility, is the Basis and Foundation of his whole Arguing, made appear in several Assertions drawn from his whole Pamphlet, in special the Epilogue thereof. 170, 171, 172, 173, 174

His unaccountable petulant Confidence noted, in challenging all Presbyterians to *Weigh all their Arguments again (not excepting Scripture Arguments) and confess them very Light,* when compar'd with the Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic Age. *Ibid.*

His Treasonable and Seditious Accusation of our Parliament, and Civil Rulers, as *pursuing only Temporal Interests and unaccount-*

able Humours, in subserviency to worldly Politicks in the present Establishment of our Church, noted.

page 174
The next uncontrovertible point of Truth own'd by the Reformed Churches Impeach'd by J. S. is the Perfection of the Holy Scriptures; This made appear. 174, 175

Protestant Divines do reject the Universal Practice of whatever Age after the Apostles, as a part of the Canon and Authentick Rule in point of Religion. *Ibid.*

The Scripture, or Rule of Religion, Written, and Unwritten, a Popish Distinction and Stratagem borrow'd from the superstitious Jews. 175, 176

That J. S. deals thus in this Controverfie in pleading Unwritten Conjectures and Oral Traditions, as from Apostles, clear'd from the Series and Scope of his Arguing. *Ibid.*

He homologats the Popish Traditions by Oral Conveyance; As likewise the Jews Oral Conveyance of the Unwritten Law to their Talmud. This made appear in his foolish Instance of three Men attaining to such and such an Age, from the time of the Apostle John, until the year 248; *Ibid.*

His Instance of Polycarp confuted. Likewise the Instance of Irenaeus, asserting he had by word of mouth from such, as had it immediately from the Apostle John, That our Saviour liv'd in the World, above 50 years, adduc'd to baffle his Hypothesis. 177

His Hypothesis further confuted and expos'd, and this Oral Tradition Manger frighted with a Gorgon's Head, by the instanced contradictory Oral Traditions, in the point of the Celebration of Easter, one pretended from the Apostle John, that it was to be Celebrated on the 14 day of the Moneth, the other from the Apostle Peter, that it was to be

be Celebrated on the day of Christ's Resurrection. Page 178

Several Superstitious Practices Instanced, flowing from this pretended Ground. *Ibid.*

The Scripture Proofs, and Testimonies of the Fathers, in point of the Perfection of the Canon. 178, 179, 180

A remarkable Testimonie of the Professors of *Leyden* to this purpose, adduc'd and improv'd. 181, 182.

Universal Reception of a Principle, or Practice by the Church, the Proximity of an Age to the Apostolick pretence of Succession from Apostles, when *Personal*, not *Doctrinal*, unsound and fallacious Grounds of Perswasion in point of Religion. *Ibid.*

That the Church may be deceiv'd by her Doctors, that the Mystery of Iniquity was working in the Apostles times, that during Antichrist's prevalent Reign, the World Wonders after the Beast, Scripture truths improv'd by the Professors (as by the Current of Protestant Divines) against the Popish Marks of the Church taken from, *Antiquity*, *Succession*, *Name of Catholick*, &c. *Ibid.*

Testimonies of *Turretin* and *Rivet* to this Scope, fortified by Scripture, and the Assertions of the Fathers. 182, 183

A Notable Testimonie of *Clement Alexandrinus*, together with Conclusions drawn therefrom, and in several Points improv'd against *J. S.*'s Pleadings. Pages 184, 185

The *Helvetick* Confession upon this Head, and several Articles improv'd also, in some Deductions against *J. S.* 185, 186

As likewise the *Scottish* and *English* Confession. 186

The Confessions of *Saxony*, of *Wittenberg*, in the same manner improv'd against him, with Inferences drawn therefrom. 187, 188

These Testimonies fortified by the Authority of the Antients, such as *Chrysostom*, *Augustin*, of *Jerom* in special, who holds that, *Mens talk in divine things without Scripture is meer Babling*; Putting thus the Imputation of Banter and Babling upon *J. S.*'s Pamphlet. 188

The Confession of *Bohem*, added to the preceeding, and *J. S.*'s Censure of *Dr. Stillingfleet* noted. 189

A notable Testimonie of *Augustin*, who would not have his own Writings, or those of *Ambrose* to be otherwise receiv'd, than as they agree with Scripture. *Ibid.*

S E C T. VI.

The Antiscriptural Method of J. S. in his Pleading, further Illustrated from the Scriptures, giving a full and distinct Sound in the Point of Church Government, and Establishing Presbyterian Government in special.

That *J. S.* owns this Principle in these, *scil.* the Sacred Scriptures determining the Species of Church Government, and particularly Authorizes *Episcopacy*, fastens a foul Blot upon him, in pleading for it from meer humane Testimonies and Practice, without the least hint of a Scripture Warrant. Pages 189, 190

That the Scripture must needs have presented an entire Scheme of Church Government Demonstrated, from several important

Grounds, such as (1) The Exercise of Christ's Kingly Office, as Political Head of his Church. (2) The Perfection of his Testament Seal'd with his Blood. (3) The necessary interposing of his Authority, for the lawful Exercise of all Church Offices, & the Blessing thereof. Pages 190, 191, 192

The Scripture is full and clear in the Enumeration of all Substantials of Government, evinc'd in several Testimonies, applied unto all these Substantials. 192

As

As also, it is clear and distinct in general Rules, respecting the Circumstantialis of Government. An Enumeration of these Rules exhibited. *Page 193*

The Scripture also points out a clear Plat-form of Presbyterian Government, Condemning thus J. S's Pamphlet. (1) All the Ordinances we owne, are represented to us in Scripture. (2) All the Officers. (3) The Judicatories, such as (1) The Congregational Eldership, which is made appear from several Scripture Grounds (2) The Presbyterian Church, consisting of Officers of divers Congregations (3) Synods of a Superiour Degree of Authority to Presbyteries, and by Parity of Reason, National Assemblies in a National Church. All these clear'd from Scripture and Divine Reason, *Pages 194, 195, 196*
 Confestaries drawn therefrom, and offer'd to J. S's. consideration. *196, 197*

C H A P. V.

Wherein are Examined J. S's Attacks upon the Author of the Treatise Entitled, Rectius Instruendum, and of the other Entitled, The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim to a Divine Right, &c. Offering an Answer to his Criticisms, and Accusation anent that Author's pretended Incongruous Citations of the Fathers, in the Tractat last mention'd, especially; Refusing also his Charge anent the Mis-stating of the Question, and bringing likewise unto the Touchstone of the Solid Principles of Logick, his two Syllogisms which he vainly Offers to the two Principals upon the Point of the Ruling Elders Office; Discovering clearly, upon the whole, his Unsoundness, Ignorance, and Self-Contradiction.

S E C T. I.

The Citations of the Fathers, Defended from J. S's Cavillations, and the Impertinency of this Charge made appear.

His first Attack upon the Citation of *Clemens*. Some Considerations offer'd to shew the Impertinency of his Charge anent the Citations, in general. *Pages 198, 199*
 This Cavillation particularly Consider'd, and Refuted. *Ibid.*
 His Cavillation upon the Authors Assertion anent *Hegesippus*, as also anent a Citation of *Ambrose*, Refuted. *199, 200*
 His gross Ignorance of *Jerom's* Writings in his Cavillation upon a certain Citation of *Jerom*, made appear. *201*
 The same Ignorance made appear in his Censure of a Citation of *Rufin's* History. *Pages 201, 202*
 His Criticism anent a Citation of *Gratian*, refuted. *Ibid.*
 As likewise upon an Assertion of that Author anent the Distinction of the Clergy and Laity. *202, 203*
 His Criticism upon the Authors Assertion, That *Cyprian* own'd Presbyters as Collegues, consider'd. *203, 204*
 That *Cyprian* resolv'd not to Act without the Clergy made good, and J. S's Cavillations repell'd. *204*

[+ + + +]

His

His Foolish Cavil, and Gloss upon the Word *Statui*, in that Sentence of *Cyprian* — *a primordio Episcopatus mei statuerimus sine consilio vestro & sine consensu plebis mee privata sententia gerere. Scil.* That it imports only a voluntary Resolution, but no Official Obligation, repell'd. Pages 204, 205

This Confutation confirm'd by an adduc'd Passage, in *Synodo ad Quercum, Ann.* 403, by *Can. 20. Con. Carth. 4.* by the Testimonie of *Dr. Forbes* in his *Irenicum*. 205

Pastors Essential Interest in Government, that Author had clear'd by several other Testimonies, to which *J. S.* could make no Return. 205, 206

A Notable Testimonie of *Jerom*, anent the Scripture Identitie of *Bishop and Presbyter*, adduc'd. The Author hath consider'd six Exceptions of *Dr. Scott* thereunto, which *J. S.* Offers not to touch. 206, 207

Likewise, two notable Testimonies of *Augustin* and *Chrysostom* to this Scope, to

which *J. S.* has given no Return. Page 207 The Author also had Examind at large, *Dr. Scott's* Citations from the Epistles of *Ignatius*, and discover'd the Unsoundness of his Inferences therefrom. 207, 208

He had also Demonstrated in Twelve Instances, the Difference betwixt our *Scottish* Hierarchie, and the Episcopacie, which first obtain'd in the Churches, to all which *J. S.* return'd no Answer. *Ibid.*

Pastors or Presbyters Authority in Council's as constituent Members, is made appear by several Canons of the Councils, to which *J. S.* amidst his Criticisms, stands silent. *Ibid.*

Several other Testimonies of the Fathers, *J. S.* had seen cited by the Author, upon whose Works he thus Grates and Criticises, but offers no Answer thereunto. *Ibid.*

Some Observes added in consequence of the whole. 209, 210

SECT. II.

A Consideration of what *J. S.* Offers to that Author, as to the State of the Question.

Bishop's Sole Power always judg'd one main Point Debateable. Page 211 That *J. S.* spends a great part of his Endeavours upon Asserting this Sole Power. 212, 213

His pretended Limitations in several Points discover'd to be contradictory to what he holds of the *Cyprianic* Bishop's Power; wherein his palpable Reflections upon *Cyprian* are discover'd. 213, 214

The Common Distinction of the *Decisive and Consultive Power and Authority* in Church Government, improv'd against him. 215

His Distinctions about the state of the Question, and the Bishop's Power Examind, and discover'd to be Null, according to the Series and Scope of his Pleading. 216, 217

His Attack upon the Author of the *Hierarchicall Bishop's Claim*, &c. more particular-

ly consider'd, with several Distinctions offer'd to evince the Impertinency thereof. Pages 218, 219

The Application with respect to *Dr. Scott*, and *Bishop Hommieman*, wherein this is more fully made appear, in some convincing Instances. 219, 220, 221

J. S. pretends not to have read *Dr. Scott*, This made appear to be a pitiful Evasion. 222

Bishop Hommieman and *Dr. Monro* plead for the Sole Power, *Ibid.* *J. S.* will needs have the Author of the *Hierarchicall Bishop's Claim*, to assert some things that are peculiar to himself, how groundlessly, made appear. 223, 224

He imputes to that Author, that he made Sole and Singular one and the same thing, This Charge Refuted by several Reasons. 224, 225

He imputes to that Author, the Assertion anent

anent the Prelats *Paramount Authority* to that of ordinary Officers, who yet are by h.m. suppos'd to have no Authority. This made appear upon several Considerations, to be ignorant puerile Sophistry. page 225

The Prelat *de facto* Exercises a *Paramount Power* over Presbyters in Government, who *de jure* have a Divine Right thereunto, altho' the Exercise is restrain'd. Ibid.

Propositions or Assertions frequent in

common speech, yea and in Scripture Language, wherein the Subject of the Proposition hath a Denomination taken from its present State, to its present Connection with such an Adjunct, as when we say, A Parliament is Dissolv'd, Sion is plow'd like a Field, Jerusalem is laid on Heaps. pages 225, 226

J. S's Impertinency in some further Quirks to this purpose made appear, yea and his Self-contradiction. 227, 228, 229

S E C T. III.

Wherein are Examined J. S's Attacks upon the Reverend Mr Rule, and the forementioned Author, anent the Ruling Elders Office, and, in special, his two grand Syllogisms upon this point, offer'd to the two Principals, are fully scan'd, and therein his childish Sophistry and gross Ignorance of the common Elements of Logick is made appear.

FROM the Paroch Minister's Authority in the Session asserted by Mr. Rule, J. S. Infers the warrantableness of the Prelat's Negative Voice over Presbyters in Church Judicatories, how falsely and foolishly made appear. page 231

No shadow of the Hierarchical Bishop's Power (ascribed to him by J. S.) over Presbyters, in the Pastors Authority in the Session, whose Negative Voice therein is disown'd by our Church. Ibid.

J. S's Argument from the Dichotomy of Church Officers into Bishops and Deacons, presented in Scripture and asserted by Presbyterian Divines, to exclude the Ruling Elder as no Divinely appointed Officer, considered and expos'd. 231, 232 &c.

This Argument improven against the Prelatic Party. Ibid.

Several Considerations propos'd and urg'd against J. S. upon this point, and in special an Instance Exhibited of a Scripture Subdivision of the general Dichotomy of Church Officers into Subordinat Branches, and such as do clearly include the Office of a Ruling Elder. 233, 234, 235

The Scripture Warrant of the Divine Right of the Ruling Elder offer'd, together with the Assertion of the Antients; and the

Sense of Protestant Divines, upon this point page 235

Some Exceptions of J. S. upon this point further expos'd. 236

Mr. Jameson asserts the Divine Right of the Ruling Elder. 236, 237

The Assertions in point of the Ruling-Elder ascribed by J. S. to Mr. Rule, and T. F. as the Ground of his grand Syllogisms. Ibid.

J. S's two Syllogisms propos'd, together with some general Considerations anent the ruinous ground thereof. 238, 239

A threefold Charge offer'd against J. S. upon his Syllogisms. The 1st. Of proving himself therein an Ignoramus in the Nature and Rule thereof. The 2^d. Of contradicting and basting his own main Principle. The 3^d. Of his seditious Impeachment of the Government; by Esponsing a Medium that overturns it. 237, 238.

He professes to Argue *ad Homines*; and therefore must suppose our Principle anent the general Term of Elder. as applicable to the two Species of the Preaching; and Ruling Elder. Ibid.

Hence the gross absurdity of his Syllogisms represented in a clear common Instance. Ibid.

Two common Principles and Canons of Logick

Logick represented further, to expose the Ignorance of his Paralogism. The 1st. *That Universalis Affirmans non convertitur simpliciter*, and therefrom the Absurdity of his Syllogism made appear. A 2d added, *cum nota*, scil. *Ex universalis affirmante non recte inferitur universalis negans*, &c. pages 240, 241

The structure of his first Argument further expos'd, in that his Syllogism being propos'd with respect to his Scope and Method, it labours of the deadly Disease of four *Termini*, because of the Ambiguity of *the Subject and Medium* 242

This further made appear from what is generally acknowledg'd touching *Axioms*, or *Attributes of a diverse Extension*, wherein there is no reciprocal Consequence in point of Existence. Ibid.

The 2d Charge and undertaking against J. S. in point of his Syllogisms, viz. *That he has overthrow'd one main Principle of his Pamphlet*. 243

Three Considerations drawn out upon his Principles to clear this. 243, 244

He holds the Power of Jurisdiction to be necessarily included in the Prelat's Official Authority of Ordination, yet the owning the Presbyterian's Power of Jurisdiction, absolutely denies his Right and Power of Ordination. Ibid.

Three Syllogisms offer'd upon his own Medium, clearly overthrowing this his Assertion. Ibid.

The 3d Charge, *That his Argument involves him in a seditious Impeachment of the Civil Government*: His Medium and Topick presented in two Syllogisms to evince this. 245

Some Queries after propos'd by him, and Improven against him. 246

His 2d Syllogism Examined, the Minor whereof is founded on the ruinous Ground of the Conclusion of the prior. 247

His Charge upon the Author of *The Hierarchy of Bishops Claim*, &c., viz. *That he had imputed to Doctor Monro, a Popish Interpretation of Matth. 20. 25.* Examined. 247, 248, 249

An Epilogizing Address to Mr. Sage, shewing, he has neither satisfied Friends nor Adversaries, in this Debate; In regard of his stretched Inferences, palpable and frequent Contradictions, and Inconsistent Pleadings. 250

Where are several clear Instances of his Betraying the Episcopal Cause, of his Affronting and Contradicting his Fellow-Plead-ers. Page 251

Particularly Dr. Scott (whose grand Argument for Episcopacy, from the Institution of the LXX Disciples, he overthrows), the *Querist*, the Arguer, Dr. Fuik, Dr. Forbes, Bishop Jewel, Bishop Morton, Bishop Bilson, yea and his Admired Dodwell: 251, 252

Together with a serious Expostulation with J. S. upon the whole; Leading to the following

APPENDIX,

Exhibiting a brief Scripture Account and Assertion of Presbyterian Principles in point of Church Government and Gospel Worship.

I. Principle, That the Teaching Pastor, Ruling Elder, and Deacon are the standing Church Officers of Divine Appointment. page 253

II. Principle, That the Offices of Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, and these other Gifts mention'd 1 Cor. 12. 28. of Miracles, Healing, and Diversities of Tongues, are Extraordinary, and now Expir'd, as peculiar to the first Apostolick Church. 254

III. Princ. That the Prelat's suppos'd Office, which inhances all Ecclesiastick Authority in his Person, with respect to his Diocese, is cross to the Scripture Rule, as being opposite to that Immediate Essential Interest in Government, which is competent to Pastors: Where are several proofs of this Essential Interest. 254, 255

IV Princ. That nothing like a Diocesan Episcopacy can be inferred from the Scripture Accounts of Timothy and Titus. 255, 256

V. Princ. That no Diocesan Episcopacy is in the Scripture Accounts of the seven Asian Angels. 256

VI. Princ. That Presbyterian Government in all its Courts and Judicatories, stands upon a Divine Basis. 257

Scripture Warrants for the Congregational Elder-ship. Ibid.

Scripture

Scripture Grounds for Presbyteries.

Pages 257, 258

The Divine Warrant of Synods, asserted and illustrated. 258, 259

National Assemblies have the same Ground and Foundation with the Synodal. 260

VII. *Princ.* The *Erastian* Mould of Church Government, such as was the late Prelacy in Scotland (which is evinc'd by Acts of Parliament), disown'd upon several Grounds. 260, 261

VIII. *Princ.* That the People have Power and Interest to call their Pastor. 261

That Prelatists disown this Power in the People and Congregation, prov'd. 262

This Right of the People to call their Pastor made good from several clear Scripture Grounds. 262, 263

IX. *Princ.* Church-mens Acting in Civil Affairs, as stated Official Civil Rulers, or constant Constituent Members of Civil Judicatories, Condemn'd, as contrary to Scripture Rules and the Ministerial Office. 263, 264

X. *Princ.* That the Plea from Antiquity is Unsound, and utterly Insufficient in the Episcopal Cause, Evinc'd. 264, 265

XI. *Princ.* Concerning Worship; I. The Imposing of Fixed Set Forms of Words in Prayer or Preaching, and astricting Pastors thereunto in their publick Officiating, is Sinful and Unwarrantable; As wanting, 1. A Divine Institution and Promise. 2. Apostolick Precept or Example, or of the Apostolick Church; Where the pretence of the Prescription of the LORD's Prayer as a set Form, is shown to be Groundless, from several Arguments. And 3. As being a Sinful Limiting of the Spirit of Prayer. 265, 266, 267

II. Symbolical Ceremonies in Worship, of Humane Appointment, Condemn'd from several Grounds. 267

Of which sort are. 1. The Sign of the Cross in Baptism. 2. Kneeling in the Act of Receiving the Sacramental Elements in the LORD's Supper, with particular Arguments against each of them. Pages 267, 268

III. Aniversary Holy Days: which are Distinguish'd from either the Deputation of a Day for Fasting or Thanksgiving, or such and such Days of the Week (or rather parts thereof) for Sermon. 268

That these Aniversary Days are Observ'd as Relatively Holy, and upon a suppos'd Mystic Signification, yea, and that the Observation of the Day is Esteem'd a part of the Worship, is evident in the Practice of the Observers thereof, and from the Arguments of the Chief Pleaders therefore. 268, 269

The Unlawfulness of this Observation evinc'd by some five Arguments, 1. That it has no Divine Institution. 2. That it incroaches upon Christian Liberty. 3. That it is a Reflection upon the Wisdom of GOD; Particularly the Observation of *Christmass-Day*. 4. That it incroaches upon the Authority of the *Fourth Command*. 5. That it has a Mischievous Tendency to introduce all *Jewish* Antiquated Days, and to Harden Papists. 269, 270, 271

The Objection from the Days of *Purim*; and the Feast of Dedication, *Joh. 10. 22, 23*. Removed. 271, 272

XII. *Princ.* In Opposition to *Independents*, there is, 1. A Subordination of Lesser to Larger Church Judicatories, Maintain'd from several Grounds. 272

2ly. That the Community of the Faithful, or Body of the People, are not the proper immediate Subject of Church Government, evinc'd by several Arguments. 273

3ly. That the Formality of Church Membership doth not necessarily require Saving Conversion. 273, 274

[+ + + + +]

E R R A T A.

Page 13. Line 11. Read to the Parliament. Ibid. l. 31. after Certainty add, *This Conveyance being understood the Mean, not the Motive and proper Ground of such a Belief.* P. 14. l. 21. After Reformation add, *Aggreable to the Pattern of the Cyprianic Age* P. 15. l. 10. for and far less, Read, or, in a further Absurdity, assert. P. 18: l. 26. dele not. P. 19. l. 1. 2. 3. Read thus, *Their Fam'd Episcopal Divine Scultetus, whatever may be said of this Fabianus, hath in so far diminish'd from the Honour and Memory of his Divus Cyprianus, to whom he ascribes such like Authority, that he Charges him with Unaccountable Errors.* P. 25. l. 32. R. *necessario.* P. 31. l. Antepenult. R. *so signal.* P. 63. l. 12. after known, add, *(which J. S. acknowledges).* Ibid. l. 16. after us, add, *and sure, with his Approbation.* P. 78. l. penult. after Church; add, *But this, with the preceeding Instance, after his Defection, cited pag. 76. we do not peremptorily press.* P. 94. l. 26. after (1) add, *In general* P. 112 l. 21. after suppos'd, add, *as for the Censure and Correction of their Errour, the Judgment of Antient Fathers anent the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, is an evident Correction and Censure.* P. 135. l. 24. after other; add, *as competent to the Roman Church.* P. 136. l. 26. after (1) add, *In general.* P. 146. l. 7. R. *this in general.* P. 160. l. 24. after §. 35. add, *which Power and Epithets do, beyond doubt, virtually include the Actus Primus of this Civil Rule, when a Door is open'd for it ; which is evident in that.* P. 166. l. 8. R. *Piacular.* P. 174. l. 9. R. *Ungodly Course.* P. 189. l. penult. after *These*, add, *of the Scriptures distinct Sound in point of Church Government.*

THese Escapes will obviously appear : Such others as the Intelligent Reader will Discover, in Point of Misplac'd Words, or wrong Figuring of some Passages, or whatever else doth Marr the Sense, Syntax, or Scope, he will easily Amend in the Perusal.

A
CONFUTATION
OF
J. S's VINDICATION

Of the (Pretended)

Principles of the Cyprianic Age ;

Exposing his Fruitless Attempt upon *Presbyterian Government* therein, and his alike Fruitless Pleadings for the *Hierarchy* upon the same Ground ; Dissolving also the chief Sinews, and Overturning the Scope of that *Voluminous Pamphlet*.

C H A P. I.

Containing some Animadversions in Proof of the Unsoundness and Inconsistency of his Principles and Reasoning.



THE Mould of this Man's Endeavour in this Treatise, has been justly esteem'd very odd and unaccountable by Persons of Judgment who have perus'd it ; For he hath taken such Measures, pleaded upon such Grounds, and prosecuted such a Scope, as never any of his Associates has therein led the way to him, since this Controversie has been scann'd and agitated : For, what Disputant, who ever profess'd to plead for Episcopacy, founded all his Reasonings for the Divine or Apostolick Right thereof upon the Principles and Practice of *Cyprian*, or the Third Age, before this new Advocate appear'd ? And 'tis strange, that he did not consider,

A

sider, how that Judicious Persons, not only of the opposite side, but even of his own Party, could not but look upon this his prolix Endeavour, and Reasoning so largely, in the Point of Fact, and a Practice of that Age, as a Fruitless Traverse out of the true Limits and State of this Controversie, and a meer Cobweb, easily swept away with a suitable Account of the true point debatable and State of this Question. Such as do, from a sincere Respect to Truth, and in an earnest Enquiry for it, embark in any Debate, according to the true Laws and Limits of Dispute, have always judg'd themselves oblig'd to plead to the true point controverted, and to make use of such Arguments as they judg'd fit to fortifie what they maintain'd, and to overturn the Principles and Pleadings of the Adversary: But, in the Judgment of all Men of Sense, who have perus'd this Piece, the Author in such a Laborious Nothing as he has offered to publick View, has neither advanc'd Arguments proper to fortifie the Episcopal Cause, nor, in the least, offered to scan these of his Opposites: And his obvious Folly doth in this also appear, that, in this prolix Endeavour, he levels against a little Tract of the Reverend Mr. Rule, a great part, and the chief Sinews whereof, he has, notwithstanding, quite pass'd over; So that his prolix Defence appears, in this respect, pitifully lame and fruitless.

Page 1. He professes his Design to defend his first Pamphlet, and to vindicate the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, with regard to Episcopal Power and Jurisdiction; And that having seen the Answer thereof, and consider'd the same seriously, he now offers this Duply. Wherein 'tis observable, from the Series and Scope of both Pamphlets, that 'tis not merely the Matter of Fact, but the Jus and Point of Right which he is oblig'd to vindicate, yea and some where would seem to do so: And how he has acquitted himself in this Proof, having never so much as offer'd to scan one Scripture Medium upon this Controversie, is left to the unprejudicated Reader to judge.

Page. 3. He acknowledges, Mr. Rule had told him, that he might spare his Pains, if he only design'd to shew his Mistake in point of History. He acknowledg'd, he was not infallible, and this would not ruine the Cause of Presbytery, tho' such a Mistake had been made appear. Notwithstanding whereof, this vain Flanting Pamphleter gives this Reason of this Appearance of his, scil. To quell his Pride who had made so great a Figure in Writing. But, 1. What Pride can he here fasten upon that Reverend Author in this point, who, by J. S's Confession, acknowledg'd he is not infallible, and possibly might be mistaken. 2ly, He had told him, That whatever he could offer in Matter of Fact, touches not the Point and Presbyterian Cause, and by J. S's Confession it is so.

Why

Why then has he spent this Volume on a Trifle without the Limits of the Cause, by his own Acknowledgment. 3ly, Since he says, this was one Reason of his appearance, *to quell that Reverend Author's Pride, who had made such a Figure by his Writings*, why did he not, for this end, attack him in these his Writings, which stand to this day without an Answer? Thinks he, this Figure could be marr'd, by shewing a Mistake in a point of Fact, which that Reverend Author judg'd not impossible, while his other Writings stand inviolable and untouch'd? Nay, 4ly, Did not Mr. Rule not only tell him, that this would not ruine the Cause of Presbytery, but likewise had appeal'd him to a Scripture Dispute upon the Question, from which he has, in this Appearance, prov'd himself a meer *Lucifugus*?

Page. 4. He looks on him as a *proclaim'd Champion of Presbytery*, because he said he wrote his second Vindication by Order, and J. S. tells us, *his Commission was not revok'd when he wrote his Defence*. But, 1. Granting he wrote that Book by publick Order, it will not follow he is such a Champion, nor that all in it is the Sentiments of all; Some Deference might be given (and that deservedly) to this Reverend Person, and likewise what he wrote might be own'd as to the Main, altho every Parcel or Sentence of what he wrote be not the joynt Sentiments of the Party; Nor can he prove the necessity of a formally revoked Commission to evince the discontinuance of any such supposed Order. 2ly, If, as he says, he considered him as a *publick Advocat*, why did he not attack him upon the *complex and main Cause*, upon the point Controverted, and by him Defended? I wonder what Judgment would be made of an Advocat, who hearing his Adversary bring many Arguments to the Cause and Point in Law, should only Answer and Attack him in some slips of a Word or Sentence, without ever meddling with his Arguments upon the Cause, but quite passing them over? Who would not think this Person worthy, as a loquacious Fool, to be check'd by the Judge, yea chas'd from the Bar.

Ibid. He tells us, "That the Argument taken from the Constitution and Practice of the Government of the Churches in the First Ages is truly Unanswerable. But, I pray, why mentions he the First Ages generally, not the Cyprianic? If he mean the Cyprianic, which his Design and Principles oblige him unto, why calls he it the First Ages, this including the two preceeding; Or if in this Denomination he intend and mean all the Three, I would know, 1. Why he confines his Dispute to the Cyprianic or Third Age with such high Elogies above the Second, yea or First? 2ly, Since our Debate is properly anent the

Constitution and Principles of the Apostolick Church, why declines he the true State of the Question, and obtrudes some sham Arguments under the Disguise of this poor General anent the Frame of the First Ages, without ever adventuring to attack us upon the First, Antientest and only proper Age to be debated? Next, I would gladly know of this Pamphleter, what is it that renders this Argument taken from the Constitution of the First Ages *Unanswerable*? Is it a Conformity to the Divine Pattern; or this Constitution meerly and in it self considered? He will not probably profess to own this last; And if the first be adher'd to, let any Person of Candor or Conscience search out and let us see a Proof of this Conformity *a capite ad calcem* of his whole Pamphleter.

Page. 5. We are told, *That the Incautious among Presbyterians clamour that they do not value the Fathers, that the Scripture is the only Judge of Controversies, and that they are not to be concluded by later than Scripture Antiquity.* Here is, 1. An implicit, if not a plain disowning and denial of this great point of Truth, *That the Scripture, or God speaking in the Scripture is only Judge of Controversies of Religion, and that no later Antiquity is to determine this point*; consequently an Impeachment of the Doctrine of the Reformed Churches, since the asserting of this great and solid Truth is term'd a *Clamour only of such as are less Cautious*. 2ly, Since he takes in the First Ages generally in this unanswerable Argument, and owns it that the Apostles fix'd a Divine Constitution of the Churches, how comes he to Quarrel the owning of this as the *First Antiquity*, and proper Rule? That he holds the Apostles to have Constituted a fix'd Platform of Government is apparent; For, 1. He pretends a continuance of that Mould and Platform in the Third Age. 2ly, He disowns Dr. Stillingfleet's Notion as to the Indifferency of Forms of Church Government.

He cites from Page. 6. to 13. *Presbyterian Writers asserting that the Hierarchy obtain'd not in the the first Three Centuries, calling this notorious Falshood.* But, 1. If he fall short of his Proof (and this is conspicuous to the Judicious Reader of his Pamphlet) the Falshood lies on himself. 2ly, Let the Tryal be made of the Bishop as he Busks him, and the many absurd exuberant Prerogatives he ascribes to him in this Pamphleter, and his Antiquity will be found spurious and absolutely short of impeaching the premised Assertion of the Presbyterians; It being notoriously known, that, *First*, Many Fathers, both Greek and Latine, disown the Difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, especially so many essential and notorious differences as this Man states. 2ly, Do grant that *Apostolorum tempore there was no difference*, whatever

Distinction

Distinction became afterward to be stated betwixt them. 3ly, None of the Authors whom he cites do deny a begun Episcopacy, and some Vestiges and Seeds thereof to have early creep'd in. The Question with him is anent the grown Monster of that stupendous Hierarchy which he asserts, wherein all Ministers in point of Government are put on a level with the People, yea below them.

Altare Dimascenum, saith he, *Pag.* 265. asserts that the Bishop had no Negative Voice in Cyprian's time, that Churches were equal, their Presbyters equal, &c. He should have told his Reader also, that this Learn'd Author asserts, "That the Bishops could not meet without their Metropolitan, who notwithstanding, had no Negative over them; Whence he infers, that no more had the Bishops over Pastors, tho' they could not meet without their Bishop, that Churches and Presbyters being equal or commensurated to each other, Cyprian makes all Dioceses equal, thus overthrowing that Towering Hierarchy, resolving in a Metropolitan, such as our English and Scottish Prelacy is, which this Man undertakes to assert. He might have seen likewise in the same Passage *Tilen's* Answer to *Bellarmin*, de Pontificatu Lib. 1. Cap. 8. comparing the Bishop to the King, and Pastors to Counsellours, the absurdity of which Similitude and Comparison *Tilen* himself zealously asserts, as likewise *Dr. Field*, de Ecclesia, pag. 137. another unexceptionable Witness. Thus also *Augustin*, who calls and owns Pastors the Bishops Collegues, *Epist.* 137. and 110. expressly thus contradicting this Assertion of *Bellarmin* owned and pleaded for by our Pamphleter.

Pag. 14: He tells us, that our Reformers propos'd to themselves the Scriptures not simply indeed, neither as sens'd by their own or any Modern Glosses, but as sens'd and interpreted by the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church, as the Rule according to which this Church was to be Reform'd. That our Reformers propos'd this Rule under such a Coercion and Limitation is an Untruth, obvious to any that do peruse our History; And, considering this Man's Scope, 'tis here evident, that, 1. He disowns the making the Scriptures simply our Rule in Reformation, or to be in any other Sense a Rule than as sens'd by the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church, and consequently denies the Scriptures to be simply and absolutely our Rule in any point of Religion. So here is confirm'd what we have charged upon him anent his censuring and condemning them as not Cautious, or as Ignoramuses, who own the Scripture as the only Rule, and do Appeal to this Judge in the point of Church Government. Hence 'tis evident, 2ly, That he has disowned and impeached the Doctrine and Confessions of all the Reform'd

med Churches in point of the Scriptures Perfection, asserting, with the Papists, that it is but a general and half Rule authentically sented by the Principles and Practice of the Primitive Church, which with them makes the Rule compleat, and to give a distinct sound in point of Religion and the Controversies thereof.

"From *Pag.* 14. through this whole Chapter, *J. S.* proposes his grand Reasons wherefore the Churches ought to be conform'd, in point of Government, to the Principles and Practice of the Third Age, taken from the High Elogies and many Advantages of that Age, inferring, with him, the necessity and advantage of this Imitation and Conformity. Such as, 1. That it had no Temptations of secular Grandure to ingage to the imbracing of Prelacy, it being a Time and Age wherein the Church was liable to much Suffering. 2ly, An Age of much Ecclesiastick Business, no Age after the Apostles had more. 3ly, An Age of great Men, such as *Cornelius, Lucius, Stephanus*, and more especially the admirable *Cyprian*. 4ly, An Age of many excellent Records, Synodical Epistles, and Forms and Constitutions, many Epistles of all sorts, Epistles from Bishops to their Clergy, from Bishops to Bishops, from all parts of Christendom. 5ly, An Age wherein the extraordinary Manifestations and Communications of the Divine Spirit had not ceased, but continued in very great plenty. 6ly, That this Age was not so far from the Apostolick, but that they might have been well acquainted with the State of Government in which the Apostles left the Churches before they left the World. 7ly, That they were bound by Principle and Interest to resist Innovations; By Principle, since it was own'd in this Age that the Government of the Church was settled by Apostles. 2ly, By Interest, in opposition to the Persecution and Reproaches both of Jews and Heathens, since they were not only Reproached by the Jews as imbracing Novel Principles, but by the Heathen World Massacred and Tyrannized over, under pretence of being peevish, wilful, humorous, Fanaticks, who had no solid nor accountable Principles.

Now, how palpably absurd this Reasoning is, will evidently appear if we consider, 1. That most, if not all his Elogies, he cannot deny to have an Application, and more proper to the Second Age than the Third, which may easily appear upon a review and application thereof, especially in the point of existing extraordinary Manifestations and Communications of the Spirit alledged by him, and Affinity to the Apostolick Age, and acquaintance with the State of the Government which the Apostles left before they left the World, wherein he must be forced to acknowledge the

the Second Age had, by far, a preference to the Third; And what Records and Accounts hereof were existent in the Third, 'tis beyond all peradventure they received from the Second, who herein had the preference and advantage of a more full and exact knowledge. And if, as is universally acknowledged, this Age has a great Cloud upon it, as to matters of Fact, 'tis a wonder how this Cloud comes to be pulled off in the Third Age, and that the Eyes thereof should be sharper in discerning the state of the Apostolick Church, than these of its Parent and Progenitor. But, 2ly, Whatever be said of the *Second Age*, there is no Body will doubt but that all these his Elogies are much more applicable to the *First*, and that it is in point of Infallible Pattern absolutely preferable thereunto. So that, upon his own Grounds, this Pamphleter is convict of Folly in sending us to the *Third* in stead of the *First Age* as the *Cynosura*, Touch-stone, or Tryal to discover the true Church Government established by the Apostles.

To make this convincingly evident, let us shortly touch a particular Application and Comparifon. 1. In that First Age *there was no Temptation to secular Grandure*. This he needs must acknowledge. The mean state, as to the external, of our blessed Lord and his Apostles affording a clear conviction hereof. Our Saviour told the Man who would follow him for the World *, *The Foxes have holes, the Birds of the Air have nests, but the Son of Man hath not where to lay his Head*. He told his Apostles †, *They were to be hated and despised of all men for his Names sake, and they were accordingly accounted the filth of the World, the off-scourings of all things* ||. Yet, on the by, we must tell him, that as there was a Seed of emulous Ambition early appearing in the Apostles, which their Master nipped in the Bud, so there was a *Mystery of Iniquity working in that time* *, the Seed of a Papacy, and there was then an *aspiring Diotrefhes* climbing up to be a Primat †. So that he may see there may be Temptations to Church Grandure even when and where there are no Temptations to secular Greatness without the Verge of the Church. 2ly, For Ecclesiastick Business, he tells us, *no Age after the Apostles had more*. And thus acknowledges the Apostolick Age had in this a preference, wherein we have the Divine Records of the Apostles Acts and Practice in the Constitution, Founding and Watering of Churches, and in the Sacred Authentick Epistles (Pardon us to say, preferable to those of Cyprian) the clear Diagram and Portraiture of

* Luk. 9. 58.

† Mat. 24. 9.

|| 1 Cor. 4: 13.

* 2 Thes. 2. 7.

† 3 Job. 9.

the Churches State, the Intercourse betwixt the Apostles and them in point of Duty, discoveries of the Assaults of Enemies and Temptations of Satan, Scandals and Censures, Practices of Sathan's Instruments, and how curb'd and obviated, Resolution of momentuous incident Cases, &c. Especially if we add hereunto the Case of the *Asian Churches*, as represented in our Lord's Epistles to the 7 Angels, this will be further convincingly evident. 3ly, As for *his flourishing great Men in that Age*, may I be bold to tell him, that the 12 Apostles, the 70 Disciples, the Evangelists, were as great Men as *Lucius, Stephanus, &c.* Nor will we except the great Infallible *Cyprian*. 4ly, As for *the many excellent Records, Synodical Epistles from Bishops to their Clergy, from Bishops to Bishops*, containing in that Age an Intelligible Scheme of the Principles thereof in the point of Church Government; Who will doubt that *the New Testament Records* are in this point infinitely preferable, a far clearer Ground of our Faith and Practice, than all the Constitutions and Epistles of the Third Age? Have we not therein the New Testament Records and Gospel History of our Saviour's Life and Doctrine, and laying the Basis and Foundation of the Gospel Church and the Government thereof? Have we not the Apostles Doctrine and Practice, their authentick Epistles unto the Churches, preferable to his Epistles from Bishops to their Clergy, yea Apostolick Epistles to eminent Church Officers such as *Timothy* and *Titus*? Have we not the *Revelation* containing an account not only of the then State and Condition of the Churches, but likewise a discovery of the various Temptations and Tryals, sad Persecutions and correspondent Outgates, Defection or Integrity of its Officers, her Eclipses and after shinings until the very end of Time; Yea and discoveries of such a Nature as do necessarily import and infer *her Declinings in that Third Age*, so much magnified by him? Yea, have we not an account of the *first solemn Christian Apostolick Council*, the Constitution and Actings whereof, none will doubt, in point of authentick exemplary Influence, are absolutely preferable to all after Councils or Canons thereof.

J. S. tells us, when speaking of these Records and Epistles of the Third Age, *that many of them are still extant*, acknowledging thus that *some of them are lost*; But needs he must acknowledge, that all the Lively Oracles, the Divine Records of the Apostolick Age are *fully extant*. He tells us further, that *the Monuments of excellent Cyprian are honoured with the greatest Veneration, as incomparable Records of Antiquity by the most Learn'd Moderns*. But may we inform his Reverence that they are incomparably short of the Apostolick Records of Antiquity truly Honoured, not by most only, but by all true Christians: So that his

his Elogy of *Incomparable* must needs evanish in this Comparifon, and will hazard its coming under the Blot of an Incomparable Folly in fuch an Affertion. *J. S.* tells us, *The four premis'd Advantages of that Third Age are certainly very great: But that the other two appear to him no lefs, if not of greater Confequence, namely the 5th. That there were in this Third Age extraordinary Manifestations and Communications of the Divine Spirit observable in the Writings of Cyprian and his Contemporaries.* Now, I think, for very fhame, he will not dare to difown it, that the First Age had in this a palpable preference, fince therein we have a clear account of the Apostles Instruction by our Lord, fourty Days after his Refurrection, in the Nature and Constitution of his Church and Kingdom *, of their folemn Seal by the Holy Spirit in the Day of Pentecoft †, their authentick Doctrin delivered touching the Government and Constitution of the Churches, their correspondent Practice pursuant to their Master's great Commiffion, the Spirit's miraculous Influences and Operations attending their infallible Doctrin, and thefe extraordinary Manifestations of the Holy Spirit largely pour'd out upon others, both on Church Officers and Members, and that in fuch a Meafure and Extent, as no Body will deny to be preferable in both refpects to any fuch fuppofed vident in the Third Age.

* *Act. i. 3.*

† *Act. 2.*

But *J. S.* tells us, *Since the diftinct Manifestations of God's Mind were in that extraordinary manner communicated to them by that fane Spirit which directed the Apostles in the Government of the Church, how could they overturn the Apostolick Constitution, and fet up another? Yea, which is, with him, of greater weight, thofe who liv'd in that Age infifted upon thefe Manifestations in the Designation and Promotion of Persons to Epifcopal Office, and in directing and encouraging them in that Office to which they were fo extraordinarily Promoted.* But, good Man, he muft be told, that, 1. 'Tis the Judgment of all found Proteftants, who difown Popifh pretences of Infallibility, that no Communications of the Spirit fince the Apostles were of fuch an *universal* Extent or Nature as thofe communicated to the Apostles, fo as to render any Church Officers, yea Councils, in their Doctrin or Practice in point of Church Government, *Infallible*. And, 2ly, That the great and ftanding Apostolick Rule, 1 *John 3. Believe not every Spirit, but try the Spirits whether they are of God,* allows, yea obliges all Chriftians, to bring the Doctrin and Practices of whatever Church Governours, yea of Councils themfelves, to this Standard and Rule of the Apostles Doctrin. So that thefe Promotions and Encouragements he talks of muft needs be acknowledged of fuch a Nature as are reducible to, and examinable by this Rule, and

if found contrary to the Doctrine and Practices of the Apostles in their Constitution of Churches, that same Infallible Spirit which taught the Apostles, will send the Promotion of such Diocesan Prelacy as he pleads for, a packing.

Come we to the 6th Advantage of this Age, upon which this Man will needs make the Practice thereof the Cynosura and Rule to the Churches, viz. *That these of the Cyprianic Age were not so far remov'd from the times of the Apostles but that they might have been very well acquainted with the state of the Government in which the Apostles left the Churches before they left the World.* And sure I am, he will acknowledge the first Apostolick Age to be, in this point, incontrovertibly Superior to the Third, since therein the *Apostles Personal presence, not our visible Practice, their living Doctrine* and authentick Sacred Oracles delivered to the Churches, put this beyond Debate; So that whatever Medium or Argument he may use in this point, may be, *a fortiori*, improv'd against him, in order to his Obligation to have stated and debated the Question in point of Church Government from the *Doctrine and Practice of the First Age*; For, if a *vicinity to the Rule* have such weight with him, much more ought the Rule it self to have been by him looked to and pondered in this Debate: If the Third Age might have known this Rule because of its *suppos'd Vicinity to the First*, beyond all peradventure the First Age is beyond a *might be* in this point, because of *immediat actual Injoyment of the Apostles Personal presence, and Doctrine and Practice* in the Constitution of the Churches. Why then hath this new Proctor led us off (as the Lapwing is said to do searchers from her Nest by traversed Flutterings) from the true seat of this Controversie and proper state of the Question? Dost he not thus expose himself, as one afraid to bring his Cause to this true Light and Touch-stone?

What he talks here, of the well being of a Society depending on the Constitution and Temperament of Government, as of great consequence thereunto, and that few or no Members but must have under Observation, and find it in their share of their Priviledge, their expectation of Security; something or other, some way or other, that may oblige them to have their Eyes upon, which he tells us is obvious to any thinking Person, and that all substantial Innovations, in Government are naturally Attractive of the accuratest Observation, and must be in the highest Degree thus in the Government of the Church. I Answer, this is a Topick well calculated for excluding Innovations as possible or probable either in this or the subsequent Ages, and consequently gives the flat Lie and Contradiction to the Scripture accounts and assertion hereof. Again, this Man Wisely supposes, there can be no Byals or Corruptions in the Affections, Will, or Inclinations of Church.

Church Rulers or Members, so that 'tis impossible they can Contradict or Counteract their Knowledge of the Divine Rule; And how cross this is to both Scripture and Experience, I may tell this Pamphleter, is obvious to any thinking Person, and consequently, the absurdity of his premis'd Notion, whereby he would state that Third Age, or even the subsequent in such a Perfection and Infallibility as excludes all Defection, whatsoever and recesses from the Divine Rule.

Finally we are told, *That the Third Age was bound by Principle and Interest to withstand Innovations, it being their Principle that the Government of the Church was settled by the Apostles, acted and assisted by an Infallible Spirit; That Innovations were Criminal; That the Interest of Christians in those times obliged them not to thwart the Definitions of the Founders of their Religion, which would have expos'd them to the spite and reproach of the Jews, the Zeal and Might of the Civil Government then bent against them, as peevish Fanaticks who had no accountable Principles.* That the First Age is in this preferable is *prima fronte* convincingly evident and palpable, if we ponder the much more lively Impressions of this Principle vigent in the Apostles times than afterward. And there were vigilant Enemies both without and within the Church. Was not the Jewish Persecution then violent, and the Reproaches of the Apostles and their Doctrine atrocious? Was not likewise the Heathenish Persecution against the Apostles violent, who all, except the Apostle *John*, suffered Martyrdom, who notwithstanding Wrote the *Revelation* in his Banishment to the Isle of *Patmos*? Was not the Apostle *James* the Brother of *John* a very early Martyr, and the Apostle *Peter* miraculously rescued from the Bloody Hands of a *Herod* the very Night before his intended Execution? Have we not several Epistles of the great Apostle of the Gentiles from Prison? And was he not delivered from the Mouth of the Lyon *Nero*, and brought once and again before him? No doubt, nothing he can pretend in point of Principle and Interest, but was much more considerable and vigent in this Age. And sure we are, the Lord's first extraordinary Messengers, the Apostles, being harassed and Persecuted, and at last their Blood shed, besides many others of the Lord's Servants of an Inferior Order, such as *Antipas* and the like, were more glorious Martyrs and Witnesses than *Cyprian*, or any of his Contemporaries.

In the next place, there is none of all these pretences but may be alleged to prove the Churches retention of Divine Institutions in opposition to the Divine Records of palpable Backslidings, such as that of the

Church of Israel so very shortly after the Laws delivery
 * Exod. 32. by Moses *, and after Joshua's Death, and of the
 † Judg. 1. 2. Elders †, and such like in after times. We have in
 the New Testament Sacred Warnings of the Churches
 speedy Defection, yea and an account of the actual Defection and
 sad Corruption of Churches while the Apostles were alive and In-
 specting them, such as these in the Churches of Corinth and Galatia,
 the last whereof had speedily turned to another
 || Gal. 1. 6. Gospel ||, the lamentable Defection and Corruption of
 several of the seven Asian Churches.

Now, I would fain know, what J. S. would Answer if such an
 Apology of the Nature which he offers were made for their Defection
 and against the Scripture Charge thereof (such as we maintain to be
 in force against Prelacy) viz. That they had such Advantages and
 Encouragements for their Standing and Integrity as are mentioned
 by him, *That they were not only near the times of the Apostles, but had the*
Injoyment of their Light, that they were in the very times of the first Gospel
Institutions, that they had excellent Records vigent, and extraordinary
Manifestations of the Spirit, &c. Nay, suppose they had all the indivi-
 dual Advantages mentioned by him, will he say, in contradiction to
 the Scripture accounts, that it was impossible they could have turned
 aside? Why then will he ascribe such an Infallibility to the Third
 Age, or assert that they were Absolutely and Infallibly kept straight
 by these Advantages? For, unless he says this, he says nothing to the
 point, while making the Frame, Constitution and Practice of the
 Church of that Third Age our Cynosura and Rule in the point of
 Church Government, as is evident he doth in the whole Series and
 Scope of his Pamphlet. 3ly, Whereas he draws the strength of this
 Argument from what they might have understood of the Apostles
 Doctrine and Practice in point of Church Government, he still, upon
 the matter, (however herein inconsistent with himself in the Scope
 and Series of his Pamphlet) must suppose *their Practice examinable by the*
Rule, and not the Rule by their Practice, so that he says nothing till this
 Conformity be cleared by a due Comparison of the one with the other;
 otherwise (as Stillingfleet has told them) he and his Fellows do in this
 bend the Rule to the crooked Stick, and make the Scripture stand Cap in
 hand to serve its Servant. And to infer from what Advantages that Age
 had, *what they might have known, what they might have improved, &c.* their
correspondent Improvement and actual standing and perseverance, is such an
 Arguing a Posse ad Esse as common Reason, as well as the premis'd In-
 stances, does convince of Folly and Falshood.

Page. 22. He Discourses of the safe handing down of signal Events by Tradition, and remarkable matters of Fact, &c. Granting this in some matters of Fact, yet in the present Case this is not to the purpose. For, 1. Our Question is not anent Matters of Fact simply considered, but anent the Conformity of the Churches Practice, and such matters of Fact as he pretends, to the Divine Rule. 2ly, Himself acknowledges this Divine Rule which must regulat these matters of Fact. 3ly, We have safely Transmitted to us this Divine Canon and Rule, and therefore need no Traditional conveyance, as touching either the Doctrine or Practice of the Apostles in this point. The Defender of the Episcopal Remonstrance by the Parliament of England, Page. 125. compares the leaving of the Divine Right, and supporting of Episcopacy by another, to the Condition of such Men, who, when God hath withdrawn himself, make Flesh their Arm. Thus also the Author of Episcopacy by Divine Right, Part 2. Page. 49.

As for what he adds, to support the Credibility of Tradition from our pleading a certainty of our Reformation from its first beginning in opposition to Prelacy, Page: 24, 25. and that Mr. Rule censures Dr. Monro for affirming that Tradition is not to be believed if it exceed 200 Years, is utterly unserviceable to his Scope, as is palpably evident: For, 1. He runs *de Genere in Genus* in this his illogical Reasoning, shewing alike Skill therein as in his two doughty Syllogisms. We speak of an Historical Human Certainty, when we mention our Knowledge of the state of our Reformation from Records: The point debateable is anent a Divine Faith of a Divine Truth, which no Human Tradition or Records can sufficiently ground. 2ly, Mr. Rule, in the place cited by him, having said, that it is hard to fix a period how far Oral Tradition can hand down a Tradition to Posterity, adds this cautional Restriction, especially if it be about the credenda of Religion, and he has told him our Question is of this Nature, and consequently is capable of no such Resolution or Rule of certainty.

Page. 27. We are told, That if proper Prelacy is found in the Cyprianic Age, then the Distinctions of Presbyterians anent the Superintendency of the first Prelates, viz. That it was of Dignity not Power, of Order not a Degree, and that these first or constant Moderators had not the sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, &c. can never evacuate the Force of Testimonies, even of the Ages prior to the Cyprianic, since those of the Cyprianic Age were far from innovating or proceeding on Principles different from these of former Ages. But, 1. What if these Testimonies of the preceeding Ages shall be found to cross those which he pretends to be the Cyprianic Principles in point of Government? Then we must either believe and give the Precedency

Precedency to these prior Principles, or make these of the Cyprianic Age the Infallible Rule. 2ly, When he speaks of the Testimonies of the Ages prior to the Cyprianic, he must, of necessity, include the first Age, else there's no plurality of Ages prior to the Third, and thus either he must make that suppos'd Practice of the Third Age regulate our Belief of that of the First, and so render it the Infallible Rule, (wherein his Absurdity and Self-inconsistency will appear palpable) or else he must acknowledge himself oblig'd to impugn the premis'd Distinctions, and evince the Power of the Prelate; Which he asserts opposite thereunto from the Principles and Practice of the First Age, and, by clear Consequence, from the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, in the Constitution of the first Churches.

Page. 27, 28. We are told, That the fixing of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age clears the Principles of our Reformers, who, in An. 1557. address'd the Queen Regent, that the State Ecclesiastical might be Reform'd according to the Rules and Precepts of the New Testament, the Writings of Ancient Fathers, and the Godly and Approv'd Laws of Justinian the Emperor. And three Years after, in An. 1560. they provok'd to the Parliament the same Rule they would stand by, scil. the Word of God, the Practice of the Apostles, and the Sincerity of the Primitive Church. This, in J. S's Judgment, oblig'd them to accept a Reformation. But, 1. I would know, whether he will say, that the Ancient Fathers intertain'd no Errors, in the Sense of our Reformers? Surely, better Antiquaries than he have made appear, that they did; And he dares not say, that our Venerable first Reformers were such Ignoramus's, as not to know so much: Since therefore the Writings of Ancient Fathers are mentioned by them indefinitely, he must needs understand these Writings mentioned with this Limitation, viz. in so far as consonant to the Divine Rule, and that they held them to be a subordinate regulated Rule; Since otherwise he will be forced to assert, that they own'd these Writings as absolutely Infallible, and without all Defect and Error; And, in either the one or other Assertion, he discovers the Unserviceableness of this Instance, and baffles his Design. 2ly, If he owne it, that Mr. Knox was a main Instrument in these Addresses, who knows not, that Mr. Knox was intimate with Calvin and Beza, and (as is acknowledg'd by Spotswood) fram'd our Book of Discipline, in Imitation of what he had seen in Geneva? Doth not Beza commend him in his Epistle 79, written to him, April 12. An. 1562. for bringing into Scotland, together with sound Doctrine, the civill, or good Discipline, asserting, that, as the Bishops brought in the Papacy, so these false Bishops, the Relicks of Papacy, will bring Epicurism into the Church, if admitted? Whereupon he exhorts Mr. Knox, That,

That, since he had once banish'd Episcopacy out of Scotland, he endeavour, that it be never receiv'd again; Tho' it flatters (saith he) with the Shew of entertaining Unity, whereby some of the best Ancients were deceiv'd. And no body will doubt, that Mr. Knox was, to the last, of the same Judgment, and accordingly prosecuted the same Design. Mr. Clerkson, in his Life, shews, that being offered a Bishoprick in England by King Edward, he refus'd it upon this Ground, as having aliquid commune cum Anti-Christo, something in it common with Anti-Christ: And will J. S. be so absurd, as to assert, that he would have been satisfied with his absolute Cyprianic Bishop, and far less, that he and our Reformers intended this in the Addresses mentioned? 3ly, Since, by J. S's Confession, they mention Justinian's Laws, with the Limitation of Godly and Approv'd, he must acknowledge, that this Godliness and Approbation must have a Respect unto the Scripture-Rules and Precepts, both of the Old and New Testament, acknowledg'd by them to be the great Rule of Godliness and Righteousness, and that, in this point of the Reformation demanded, they had a special respect to the Doctrine and Rules of the New Testament, the Christian Churches Divine Oracle, as to Doctrine, Worship, Discipline and Government thereof. And it being so, no Body of common Sense will disowne it, that the Writings of the Fathers mentioned by them, are to be understood with the same Restriction and Subordination to the same Rule. 4ly, The very next Testimony clears this to Conviction, wherein the Word of God, and Practice of the Apostles is mention'd in the first place, and thereafter, the Sincerity of the Primitive Church, not the Primitive Church simply and absolutely, but in so far as sincerely walking up to this Rule. Else, if J. S. disowne this necessary Interpretation and Restriction, he will make these our first Reformers absurdly to assert, that there was no Mixture of Corruption in the Primitive Church, but that it was absolutely perfect and sincere, which no Protestant ever said, and none will be so absurd as to assert, that the Reformers had such an inconsistent Meaning or Intention.

But, says J. S. *they distinguish betwixt the Practice of the Apostles and the Sincerity of the Primitive Church, and he asks, in what Age after the Apostles, could they find more of the Sincerity of the Primitive Church, than in that of the Cyprianic? I Answer, 'Tis true they distinguish them, but so as to distinguish the Rule from that which is thereby Ruled, and, by clear Consequence, make them not one and the same, nor ascribe to them, in this point, one and the same Authority. I would ask J. S. if they had said, that they demanded Reformation according to the Sincerity of the Practice of the Apostles, and the Sincerity of the Primitive Church,*
thus

thus equiparating the Sincerity of the one and the other, would he have own'd the Designation, and not rather have condemn'd them of a horrid Error, in insinuating somewhat not sincere in the Practice and Doctrine of the Apostles in point of Church Government? By Parity of Reason it must needs follow, that expressing themselves as is above touched, they ascribe an *Infallibility and Perfection to the first*, but a *Defectiveness and Fallibility to the second*, and do make their Appeal to the first *Absolute*, as the *Infalible Rule*, to the other *Conditional only*, in so far as consonant thereunto. 2ly, To his Question I Answer, x. He therein supposes our Reformers excluding the Apostolick Age, as not included within the Compass of the *Church Primitive*. I hope he will not deny, that it is *Primo-Primitive*, and he will not disowne it, (sure he cannot) that the *Practice and Doctrine of the Apostles* deliver'd to the Churches, and the *Primitive Church it self*, are distinguishable Things and Terms, and are here distinguish'd, nay, he acknowledges, they are *expressly* distinguish'd. 2ly, He himself confirms the Answer adduc'd, and, in his next Question, exposes and baffles himself. *In what Age during the first Three Centuries*, says he, *could they have found so full, so clear Information concerning the ancient Constitution of the Church Government?* The Answer is easy, much more in the first Age, or else J. S. spoke Nonsense, in naming all the *Three* excluding the *First*.

Page. 32. Mr. Rule said, a Bishop, in Cyprian's Time, is not a Diocesan with sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction, if he prove that, let Cyprian and him call us Schismaticks. Here is the point, says J. S. as stated by Mr. Rule, and the Stress of the Cause in which I engag'd with him. Now, let it be considered, that J. S. all along disownes the Sole power of Jurisdiction, as ascribable to the Bishop, (whatever, upon the Matter, the Testimonies of Cyprian and others, as Gloss'd by him, will amount to) and if the Stress of the Cause is laid on this, 'tis evident, that he has never prov'd that which Mr. Rule calls him to prove, and upon Proof whereof, he allows J. S. to call him Schismatick; So that 'tis evident, this clear State and Stress of the Cause has so distress'd his weak Indeavours, that, in all this Rambling Pamphlet, he asserts nothing to the purpose, nor has Answered Mr. Rule's Demand and Challenge.

Page. 33. Mr. Rule had said, Page. 10. *That Parity of Power was not wholly taken away in Cyprian's Time, tho' many Corruptions had crept into the Church, and this Declension from absolute Parity went along with them.* Upon this J. S. fasteneth his Quibble, calling this a *Mystery*, since, if we take away any part from Parity, there's no longer Parity but Imparity, which

which consists in Indivisibili. But, looking to the Scope and Contexture of Mr. Rule's Discourse, this Quibble appears very impertinent. He should know, that, altho' Parity in *Abstracto*, or under that Reduplication, as such, doth thus consist in *Indivisibili*, and to say otherwise were *Implicantia in Adjecto*, and Parity were Imparity; Yet Parity in *Concreto*, or Concretely consider'd, as denominating Subjects qualified with Power, or otherwise, admits of Extension and Degrees, according to the Nature of that Quality or Power, wherein the two Subjects are compar'd, as may be Exemplified in a Multiplicity of Instances. Thus, as is said, the Term *Power* importing a Quality admitting Degrees, there may be both Parity and Imparity in the different Respects of these Degrees, which makes, according to Mr. Rule's Expression, *Purity, Power and Parity* to be of such a Latitude, as admits a Comparison or Distinction of *Absolute Parity*, and that which is in part, which may be fitly and fully exemplified in many Instances, if needful. Take two Waters, the one luke-warm, the other hot in extreme, there's both Parity and Imparity; A Parity with respect to Heat as consider'd as opposite to chill Coldness, yet Imparity with respect to the Degrees of that Quality. The Man in the Heat and Height of the Fever, and the Man in the first Advances of it are *parēs* with respect to the Disease, as considered simply as opposite to Health, since they are both Diseas'd and Feverish, and in that simple respect *parēs*, as the Disease stands opposite to Health, or in this Comparison; Yet there's Imparity with respect to Degrees. Take it in Moral Qualities, a Man very Learn'd, and a Schollar advancing in Learning, and having reach'd considerable Degrees thereof, are both fitly denominated Learn'd, as Learning is opposite to meer Ignorance, yet there's an Imparity with respect to Degrees. An hundred such Instances may be given, where there is a Quality denominating two Subjects, there's a general Ground of Denomination reaching both, and consequently wherein both agree, and are *catenus* equal, else the general Predication were true of the one and false of the other. If J. S. cannot understand, how Power may be taken away in part, not wholly, I know not what he will readily understand, or if he understand himself. He holds, *there is an intire Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction competent to the Bishop*; He makes the Bishop sole in both, say we: No, saith J. S. *he is sole in Ordination, not in Jurisdiction*. Now then, the Power of the one is taken from the pastor, not the other; Here is Power taken away in part, *scil.* in Ordination, but not in Jurisdiction. Ergo, not wholly; Consequently, here is Parity and Imparity in different Respects. Bishop Honnieman holds, *That the Bishop and Pastor are*

meant the same in the Acts of Order; There's Parity of Power, not so in Acts of Jurisdiction: Here is Power taken away in part, not wholly, consequently the same Parity and Imparity exemplified, or Mr. Rule's Distinction of the Absolute Parity, and Parity in part. I would know, how J. S. understands the Accomplishment of the Prophecy, The Scepter shall not depart from Judah, nor a Law-giver from between his Feet, till Shiloh come? Was the Kingly and Sovereign power still existing and in force, or in the same Degree of Sovereignty as formerly, from the time of the Captivity until our Saviour's Coming. when their Kings and Governours were under the Jurisdiction of a Foreign Prince, and the Kingdom became base, as Ezek. 17? Yet the Accomplishment of that Divine Oracle and Prophecy puts it beyond all Debate, that a Power of Government was still existing in that Royal Tribe of Judah, and Family of David, until that period of the coming of Shiloh, till which period, the Scepter was not totally departed, and consequently there was no absolute Parity, to use Mr. Rule's phrase, in respect of Power betwixt the Governours after that Captivity, and these that before held the Royal Scepter, yet, in respect of the Scepter or Power, simply and absolutely consider'd, they both had the Scepter, and were in this distinguish'd from such as neither did nor could acclaim it, and thus were eatens, or in so far, according to that Prophecy, pares, the Denial whereof would impeach the Truth of the Prophecy it self. Not to enforce again here the Absurdity which Mr. Jameson has fastened upon him, of reducing the Bishop's Power above the Presbyter to such an insignificant Atom (may I call it so) of Difference, as is not, in the least measure, distinguish'd from an absolute Parity; Therein pulling down, as it were, with his own Hand, that Magnificent Structure of the Cyprianic Bishop's many and high Prerogatives above a Presbyter asserted in his Pamphlet.

Pag. 35. Fabianus is own'd as Ordaining Novatianus a Presbyter, not only without the Consent, but against the Inclinations of both Clergy and People. Now, if J. S. owne, that thus he Ordain'd without and against them, this Assertion will go far to prove, that the Bishop is Sole, as well in Jurisdiction as in Ordination. For if, in so signal an Act of Government, he may act without and against them, why not, I pray, in all others? If he may admit whom he pleases into the Number of Presbyters, why may he not use and govern them also as he pleases? Mr. Rule had said, that this was the Practice of an Aspiring Pope. And J. S. tells us, he is the first that attempted to diminish his Honour and Memory. But why do not such thus diminish from his Honour and Memory, who plead for Bishops Ordaining with Concurrence of Presbyters,

byters, since that Fourth Council of Carthage? He should have also consider'd, how their own Fam'd Episcopal Divine *Sculterus*, besides divers others, have diminish'd from his Honour and Memory, in ascribing very unaccountable Errors unto him; So that, in such a Charge, Mr. Rule was neither sole, nor the first that condemn'd the Bishops acting without the Clergy. Moreover, Mr. Rule had told him, That this Act was not only condemn'd by the Clergy and People, but by Cyprian's constant Practice, yea moreover he asserted, that himself did promise, it should not be made a Precedent. And, from that which is said, that the Bishop had prevail'd and Ordain'd him, Mr. Rule inferr'd, that he had prevail'd at least with some of the Clergy, tho' they did at first much resist it. But this J. S. passed over *sicco pede*, as the most of all that his Antagonist has against him.

Pag. 38. We have it asserted, that that place, 1 Pet. 5. 2. is, by Mr. Dodwell, fairly interpreted to prove the Bishop's Power of Disposing of the Revenues of the Church. An Interpretation not unlike to that of a Pope to prove his Headship, *In principio Deus creavit Cælum & Terram, Ergo*, the Pope is infallible Head of the Church, unless we will, with the *Manichees*, admit Two Principles; And not unlike that other Interpretation of the Voice from Heaven to Peter, when the Vessel was let down from Heaven with all sorts of Beasts, *Rise Peter, Kill and Eat, Ergo* the Pope has Sovereign Power over the Church Catholick.

For his Commendation of Dodwell, in this high Elogy of the Incomparable Dodwell, and his entituling Dr. Pearson the Great Doctor, whom his Friend Dr. Monro calls the Incomparable Bishop of Chester, we need not stand to enquire, how far he makes these two pair of Incomparables *pares*, and whether their Parity consisted in *Indivisibili*, and whether, in this point of Episcopal Learning, they were so absolutely equal, and to the least Atom *Heady-peers*, that there was no gradual Difference betwixt them. He censures the Author of the Hierarchical Bishop's Claim, for asserting, that Apostles had a Supreme and Collateral Power; But if he assert an Equality betwixt these his two Incomparables, that Author may, as to this point, tell him, *Jam sumus ergo pares*, and that he must retract his Censure. His Friend Bishop Honniceman, impugning *Naphtali*, said, that the Assertion of two Sovereigns in a Kingdom was to make two Gods; So that J. S. will find it a pretty hard Work to accord with the Bishop in this Assertion. But not to notice this further,

Pag. 40. He Censures Mr. Rule, for saying, That he was more inclin'd to write *ad Hominem*, than *ad Rem*, for that which he took to be the Truth of God. By what imaginable Consequence, or Chain of Consequences, can it

follow; (saith J. S.) that I put a higher value on the one thing, than on the other, because I chus'd to begin with it in the Order of Writing. I Answer; That Mr. Rule fixed not his Charge upon this Order, simply considered, but founds it upon this important Ground, *viz.* That he being called to the right Order by his Antagonist, i. e. the true Scripture Debate, as in the first place and properly, yea solely the point to be begun at, spent his Essay upon this Trifling Question, anent the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, which is utterly remote from the premised true Subject of the Debate; And this his Trifling Voluminous Pamphlet confirms the Charge, wherein he has wholly declined the true State of the Controversie. Nor can he evade, by telling us, that *Delaying is no Waving*; For, in this Case, since he cannot deny, that the State of our Controversie is a Scripture Dispute, anent the *Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles in point of Church Government*, his Delaying to speak to this point in Question after he is called to it, (yea all this time Delaying, or, to speak truly, quite giving it over) is a *meer Waving*, and exposing the Weakness of his Cause, which cannot abide the Scripture Light and proper Decision.

Pag. 41. He asserts, *That Episcopal Government was instituted by the Apostles, did prevail in all duly constituted Churches, in part of the First, and through all the Second and Third Centuries.* What means he by *duly constituted Churches*? If Episcopally constituted, then it seems some Churches in the first Age wanted Prelates, and so were not duly constituted, and thus the Apostolick Constitution was but Mank and Defective, till compleated in the Second and Third Age. If he say, he means that all Churches were not fully constituted in that Age. I Answer, 1. There's a vast Difference betwixt not *fully* constituted, and not *duly* constituted. A Church may be in a good measure constituted according to Gospel Rules, and in so far duly constituted, altho' several things may be wanting, as to a full Constitution, but not to be duly constituted, imports somewhat amiss in the Constitution it self. 2ly, When we speak of *the Apostolick Age*, in its intire and full Extent, as reaching not only to the Death of the Apostle John, who (if History may be believed) long survived the rest, and none will doubt, in the Apostolick Inspection of Churches, but likewise includes all the after Duration of that Century; We must, in point of Church Government, consider that Age, with respect to the *Doctrine and correspondent Practice of the Apostles, in the Constitution of Churches*; And therefore, how absurd is it, to assert, that the Churches which they Planted and Watered, in all that Extent of Time, were not rightly or fully constituted in their *Organick Being*, till compleated in the subsequent,

quent, Second or Third Age; Besides, that the Doctrine and Practice of the Third Age is thus made the *Cynasura* or Touch-stone, to try the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles in this point, 3^{ly}, By what Rule were all the Churches of the Second and Third Ages rightly constituted? Does he not draw the Universally supposed right Constitution of the Churches in the Second and Third Age, from a supposed Conformity to the First, and if the Church in that Age was but in some parts of it rightly constituted, in others not, then it seems the Conformity is not clear and adequat, at least the Constitution of the Church in the Second and Third Age was more exact and universally commensurated to the Apostolick Pattern than the First, which I know not who will believe, if not J. S. 4^{ly}, He asserts that the Apostles instituted this Government of Prelacy; and holds, that it took place in all duly constituted Churches in part of that First Age. Now I would know upon what Ground he asserts, that this supposed Apostolick Government took place only in part of that First Age, not through the whole? For if the Apostles did thus constitute Churches, he will not disown that their Constitution was uniform and of the same Mould. And here he has need to beware of a twofold Absurdity, viz. In either ascribing to the Apostles a Negligence or Unfaithfulness in point of this Constitution; Or, that some Churches owned and established, during their Inspection, some opposite Frame of Government; As likewise that Evangelists appointed by Apostles in the Constitution and Government of Churches, walkt not up to their Pattern through all the First Century: And, as is said, it is somewhat Mysterious how this Defect or Negligence came to be rectified in the Second or Third Age. And sure, none who Reads the Scripture sincerely, will dare to call into Question the Apostles Faithfulness, Diligence, yea and Success, through the Lord's blessing upon themselves and the Labours of Evangelists and others, in the due Constitution of the Churches. If J. S. shall alledge, that the *Mystery of Iniquity and Corruption in point of Government, did in our Principles, early begin, even during the Apostles time*; 'Tis Answered, This confirms what is said, since the first and early beginnings of Corruption in point of Government opposite to the Apostolick Constitution, as well as in point of Doctrine and Worship, has the Apostolick Scriptural Recorded Testimony against it, and their strenuous Endeavours in opposition to it, shewing their Zeal in maintaining their uniform Mould of Government, Witness the Apostle Paul's asserting of the early Working of the Mystery of Iniquity, compared with his Warning the Elders of *Ephesus* of such like Defection, Acts

20. 29, 30. and the Apostle *John's* curbing the Aspirings of a *Diotrephes* above his Brethren. Besides that the account which we have in Scripture of the working of the Mystery of iniquity in the First Age, and taking Root and growing in the succeeding, will, in the Judgement of all unprejudicated Persons, make it uncontroversibly clear that what Defects in point of Government, or aberrations from the Apostolick Rule, some Churches of the First Age might be Guilty of, could not be rectified, but were rather increased in the Second and Third.

He declares, *Ibid.* and peremptorily, that he will not say, *that the Elders of Ephesus whom the Apostle warns, Act. 20. 30. were Diocesan Bishops.* Here it may be asked, *Whether he judg'd this Church of Ephesus was duely Constituted according to Apostolick Institution, when Paul gave this last and farewell Charge to these Elders, and Scripture Bishops?* For, that there is an Episcopal Power ascribed to them, I hope he will not deny, the Text being therein clear and express, the Apostle using this Argument to excite them to Diligence in their Office, *viz.* That *the Holy Ghost made them Overseers or Bishops over that Church*; If he acknowledge this Church was duely Constituted according to Apostolick Institution, then here is an Instance of an Apostolick Church Constituted according to Apostolick Institution without Diocesan Bishops, and with Pastors Exercising a joynt Collegiat Episcopal Power; Therefore he overthrows his Assertion that the Apostles Instituted Diocesan Episcopacy: For he will not dare to affirm that the Apostles did not Constitute Churches in an uniform Mould of Government, or that the Apostle *Paul* in such a Charge, and in leaving the Church thus Constituted, did contradict or counteract his Fellow Apostles. But if he shall be bold to assert that this Church was not duely Constituted according to Apostolick Institution, he charges an unfaithful Defectiveness upon the Apostle *Paul*, in not hinting, in the least, in this his last and farewell Charge and Exhortation, the necessity of their Conformity to such an Episcopal Institution as he supposes Apostolical, nay in contradicting this supposed Institution while committing this Episcopal Charge to the Elders, and this before *Timothy* their pretended Bishop then present with the Apostle.

Pag. 42. He disowns *his pleading for the Bishops sole Power of either Ordination or Jurisdiction*; Which notwithstanding all his Clamours against Mr. Rule for imputing this to him, he clearly asserts, as is evident, *Chap. 4. §. 11.* wherein in *terminis* he asserts the Bishops sole

Sole Power of Ordination, and owns it, that he had in his first Book asserted this: *I said so indeed*, saith he, but his [*Indeed*] is little worth, for here he contradicts and denies *that he ever said so*.

Pag. 44. Mr. Rule had said (Pag. 35.) *That the Fathers Holy Zeal and excellent Rhetorick made them sometimes overlash in their expressions and invectives against Schism*. Upon which he tells us, *he cannot comprehend how holy Zeal and excellent Rhetorick could have produc'd such a bad effect, as an unjust Condemnation of Schism*. But, 1. This superficial *Momus* should have accounted for what Mr. Rule chargeth him with in that very Page, *viz.* That there being an account of 7 General Councils at Carthage, he cites *Concilium Carthag.* without any Discrimination, hiding thus his Error in case places be mis-cited. 2^{ly}, He should have accounted for his charging Presbyterians with all those Imputations put upon Schism by the Fathers cited by him, such as these of *Renegados, Apostats, Antichrists, the Devils Priests, &c.* and Answered the Dilemma Mr. Rule offers to him; Either he applauds and thus applies these Characters, or not; If not, his Citations are impertinent; If he do, will he think it just that all this Dirt be thrown back upon his Party, whom we reckon for Schismatics: This Mr. Rule told him he is tender of, and thus in point of Charitable Modesty has undone and sham'd this petulant Banterer. 3^{ly}, Mr. Rule said that *the Fathers Zeal and Rhetorick made them sometimes overlash in their Expressions about Schism*, which Judgment and Character of them he Fortified by the Observation of the Learned *Daille* *, shewing also that the Fathers themselves were aware of this with respect to the Writings of one another, citing *Hierom, Epist. 139. ad Cyprian.* And *Apolog. contra Ruffin. Petavius* tho' a Jesuite having the same Observation in *Panar. Epiphan. ad Hæres. 6. 9.* So that *J. S.* might have observed this was no peculiar Imputation of his Antagonist. But here, as elsewhere, we have him Courtaling and Disguising what he cannot Answer. Moreover, I would fain know, upon what ground he can deny that Zeal against an Error or Vice may be Holy, and also the Person's Rhetorick Good, and yet the remains of Corruption, where-with the Graces of the best of Saints is mix'd, (consequently even good Rhetorick) may be productive of *such an overlash in manner of Expression*. I think he will not deny to *Moses* holy Zeal, yea and excellent Rhetorick, who *was mighty in Words, as well as Deeds*, and yet notwithstanding there was an *Overlash* in the Expressions of his Holy Zeal and Rhetorick against the Wicked Rebellious *Israelites*, when
he

* *Right use of the Fathers, C. 5.*

he said, *Ye Rebels must we fetch Water out of this Rock* *. 4^{ly}, Mr. Rule said not, That their good Zeal and Rhetorick produc'd this Effect of an unjust Condemnation of Schism, as J. S's blind criticising Zeal prompts him to suggest, but that they did *overlass sometimes in their Expressions about it*. Now who can deny that these are very well consistent, and that the Condemnation of a Crime or Error may be just and true in it self, tho' there may be *some overlass sometime in the manner of Expression*.

J. S. *Ibid.* had said, *That by Cyprianic Principles, all Bishops were equal*. Hence Mr. Rule observed, *that he is for Parity in the Church*, and tells him, *that if it be found among Bishops he knows no Scripture, nor Reason, which condemns it among Presbyters*. J. S. thinks he twits his Antagonist Wittily; when he adds, *and truly neither do I*. But, 1. He should have accounted for his Foolish Argument to prove the Bishop, the Center of Church Unity, *because the Church is an Organical Political Body, which must have a Principle of Unity upon which all the Members must hang; else they are no Members*. Which Argument, as propounded by him, Mr. Rule did shew to stand cross to the common Principles of Logick, *there being three premises expressed and a fourth necessarily to be understood, ere the Conclusion can be reach'd*. And besides his other Impertinencies, he shewed the false Supposition his Argument is grounded upon, *scil.* that the Principle of Unity in a Political Body must needs be *One Person*, and cannot be a *Society* and *Consistory*, a Principle discarding all Civil Government as unlawful, except Monarchy. He pretends to vindicat his Book; Where is his Vindication of that which is charged upon him in this very Page which he cites? But, 2^{ly}, To come more closely to this simple Sarcastm; If he own a Parity among Bishops, he disowns both the *English*, and the late *Scottish* Hierachy; For as in the last the Bishops were, so in the first they are subject to Arch-Bishops, did Swear and do Swear Obedience to them, yea and all of them to the Metropolitan the Center of their Unity. 3^{ly}, If he acknowledge all Pastors or Presbyters equal, equal I say, by Scripture Rule (for he will not disown it that herein the Pastors Office as well as the Bishops stands delineated) they must be such in all *Official Authority ascribed to them in Scripture*. And this Official Authority according to the Scripture accounts thereof reaching both the *Keyes of Doctrine and Discipline*, the *Supereminent Official Authority* of the Prelat inhancing this Power in himself, and deriving it to Pastors as his *Substitutes and Suffragans*, is evidently cut off and excluded,

Pag. 45. He Criticises upon Mr. Rule's two Testimonies from *Firmilian* *, but quite passes over several * Pag. 49. Citations of *Cyprian*, cited in that and the preceeding Page, to prove Presbyters Authority in Judicatories, as *Epist.* 10. §. 3. wherein they are owned as the *Præpositi* and having a Ministerial and Episcopal Inspection. *Epist.* 28. commending the Clergy of *Carthage* for debarring from Communicating with them *Gains* Presbyter *Didenſis* and his Deacons, who had Communicated with the Lapsed, wherein he tells them, they Acted according to the Discipline of the Church. Likewise, Presbyters Judicial concurrence with the Bishop he proves from *Epist.* 25. §. 17. wherein it is affirmed, that in condemning Schismatics, *affuerunt Judicio & Cognitioni*. Likewise §. 21. speaking to *Cornelius* Bishop of Rome, he expressly mentions the Clergy as Ruling together with *Cornelius*. His words are, *Florentissimo Clero illic tecum præſidenti*. Citing also to this purpose, *Epist.* 58. §. 2: also *Epist.* 62. 65. adding that Passage of *Epist.* 6. §. 4. *Doleo enim quando audio — nec a Diaconis nec a Presbyteris regi posse. i. e.* I regrave that they can be Governed neither by Presbyters, nor by Deacons. Adding *Pamelius's* Note on this Passage, *Hinc non obscure colligitur viguisse adhuc Carthagini ætate Authoris Prærogativum Presbyterorum ac Diaconorum Primitivæ Ecclesiæ, qua communi totius Presbyterii, i. e. Presbyterorum & Diaconorum Collegii consilio administrabantur omnia ab Episcopis, i. e.* "That 'at this time the Presbyters Prerogative owned by the Primitive 'Church was still vident at *Carthage*, scil. their Interest in Govern- 'ment, and that the Bishop Administred the same with their Concur- 'rence and Counsel. To confirm which, he tells us, *Pamelius* cites *Ignatius*, as he had before also cited him. §. S. having passed over this *siccò pede*, as to the Testimony of *Firmilian*, he alleges that Mr. Rule infers from this, *That. Præpositus signifies Bishop, Senior Presbyter according to Pamelius, that therefore he is for Parity betwixt Bishop and Presbyter.* A gross Distortion. Mr. Rule having cited *Firmilian's* Epistle which is the 75. *ad Cyprianum*, and that Passage thereof, *Necessaria apud nos fit ut per singulos annos seniores & præpositi in unum conveniamus — ut graviora communi Consilio dirigantur*, and §. 6. — *Præſident majores natu & potiores qui & baptisandi & manum imponendi & ordinandi possident potestatem*; Wherein the common Council of Presbyters in all the weighty Affairs of Government and their Authority even in Ordination is asserted; From hence he infers, that all Power is ascribed to the Presbyter that is given to the *Præpositum* or Bishop. He after cites *Greg. Nazian.* who, in his Apology, shews, that the Apostle did make Canons for Bishops or Presbyters, 1 *Tim.* 3. *Tit.* 1. asserting,

Presbyters Authority in Government; Also *Ambrose*, Epistle to *Syagrius*, anent *Syagrius's* being censured for passing Sentence by himself, *sine alicuius Fratris consensu*, without the Concurrence and Consent of any of the Brethren: Shewing also, that his own Sentence was acquiesced in, because *hoc iudicium nostrum cum Fratribus & Con-Sacerdotibus participatum processit*, was past by Concurrence of his Brethren and Fellow-Presbyters. Also *Chrysostom*, Hom. 11. on 1 Tim. asserting that there is almost no Difference betwixt the Bishop and Presbyter, rendering this Reason wherefore the Apostle omits the Order of Presbyters and passeth to that of Deacons; Adding further, in Confirmation of this Reason, That Presbyters are Ordained for Teaching and Governing the Church, and what the Apostle had said of Bishops he applies to Presbyters.

Judge then, says Mr. Rule, if *Chrysostom* was for the Bishops
 * Pag: 51. sole Jurisdiction. He cites also * *Augustin*, Epist. 19. wherein he sets all the Difference betwixt Bishop and Presbyter on this Foot, that *Episcopatus* was *Presbyterio major secundum honorum vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit. i. e.* That the Difference betwixt Episcopacy and the Presbyterat, was only Nominal, and flowing from the Churches Custom. From whence he infers, that *Augustin* places the Prelation of a Bishop above a Presbyter in the Title of Dignity, but speaks not a word of Superior Power. Next, not only does he deny, that it had its Original from Divine Institution, putting in the place thereof a Human Custom only, but he speaks of it as lately settled, *jam obtinuit*, tho' this was after 420 years, so that it was neither Constituted nor Universal till then. Citing also *Salvianus*, who makes the Levitæ and Sacerdotes to be the Apostles Successors, not mentioning Bishops as distinct. Also *Gildas*, who frequently speaks of Bishops and Presbyters promiscuously. All this *J. S.* passes over *sicco pede*, as likewise *Jerom's* Epistle ad *Heliodorum* & ad *Demetrium*, *Ambrose* Epist. 80. *Cyprian* Epist. 12. wherein it is made good that Penitents were received by the Bishop and Clergy. Neither doth he touch Mr. Rule's Examen of Prelats Prerogative in Confirmation, together with the Proofs adduced by him: As also his Examen of what *J. S.* had offered for Prelats Prerogative in point of Ordination, Pag. 52. 53, 54. In all which and many such Instances 'tis uncontroversibly clear, that he has taken but a very superficial view of his Adversaries Strength and Reasonings in this voluminous Pamphlet.

Amongst other Proofs of Presbyters Power in Ordination, Mr. Rule had cited that Passage of *Jerom*, *Alexandriæ a Marco Evangelista usq; ad Heracleum & Dionysium Episcopos, Presbyteri semper unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant: i. e.* That

at Alexandria from Mark the Evangelist until the Bishops *Heracles* and *Dionysius*, the Presbyters having chosen one from among themselves, set him in the higher Seat, and peculiarly term'd him *Bishop*. Whence he infers, that during that time all the Power and Authority of the Bishop was given by Presbyters; They Elected him, nor had he any other Ordination or Communication of Power but what he had from them, in the Opinion of *Jerom*. To this Testimony *J. S.* excepts, 1. His leaving out that Clause, *Quomodo si Exercitus Imperatorem faciat, i. e.* As an Army chooseth a General, &c. which he says, would have marr'd his whole Plote and Conclusion. I Answer, not at all, because, as is notourly known, no Allusion or Similitude is Argumentative in this Case, because of many apparent Absurdities; Nor is any Similitude to be strain'd so as to infer an absolute Likeness, for this were Identity, not Similitude; And any who ponders *Jerom's* Scope here, and in his Comment on *Titus*, his Epistle to *Evagrius*, will easily Judge, that he was as far from making the Bishop such an Emperor over Presbyters as East is from West.

He Quarrels the Consequence. They had the Power and Authority of choosing and nominating him, Ergo he had all his Power and Authority from them. But, 1. He offers no Reason of his denial, as if it were enough for him to deny what is made good by clear evidence. 2ly, He but disguises and curtails the Passage and Expression used by *Jerom*, for thus the Words run, *Presbyteri unum ex se electum in excelsiori gradu collocatum Episcopum nominabant*, where 'tis evident, in *Jerom's* Sense and Account of this matter, that these Presbyters pitched upon one of their own Number, whom they thus Advanced, and who, as to the Main, and in point of Official Power and Authority, was still a Presbyter, because, in the 2d. place, All the Difference betwixt him and them was in this, that they set him in an higher Seat, or Bench, as Cloathed with a derived presiding Inspection. 3ly, That they gave him the Name of Bishop as set up in this Precedency, and as Mr. Rule well infers, he had no Consecration of his fellow Prelats, as having this Sole Authority. In stead of this true Sense and vigour of the Passage, *J. S.* will have it to bear no other Inference, but that they had the Power of Choosing and Nominating their Bishop, such a Power as the Chapter hath to Nominat the Person who is to be Bishop, altho' only the Bishops can Invest, Consecrat and Inaugurat him in his Office, whereas *Jerom* says, that all his Authority in *Univerſum* either as to Inauguration, or call it Consecration, or Exercise of his Office, flowed meerly from the Presbyters free Choise, who by this their free Election set him up to Preside over them, as an Assembly Chooses and

Nominates a Moderator, in no other manner, and for no other end. 3ly, Mr. Rule did further infer from this Passage. *That if the Presbyters made a Bishop, it could not be he alone, but the Bishop with them, and as one of them, that made Presbyters.* J. S. says, *Who can be so pert as to say this is no good Consequence?* But this Sarcasim lights upon himself, who is so pert as to deny so clear a Consequence, the Connection whereof is evident, 1. *A Majore ad Minus*, The making a Bishop is a higher Act of Authority in his Principles than making a meer Presbyter, Therefore if the Presbytery had Authority of making a Bishop, and set him up as their President, or Head, much more had they an Interest with this their President and Head to Inaugurate or Ordain a Member or Fellow-Presbyter; And therefore the Bishops Sole Prerogative in Ordination, which he is bold to assert, is clearly cut off and excluded. 2ly, If the Bishop was set up by them thus to Preside, to be sure they did it not to destroy their own Power, but to Fortifie it by such a Head of their Union, not to dissolve or annihilate their Judiciary Power, and therefore the Bishops acting is still to be construed with their Authoritative Concurrence. 3ly, He was set up as one of them, *Unum ex se electum* says Jerom, wherefore by his Election he was still *Unus ex ipsis* in their Sense and Design; And if so, his personal Act was no Judicial Act, as J. S. pretends the Act of the Prelate is, and no otherwise Judicial than with their Authoritative Concurrence.

Mr. Rule had further disproved the Prelates Sole Power of Ordination from several other Testimonies, As, 1. That of *Hilarius*, who lived in the middle of the Fourth Century, on *Epbes. 4.* 2ly, That of *Novatus*, a Presbyter in *Carthage* who Ordained *Felicissimus* while *Cyprian* was Bishop. Citing also *Cyprian* Epist. 33. likewise Epist. 24. Epist. 10. §. 2. Likewise *Concil. Carthag. 4. Can. 3.* and several such Passages, pag. 55, 56, 57. wherein he makes appear Presbyters Power in Ordination, and confutes some of J. S's Subterfuges in his first Pamphlet. All which this Man scims over *sicco pede*. Only, as to what he has pag. 58. against J. S's Proofs for the Bishops Sole Power in Ordination, who had adduced the Instance of the Ordination of *Aurelius*;

Mr. Rule had Answered three of his Reasons: Upon the first, anent the same Power in all Ordinations, he had told him, that it doth not thence follow, they might so dispose of Ordaining Power with respect to those whom God had appointed, and about whose Ordination he had given Rules in the Word. To the 2d Reason, anent the Bishops asking only the Counsel of Presbyters about the Manners

‘Manners and Merits of the person to be Ordained, not their Concurrence in the Act of Ordination, Mr. Rule had told him, that not their Counsel only, but their Joynt Suffrage was necessary, as he had before made appear, and that the not mentioning of it in this Act of Ordination, is not to the purpose, seing it is consequential to their Office and Church Power. He tells him further, that this was a single Instance in an extraordinary Case, for which Cyprian spends a whole Epistle in making Apology, and insinuates the contrary, when he shews *what he us’d to do*, and gives a *singular Reason* for what he now did. Telling him further, that such an Act does not import a Custom. To a Third Answer of J. S. that Cyprian Consulted Presbyters of his own Easiness and Condescendency, his Antagonist Answered, that he had before refuted this, and that J. S. is herein inconsistent with himself, who holds, that the Bishop was the Monarch, and the Presbyters his Senate, and that he will not say, that ’tis *ex bene-placito*, that Kings Consult their parliaments, unless he be for the Turkish Government in Church and State. Now, to shew this Man’s Prevarication and Triffling, of all these Answers passed over in silence, he only Nibbles at this last Clause of the Third Answer, wherein he, r. Grants, “That ’tis not *ex bene-placito*, that Kings Consult their Parliaments, about granting Commissions to Inferiour Officers in Civil or Military Imployment. 2ly, He asserts, that Thousand such Commissions had been granted by our Kings, yet he remembers not, that any of them did Consult their Parliaments about any of those Commissions, but gave them without such Consultation. Then, sure, it must be *ex bene-placito* they Consult them, or else, he must say, they infringe the Parliament’s Right, in giving such Commissions, so that his Answer confutes it self, and confirms what Mr. Rule had offered against him. I hope, he will grant, that what he holds of this Easiness of Cyprian, or such like, had respect to all points of Government, and Judicial Actings thereof. Says he not, that when Cyprian professes *ab initio Episcopatus mei decrevi*, &c. that he is determined to do nothing without the Counsel of Presbyters, since the beginning of his Episcopacy, to proceed in no Act of Government without the Concurrence of Presbyters, that the Word *Decrevi* points only at his Voluntary Condescension, but imports no peremptory Obligation, and therefore the Parallel will hold, that he makes him such a Monarch, as Consults his Senate or Parliament only *ex bene-placito*, or out of his own Condescendency and Easiness, as he expresses it.

Mr. Rule, § 43. adduces another of his Testimonies from *Cyprian, Epist. 41.* as also § 44. another of his Testimonies from *Epist. 39.* and 29. To which he has offered several Replies and Confutations, all which *J. S.* passes over *sicco pede*. And whereas *J. S.* in proof of the Bishop's Power in Ordination, *Pag. 43.* had produced the second Canon of the Apostles, commonly so called, which is, *Let a Presbyter be Ordain'd by one Bishop, and likewise a Deacon, and the rest of the Clergy.* In Answer to this, Mr. Rule had told him, (*Pag. 61.*) *That the Authority of these Canons was contraverted even among Papists, as Sixtus Senensis, Lib. 2. ad Voc. Clemens, Pag. 62, 63. and Carranza. Summa Concil.* with others. Moreover, *That the Contentions about the Number of them, make them all to be suspected.* He also further made it appear, *That the Canons, tho' admitted, prove not this conclusion.* To this *J. S. Pag. 46.* answers only to that point of the Contentions about the Number of the Canons, and tells him, *Let the Canonical Books of Scripture see to it, unless there has never been any contention about the Number of them.* A witty Answer, no doubt; As if the same inherent and convincing Impressions of a Divine Inspiration, demonstrating their Divine Authority were to be found or acknowledged in these Canons, as there is in the Canonical Books of Scripture, which the Contentions or Doubts of some Persons can no more impeach, than Doubts or Debates anent the true genuine Sense of these Divine Oracles themselves. But further, Mr. Rule had cited *Rivet's Critica Sacra, Lib. 1. C. 1. Pag. 93.* and *Peter Martyr, Loc. Com. Clas. 4. C. 4. Pag. 779.* who brings sufficient Grounds for rejecting them, as neither done by the Apostles, nor collected by *Clement*, to which *J. S.* can return no Answer.

Moreover, from what *J. S.* had asserted, *Pag. 44. That after Cyprian's time, it was appointed by the Canons, that Presbyters should concur with the Bishops in Ordinations,* Mr. Rule infers, that this overthrows all his Discourse of the Bishops Majesty, Sovereignty, Uncontroulable and Unaccountable Power, &c. To which *J. S.* Replies, That he cannot see the Consequence, or if Kings can discover it, it will be their Wisdom to bethink themselves, before they admit of the Concurrence of their People to the making or executing Laws, lest they bid Good-morrow to their Majesty and Sovereignty, as well as their Uncontroulability and Unaccountableness. But, **I.** The Consequence, which this Man cannot see, is evident and clear to any of common Sense; For, if the Necessity of a Judicial Concurrence of Presbyters, in Order to the putting forth or exerting this Act of Ordination, impeacheth not an absolute Sovereignty, Uncontroulableness and Unaccountableness, surely nothing will; For suppose the Prelate inclined and resolved to Ordain,

Ordain, in Opposition to the Design and Intentions of Presbyters, either their Essential Interest therein can stop his Design, or not; If it can, and thus Controul him, where is an Uncontroulable Power, so zealously contended for in this Voluminous Pamphlet, Ch. 6. throughout, as likewise, Ch. 7. §. 59, 60, 61, 73. If they cannot, where is their Essential Interest in the Ordination, since the Bishop may perform it without and against them? As for his Caveat, with respect to Kings, 'tis of a piece with the rest of his wise Inferences, there being a palpable Difference betwixt Kings being, by Laws in a Limited Monarchy, (Limited, I say, in Opposition to that Turkish Arbitrary Monarchy, which this Man and his Fellows covet) tied to Consult, yea and have Consent of Parliament in Enacting Laws, and a Prelate or Prince's Consulting only *ex bene-placito*, being free to Act without, or even against Parliaments, or Peoples Rights, Votes or Priviledges, whether in Matters Civil or Ecclesiastick.

J. S. had affirmed, that the Bishop had full power in Cyprian's time, without asking the Consent or Concurrence of Clergy or People, to settle Presbyters within his District, for proving which, he adduces Cyprian's Epist. 40. written to Carthage, *That they should receive Numidicus as a Presbyter among them*: And J. S. adds, *probably he was Ordained before*. To this Mr. Rule Answers, that, having before written on that Point and Question about the Power of Election, in a Book which J. S. had seen and cited, he hath neither stated the Question, nor spoken to the point. 2ly, That if Numidicus was Ordained before, then he was also placed in Carthage before, and that there's Cause to think, he was Ordained by the Consent and Concurrence of the Presbyters of Carthage, that at least J. S. cannot prove the contrary, which is necessary for establishing his Conclusion. 3ly, That he who animadverts on Pamelius's Notes on Cyprian, hath these Words on the beginning of the Epistle, *Etsi Vocatio Numidici magis erat Extraordinaria, quam Ordinaria, tamen non sine Plebe Carthaginensi Presbyterio ascribitur, i. e.* Altho' the Vocation of Numidicus was rather Extraordinary than Ordinary, yet he is not assumed to the Presbytery, without the People of Carthage. Whence he infers, (says Mr. Rule) that Ordinations without their Consent, are *Profane & Irrite*, Profane and Unlawful. 4ly, That J. S.'s Work is to prove, that it was the Practice and Principle of the Cyprianic Age, *That a Bishop by himself placed Ministers*. This, saith he, cannot be inferred from one single Instance, and that in a Time of Persecution and Dissipation, and where there was no signal Appearance of Divine Determination, that Cyprian's Words are, *Admonitos nos & instructos Dignatione Divina, sciatis ut Numidicus Pres-*

byter adscribatur Presbyterorum Carthaginiensium Numero. He lets them know, that he was admonished and instructed by Divine Condescendency, to admit *Numidicus* into the Number of the Presbyters of *Carthage*. Mr. Rule offers to the Consideration of J. S. or others who desire Satisfaction in this point of the Election of Pastors, *Blondel's Apol. pro Sent. Hieron.* from Pag. 379. to 548. where it is traced through all the Ages of the Church. Of all which Answers, J. S. dare only nibble at the second, and endeavours to ridicule Mr. Rule's Consequence, as if *Numidicus's* being Ordained, had been adduced by him absolutely, and without respect to the present Case and Circumstances, to prove his being placed in *Carthage*. But how he ridicules himself in this Inference, is palpable to any who ponders Mr. Rule's third and fourth Answer, which J. S. durst not meddle with, and that he intended no such thing, but supposes, according to what he cites from the *Animadverter* on *Pamelius's* Notes, that, upon this Hypothesis of his being Ordained at *Carthage*, *non sine Plebe Carthaginensi*, he was thus assumed. Now, what a pitiful *Momus* must this be, who, in this point, being challenged to a formal Dispute, and called to answer so many Arguments offered against his Assertion, dare only Quibble or Nibble at a Word of his Antagonist, and then, tho' flying from the Cause and Point, run away *Tbraso*-like with a Cry of Victory.

Pag. 47. We have J. S. leaping over from Mr. Rule's pag. 62. to pag. 68. omitting several important Answers of Mr. Rule's, and Efforts upon his Pamphlet. He had cited a passage of *Cornelius's* receiving persons, about whom he call'd the Presbytery, without asking the peoples Consent. Upon this Mr. Rule had told him, that he had a few Lines before acknowledged, that after they were receiv'd in the Presbytery, the people were made acquaint with it, and not one Word of the Bishop's receiving them by himself. Mr. Rule added, That as if designing to refute himself, he cited a Letter of these persons, shewing, that they were reconciled to the Bishop and whole Clergy, overthrowing thus the Bishop's Sole Power of receiving Penitents. In Answer to this, J. S. contradicting still himself, disowns his pleading for the Sole Power, quarrels Mr. Rule's Consequence.

What (saith J. S.) will their asserting, that they made their peace with the Bishop and Clergy, hinder this Sole Power of Reconciling, and Authoritative and Judicial Absolving Penitents? If so, then the People had their Share of this Authoritative Reconciliation, since they also assert, that they made their Peace with the Joy and Good-liking of all the People; Nay, saith he, thus neither Power of Reconciliation was in Bishop or Clergy intirely, or in any particular Church, since they

they were reconciled to the Catholick Church. But the silly Insignificance of this Reasoning appears, when 'tis considered, that Mr. Rule's Consequence was anent a *Judicial Authoritative Absolution, and Receiving of Penitents*, intended by them in that Letter, which Mr. Rule distinguisheth from, and opposes unto the Bishop's *Sole Power of Receiving of Penitents*, asserted by J. S. since he had cited their Letter, which mentions their Reconciliation not only to *the Bishop*, but to *the whole Clergy*. Where is then, says Mr. Rule, *the Bishop's Sole Power of Receiving Penitents*? Moreover, J. S. hath told us of the *Joy and Good-liking of the People in this Authoritative Absolution*: Now, this Joy, Reception, and Good-liking of all the People, he will certainly distinguish from the Ministerial, Authoritative, or say Episcopal, or Judicial Absolution of Penitents, as he terms it, as the Effect from its Cause; So that his Reflection upon Mr. Rule's Inference, *scil.* All have a Share of the Power of Reconciling (he must understand a Judicial Absolving Power, to use his own Term.) with whom the Absolved are Reconciled, is palpably senseless: For neither dare he assert, nor can he, with any Shadow of Reason, alledge, that Mr. Rule intended, that all to whom the Penitent is Reconciled have the Authoritative Power of Absolution, since both Mr. Rule and he are speaking of Reconciliation, as respecting *the Bishop and Clergy*, whom he here would insinuate to be *the Church Representative distinct from the Church Collective*. And he will not be thought to owne the Bishop as Sole in this Absolution, tho' herein still inconsistent with himself.

Mr. Rule, Pag. 69. shews, that the last Prerogative of the Bishop mentioned by J. S. and pleaded for by him, is *his Delegating, not his Presbyters in common, but two of them, Rogatianus and Numidicus, with two Bishops, Caldonius and Herculanus, to consider the State of the Poor at Carthage, and to pronounce the Sentence of Excommunication against Felicissimus and Augendus, which they executed against them and some others*. Hence Mr. Rule, 1. infers, That, if this Discourse prove such a Power of Delegation, it will also prove such a Power in one Bishop over another; Which J. S. allows not, -seeing he asserts, Pag. 27, 28, 35. *That every Bishop is Supreme, and hath no Ecclesiastick Superior on Earth*. Now, let us hear J. S's pitiful Reflection and pretended Answer. 1. He makes his own Assertion to be only this, *viz.* *That Cyprian delegated these two Bishops, to order some Affairs relating to the Church of Carthage*; Whereas his Scope and Expressions clearly bears, that, as an Instance and Evidence of Cyprian's Authority over Presbyters, he Orders, or Delegates (yea, and even in order to this weighty point and Censure of Excommunication), not the Presbytery or Pres-

byters in common, but two Presbyters to deal in this Affair ; So that he evidently assumes this Delegation, as his *Medium*, to prove this Supereminent and Peerless Authority of a Bishop over a Presbytery, or the Bishop's Sole Prerogative in this point And, upon this Ground, Mr. Rule did well infer, that if this his *Medium* be valid, it will conclude the same Authority over these Bishops, or of one Bishop over another, since this Delegation reached and respected them, as well as the Presbyters. This Consequence *J. S.* endeavours thus to ridicule, A Bishop's Power to Delegate another Bishop, to order any Matter for him, gives the Delegating a Power over the Delegated, and destroys the Equality of Bishops ; Imputing this to Mr. Rule as his own Assertion, and comparing it to his Writing to one of his Brethren, or Colleagues in *Edinburgh*, about the Affairs of his Paroch when absent, as if, in his Sense, this did import Authority over him. But how pitifully Impertinent is this Reasoning, will easily appear, when 'tis considered, that Mr. Rule did not draw the Consequence of the Superiority of one Bishop to another, from this Delegation *simply*, or *in it self considered*, but from *this Medium*, or *Delegation as improven by J. S.* arguing thus *ad Hominem* ; Since our *Momus* argues the Bishop's Prerogative over the Presbytery from this Act and Instance, that he Delegated these two for this Work, together with the Bishops, and not the Presbytery, hence Mr. Rule inferred against him, that if the Delegation prove it, which respected the two Bishops, as well as the two Presbyters, it will prove the same Superiority over them ; Improving thus *J. S's Medium* against himself : So that the absurd Inference is his own, not Mr. Rule's. Did ever any (but such an ignorant Wrangler as this) imagine, that an absurd Consequence drawn by an Opponent upon *his Adversary's Medium*, is simply the *Judgment and Assertion of that Opponent* ? And will not any of common Sense understand this Opponent to be of the contrary Judgment, since he is suppos'd to hold the Consequence, in it self considered, to be absurd ?

But suppose *J. S.* had never so much of the common Sense of Arguing, as to have understood this, yet he might have seen it convincingly evident in Mr. Rule's second Answer, wherein he sets down his own positive Judgment, and disownes this Consequence, as in it self Absurd, whatever it be in *J. S's* pleadings. His second Answer is this, *Sending a Messenger to do for us what we are restrain'd from doing, is not always an Act of Authority: One Friend may send another, if he yield to it, as well as a Master may send his Servant.* Here, as I said, we have his positive Sentiment in this point, and very well caution'd, wherein he further impugns *J. S's Medium*, adduc'd to prove the Bishop's Authority over the

the Presbytery, since a Delegation, simply considered, will not prove this, as *J. S.* himself acknowledges.

But let us hear our vain *Momus* Insulting, *Happy is that Party, saith J. S. that has such a Master of Reasoning for their Champion.* But he has rather discovered, how Unhappy the Prelatic Party is in such a punny Proctor, or Pratter rather, as himself, who discovers such gross Ignorance in the solid Methods of Reasoning, while taking a Conclusion drawn from his own *Medium* to be his Adversary's Judgment and Conclusion, yea, and moreover, while he ignorantly takes his Antagonist's opposite contrary Conclusion and Instance, adduced to discover the Weakness of his *Medium*, to be contradictory to his Adversary's own Judgment, or Principle, which is only a Contradiction of his false Conclusion and Inference. And therefore, he proclaims his Folly in that Exclamation which he subjoyns, *Courage, Brethren,* (Addressing, in his phantastick Humour, Mr. Rule's Collegues, upon Supposal of such a Delegation as is mention'd) *Mr. Rule may delegate you, and yet acquire no Authority over you.* Indeed the Presbyterian Brethren may take Courage in this, as in many other Discoveries of *J. S.*'s Weakness, yea and acting the Fool upon a Stage, while pretending so successfully to plead the Episcopal Cause.

But, 'tis pleasant to see, how Nonsensical he is, and in the Briars of Self-inconsistency, in what he adds further. *It is very true, saith he, in one Sense, i. e. it is not indeed an Act of Authority over the Person sent or delegated.* And therefore, say I, your Inference was nought, in concluding the Bishop's Sole Power from the Delegation, simply, and in it self considered, and Mr. Rule's Inference against you was good, that your *Medium* will equally strike against the Equality of Bishops; And so your Argument proving too much, proves nothing. *J. S.* tells us, *the Original Equality of Bishops,* notwithstanding Mr. Rule's Inference, and upon his Concession, *is both Wind-tight and Water-tight:* But, from what is said, 'tis evident, his *Medium* hath made it neither *Wind-tight* nor *Water-tight*, but, through Idleness of his Hands, and his shallow unskilful Arguing, that long since Tottering-House is dropping through, and Presbyters Official Equality without Bishops, notwithstanding his *Medium*, yea and upon his Concessions, is both *Wind and Water-tight.* But, saith *J. S.* *it is false in another Sense, that only in which it might be serviceable to G. R.* And what is that Sense, think we? Thus he exhibites it, *viz. That it is not always an Act of Authority over the Church, in which the Matters are to be ordered by vertue of that Delegation.* Where, 1. We may see this Man's shameful Prevarication and Flinching from the point debateable. For, the Question 'twixt him and Mr. Rule was not anent

an Act of Authority over the Church in general, but of the Bishop over a Presbytery, or of one Church Officer over another, and he has acknowledg'd, the Delegation, simply considered, will not bear such a Conclusion; So that, in the Sense he has owned, 'tis only and properly serviceable to Mr. Rule, and the other Sense was not by Mr. Rule intended. In the next place, Mr. Rule, in his second Answer, had said, *That sending a Messenger to do what we are restrain'd from doing, is not always an Act of Authority, since one Friend may send another, as well as a Master his Servant*; In which Instance he shews, that, in some Cases, he supposes it is such an Act. Finally, since he grants, one equal in Authority over another may give such a Delegation, both having Authority over the Church, with what Sense could he say, that this Sense would have been serviceable to Mr. Rule, viz. *That 'tis not always an Act of Authority over the Church, since, as 'tis said, Church Officers Authority over the Church was not the Question 'twixt Mr. Rule and him*?

This Planting *Thraso* Glories in exhibiting a Dozen Instances, as he calls them, of Mr. Rule's Abilities in Reasoning, Boasting he could have tripled the Number. But, to any who peruse his Pamphlet, 'tis evident, he has exhibited Instances, not a few, of his own Ignorance and petulant Folly, since he not only skips over, in this Voluminous Pamphlet, most of all Mr. Rule's Reasonings and Confutations of his first, but offers such Impertinent groundless Quibbles for Replies, as discovers he understands not whereof he affirms. For his Rant and Quibble anent *Eusebius's* supposed mentioning of *Sozomen*, and his Insolent Mockery of Mr. Rule, and several Learned Men, who have taken him to mean the Author so called, 'tis well that he is bold to stage for *Ignoramus's* so many considerable Authors, as well as Mr. Rule, Mr. *Jameson*, and T. F. in special the Famous and Learned Mr. *Melvil* and Mr. *Calderwood*, either of whom could have taught such a Hawker as J. S. 'Tis well known, that Mr. *Melvil*, in special, was, as in other points of Learning, so, for Knowledge in the Greek Tongue, Inferiour to few, or none of the Age; And 'tis pretty odd, yea and Unaccountable, that, for so long a time, so many Learned Searchers of *Eusebius*, and even the English Doctor *Merideth Hammer*, his Translator, (a Man who has discovered both exact Diligence, and Knowledge of the Greek) could not discover this Mistake, which J. S. or some of his Fellows Learning has now found out. But, as in his other Attempts to asperse this Reverend Author Mr. Rule, so, in this, he hath blotted himself. He would seem mightily seen, forsooth, in *Eusebius*, undertaking the Defence of his History, yet dares not, in the least, meddle with the many weighty Grounds of its Falshood exhibited by Mr.

Melvil, Didoclarivus, yea the Famous Josephus Scaliger, and even by Spalatensis himself, Lib. 4. Cap. 1. with several others.

He Censures Mr. Rule, pag. 52. for saying, *That Cyprian's Authority is insufficient to prove a Divine Truth*, citing his Preface; And adds, *be it so, but did not you appeal to him.* I Answer, Mr. Rule never appeal'd to him in this point, scil. the Decision of the pretended *Jus* of the Diocesan Prelate, and in that Preface which J. S. might have been ashamed to mention he had appeal'd him to a *Scripture Dispute*, offering large proofs from Scripture and the Fathers, that *the Scripture Decision is only to be look'd to in this point.* And for the Appeal mentioned, Mr. Rule, as I said, never appeal'd to him as giving the deciding Stroke in this Controversie, but only in Opposition to J. S's *Scottish* and *English* Hierarchists, and to clear that point of Fact, that Cyprian's Bishop and theirs are Two, or Distinct in point of Power and Authority. And J. S. in this voluminous Pamphlet is so far from disproving this Assertion, that in many respects he has made it good and confirm'd it, as is already made appear.

As for his long winded Censure of Mr. Rule in recommending Books, he has therein, as much as in other points, proclaim'd his Folly. 1. He is Guilty of a gross Forgery, in asserting that Mr. Rule recommended Mr. Bayns in the Controversie betwixt Prelatists and Presbyterians, since 'tis evident in the place cited by him, scil. pag. 52. that he only recommended him and Mr. Peregrine's Letters Patents of Presbytery, &c. upon a special and particular Head, *touching the Reception of Penitents by the Bishop and Clergy*, in Opposition to the Bishop's pretended Sole Priviledge herein; Shewing, that they had somewhat singular upon this very point, and thus restricting his Recommendation. So that his phantastick long winded Quibblings, anent their supposed Errors in this Controversie, are like the rest of his Reflections, bombastick Talk, nothing to the purpose, Mr. Rule never having absolutely Recommended these Authors, as he asserts. He knew, there were at Hand, in order to such Recommendation in this Controversie, many Learn'd Writers, to whom none of his Party are able to Answer. Besides, can J. S. prove these Consequences or Assertions, which all his prolix Ignorant Tattle is founded upon, viz. 1. *That a Man's Recommending some Authors as having spoken pertinently to a certain particular point, will infer his judging such Authors intirely, or absolutely sound in the whole of any Controversie; Or, that he has recommended them as such, or under such a Notion.* And, 2ly, *That the asserting, that one, or both these Authors have spoken pertinently to a certain point of Fact (that instanced, in special) will infer the Assertion of their intire*

intire soundness in this Controversie. Who sees not the Folly and impertinency of both Conclusions or Inferences?

Page. 69. Our voluminous Pamphleter will have us now believe, he has Travelled to Hercules's Pillars, and tells us, *He has fix'd the Controversie, brought it to such a point as shews the true Mark at which all pertinent Arguments on either side must hereafter be levell'd. A great Acquittance! Well, what is this fair fix'd Mark which all Arguments on either side must level at? Why, 'tis this: His Design is to try to put it beyond all Controversie for the future, that there was true, real and proper Prelacy in S. Cyprian's Age, that Cyprian and his Contemporaries have depos'd for the Divine Right of Episcopacy; which Foundation being laid, he tells us, he may have occasion to run it up to the true Source, the Apostolick Constitution of Church Government.* Now, how inconsistent Rambling there is in this big Thrafonic Boast and Undertaking, will evidently appear if we consider, 1. He grants elsewhere, that all that can be proved in point of Fact from Cyprian will not amount to prove a *Divine Right*, and this in more places than one, however in this inconsistent with himself, as will after appear. Hence let all Men of common Reason Judge, with what Sense he could assert the clearing this point of Fact to be the *Apex and Mark* which all Arguments on either side (he must of necessity understand and include in the first place *Scripture Arguments*) are to level at: If it be such a *Mark* to be fix'd on, then surely it must be such as it is the Touch-stone and Cynosura to try which of the Arguments are true and genuine, solid and convincing, and which not: And if so, then sure this point of Fact is the fix'd Center, the infallible first Principle which all are to rest in. Hence, by an inevitable consequence, he makes this Practice to be the Infallible first Rule, and consequently contradicts himself in his pretended Appeal to the Scripture Rule, since in so far he acknowledges that this point of Fact will not instruct a *Jus Divinum*. 2ly, He makes this Cyprianic Practice the *Foundation to be laid*, and his running up to *Apostolick Constitution* a sort of *Superstructure* built upon, and, as it were, born up by this *Foundation*. But if the *Apostolick Constitution* be the only Divine Rule and Cynosura, why has he not laid this *Foundation*, especially since his Antagonist appeal'd him to it, as the only proper *Foundation*. Was ever such a preposterous Fabrick existent, till J. S. forged it, or such a *Hysteron-proteron* in this point asserted? But again, 3ly, I would know, what he means in calling this Cyprianic Practice a *Foundation*? Whereof is it a *Foundation*? Whether of a meer point of Fact, touching the existence of *Episcopacy* in that Age, or the Churches entire Embracements of it? Or, the *Foundation* of the *Jus* and *Divine Right* of that Government?

If he hold to the first, how can he call a meer point of Fact or Practice of the Church a *Foundation Proof* in a *Scripture Debate*? And, no doubt, all may see, that in the current of his Arguing, he asserts it to amount to much more than the force of a meer Practice. If he hold to the second, *viz.* That this Practice is the *Foundation of a Divine Right*; Then I infer against him, 1. That he makes it the *Infallible Rule*; And, 2ly, He is *Inconsistent* with himself, in granting, *that this evinc'd Practice will not prove a Divine Right*. 3ly, He acknowledges the Apostolick Constitution the *Source and Fountain*. This *Source and Fountain*, he must needs understand with respect to a *Divine Right*, altho' he expresses this darkly and generally, not shewing whereof it is a *Source*. But sure, if in any sound Sense it be a *Source*, it must be the *Fountain* whence the *Divine Right* flows, and whereby all after Practices are to be measured: This, therefore, must be the *Apex and Mark* that all Arguments on either hand are to level at; This, and this only must be the proper *Foundation*; Why then, in contradiction to himself, obtrudes he another *Apex, Mark, and Foundation*? And how absurdly contrary to the Sense, I am sure, of all protestants, will he have all Arguments to be levelled at this *Mark* of the *Cyprianic Practice*, which he calls the *true Mark*: So that, in his Sense, the Arguments that do amount to prove the Practice do necessarily infer the *Scripture Decision* in this point: If this be not to make the meer Practice the leading Rule, and paramount to the Scripture Light, let any Judge.

Pag. 64. F. S. tells us, *That if what he has digested in this his Defence be not able to make Mr. Rule yield, he knows not how to convince him.* Yield to what? J. S. will tell us, that there was real proper Prelacy in Cyprian's time. But, 1. If by real proper Prelacy, he mean such Diocesans as are all on a level, without Dependence of any upon another (as he has frequently represented his Diocesan), then he has been at all this pains in his voluminous Pamphlet to set his *Cyprianic Prelacy* by the Ears with his *English and Scottish Hierarchy*, which is of a clean contrary Mould, as all do acknowledge. So that he has not only lost his Labour, but for his Disservice to his Party, and Affront put upon their beloved Hierarchy, in cutting them thus off from this eminent *Cyprianic Pattern*, deserves their severest Censure. 2ly, Did not Mr. Rule appeal him to a *Scripture Dispute* upon this point? Nay has he not acknowledg'd (however in this inconsistent with himself, as is often observed) that this matter of Fact will not amount to prove a *Divine Right*: So that, to all who Read his Pamphlet, 'tis evident, that he has given over the true Debate, and declines the true State of this Controversie,

Controversie, Confessing he has nothing to plead from *Scripture* for this his great *Diana*, and that all his ability in this Controversie is *Extraneous* and *Extrascriptural*. Further, in the 3^d. place, he thus contradicts his insinuated Offer, when this his Goodly Foundation of an existent *Episcopacy* in *Cyprian's* Age is laid, to run it up to the true Source of the *Apostolick Constitution*, wherein he boasts of a *Scriptural Original* of this *Prelacy*, and of ability to make this appear. Why then cuts he out his ability so short as to reach no further than the matter of *Fact* in *Cyprian's* Age, and gives over the convincing of his Adversary, if this do not amount to conclude the point. Will this Man in his *Ravings* never be one with himself?

Upon Chapter Third, there is vast ground of *Animadversion* offered upon his pitiful *Triflings* and inconsistent *Ramblings* to any that are willing and have so much spare time. 1. In general, He cites a number of *Learn'd Authors*, and *Writers* for *Presbyterian Government*, acknowledging that an *Innovation* from the first *Divine Frame* of *Government* came in before the end of the first Century, scil. the constant *Presidency* of One call'd a *Bishop*, with some *Power* annex'd thereunto, who do also hold that this *innovating Prelate* was not a meer *Moderator*, but had some further extent of *Power* annex'd to this his fix'd *Presidency*. Now, how shallow and impertinent this is, is obvious to the meanest *Reflection*. First, *Mr. Rule* still held him to the *Divine Standard* of *Scripture*, and told him that neither he, nor any *Presbyterian* laid the stress of their Cause on the *Principles* or *Practice* of the Church, simply considered, that 'tis *Divine*, not *Humane Authority* we take for the ground of our *Belief* and *Practice* in this point. 2^{ly}, The *Learn'd Authors* cited by him do, by *J. S's* Confession, acknowledge and hold, that whatever beginning of *Prelacy* or *Power* affix'd to these *Moderators* obtain'd in the First Age, was an *Innovation* and *Recess* from the *Divine Pattern*; So that upon both grounds, instead of reaching in these Citations a Thrust at *Mr. Rule*, he doth therein Stage himself as an *Impertinent Triffler*. *Mr. Rule* (as is said) appeal'd to *Scripture Decision*, the *Divines* cited by him do in these very places stand to the same *Appeal*, holding that the very first apparent *Prelacy*, or the first excrescent *Power* of a *Moderator* beyond the Office of a *President*, meerly such, was a *Recess* and *Aberration* from the *Divine Institution*; So that in both respects they do stand on *Mr. Rule's* side in this Debate, and do check and condemn our Pamphleter.

This will be convincingly clear, if two things be further pondered, 1. That *Mr. Rule* never disown'd that there were some beginnings of *Prelacy* which early crept into the Church, and did appear, and as to

to the point of Fact, did Limit and State the Question with him upon such a Prelacy as he had asserted to be prevalent in the Cyprianic Age, viz. not only a Prelacy totally excluding Ruling Elders, as he had asserted page 8. of his first Pamphlet, but such a Prelacy, or Prelate, as was Essential to a Church, so that without the Prelate no Church could subsist, as he had asserted, pag. 19. "A Prelate, or Prelacy, whose Power is Monarchical, as he asserted, pag. 22. and whole simple Deed is *eo ipso* the Churches Act, asserted also by him, pag. 24. Such a Prelate as is Subordinat to none, pag. 27, 28, 35. Who is a Supreme Ecclesiastical Magistrat, and has Majesty ascribed to him, pag. 43. A Prelacy and Prelate who is a Sovereign and Peerless Governour, and has a Supreme and Unaccountable Power, asserted by him, pag. 65, 67. See Cyprianic Bishop Examined, pag. 3. 2ly, The Acknowledgment of a Fix'd Moderator, with some more Power than the meer Moderator, or Præses, obtaining towards the end of the First Age, or after the times of the Apostles, being the furthest Extent of the Assertion of these Divines cited by him, who sees not, that this is as far from coming up to Patronize J. S.'s Cyprianic Bishop, above described, and, consequently, the Prelate, or Prelacy, anent which Mr. Rule Challeng'd his Proof, as East from West? From hence 'tis evident, that these Divines, as is said, stand for Mr. Rule, and do condemn Him.

In the next place, he adduces Mr. Rule's and others Acknowledgment, that a Moderator was still judg'd Essential to Church Government *Ordinis causa*, and tells us, that this overthrows the Distinction betwixt the Priority of Dignity or Order, and that of Power and Jurisdiction, made use of by G. R. and his Brethren, the last whereof, they assert, was not assum'd by the first Prelates, who had this Presidency *Ordinis causa*, since the Divines cited by him do acknowledge, that the Prelacy introduc'd after the Apostles was an Innovation, and a Recess from the Order which obtained as long as the Apostles liv'd; For, saith J. S. How could it be an Innovation? How a Recess from the Original Order, if nothing more was conferr'd on Bishops than what they had been in Possession of, since the first Institution of Presbyteries? That the Power and Priority of Order and Jurisdiction are in themselves clearly distinguishable, J. S. cannot but acknowledge, yea clearly doth assert that it is the Principle of the Divines cited; Which I prove thus: If the Presbyterian Moderator, or the Præses, *Ordinis causa*, was the Divine Pattern and Institution, and the fix'd Præses with a further Extension of Power was an Innovation and Recess from this pattern; Then there is a clear Distinction stated, in their Principles, betwixt the

Two: But thus it is in their Principles; *Ergo*. The Connexion is clear, there being an evident Distinction betwixt the *Divine Pattern*, and *Innovation*, in themselves considered. Next, If the fixing of a *Præses durante vita* be cross to the Essential Authority of Pastors in Government, as being an Encroachment upon, and Limitation of these Gifts and Graces suiting such a Duty and Office, competent to other Members of the Judicatory, especially if this draw along with it some beginnings of more Power than is competent to a meer President *Ordinis causâ*; 'Tis evident, that this fix'd Presidency of such a Nature and Tendency as is instanc'd, was beyond that of a meer Presidency *Ordinis causâ*, and in so far an Innovation and Recess from the Divine Pattern, altho' the Jurisdictional power of Judicatories was not thereby at first excluded, nor did these presidents intirely encroach upon the same: So that both Assertions stand good: The very first Priority of the Nature and Tendency instanced was in so far an Innovation, and yet reached not that *Power of Jurisdiction* which Prelates after assum'd: Again, that the Priority and Presidency instanc'd was from the beginning, and coëteraneous with the Institution of Church Judicatories or Presbyteries, J. S. cannot make appear to be the Assertion or Principle of presbyterian Writers, this being the *Episcopus humanus*, and thus distinguished by *Beza*, from the *Divine Episcopacy*, which first took place by our Lord's Institution, in his *Tract. de Tripl. Episc.*

As for the Assertion of Presbyterian Divines in point of a Constant Moderator, whatever, as to matter of *Fact*, might be drawn from some Assertions this way, yet the absolute Parity of Pastors, in point of Government, being so fully and peremptorily asserted by all of them, and those in special cited by J. S. *Chap. 3. §. 74.* it follows, by inevitable Consequence, that whatever Encroachment upon this Divine and Absolute Parity of Pastors may be made appear to attend such constant Moderators *durante vita*, must needs be, upon this ground, disowned by them, as to the *Jus*, or *Divine Right* thereof. And this the Connexion betwixt the Cause and Effect doth necessarily require.

I cannot but, upon this Occasion, Reflect upon a considerable passage of the Worthy and Famous Mr. *Dickson* in his Commentary on *Matth. Chap. 21. v. 25. 26, 27.* *The Princes of the Gentiles exercise Dominion over them, &c. But it shall not be so among you, but whosoever will be great among you let him be your Minister, and whosoever will be Chief among you let him be your Servant.* Upon which words, (having noted that all

“Majority

“Majority of Power, all greatness of Jurisdiction of one over the Rest, is by our Lord forbidden to his Ministers; He adds, for his sixth Doctrine upon this Context; “Not only doth our Lord discharge all Majority of Power among the Apostles, and in their Persons among Preachers of the Gospel, but also all stately *Primacy* or *Dignitary Priority*: [All *Chiefness*] albeit without Jurisdiction, such as [is Constant and Unchangeable Presidency in Assemblies]; And therefore he prescribes the curbing of this Inclination, by enjoying the study of Submission Mutual, and each Man’s Serving of the rest, for the furtherance of the Common Work; *For let him be your Servant* importeth this: Inferring thus Judiciously, the prohibition of this unchangeable Presidency in Assemblies from the command of a *Mutual Submission*, and *serving of each other*, with a Design of advancing of the common Good of the Church; Clearly thus Homologating the ground which we have formerly offered against this *fix’d and constant Presidency*, scil. that it is a Limitation of, and Encroachment upon such Governing Abilities, Gifts, and Graces, as may be supposed in other Members of the Judicatory, all which are given and bestowed by the Spirit of God for the Churches common Good and Well, as the Apostle asserts, 1 Cor. 12. 7.

Chap. 4. He disowns the pleading for the Sole Power of the Diocesan Prelate. But besides that he has been herein sufficiently Exposed and Chastised by Mr. *Jamelson*, it is further Remarkable, that, 1. He has not touched the point as stated by Mr. *Rule*, and upon which he engaged in this Debate with him. Mr. *Rule*’s Assertion in his *Def. of the Vind. of the Church of Scot.* and in his *Cypri. Bishop*, &c. is, That the Bishops of the Cyprianic Age had not the Sole Power of Jurisdiction and Ordination, That these Bishops were not Diocesans with such a Sole Power. Now, since he so frequently disowns, in this Chapter, his pleading for the Sole Power, §. 7, 10, 11, &c. and condemns his Book to the Fire, if he do, ’tis evident he has not touch’d Mr. *Rule*’s State of the Controversie, and the proper Ground and Occasion of the Debate: But his pleadings are meerly usefess, as not amounting to prove the Cyprianic Bishop to have been our Diocesan; Because, 1. They prove not, according to J. S.’s former Acknowledgment, that Sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction owned by Episcopalians, as Mr. *Jamelson* has made appear. 2ly, They prove not the Negative Voice, which, according to J. S. is a special Jewel of the Episcopal Sovereignty; For he owns the Cyprianic Episcopacy to be such as is acknowledg’d by *Chamier*, *Blondel*, &c. Thus, Chap. 3. §. 68, &c. But certain it is, that their Acknowledgments, even as represented by him, make not

a *Negative Voice* to have been assum'd by such Presidents, but some little *Imparity*, or *Majority of Power*. Hence appears his Impudence, in adducing these to prove a *Negative Voice*, as if what they assert did include the same, yea, and endeavouring to set them in terms of Contradiction with Mr. Rule, who, in his *Cyprianic Bishop*, never disowned this. He acknowledges them Learned, yea Learned Antiquaries whom he cites; Why has he then receded from their Judgment?

Pag. 118. The Question is stated by him thus, *Whether the Church should be Govern'd by Pastors acting in Parity, having equal power, without the Superiority of one Pastor above the other Pastors?* Which state of the Controversie, is, 1. *Lame and Imperfect*. 2ly, *Obscure and Undistinct*. And, 3ly, *Repugnant to his own Pleading*. *Lame and Imperfect*, since the Question is touching the *least Degree of Imparity*, much more such as includes a *Negative Voice*, and most of all such as wrests from Pastors the whole Power of Government. So that his State of the Question reaching only the first, it touches not the other. That this *Sole Power* is own'd by the Church of England, is evident from that Passage of King Charles I. cited Chap. 4. S. 36. where his Majesty supposes, that preceeding that Concession of his mentioned, anent the Concurrence of Presbyters with Bishops, the whole burden of the Government lay upon the Bishops Shoulders: And none will doubt, that thus it was all over the Church of England, and Scotland likewise. Next, his State of the Question is *Obscure and Indistinct*, since he shuts up all in the general Term of *Superiority of Power* as distinct from *absolute Parity*. 3ly, This State of the Question crosses his Pleadings; For, to the *Cyprianic Bishop* (the Pattern, with him, for the Prelacy he owns) he ascribes not a bare *Majority and Superiority of Power*, but a *Sole, Absolute Power*. Thus Chap. 7. S. 10. pag. 345. and S. 11. pag. 347. and S. 12. Pag. 349. He declares, that the *Cyprianic Bishop*, by the Principles of that Age, had such a Power, as that by himself, when he thought it expedient, he could have given Laws to all his Clergy, Presbyters as well as others, and that he did it not always, was the result of prudence, not the defect of Power, &c.

As for his ascribing to the *Cyprianic Bishop* a Power, he calls *Sovereign*, not *Sole*, Chap. 7. pag. 340. Let him see to the Reconciliation of his own Inconsistencies. Whereas he says, in Answering the difficulty of the Disparity between the Antient *Cyprianic*, and his Modern *Diocesan*, Chap. 7. pag. 149. *That tho' the Cyprianic had an absolute inherent Power, yet he judg'd not himself bound always to act absolutely; But that it was lawful, as well as prudential, for ordinary, to restrict them*

themselves, so far as to act with Counsel and Advice; Whence he infers, There is no Error in our Constitution. But what pitiful Blunder is this? If this absolute Power competent to the Cyprianic, he ascribe not to the Scots Constitution of Prelacy, then there is an Essential Disparity between the Two: If he do ascribe it, he maintains the inherent Right of the Bishop's absolute Power, and in the state of the Controversie not proposing to maintain it, he flatly contradicts the pleadings drawn from the Character of the Cyprianic Bishop.

He will needs have the State of the Controversie to be Parity or Imparity; But his Grounds to prove it are palpably nought. 1. He will have it to follow upon the Exclusion of the Sole Power. Thus, Ch. 4. Pag. 182. But what pitiful Consequence is this? For, secluding the Controversie of Sole Power, there remains the great Controversie of a Negative Voice, which the Controversie of Parity and Imparity does not comprehend.

He brings in a Presbyterian saying *, That granting * Ch. 4. Pag. 184. Episcopacy now in England were pull'd down, that the Bishop should have nothing left him, but only (as some have projected) a good Benefice, with Care of Souls; whereto they should be tied, should have a very small Diocess, the Name of Bishop peculiar to themselves, to Ordain Ministers in their Diocesses, with Concurrence of other Ministers, to be constant Moderators during Life, upon Condition of good Government, &c. Yet cannot such an Office be lawful in the Church. Where 'tis evident, that the grand Episcopacy of Sole Power, and the Moderate of a little Majority of One to other Pastors, are distinguished, that the former, not the latter, was then in Being through all England, and consequently was maintain'd by Episcopalians.

His next Reason to prove this the State of the Question, is taken from the Tendency of Arguments on both sides. 1. Presbyterians design to prove Parity, and not meerly to overturn Sole Power. But will it follow, that because they are not designed only against the Sole Power, but further to prove Parity, that therefore only Parity, and not Sole Power, is controverted? It rather plainly follows, that both are controverted, viz. Parity controverted by others, and maintained by them, and therefore they use Arguments to prove it; And Sole Power maintained by others, and controverted by them, and therefore they use the same Arguments (à Minore ad Majus) finally to overturn it. But, 2ly, Are there none of their Arguments not so very prevalent for Parity, and yet strike deep at the Roots of Sole Power? See Ch. 4. §. 4. Pag. 121. And reconcile him with himself, where he says, by removing the Solitude of Power from the State of the Controversie, Presbyterians best Arguments become Inconcludent; For they only

overturn that, and no more. But then, 2ly, says he, the Controversie must be Parity or Imparity, and not Sole Power, because the Arguments of Prelatists conclude the One, and not the Other. 1. The Jewish Hierarchy, or Apocalyptick Angels conclude not a Sole Power. Ergo quid? They conclude not a Negative Voice, nor ever shall, Ergo, A Negative Voice is not controverted? 2ly, The Constitution of the Church of the Cyprianic Age, (according to his Acknowledgment; however, when it serves his Turn, he contradicts it) ascribes to the Bishop an Absolute Power, as an Inherent Right; And so, by his own Rule, here's sufficient Reason for taking Sole Power into the State of the Controversie.

For what he adds, that Success of Discipline, with Dispatch of Business, is better attained by Superiority of Power with a Negative, than with a Sole Power. 'Tis true, Dispatch and Success, right or wrong, may be ascribed to a Sole Power; But a Right, as well as Quick, Dispatch, is best obtained by Plurality of Advice, and Parity of Power; And the Reciprocal Negative of the Bishop, and Consistory maintained by him, is subject to most Stops.

How sadly disingenuous and weak he has been in the Citation of Authors, Mr. Jameson has fully demonstrated. One remarkable is, Ch. 4. S. 94. where, speaking of the Constitution of Episcopacy in An. 1610. he says, that one of the Canons of that Assembly is so plainly against the Sole Power of Ordination, that Calderwood has nothing to say, but that, by that point, much was derogated from the Power of the Presbytery. Which is false, for he says more in that same place, Pag. 638. of his History, That the Bishops had no regard to the Assembly's Act on that Head, but, notwithstanding thereof, acted absolutely many times, not so much as assuming the Ministers of the Bounds, giving Ordination in their chappels, &c. Which, as it doth discover, how unfaithfully he cites the Sentiments of Persons, who seem to favour his Cause, thus also his Impudence, in challenging Mr. Rule, and the whole Fraternity, as he terms them, to produce an Instance of a Presbyter Ordain'd by any Scottish Bishop since the Year 1610, without the Concurrence of Presbyters, Ch. 4. S. 99. for here is Calderwood's Testimony for several such Instances.

The Weakness of several of his Citation Proofs appears in several Instances, particularly, Ch. 6. S. 2, 3, &c. Where, to prove Bishops, as contradistinct from Presbyters, to be Successors of Apostles, he brings Cyprian, saying, That Deacons ought to remember, that our Lord chus'd Apostles, i. e. Episcopos & Præpositos, Bishops and Rulers, and that, after our Lord's Ascension, Deacons were made by the Apostles, for the Service of their Episcopacy. Where there's not a word of Bishops in Opposition to Presbyters, but of Bishops and

and Rulers in Opposition to Deacons. Thus we have impregnable Reasoning, Bishops and Rulers are the Successors of the Apostles in Opposition to Deacons, Ergo, they are the Successors of Apostles in Opposition to Presbyters. This Reasoning will appear the weaker, if we consider, that, 1. By *Præpositi*, or Rulers, Presbyters are frequently understood. And next, whether we understand by Rulers here only Bishops, or not, what is ascribed to them makes them Successors of the Apostles in Opposition to Deacons (their Office being instituted by Christ first, and that of Deacons being after subjoined as a Help), agrees not to Bishops in Opposition to Presbyters, but is a Dignity belonging unto Presbyters, as well as unto them. Hear another of his proofs, *S. 5. Ejusd. cap.* where he brings in Cyprian saying, *You constitute your self Judge of Christ, who says unto his Apostles, and thereby to all Bishops who succeed to Apostles by Vicarious Ordination, They that hear you, hear me, &c.* Therefore they succeed to the Apostles, yea, and succeed exclusively of Presbyters. A good Consequence; The Succession clearly importing Presbyters, as is said. In the former Instance, the Property laid down of the Successors of Apostles, was Persons having their Office instituted by Christ himself; That laid down in this Instance, is their having this Promise of Christ attending their Office, *viz. He that heareth you, &c.* Both which none can deny to belong to every Presbyter, when called forth by Christ to preach the Gospel. And if Cyprian hold, our Lord said these Words to the Apostles, some will alledge a Blunder, since they were said to the Seventy, tho' indeed the Words properly reach the Apostles, not them only, and do clearly include Presbyters sent forth upon this Errand.

Take another Instance, *Ch. 6. S. 66.* He proves the Bishop's Sovereign Interest in Baptism, by a Passage of Cyprian, *Pag. 293. S. 64. Nec nobis credentium Populus nullam per nos consecutus Baptismi Spiritus Sancti Gratiam judicetur.* *S. 66.* He tells us, "Cyprian proving his Episcopacy against Papianus, he argues *ab Absurdo*, if he were not a true Bishop, it would necessarily follow, none of these, who, in the District he pretended to be Bishop of, had been Converted to Christianity, had been either Baptized or Confirmed. Cyprian, says he, Baptized not all himself, but most part being Baptized by Presbyters and Deacons, how can the Argument *ab absurdo* conclude, without making these Presbyters and Deacons do it by Subordination, and particular Allowance? And this Supposition, with him, concludes irresistably Cyprian's Sovereign Power. But, will he hold Cyprian to be infallible in all his Argumentations? Again, Cyprian's Argument *ab Absurdo* will conclude, without Supposition of his Sovereign Interest in Baptism:

1. *Cyprian's* Words do not respect all that were Baptized within his Diocese but only such as were Baptized by himself, (*Nullam per nos consecutus Baptismi Gratiam*) : Does not his Argument conclude better by this *Personal Administration*, than by any pretended *Sovereign Interest* in Baptism administered by others ? If he were not a true Bishop, his Baptism is more clearly null in the former respect, than in the latter.

But next, giving, not granting, that Presbyters are to be here included, even on this Supposition his Argument may be good, without the *Sovereign Interest* in Baptism : For, 1. If he were no Bishop, not only the Baptism which he personally administered, but likewise that which was administered by Presbyters and Deacons, whom he Ordained, was null, and that without supposing any *Sovereign Interest* in their Administration of Baptism. And, 2ly, The Baptism of all other Presbyters adhering to him as their Bishop was null, since, in adhering to a *counterfeit Bishop*, they separated from the true Bishops, and thus Baptized without the Church ; And all this without supposing their Dependence alledged by *J. S.*

To prove the same forementioned Interest in Baptism, *Pag. 298, §. 72.* he brings this Argument, " A certain Man Baptized in an Heretical Communion, at length came over to the Communion of the Church of *Alexandria*, and living long in it without any other Baptism, came to *Dionysius* the Bishop, and earnestly besought Baptism, which he refused, perswading, that it was not needful, and all this without mention of any other Presbyter's being consulted or concerned. A mighty proof, the strength whereof lies in one of two ; Either, 1. That the Man sought his Baptism from *Dionysius*, and none of all the presbyters in the City of *Alexandria*. But this is nought, and will as well prove, that a Man seeking Baptism to a Child from one Minister in *Edinburgh*, and not from the other Ministers, will prove that Minister's having an Interest in that Holy Sacrament, which the others had not. Or, 2ly, The strength lies here, that *Dionysius*, without consulting his Presbyters, refused to give it. But, 1. How is that proven ? He says, it seems not to be insinuated in the Account of this Matter. Such a Negative Witness is no sufficient proof. 2ly, Will his not consulting prove his *Sovereign Interest* in Baptism, beyond these he did not consult ? Suppose a Minister of *Edinburgh* refuse a Scandalous Person the Privilege to present his Child, before his Satisfaction, without consulting the other Ministers ; Will this prove his *Sovereign Interest* in the Administration, or in Admitting Sponsors, beyond what they can claim to ? And, in a word, his wise Reason will not only prove a *Sovereign*, but a *Sole Power* of the Bishop, and that Presbyters had none at

at all : For, if the Bishop had the *Chief Power* only, and Presbyters a *Subordinate Power*, if the Case was straitening to himself, he would, and ought to have taken their Minds thereanent ; But his Argument excludes even so much as a Consultation, or Advice.

See another of his Proofs of the same Stamp, *Ch. 7. S. 23. Pag. 382.* " He proves the Bishop's *Sole Definitive Voice* in that Council of *Carthage*, anent Heretical Baptisms, *An. 256.* from this Ground, that ' they had the *Sovereign Power of Baptism* by the Principles of these ' Times, and the Case being such to be determined in the Council, ' was a Case about Baptism, which none, besides the Bishops, had ' Right to determine in. But, can he say, that no Person, whoever he be, has Power to give his Decisive Judgment, unless cloathed with *Sovereign Power*, in that Affair, in which he is called to give his Judgment ? Will not a *Subordinate Power* do his Turn, but he must be cloathed with *Sovereignty* for that Effect ? I would know, 1. What Difference he can make betwixt *Sovereign* and *Sole*, if the One, as well as the Other, shall exclude Presbyters, in Judgment, from a Voice of Decision ? 2. What shall become of the *Scottish Diocesan* ? If his Argument hold, by the *Scottish Constitution*, he must lose his *Sovereignty*. Yea, 3^{ly}, What became of *Cyprian* with his Presbyters at *Carthage*, when he gave them not barely a *Deliberative*, but a *Definitive Voice* ? Nay, his Argument not only contradicts common Sense, but even his own Reasoning elsewhere, when he is at pains to prop Episcopal Sovereignty on a *Negative Voice* ; Thus, *Ch. 6. P. 316.* Which clearly supposes *other Voices*, and, consequently, if his Reasoning be good, *Ch. 4.* is Inconsistent with such a *Sovereignty*, as includes a *Sole Power*.

'Tis obvious to any Reader, that his Principles, in this Voluminous Pamphlet, are both Dangerous and Incoherent. 1. Dangerous. There is a deal of Popish Tenets apparent in them, as, 1. That of his *Principle of Unity*, taken notice of, and improven against him for proving a Pope, by Mr. Rule, to which he has Reponed nought but Banter, as we may see, *Ch. 9. S. 7.* 2^{ly}, That Assertion, *That there is more Evidence for Episcopacy, than for the Canon of the Scripture*, proposed in an impudent Boasting, *Ch. 9. S. 13. ad fin.*

But then, his Principles are likewise Incoherent, 1. Not to insist on the Nonconsistent Contradictory Account of his *Cyprianic Bishop*, sometimes making him to have had a *Sole Power*, See *Ch. 7. Pag. 349.* and again frequently Recanting it, and making him not to have had it, for which see *Pag. 340.* and *Ch. 4. Pag. 123, 124.* as having been in a Strait what to make him ; For, he foresaw, if he did not make

him to have the *Sole Power*, and give Presbyters only Voices of *Deliberation*, not of *Decision*, especially in Synods, he would say nothing to Mr. *Rule*, see *Cb. 7. Pag. 350.* And again, if he should fairly and fully hold the *Sole Power*, he saw, he must contradict the State of the *Question* anent *Episcopacy*, maintained, *Cb. 4.* Thus he presents his Bishop a meer Amphibion and Versatile Proteus, making him sometimes to have this *Sole Power*, sometimes not to have it. 2ly, His Account of the *Cyprianic Bishop* is Inconsistent with the Constitution of the *Scottish Diocesan*, *An. 1610*, which he himself maintains, and that not in things Trivial and Circumstantial, but, in point of the *Cyprianic Episcopacy*, *Substantial* and *Essential*. Consider, 1. That, in his Account, the *Cyprianic Bishop*, however he, for ordinary, did limit himself, yet had an *Absolute Inherent Power*, which he might, at pleasure, exercise, *Cb. 7. Pag. 349.* 2ly, The *Cyprianic Bishop* had a *Licentia*, a Power of doing things within his Diocess, of which he was to make no Account, *Cb. 6. Pag. 224.* Now, the *Scottish Diocesan*, by his Constitution, as his Power was in no respect *Absolute*, so neither was it *Unaccountable*. See *Cb. 4. Pag. 178.* and *Calderswood*, who gives Account, that Bishops were responsible to Assemblies, and, by them, frequently before, called to an Account. The Bishops, in *An. 1638*, in their Declinator, did not disowne this to the Assembly at *Glasgow*, and only declined them on that pretence, that they judg'd them no Assembly, for want of due Countenance of Civil Authority. 3ly, The *Cyprianic Bishop*, according to him, had the *Sole Decisive Suffrage* in Synods and Councils, *Cb. 7. Pag. 354.* But, by the fore-mentioned Constitution, *An. 1610*, Presbyters, as well as Bishops, in like Cases, had the Priviledge of Decision.

Amongst many other Inconsistent Blunders, that is considerable which he has, *Pag. 523.* where, having told us, "That if G. R. and his Brethren shall think fit to examine what he has said, they must not think it enough, to raise Mists against the Reasonings used by *Cyprian* and *Firmilian*, for asserting the *Divine Institution of Episcopacy*; They must remember, saith he, our present Enquiry is, whether they believed such an Institution; And not, whether the Arguments were good, which moved them to believe so? For who knows not, that 'tis very ordinary for Men, very firmly to believe sometimes *Truths*, sometimes *Errors*, when yet, in the mean time, their Faith is founded on *very insufficient Arguments*. From whence it is easy and obvious to inter, 1. That, by his Confession, their Reception of Episcopacy upon Divine Right, or as a Divine Institution, will not prove it, or bear the Conclusion, that, *in very deed, it is so.* And therefore, by his

his Confession, in all this Voluminous Pamphlet, he but beats the Air, and has never touched the main Controversie with Presbyterians, which is touching a *Divine Right*, as he cannot but acknowledge, and thus belies the Title-Page of his Pamphlet, wherein he pretends to *state the main Controversie with Presbyterians*; For thus he expresses it in the Title-Page, that, in his pretended Vindication of the Principles of the Cyprianic Age, *the main Controversie betwixt those of the Church and the Presbyterians is fully and distinctly stated*. Is it not strange, that this Man shall dare to affirm he has stated *the main Controversie with Presbyterians*, when he states it upon such a point of Fact, as is, by his Confession, consistent with Prelacy's being *contrary to the Divine Institution*, and that both the Principles and Practice of Cyprian, yea of this whole Third Age, was, in this point, an Error; Which will be evident, if we consider, 2^{ly}. Since he grants, that there may be a *firm Belief of an Error*, and founded upon *uninsufficient Arguments*, yea and that it is *ordinary*, yea *very ordinary for Men thus to believe*, he doth in so far acknowledge, that this point of Fact, viz. *That Cyprian and others holding the Divine Right of Episcopacy as an unquestionable point of their Faith, is infinitely short of proving the thing it self, or that it really is of such a Right, and has a Divine Warrant*, and therefore, that he but mocks and pitifully blunders in the last Chap. and Parag. of his Pamphlet, in challenging all who are in their Judgment against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, *to joyn their Arguments together, and put them in the Ballance with the Principles and Universal Belief of the Cyprianic Age, and ingenuously confess they are light and of very little moment*. Yea he is bold to say, *That the Universal Faith and Practice of the Cyprianic Age amounts even to a Demonstration* against them. A strange Demonstration, no doubt, to invalidate all Scripture Arguments against Prelacy, drawn from such a *meer Practice and firm Belief of Men*, which, by his Confession, may be founded upon an Error, and thus have a Crack and Falshood in the bottom of it. Again, 3^{ly}, His inconsistent Blunder in this point is palpably evident in §. 40. Cap. ult. For he tells us, " That Cyprian, Firmilian, and whoever else, in those days, reasoned from our Lord's building his Church on St. Peter, for the Divine Institution of Episcopacy, did reason *solidly and upon good and firm Principles*, which, he tells, us is demonstrated fully and clearly by the Admirable Mr. Dodwell in his *VII. Cypr. Dissert.* Now, if these Fathers reasoned *solidly* for this Divine Institution, yea and reasoned *solidly* from Scripture Grounds, so that their Arguments amounted even to *Scripture Demonstrations*, how comes he to insinuate that the Arguments moving them to believe so, might have been *Insufficient*, and founded upon Errors? Besides, it fol-

lows, that all his forementioned Grounds for fixing the Principles of that Age, adduced by him, *ch. 2.* are a meer Sandy Foundation, which will not at all bear the weight of that Conclusion he frequently infers, *viz. The Derivation of Episcopacy from the Apostles*; For he asserts, he can run up this Foundation of their Practice to an *Apostolick Constitution*, and clear the Connection of the one with the other; And if so, it is beyond all peradventure, that this Foundation and Practice could have no Error in it. If any shall object, that what he asserts anent a *firm Belief* which may be founded upon an *Error*, is his Assertion in *Thesis*, not in *Hypothesis*, or with Application to the present Case; It is Answered, this will not help our Pamphleter; For, if Presbyterians can disprove the supposed Reasonings of *Cyprian*, and others for this *Divine Right*, he must grant the *Perswasion* is founded upon an *Error*, and he granting, that a firm Perswasion may be thus founded, Presbyterians have said enough against him, and he against himself, in this Concession, if they can disprove this *Divine Right*. Nay, his granting, that a *firm Belief* may be founded upon *unfufficient Arguments*, I mean *Subjectively Firm*, or *Fix'd Perswasion*, doth necessarily oblige him to make the Enquiry anent the Perswasion *Objectively Firm*, and to make this the State of the Question, or the proper Enquiry. Moreover, if he is firmly perswaded, or *very well satisfied*, as he here asserts, that *Cyprian*, *Firmilian* and others, *reason'd solidly*, and upon *firm Principles*, for the *Divine Institution of Episcopacy*, and that this has been demonstrated *fully and clearly* by *Dodwell*, he stands obliged to bring this his *Satisfaction*, and *Dodwell's* supposed solid Demonstration of *Cyprian's* Arguing and principles, to a Scripture Trial and Debate; Since himself acknowledges, that this *Divine Institution of Episcopacy* cannot otherways be vindicated and made appear.

Chap. 4. He will have the *Chief*, not *Sole Power*, to be the Question, wherein he is sufficiently chastised by Mr. *Jameson*. "Mr. *Rule* have ing examined his Explications of *Chief*, and asserted, that they are much the same with *Sole Power*, in his Sense; And moreover, having argued thus, If Presbyters cannot act, except the Bishop please, they must follow his Light, whatever be their own, and, consequently, have no Power. To this he Replies, *That it is one thing, to say, they can do nothing without him, and another, to say, they must do whatever he commands.* But, notwithstanding this Quibble, Mr. *Rule's* Consequence stands firm, and clearly follows upon what *J. S.* maintains; For, in his Principles, in the whole Extent of all the Actings of Church Government, the Bishop's Act is construed properly theirs, and

and they are obliged to follow that which he calls the Bishop's *Liberum Arbitrium* and *Licentia*. And who can disowne it, that, in this point, his Light is properly theirs, if his whole Conduct in point of Church Government must necessarily draw along their Concurrence, so that there can be no Counter-acting, yea no Acting without him. The Instance of *J. S.* and his Answer is very frivolous, 'Tis one thing, saith he, they can do nothing without him, and another, they must do what he commands. For, whatever Distinction may be fixed betwixt these in *Theſis*, yet upon his *Hypothesis*, and in the Series and Scope of what he discourses upon the Bishop's *Absolute Licentia* and Power, they are one and the same; For, if he have such an *Absolute Licentia* and *Liberum Arbitrium*, in Acting, Ordering and Commanding, in point of Church Government, then this *Absolute Power* must needs have the Correlate of an *Absolute Obligation to Obedience*. And his Instance, whereby he thinks to fortifie his Answer, makes this apparent, Should Mr. Rule, says he, command his Son to marry his Sister, he is not bound to follow his Light, yet he would judge him Undutiful, if Marrying without his Consent. But, I pray, whence flows the Unwarrantableness of the first Marriage, if not from the restricted Power and Authority of a Parent, or Head of a Family, and its being over-ruled by superiour Laws? Nay, *J. S.* himself will find it hard to prove, that the Parent's Consent is so absolutely and simply necessary, that there cannot be a Case assigned, wherein the Child might Marry without it. But, make the Parallel just, and assign to the Parent that *Absolute Licentia*, and *Liberum Arbitrium* in the Government of the Family, which he ascribes to the Prelate in the Government of the Church, and that his Command, Act, or Signification of his Pleasure, lays an inviolable Obligation of Obedience upon the Family, then the Son were obliged to Marry as he commands, and, in Case of the highest Necessity, inviolably obliging the Parent to this Consent, in point of a Marriage otherways lawfull, could not Marry without it.

In further Confirmation of what is offered above, 'tis pleasant to consider, how *J. S.* Sums up his suppos'd grand Proofs of Episcopacy. Chap. 10. Having said, that the Reception of Episcopacy as of *Divine Right*, by Cyprian and his Contemporaries, is an Argument of mighty weight against Presbyterians, he Sums up his Proofs in Chap. 6. S. 2. 3, 14, 17, 33, 34, 36. as also Chap. 7. S. 41. viz: "That Bishops were Successors of Apostles in *supreme Power-Ecclesiastical*, that none were accounted Bishops but such who had a regular Succession from Apostles, that Episcopacy was judg'd so of *Divine Right* that there could be but one Bishop in a City, that Separaters from them were judg'd

'Ulurpers

' Usurpers against Divine Precept and Institution, that the Bishop is
 ' term'd God's High Priest, and his Office God's High Priesthood,
 He tells us further, " That Cyprian Reasons from Texts of Scripture,
 ' and that frequently for proving himself God's High Priest; For
 which he refers to Chap. 6. §. 33. 34. " That he was the *one Judge* in
 ' his District, a Peerless Pastor, that he believed the Rules observ'd in
 ' Ordination, Promotion, and Election of Bishops, to be of *Divine*
 ' Appointment. In all which we may see, how pitifully this Man preva-
 ricates. 1. He disowns his asserting, that Cyprian pleaded for the *Divine*
Right of Episcopacy, Chap. 10. §. 1. (and this in Contradiction to what
 we have heard above). Mr. Rule having alleged, that Cyprian pleads
 only for the *Divine Authority* of the Church and her Bishops, that is
 Pastors, not for a *Divine Right* of a Prelation of some above others;
 He Answers he had not affirm'd, that Cyprian pleaded for the *Divine*
Right of Episcopacy, that he had never occasion to plead for it, since no Man
 doubted of it in his time. Thus, evidently asserting, that Cyprian never
 having the Occasion of pleading for this *Divine Right*, he clearly owns
 it, that nothing he has now cited of Cyprian, will amount to prove his
 pleading for this *Divine Right*; Since, as he asserts, no Man denied it,
 nor gave Cyprian such an occasion to plead. And he will not say, that
 Cyprian in any pleadings was beating the Air, and pleading for that
 which none call'd in Question. Notwithstanding whereof he brings
 in Cyprian here, in the Passages cited, as pleading for his Office upon
Divine Precept and Institution; For, in the places cited, he affirms, he is
 pleading against Novatianus and Fortunatus, who were Schismatick
 Usurpers. Now, if he pleaded against an Usurpation upon the premis'd
 grounds of a *Divine Precept and Institution of Episcopacy*, this was a
 downright pleading against them, upon a *Divine Right* of the Office it
 self, or a pleading of that *Divine Right* as a Medium and Ground of his
 Argument. Nor can it be said, that he only asserts his not pleading
 this in his first Pamphlet, for therein he ascribes the same Prerogatives
 to the Bishop as in this, *scil.* That there can be no Church without him,
 pag. 19. that his Power is Monarchical, and his Deed the Churches Act,
 pag. 22, 24. That he is Subordinat to none, pag. 27, 28. 35. That he is
 Sovereign, Peerless, and Unaccountable in his District. And as he owns all
 these Prerogatives of the Prelate, so he owns, that Prelacy Cloathed
 with all these Priviledges is of *Divine Right*, pag. 26. 2ly. If Cyprian
 believ'd these Prerogatives instanced, upon *Divine Warrant and Institution*,
 and that Prelacy thus Priviledg'd was an Office and Ordinance of
Divine Appointment, then he must either say, he believ'd a Falshood
 and Fable, or a *Divine Truth*. He will be far from owning the first;
 And

and if he assert the second, he must own it, That, 1. Cyprian pleaded for a *Divine Right*. 2ly, That himself pleads this *Divine Right* upon this *Reception and Belief* of Cyprian and his Contemporaries, as of this Pamphlet, wherein he asserts not only this *Reception and Belief*, but that the *Reception* was from the Apostles, yea he pleads several pretended grounds, that in this *Reception and Derivation* that Age had an *Objective certainty*, and could not be mistaken. Again, he tells us, *That Cyprian had no occasion to plead this Divine Right, because none denied it*; And thus I would fain know, what means that *Scripture pleading*, yea and frequent *Scripture pleading*, which he ascribes unto him? His Charge upon the Persons instanced, say it was a Separation from the Episcopal Church, must be of necessity suppos'd to derive its strength from the *Divine Institution of the Office*. And that frequent Reasoning from *Scripture*, which J. S. mentions, to enforce the necessity of a due Subjection to God's High Priest, necessarily importeth this. Again, if Cyprian was the *One Judge* to his Diocese, as J. S. asserts, I hope he will acknowledge, he was the *Sole Judge* to it, at least by necessary Consequence he is thus oblig'd; For to be the *One Judge* Emphatically, or in an Exclusive Sense, as it is here Represented by him, and to be *Sole Judge* are of so near an Affinity, that he cannot possibly separat them, nay no Sophistry can. And thus he has here overthrown, at one dash, and in one word, all that he pretends against his ascribing a *Sole Power* to the Cyprianic Bishop, discovering his groundless Clamours against his Antagonist for imputing this unto him, and has himself confirm'd the Charge. In S. 41. Chap. 6, to which he refers, Cyprian is oblig'd to hold that he is Christ's only Vicar and Representative in his Diocese, that he is the *One Judge* in Christ's stead, which evidently confirms what is said. Finally, he tells us of Cyprian's Reasoning, and that frequently from *Texts of Scripture*, and to make it appear that he has prov'd this, he refers to Chap. 6. S. 33, 34. whereas there is not a word of any Text of Scripture in the places cited to prove this suppos'd Prerogative of the Bishop, where we Read only the Terms of *Priests*, and *High Priests*, and in the Marginal Citations, there's nothing but an empty sound of *Priests*, *Altars*, *Apostolick Succession*, *Church Unity*, but of *Scripture Testimony*, to fortifie these pretended Episcopal Prerogatives instanced, there is not one Jot.

The places of Cyprian and others, cited to prove the Bishop's Superiority to Presbyters, he will needs Interpret of, or rather strain to import their Sense of the Bishops Office as specifically Distinct, and that by *Divine Right and Institution*, from the Office of a Presbyter.

Whereas

Whereas 'tis evident, and by several of the Learn'd made appear, that by the first the Pastoral Office is properly understood, as the ordinary standing Function of the highest Nature, and, in point of Divine Right, the same with that of the Presbyter, but by Ecclesiastick Constitution made thus Distinct, and that Cyprian and his Contemporary Bishops never took up, nor entertain'd our Prelatists new Notion of a Presbyter or Pastor specifically distinct from, and Subordinat to the Bishop *Jure Divino*, so that the then Subordination of Presbyters to Prelates, who had in a considerable measure enhans'd the Government into their hands, they held to be a product of, and founded upon the Churches Authority, for pretended Union and Order of Government. Hence this Ground of Order and Unity in Opposition to Schism is pleaded by Cyprian and others, against such as did in any measure oppose this Authority which Bishops had assum'd. But our Episcopalians new Arguments anent the Episcopal Authority of Timothy and Titus, of Apostles above the Seventy, of the seven Asian Angels, &c. was never pleaded as Authorizing Bishops Divine and specifically distinct Office above the Pastor. To this purpose several Passages of the Antients are exhibited to prove this their Sense of the Bishop's Office, as being one with that of the Pastor's *Jure Divino*. Irenæus, Hæc. Lib. 3. Cap. 4. makes Presbyters properly Successors of Apostles, *Cum autem iterum ad eam traditionem quæ est ab Apostolis, quæ per Successiones Presbyterorum in Ecclesiis custoditur, &c. i. e.* "When Hereticks were called to Apostolick Tradition preserv'd in the Churches by Succession of Presbyters, they will own themselves Wiser than both Apostles and Presbyters, &c. And Lib. 4. Cap. 43. *Quapropter iis, qui in Ecclesia sunt, Presbyteris obaudire oportet his qui Successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus, &c. i. e.* "We must hearken to such Presbyters in the Church, who have a Succession from Apostles, who, together with the Succession of Episcopacy, have receiv'd the Gift of Truth. Where he not only asserts the Succession of Presbyters to the Apostles, but likewise attributes the *Successio Episcopatus*, or the Succession of Episcopacy it self, to these very Presbyters. And Chap. 44. he shews that the Church entertains such Presbyters of whom the Prophet says, *I will give your Princes in peace, and your Bishops in Righteousness.* Their own *Stillingsfleet* has observ'd upon these Passages, that the Apostles being now remov'd, and in several Churches Presbyters Subject to Bishops, yet the Community of Names was still retain'd, and those who are said to Succeed the Apostles are call'd Bishops in one place, and Presbyters in another, and the very *Succession of Episcopacy* is ascrib'd to Presbyters.

To this Scope Cyprian himself is also cited, who not only calls Pastors the *Compresbyteri*, but ascribes also to those he calls the *Præpositi*, a Succession to Apostles by a vicarious Ordination. Epist. 69. edit. Pamelæ. §. 4. compar'd with Epist. 3. a Clero Rom. Ep. 62. and 65. Jerom says that Presbyters are loco Apostolorum, and that they do Apostolico gradu succedere. See several places of Ignatius and Clemens Romanus cited by their own Stillingfleet, Iren. pag. 308. 309, &c.

Remarkable is that Testimony of the Martyrs of the Gallican Church, in their Epistle to Eleutherius, Bishop of Rome, who call Irenæus ἐπισκοπὸν ἐκκαταστάς, when, as Blondel observes, he had been nine Years Bishop of Lions, in the place of Potbinus. Thus Apol. pag. 31. "And 'tis very improbable, saith Stillingfleet, that commending one to the Bishop of another Church, they should make use of the lowest Name of Honour appropriated to subject Presbyters, which were a great Debasing of him, had they look'd on a Superior Order above those Presbyters, as of Divine Institution. Nay, Cyprian himself shews, that Ecclesia est Plebs Episcopo coadunata, & Grex Pastori adhaerens, i. e. The Church is the Flock joyn'd to the Bishop, and adhering to the Pastor.

The same Author has observ'd, that such as acknowledge Superiority of Bishops over Presbyters do impute it to an Act of the Church, as contradistinct from a Divine Institution; To which purpose the known Testimony of Jerom is cited, who tells the Bishops, they owe their Superiority above Presbyters to Ecclesiastick Custom rather than to the Truth of Divine Institution. Also the Testimony of Ambrose, or Hilary on Eph. 4. who has the same Assertion, Quia primum Presbyteri Episcopi appellabantur, &c. i. e. "Presbyters were at first called Bishops, so that one being remov'd another Succeeded, but the after Presbyters being found unworthy to obtain this Presidency, this Method by the Judgment of many Priests or Presbyters was chang'd, so that upon mature Advise ment, it was appointed, that not the Order, but Merit should constitute a Person the Bishop. It is the Inference of Stillingfleet, "That hence it is clear, he asserts all the difference between a Bishop and Presbyter to arise from an Act of the Church, choosing Men for their Deserts, when before they Succeeded in Order of place. That it was strange that Augustin, citing these Commentaries with applause of the person, did not rather stigmatize him for an Heretick, if it had been then the Opinion of the Church, that Bishops in their Power over Presbyters did Succeed the Apostles by a Divine Right,

Augustin's known Testimony, Epist. 19. is apposite to this purpose, *Secundum bonorum vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio major est, &c.* Our Author doth thus paraphrase it, that thereby it is implied, it was not so always; else to what purpose serves that jam obtinuit, and that the Original of the difference was from the Church. To this purpose the Testimony of Isidor, Bishop of Sevil in Spain, is cited, *de Eccles. Offic. Lib. 7. Cap. 7. His sicut Episcopis dispensatio mysteriorum Dei commissa est; præsumt enim Ecclesiis Christi & in consecratione Corporis & sanguinis consortes cum Episcopis sunt, &c. i. e.* "The Dispensation of the Mysteries of God is committed to Presbyters as well as Bishops; For they are set over the Churches of Christ, and are Associates with the Bishops in the Consecration of the Body and Blood of Christ. Where he asserts the Identity of the Bishop and Presbyter in Name and Thing; Adding, *Sed sola propter auctoritatem summo Sacerdoti Clericorum Ordinatio reservata est, ne a multis Ecclesiæ disciplina vindicata, concordiam solveret, scandala generaret, &c.* That for the greater Honour of the Bishop, and preventing Schisms, the Power of Ordination was reserv'd to him. Where 'tis observ'd that by the word Authority, he means not that of a Divine Command, which would contradict his following words, *that it was to prevent Schisms and Scandals*; For he after produces the whole forementioned place of Jerom to the same purpose. Here J. S. hath two things deserving his Observation, besides that the Difference between the Bishop and Presbyter is ascrib'd to Ecclesiastick Constitution, 1. That in the Administration of the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper Presbyters are said to have equal Authority with the Bishop, contrary to what he at large pleads for in point of the Bishop's Supreme Authority here-
 in *. 2ly, That the Authority of the *summus Sacerdos* ascrib'd to the Bishop is asserted to have no other Basis but that of Ecclesiastick Constitution; Whereas he will needs have the Title of *summus Sacerdos* to import the Divine Warrant of the Bishop's Supremacy over all Presbyters of the Diocese, and to imply a like *Jus Divinum* with that of the High Priest under the legal Dispensation †. To this purpose is cited also Concil. Hispal. secundum. Decret. 7. apud Bin. T. 4. p. 560. wherein all the Right of the Bishop's Superiority to the Presbyter is ascrib'd unto the *novellæ* and Ecclesiastick Regule; And having mentioned several Prerogatives of the Bishop from which Presbyters are restrain'd, they add, *Hæc omnia illicita esse Presbyteris quia Pontificatus apicem non habent, quem solis deberi Episcopis, auctoritate Canonum præcipitur.* Here Marches are rid betwixt the

* Chap. 6. §. 63,
64, 65, &c.

† Chap. 5. §. 26.
‡ Chap. 6. §. 33,
34, 35.

the two Offices, by this partition Wall only of the *Ecclesiastick Canons*, but by no *Command of Christ*, or *Divine Institution*. To these Testimonies, we may add such an one as cannot but have greatest weight with our Episcopalian, viz. That of King Charles I. who in his Conference with Mr. Henderson at Newcastle, asserts, "That the Bishop or Arch-bishop is no new Officer distinct from the Pastor, but only made distinct for Order of Government, such as are, saith he, in Scotland, Moderators of Assemblies and others. So that in His Majesties Sense here expressed, the Bishop has only a Superiority founded upon *Ecclesiastick Constitution*, and has no more Authority over Pastors by *Divine Right*, than Moderators of Assemblies.

Thus 'tis evident, that in all his pleading for the Diocesan, and their Perswasion of the *Divine Right* of their Office alleg'd by him, he has mis'd the Mark; For, in order to this Proof, even in point of Fact, he should have produc'd their Reasons and Arguings from Scripture, laying level to this Scope, viz. *That there is such an Office as that of the Bishop specifically distinct from that of the Pastor or Presbyter Instituted by the Apostles*; Yea and should have produc'd their pleadings upon the *Episcopal Grounds instanced*, and that there is such an Officer as that of a meer Presbyter in such a manner Subject, and owing such Obedience to the Bishop, as he asserts, and this, as I said, by *Divine Appointment*. Now, there is nothing in all his Citations which has the least shadow of any such Belief or Perswasion thus Grounded; For, all that Talk of Cyprian, or others of *Apostolick Succession*, Peter's Chair, of Unity, and the like, still resolves in this, and can amount to no more, viz. *That there were Officers Gloat'd with Power of Order and Jurisdiction, and those of Divine Signature, who had de facto Presbyters Subject to them*, but that these Presbyters were, as in that State, of a lower Divine Station, or holding an Office specifically distinct from the Bishop, any otherwise than by *Ecclesiastick Constitution*, or such Canons as are above mention'd, this they never dream'd. Which is evident from that which J. S. pleads in point of the Antients Dichotomatizing Church Officers into Bishops and Deacons, at least as cited by Blondel, which he apparently approves of in order to the excluding of Ruling Elders, such as Jerom, Clemens Romanus, Polycarp, Justin Martyr, Clemens Alexandrinus, Origen, Cyprian, &c. See pag. 459. Now, this Account and Argument from Dichotomies, will invincibly prove that the Antients, and these in special cited by him out of Blondel, to no less than the Number of Twenty One, understood the Bishop and Presbyter to be one and the same Office, else there were no such Dichotomy as stands thus attested by so

many Witnesses; And the same Argument, which from hence he hath deduc'd against the two Principals, pag. 460. in opposition to *Ruling Elders*, will equally exclude the *Bishop*, at least if he own this *Dichotomy*, since, as he pleads, these Antients understood *Teaching* and *Ruling*, the Power of Order and Jurisdiction to be necessarily included in the *first Member* or Branch of this Division, and consequently did not Trichotomatize, or Subdivide the Episcopal or Pastoral Office, which they held to be all one, into Superior and Inferior Orders and Degrees.

It were tedious, and, in a great measure, but *actum agere*, to give a full account of the many gross Contradictions in J. S's pleadings, which Mr. Jameson has Succinctly perform'd. I shall therefore give this short Review. 1. As Mr. Rule had told him, he makes his Bishop a strange Animal, a meer Proteus, sometimes exalting him to the *highest Pinacle of Uncontroulable, Absolute, Peerless Power, as accountable to Christ only for the Government of his Diocese*, having his *Liberum Arbitrium* and *absolute Licentia* for his Rule in Government. Thus Chap. 7. §. 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 12. Again so depressing him that he becomes a humble Suppliant only for *some Majority of Power*, or whatever Degrees of Imparity may state a Distinction, were it never so inconsiderable betwixt him and Presbyters. He tells us, Episcopal Arguments conclude only *Imparity*, and that this is the *state of the Question*, Chap. 4. §. 112. compar'd with 102. yea the least Degree of *Imparity* these humble Men will be satisfied with, Chap. 2. §. 5. Here's the *maximum quod sic*, and *minimum quod non* conjoyn'd in his Prelate, whom, in his pleading, he tosseth from *Zenith* to *Nadir*. 2ly. He will have our Scots Prelates of the same cut with the Cyprianic. Now, our Scots Prelates, he contends, were tied up by Rules and Canons to Act with concurrence of Presbyters, yea professed to own a Subjection to the General Assembly, and therefore were not to Act Solely, yet his Cyprianic, as above describ'd he will have to be an Absolute, Unaccountable *Liberum-Arbitrium-Man*, without the least shadow of such an Obligation, who by an *Absolute and singular Authority* could give *Laws* to all his *Diocese*, *Presbyters*, as well as others. Thus Chap. 7. §. 6, 10, 11. He tells us, Chap. 4. §. 34. that the Bishops in their Declinator presented to the Assembly 1638. own'd Pastors or Presbyters *Decisive Voice* in Church Judicatories, own'd Bishops *Subjection to the General Assembly*. that they allow'd the *Decisive Voice* of Preaching Presbyters, and the *Judicial Power* of Presbyteries themselves Acting by Rule within their Sphere: Yet, Chap. 7. §. 13, 14, &c. he holds that in Provincial Councils the Bishops alene had *Definitive Voices* in all these great points, *sic*
The

The making of Canons, determining Cases, deciding Controversies, forming Sentences, inflicting Censures. Here's our Prelats Assertion in their Declinator, and the Cyprianic Bishops Prerogatives agreeing like Light and Darkness, and J. S. is Shipwreck'd upon this *Scylla* or *Charybdis*, viz. Either he must own it, that the Cyprianic Bishops, in the premis'd Prerogatives and Exercise of Power, were ingrain'd Usurpers upon the Pastors due Authority, or that our Scots Prelates, in the premis'd Concessions and Assertions, were Traitors to the Episcopal Interest, and Betrayers of their Trust and Office. Again, 3^{ly}, He will have these absolute Gentlemen to be *Jure Divino* such, and that they thus Acted upon a Divine Warrant, pag. 208. He tells us, the Bishop had *Power alone* (and this Power he holds deriv'd from Apostles) *to make Laws, Power alone to command Presbyters, and oblige to obey*; Yet notwithstanding, he owns the Divine Warrant of our Scots Prelacy, yet asserts our Prelates to have been oblig'd to Act with concurrence of Presbyters. Here's a *Jus Divinum* stamped upon Bishops *Absolute*, and also *Limited Power*. Again, 4^{ly}, He holds, that the Allowance of Presbyters Concurrence with the Cyprianic Bishop in his Government, was a *meer Gratification of his Courtesie and Condescending pleasure*: When it is Objected to him, that Cyprian expresses his Resolution to *do nothing* in point of Government *without concurrence of Presbyters*, he pleads zealously, that the word *Statui*, in Cyprian's Language, imports no Obligation. Thus Chap. 7. pag. 344. *Statui*, saith he, imports only a *voluntary Condescension*, it was the result of his *free Choise*, had he pleased, he needed not, *scil. so to resolve*. Hence 'tis evident, that he cuts off from Pastors absolutely all Power of Jurisdiction, as well as of Ordination. Nay, he holds they had no more Interest in Judicatories or Synods than the Common People, that is, to hear, and see, and give Consent. Thus Chap. 7. §. 61, 62, 63, 64, 69, 70. Yet he denies that he ascribes the Sole Power of Jurisdiction to the Bishop. Thus Chap. 4. pag. 124, 125. *Burn my Book*, saith he, *if I ascribe a Sole Power to the Cyprianic Bishop*. I said, the Bishop in Cyprian's time had Sole Power of Ordination; I said so, saith he, *but where did I say, he had Sole Power of Jurisdiction?* pag. 131. He Quarrels the imputing to him that he ascribes to the Bishop a *sole decisive Suffrage and Negative Voice*. 5^{ly}, Apostles according to him had the sole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction by Divine Right, and by vertue of their Office, this Power, he asserts, was *in solidum* devolv'd upon Bishops, as their proper immediat Successors, and the same Power he makes Cyprian all along to plead; Yet, as we have heard, he peremptorily denies, that Cyprian and his Contemporaries were *Sole-Power-Men*, and asserts, they

they were so far from acclaiming this, that they were satisf'd with what may be called *Imparity*, or *Majority of Power*, were it never so little beyond an *Absolute Parity*; For, he is peremptory in holding *Parity* or *Imparity* to be the proper State of the Question. Thus, *Ch. 4. §. 102.* And thus he holds it to be stated by that large Train of Episcopal Pleaders cited by him; And sure, he will not own his setting them in Terms of Contradiction to the Authority and Power of his Cyprianic Bishop. Thus they succeeded - Apostles, and not succeeded Apostles, in their Office; Or, succeeding, betrayed their Apostolick Trust. 6ly, Bishops and Presbyters are so vastly discrepant, that they make distinct

Offices, the Bishop's Office is the High-Priesthood, * *Ch. 6. §. 35.* and *Sacerdotii Sublime Fastigium* *; Cornelius ascended to the Bishoprick of Rome, not per saltum, but having gone through all Inferiour Ecclesiastick Offices, he regularly ascended through all Inferiour Orders, he had been Acolyth, Exorcist, &c. and at last a Presbyter, before he obtain'd this high Fastigium, and highest Order. This he will have confirmed by Optatus Milevitanus, Lib. 1. Fol. 6. who makes Deacons the third Order, Presbyters the second, *Sacerdotium*, Bishops the Apices and Princes of all. Origen he will have to assert the same, *Hom. 11. on Jerem.* and Jerom to compare the Church to a City, the Episcopal Office to the Castle commanding it. See Chap. 6. pag. 264, 265. Yet let us Consult Chap. 3. pag. 74. we will find him asserting, that the Question is but a meer Nicety, *Whether the Bishop and Presbyter make distinct Orders, or are not one and the same Order?* This he makes a meer Nominal Debate, and little other than a Controversie about Words, when sifted to the bottom; According thus to Augustin's saying, that the Bishop was greater than the Pastor, only *secundum Honorum Vocabula quae Ecclesiae Usus obtinuit.* 7ly, We have heard, that he peremptorily denies his ascribing to the Bishop the Sole Power of Jurisdiction: But not only has he ascribed to the Bishop such a Sovereign Command, as robs Pastors of all Power, but, which is yet more, he sets them below the People in this point, and offers pretended Instances, more than one or two, to shew, that, in the cyprianic Age, they were, as to Power or Interest in Church Judicatories, below the Priviledges of the People: As, 1. Presbyters, saith he, gave but Advice, but the People Consent. 2ly, "Cyprian speaks of a *Mutuus Honor* due unto the People, but he speaks of no such thing as due to the Clergy. He mentions "things to be ordered in Synods by common Advice, as "an Honour due to the People, but no such thing is said concerning "Presbyters; "And we must not think, says he, that Cyprian said this carelessly or inadvertently, since it exactly agrees with his Do-
ctrine

‘ doctrine cited *Pag.* preceeding, *scil.* *Epist.* 19. P. 42. See *Pag.* 388, 389, 390, 391. Yea, *Pag.* 389. he challengeth G. R. upon Search of the Cyprianic Monuments, “ to shew such Five Testimonies concerning the Interest of Presbyters in Provincial Councils, as he alledges “ he has shown for that of the people. Yet he allows “ his Book to “ be burnt, if he ascribed a Sole Power of Jurisdiction to the Bishop, and tells us, “ he was at all pains, in his first Book, to shew, that he “ pleaded not for the Bishop’s Sole Power of either Ordination or “ Jurisdiction, *Ch.* 2. P. 42. To these palpable Contradictions, I might add an Eight Instance, anent what he asserts of *Jerom*, *scil.* That he pleaded not for the Unalterable Right of Parity. Now it is notourly known, that *Jerom* pleads for the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, from several clear Scripture Grounds, arguing the point thereupon, and therefore *Jerom* could not hold this Apostolick Government to be Versatile or Alterable. See *Pag.* 75, 76. Again, *gly.* *Pag.* 143. He tells us, that all that *Andrew Logie*, Arch-Deacon of *Aberdeen*, pleads for, in point of Episcopacy, is, that one be preferred over the rest for Keeping Order, and avoiding Confusion, and this *ad culpam* only, and not *ad vitam*. How clearly this mean Account of the Bishop’s Power contradicts that *Fastuous, Absolute Dominion* he ascribes to him, is obvious to the meanest Reflection. Further, (for I am almost wearied in Tracing this Man’s Inconsistencies) he owns his calling Bishops Monarchs, he denies it will follow they had Sole Power. Had Julius Cæsar, saith he, Sole Power after he turn’d Monarch of the Roman Empire? Thus, *Ch.* 4. §. 10. Yet, *Ch.* 5. §. 40. Cyprian used the Term *Licentia* to express the Paramount, Peerless, Uncon:roul’d and Unconfin’d Power of Roman Emperours. And who knows not, that this Power in the Roman Emperours, especially that of Julius Cæsar, was Sole and Singular? Again, he parallels the Authority and Power of his Cyprianick Monarch, with that of the Kings of Scotland, who, notwithstanding, as he asserteth, *Ch.* 4. §. 115. cannot make one single Law, without Consent of Parliament; So that our Monarch’s not having the Sole Power, are, in this, far short of the Roman Cæsar, the one having the Sole Power, the other not; How then is his Cyprianic Bishop parallel’d to both, in point of Power? Moreover, he tells us, (*Ibid.*) that Bishop Lighton yield’d to a compleat Parity in the Conference at *Passey*, allowing only the Bishop to be Fix’d President, and thus, in his Sense, must have intirely given up the Episcopal Cause, whose Concession, notwithstanding, he tacitly approves of. To these we might add a notable Passage of the Man’s inconsistent Disingenuity. It is, *Ch.* 4. §. 99. where he asserts, that, since the Year 1610, we have had, under the Episcopal

Episcopal Government, our Kirk-Sessions, our Presbyteries, and Synods, and that alwise as *Formal and Stated Judicatories*. Did not even these Inferiour Judicatories, *saith he*, Kirk-Sessions and Presbyteries, perform many *Acts of Jurisdiction*, without so much as Consulting the Bishop? Now, shall we think this Man was in Earnest, when he wrote and asserted this, or considered what he was doing in such plain inadvertent Mockery? I would know, whether he owne the Lawfulness or Warrant of these Judicatories, which he terms thus *Formal and Stated*, and of their *Judicial Actings* instanced by him accordingly? If he does not owne them, then he disownes that which he calls the constant current Practice of our Church under Episcopacy, since the time instanced by him, and thus contradicts his Scope in adducing the same: But, if he owne this Constitution, and Judicial Actings of the Judicatories mentioned, then, 1. He crosses all his Pleadings for the Bishops Power in Ordination and Jurisdiction, his *Negative Voive* over Judicatories, and such other Prerogatives; For he tells us, these Judicatories perform'd many *Acts of Jurisdiction*, without so much as consulting the Bishop. Can any Encroachment be, in his Principles, more Unaccountable? 2ly, He will not only have Presbyteries, but even Kirk-Sessions, thus to have acted. Now, it is Uncontrovertible, that these Judicatories are made up of *Ruling Elders*, whose Office he absolutely disownes and disputes against, this taking up a great part of *Ch. 8.* from §. 6. to 24. wherein he labours to prove, that this Office and Officer was disowned by the most valuable Antiquity, and he endeavours to remove whatever is pleaded for them upon this Ground, *scil.* from the Testimony of *Origen Tertullian, Jerom, Augustin, Gregorius Magnus, Isidorus Hispalensis, Basil Optatus, Cyprian.* Yea, he produces several Arguments *ad Homines*, viz. *G. R. and T. F.* against *Ruling Elders*. Here then is a Judicatory consisting of such Members as, in his Principles, are unknown to Scripture and Antiquity, yet exercising Church Government, and that Independently upon the Bishop. yea and a *formal and stated Judicatory* own'd by our *Scots* Bishops in its Authority and Exercise, and as a part of their goodly Hierarchy. Let our Grand Vindicator call in *Vulcan's* Gimmerers to Sodder these Inconsistencies, or advise how he will frame an Apology to his Patrons, the Bishops, for this pitiful unaccountable betraying of their Cause. In special, he owes an Apology to the *English* Bishops, as aspersing their Church Government as *Lame and Imperfect*, because destitute of, and disowning such

* *Ch. 9. §. 14.* *Formal and Stated Judicatories.* Finally, he holds*, That his Episcopal Champions are *stout Pleaders for the Churches In-*
trinsicke

intrinsic Power, in Opposition to *Erastianism*, and that upon much better Principles than any Presbyterians in Scotland, or in Christendom. But, how cross this is to the Principles and Practice of many, if not most of that Party, is clear as the Noon-day Light.

Whigist *, whom J. S. magnifies as the first Pleader in England for Episcopacy, holds, "That Church Government is committed to the Magistrates; That all Ecclesiastical, as well as Civil Courts, are in Her Majesties Name; All their Jurisdiction, and Exercise derived from Her. Sir

* *Second Answ. to Cartwright.*

George Mackenzie † asserts, "That the King is come, by our Law, in place of the Pope. And, by the Act

† *Inst. P. 33.*

1. of Parliament 1. of King Charles 2. *Seß. 2.* it is asserted, "That the Ordering and Disposing the External Policy and Government of the Church does belong to His Majesty, as an Inherent Right of the Crown, by virtue of his Royal Prerogative and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical. And 'tis declared, *Ibid.* "That whatever His Majesty shall determine in this External Government, by Advice of the Arch-Bishops and Bishops, and such of the Clergy as he shall please to nominate, the same consisting with the Laws of the Kingdom, shall be valid and effectual. Moreover

‡ *Ecc. Pol. P. 2, 19, 20.*

Hooker §, whom J. S. calls the Great Hooker, is against all particular Forms of Church Government, ascribing its Determination to the Civil Magistrate. Suttle * also disownes all Governing Power in the Church. And as the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury, with the whole Body of the Bishops then in Being, in the Reign of Henry VIII. in Answer to some Questions proposed, gave under their Hands and Subscriptions, "a Renunciati^{on} of all Ecclesiastick Authority proper to the Church, or Intrinsic therein, ascribing it intirely to the Christian Magistrate, as his Essential Office †; So it is notourly known, that the whole Tribe of our Scottish Prelates were Zealous Promoters and Asserters of the Ecclesiastick Supremacy ascribed to King Charles II. by our Laws; As were their Predecessors, of the same Supremacy assumed by King James VI.

* *Lib. de Presb. Ch. 4. Pag. 6, &c.*

† *aid. Stillingfleet, Iren. P. 389. to 395.*

There are many other things, which would give Ground of large Animadversion in the shattered Discourses of this Voluminous Pamphlet, and which may be hereafter touched; But this first Chapter having thus far swell'd to such a Bulk, we must proceed to some more close Review of that which is the grand Topick of this Man's pleading, *viz. The Frame and Principles of the Cyprianic Age in Matters Religious; Wherein we hope to make it appear, that this Age, if we may take an*

Estimat from the chief Doctors thereof, was so far Corrupted and Degenerated from Apostolick Purity, that this Source, from which J. S. derives his Pleadings, in point of Church Government, and otherwise, is a troubled Fountain, and corrupt Spring, wherein abounded not a few gross and unaccountable Errors, cross to the Scripture Rule and Standard.

CHAP. II.

An Account of the Christian Churches Declining and Eclipse in Point of Gospel Purity, and of the Prevalent Errors of her Chief Doctors in the Third Age, of Cyprian in special, as they are Represented by the Centuriators, and others.

THE further the Church advanc'd in time from the Apostolick Age, (say the Centuriators) the more Rubbish and Corruption was mixed with her Doctrine. In Reciting and giving an Account of these Errors, Instance shall be given in the Chief and Fam'd Doctors of that Age, such as *Tertullian*, (whom this Author shews, that *Cyprian* had such Esteem of, as to intitle him *his Master*) *Origen* and others : Afterward the gross Errors of *Cyprian* himself shall be exhibited, as they are drawn from his Writings by approven and unexceptionable Authors, to discover this Author's precipitant Folly, who some way will Deify this Father, at least, render him so Infallible, as to make his supposed Principles and Practice, in point of Church Government, the leading Rule and Measure of the Churches Practice in after Times.

To begin then our Compendious View with an Account of *Origen*; *Epiphanius*, from his Words upon *Psal. 1.* and other places, affirms this to have been his Judgment, " That Christ was not truly God, but Created, and according to Grace denominated the Son of God ; Which is the Blasphemous Opinion of the *Socinians*. Also, in his 8th *Hom. on Genes.* Because that (*Chap. 22.*) God is called the Angel, " he thinks it may be proved, That as Christ, among Men, was found in fashion of a Man, so among the Angels he was, in fashion, found as

as an Angel. He avouches, "That Christ's Blood was not shed at Jerusalem only, where was the Altar and its Basis, and the Tabernacle of God, but that also the same Blood was sprinkled above that Altar which is in Heaven, where the Church of the First-born is. *Hom. 1. on Lev.* Also, *Hom. 2.* he holds, "That, in Heaven, Christ is offered not for Sins, but for Office, but that on Earth, where Sin reigned from Adam to Moses, he is offered for Sin, and thus, by his Blood, hath pacified all in Heaven and Earth. He asserts also, *Hom. 7.* upon the same place, "That Christ hath not yet perfect Joy in Heaven, being necessitated to mourn for our Sins, and because his Body the Church is not yet Glorified. *Epiphanius* also, *Lib. 2. contra Hæres.* asserts, "That he affirms, that the only begotten Son cannot see the Father, neither the Spirit the Son, neither Angels the Spirit, &c. *Dionysius Alexandrinus*, in the *Epist. contra Sabellianos*, wrote, "That the Son is a piece of Work framed by God, not properly and naturally the Father's Son, but different and alien from his Substance, as the Vine is different in Substance from its Dresser, and the Ship from its Framer, and therefore, because somewhat made and framed, he had not any previous Existence. These Words the *Arrians* cited for their Opinion, as *Athanasius* relates, in *Epist. de Sent. Dionys. Alex. cont. Arianos*. All which, how Contumelious and Blasphemous it is against our Glorious Redeemer, no sound Christian can be ignorant.

But again, as touching *Origen*, *Basil*, *Lib. de Spir. Sancto*, shews, that *Origen*, in this Age, held no solid, but prodigious monstrous Opinions of the Holy Ghost, viz. "That he withdraws from the Saints in the Conjugal Action: Thus, *Hom. 7. on Numb.* "That in the Saints he hath but a Temporary, Fluid, no Perpetual Residence. Touching the Creation, he maintains several Errors, viz. "That God made another World before this that is now Created, *Lib. 3. de Princ. G. 5.* As also, "That, after the Corruption of this, there shall be another: As also, that there had been other Worlds before this was. He affirms also, *Hom. 3. on Cant.* "That the Creatures are made after some Celestial Images; And several such Fopperies: *Hom. 4. on Ezek.* he holds this monstrous Opinion, "That the Earth is an Animal or Living Creature, yea and Sinful Creature, because God said to Adam, *Dust thou art, and to Dust thou shalt return.*

Moreover, as to Angels, he every where ascribes Bodies to them. *Lib. 2. de Princ. G. 2.* "It seems to me, saith he, impossible, that Rational Creatures can remain without Bodies, when they attain their highest Pitch of Happiness and Sanctity. He holds also, "That, in the last Judgment, every Angel will bring along with him, such

over whom he has watched, and whom he has instructed, and for whom he has seen the Face of God; And that the Angels, who have been more slack and negligent, will be judged by the more strenuous Men. Concerning the Order of Angels, he has also many foolish Dreams. *Lib. 1. de Princ. C. 8.* He held, "That they were to be invocated, *Hom. 1. on Ezek.* where he proposes this Formula of Invocation, "Come, O Angel, assist, by thy Converse, one that is converted from former Errors, from the Doctrine of Demons, from Iniquity crying aloud, and receiving him, as a good Physician, refresh, cherish, and instruct, &c.

Concerning the Fall of Angels, The Fathers of this Age (say our Authors) held the same Opinions, which *Justin* and *Clemens* entertained, upon the bad Understanding of that Passage, *Gen. 6. The Sons of God saw the Daughters of Men, that they were Fair, and they took them Wives of all which they chose, viz:* "That they had a Conjugal Fellowship with Women: We know, saith the Author of the *Sermon de Singularitate Clericorum*, "That the Angels fell with Women. *Metbodius*, in his Sermon of the Resurrection, saith, "That the Devil became wicked concerning the Administration committed to him, and conceived Envy against us; As also, those who afterward loved the Flesh and conversed with the Daughters of Men out of a Concubinate Love. As touching the time of the Fall of Angels, the Author of *Hom. on Cant.* holds, against *Cyprian* and *Origen*, "That the Devil fell from Heaven in the time of Christ's Passion.

Concerning the Devil, *Origen* himself was of Opinion, (*Hom. 25. on Joshua*) "That when one Devil is overcome by one certain Saint, he dare not come in again and assault another Man, but is sent by Christ into the Abyss; From this Ground, "That God tramples Satan under our Feet. Moreover, against what he hath said, *Lib. 1. in Job.* "That the Devil cannot be saved, nor return to Heaven, he asserts, *Lib. 1. de Princ. C. 6.* "That the Devil may be saved in after future Ages, since there is in them the Faculty of a Free-Will. *Lib. 3. de Princ. Cap. 6.* he saith, "That the last Enemy that is destroyed, is not to be so understood, as if his Substance should perish which God has made, but that his Purpose and Hostile Will, which is not of God, but comes from himself, perisheth. Yet, in his 8. *Hom. on Joshua*, he absolutely denies, "That, in the Resurrection, there shall be a Devil: At that time, saith he, there shall be no Devils, because then there shall be no Death. He asserts also, *Hom. 6. on Exod.* "That the punishments deserved by the Devil in this Life, are not inflicted on him, but fall upon his Children, i. e. Sinners,

Also;

Also, *Hom. 1. on Gen.* he asserts, "That Man at first was Created after the Image of Christ. *Methodius* also, in his Sermon on the Resurrection, ascribes to *Origen*, and charges upon him this Opinion; That, together with his Fellows, *Proclus* and *Aglaophon*, he held, "That the Soul was yet without Pain or Suffering, and before its Conjunction with the Body, sinned in Paradise, and that thereafter it was shut up in the Body, as into Chains in a Prison. He shews also, that they held, "That Souls are cast out of Heaven, and pass through Fountains, Fires and Waters upon the Top of the Firmament, until carried to our World. *Apud Epiphan. Lib. 2. cont. Hæres. Tom. 1.*

Concerning Free-Will, *Origen* asserts, *Hom. 9. on Numbers*, "That our Sense and Judgment is able to choose what is Good, that it may become a Vessel unto Honour; Or, things Evil and Terrene, that it may become a Vessel of Dishonour. *Hom. 12. upon that Passage of Scripture, What doth God require of thee, O Israel, but that thou fear the Lord thy God, &c.* He says, "These Words may imprint a Blush upon them, who deny to Mankind Free-Will: How could God require, unless Man had that in his Power, which he ought to offer unto God, requiring it of him. Many other things he hath, *Hom. 20. as also Hom. 6. on Judges, and Lib. 2. on Job*, "The Power of Faith and Piety (saith he) is in Mens Free-will, for if they will eschew Evil and do that which is Good, they are able and sufficient, and the Evil one will not prevail over them. Likewise *Lib. 1. de Princip.* "It follows (saith he) that the Power lyes in us, and in our motions, that either we be Happy and Holy, or by our sloth and negligence go on to Wickedness and Perdition. *Methodius*, in his Sermon on the Resurrection, asserts, "That the Power is in our selves either that we believe or not believe, and that in this our Free-will is conspicuous. In all which we may see the early spreading, bad Tincture and Tendency of that Principle.

Concerning Original Sin, *Origen* speaks thus, *Hom. 12. on Jer.* "Although *Adam* Sinned, yet his Mind fell not down to absolute Wickedness. *Lib. 1. on Job.* he ascribes as much and the same Innocency to *Job's* Sons as *Adam* and *Eve* had in Paradise. He ascribes also to *Job*, that he was free from Sin, from every Impiety, and every thing Unlawful, that neither in his Thoughts, nor the Counsels or Designs of his Soul, or Deliberations of his Heart he sinned. Also *Lib. 3. on Job.* He ascribes such Perfection to Saints, that he denies they can be reprehended without Sin.

As for what concerns the Law of God, in *Hom. 8. on Exod.* Expounding the Dialogue, he seems to assert, "That such as are Baptized are

are able in all things to obey the Law. The same saith the Author of the Homilies on *Canticles*, as the Centuriators affirm: "The Word and Command is not irregular, according to that Author, nor enjoyns what is impossible, *scil.* to Man in his Natural state. Origen also erroneously Judged, "That the Law of *Moses* purgeth us from Sin, yea and that the Law can privilege us with Immortality. Also *Hom.* 9. on *Numbers*, he contends, "That the Law is the vertue and strength of the Gospel, that the Gospel is then rightly understood when apprehended as founded upon the Law's Foundation; That the Law is called the Old Testament, to them who carnally understand, but is new to them who understand Spiritually. Also *Hom.* 6. on *Levit.* "He Judgeth that Christ, (*Matth.* 5.) expounded not the Law, but commanded some things more perfect than the Law. Also *Hom.* 11. on *Numbers*, he holds, "That Christ hath set us at Liberty and delivered us from the Curse of the Law, that is of the Ceremonies, but not from the Curse of the Command, or of the Testimony, or of the Judgments.

As for what concerns the Gospel, to that Question, *Hom.* xi. in *Levit.* Wherefore the Law denounced the punishment of Death to the Adulterer, but not the Gospel? He gives this Reason and Answer, *scil.* "Because the Law would purge our Sins by Temporal punishments, but the Gospel by Repentance. As also in like manner he doth in the same place Judge, "That Sins which the Law punisheth capitally are purged away by the punishments themselves, but that the only and plain Declaration of the Gospel is to the Simple and Innocent, sufficient to Salvation: Thus grossly *Tractat.* 26. on *Matthew.*

As for Justification, Origen, *Lib.* 1. on *Job.* Declaming concerning the Righteousness of *Job*, "He pronounceth him Justified only for his Vertues and legal Works; Of his Faith he speaks nothing, only he adds, "That his hope in a Righteous Just God and diligent Righteousness was a part of the Righteousness of *Job*. Many such Errors are recited by the Centuriators. The Author also of the Homilies on *Canticles*, making a twofold Righteousness, one of Faith, another of Works, imputes Salvation to both.

Methodius also hath pronounced many things of this Nature in his Sermon of the Resurrection, whereof the Fragment is extant with *Epiphanius*, *Lib.* 2. *Tom.* 1. He appears to be of the Judgment, "That by the fulfilling of the Law of Nature through Christs help we are Justified. Several such Assertions he hath, discoursing of Christs Restoring

Restoring that Law of Nature for the end of our Justification.

Upon the point of good Works, the Historians observe, that the Doctors of this Age, more than the preceeding, had declined and departed from the Doctrine of Christ and the Apostles. Origen in many places ascribes the Preparation unto, yea and the cause of Salvation to good Works, as *Tract. 32. on Matth.* where he "compares them to the foolish Virgins who prepared not themselves to Salvation by good Works. And *Hom. 24. 26. on Joshua.* "He ascribes to good Works the Lord's dwelling in us. In *Lib. 8. on Ep. ad Rom.* "He asserts, that the Works which Paul rejects and frequently vilifies, are not the Works of Righteousness commanded in the Law, but such Works wherein they glory who observe and keep the Law according to the Flesh, that is, either the Circumcision of the Flesh, or the Rites of the Sacrifices, the Observations of Sabbaths, of new Moons: These, and such like, are the Works by which, according to him, Paul denies we can be Justified. In which Assertion he appears clearly to Homologate and Patronize the Popish distinction of Works of the Law in the point of Justification, *scil.* That Paul excludes only the Work of the Ceremonial, not of the Moral Law. Yea in downright express terms he asserts (*Ibidem*) "That God will render in the Life to come according to the measure and degree of Merits.

The Historians also assert, that the Writers of this Age have signally depraved the Doctrine of Repentance, while they ascribe and reduce it to the work it self of the Penitent, imputing unto it the pardon of Sin, making no mention of Faith in Christ and free Remission through his Blood. Among other Lapses of Origen, "He enjoyns Sinners to expiate what Sins they have committed, by Repenting, Weeping and Satisfying for the same, because the Prophet saith, *If thou shalt return and bemoan thy self thou shalt be saved.* Thus *Hom. 6. on Exod. Hom. 15. on Levit.* he asserts, "That Repentance, that is, Tears and good Works are the price by which our Sins are Redeemed; Wherein he evidently Patronizeth the merit of Works. He asserts also, "That Conversion is our own Work and Act, upon that saying of Christ, *The Kingdom of God is within you.* Thus *Hom. 24. on Numb. and Hom. 3. on Judges,* "As long time, saith he, as thou art conscious to thy self to have Erred, as long time as thou hast turned aside or Transgressed, for as long time humble thy self to God and make Satisfaction to him. *Hom. 10. on Jer.* citing that saying in the Epistle to the Hebrews, *It is impossible for these who were once enlightened, &c.* He seems himself to deny Repentance to the relapsed, yet, not consistent with himself, *Hom. 13. upon the*

the same place, he seems to promise to the relapsed after Baptism the expectation only of Purgatory.

He is also reported to have entertained some prodigious Dreams concerning Baptism after this Life, *Hom. 14. on Luke*, "I Judge, (saith he) that after the Resurrection from the Dead we stand in need of the Sacrament to purge and cleanse us. He affirms, That the Lord Jesus will set himself in a fiery Flood, besides a flaming two handed Sword, that whosoever after they are past from this Life desire a passage over to Paradise, and stand in need of purging, he may in this River Baptize him, and transmit him to the desired place, but that the Persons who have not the Sign and Badge of prior Baptism, be not Baptized in this fiery cleansing. For, saith he, a Person must be first Baptized by Water and the Spirit, that when he comes to the fiery Flood, he may shew himself to have kept the Washings both of the Water and Spirit, that thus in Christ Jesus he may merit a Reception of the Baptism of Fire.

Moreover, in the Writings of the Doctors of this Age, there are Footsteps not obscure of the Error of the Invocation of Saints. Among others we have with *Origen* the Formula of this Invocation. Towards the end of his *Lib. 2. on Job*. "O blessed Job pray for miserable us, that the tremendous Mercy of God may protect us in all Tribulations, and rid us from all Oppressions of the Wicked, and give us Fellowship with the Just. Write and Inroll us with those who shall be Saved, and make us rest with them in his Kingdom, where we shall for ever magnifie him with the Saints. *Hom. 16. on Joshua*. He Judges, "That the Martyred Saints do fight together with us, and help us by their Prayers, and this he proves by the Authority of a certain Senior Master. To which may be added, that the Author of the Sermon *de Stella & Magis*, or the *Star and Wise Men*, holds the Opinion, "That the Innocent Infants slain by *Herod* were made the first Martyrs, and do in Heaven plead for Gods Clemency and Mercy for all those who Suffer Persecution, yea and do obtain Pardon for some that are Unworthy. The History is also known in *Eusebius, Lib. 6. Cap. 5.* that the Martyr *Potamiana* appearing to the Executioner, *Basildes*, in his Sleep shewed that Interceding with the Lord for him she had obtained the cure.

The History also shews, that the Doctors of this Age entertained no small Errors concerning the Church. Among these *Origen* had his signal Errors, and no small Blots, about the Power and Duties of the Church. For instance, concerning Excommunication, he saith, (*Tractat. 1. in Matth.*) "If any Person who will bind and loose is himself

‘ himself tied in the Bonds of Sin, he in vain doth either bind or loose. Wherein he holds Conversion indispensably necessary in order to Ministerial Acts. He also Disputes, “ That it is not permitted to Ministers of the Church that they should enjoy Earthly Possessions or Houses in Cities, more Coats than one, more Money than sufficeth for Food and Raiment. Thus *Hom. 15. on Levit.*

The immoderat Esteem and Extolling of Martyrdom prevailing in these first Times is by Historians ascribed to these Doctors, among whom, *Origen* doth prefer “ Martyrdom to Baptism, and holds that thereby we are more purified than by Baptism ; Also that by Baptism Sins that are past are purged away, but by Martyrdom Sins that are to come are slain ; That the Devil himself can lay nothing to the charge of the Souls of Martyrs, because wash’d with their Blood, and made Glorious and Illustrious by their Death.

Upon the point of Marriage, the erroneous depressing of it, and immoderat Extolling Virginity had its signal advances in this Age. Upon this Head concerning Marriage, *Origen, Hom. 19. on Luke*, saith, “ Now there are found second, third and fourth Marriages, not to speak of more, and we are not ignorant that such Marriages cast us out of the Kingdom of God. And in the same place he affirms, That not only Fornication, but Marriage repells from Ecclesiastick Dignities, for neither Bishop, nor Presbyter, nor a Deacon, nor a Widow can be lawfully a Digamist. As touching Virginity and Celibate, *Origen Lib. 10. Epist. to the Romans*, “ makes Virginity a work of Perfection, and thus, with other Doctors of this Age, gives Patrocinny to Monastick vows.

As to the Resurrection, *Methodius*, in his Sermon of the Resurrection, amongst other things recites these words of *Origen* on the first Psalm, wherein he appears to deny the Resurrection. “ This I say Brethren, that Flesh and Blood cannot inherit the Kingdom of God, neither Corruption inherit Incorruption : It may be it shall be preserved, *scil.* the Flesh, by him who once made this his own Flesh, but Flesh shall it no more be, but what was once impressed on the Flesh shall be impressed upon the Spiritual Body. He recites also this Argument of *Aglaophon* and *Origen*, “ The Blessed shall in the Resurrection be as Angels, but Angels have no Flesh, therefore the Blessed shall not rise in the Flesh.

As for what relates to the place of Souls departed, *Origen Hom. 5. on Psalm. 36.* saith, “ That the Prince of this World cometh to every Soul departing out of this World, and the Aëreal Powers, and enquires if they find therein any thing of theirs, if they find Cove-

'confess it is of their part, if Wrath or Luxury, if Envy and every
'such like, finding every one what is theirs, they defend and draw to
'themselves, and to that part or piece of Guilt they do bend to. A
strange and Antiscriptural Conceit.

Besides what is hinted, Historians do also deprehend scattered in
Origen, these hints and seeds of Purgatory. *Hom. 2. on Psalm 36.*
"This Sin, saith he, of Anger is one of these which brings Wood,
'Hay and Stubble to the Building, and of necessity these materials
'must be tried by Fire, so that we continue so long in the Fire till the
'Wood of Anger be consumed in us, the Hay of Indignation, &c.
Hom. 3. on the same place, speaking of the Fire wherein the Work of
every one is to be tried, "I Judge, saith he, that we must all come to
'this Fire, though a Person were Paul or Peter, &c. *Hom. 8. on*
Levit. He asserts, "That such as commit Sin which is neither for-
'given in this Life nor that to come, remain unclean for two Weeks,
'but in the beginning of the third they are purged from unclean-
'ness. Many such things are recited out of *Hom. 12. on*
Ezekiel, and *Lib. 5. contra Celsum.* Also *Lib. 1. de Princ. Cap.*
6.

As to the last Judgment, Origen (*Lib. 3. on Job.*) Judged, that all
Faithful and Unfaithful will not be brought to Judgment; "That
'Pagans and all Infidels shall not come into Judgment, but are on
'this ground already Condemned and unexcusable, because of their
'Infidelity, and shall be shut out to the punishments of the Damned.
'On the contrary such as appear to be in the Faith, and are reputed
'of a bad Name, shall give account of every day in that terrible
'inquisition of the Judgment, &c. Also *Hom. 9. on Ezekiel,* he hath
a strange Speculation, "That every one of us in the day of Judge-
'ment shall be Justified by another, and Condemned by ano-
'ther.

As touching the Happiness and Rewards of the Just, Historians recite
his monstrous Notions and Fictions, viz. that *Hom. 1. on Joshua,* he Judges,
"That the Godly shall receive the Inheritance of Devils which they
'had before their fall, and of such Devils whom in special they have
'overcome. *Hom. 10. on the same place,* he Judges, "That such as
'have believed, but have thereunto added no Amendment nor
'change of Manners, shall be Saved, but not without a note of In-
'famy. *Hom. 27. on Numbers,* he asserts, "That Souls after the
'Resurrection shall not ascend to the highest Mansions all at once,
'but by many Mansions and Degrees, until they come to the Father of
'Lights. Against that Scripture, *We shall be caught up to meet the Lord. &c.*
Hom.

Hom. II. on Numbers, he Dreams, "That in the Life to come 'some Men shall not see God, but only Angels, and that God will 'subject some Men to some Angels, others to others, Several other figments are to be seen in his Homilies on the Book of *Numbers*.

Concerning Damnation and the punishments of the Damned, *Origen* maintains several Errors. *Lib. 2. de Principiis*, and elsewhere, as *Hom. 6. on Exodus*, He Judged, "That God had fixed a measure of 'Damnation, and that in their time the hardened Jews shall be Saved, and this he proves from the Epistle to the *Romans*, *Chap. II. Blindness in part hath happened to Israel according to the Flesh till the fullness of the Gentiles are come in*.

Hitherto we have had a discovery and *vidimus* of the many monstrous Opinions in the chief points of the Christian Faith maintained by this great Doctor of the Third Age. And with such Heterodoxy we shall find *Cyprian* and his other Contemporaries, Tinctured and Charged by the Centuriators, wherein it will appear how absurdly this new Pamphleter, from the Doctrine and Practice of *Cyprian* and his Contemporaries, endeavours to commend the Third Age, and by his pompous Elogies will needs present it as a Pattern of Gospel Purity to the Reformed Churches. Let us now proceed to another famous Doctor thereof, *Tertullian*, from whose illustrious Name and Doctrine also our Pamphleter will needs commend this Third Age as a Pattern to the true Church, and in special on this Ground, that he was *the great Cyprian's Master*, from whom he denominats this whole Age, whose Writings his little god *Cyprian*, he tells us, had in such Veneration, and was so highly therewith Delighted, that when about to Read him, he used this phrase, *Give me my Master*. Let us therefore consider how many and gross Errors this Illustrious Master of *Cyprian* maintained.

Concerning God he is accused as having dangerous Expressions, *scil.* that he *had a Body*. Thus in *Lib. Advers. Prax.* "Who will deny that 'God is a Body, altho' God be a Spirit, a Spirit being a Body of its own kind in its own likeness. This Error *Augustin* refuted, *Lib. 10. De Genes. ad Liter.* *Tertullian* (saith he) feared that God should be nothing if he were not a Body, and of God he would Judge no other-wise.

There is also a dangerous Error imputed to him concerning Christ by Historians. For in his Book of the Trinity he saith, "That of 'necessity the Father must needs be first, because in some respect 'he goes before him who hath an Original and Beginning, who him-

'self knows no Original. He therefore (i. e. the Son) proceeded from the Father when the Father would. And in his Book against *Hermog.* "Neither could he be before the Son, neither the Judge before the fault, saith he, but there was a time when both the fault and the Son was not, which might make the Father Judge and Lord. Several such things are rehearsed from his Book *Advers. Prax.*

As touching the Holy Ghost, *Tertullian* after his Defection to Montanism, "Judged with *Montanus*, that the Holy Ghost did not deliver what was necessary to the Church by the Apostles, but by the Comforter or Paraclyte of *Montanus*, of which Opinion he scattered many Testimonies, (*Lib. de Monogam*) which he Wrote against the Church ; Wherein among other Absurdities, speaking of Marriage, he saith, "If Christ took away what *Moses* commanded, why not also the Paraclyte hath taken away what *Paul* indulged, Other Testimonies are exhibited by the Centuriators to this purpose.

Concerning the fall of Angels he vented this Fiction, (*Lib. de habitu Mulierum*) "Angels, saith he, rushed from Heaven to the Daughters of Men. Strange ! after their evaporat libidinous Moments they breathed for Heaven. From this, as from many such Instances, 'tis evident, that the true literal Sense of many Scriptures was hid from the Fathers, which is now clear and perspicuous to the Reformed Churches, and there the Errors of the Antients discovered. In his Apologetick he seems to speak "of the Generation or begetting of Devils, when from Angels, corrupt by their own will, there flowed a more corrupt Nation of *Dæmons* Condemned by God, together with the Authors of their kind, &c. In his Books *De Habitu Mulierum & Cultu Fæmin.* He held Opinion, "That Devils were Authors of Womens Ornaments, and to have revealed to Men some hidden and secret Arts. In his Book of the Resurrection he held the Opinion, "That Man was Created after the Image of Christ, viz. such an Image which the Man Christ represented.

Concerning *Free Will*, together with other Doctors of this Age, he is reported to have held the Opinion, that after the Fall, the Freedom of Man's Will remains intire. Thus *Lib. 2.* against *Marcion*, "Thus, saith he, in the succeeding Laws of the Creator he is found propounding Good and Evil. Life and Death, but no otherwise will we find the whole Order of Discipline disposed by Precepts by God inviting, Threatning, Exhorting, then towards Man still free and voluntary, either with respect to Obedience or Contumacy, The same he hath,

Lib. de Exhortatione Castitatis, " Since, saith he, we have from his Com-
mands what he will and what he will not, the Will is now in us to
choose either, as it is written, *Behold I have set before thee Good and
Evil, for thou hast eaten of the Tree of Knowledge*, and therefore we
ought not to impute and refer that to the Will of God, which is
committed and laid open to our own Arbitriment and Will, &c.
In his Book *de Monogamia*. *I have set before thee Good and Evil, choose thou
what is Good*. " If thou cannot, because thou wilt not, (for he shew-
eth, that thou can, if thou wilt, because he hath proposed both to
thy Arbitriment and Choice) thou must needs flee from him, whose
Will thou dost not perform.

As touching *Sin*, *Tertullian*, *Lib. de Anima*, judged, that Godly Per-
sons are procreated by the Godly ; For thus he saith, " The Apostle
hence affirmeth, that Saints are procreated and begotten by either
Sex who are Sanctified, and that as well from the Prerogative of the
Seed, as from the Law and Rule of the Institution.

Concerning the Law of God, he, with other Fathers of this Age, is
reported to have held very Erroneous Opinions. In his Book against
the Jews, he disputes, " That the Saints in the Old Testament, as
Noah, Abraham, Melchisedeck, and others, were Righteous by the
Righteousness of the Law of Nature. For what relates to Good
Works, in his Book *de Patientia*, he seems to judge, " That Good
Works do both go before Faith and follow after it. This he affirms
of Patience. And elsewhere, viz. *Lib. 4.* against *Marcion*, he shews,
" That the chief Cause of the Justification of *Zacheus*, was, that he
ignorantly fulfilled the Precept of *Isaiah*, *Thou shalt deal thy Bread to
the Hungry*.

Upon the point of Repentance, he is found to have depraved this
Doctrine, together with most of the Writers of this Age, imputing
Remission of Sins to Contrition, for *Tertullian* admits only one Repentance
after Baptism, (as also in the preceeding Age, *Clem. Alexandr.*) *Lib. de
Poenitentia*. " Repentance, saith he, which, by the Grace of God, is repre-
sented and enjoined to us, restores us into God's Favour, being once
known and received, can never afterward be foredone, or sealed
again, by the Iteration of the Fault. In his Book *de Pudicitia*, he
asserts, " There are some more Grievous and Fatal Sins, which are
are not capable of Pardon, namely, Man-slaughter, Idolatry, Deceit,
&c. Of these he affirms, " Christ is no Intercessor and Obtainer of
Pardon ; He shall not at all commit these, saith he, who shall be born
of God, and to be no more a Son of God, if these be committed.
In which Words, he has added to the Sin truly unpardonable, several
others,

others, and therein wrong'd and impeach'd the Sovereignty and Extent of the Grace of God, appearing in the Scripture Instances of the Pardon of such Sins in the Elect and truly Regenerate, as in *David*, *Manasseh*, &c. In the same place, he doth also ascribe the Pardon and Expiation of Sin to publick Confession and Satisfaction. Therein homologating the Popish Doctrine in this point.

Upon the point of Baptism, in his Discourse thereanent, he asserts, (in Opposition to the Doctrine of all the Reformed Churches) "That the Baptism of *John* performed nothing Celestial or Spiritual; but gave a previous Ministration only thereunto. Also, in his Book concerning Baptism, he holds a strange Opinion, "That Children are not so soon to be Baptized, and to that of *Matth. 19. Suffer little Children to come to me, and hinder them not*, he Answers, "Let them come when they are grown up, let them come when they have learned, while they are taught whether they come; Let them become Christians while they are able to know Christ; Wherefore doth the Innocent Age hasten to the Remission of Sins; Yea and he will have Baptism delayed to such as are not Married, upon this Ground, that Temptation is prepared for them.

The Administration of the Eucharist, he calls an Oblation and Sacrifice, (*Lib. de Cultu Fœmin.*) and in so far, with other Doctors of this Age, he hath given Occasion, and paved the way to the Idolatry and Superstition of the Popish Mass, as *Stillingfleet* has well observed, *Iren. Part. 2. C. 6. §. 11.*

For what relates to the Church, and the Roman Primacy, in his Book *de Pudicitia*, he seems to judge, "That the Keyes were committed only to *Peter*, and that the Church is built upon him.

Tertullian also, as other Doctors of this Age, did extravagantly extol Martyrdom. In *Scorp.* he almost equals it with Baptism, saying, "That our Filthiness is wash'd away in Baptism, but our Spots are made white by Martyrdom. And, in his Apology, he saith, "Who would not desire earnestly to suffer, when Suffering comes, that he may merit and obtain the Grace of God, and commence and complete all Favour and Pardon from him, by the Compensation of his Blood, for in this Work all Sins are pardoned. And, in his Book *de Anima*, "If, saith he, thou suffer and die for God, thy Blood is the intire Key of Paradise.

Concerning Marriage, he is reported to have discoursed very irreverently, after his Defection, in the Books which he wrote against the Church. In his Book *de Monogam.* he affirms, "That the Rule and Doctrine of one Marriage is both ancient and proper to Christians;

'rians. In this Book, he hath heaped together several Absurdities. In his Book anent the Exhortation of Chastity, he makes Marriage of a Kin to Uncleanness. In his 5th Book advers. Marcionem, together with several others of this Age, he prefers Continency and Virginity to Marriage.

He ascribes also a Necessity, yea and Merit, to several things indifferent. As, in his Book *de Jejunio contra Psychicos*, he affirms, "That Fastings do merit at the Hand of God, not only the Change of Nature and the Aversion of Hazards, or the Obliterating of Faults, but likewise the (Agnitionem) Recognizance of Sacraments; Affirming a little thereafter, "That Sins are expiated by Abstinence and Fasting."

As for what relates to the place of Souls departed, Tertullian is accused by the later Writers of this Error, that he affirmed, "the place of the Blessed, before the Resurrection, not to be the Celestial Mansion, but a place only above Hell."

Many other Errors of Tertullian Historians have related, the Abridgement whereof may be seen with the *Magdeburgians*, *de Tertulliani Navis*, besides several gross Errors concerning the Trinity & the Essence of God. It is no small Error of Tertullian which is represented, concerning "the Kingdom of Christ, and a Voluptuous Life of the Godly upon Earth, for the space of a Thousand Years before the end of the World. He sometimes calls Montanus the Comforter, and, in an evident Infatuation, affirms, "That the Holy Spirit was in the Apostles, but the Comforter was not; And that the Comforter had revealed more to Montanus, than Christ had brought forth and manifested in the Gospel; And not only more; but also things greater and better. Many such Fictions of his may be read with the Authors mentioned.

The Centuriators also (Cent. 3. Cap. 10. Pag. 230, 231.) have represented from Authors the Errors and Blots of Dionysius, shewing, that there is extant with Nicephorus, Lib. 6. Cap. 25. an intire and full Chapter described from the Epistle of Basilin Magnus to Bishop Maximus, concerning the Errors of this Dionysius, especially that homologating the Impiety of Lybicus the Heretick. Together with the Diversity of the Substance of the Trinity, he maintains and asserts the Difference also of the Substance and Essence, and, as it were, a remitting of Power and Mutation of Glory, &c.

Let us now make our Advance to Cyprian, whom our Pamphleter obtrudes as a little God, and his Doctrine, together with his Practice in point of Government, as the Churches great Rule. We will find the

the Historians reciting his signal Errors and Blots. In his Sermon de *Eleemosyna*, he affirmed, "That Christ satisfied only for Original Sin, but that we our selves must satisfie for Actual Sin. Here also, as it were on the by, we may notice, that the Author of the *Tractat. apud Cyprian. de Sina & Sion*, heretically distinguished "betwixt Jesus and Christ, affirming, that the Flesh of our Lord was called Jesus, and the Holy Spirit which descended from Heaven, Christ; And that thus the Spirit and Flesh mixed are Jesus Christ. In which Opinion, he intirely embraceth the Heresie of *Marcus* and the *Colarbasti*.

Cyprian also (*Lib. 1. Epist. Ep. 12.* and elsewhere) did erroneously judge "the Holy Spirit to be in the Power of the Ministers, and to be given by them even in respect of his Person. In his Exposition also of the Creed, he affirms, "That when God made the World, he set over the same certain Presidents of the Celestial Powers and Virtues, by which the World and Mankind was to be Governed and Ruled. *Tract. 4. de Van. Idol.* he judged, "That the Angels fell upon this Ground, that being immersed in Earthly Things, they fell from their Celestial Vigor, by an Earthly Infection. In *Tract. 2. de Habitu Virginum*, according to the Conceit of his Master *Tertullian*, he is of Opinion, "That the Art of Dying and Colouring of Wools, had been revealed and did proceed from the Devils, descending to Earthly Contagions.

Following also this Erroneous Master, he drunk in the Errors concerning *Free-Will*. For he judged, *Lib. 3. Epist. 3.* "That Man left to his Free-Will, and placed in his own proper Arbitriment, hath an Inclination unto, and may bring to himself either Death or Life. And, *Lib. 3. ad Quirinum, Cap. 52.* he judgeth, that, in the Book of *Deuteronomy*, that Passage, *viz. I set before thy Face Life and Death*, "there is placed in Mans Free-Will a Liberty of Believing or not Believing. As also, that this is affirmed by the Prophet *Isaiab*, *If ye be willing and will hear me, ye shall Eat the Good of the Land.*

As touching the Law of God, together with other Doctors of this Age, especially *Origen*, he asserts the Possibility of Fulfilling it. Thus, *Serm. de Baptismo Christi*, "Because, saith he, we both know what we are to practise, and are able to perform what we know, thou commands me Lord that I Love thee: This I both can do, and ought to do.

As touching the Gospel, in that same Sermon de *Baptismo Christi*, discoursing of these Words, (*Hear ye him*) he almost makes no mention of the Gospel, but only of the Law. As to Justification and Good Works, (*Lib. 3. Epist. 25.*) he judgeth, "That subsequent Sins are

vailed

' veiled and hid by the Defence of preceeding Merits: Upon the Ground of which Error also, he ascribes unto Discipline, that is, to Good Works, " That it is the Guardian of Hope, the Preserver of Faith, and that which procures our abiding alwise in Christ, our continued living in God, and our arriving and coming at last to the Celestial Promises and the Divine Rewards. Also, (*in Sermone de Oratione*) " As we continually, *saith he*, do Sin, let us purge away our Sin with Assiduous Sanctification. In like manner (*in Sermone 1. de Eleem.*) he expressly holds this Opinion, " That Sins committed after Baptism are extinguished by Alms and Good Works. And this Doctrine he endeavours to prove by that Sentence of *Tobi. 4.* say our Authors, *viz.* " That Sins are purged away by our Alms and Faith. And from that of *Ecclesiasticus 3.* " As Water extinguisheth Fire, so do Alms extinguish Sin.

He entertained also Errors concerning *Repentance*, together with his Master *Tertullian*, and most Writers of this Age. Thus, *Lib. 1. Epist.* 3. he affirms, " That Sins are expiated by Satisfaction, and that we are thus redeemed from them. And in *Lib. 3. Epist. 18.* he gives this Definition of Repentance, " That Man doth repent who is meek and patient to the Divine Precepts, and obtemperating the Priests of God, doth merit God by his Obsequious Obedience, and Righteous Works. In the same place he saith, " That the Lapsed may be helped and relieved before the Lord, by the Assistance and Help of the Martyrs. The Centuriators also assert of this Author, that (*Serm. de Pass. Christi*) he appears to ascribe " a Merit to our Contrition and Confession, and ownes it, that Corporal Punishments satisfy for Eternal; Affirming, in Consequence hereof, " That Eternal Punishments succeeded not to the Temporal of the *Sodomites*, that the Punishment was to them for a Remedy, and the Torment for Absolution. A strange and most unaccountable Character of that Stupendous Stroke, which, none will doubt, is disowned by all the Orthodox, as of a sadly dangerous Tendency, and clearly contradicting the Scope of that Scripture, and expressly the Apostle *Jude's* Account thereof, who shews, that these filthy *Sodomites* suffer the Vengeance of Eternal Fire, v. 7.

For what relates to Baptism, he saith, *Lib. 1. Epist. 12.* " That the Water must be first cleansed and sanctified by the Priest, that it may, by its Washing, purge away the Sins of the Man who is Baptized, because the Lord saith by the Prophet *Ezekiel. And I will sprinkle clean Water upon you.* An egregious Application and Paraphrase, no doubt, of this Prophecie, and worthy of an Impression on *Corinthian* Brass.

Where also he is bold to affirm this, " That the Person Baptizing gives the Holy Spirit, and sanctifies the Baptized inwardly ; As also, " That the Person Baptized, of necessity, must be anointed, that, upon receiving the Chrism and Ointment, he may be anointed to the Lord, and have the Grace of Christ in himself. The Opinion of Rebaptizing such as were Baptized by Hereticks, was held by him and others of this Age, as the Centuriators relate.

Concerning the *Sacrifice* and *Eucharist*, he also superstitiously feigns, that some Virtue and Efficacy is added to it from the Person who administers the same. *Lib. 1. Epist. 1.* where he asserts, " That the Eucharist is sanctified on the Altar, and, *Lib. 2. Epist. 3.* he affirms, that the Priest sanctifies the Cup, " that the Priest performs the Office of Christ, and that there is a Sacrifice offered to God the Father, also that the Passion is the Sacrifice which we offer unto God. This Phrase (of Offering a Sacrifice) he learned from his Master *Tertullian*, who uses the same, speaking of the Supper.

As to the *Invocation of Saints*, there are found, in the Writings of *Cyprian*, some not obscure Foot-steps thereof, as also with other Doctors of this Age. For, *Lib. 3. Epist. 15.* he affirms, " That the Lapsed are, before God, assisted by the Help of the Martyrs : As also, in the end of the first Epistle, *Lib. 1.* he insinuates not obscurely, that the Martyrs and Saints Departed do pray for the Living ; " Whoever of us, saith he, shall first pass off from Time, the Divine Condescendence so accelerating the Departure, let our Love continue and stand before God, and let not Prayer cease for our Brethren and Sisters with the Mercy of the Father.

Concerning the *Church*, and the *Roman Primacy*, he drunk in also the Error of his Master *Tertullian*. For speaking of the Order in the Church, *Lib. 1. Epist. 8.* " God is one, saith he, and Christ is one, and there is one Church, and one Chair or Cathedral founded upon the Rock by the Voice of the Lord, there can no other Altar be constituted and appointed, nor can there be a new Priesthood, besides that one Altar and one Priesthood, whosoever gathereth elsewhere doth scatter. And, *Lib. 3. Epist. 11.* " *Cyprianus, Maximus, Urbanus*, and *Salonius* do judge, that there ought to be one Bishop in the Catholick Church. *Lib. 4. Epist. 8.* he doth expressly, and in special, assert, and this without any Foundation in the Holy Scriptures, " That the *Roman Church* ought to be acknowledged by all others, as the Mother and Root of the Catholick Church. Likeas also, (*Lib. 1. Epist. 3.*) and in his *Traſſat. de Simpliciter. Prælat.* he calls " *Peter's Chair* the principal Church, from which the Sacerdotal Unity hath its Origin :

ginal: And frequently, elsewhere, he affirms, that the Church is founded on Peter; As *Lib. 1. Epist. 3. Lib. 4. Epist. 9. &c.* He hath also, upon this point, other dangerous Opinions, as, "That the Pastorate, or pastoral Office, he tyes to an ordinary Succession, *Lib. 1. Epist. 6.* Also, that he denies, "That the Bishops and Governours of the Church can be judg'd, no not in a Council, *Lib. 4. Epist. 9.*

As to Martyrdom, he affirms, *Lib. 2. Epist. 6.* "That Immortality is purchased by the Blood of Martyrs. And, *Libro de Exhortatione Martyrii*, he hath a dangerous saying, "That Martyrdom is a Baptism in Grace more Eminent, in Power and Efficacy more Sublime and Excellent, in Honour more Precious, than the Baptism of Regeneration.

As to Marriage, *Cyprian (Tract. 2. de Habitu Virginum)* holds a violent Judgment against it. "That the first Law, according to him, did command Generation, but the second did perswade Continency. He doth, as it were *ex professo*, express a sort of Detestation of the Female Sex. *Lib. de Bono Pudicit.* he saith, "Virginity doth equal it self to Angels, and if we enquire more narrowly, doth even exceed them, while wrestling in the Flesh, it obtains the Victory, and even against that Nature which the Angels have not. In his Sermon of Christ's Nativity, he prefers "Continency to Marriage, and such Continency which necessity doth not enforce, but the Counsel of Perfection perswades. And what a Foulfom Popish Savour this with preceeding Sentences, doth represent to us, I need not express.

For what relates to Antichrist, the Author of the *Tractat. de Sina & Sion*, with *Cyprian*, doth affirm, in a Signal Dotrage, "That *Enoch* being translated to a certain Place, is preserved, in order to the founding of Antichrist.

Who desires a joint View of the Errors of *Cyprian*, may see them digested and abridged by the Centuriators, in the Instances ensuing, *Cent. 3. Cb. 10. P. 247. viz.* That, following *Tertullian*, he, for the most part, represents Repentance by the Name of Satisfaction and Exomologetick or Expiatory Acts, to which he ascribes the Cause of Absolution and Remission of Sins. And, in his Sermon *de Lapsis*, "The Lord, saith he, is to be pleased and atoned by our Satisfaction. He speaks also doubtfully and dangerously, in the same place, concerning the Repentance and Pardoning of the Lapsed. As likewise, from that saying of the 5th of *John*, Behold thou art made whole, sin no more, he draws a hard and bad Consequence, "That no Hope of Mercy remains unto such Delinquents, as have once begun to know the Lord. In his *Tractat. 2. de Habitu Virginum*, he also asserts, "That a Sin committed against the Lord, cannot

be absolved, nor the Sinner loosed therefrom, no, not by the Priest. In his 5th Sermon de Lapsis, he's reported by the Centuriators, to have taken up Ceremonies from *Tertullian*, out of the *Traditions of Montanus*, such as *Consecration and Unction after Baptism*.

Whoever will consult the *Magdeburgens.* Cent. 3. C. 10. P. 239. may read the Abridgment of *Tertullian's* Errors concerning several important points of the Christian Religion, upon which Ground, the Centuriators tell us, his Books have been condemned by the Orthodox.

That great and vehement Pleader and Orator in the Episcopal Cause, *Joseph Hall*, in the Defence of his Remonstrance to the Parliament of England, in Answer to *Smetstymnum*, commends, with high Elogies, *Abrahamus Scultetus*, as a Signal Friend and Patron of the Episcopal Interest; Our Episcopalians, then, must needs acknowledge him a most Unexceptionable Witness in this Point: Let us then consider, what Errors are ascribed to *Cyprian* by this so much Famed Episcopal Divine. In his Book, Entituled, *Medulla Theologiae Patrum*, Lib 8. C. 24. which has this Title, *Errores & Navi Cypriani*, P. 369, 370. he affirms, that *Cyprian* confounds the Doctrine of *Justification by Faith* with *Justification by Works*, since, in down right Terms, he affirms, "That the Sins which go before Conversion are purged by the Blood of Christ and Sanctification, but such Sins, or Blots, as we are guilty of, and contract after Conversion, are purged and washed away by Alms-deeds, that by these, all such Transgressions are covered and expiated. Which all will acknowledge to be a very gross Error, and homologating the Antichristian Doctrine in one of the chief points of the Popish Controversie, and thus a gross Impeachment of the Doctrine and Confessions of all the Reformed Churches.

Moreover, *Scultetus* ascribes a Contradiction to him upon the point of *Free-Will*, because, Lib. 3. Epist. 25. he affirms, "That Confession, Perseverance with all Good Works, are wrought in us by God, that he is the Author of all the Good we perform, that from him we live, and are able to perform what is Good. Thus also, Lib. 2. Ep. 2. Notwithstanding whereof, Lib. 3. Ep. 3. he teaches the contrary, saying, "That Man is left to his Liberty, and so placed in his proper Free-Will, that he may either desire and bring upon himself Death or Salvation.

Omitting several others, this Episcopal Doctor recites and ascribes to *Cyprian* these 13 Errors. 1. "That he judg'd, that such as were Baptiz'd by Hereticks, ought to be Rebaptiz'd. 2. That, with too much Anxious Superstition, he urges the mixing of Water with Wine in

in the Lord's Supper, upon this ground, that Blood and Water flow'd from Christ's pierc'd Side. 3^{ly}, That he held, the Baptism Administred by a bad Minister is not Legitimat; Which Error is oppos'd by the Author of the Sermon *De Baptismo*. 4^{ly}, That he affirm'd the Holy Ghost to be Inferiour unto Christ: Thus in the Epistle *ad Pompeium*. 5^{ly}, That he held Baptism, to be simply and absolutely necessary unto Salvation (a Popish Error long since baff'd by all sound Protestants): Upon ground of which Error (saith our Author) he fell into another, in affirming the Sufferings of the Penitent Thief to have supply'd the place of Baptism. Upon which point *Augustin* gave a far better Judgment, affirming, that the Faith of his Heart apprehending Christ, Justified and Saved the penitent Thief, and this case of necessity did exclude Baptism. 6^{ly}, That he ascribes Remission of Sins to the Sinners Satisfaction. Thus Sermon *de Lapsis*. 7^{ly}, That he enjoyns the Lapsed not to despair of Mercy, yet in the same place he will not have the penitent Lapsed to promise themselves Pardon. And of this Nature (saith our Author) he hath many dangerous Assertions in the same Semon. The 8th is what was touched before, *viz.* That he retains, urges and defends the *Montanistical Ceremonies*, such as *Consecration* and *Unction after Baptism*, which he receiv'd from *Tertullian*. Thus *Lib. 1. Ep. ult* 9^{ly}, That he is too Hyperbolick, and runs too high in the commendation of *Calibat*, or Virginity, wherein he hath consenting with him the Author of the *Calibat* of the Clergy, and another Writer of the Sermon concerning the Nativity. 10^{ly}, That he permitted the Lord's Supper, *as indispensably and absolutely necessary to Salvation*, to be given to Infants. Sermon *de Lapsis*. 11^{ly}, That he held it unlawful for Christians to wadge War, *Lib. 2. Ep. 2.* 12^{ly}, That (as is above touch'd) in a new and odd Devotion he Admonish'd and Exhorted the Living to remember him before God after Death. *Lib. 1. Ep. 1.* 13^{ly}, That he held this Opinion, that Baptism it self is without the Holy Spirit, who is then first given and received, when the Bishop, upon his Invocation of the Holy Spirit, imposes his Hands upon the Baptized, and not before; Which Opinion and Error of his, saith our Author, *Jerom* doth refute.

The Errors and Heresies begotten or brought forth in the preceeding Age had their signal Growth in this, as would be evident to any who will compare what is observ'd by the Centuriators in both, who shew, that the Second Age may be truly called a Seminary of these Errors, which overspread the Church in after times, the Original whereof they deduce partly from Judaism, partly from Humane Wildom, and Sophistical.

Sophistical Philosophy, made the Standart and Measure of Religion, the vulgar Prevalency of Heathenism, together with the Ignorance of the Scriptures and Sacred Languages, as also the unconcernedness of Emperors anent, and hatred of the true Religion. The Heresie of the *Carophrygians* was maintain'd and propogated at *Rome* by *Proclus*, as Testifies *Eusebius*, Lib. 6. Cap. 21. *Jerom* has also shew'd, that *Tertullian* in *Africa* deserted the Church and went over to the Tents and Camp of the *Montanists*. *Berillus* the famous Doctor in *Arabia* fell into this Heresie of *Artemon* concerning Christ, that he affirmed, "That Christ did not exist before he became Man, with respect to a proper and distinct Substance from that Nature. *Jerom* thus shortly represents that Heresie in the Catalogue of Ecclesiastical Writers, affirming that he fell into that Heresie which denieth Christ to have had a Being before his Incarnation.

Whosoever shall Read and diligently Weigh the Catalogue of Heresies represented by the Centuriators, will find how fruitful a Growth they had in these First Ages, v. g. That Heresie called *Helcbesaitarum*, in *Arabia*, under *Philip*, concerning God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, Remission of Sins, the Scripture, &c. According to the Relation of *Theodoret*, *Epiphanius*, *Eusebius*. The Heresie of the *Novatians*, or *Catharists*, under *Decius*, concerning Repentance, concerning Salvation, Baptism, Mariage. The Heresie called *Patripassianorum*, imputing Sufferings unto God the Father, also concerning Christ, whose Body they placed in the Sun, &c. The *Nepotian* Heresie, under *Galienus*, which prevailed in *Egypt*, and laid the Foundation of the *Millenary Error*. The *Samosatenian* Heresie prevailing in the times of the Emperours *Galienus*, *Claudian* and *Aurelian*, concerning God, concerning Christ and the Holy Spirit, &c. The Heresie of the *Manichees* in the time of *Probus*, concerning the Scripture, God and Christ, &c. Whosoever, we say, shall ponder the Heresies prevalent in these times with respect to their variety and multiplicity, how many places, how many famous Doctors were infected thereby, how deeply Rooted, and of how long continuance, it may appear one of the prodigious Wonders of our Age, that this Pamphleter J. S. has taken the boldness to present the Principles and Practices of the *Cyprianic* Age, as the Authentick Rule to all the Churches in point of Church Government.

C H A P. III.

Wherein is Demonstrated and made appear the absurd and fruitless Endeavour of this Pamphleter, to prove, from the Writings or Practice of Cyprian, or the Contemporaries alledg'd by him, an Universal Reception of the Diocesan Form and Mould of Church Government in the whole Christian Churches through the World.

THE Undertaker of such a Work and Design as this Man has Attempted, all will acknowledge, must needs be furnish'd with an exact Knowledge of the State and Government of all the Churches, in what place of the World soever planted and propagated in that Third Age. The Historians give us account, that the Church planted by the Apostles and their Successors was by this time Propagated through the great part of the habitable World, as may be concluded from the Writings of the considerable Writers of these times. *Tertullian*, in his Book *De Præscr. Hæret.* positively affirms, the Church had then continued and Flourished in *Asia*, *Africa*, and *Europe*. *Origen*, *Hom. 4. on Ezekiel*, makes mention of the Churches spread to the *Worlds outmost bounds*. And *Eusebius*, *Lib. 8. Cap. 1.* shews, that before the Persecution moved by *Dioclesian*, the Christian Doctrine was vident among all Men, both *Greeks and Barbarians*. In special, the Historians recite the Catalogue of the Churches Flourishing in this Age. As first, through *Asia*, to wit in *Jerusalem* and *Gaza*, *Eusebius*, *Lib. 8. Cap. 12.* Many Learned Doctors, such as *Theodotus*, *Domnus*, *Theotecnus*, and others, make mention of the Church of *Cæsarea*. There was at this time a Church in *Tyre* and *Sidon*, as Witness *Eusebius*, *Lib. 8. Cap. 13.* who mentions a certain *Tyrannion*, whom he calls Bishop of *Tyre*, and one *Zenobius*, whom he calls a Pastor, or Presbyter of *Sidon*. The same *Eusebius*, *Lib. 7. Cap. 29.* makes mention of illustrious Churches in *Syria*. *Epiphanius* makes mention of the Church of *Mesopotamia*. *Archilaus* and *Marcellus* flourished Doctors

of this Church, to wit, in *Casabara of Mesopotamia*. *Eusebius* also makes mention of the Church of *Laodicea*. And that there were a good number of famous Churches in *Syria*, may appear by the History of the Persecution under *Dioclesian*. *Eusebius* also mentions the *Rhosenian* Church. *Lib. 6. Cap. 12.* There was also in the Metropolis of *Cilicia* a Church, viz. in *Tarsus*, as Witnesseth *Nicephorus, Lib. 6. Cap. 32.* and *Eusebius, Lib. 7. Cap. 28.* *Vincentius* also Writes, *Lib. 11. Cap. 52.* The Church of *Perga* in *Pamphilia* under *Decius* furnished Martyrs. The Histories also make mention of the Churches of *Ephesus, Smyrna*, to have continued in this Age in *Jonas*. As also the Church of *Sardis* and of *Tralleis*, the Church of *Philadelphia* and *Magnesia*, mentioned by the Historians in the preceeding Century. There continued also a Church in *Phrygia* at *Hierapolis*, even from the Apostles times. As also in *Lamsacus*, *Vincentius* recites the Martyrs Suffering under *Decius*. *Dionysius Alexandrinus apud Euseb. Lib. 7. Cap. 7.* makes mention of the Church at *Synada* a City of *Phrygia*. There were also famous Martyrs in *Nicomedia* of *Bithynia*, *Euseb. Lib. 8. Cap. 6.* who also mentions in a Writing to *Stephanus* Bishop of *Rome*, the Churches in *Pontus, Bithynia* and *Galatia*. That there was also an antient Seat of the Church at *Ancyra* of *Galatia* is evident by *Eusebius's* Narration, *Lib. 5. Cap. 17.* *Tertullian* makes mention of the Churches in *Cappadocia* in his Writing *ad Scapulam*. That there were also Christians in *Melitena*, a Region of *Armenia*, Situated upon *Euphrates*, the History of the Persecution under *Dioclesian* makes evident, *apud Euseb. Lib. 8. Cap. 6.* The *Magdeburgers* also affirm that there were Churches among the *Indians*, whereof they mention some restor'd by *Pantenus*. They also make mention, that *Vincentius* relates out of the *Martyrologie, Lib. 11. Cap. 52.* That there were Christians found in *Persia* at the time that *Decius* rais'd up Persecution. *Tertullian* also Writes, *Lib. contra Judeos*, That *Parthians, Medes*, and *Elamites* did believe in Christ. *Eusebius* also makes mention of the Church in *Arabia, Lib. 6. Cap. 21. and 33.*

Let us proceed from *Asia* to *Afric*. And in *Egypt* first there occurs the Church of *Alexandria*, famous for many eminent Doctors, *Demetrius, Origen, Clemens, Dionysius, &c.* The History also of this Age mentions the Church of *Hermopolis, Euseb. Lib. 6. Cap. 46.* To pass over many others. It is also evident from the History of these times, that there were some famous Churches in the Country of *Cyrene*: Thus *Euseb. Lib. 7. Cap. 26.* The Centuriators also affirm, that very probably there were existing in this Age *Aethiopian Churches, which were planted by the Apostles*. Beside the Church of *Carthage*, where *Cyprian* was Bishop, *Tertullian* makes express mention of the Churches of the *Mauritanians* and

and *Getulians*. That at this time there was still existing a Church in *Crete*, the recent Memory of the two Doctors *Pinytus* and *Philippus* gives no obscure evidence. That there was also existent at this time a Church in *Sicilia*, the Epistle of the *Roman* Presbyters and Deacons to *Cyprian*, which in the 2^d. Book is the 7th in number, is a clear and evident Proof.

In tracing the spread of Christian Churches, if we pass over with Historians from *Afric* to *Europe*, we will find Testimonies anent a multitude of famous Churches in almost all conspicuous places in this Age. *Tertullian* makes mention of the Churches in *Greece*, *Lib. de vel. Virg.* *Nicephorus* makes mention of the Church of *Athens*, *Lib. 5. cap. 2.* *Tertullian* also mentions, *Lib. de Præs. adv. Hæres.* the Church of *Corinth* in *Peloponnesus*. And there is no doubt, that these two eminent Churches extended themselves largely towards places adjacent. *Tertullian* also makes mention of the Church of *Philippi* in *Macedonia*, as also of *Thessalonica*. So doth *Nicephorus*, *Lib. 8. Cap. 6.* of the Church of *Byzantium*. The Centuriators also affirm that there were existent in this Age in the rest of *Thracia* Churches, namely at *Anchialum* and *Debelium*. It is also probable, that the *Dalmatian* and *Illyrian* Churches were existent in this Age when *Constantine* the Emperor convened the Synod in *Sardica* of *Illyrium*. That there were remaining Churches in *Italy*, as in *Rome*, the frequent Synod convened there against *Novatus* is an evident Proof, whereof *Eusebius* Writes, *Lib. 6. Cap. 43.* Another Synod was also gathered against Pope *Marcellinus* the Apostate. If we shall give Faith to *Vincentius* his *Speculum* we will find also in several other places the Church of God entertained, at *Verona*, *Beneventum*, *Spoleum*, in *Lucania*, and other places. Of which places he recites the Martyrs, *Lib. 11, & 12.* *Tertullian* also, *Lib. con. Jud.* makes mention of the Church among the *Gauls*. As also of the Church at *Orleans* and *Lyons*, *Cyprian*, *Lib. 3. Ep. 13.* The Church of *Burdeaux* is evident from the Epistle of *Martialis*. *Vincentius* also, in his *Speculum*, making mention of the Martyrdoms of this Age, doth rehearse many places of *France*, wherein the Martyrs were apprehended and condemned to Death, *Lib. 12. Cap. 10.* As for the *Spaniards*, *Tertullian*, to other Churches which he names, adds also the *Spanish*, *Lib. con. Jud.* where he affirms that in all the *Spanish* Coasts and divers Provinces of the *Gauls* the Name of Christ doth Reign. Not to mention the Churches rehearsed by *Cyprian*, *Lib. 1. Epist. 4.* *Vincentius* also rehearses several Cities in *Spain* wherein there were Churches settled, such as *Tarracona*, *Emerita*, *Cesar-Augusta*, *Complutum*, called now *Alcala de Henares* with others. In which Cities he makes mention of

Martyrs who suffered at this time under *Valerian* and *Dioclesian*, Lib. 11. and 12.

For the *British Churches*, we have the Testimonies of Antient Writers, such as *Tertullian*, *Beda*, *Joannes Major*, and others, touching the early Reception of Christianity, and the establishing of Churches there; As also in *Ireland*, as shall be after made appear. *Tertullian*, Lib. adv. *Jud.* mentioneth also the Churches in *Germany*, *Vincentius* also, Lib. 12. mentions Christian Martyrs at *Nerona* on the *Rhein*, in *Cologn*, and at *Triers*. Whosoever shall Read the Centuriators, will find many more places, where the Christian Church was propagated in this Age.

Since therefore 'tis evident, even to a Demonstration (I mean as far as the Faith of History can reach), that the Gospel was Preached and Gospel Churches Planted in such a vast Extent through the habitable World in this Age; It lies upon this Pamphleter (if he would shew himself indeed a *Hero*, not a meer *Thrafo*, in this Controversie and Debate) to prove and make out, that all the Churches in whatever places settled in this Age were, in point of Government, of the Diocesan Form and Mould, Constituted under such an Episcopacy as he describes, Chap. 6. 7. that is, *That they were Diocesan, Subject to such a Diocesan Prelat as had many Pastors or Presbyters under his Government, who deriv'd only from him, as their Lord, a precarious or vicarious Power, who were Subject (or rather enslav'd) to such a Bishop as he describes Cyprian himself (the Form and Mould of whose Episcopacy he presents in many places of his Pamphlet as the Authentick Samplar and Pattern of all the Churches), such a Bishop as is properly the Lord of all the Pastors of the Diocese, who is set over them as their sole Governour, whose only Hand holds the Ballance of Government, who as the High Priest stands on the highest Step or Pinacle of a Sacerdotal Power, (to use his own Phrasiologie: Sacerdotii tenet sublime fastigium) who is Pastor in chief and properly and primarily of the Diocese, the one only Judge thereof, the same to the Diocese that a King is to his Kingdom, yea such an one to whom upon this Ground Kingly Majesty is properly ascribable, who hath the Supreme Power of Sacraments, and in special of Baptism, to whom only the Legislative Power over Pastors and Flocks of the Diocese is properly and primarily competent. All which Priviledges of the Prelate he undertakes to prove from the Principles and Practice of Cyprian, with his other Contemporaries, Chap. 5, 6, 7.*

Moreover, 'tis incumbent upon him to prove, that the Christian Churches in the whole Extent mentioned were Subject to such a Prelacy or Prelats, to whom only was competent the Decisive Power and Authority,

or giving Suffrages in Synods and Ecclesiastick Councils, wherein he is bold to assert, that Presbyters or Pastors had no Authority above the Vulgar, (whereof afterward). That the Christian Church, I say, was thus absolutely and universally Governed, this Pamphleter hath not, nor shall never be able to make appear, by any shadow of good Consequence, from the Writings of Cyprian or Contemporary Bishops.

For, 1. Giving, not granting, that the Church over which Cyprian did preside and others mentioned in his Epistles, had been of such a Diocesan Form in point of Government, as he alledges, by what Consequence shall he prove from this, that the Christian Churches spread through the whole World were cast into the same Form and Mould, and did concur and consent to such a Government? Such a Conclusion cannot but be exposed to Mockery and have Folly Written in its Forehead, since the far different State and Circumstances of other Churches might be such, as did not only require, but render necessary a Frame of Government different from a Diocesan, wherein the Bishop is Cloathed with such an Absolute Power as he alleges; Yea that in point of Fact it was so, if Credit may be given to some Patrons themselves of Episcopacy, shall afterward appear. 2^{ly}, Whoever shall seriously ponder the State and Condition of the Churches mentioned, will be forc'd to acknowledge, that many of them, at least, were, in point of Government, of a Frame and Constitution different from the Diocesan mentioned; They being so stated in point of Remoteness of Bounds, the small Number and narrow Circuit of Professors where the Christian Doctrine was receiv'd, over whom, notwithstanding, there were Pastors and Ecclesiastick Governours or Presbyters established, whose mutual Counsel and Ministerial Correspondency in Church Government and Consistorial or Synodal Union in the Churches Concerns and Affairs in so far as could be obtained, he can with no shadow of Reason deny; And that therefore by no imaginable Consequence they could admit of such Diocesans with such a Pompous, and Majestical Superintendency over Pastors and People as he pleads for.

The Learned Clarkson, in his Book, entituled, *A description of the Primitive Episcopacy*, Chap. 2. makes appear, that in Dorps, or little Villages, there were Bishops constituted, who, according to the then usual Form of speaking, had this Title of Bishops; Such Villages as were Hydrax, Palæbisca, Olbium, Zygris. Several such Instances are adduc'd by him to clear this; That in the *Breviary of Miletius*, wherein he gives Alexander an account what Bishops he had made; Among the

rest there is *νεκροταφιστήριον* in *Athanas.* *Apol.* 2. pag. 612. And a place called *Andromene* was the Episcopal Seat of *Zoilus*, as *Athanasius* informs us. Which two last (with divers others which I will pass by) are in all probability Villages, since there are no such Cities discovered in *Egypt*. *Tinus* is a Village, according to *Stephanus*, and it had two Bishops at once, *Ausonius* for the *Meletian* Faction, and *Paul* for the Orthodox, *Athanas.* *Apol.* 2. *Secontarurus* was a very small and contemptible Village that *Ischyrius* was made Bishop of, containing so few Inhabitants, that there was never a Church there before, as *Athanas.* *Apol.* 2. pag. 642. The Writers of the Life of *Chrysostom* tell us, that *Theophilus* of *Alexandria* settled a Bishop in a place called *καυιδειον*, a small Hamlet. *Anonym. vit. Chryst.* pag. 345. To pass by several such Instances, that is considerable which he hath, pag. 25, 26, 27. Having mentioned the Apostles placing Elders, or Ministers for every Church, *Act.* 14. 23. And that our new Episcopal Pleaders will needs have these Elders to be Bishops, he takes notice of the places mentioned, *v.* 20, 21. where these Bishops were constituted, *viz.* *Antioch*, *Iconium*, *Derbe*, and *Lystra*. *Antioch*, says he, tho' the Metropolis of *Pisidia*, yet was not so great, but that all the Inhabitants could meet together to hear the Word, *Act.* 13. 44. *Iconium* in *Strabo* is but a small Town, *Lib.* 12. pag. 391. *Derbe* in *Stephanus*, is *oppueion*, a Fort, or Castle of *Isauria*, which *Strabo* calls not a City, but the Seat of *Antipater*, *Lib.* 12. pag. 368. *Lystra*, which is *Ptolomie's Ausra*, and *Strabo's Isaura*, was but a Village, *Strab.* *Lib.* 3. pag. 112. Hereby saith he, it appears that in Scripture small places do pass under the Name of Cities; *Derbe* a Fort or Grange, and *Lystra* are called Cities of *Lycaonia*, *Act.* 14. 6. Adding, that where there is a Church, whether the place be small or great, there, according to Scripture accounts, there ought to be a Bishop. And likewise that the Apostle Ordain'd Bishops in Villages, and other places as inconsiderable, and lest the Practice Warranted by Apostolick Example and Authority. He adds that *Artemidorus* giving an account of all the Cities in *Pisidia*, reckons but Eleven, whereas there are Twenty two Bishopricks in the Catalogue of *Leo*, *Strab.* *Lib.* 12. p. 392. See many Instances of this nature through the rest of this Chapter, and in special what Advantage this Learn'd Author makes of Prelatists constituting 100 Bishops in *Crete*, tho' *Plinie* who Wrote in *Vespasian's* time, a little after the Apostles Death, found but Fourty Cities there, (only the Memory of Sixty more) and *Ptolomie* gives an account of the same Number. So that the most of the Fourty called Cities were little better than Villages. *Strabo*, saith he, shews that *Crete* had *πενήκοντα πόλεις*, *Lib.* 10. pag. 328. but

but only Three of any great Note, and of these Three one lost its greatness before Titus knew it.

Moreover, from the Constitution of such Bishops, and their Description exhibited by approv'd Authors in Cyprus, Armenia, Pontus, Lycaonia, Bythinia, Cappadocia, viz. Bishops of such a Nature, Form and Mould as were those of whom we Read, *Act. 14.* who were plac'd and Ordain'd *κατ' ἐκκλησίας*, or Church by Church, this Learned Author makes appear, that the Bishops of that time were oblig'd to perform all Pastoral Duties to their Flock, and before the growing Corruption of Government he doth demonstrat, that they stood engag'd to a Personal Inspection and Watching over them. Of which Inspection he particularly recites these Parts or instances, *Chap. 7. pag. 179, &c.*

1. They were obliged to take diligent heed unto, and Watch over the Reception of all Members of the Church, viz. That they were endow'd with suitable Qualifications of Church Members. Likeas in our Church the same Office and Duty is incumbent upon Pastors of particular Congregations and Paroches. This he proves from *Eusebius de Vita Constantini*, Lib. 4. Cap. 64. 2ly, The Primitive Pastor or Bishop was oblig'd to Note, and for that end with all Cautious Diligence to observe such as did walk Disorderly, to Rebuke them also, and, the matter so requiring, to separate them from the Congregation, that is, in a Gospel Method, and upon Supposition of their Contumacy. 3ly, To understand exactly the Temper and Condition of such as were in the State and Condition of Penitents, what Fruits of true Repentance they did evidence, and according as the publick Profession of Satisfaction did require, to lengthen out or abridge the Course and Progress of their Censure. *Concil. Nic. Can. 11.* 4ly, They were oblig'd diligently and by frequent Preaching to Feed the Flock, to Administer the Sacrament of the Lord's Supper in the full Congregation. *Tertullian de coron. Milit.* 5ly, To Watch over the State of the Souls of all Members of the Church, giving all Diligence in order to an exact Knowledge thereof, as being to give account thereof to Christ, as it is, *Heb. 13. 17. Isid. Lib. 5. Ep. 323. Prosper de Vita contempti. Lib. 1. Cap. 20.* citing also to this purpose *Chrysostom*, who upon that place *Heb. 13.* asserts that his Soul trembled at the Reading this Precept. 6ly, That one Table only was in one Church set apart for the Administration and Celebration of the Eucharist. This Custom, he tells us, prevail'd long. The Device of Communicating otherwise than Personally at one Table with the Pastor or Bishop, and sending the Consecrated Bread to others, that they might not seem excluded

excluded from the Communion of the Church, he tells us, is a novel Invention which had for its first Author *Melchisedech* Bishop of Rome, Anno 313. according to *Baronius's* reckoning. 7ly, or only in publick preachings were these Bishops to have a Regard to the Condition of the People in general, but moreover to make their Admonitions proper and suitable to the private State and Circumstances of every Person, of which kind many Duties are reckon'd up by *Isidorus Perus.* and may be read, Lib. 3. *Epist.* 216. Lib. 1. *Ep.* 149. See *Clarkson, Chap.* 2. 4. 6. and *Chap.* 8. 9. who also makes appear that for a long Tract of Antiquity, there was no Bishop of Pastors, or Inferior Bishops, or such as did arrogate a Precedency over many Churches united in one Diocesan.

3ly, No Man of Sound Judgment will deny, that there were Christian Churches settled in places of the World, the Knowledge whereof, hath not come either to our Time or Ears, and far less publick Tables of the Succession of Pastors or Bishops. What Person, who has not a Brazen Forehead, will be bold to affirm, that the shattered Monuments of Antiquity now extant, or the rotten Fragments of Histories, Worm-eaten with the Rust of Time, can exhibite unto us an exact Account of the State and Condition of every particular Church existent, and constituted in these Ages through the World? Now, if there be, in this point, an *Hiatus* and *Vacuum* in History, or a Defect in the Historical Accounts, the Basis and Foundation of this Historical Argument being shaken and raz'd, the Superstructure rais'd thereupon, must needs fall to the Ground. This will be convincingly evident, if these things be duly pondered.

1. What the State of all the Churches in this Age was, in point of Government, is properly, *A Question in Matter of Fact*, and therefore is to be resolved and cleared by the Authentick, and absolutely approved, and intire History of that Time. And even supposing the History, the Resolution is but still probable, not infallible, as is evident from what is said. 2ly, This Author's Assertion and Design, as it comprehends the State of all Churches existing in the whole World in this Age, in point of Government, so his Proofs, Arguments and Instances must be adequate and levelled to this Scope, else they signifie nothing; So that if but one Church shall be found of a Form of Government distinct from the Diocesan, the whole Fabrick of his Argument falls to the Ground, since all do know, that, in a Question, specially of this Nature, a contrary Instance sufficiently overthrows an Universal Affirmative; And 'tis of no Avail to say, that an Affirmative Assertion stands good; till we shall exhibite Instances of Churches not of the Diocesan Form;

For

For (besides that such Instances can be exhibited) the Affirmative and the Proof, consequently, lies at his Door, which, no doubt, he will perform *ad Calendas Græcas*. And, in this Endeavour, is but Rolling *Sisyphus's* Stone, which will still return upon him, and renew his Labour. This will further appear, if we consider, that,

1. In order to evince this point, he is obliged, of necessity, to produce all the Authentick and Genuine Writers of this Age, and their positive and clear Assertion upon this Question, in point of Fact, *scil.* That all the Churches of the World were of the Diocesan Mould and Form. And when the Undertaker has won over this, and manag'd this Difficulty, there stands yet in the way another insuperable Mountain: For, in order to a clear and infallible Knowledge of this Point, (I mean as far as History can reach) there must be produc'd the Judgment of all the Churches, not only touching the Existence, but also the Approbation of this Government, and this in the Extent above-mention'd, *scil.* through the whole World, where Churches were planted. But what Man, in his Wits, will undertake to make this appear, or, without the Stain of Unparalell'd Impudence, will be bold to assert the same, or, that the Writings of the Three first Ages after 1400 Years, are come to our Hands sound and incorrupted? 2^{ly}, 'Tis certain, that, as many Writings of the Ancients are corrupted and interpolated, and that very few, if any, have come sincere and pure to our Hands, nor could they, before Printing (comparatively but a Novel Invention), so, many excellent Men, both Ministers and others in every Age, never wrote any thing, nor inclined thereunto; And who will be bold to say, that, in every Corner of God's Habitable Earth, where a Church was gathered and constituted, either Members or Officers concern'd themselves to write, and far less to present to Posterity, the State and Principles of the Church, in their Time and Place, and specially in point of Government? And tho' a Man should arrive at the Boldness to assert the contrary, what a *Non Ultra* of Impudence were it, to assert, that all these Writings are come to us pure and intire? How Mank and Mutilated the Humane and Historical Monuments are of the First Age, after the Acts of the Apostles, of the Second and Third Ages, which are, in this point, most considerable; How dark and involved in vast Historical Gaps, the petty Narrations are of the Church Government and Governours, and how stuffed with several Errors and Old-Wives Fables, besides *Eusebius's* Acknowledgment, who is the prime Historian and the Torch-Bearer to them that follow, several of the Learned have made appear; Especially *Scalliger*, *Prohad Hist. Euseb.*

But

But finally, and above all, the Assertion of this Pamphleter, and the petty Reasons adduc'd to support it, are intirely overthrown and refuted, if we can prove, and make appear from approved Histories, that, during this Age, or before it, there were exsistent Apostolical Churches without his Diocesan Bishops, and whose Government was managed by the common Counsel of Presbyters. A contrary Instance, if but one, is sufficient (as I said before) to overthrow his *Universally Affirming Proposition and Sentence*, when the Question is of Fact. To make the beginning then of our Examples and Instances at Home; Concerning our Church of *Scotland*, (the Government whereof is now our Ball of Contention and Debate) we offer these things to be considered.

i. 'Tis universally acknowledged, that the Sun of Righteousness did very early visit this Island, and (to speak so) darted down his Rays of Evangelical Light upon our Nation. Such as have made Inquiry into the Original of our Church from the first Times thereof, have justly judg'd the same to be among the First-Fruits of the Gentiles. Certain of the Disciples of the Apostle *John*, driven this length by Persecution, are reported to have brought unto us the precious Gospel Message. *Buchanan* tells us, *Lib. 5.* "That the Scots were taught Christianity by the Disciples of the Apostle *John*, and, *Lib. 4.* "That many Christians of the *Britains*, fearing the Cruelty of *Domitian*, took their Journey into *Scotland*: Of whom many Famous, both in Learning and Integrity of Life stayed, and fixed their Habitation therein. *Tertullian* makes mention of "the Gospel Light diffusing it self even to our Island and Nation: The Gospel Light, saith he, pierced into all parts of the World, and even as far as to *Britain*, and to that part of the Isle, to which the Roman Arms and Strength had never advanced. Thus, *Lib. con. Jud.* None doubts, that he partly wrote in the Second Age. In that premised Phrase concerning that part of the Isle, into which the Roman Arms did not pierce, he, no doubt, understands such a Tract of the Island, as lies beyond the Trench, or Wall, placed at first by the Roman Emperor *Hadrian*, thereafter by *Antonius Pius*, and lastly by *Severus*, whereof the Scots are Inhabitants, according to that Verse,

Roma Sagittiferis prætendit Mania Scotis,

That Rome was put to guard it self by Walls from the Scots Arms and Arrows. Altho' the Profession of Christianity obtain'd not in *Scotland* universally, before the Times of *Donald I.* the first Crown'd Head who owned the Gospel, about the beginning of the Third Age, who, by his Authority, established the Profession and Doctrine of the Gospel, expelling Heathenish Idolatry. About the beginning of this Age, in the

the Reign of *Cratbilinth*, the Ninth Persecution arose under *Aurelian*, and the Tenth by *Dioclesian*, which brought unto us, from divers Provinces of the Empire, many Famous Men of God for Learning and Piety.

2^{ly}, We are diligently to observe, that the *Culdees*, so called, because (as most do judg) acknowledg'd serious Worshippers of God, having, from some Forraign Parts, settled in this Nation, these Holy Men of God, being Confirm'd and Strengthen'd by the Authority of this Illustrious Prince, reduc'd this Christian Church to an Organick Frame and Mould, settling the same according to the Presbyterian Gospel Rules, in so far as these Times could admit, Teaching diligently the People, and being Consociated in a Gospel Simplicity, did, by joint Counsel and Equal Ministerial Authority, exercise the Establish'd Presbyterian Government, promoting thus, successfully, the pure Doctrine of the Gospel, and true Piety, the Native Effect and Product thereof, notwithstanding of the Rage and Opposition of the Heathenish Priests, who, from the Places where they Sacrificed, were called *Druids*. Of these our First and Ancient Doctors, the History gives this Account, that, in stead of personal Emulation for Worldly Greatness, theirs was an Emulation for promoting Truth and Holiness, in whom there shined so much of the Splendor of Evangelical Sanctity, that the very Cells wherein they fix'd Residence, (as our Famous Historian *Buchanan* testifies) were by the People had in such Veneration, that they were esteem'd Sacred; "Hence, saith he, the Custom of the Ancient *Scots*, in calling Temples [Cells], was propagated to Posterity.

3^{ly}, By the Consistent Judgment of approv'd Writers, *Palladius* was the First Author of our Commerce and Union with the Roman Church, who, in the beginning of the Fifth Age, by Influence of, and Commission from the Roman Bishop, laid the first Foundation of the Hierarchical Prelacy, which proved the *Embryo* and Fountain of our Churches Defection and Corruption. *Palladius creditur primos Episcopos in Scotia creasse*, (saith *Buchanan*, Lib. 3.) *nam ad id usque tempus Ecclesiæ absque Episcopis regebantur, minori quidem cum Fastu & externa Pompa, sed majori Simplicitate & Sanctimonia*. " *Palladius* is judg'd the first that set up Bishops in Scotland, for, until that time, the Churches were governed without Bishops, tho' with less External Pomp and Splendor, yet with more Simplicity and Holiness. *Palladius primus omnium qui Sacrum inter Scotos egeret Magistratum, à summo Pontifice Episcopus creatus*, saith *Bœtius*, Lib. 7. " That *Palladius* was the first who exercised Holy Magistracy (he means Prelacy) among the *Scots*, being by the Pope created

created Bishop. *Ante Palladium per Sacerdotes & Monachos, sine Episcopis Scoti in Fide erudiebantur*, saith *Joan. Major*, Lib. 2. C. 2. "Before the coming of *Palladius*, saith *Fordon*, Lib. 3. C. 8. *Habebant Scoti Fidei Doctores & Sacramentorum Administratores Presbyteros solummodo*." That the Scots, before the coming of *Palladius*, had Presbyters only for their Instructors in the Faith, and Administrators of Sacraments. This Truth, in point of History, is so incontrovertible, that *Baronius* himself, the great Popish Historian, is forced to acknowledge the same. For thus he expresses himself at the Year 404. *Scoti primum Episcopum a Celestino acceperunt*, "That the Scots received their first Bishop from Pope *Celestine*. *Palladius ad Scotos a Pontifice Romanæ Ecclesiæ Celestino primus mittitur Episcopus*, saith *Beda*, Hist. Lib. 1. "That *Palladius* was sent to the Scots, as their first Bishop, from *Celestine* the Pope of Rome. So that our Hierarchical Pleaders, nill they, will they, must needs acknowledge their Hierarchy in this Nation, at least, to be of a Popish Descent and Original. After the settling of this Unhappy *Palladius*, and the Foundation laid of Hierarchical Tyranny by him, History gives Account of the sad Decline and Eclipse of Evangelical Simplicity, Piety and Virtue; And the more than *Cimmerian* Darkness of the *Romish* Superstition did, in the following Ages, increase, and, at last, overwhelm the Languishing Church, altho' there wanted not, in these Declining Times, and Corrupted Ages, a Series of the Lord's Faithful Witnesses, of whom *Colmannus* and many others are mention'd, who chus'd rather, as Historians assert, to leave their Places, than receive the Rites of the *Romish* Church.

These *Culdees*, and Faithful Servants of God, namely *Clemens* and *Samson*, are said to have rebuked sharply one *Boniface* sent from Rome to Scotland, and to have marked him with this Infamy, "That he, together with his Associates, made it their only Work and Design, to seduce the People of God from the Obedience of the Lord Jesus Christ, and draw them to the Servitude of the Bishop of Rome. This was about the end of the 7th Age: And in the 8th Age following *Alcuinus*, and his Schollar *Rabanus Maurus*, *Joannes Scotus*, *Claudius Clemens*, both by Word and Write, did detect and rebuke the Corruption of this Hierarchy, which, in the 9th Age, became so Abominable and Hateful to All, that our King *Constantine II.* was necessitated, in a Solemn Meeting of the States, by several Laws then enacted, to put a Stop to the growing Luxury and Tyranny of the Prelates, and their Underlings. In the following Ages, (as Branches from this Corrupt Root) Swarms of *Dominicans*, *Franciscans*, and such Popish Locusts, came in great abundance into Scotland.

Whosoever

Whosoever shall impartially consider the Accounts of the Reformation from Popery, will find, that Hierarchical Prelates have always appeared Ingrain'd Enemies thereof, Cruel Persecuters, yea Murderers of such as have thirsted for the Purity of the Gospel, stirring up our Princes and Magistrates to the enacting of such Laws, as might put a Bar to Reformation, that they might act their Cruelty under the Vizard of abus'd Authority, altho', when Princes would put any Check to their usurped Power, they stood not to oppose and affront them; Whereof the Histories exhibite plentiful Instances. As to the Prelacy erected in this Reformed Church, the lamentable, and almost too late Experience thereof, hath taught us, what Corruption, both of Doctrine, Worship and Government, had, by their means, overwhelm'd this Church before the Year 1638, for which we have the Testimony of an Impartial Witness, Doctor *Burnet*, present Prelate of *Salisbury* [Memoirs of the D. of *Hamilton*]. And, as to the late Erection of this Hierarchy since the Year 1662, what Evils have attende'd the same, what Corruption of Evangelical Purity, Horrid Inundations of unheard of Prophanity, and Immoralities of all sorts, what Hostile Depredations of the best parts of the Nation, laying almost whole Shires and Countries desolate, what Oppression and Invasion of the Liberties both of the Church and Nation, what Bloody Broils and Tumults, what Formidable Advances of the Mystery of Iniquity, threatening the total Ruine and Subversion of the Protestant Religion, so that, at length, a Popish Prince, by the Influence of our Prelates and their Adherents, ascending the Throne, this Design was prosecuted with a bare-fac'd Confidence, we may attest the publick Sense of the Nation, our present happy Constitution and Laws for a Discovery thereof. All these Effects and Issues, we say, have a clear Demonstration from that Assertion of our Civil and Church Liberty in the *Claim of Right*, together with other subsequent Acts of our Honourable Estates, when, from a deep Sense of the Premisses, the Crown was offered to King *William*, the blessed Restorer of our Liberty. So much for the State of our Church of *Scotland*, wherein is exhibited a convincing Instance, overthrowing our Pamphleter's Design and Assertion.

To proceed to other Churches, *Botivius* asserts; "That this first Government of our Church was after the Method, and conform to the Example of the Church of *Alexandria*, Scot. Hist. Lib. 6. Wherein the Government was Administrated by the common Suffrages and Ecclesiastick Classes, choosing their own Presidents according to the Form of our Church. Their own *Stillingfleet* will tell our Prelatists, *Iren. C. 7.*

P. 305. "That, if we believe *Philostorgius*, the *Gothick Churches* were planted and governed by Presbyters for above 70 Years; For so long it was from their first Conversion to the Time of *Ulphilas* whom he makes their first Bishop. Adding, that there's great probability, That where Churches were planted by Presbyters, as the Church of *France* by *Androchius* and *Benignus*, that afterward, upon the Increase of Churches and Presbyters to rule them, they did, from among themselves, choose one to be as the Bishop over them; For we nowhere read, saith he, in those early Plantations of Churches, they sent to other Churches, to derive Episcopal Ordination from them; Clearly asserting their Original Frame to have been opposite to the Hierarchy, and absolutely averse from any Acknowledgment of a Divine or Apostolical Right thereof.

To proceed to other Instances, *St. Patrick*, who is called the Apostle of the *Irish*, is reported to have placed in *Ireland* Bishops by Hundreds, in the first Plantations of that Church; Witness *Usser de Hyb. Relig. P. 59.* And that all these were of the Diocesan Order, and Moulded in that Frame, no Man, in his right Wits, will be bold to affirm. *Nemius* reckons up no fewer than 365 Bishops there. This also is worthy of Observation, that the Bishops and Churches, over which they were set, runs to the same Number and Reckoning. *Clarkson*, in his *Prim. Episc. P. 40.* proves this equal Number of Bishops and Churches from *Bernard* and *Baronius*. *Bernard* reports, That, when *Malachias* went to *Ireland*, almost 600 Years after *St. Patrick*, Anno scil. 1150, the Bishops were constituted in this Method and Order, viz. That every single Church had its Bishop. Thus *Bernard in Vita Malach.* *Baronius ad An. 1109, Not. 16,* relates from the Writings of *Langfranc* to *Tarlachus* King of *Ireland*, that, in Villages and Cities, (which, no doubt, at that time, were in *Ireland* very small) there were many Bishops Ordained.

Likewise in *Africa*, (however our Pamphleter may oppose) even in the Time of *Cyprian*, there was, in the Council of *Carthage*, over which he presided, a Multitude of Bishops, and, no doubt, a far greater Number, placed therein; So that no considering Person can imagine, they were all of the Diocesan Form and Mould, considering, that, in *Africa*, there were, at this time, few Christians, besides those that were in the *Roman Colonies*: And the Jurisdiction of these Bishops was confined to small Villages, by the Confession of *Pamelius* himself. Moreover, a long time after this, while the Persecution of the *Vandals* was raging, as is related by *Victor Uticen. Lib. 1.* after the Death of the Bishop of *Carthage*, in the *Zeugetan* and *Proconsular Provinces*,

Provinces, the Number of the Ordinary Bishops was 164. Others recite more. From this great Number and Multitude of Bishops, which may be demonstrated by several other Instances, 'tis convincingly evident, they could not be all of the Diocesan Form and Order.

Heylyn himself (*Cosmogr. Pag. 342.*) shews, that these Irish Bishops, for the most part, were possessed with no greater Sallary, than a little piece of Land, sufficient for the Pasturage of two Milk-Kine. In *Africa* there was a Bishop's Seat in every little Village, to which his Church and Inspection was confin'd. See *Thornd. Eccl. Jurisd. Investig. Pag. 53.* In *Augustin's* time, in the five Provinces of *Africk*, there were no fewer than 900 Bishopricks. Several Instances to this purpose may be seen with the Learned *Clarkson, Lib. Præd. P. 41, 42, 43.* 'Tis observable to this purpose, what our Learned Mr. *Jameson* offers, (*Naz. Quer. P. 32.*) speaking of the great Number of the Bishops in *Africk*, having told us out of *Victor Uticensis*, That there were in the *Zeugetan* or *Proconsular Province*, 164 Bishops, he saith, others reckoning more, adding, that this was but a small part of what the Romans possessed in *Africk*, that there being few Christians there, the Old *Africans* being called by the same *Victor* [Gentiles,] and many of the Romans themselves not having yet embrac'd Christianity. Now subduce, saith he, from that small Number of this *Zeugetan Province*, who were Christians, the many *Arrians*, and other Hereticks and Schismatics, whom these Bishops did not reckon as a part of their Flocks, and surely there shall scarce be found so many as to make up above 164 Paroches. Adding further, that Doctor *Maurice* asserts, (*Pag. 164.*) that all the *African Bishops* in *Cyprian's* time, could not have supplied the Diocesses of one Province in the Fifth or Sixth Century.

Upon this point likewise we may adduce the foremention'd Impartial Witness, Dr. *Burnet*, present Bishop of *Salisbury*. in his *Vindication of Scottish Prelacy*, Observation on the first Apostolick Canon, p. 50, 51: who shews, in Confirmation of what we have said, and from the Authors mention'd, "That Scotland from the time of its Conversion to the Faith, Anno 263, until the Year 430, was Govern'd by our Culdees without Bishops. He tells us likewise, that in *Carthage* they wanted a Bishop 24 Years, when *Handereck* invaded them, and a Bishop being by him offered, providing the *Arrians* might have the free Exercise of their Religion, they answered, *Ecclesia non delectatur Episcopum habere*, that their Church desir'd and valued no Bishops. So *Victor, Lib. 2. Pers. Vand.* 'Tis true, the Doctor adds a Patchement, upon these Terms, but

but there is no such thing in the Author. He tells us likewise from *Theodoret, Hist. Lib. 4. Cap. 23.* That when *Meletius* was driven out of *Antioch*, *Diodorus* and *Flavian*, two Presbyters, Rul'd that Church. He tells us likewise, in Confirmation of what is said, that the *Gothick* Churches were Planted and Constituted for 70 years together without a Bishop. He tells us likewise, that, in the beginning, the Bishops whole Charge was call'd *Paroichia* a *Paroch*, and by the strain of *Ignatius* his Epistles, especially that to *Smyrna*, it would appear that there was but one Church, at least but one place, where there was one Altar and Communion in each of these Paroches: For he saith (*Ignatius* scil.) there was one Bishop, one Church, and one Altar. And *Cyprian* phraseth the Erecting of a Schism by Erecting of an Altar against an Altar, which seems to import there was but one Altar in the Bishop's Paroch. And whether the Doctor makes not here these first Bishops, (and in special according to *Ignatius*) *ee* Pastors of Paroches, is left to the Readers Judgment.

In the Age immediatly succeeding that of the Apostles, no doubt, the Number of Christians was greater than in the First Age; Notwithstanding, in the beginning of the Fourth Age, in great Cities, which in Amplitude surpassed *Ephesus* it self, there were no greater number of Christians than could meet for Worship in two places at most. *Constantine* the Great contain'd all the Christians of his Royal City of *Constantinople* in two Temples. *Vid. Tripart. Hist. Lib. 2. Cap. 8. in Gen. Exam. pag. 399.* Poor Dorps had their Bishops, as is clear in History. *Nazianzon* a little Town, or rather little Village, near *Cesarea* was all the Episcopal See, or Paroch rather, of the Fam'd *Gregory Nazianzen*. In *Chrysostom's* time, as appears, *Hom. 3. in Act.* the Bishop was set over one Town or City; Yea among the *Arabians*, and those of *Cyprus*, *Sozomen* sheweth, *Hist. Eccl. Lib. 7. Cap. 19.* That the Bishops were in the smallest little Villages which contain'd their whole Charge. Accordingly the 4th Canon of the Council of *Carthage*, inserted by *Gratian* in the Body of the Decrees, *Dist. 41. Decrees,* that *Episcopus non longe ab Ecclesia, vilem Supellectilem, &c.* That the Bishop have his little Manse not far from the Church, that he have mean Houshold Stuff, &c. *Et Dignitatis suae Auctoritatem, Fide & Meritis querat,* and purchase Authority to his Office or Dignity by Faith and good Works. *Sozomen, Lib. 6. Cap. 16.* Relates of *Basilius Magnus* Bishop of *Cesarea* that he answer'd the Emperors Prefect, who Threaten'd the Confiscation of his Goods, thus, *Horum nihil me cruciare potest, equidem opes non habeo, præterquam laceram Vestem & paucos Libros,* None of these things can trouble me, I have no Riches, but a torn Garment, and a few Books.

If it be Objected, that some Instances adduc'd are without the limits of the Cyprianick Age; 'Tis Answered, 1. That Mr. *Clarkson*, *Blondel*, and others draw their first Measures from the times of the Apostles, and their Constitution of Churches, as is evident to such as do peruse them. 2ly, *J. S.* pretends an exact Conformity of the Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic Age to the Original and Apostolick Constitution of Churches; So that if a Disconformity be found, the Foundation of his Argument is crush'd. 3ly, The instanced Constitution of Churches is own'd by the chief Episcopalians, and many of the Antients, as *Primary and Apostolical*. Bishop *Burnet* holds, that in the beginning, the Bishop's whole Charge was call'd *noesmia*, and this by the strain of *Ignatius's* Epistles, as is above touch'd.

See the same asserted by *Willet* *, who owns the Identity * *Synops. Pap. Con. 5. Quest. 3. Part 7.*
of Bishop and Presbyter in the Apostles times. *Morton*, *Apol. Cath. Lib. 1. pag. 118.*

Bishop *Jewel*, against *Harding*, pag. 121. *Stillingsfleet*, *Iren.* pag. 392. 393, 394, 395. There is a Catalogue of Greek and Latin Primitive Doctors cited by *Medina* to this purpose and Scope, (as he is cited by *Bellarmin*, *Lib. 1. de Cler. Cap. 15.*) such as *Ambrose*, *Augustin*, *Sedulius*, *Primasius*, *Cbryostomus*, *Theodoret*, *Oecumenius*, *Theophylactus*. See several of these Testimonies set down as agreeing with *Jerom* by *Sixtus Senensis*, *Bibl. Sanct. Lib. 6. Annot. 319, 324.*

C H A P. IV.

Wherein is made appear, that the Existence of Episcopal Government in the Cyprianic, or Third Age, tho' suppos'd, is absolutely short of proving either a Divine or Apostolick Right, and the Obligation of the Gospel Churches to be Conform'd to that Episcopal Pattern. Wherein is also made appear, that J. S. is involv'd in unextricable Absurdities, whether he Argue from the Principles and Practice of the Third Age simply and absolutely consider'd, or from the Reception of Episcopal Government therein under the Notion of an Apostolical or Divine Right. This Pamphleter's absurd Extension of the Episcopal Jurisdiction, and Depression of the Pastoral Office is noted. The Difference also is Stated, in several Instances, betwixt the Cyprianic Bishop, describ'd by him, and the truly Apostolick and Scripture Bishop. 'Tis also made appear, that he hath Impeach'd the Doctrine of the Reform'd Churches in two signal Points, scil. The Perfection of the Scripture, and Fallibility of the Church.

S E C T. I.

Wherein is evinc'd J. S.'s absurd Arguing whether from the meer Practice of the Church, or the Reception of Prelacy under the Notion of Apostolical Right; And that either, or both Grounds are utterly Unserviceable, to support his Conclusion, and the Scope intended by him.

AMONGST the many that have Written on this Subject, as Patrons of the Episcopal Cause, who have endeavour'd to evince a Divine Right of Prelacy, this Pamphleter (as we have already observ'd) is the first who hath proceeded in this Method, and pleaded that Cause from such a Principle and Topick as that of the Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic or Third Age. That his voluminous Pamphlet, in the whole Series

Series thereof, levels at this Scope, tho' he sometimes seems do dissemble it, is evident to any that consideratly Reads it. In the very Title Page he pretends to State and Discuss the *main Controversie between the Presbyterians and Episcopalians*, which, all do know, is anent a *Divine, or Apostolick Right* of either the one or other Government. He boasts also of overthrowing Mr. Rule's *main Defences, or Subterfuges*, as he calls them; And 'tis certain that Mr. Rule Appeals to *Scripture Decision* in this point. He also shews, in the same Title Page, that he has demonstrated Episcopal Government to have been *Universally delivered to be of Divine Right* in the Days of Cyprian; And he will not disown it, that he intends its being delivered from the Apostles and by them, may be clear and positive in this Assertion; Nor will he say, that this *Divine Right* was a *suppos'd only*, and not a *real Divine Right*, upon this Ground: Which brings to Mind the Mould of the Argument us'd by King Charles, in his Conference with Mr. Henderson, viz. "That nothing was retain'd in the Church of England, in point of Government, but what was receiv'd, from the times of the Apostles, to be the Universal Practice of the Primitive Church, &c. Which may be further made appear from the Scripture he is bold to prefix, Tit. i. 11. *Οὗτος δὲ ἑμψοιζῆται*. And this Pamphleter will not pretend, that the meer Practice of the Third Age will silence Presbyterians Pleadings from Scripture without any prior Ground. This may be also further confirm'd from the high Elogies he puts upon this Third Age, Chap. i. viz. *That it was an Age affording no Secular Temptations towards Episcopal Preeminency, an Age of great Men, affording many excellent Records, &c.* (whereof above). And in a Word, let the Elogies he bestows upon Episcopacy, and his Seditious Challenge fasten'd upon the Governours of this Nation in the present Establishment, Pag. 534, 535. of his Pamphlet, be duely weigh'd, and this will be evident beyond Contradiction. So that, either this Proof of *Divine Right* must be the Scope he drives at in this Pamphlet, or, it must be a Chimæra, unperceptible, and fluctuating in the *Spatium Imaginarium* of his own phantastick Brain. The Sum, therefore, of what he offers in this large Fardel of Testimonies may be reduc'd to this Argument and Syllogism: "If in the Third, or Cyprianic Age, the Episcopal Government did obtain, and was receiv'd in all the Churches, as delivered from the Apostles, or of Apostolick Original; Then it is to be receiv'd and acknowledg'd by all the Churches of Christ, as of Divine Right: But this Government was thus Universally receiv'd by all the Churches of the Third, or Cyprianic Age; Ergo, This Government is to be embrac'd and receiv'd by all the Churches, as of Divine Right. The Assumption of this Argument

we have discuss'd in the preceeding Chapter. The strength of the Major Proposition we shall now enquire into. And I do, in the Confidence of Truth, deny the Connection thereof, and shall Demonstrate, that this great Foundation and Topick of his whole Pamphlet, bearing the whole Fabrick and Superstructure thereof, is Rotten and Ruinous, and must needs sink and perish by its own absurd Falsity. My opposite Assertion then is this, That the Hypothesis of the Existence of the Episcopal Form of Government in the Third Age can neither prove a Divine nor Apostolick Right, even admitting that it was receiv'd as of Apostolick Original; And that, consequently, there lies no Obligation upon the Churches to be conform to that Pattern upon this Ground.

1. Then, I thus Argue, in general; If the premis'd Argument or Connection of the Major Proposition be solid, then the Tie or Chain of this Connection must either flow from the Churches Practice, in it self, and absolutely consider'd as such; Or, it must flow from the Conformity of this Practice to the Apostolick and Divine Pattern. That this Right or Obligation flows from the Churches Practice, simply, and in it self consider'd, no Man of common Sense and Judgment, if not this Pamphleter will be bold to assert, because of the many gross and evident Absurdities attending such an Assertion: Yet, upon Consideration of this Man's Confidence, and the Strain and Series of all his Arguments in this voluminous Pamphlet, made up of Humane Testimonies in the Third Age, I shall upon this Branch of the Dilemma make it appear by some Reasons, that no shadow of an Obligation can flow from this Practice, tho' suppos'd, and that J. S. himself is palpably inconsistent with himself if asserting so much.

1. If the meer Practice and Reception of this Government be the leading Rule in this Question, or by an Intrinsick Authority Decisive thereof, then, of necessity, the Churches Practice must be of this Nature and Authority, and thus Decisive in every Controversie, as well as in this, and by this means the meer Practice of the Church shall afford a Demonstration *a priori* for finding out and investigating the true Sense and Interpretation of the Scripture, and of this point of Church Government in special, and thus Men shall have Dominion over our Faith, in express Contradiction to the Apostle Paul, 2 Cor. 1. last. *Not that we have Dominion over your Faith, saith he, but are helpers of your Joy; for by Faith ye stand.* Moreover, upon this Ground or Reason, our Faith shall be no more a Divine Faith, but Degenerate into a Humane Credulity, as founded upon a meer Humane Testimony. Nay further, the Scripture it self shall thus become of a meer Humane and Private Interpretation, as

as if the Prophecy had come by the Will of Man; Which also is an express Contradiction to the Apostle Peter, 2 Pet. i. 20. *The Prophecy came not in old time by the will of Man, but Holy Men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost.* Upon this Ground Tertullian said, *Nisi homini Deus placuerit, Deum non erit, Homo jam Deo propitius esse debebat.* That if God please not Men he shall thus be no God, so that Man must be propitious and favourable unto him.

To this purpose we have a very Remarkable Passage of their own *Stilingsfleet*, *Iren.* Chap. 4. pag. 297. After he has related that Passage of *Eusebium* his History, *Lib. i. Cap. 4. viz.* That 'tis hard to find out who Succeeded the Apostles in the Churches planted by them, *unless it be those mention'd in the Writings of Paul.* "What then, saith he, be- comes of our unquestionable Line of Succession of the Bishops of several Churches, and the large Diagrams made of the Apostolical Churches, with every ones Name set down in his Order, as if the Writer had been *Clarenceaux* to the Apostles themselves? Is it come to this at last that we have nothing certain, but what we have in Scriptures? And must then the Tradition of the Church be our Rule to Examine Scriptures by? An excellent way to find out the Truth, doubtless, to bend the Rule to the crooked Stick, to make the Judge stand to the Opinion of his Lacquey, what Sentence he shall pass upon the Cause in Question: To make Scripture stand Cap in hand to Tradition, to know whether it may have leave to speak or no? Are all the great outcries of Apostolical Tradition, of Personal Succession, of unquestionable Records resolv'd at last by the Scripture it self, by him from whom all these long Pedegrees are fetched? Then let Succession know its place, and learn to vaile Bonnet to the Scriptures. And withall let Men take heed of over-reaching themselves when they would bring down so large a Catalogue of single Bishops from the first and purest Times of the Church; For it will be hard for others to believe them, when *Eusebium* professeth it so hard to find them. Well might *Sedliger* then complain that the Interval from the last Chapter of the *Acts* to the middle of *Trajan*, in which time *Quadratus* and *Ignatius* began to Flourish, was *tempus idolorum*, as *Varro* speaks, a meer Chaos of time filled up with the rude Conceptions of *Papias*, *Hermes* and others, who like *Hannibal* when they could not find a way through, would make one either by Force or Fraud.

2ly, If this new Proctor of the tottering Cause should found his Conclusion upon the meer Practice of that Third Age, he shall never be able to eschew a Contradiction to himself; Since he pretends, as is

above clear'd, that the Episcopal Government is deriv'd from an *Apostolick Institution*, and in so far he appears to lay the Foundation of his Argument, not meerly upon the Churches Acknowledgment and Reception of Episcopacy in that Age, and pag. 534. he asserts the Church to have receiv'd and practis'd this Government upon the *Apostolick Approbation*, yea and *Institution*, altho' in a strange unusual ignorant Inadvertency, he offers not a Jot from the Holy Scriptures to make this appear, but his whole Arguings run to this Issue, viz. to prove the Churches Reception of Episcopal Government in that Age. Now, whatever Consequence may be drawn from his dark and shattered Method of Arguing, yet this pretty Advocat will not dare, in *Terminis*, to assert, That the Church in the Third Age held such an Opinion as this, That the meer (or say Universal) Reception or Practice of Episcopacy is a sufficient ground to prove the *Apostolical Approbation or Institution* thereof. Nay, doth he not assert that all *Humane Traditions* were disown'd by the Church in that Age, and with admirable Sagacity (forsooth) distinguish'd from *Divine Institutions*? Thus pag. 535. and in several other places: So that thus he can not but fall into the Ditch of a new Contradiction.

3ly, The absurd Assertion of the Principle mention'd must needs set him by the Ears with all his Fellow Pleaders in this Controversie, and engage him in a signal Contradiction against them, to the great Reproach of the Episcopal Cause. For, (as is said) take the whole Tribe of the Pleaders for this Interest, not one shall be found who attempted to prove the Divine Right of Episcopacy from the Practice and Principles of the Third or any preceeding or subsequent Ages, simply and absolutely consider'd, but the Source, Strength and Force of all their Arguments and Pleadings resolves and terminates in the Correspondence of this Practice to the Divine Pattern and Institution. Hence we have heard their great Arguments produc'd from these Fountains and Topicks, viz. "The pretended Episcopal Authority of Apostles, and a Succession of Bishops from them, likewise the Episcopal Office and Authority of *Timothy* and *Titus* over the Churches of *Ephesus* and *Crete*, and their Supereminent Inspection over the same, as likewise of the Seven Angels of the *Asian Churches*, from both which a great busse is made anent their respective Successors also. And this Method of Pleading has been by their best Advocates judg'd so necessary, that their great Patron Dr. *Hammond*, rather than lose it, falls upon a new Topick in asserting the Presbyters mention'd in Scriptures to be formally Diocesan Bishops and properly of that Order, thus falling foul upon, and baffling the Principles of his Fellows, whose

Pleadings

Pleadings he probably judg'd weak and inconsequential. Of this Nature, as we said before, was King Charles I. his Argument, in his Conference with Mr. Henderson, who thus Epitomises the Episcopal Strength upon this point, "That nothing was retain'd in the Church of England but what was receiv'd from the Apostles to be the constant Universal Practice of the Christian Church, adding, that by the Removal thereof the Church must needs be depriv'd of a lawful Priesthood (or Ministry) and then how the Sacraments can be Administrated, said he, is easy to Judge.

4ly, This Pamphleter must, of necessity, acknowledge, that, supposing the Strength, Relevancy and Efficacy of the Arguments drawn from Scripture for the Divine Right of Presbyterian Government, and that they do evince this Form of Government to have been Instituted by the Apostles, this tedious Legend which he presents of the Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic, or Third Age, must needs vanish as Smoke, and can signifie nothing: Hence he must acknowledge, that in this Laborious Pamphlet he has absolutely lost his Labour, and has never touch'd the point Controverted, but has been fighting with his shadow, and beating the Air, in Arguing meerly from the Principles and Practice of that Age, not having, a *capite ad calcem* of this whole Laborious Nothing, in the least touch'd, far less taken into Consideration and discuss'd or enervated the many solid and nervous Arguments drawn from Scripture against that Episcopacy for which he here pleads.

Now, what a pitiful Pleader, or rather Pratter must this be, who, to so many Arguments for Presbyterian Government, drawn from the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, hath nothing to Answer, or oppose, but the Principles or Practice of the Third Age, as Patronizing another Government. The Treatise entituled, *Rectius Instruendum*, presents no fewer than ten Scripture Arguments against the Office of the Diocesan Bishop, and near as many against the Prelat of the Erastian Mould, having made good, from the then standing Laws, that the late existent Scottish Prelacy was both Diocesan and Erastian. This piece J. S. professes to have seen, and to all these Arguments has no Answer, but the Principles and Practice of the Third Age, which, upon this Ground, he must either acknowledge Authentick, or that he has yielded the Cause in point of a Scripture Dispute, and shewn himself a meer *Lucifugus* from the Scripture Light in this point.

5ly, The Topick and Substratum of an Argument drawn from the Principles and Practice of the Third Age, or of any Antecedent or Subsequent, simply considered, will necessarily oblige to owne the Errors, and Declinings from the Scriptura

Scripture Path and Rule, prevalent in that, or the other Ages; And in special, the Errors mentioned, and such others as did universally prevail in the Second and Third Ages, if we may receive the Attestation of Histories which is this Pamphleter's own Rule, scil. not only the Millenary Error, which Justin Martyr affirms to be his own Judgment, and of all the Orthodox every where in his time, Lactantius also calling them but Nominal Christians only, who judge otherwise, and this after a prolix Discourse upon this point; But likewise the fore-mentioned Error of giving the Eucharist to Children, wherewith Augustin himself seems to have been tainted, Lib. 1. de Peccat. Merit. Besides these, I say, his Principle and Topick will oblige him to Patronize the other Errors prevalent in these Ages, and to Espouse the Pleadings for them; For Instance the Errors and Practices recited by Basil, which are pleaded to be of an Apostolick Original, and by Tradition to have flowed from the Apostles, as J. S. pleads in the point of Prelacy, viz. Praying with their Face to the East from Easter to Whitsunday, The Anointing Persons in certain Cases, Signing Men with the Sign of the Cross, &c. Basil. de Spir. San. C. 27. Likewise the Error of Free-Will, which obtained till Augustin's time, who flourished in the Fourth Age. To which we may add the gross Error concerning the Vision of God, that the Souls of Saints departed see not his Face until the Judgment of the Great Day, which, with several others, universally obtained in these Times.

If J. S. shall except upon this universal Reception, and thereupon place a Distinction betwixt the Reception of these Errors, and that of Episcopal Government; 'Tis Answered, 1. That the universal Reception of the Errors mentioned, (and others not mentioned) has a sufficient Historical Ground, as to the time of their Prevalency, accounted for by Authors, whatever Contradiction was made to them afterward. 2ly, This Pamphleter has not yet made appear, that Episcopacy did universally obtain in all the Churches established through the World, as is above evinced. 3ly, Upon the Hypothesis, that the fore-mentioned Errors did universally obtain, and were asserted and practised in all Churches, or in this Third Age, the Principles and practice whereof J. S. has in such Admiration, would he not be ashamed to infer, (if at least he disowne these Errors) that the practice of the Church had transformed them into Truths, and the sinful practice thereof into Duties, in Contradiction to the Scripture Light in this point. So that our Pamphleter, reduced to these Straits, must, of necessity, seek another Foundation for his Conclusion in the point of Prelacy, than the Principles and Practice of the Church of that Age, else his Cause is desperate and lost.

If it shall be further objected, That this Reception and Practice of the *Cyprianic* Age is not simply the Ground and Topick of his Argument for a Divine Right of Prelacy, but in so far only as received, and flowing from an *Apostolick Institution*: I answer, Altho' the full discussing of this Objection I reserve till I come to the second Branch of the *Dilemma*, yet I shall here give a previous Touch at some things in Answer thereunto.

1. If he quite the meer Practice and Principles of the Age, as the Ground of the Argument, and betake himself to this pretended Institution mentioned, then he acknowledges, in so far, the Strength of what is offer'd against him, if founding his Perswasion upon the Principles and Practice of that Age, as that, 1. This will give a Patrocinium to Errors, from the meer Assertion and Pleadings of such as hold them, unless he hold, that an Universal Reception will import an Infallibility, a Principle disown'd by all Protestants, as I shall shew. So that this will patronize and approve the forementioned Errors upon the Hypothesis, as is said, of an Universal Reception, and the Old Testament Churches Errors and Declinings from the straight Path of the Word of God, shall thus be owned as Truth and Duties.

2ly, If he betake himself to the fore-mention'd Divine and Apostolick Institution, then he must acknowledge, 1. His Obligation to have clear'd this Conformity by Scripture; And, 2ly, That, not having attempted this, his brittle Conjectures mention'd, whereby he would prove this Conformity, can amount to no Argument, unless he will absurdly assert, that a *Scripture Consequence* may subsist and be valid, where no *Scripture Ground* appears to support it.

But further, I thus argue; Since, from what is already offer'd, touching the State and Condition of that Third Age, and the Writings of *Cyprian* in special, that he, with other Famed Doctors thereof, did grossly err in several important Principles of the Christian Faith, by what Reason, yea, or shadow of Reason, can he, or any Man else, prove, that *Cyprian* was free from erring and straying in the point of Fact, or with respect to his Carriage and Practice in point of Church-Government, or his, or others Accounts of the State of the Church in their Time? For, 1. If he shall hold, that *Cyprian's* Epistles, or his other Writings, are, in point of Fact, of Infallible Verity, and properly and primarily to be acquiesc'd in; Why not also in the Matter of Judgment and Opinion, since, in both Cases, the Foundation of our Perswasion and Certainty must needs be a supposed Infallibility ascribed to these Writings.

The Distinction, whereby Doctor *Monro* endeavours to eschew this Absurdity in his Pamphlet, entituled, *An Enquiry into the New Opinions, &c.*

is obviously insignificant. He tells us, "That the Errors of the Fathers, in point of Doctrine, do only infer a Weakness and Infirmary in the Understanding and Judgment, but to deliver to Posterity that which is false in Matter of Fact, doth prove a Malicious Disposition and Intention of the Will, which, without a gross Breach and Impeachment of Christian Charity, cannot be imputed to Holy Men, especially such as were Crown'd with Martyrdom, besides that such Prevarication and Deceit must needs have been exposed to the Censure and Correction of the Age wherein they liv'd. This Distinction, we say, in the present Case, is of no value. For, 1. Neither this Author, nor any of his Associates, have, as yet, made appear the Unanimous Consent and Testimony of all the Fathers, or Martyrs, upon this Point and Question. 2ly, We must, of necessity, distinguish an Error in the Judgment in point of Fact, and a correspondent Erroneous Practice, from a Malicious Intention and Design of propagating an Error, and deceiving others thereby, or else we must impute such a Malicious Design to the premised Errors, as in the Writings of the Fathers delivered to Posterity; Since, none can doubt, their Design in Writing was, that the Posterity might read and improve the same. But that they had a Malicious Intention to deceive, or obtrude an Error upon the Posterity, cannot, in Reason or Charity, be supposed. 3ly, That Episcopacy was handed down to them by the Apostles, this Pamphleter holds was their Principle, and their Practice in the Exercise of this Government, which he supposes necessarily inferring the same, the Practical Error must needs be the Effect and Product of the Prior. Moreover, if the Exercise and Reception of this Government, which he supposes, shall either prove its Legitimate Use, or Divine Right, the same Principle, as is said, would erect the Principles and Practice of the Ages succeeding to the Apostolick, into a Tribunal higher than the Scripture, and the supposed Successors of Timothy and Titus, whom some of the Ancients make Bishops, and Arch-Bishops, and some Metropolitans, shall be a Demonstrative Proof of the Sense of these Scriptures, wherein the Office of Timothy and Titus is described. The People of Israel's Idolatrous Practice in Worshipping of the Golden Calf, supposing it Universal, shall determine the Sense of the Second Command, immediately before delivered, and shall be an Orthodox Exposition thereof. The same may be said of other Breaches of the Law upon the like Hypothesis of an Universal Practice. And here we pose J. S. with this Query, Suppose the Usurpation of the Bishop of Rome had, in this Age, arriv'd at its Non Ultra of pretended Primacy, or such Degrees thereof, as he will probably profess to disprove, suppose also the Visible Church her

her Universal Reception thereof at that time, and suppose it pleaded for by the Fathers and Learn'd Men, as in these Gradual Advances it was, by several of the Ancients, who foresaw not its Monstruous *Apex*; Sure, he will not owne, that this Universal Practice and Pleading would justify this Monster. I know nothing he can Answer, except the denying the Hypothesis, and asserting the Impossibility of the thing it self, which speaks not at all to the point; Nor can any Rational Man admit it, for it will still rest upon the Infallibility (in this Case) of *Cyprian*, or his other Contemporaries, a Supposition which the fore-mentioned Instances do sufficiently refel,

But now, to proceed to the other Branch of the *Dilemma*: If the Strength of his Arguing be suppos'd to flow, not meerly from the *suppos'd Practice* of the Third Century, but the *Conformity* thereof to the *Divine*, or *Apostolick Pattern*; Then, 1. It appears, that he has gone Antipode to all his Fellow-Pleaders, and crossed their Method, so that his Pamphlet deserves to be disown'd and condemn'd by them, since, as is said, 'tis notourly known, that they all, in order to this Proof, fetch the Original from the Apostles, beginning at that suppos'd Fountain, and do thence conclude a Warrant to the Churches Practice, whereas this Man begins his Proof from the Practice of the Church, which he supposes Universal, and from thence, as the leading Argument and Topick, concludes the Divine and Apostolick Warrant.

It were a prolix and tedious Work, to give a renew'd particular Discovery, by Instances, of *J. S's* crossing his Fellows in his Method of Pleading, whereof there are plenty at hand. Doctor *Scott* *, begins with the *Institution of our Saviour*, then advances to the *Practice of the Apostles*, and then, in the third place, pleads the *Conformity of the Primitive Church thereunto*, and not her *Practice meerly*, putting this at the Foot of the Argumentation, as the Appendix and Rear (as it were) of his Army, which this Man places in the Front of the Battel. Doctor *Monro*, his dear Associate in the Cause, in the fore-mentioned *Enquiry into the New Opinions*, &c. Pag. 105, 106, 107. makes this the State of the Question, "Whether the Apostles committed their Apostolick Authority, which they exercised in particular Churches, to single persons, or a College of Presbyters Acting in Parity in Ecclesiastick Government? And, in Proof of this Point, tells us, "He will first view the Holy Scriptures, then Ecclesiastical Records. Whereas this Man presents for his First, yea only Proof, the *Ecclesiastick Records of the Cyprianic Age*, without the least hint of a Scripture Argument, through his whole Pamphlet. The Surveyer of *Naphtali* betakes him, in his Proof, also to this Method, 1. To

* *Christian Life*,
Part 2. P. 388, 389.

the Rule of the Apostolick Epistles, and, in the next place, to what further Light the History of the purer Times affords; as the Secondary and less principal Argument, and therein baffles this Pamphleter, who takes all his Measures from the Practice of the Third Century. The same may be seen in Bishop Downam's Defence of his Sermon, Bishop Hall, in his Remonstrance to the Parliament, and Defence of it against *Smectymnus*; Thus also the Author of the Piece, entituled, *the Differences of the Times*; Thus also the Author of *the Brief Account of the Ancient Church Government*, lays the chief Foundation and Strength of his Pleading upon the *Apostolick Power derived to their Successors the Bishops*; Besides many others which are well known. 2ly, This Man's inconsistent and absurd Prevarication, in this his Method of Arguing, (which appears to be *Hysteron-Proteron*, or Antipode to that of his Fellows) will be further evident, if it be considered, that he has fled from the Point debatable, even with Mr. Rule, and that, in this long Career of his tedious Pamphlet, he has run away from the Point, and with his Back to the Cause and his Adversary. For Mr. Rule, in the Preface of his Answer to his first Pamphlet, to which he pretends to reply, told him, that he laid not the Stress of the Point upon the Principles of this or that Age of the Church, challenging him to a Scripture Dispute upon the Question, (from which he appears a meer *Lucifugus*) and not only so, but fortified his Challenge by several Grounds, telling him, First, "That 'tis unaccountable, that, in a Matter upon which Salvation doth so much depend, in their Opinion, they should lay so much Stress on the Opinions of Men, and the Testimonies of the Ancient Church, seeing all, except Papists, agree, that Matters of Faith, on which Salvation dependeth, must be determined only by Scripture, and that God speaking in his Word, is the only Judge of such Controversies. 2ly, He told him, "That the Fathers themselves plead for this, and disowne both each himself, and one another as either Judge, or sufficient Witness in such Debates: Confirming this by the Testimony of several Fathers, such as Optat. Milevit. contra Parmen. Lib. 5. Augustin, Epist. 19. who shews, that One Apostle Paul is to him beyond all Fathers. And, by Consequence, Mr. Rule ascertained him, that one of his Scripture Arguments, which he had in other Pieces adduced, was enough to oppose unto, and baffle whole Volumes of such Stuff, as J. S. has here presented. Thus also the same Augustin, Ep. 3. and Tom. 2. Epist. 102. Paulinæ. And, in special, that, in particular, the Mark of Insufficiency to prove a Divine Truth, as set in Cyprian's Authority by Augustin, Lib. 2. contra Cresc. C. 32. & Ibid. C. 31. Again, in the next place, he offered this to J. S. "That the Ancient Bishops,

Bishops, and other Divines, when they gave Marks of the True Church, brought them alwise from Scripture, not from Humane Testimonies, citing *Augustin, Epist. 50.* who charges "them with wonderful Blindness, who seek Christ in Scripture, and the Church in Humane Writings, citing to this purpose *Cyprian in Epist. Cecilio*, and in that to *Pompeius*, who proves, "That we must follow Christ and his written Word only, as our Rule, and not old Customs and Practices. And, in a word, he had told this Pamphleter, *Pag. 2.* "That if we should grant all that he pleads for, it would not ruine the Cause of Presbytery, nor establish Prelacy, that all the Victory he could thus achieve, were the evincing of a Mistake in Matter of Fact, as related in Ancient History. But neither he, nor the Presbyterians, generally, did ever lay the Stress of the Cause on the Principles and Practice of the Church, after the Apostolick Age. — That 'tis Divine, not Humane Authority, that we take for the Rule of our Belief and Practice in the Matter of Church Government, and managing the Affairs of the House of God. *Timothy* was to be guided by it, *1 Tim. 3. 14, 15.* and so will we. That before, he had declared himself fully to this purpose. That, by such Attempts of a Critical Vindication of *Cyprian*, he, in vain, imagines to silence Presbyterians, who have other Grounds, if beaten from this.

Now, this Pamphleter being so pertinently, so clearly, so peremptorily challeng'd to a Scripture Dispute, and called to the Scripture Bar in this Debate, and not only so, but likewise the Debate concerning the Sense of *Cyprian* being by his Antagonist laid aside, as impertinent to this Question and Controversie, yea even in the Sense of *Cyprian* and Eminent Fathers themselves, what a pitiful *Thrafo* has this Man made himself appear to be, and how frightened by Scripture Light from this True and Genuine Debate, in offering to publick View such a Voluminous Pamphlet, stufferd with Airy Babblings anent *Cyprian's* Episcopacy, without so much as once touching the true State of the Question, and the Scripture Dispute to which he was challeng'd. His petty Policy herein has been before laid open, *viz.* to draw his Antagonist from the true Scripture State of this Controversie, into a fruitless Enquiry into the Sense of Humane Writings; Wherein, as their own *Stillingsfleet* has told them, *we are liker to lose our selves, than reach any Certainty of Truth.* His Antagonist had told him, "That, in writing before 12. Sheets on this petty Subject, he had but a poor Prize, *egregiam Laudem & Spolia ampla*, that he did not intend to Trifle with him in such Work. Could any Man of Ingenuity, or Sense, have been more peremptorily deterred from meddling any more in such a fruitless Piece of

Work? And yet this Pamphleter must again appear in the same very discarded Trifling Employment, in a Fardel or Pamphlet of no less than 536 Pages, wherein, indeed, he has reached one Effect of his Writing, in it self considered, if we distinguish *Conditio Operis*, and *Intentio Operantis*, that, since he would needs again appear a Fool in Print, he is not to be reckoned among those of the lesser Size, but a Fool in *Folio*.

3^{ly}. To prosecute further this other Branch of my *Dilemma*. if J. S. will say, that he pleads not merely from the *Practice of that Age*, but the Conformity thereof with the *Divine Pattern*, then (as is hinted above) all Men of Sense will acknowledge, he was concerned in the Comparison of the one with the other, since Presbyterians suppose, that they have, by many Scripture Arguments, evinced the Unwarrantableness of that Prelacy he pretends existent in Cyprian's time, and thus, 1. For any thing he has Answered, they overthrow his great Foundation and chief Pillar of his Opinion, *viz.* "The Derivation of that Prelacy from the Apostles, and that that Age did adhere to the Divine Rule, rejecting all Innovations in point of Government, and otherwise; For if these Arguments hold good, they were guilty of a Straying from the Scripture Rule, and had embraced unwarrantable Humane Inventions in point of Government, and upon this Ground and Hypothesis, all these *Grand*, or rather *Airy* Topicks, which he presents, *Ch. 1.* are quite baffled and excluded, such as, "the Humility of that Age, "in not aspiring to Episcopal Pre-eminence, that it was an Age of "much Ecclesiastick Business, an Age of Great Men, affording excellent "Records, wherein extraordinary Manifestations of the Spirit were "frequent, so near to the Apostolick Age, &c.

Now, what a pitiful Pleader must this be, who holds fast, and pleads upon such *Humane Conjectures*, and yet stands Mute to *Scripture Arguments*, brought to overthrow them. 2^{ly}. The true State of this Question being, by the Acknowledgment of all, properly, and in its own Nature, not *Facti* or *Juris Humani*, but *Juris Divini*, or (to speak so) *Facti Apostolici*, and clearly running to this Issue, "Which of the "two Rival Forms of Government are commensurated to the Divine "Pattern and Standard of the Apostolick Doctrine, Constitution and "Practice; And accordingly, he being, by his Antagonist, and by all Presbyterians, called to plead his Cause at that Bar, and before the Divine Judge, moreover, his Plea and Principle being this, *That the Diocesan Prelacy existing in that Third Age is Apostolical*, what a meer Dispute-Deflector has he discovered himself to be, in spending all his Pleading and Arguments upon the Proof of a simple *Humane Practico*, when he should have pleaded the *Jus* and *Divine Rights*: As if a Person challenged for

no genuine Heir to an Estate, or the true and lawful Issue of the Person having Right to dispose of it, his Proctor or Defender should draw his Proofs from the *Man's actual Possession, his personal Qualities*, or such like extraneous Grounds, without the least Respect to any *Reasons or Principles*, which, *in Law*, can evince either his being the genuine Heir, or *his legal Right and Title*.

Just such is the Case in Hand, when we do, from Scripture, from the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, prove the Hierarchical Prelate to be no Plant of the Lord's Plantation, to be an Usurper, and to have no lawful Office in the House of God, to be a Spurious Brood, but no genuine Off-spring of the Apostles, and the true Apostolick Gospel Church and Ministry, all the Answer offered by this Pleader is, that there were such Bishops existent in the Third Age, confidently affirming them to have succeeded the Apostles, that his Deified Cyprian was a Martyr, and a Good Man, (which none do deny) but when called to the Law and the Testimony, to prove the Hierarchical Prelate's Title and pretended Right, or, to Answer our contrary Evidences drawn from the Great Master of the House his Law and Testimony, here he stands Mute, and without an Answer, and thus palpably appears a fruitless non-plus'd and vain Pleader.

This brings to Mind a remarkable Passage of their own *Stillingsfleet*, Ch. 6. p. 294. *Iren.* having mentioned the *Defectiveness, Ambiguity, Partiality and Repugnancy* of the Records of the Ages succeeding the Apostles, he adds, "When Men are, by the force of former Arguments, (he means such as he has offer'd against the Divine Right of Prelacy) driven off from Scripture, then they presently run to take Sanctuary in the Records of Succeeding Ages to the Apostles. Thus *Estius* no mean Schoolman handling this very Question of the Difference of Bishops and Presbyters, very fairly quites the Scriptures, and betakes himself to other Weapons. *Quod autem Jure Divino sint Episcopi Presbyteris Superiores etsi non ita clarum est e Sacris Literis, aliunde tamen satis efficaciter probari potest* *." That tho' the Superiority of the Bishop to the Presbyter cannot be made appear from Scripture, yet it may be effectually prov'd from other Grounds, viz. from such Principles as *J. S.* has espous'd. Upon this Doctor *Stillingsfleet* adds, and thus Animadvert, "Ingenuously said, however, but all the difficulty is, saith he, how a *Jus Divinum* should be prov'd. when Men leave the Scriptures, (this Difficulty *J. S.* should have consider'd before he presented his vain blustering Pamphlet) which makes others so loath to leave this Hold: Although they do it in effect (N. B.) when they call in the

* In Sent. Lib. 4.
Dist. 4. Sect. 25.

the help of Succeeding Ages to make the Scripture speak plain for them. We follow therefore the Scent of the Game (saith he) into this Wood of Antiquity, wherein it will be easier to lose our selves than to find that in which we are upon the pursuit of, a *Jus Divinum* of any one particular Form of Government.

Thereafter he prosecutes at large, and evinceth this his Charge, 1. *Of the Defectiveness*, 2ly, *Of the Ambiguity*, 3ly, *The Partiality*, and 4ly, *The Repugnancy of the Records of succeeding Ages which should inform us what the Apostolical Practice was.* Upon this point of the *Ambiguity* he Undertakes to make evident, 1. "That Personal Succession might be without such Superiority of Order as Episcopalians pretend. 2ly, That the Names of Bishop and Presbyter were common after the Distinction between them was introduc'd. And, 3ly, That the Church did not own Episcopacy as a *Divine Institution*, but *Ecclesiastical*, and those who seem to speak most of it do mean no more. These three he also prosecutes with much Critical Learning and with this protest Design; viz. to shew that the Churches own'd not the Order of Episcopacy as of Divine Institution, and to invalidate the Testimony of Antiquity upon this point. So that this great Doctor and *English* Bishop condemns J. S's voluminous Pamphlet as a meer Speeder-web, easily and intirely swept away with a Touch of Scripture and sound Reason, and himself as acting a Stage-Fool therein, in stead of stopping the Mouths of Presbyterians thereby, as this Man has the Impudence to assert.

4ly, This Conformity of the Cyprianic Bishop to the Apostolick Pattern, our Pamphleter holds, may be trac'd by Succession, and a continued Historical Series thereof; This, with the foremention'd Conjectures to evince the same, recited, *Chap. 1.* 'tis long since *Stillingfleet* has refuted and overthrown, and thus the only apparent Foundation of his pleading a Divine Right, which points out this Man's officious precipitant Folly, in presenting such a Topick as has been so frequently overthrown. I shall therefore offer upon this Head and Argument the following Animadversions.

1. This Argument's Ground is easily and clearly refuted by the vast and long *Hiatus* as to any solid Tract of History from the *Acts* of the Apostles till *Trajan's* Reign, acknowledg'd by *Eusebius* in the Proem of his History, who saith, he enters a dark Defart, having no Footsteps of any going before him, but only *quæres æqueus*, some petty occasional Narrations left by some Persons in their own time. *Scaliger* (of whom mention is made before) *Proleg. in Chron. Eusebii*, asserts that *Intervallum ab ultimo capite Actorum Apostolorum ad medium Trajani Imperium*,

Imperium, quo tractu Quadratus & Ignatius floreant, plane cum Varrone admodum vocari potest, in quo nihil certi de rebus Christianorum ad nos pervenit præter admodum pauca quæ Hostes pietatis obiter delibant, Suetonius, Tacitus, Plinius; Quem hiatus ut expleret Eusebius in his quibusdam Clementis nescio cuius (non est enim eruditus Clemens Alexandrinus & sequens) & in Hegesippi non melioris Scriptoris sine delectu depromsit. That from the end of the Acts of the Apostles to the middle of Trajan's Reign there is no clear or certain Tract of History to give Light in the Affairs in the Christian Church, except some very few things which the Enemies of Christianity and Heathen Historians have touch'd in the by, such as Suetonius, Tacitus, Plinius; Which Gape that Eusebius might fill up, he drew from the Fragments of an uncertain Clement (not the Learn'd Alexandrian Clement) and the five Books of Hegesippus, a Writer no better, several things without due Consideration.

Tilen acknowledges *, that these first Times *magnas lacunas & hiatus habent*, have great wants, and are interrupted by signal Blanks and Defects, and that a *sine Actorum Apostolorum ad Trajani tempora nihil habemus certi*, that we have nothing clear and certain in History. viz. in Church Affairs, from the end of the Acts of the Apostles till Trajan's Reign.

* Cont. 2. Lib. 2.
Cap. 2. Note 39.
& Chap. 3. Note 6.

2ly, This his Grand Argument is baff'd and excluded; by the many Instances of Churches Govern'd without Prelats; whereof above; And Instances may be further seen exhibited by Stillingfleet, *Iren. pag. 374. 375, 376, 377.* who mentions among others, even the Church of Carthage in the time of Hunerick King of the Vandals. See Victor Uticen. Lib. 2. de Pers. Vand. Balsamon in Canon. 57. Concil. Laod. And no doubt, such Instances as do impeach a pretended Universal Reception of Prelacy, do equally overthrow this suppos'd Universal Reception upon ground of a Divine Institution.

3ly, Not to mention the Catalogues of Bishops from the Apostles, sufficiently expos'd and convict of Forgery by their own Stillingfleet, and several Learn'd Writers (see Appendix to the *Jus Divin. Minis. Evang. Propos. 4.*), this pretended Succession and Derivation has an incurable Wound from the many Testimonies of Fathers disowning any such Hierarchical Official Distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter, as this Pamphleter pretends a Divine Right for. Irenæus in his Epistle to Victor cited by Eusebius, Lib. 5. Chap. 23: calls Anicetus, Pius; Higinus, Telephorus, Xistus, Presbyters of the Church of Rome, Presbyteri illi qui te præcesserunt. Tertullian. Apol. cap. 39. calls the Presidents of the Church Seniores or Presbyters, *Præsident probati quique Seniores.* Irenæus Lib.

Lib. 4. Cap. 22. has these Words, *Quapropter iis qui in Ecclesia sunt Presbyteris obaudire oportet, his qui Successionem habent ab Apostolis, sicut ostendimus qui cum Episcopatus Successione charisma veritatis certum secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.* Where it is evident, and accordingly observ'd in the forementioned Appendix, 1. That Presbyters are call'd Successors of Apostles, 2ly, Call'd also Bishops, 3ly, Apostolical Doctrine is said to be deriv'd by their Succession, 4ly, That whatever is said of Bishops is also said of them. If we will consult the Learn'd Whittaker, de Pontif. Quæst. 2. Cap. 15. He will tell us, that *Patres cum Jacobum Episcopum vocant, aut etiam Petrum, non proprie sumunt Episcopi nomen, sed vocant eos Episcopos illarum Ecclesiarum in quibus aliquamdiu commorati sunt,* "That the Fathers when they call'd James or Peter Bishops, they understand not that Name properly (he means in the Hierarchical Sense of a Bishop with Official Authority over Pastors) but they call them Bishops of the Churches where they for some time Resided. To this purpose speaks also Dr. Reynolds contra Hartum, Cap. 2. Thus also Bishop Jewel in the Defence of his Apology against Harding, Part 2. Chap. 9. pag. 198. clears from Chrysostom, Jerom Augustin and Ambrose, that they held the Identity of the Office of Bishop and Presbyter. "All these saith he, together with the Apostle Paul, by Mr. Harding's Advice, must be holden for Hereticks. Where it is evident, he holds this Official Identity to be maintain'd by them as Scriptural. Cassander himself, Consult. Artic. 14. has this Expression and Sense in this point, *An Episcopatus inter Ordines Ecclesiasticos ponendus sit, inter Theologos & Canonistas non convenit; convenit autem inter omnes in Apostolorum ætate inter Episcopos & Presbyteros nullum discrimen fuisse.* That 'tis Debated between Theologues and Canonists whether Episcopacy is to be plac'd among the Ecclesiastick Orders, but 'tis agreed among them all and Universally, that, in the Times of the Apostles, there was no Distinction betwixt a Bishop and Presbyter.

Whittaker, Controv. 4. Quæst. 1. Cap. 3. §. 10. hath this remarkable Expression, *Sensit sane cum Aërio Hieronymus, quo minus curandum est Aërium nobis objici ab Insulsis Hominibus; Si fuit in hac re Hereticus Aërius socium hereseos habuit Hieronymum, nec illum modo, sed alios Patres, Græcos pariter & Latinos.* "That Jerom was of the same Judgment with Aërius in point of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, and that therefore the Objecting of Aërius by Ignorant Men as condemn'd of Heresie is of no value; If Aërius was an Heretick in this point, he had for his Associates in that pretended Heresie not only Jerom, but both Greek and Latin Fathers. His Worthy and Judicious Antagonist Mr. Rule has also observ'd in the piece forecited, that the African Fathers

thers, after *Cyprian*, do not speak so highly of Episcopal Prelation as *Cyprian* doth, citing *Augustin*, Ep. 19. unto *Jerom*, whole Words are these (*sub finem*), *Quonquam enim secundum honorum vocabula quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit Episcopatus Presbyterio major sit, tamen Augustinus in multis rebus Hieronymo minor est.* "That altho', according to the use ' which then obtain'd, Episcopacy was greater than the Presbyterat, ' yet in many things *Augustin* is Inferior to *Jerom*. Where are two Diminutives, the one derogating from the Degree of Episcopal Authority, making the Distinction betwixt Bishop and Presbyter meerly Nominal; The other from the Perpetuity and Divine Right of it, resolving this *Jus* and Right into meer Ecclesiastick Custom. His Antagonist also cited *Prim. Uticen*, who calls the Presbyterat, *Secundus & pene unus Gradus cum Episcopatu; sicut multis Scripturarum Testimoniis comprobatur **. To this Scope many others * *In Tim. I. C. 3.* might be cited: *Jerom* in *Epist. ad Evag.* and in *Pauli Epist. ad Titum*, after his Proof of this Identity of Bishop and Presbyter from Scripture, pronounceth thus of the whole Cause, *Sciant Episcopi sese magis consuetudine quam dispositionis divinæ veritate Presbyteris esse Superiores & in communi debere Ecclesiam regere.* "That the Prelats owe ' their Authority rather to Custom than any Divine Warrant. Asserting also, that in the whole Apostolick Age, the Churches were Govern'd *communi Presbyterorum Concilio*, by the common Council of Presbyters. Remarkable is that Testimony of *Chrysostom*, *Hom. 11.* on *1 Tim. 3.* Having propos'd the Question in the beginning of the Homily, Wherefore the Apostle, having describ'd the Bishop, passes over to the Diaconat, without mentioning the Prebyter or Pastor, he gives this Return and Answer, *Quia inter Presbyterum & Episcopum nihil interest & quæ Episcopo scripserat Apostolus, eadem Presbytero conveniunt; quippe quæ Presbyteris commissæ est Ecclesiæ cura.* That there is no difference betwixt the Bishop and Presbyter, and what the Apostle ascribes to the first, agrees also to the second, since Presbyters likewise have the Care or Government of the Church committed unto them. To this purpose also several Passages of *Ignatius* his Epistles do accord, and specially his Epistle to the *Magnesians*, wherein he enjoyns Obedience to the Presbtery as well as the Prelate: Besides several other places in his Epistles well known. To these Testimonies may be added the clear Account Presbyterian Writers have given of the Authority of Presbyters in Councils, comprobated by the Canons, *scil. 1. Can. Conc. Antioch. 13. Can. Conc. Ancy. together with 13 Can. 4 Conc. Carthag.* Here, on the by, 'tis noticeable that the Tractat, entitul'd, *Hierarchicall Bishops Claim, &c.* (upon some Passages whereof this Pamphleter would

needs Act the Critick) having cited the premis'd Testimony of *Jerom*, Examines at large six Exceptions of *Dr. Scott* upon the same, as also his several Conclusions drawn from the Citations of *Ignatius's* Epistles, in Answer whereunto he offers not a jot, but leaves the Doctor therein expos'd, without affording his Fellow-Pleader the least help in the point. But this we may again touch.

Now from what is above offer'd, 'tis evident, that, if *J. S.* undertake to prove a deriv'd Succession, yea and Universal, of the Diocesan Hierarchical Bishop he pleads for, from the Apostles and Apostolick Age, he stands oblig'd to perform this great Task and Undertaking, I. By United and Harmonious Testimonies. 2ly. He must prove, *That whatever the Antients speak of Bishops, is by them intended of his suppos'd Hierarchical Diocesan Bishop.* 3ly, *That these Diocesans come by an uninterrupted Line from Apostles.* But that none of these he attempts, or, if attempting, can perform, is evident from what is said. Not the First, there being a multitude of Fathers holding the Official Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, and disowning thus the whole Foundation of his Pamphlet. Not the Second, by the same Reason; Nor the Third, till he has Answer'd what their own *Stillingsfleet* and others have pleaded against such a Succession: And to discover the Absurdity and Inconsistency of any such pretences, he will thus make these Fathers mention'd to contradict Scripture and themselves in their Sentiments of Prelacy. And upon the whole, this point of *Act*, which he pretends, viz. *The Succession of the Cyprianic, or Diocesan Bishop from the Apostolick Age; and that in an Universal Series,* being to be prov'd and attested by Witnesses or approv'd Writers, and it being certain, that this Testimony must needs (as all Testimonies which make Faith in any Cause) be Harmonious, so as no Witness contradict another, the multitude of contrary Attestations of so many Famous Witnesses in this point doth wholly evert his Proof, and raze it to the Foundation, rendering it in like manner Fruitless, as was the pretended Proof of the Enemies of our Lord, brought to Fortifie their forg'd Accusation which they were forc'd to abandon and give over, because the *Witnesses agreed not together.*

S E C T. II.

The Scripture Account of the Mystery of Iniquity Working in the Times of the Apostles, Improved to the same Scope with the preceeding Grounds.

O U R Pamphleter acknowledgeth, that Presbyterian Divines do plead this Argument against Prelacy, tho' he hath offer'd no shadow of an Answer to it : We shall, therefore, in the next place, Improve this Argument against that Derivation of his Episcopal Hierarchy, which he supposes existent in the Third, or *Cyprianic Age*, from the Apostles ; For, if it be found a part of the Mystery, then Working, then, sure, the Child must be like the Parent, the poison'd Stream must favour of the poison'd Fountain.

1. Then, that this Mystery of Iniquity, is the Mystery of the Papal Primacy, with its horrid Principles and Practices upholding it, I hope he will not deny ; Or, if he be so much in Love with his Hierarchy as to deny it, 'tis easy to bring a Cloud of Protestant Divines to Witness against him. He seems to put a great value upon *Dodwell*, (who, together with others of his Associates, is in Love with a Patriarchat) that I doubt not, such an Assertion will have no good savour with him. But however, I find nothing in his Pamphlet peremptory and positive against it ; I do therefore proceed, and offer it to be considered.

2ly, That the Seeds and Foundations of the Papal Hierarchy were then sown and laid, yea and acting, is clear from these parallels, 2 *Thes.* 2. 3. and 7. v. with its parallels, 3 *Joh.* 9, 10. compared with 1 *Joh.* 2. 18, 19. *Rev.* 13. *per totum* ; As might be largely clear'd from Protestant Interpreters, whereof to give a short Touch, the *Belgick* Divines upon that first Text understand by this Mystery, " The secret ceiming up of this Unrighteous Antichristian Dominion, as it was by little and little promoted in the Church of Christ, namely by Sathan and by some of his Instruments, who, by desire of Rule, (as once *Diotrephes* is reproved for it, 3 *Joh.* 9, 10.) and by bringing in of false and Superstitious Doctrines, and humane Inventions, herein offered Sathan their hand, even from the Apostles times. Upon that Passage, 3 *Joh.* 9. *Who loves the preeminency*, They give this Sense, " That is, who out of Ambition exalteth himself above

his Brethren, seeking after this, to Lord it over them, (expressing this, as is observ'd above, in the terms wherein the Apostle Peter discharges a Prelacy, or Lording over God's Heritage, 1 Pet. 5, 3.) and to draw all Respect to himself alone, receives us not, that is, Esteems neither me nor my Intercession. That parallel, 1 Job. 2. 18. *Ye have heard that Antichrist shall come*, they thus understand, viz. "That he is upon his way, or beginning to Act. The many Antichrists, they understand, of his Forerunner and false Teachers. Diodat by the Mystery of Iniquity, understands "The Devil's Work of usurping Christ's Dignity under the Mask of Piety and Christian Religion. Rev. 13. 11. and 17. 5, 7. *opposue to the Mystery of Godliness*, 1 Tim. 3. 16. *The working of the Mystery*, he thus expounds, "That it begins to frame and insinuate it self into the Spirits and Minds of Men. Upon the Instance of *Diotrephes*, he shews, "That the Apostle condemns Ambition, a dangerous Pestilence in God's Church. The great *Antichrist*, 1 Job. 2. 18. he expounds to be, "an Opposer of Christ's Doctrine and Spiritual Kingdom, with Usurpation of absolute Command. Putting thus a black *Theta* upon that *Peerless Power*, and *absolute Licentia*, which J. S. ascribes to the *Cyprianic Bishop*. The *English Annot.* thus paraphrase that place, 2 Thes. 2. 3. "The Mystery of Iniquity opposite to the Mystery of Godliness, it signifies the secret rising of Antichristian Dominion, whereof some Foundations were secretly laid in the Apostles times by Sathan and his Instruments, who by desire of Preeminency in the Church, 3 Job. 9. 10. and by introducing of false and Superstitious Doctrine began to build his *Romish Babel*, shewing also that the Word *Mystery* was Written on the Pope's Mitre, citing *Casaubon* in *N. Test.* The *Diotrephes seeking Preeminency*, 3 Job. 9. they shew to be understood by some of a *prime Pastor*; Others say, "They take it to be a common Name applied to one there that eagerly and inordinately sought for Superiority over other Ministers and Christians, hence arrogant Men were call'd of old *Diotrephes* nourish'd by *Jupiter*. Loves Preeminence, i. e. say they, He was such a Pastor there as would not let strange Ministers be receiv'd, lest he should be slighted and not be accounted Highest and most Excellent in that Church. Upon the *Antichrist* mention'd, 1 Job. 2. 18. they shew, "That *ant* in Composition notes an Opposite, 2 Thes. 2. 4. 2ly, A Deputy, Act. 13. 7. The Pope opposes himself to Christ, and calls himself Christ's Vicar. *Pool*, Annot. upon 2 Thes. 2. by *Working of the Mystery of Iniquity*, understands, "The Working of Wicked Doctrines and Practices secretly and subtilly as a Mole Works under Ground, In Doctrine, damnable Heresies.

' Heresies were broach'd, 1 Pet. 2. 1. In Worship, Inventions and
 ' Commandments of Men, under pretence of Reverence, Devotion
 ' and Humility, Col. 2. 23. In Practice, Dispensations to Moral Im-
 ' pieties, under colour of Service to the Catholick Church. This My-
 ' stery, *saieth the Apostle*, already worketh, in the false Doctrines, and
 ' false Teachers of his Time, in Traditions and Inventions of Men
 ' obtruding themselves into the Worship of God in his Time, the
 ' Affectation of Pre-eminence in the Church in his Time, and making
 ' Merchandise of the Gospel, and Gain Godliness, &c. Our
 ' Learned and Judicious Countreyman Mr. *Ferguson* expounds thus the
 ' Working of this Mystery of Iniquity; " That Antichrist and Antichristian-
 ' nism had early Entry to the Church, tho' not avow'dly, yet secret-
 ' ly, Antichristian Dominion and Doctrine were even then working
 ' and advancing by little and little towards a Height, in so far as Justi-
 ' fication by Works, Gal. 2. 16. the Worshipping of Angels, Col. 2. 18.
 ' Abstinence from certain kinds of Meats, Col. 2. 21. and from Mar-
 ' riage, and such like Antichristian Doctrines were preached, and De-
 ' sire of Rule and Pre-eminence among Church Men over their Bre-
 ' thren, and the Flocks of Christ, had then possessed the aspiring Spi-
 ' rits of some, 3 Job. 9. It was a Mystery then, *saieth he*, and in the
 ' time following till Antichrist should be revealed, and after his Reve-
 ' lation a Mystery still without Eye-Salve from God. He observes,
 ' that Satan began early to counter-work Christ's Kingdom, in setting
 ' up his own, as soon, or a little while after Christ set up the Gospel
 ' Kingdom in the Christian Church, and therefore (*saieth he*) the
 ' Antiquity boasted of by Papists, is no undoubted Mark of the True
 ' Church, for Antichristianism is but by few Years of later standing
 ' than the Kingdom of Christ under the Gospel. He further observes,
 ' That Satan, when he cannot work avowedly, works under Ground,
 ' that his Instruments are not idle, when they appear not, that Anti-
 ' christianism did work, when it appeared not above Board, that
 ' Antichristian Errors, and the Height they aimed at, appeared not at
 ' first, and that therefore 'tis no wonder, tho' Men, otherwise Gracious
 ' in the Primitive Times, who were kept busie in maintaining Truth
 ' against other avowed Errors of those Times, unawares, and through
 ' Inadvertency, did somewhat to countenance the rising of that
 ' Episcopal Seat, in some Steps of its usurped Dominion over the
 ' Church of Christ, which, tho' improved moderately for Terror of
 ' Hereticks at first, yet, in Ages following, after the Removal of these
 ' Gracious Fathers, did end in avow'd Antichristian Tyranny.

We might multiply, to a great Number and Bulk, Protestant Writers, interpreting the *Mystery of Iniquity*, with the premised Parallels, to the same Sense and Scope with others above rehearsed; But this being evident to all that are acquaint with them, I need burden the Reader with no more Citations; But, from what is said to my present scope and purpose, shall offer these Inferences.

1. That this *Mystery*, (in the Sense of Protestant Divines) in one main part of it, did consist in Ministers affecting *Pre-eminence*, and *Lording* over their Fellow-Brethren. So that an *avow'd Lordship* over them, specially such as *J. S.* pleads for, brings the Hierarchical Prelate palpably within the Compass of that *Lording over the Brethren*, understood to be part of this *Mystery*, besides the *Civil Peerage* and *State Offices* which Prelates do claim and exercise. As for the *Pre-eminence*, reckon'd the same with this *Lording over Brethren*, tho' the Affectation thereof aggregates the complex Guilt, as signally putting on to seek and exercise this *Pre-eminence* wickedly, yet it is apparent, that the *Pre-eminence* it self is here condemned, as an *Embryo* of the Antichristian Dominion.

2ly, It is apparent, that this, with the other Doctrines and Practices, making way for this Antichristian growing Monstruous Tyranny, had its *Subtile Beginnings*, and *Specious Pretences*, hiding the ugly Aspect and Tendency thereof even from some Good Men.

3ly, It is evident from the Sense of Protestant Divines exhibited, that this *Mystery of Iniquity* had thus occasion to grow, the Evil one Sowing his Tares while Men slept, yea and to act, and work, and was still making its gradual Advances, when not discovered, till it arriv'd at its *Apex* of *Absolute Supremacy*, when that Impediment was removed which the Apostle speaks of 2 *Thes.* 2. 7. Beza's Humane Episcopacy and fixed *seats* had, in its Beginning, specious Pretences and Appearances of Unity, Peace and Order, but as that great Divine has well observed upon *Phil.* 1. 1. "When he who was set over the rest of the Brethren, whom *Justin* calls the *seats* or President, began to be peculiarly called the *Bishop*, from hence the Devil began to lay the first Foundation of Tyranny in the Church of God, the whole Administration and Government of the Church being, as it were, with the Name, transferred upon One, (here is *J. S's* *Cyprianick* Prelate portrayed to the Life) then from the Episcopal Tyranny it came to Metropolitans, whom they call Arch-Bishops, &c. From Metropolitans they advanced the first four primary Patriarchs, the Christian Republick being, as it were, divided into four Men, until the Fortuitous Accession of the fifth, because of the Dignity of New

'New Rome; Hence arose perpetual Contests till the rest ceding, the
'Contest continued with these of Rome and Constantinople. And after
'shewing, that the Roman Bishop has invaded both Churches and
'Kingdoms of the West, by a just Judgment depriving them of their
'Scepters, by whose Help he invaded a Tyranny over the Churches,
'he adds this Remark upon the whole, *Behold, of how great Moment and
Consequence it is, to decline, even in an Hair-breadth, from the Word of
God.*

'Tis hence evident, beyond all peradventure, that this Working of
the Mystery of Iniquity, and of Antichristianism, according to the
Apostles Scope, in the Extent and Sense exhibited by Protestant Di-
vines, behoved to be, of necessity, well advanced in the Third or
Cyprianic Age, viz. both in *Doctrine, Worship and Discipline*. For, this
Pamphleter, without exposing himself to Hissing, will not dare to
assert, that it was either dead, or making no Advances, for so
long a time as 240 or 50 Years, since it had taken Life, was moving
and acting in *Paul's* time. Nay it clearly follows, that its Advances
behoved to be, by that time, very considerable.

Finally, this Acting, Growing Monster, and Mystery of Iniquity,
respecting, in the Sense of Protestant Divines, *the Government of the
Church*, and, in this respect, affecting Christ's Visible Kingdom, which
the final Issue and Apex, in the Antichristian and Papal Headship and
Dominion, makes convincingly evident. None can deny, that the
Advances of it, by this time, in this point of Government, behoved
to be very considerable, and of an eminent and signal Growth. Now,
upon this Ground and true Hypothesis, I dare refer it to any Man of
Sense, even to *J. S.* himself, whether a clearer Contradiction can be
readily supposed, than there is betwixt these two Propositions, viz.
[The Mystery of Iniquity, or Corruption of the Churches Govern-
ment, as well as of her Doctrine and Worship, this Mystery, I say,
and Corruption having then its Seed sown, was still acting, working
and growing in after times, and advancing towards Antichristian Do-
minion and Tyranny]. And yet notwithstanding [The Church in
the Third Age, yea throughout that whole Century, was most averse
from all Innovations, yea and universally and peremptorily walking
up unto, and embracing that very Government established by the
Apostles, without the least Aberration from that Rule. Yea this very
Government established by the Apostles, by an intire and uninter-
rupted Series and Succession, was derived intire unto the then Bishops go-
verning the Churches through the Christian World]. This being *J.
S's* Assertion, yea the Scope of his whole Pamphlet, I will be bold

to assert, either Protestant Divines have been in a Mistake, in their Sense and Accounts of the Scriptures premised, or this his Assertion is a gross Contradiction thereunto, and evident Falshood. Thus 'tis evident from the Scripture Accounts of the State of the Church in the Times of the Apostles, that the Evil One had Sown his Tares, and Infill'd his Poison, his deadly working Poison, so early in the Church, that unless we disowne the Authority thereof, we must necessarily suppose, that this *Embryo of Antiscriptural Dominion and Tyranny in the Church, had arrived at considerable Growth in the Third Age.* But to make this further convincingly appear, and drive the Nail of this Argument to the Head, I proceed to discover, from the State of the Church in that Age, that, *in point of Fact,* it was so,

SECT. III.

That the Churches Doctrine and Worship was considerably Corrupted in the Third Age, the Seeds Sown of Antichristian Apostasie therein, and, in special, the True Apostolick Church Government signally Deprav'd.

IN this Proof, we shall begin with a Rehearsal of such Popish Errors, as made way for the Revelation of Antichrist, which we will find to have been considerably prevalent in this Age; At least, that the Seeds thereof were sown, and appearing above Ground, tho' not of so full a Growth and Extension, as afterward appeared.

In the point of *Justification by Good Works,* we have considerable Instances. We heard *Origen*, in more places than one, in some measure, tainted with this, and homologating the Popish Distinction of the Works of the Law rejected by *Paul* as the Causes of our Justification, *scil.* That he intends the Law and Works Ceremonial, and not Moral: Thus, *Lib. 8. in Epist. ad Rom.* Thus also *Tertullian* in many places above rehearsed, such as, *Lib. 4. cont. Marcion. &c.* We heard also, that *Cyprian* himself was not without a considerable Tincture of this Error, who asserts, *That the Sins following after Regeneration, are veiled and removed by preceeding Merits, and expiated by Charitable Works, and the like;* Wherein he distinguishes them from the Sins going before

before Conversion, which, with him, are expiated by the Blood of Christ and Sanctification, Lib. 3. Epist. 25. That Christ has satisfied for Original Sin, but we must satisfy for Actual Sin. Let J. S. consult their own *Scultetus*, Ch. 24. *Medulla Patrum*, where he will find this and several other Errors charged upon him, as is above cleared.

2ly, The Popish Doctrine of the Power of Free-Will, (the great and signal Pillar of the Doctrine of Merits) we have heard how it was Patronized in that Age, by eminent Doctors thereof. We heard *Tertullian* * affirming, "That God, in commanding us, shews, that we may obey him, if we will. And, *Hom. in Num.* he asserts, "It is not possible, God should command and require, unless Man had that in his own power, which he might offer to God commanding. We have also heard, that *Cyprian* himself †, following his great Master *Tertullian*, doth clearly and positively assert, "That † *Lib. 3. ad Quirin. C. 52.* there is a Freedom in Man's Will to believe, or not believe; Making, thus, Faith, which is the great Condition of the New Covenant, the Fruit and Effect of our Free-Will, not of the Grace and Spirit of God, in flat Contradiction to the Apostle, *Eph. 2. 8, 9.* For by Grace are ye saved through Faith, and that not of your selves: It is the Gift of God. Not of Works, lest any Man should boast. Making also the Man believing to difference himself from others, in Contradiction to the same Apostle, *1 Cor. 4. 7.* For who maketh thee to differ (or distinguisheth thee) from another, or what hast thou that thou didst not receive, &c. And, in Correspondence to what is above asserted, anent the Connexion betwixt this Doctrine of Free-Will and Merit of Works, we find their great Champion *Scultetus*, from several places, charging the Opinion of the Merit of Works upon *Cyprian*, scil. *de Eleem. de Simplicitate Prelat. Operum Justitiam*, saith this Author, manifeste urget, dicens: *Justitiæ Opus est, ut promereri quis posset Deum Judicem. Præceptis ejus & Monitis obtemperandum est, ut accipiant Merita nostra Mercedem.* He sheweth, that *Cyprian* manifestly urgeth and presseth the Righteousness of Works, saying, "That we have need of Righteousness, that thereby we may merit before God our Judge. We must obey his Commands and Exhortations, that our Merits may receive a Reward. How flatly this contradicts the Confession & Doctrine of all the Reform'd Churches, and how clearly it asserts and homologates the Antichristian Popish Pleaders, and lays the Foundation of several other their Superstitious Principles and Practices, I need not tell J. S. Nay, how flatly this contradicts the Apostle, in the premised and several other Scriptures, yea our Blessed Lord Jesus, who says, *Luke 17. 10. When*

ye have done all these things which are commanded you, say we are unprofitable (not meriting) Servants, we have done that which was our Duty to do. J. S. will also do well, to review that full Account of Cyprian's Errors exhibited by their own *Soul-tutor*, together with the gross Contradictions charged upon him, and made good from several of his

* *Lib. Cit. C. 24.* Writings*; Wherein he will easily discover, that his *Divus Cyprianus* was no Infallible Oracle, but, in a considerable measure, stained with the Errors and Corruptions of that Age.

2^{ly}. The odd Notions, such as that of *Angels Tutelary*, entertained by *Origen*, as we have heard, and others such like, was, no doubt, a fruitful Seed of the wicked Superstitious Popish Doctrine and Practice of *Angels Worship*, to which they wickedly adhere to this day, to the great Dishonour of God, who will not give the Glory of Religious Worship (his Incommunicable Prerogative) unto Creatures, and in express Contradiction to Scripture Prohibitions, *Col. 2. 18. Rev. 19. 10. and 22. 9.* We heard of *Origen's* Notion of the Orders of *Angels*, largely improven since by the Superstitious Schoolmen, yea his prescribing the very Form of their Invocation, (*Hom. 1. on Ezek.*)

4^{ly}. For the Popish Doctrine in vilifying and Disparaging Marriage, we have heard how fruitful Seeds thereof were sown in this Age. We have heard how *Origen* and *Tertullian* were deep in this Guile, and tainted with this Error, as also *Cyprian* himself (whose joint Influence, J. S. will not doubt, was spreading and signal in this, as in other points). That *Tertullian* makes the "Marriages that goe beyond the first, of an Affinity with Uncleaness and Whoredom, *Lib. de Monogam.* We heard *Origen* asserting, "That the third and fourth Marriage casts out of Heaven, that Marriage rejects from Ecclesiastick Dignities, *Hom. 129. on Luk.* And that *Cyprian*, *Traet. 2. de Habit. Virgin.* declaims violently against second Marriages. All which, and many such like Doctrines and Assertions of these Eminent Doctors of the Third Age, how signally they did contribute to advance the Mystery of Iniquity in this point, is obvious to the meanest Reflection. The Apostle, *1 Tim. 4. 1, 2, 3, &c.* giving Warning of this Mystery of Iniquity in the latter days, after he has shown the Power of Seducing Spirits, and wicked Doctrines of Antichristianism, and the obstinate Hardness of Heart attending the same, in Correspondence to what he asserts to the same Scope and purpose, *2 Thes. 2. 11.* presents this first Instance of that wicked Delusive Doctrine forbidding to Marry, as all the Popish Church, to this day, forbid it to their Clergy universally, from the highest to the lowest, as a base State, unworthy.

thy of an Ecclesiastick Person. Which leads us to a fifth Instance.

5ly, The Foundation of *Monastick Superstitious Vows* of single Life in both Sexes, whereby the Unclean Spirit has taken Advantage to fill the Christian World with Monstruous Filthiness for many Generations, was also laid in the Foolish and Antiscriptural Exalting of *Virginity or Celibate*, in the Writings of the Doctors of this Age. We heard, that *Tertullian* calls it a *higher Degree of Sanctity*, Lib. 5. adver. Marcion. *Origen*, a *Mark of Perfection*, Lib. 10. in Epist. ad Rom. And that *Cyprian* expresses a sort of *Detestation of the Female Sex*, de Bono Pudic. Holding, that *Virginity equals us to Angels*, Lib. de Sing. Cler. Calling likewise, *Chastity, or Celibate, an Angelical State*; Serm. de Nativ. And how strongly this favours of that Error mentioned in point of Marriage, which the Apostle proposes as the first Instance of Antichristian Detraction, yea how flatly the premised Doctrine contradicts the Apostle asserting, Heb. 13. 4. *That Marriage is Honourable in all, and the Bed Undefiled*, is equally obvious and conspicuous.

A sixth Instance I shall give, is of that Seed of the Popish Distinction of *Commands* distinct from *Counsels*, and in *special Counsels of Perfection* beyond the ordinary Rate of *Commanded Obedience*, the Seeds whereof we will find to have been sown also in this Age. We all know, how this is pleaded for, and improven by the Popish Agents. The Jesuites of *Rhemes*, upon *Mat. 19. 21. Jesus said unto him, if thou wilt be perfect, go and sell all thou hast, &c.* plead, with their utmost Skill, Sophistry and Oratory, for this Distinction, which is as vain as their other Pleadings, and cannot be the Sense of this place, since our Lord had declared Perfection to consist in *keeping the Commands*, and therefore could not commend any Perfection of commanded Obedience beyond the *Commands*; Nor can there be a more foolish and nonsensical Supposition than this, that the Young Man had kept the *Commands*, or that our Saviour did suppose so much; For had he kept them all, nothing had been wanting to obtain Eternal Life, which contradicts our Blessed Lord's Assertion, that something was wanting to obtain the same. So that 'tis clear, that this Young Man had kept none of the *Commands* in the proper Spiritual and Genuine Sense thereof, whereof our Saviour by this Speech endeavours to convince him. And for the special Precept, *Go sell all, &c.* as it had its Authority derived from our Blessed Lord, the Glorious Author and End of the Law, so likewise its Foundation in the Law Moral, obliging to Love our Neighbour as our self, not to Cover, but to be ready to Relieve the poor Members of Christ. And in a word, we must not take the Pre-

cept to be concluded within these Limits, Go *sell all*, &c. but to be extended to that which follows, *Come and take up the Cross, and follow me*, pointing out Faith, and our Conformity to Christ, to be our Christian Perfection, not voluntary Poverty. But this *obiter*. See *Cartwright*, against the *Rhemists*, upon the place. *Poole's Ann.* and others.

But now, if J. S. shall enquire, where we find the Foundation of this Doctrine laid in the Third Age? I hope he will look upon't as one Instance for all, if I shall exhibite unto him the Assertion of his great Infallible Cyprian, from whom this whole Age is denominated Cyprianic. We heard, that, *Serm. de Nativ.* commending Celibate and Chastity, he brings a Proof expressly from a *Counsel of Perfection*; Speaking of Continency, he makes it such, *Quam non cogit Necessitas, sed Perfectionis suadet Consilium*. Asserting clearly, according to the Popish Distinction, a *Counsel of Perfection*, beyond what the Necessity of the Law and Command obliges.

7ly, We will find the Popish Doctrine of *Purgatory* had its beginnings in this Age, and that the Fathers thereof brought Fewel to this Fire. We heard *Tertullian's* Error from our Authors, *viz.* That *Locum Beatorum ante Resurrectionem non Cœlestem dixit, sed Inferi saltem sublimiorem*, that the place of the Blessed Souls before the Resurrection is not the Celestial Habitation, but some inferiour place higher than Hell. We heard also, that *Origen* asserts this Fiery Purgatory after this Life in several places already cited, *scil. Hom. 3. in Psal. 36.* and in several other places.

8ly, The Popish Doctrine of the *Invocation of Saints*, had also its growing Tincture and Seeds in this Age. We heard the Formula of it out of *Origen, sub fin. Lib. 2. in Job.* O Beate Job ora pro nobis miseris, &c. O Blessed Job pray for us miserable Sinners, &c. Thus also the Author of the Homilies in *Cant. Hom. 3.* asserts the same Intercession of Saints for us out of the Book of *Maccabees*. We also heard, that *Origen, Hom. 16. on Josh.* asserts, "That the Holy Martyrs Fight together with us, and do help us by their Prayers. *Cyprian* also, *Lib. 3. Epist. 15.* affirms, "That the Lapsed are assisted before God by the Help of the Martyrs. The same is asserted of the Infants kill'd by *Herod, scil.* by the Author *Sermonis de Stella et Magis*. We heard also, that *Cyprian, in fin. 1. Epist. Lib. 1.* seeks "the Help of a Friend, if he die first, in Praying and Pleading in his Behalf for the Mercy of the Father. *Si quis hinc nostrum prior preceſerit, apud Patris Misericordiam non cesset Oratio.* This is plac'd by *Sculetus* in the 12th place among the Errors imputed to *Cyprian, Quod nova Devotione Viventes admonuit, ut post Mortem sui apud Deum*

Deum memores essent, *Lib. 1. Epist. 1.* That (as we heard above) in a piece of new Superstitious Devotion, he admonish'd the Living to be mindful of him before God after Death. Now we all know that this Supposition and Superstitious Opinion, anent the Saints departed their Prayers for the Living, yea and that with respect to the several Cases of the Living made known to them by God, their Prayers and Intercessions are thus singularly helpful; That this, I say, has laid the Foundation of the *Popish Invocation* accordingly, and is pleaded as the great Ground of this piece of their Superstitious Devotion by the *Popish* Pleaders and Advocats is evident beyond all Exception.

gly, Several *Popish* Errors touching *Baptism* were also springing up in this Age, as is clear from what is premis'd, *Ch. 1.* "The Essential Difference of *John's* Baptism from *Christ's*, and that the Baptism of *John* conferr'd no Spiritual Blessing, is asserted by *Tertullian*, *Serm. de Baptism*. We heard of *Origen's* prodigious Notions of it, making way for the Opinion of its *absolute Necessity*, such as his Dream of the "Necessity of Baptism after the Resurrection, and *Christ's* standing beside the Firey Stream with his Firey two edg'd Sword, to receive or reject Persons, accordingly as they are sufficiently purg'd or not, *Serm. 14. on Luk.* A Passage also giving a notable Patrociny to the *Popish* Purgatory. We heard also, that *Cyprian* owns the necessity of the Sanctification of the Water by the Priest, *Lib. 1. Epist. 12.* and is also bold to assert, "That the Person Baptizing confers or gives the Holy Spirit, and that Baptism it self doth inwardly Sanctifie; Which also affords a Patrociny to the *Popish Opus Operatum*, and the Doctrine of the Indispensible necessity of Baptism, both which are disown'd by all the Reformed Churches. We heard him also assert, "The necessity of Anointing with Oyl to attend Baptism, that upon the Anointing with the Sacred Chrism, the Person Anointed may obtain the Grace of *Jesus Christ*. Wherein he doth palpably Patronize the *Popish Unction*. Other Ceremonies also in Baptism, together with Prelatical Confirmation are asserted by *Cornelius*, who Writing of *Novatus* *, hath these Words, "Neither did *Novatus* obtain after his Disease such things as the Churches Canon requires, viz. a Signing or Confirmation conferr'd by the Bishop, and since he was not Priviledg'd with this, how could he obtain the Spirit's Seal. We have heard of *Tertullian's* Error anent the not Baptizing of Children before the Docile Age, *Lib. de Bapt.* Also of *Cyprian's* Error anent the Rebaptizing of such as were Baptiz'd by Hereticks, and his Error anent the Nullity of Baptism Administred by a bad Minister: In both which he gives Patrociny to two *Popish* Errors, the first anent the Necessity of Baptism, the second

* *Apud. Euseb.*
Lib. 6. Cap. 43.

anent the Necessity of the good Intention of the Administrator. These Errors *Sculetus* makes the first and third in Number. *Sculetus* also, we heard, imputes this unto him, in the fifth place, upon the point of Baptism, "That holding the absolute Necessity thereof to Salvation, he fell into that other Error anent the Penitent Thief's Sufferings sup-
'plying the Room of Baptism, resell'd (saith our Author) by *Augustin*.

Truly, I may here add the Error concerning the Number of Sacraments own'd in this Age. 'Tis notourly known, that all the Reform'd Churches do own only two Sacraments of the New Testament, *scil.* Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as might be clear'd by a large Cloud of Witnesses, and rehearsal of Protestant Writers and Confessions of the Churches. But by J. S's bold Affirmation, Chap. 6. §. 89, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, "Confirmation was by *Cyprian* and his Contemporaries held to be a distinct Sacrament from Baptism, depending upon a distinct Institution, producing distinct Operations, capable of a Contradictory predicat from Baptism, the one being iterable and the other not, the one so far from being an Appendage of the other that many years might have interveend between them, that Confirmation was as much design'd for conferring the Ordinary as Extraordinary Gifts of the Spirit. Here I may say we have *Confitentem reum*, and that by his Confession, *Cyprian* and his Contemporaries in this Controversie of the Number of Sacraments, stood on the Popish side of the Cause.

Truly, The Popish Errors in point of the Eucharist, had also several Seeds sown in this Age. *Cyprian* attributes a Virtue therunto from the Administrator, adding to this another piece of Superstitious Phrasiology, *scil.* "That it is Sanctified on the Altar, that the Chalice or Cup is Sanctified by the Priest, *Lib. 2. Epist. 3.* That the Priest, as Christ's Vicar, offers a Sacrifice to the Father; Which Phrase of offering of Sacrifice *Tertullian* makes use of, speaking of the Supper, *Lib. de Cult. femin. & Martial Epist. ad Burdegal.* "The Supper of the Lord, saith he, that is the Sacrifice is offered unto God upon the Altar. Now these Phrases and Notions of Altars, Sacrifices, Priests, Offerings, and Sacrificing, of vicarious Priesthood in this Offering, (whatever charitable Construction some might put upon the same anent an Orthodox Sense and Intention) yet that the Popish Mass, the Idolatries and Superstitions thereof, *scil.* its being offered by a Priest properly so call'd, and as a Sacrifice propitiatory to the Father properly so call'd, had its Rise from such Notions, which, leavening the Spirits of Men more and more, grew up at last into the premis'd Wicked Heresie, is beyond all peradven-

peradventure. So that we may truly say, this Seed of the Mystery of Iniquity, as well as others, was then sown. Besides, the indispensable and absolute Necessity of this Ordinance to Salvation, as another Error upon this point, is found asserted by Cyprian, (*Serm. de Lapsis*) the Tenth in Number imputed to him by *Schulerus*.

Hitherto we have seen what Seeds of Antichristian Errors and Superstitions were sown in that Age, and how they had taken Root and fructified, consequently how far the Mystery of Iniquity had then advanc'd. That in the point of *Worship* there were sad and signal Corruptions creeping in at this time, as the necessary Effect and Product of the former Corruption of *Doctrine* instanc'd, needs no new Confirmation or Recapitulation by reiterated Instances. I do therefore proceed to that other Branch of the Mystery of Iniquity instanc'd, *scil.* *The unlawful Dominion in the House of God.*

That there was in this Age, the Seed sown of an unlawful *Antichristian Dominion* in the House of God, needs no other Proof than representing in a just Comparison, what is asserted by Protestant Divines in point of an Unlawful Dominion in Ministers or Church Officers one over another, upon the Texts forecited, pointing at the Mystery of Iniquity, and the Dominion and Absolute Power over Pastors ascrib'd by J. S. to the Cyprianic Bishop, together with the Assertions anent a Primacy, or a Power, at least very much favouring of it, ascrib'd by Historians to Cyprian and others. To point at the

1. The Primacy of *Peter* and of the *Roman Church* had its begun Notions in this Age, and these not obscurely express'd, as is evident from what is premis'd, and therein the Popish pleading not obscurely Homologated and Patroniz'd. We have *Tertullian* asserting, "That the Keys were committed to *Peter* only, and that the Church was Built upon him, *Lib. de Pudic.* Cyprian himself, speaking of the Order of the Church, *Lib. 1. Epist. 8.* "God, saith he, is One, Christ is One, there is One Church, One Chair or Cathedral, founded by the Voice of God upon *Peter*, there can be plac'd no other Altar, neither can there be a new Priesthood besides that One Altar, and One Priesthood: Whoever gathereth elsewhere scattereth. *Lib. 2. Epist. 11.* "Cyprianus, Maximus, Urbanus & Salonius do Judge that there ought to be One Bishop of the Catholick Church. *Lib. 4. Epist. 8.* he expressly saith, and that against the Scriptures, "That the *Roman Church* is to be acknowledg'd by all other Churches: as the Root and Mother of the Church Catholick. And *Lib. 1. Epist. 3.* and

and *Tract. de Simpl. Pralat.* he calls "The Chair of Peter the principal Church, from which Sacerdotal Unity has its Original. The Historians also take notice of his asserting frequently, *That the Church is built upon Peter, Lib. 1. Ep. 3. Lib. 4. Ep. 9, &c.* Origen also, *Tract. 51. in Matth.* asserts, "That Peter by Promise obtain'd to be the Foundation of the Church. Also *Hom. 17. on Luk.* he calls Peter the Prince of the Apostles. Now, whatever favourable Construction in an excess of Charity, some may put upon these sayings and Assertions in point of an Orthodox Sense and Meaning, *scil.* That therein is intended only a Priority of Order or Precedency, not of Authority or Power, (which is the ordinary Apology for these and several such like Assertions) yet sure I am, they appear to cast a favourable Aspect upon his Holiness's Mitre, and the Church of Rome's arrogated Supremacy, and do evince that the Notions and Impressions thereof were then taking Root, and in so far the Popish pretences and pleadings signally therein Homologated, since we must needs acknowledge that the Sense and Expressions of these great Men of that Age in this point could not but have a signal Influence upon the Perswasion and Judgment of others; And since many of Inferior Note, both Church Officers and Members, as also others of the lesser Size in point of Knowledge, could not apprehend such Limitations and Distinctions, as are now made use of to Defend the Orthodox Intention of these Fathers, we must consequently acknowledge that the gross and poisonous Error mention'd must needs have had a spreading Tincture, and correspondent Growth and Impression. And no Body will call into Question, that upon the Hypothesis of such overstretching Notions and Expressions anent Peter's Primacy, and the Preeminency of the Roman Church, consequently, of Bishops over Pastors, as were intertain'd by the great Doctors of that Age, and the more rude and dangerous Extension thereof in many others, it is incontrovertibly evident, that the Mystery of Iniquity in the point of Church Government, which began to take Life, and grow in the Apostles time, had at this time its signal Growth and Advances; Altho' the stop and Remora mention'd by the Apostle, *2 Thes. 2.* made the Advances the more slow and less discernable. I need not here stand to Improve an Argument *ad hominem*, and that J. S. has screw'd up the Cyprianic Bishop's Power to the apex of an absolute unaccountable Supremacy, which is indeed the very Source and Poison of Antichristianism, so that in J. S's Sense, Cyprian both in Judgment and Practice hath own'd the same. But this we shall at some length prosecute anon. Nor need I here stand to represent the gross and senseless Dreams which the Antients are known to have intertain'd concerning

Concerning the Antichrist, which are such as do bewray their gross Ignorance of *the Mystery of Iniquity*. So that we need not wonder, that while Men slept, the Evil One sow'd his Tares, and that this Mystery of Iniquity had such signal Progress, since in that Age, yea and in the preceeding Times, Men of Eminency were so Ignorant of its Nature and Tendency.

2ly, To speak to this point comparatively, and with respect to J. S. his Sense and Pleading, if we shall acknowledge, that in the premis'd notable place of *John*, concerning *Diotrephes's* affecting Pre-eminency over the Brethren, and that place, 1 *Pet.* 5, 3. condemning a *Lordship over the Lord's Inheritance*, the Pre-eminence and Dominion of Pastors over Pastors is discharg'd and forbidden, or over their Brethren and Co-Presbyters, which no Man of sound Judgment can deny, all Ministers of the Church being by our Lord acknowledg'd as Brethren only, over whom he himself is the Only Lord, and Peter in the same Epistle designing himself a Co-Presbyter or Fellow-Pastor, it will hence follow evidently, that J. S. in ascribing (in his whole Pamphlet) to Cyprian and Contemporary Bishops of this Age, such an *Absolute, Unrestricted Power and Dominion over Pastors*, stands convicted out of his own Mouth, of impeaching the Authority of these Scriptures, and the Commands therein imported, and of pleading for an Antichristian Hierarchy therein prohibited.

To make this convincingly evident. I will instruct my Charge against J. S. in point of Fact, in these Instances of the Dominion and Power he ascribes to the Hierarchical Prelat.

1. Let what he asserts, Chap. 6. from J. 25. and thus through the whole, be consider'd, then it will be evident that the Power he ascribes to his Hierarchical Prelat, and which he makes Cyprian to own and Exercise, is either such as stands condemn'd in the premis'd Scriptures, as a part of the Mystery of Iniquity in point of Government, or it is nothing. J. 24. He gives him "a Chair or Throne Elevated above all others, such a Chair and Throne as needs not so much as consult any in Government. J. 25. A Sovereign Power of the Discipline of the Church. *Ibid.* Such a Power as renders him Head of the Church and Principle of Unity, such a Chair as imports Ecclesiastical Sovereignty, and is a Symbol thereof. J. 26. Such a Chair as imports a Sovereign and Independent Power of the Sacraments, such a Chair as was the High Priesthood, that could not admit a Second, *ibid.* J. 27. He musters up his Titles, as being *Papa*, (Honestly said indeed) *Pontifex*, *Antistes*, *Dux*, *Head*, *Signifer*, &c. *Sole Steers-Man of the Ship of the Church*, J. 31. whose hands only hold the
S
Balance

Balance of Government, yea and to be manag'd at his Discretion: A notable Rule or Fundamental, no doubt, this is of Government, and absolute Sovereignty, with a Witness; Much of Affinity with the Sovereignty which his dear Fathers ascrib'd to King *Charles II. viz.* "That he might dispose of all Church Meetings and Matters cognoscible in them as His Majesty should think fit. Thus in that Parliament whereto the Duke of *Lauderdale* was Commissioner. §. 32. "That he was not only the Pastor, but also the Chief, yea the One Pastor, the Fountain of the Flocks Unity, the Peerless Shepherd, §. 36. The Judge, yea the One Judge who Represented Christ, who Judg'd as Christ's Vicar, within his Districts, the Peerless Judge, the Principle and Center of Unity, §. 42. 43. And, §. 24. Chap. preceeding, he makes him speak in the Language of the Apostle, *I Cor. 5. That tho' absent in Body he was not wanting as to his Administration.*

2ly, 'Tis evident, that he ascribes to his *Cyprianic Bishop* an *Absolute Negative* over all the Suffrages of Pastors or Presbyters, such a *Sovereign, Paramount and Peerless Power* as he might, *pro Libitu*, (to use his own Term) repress, restrain and absolutely cast their most Unanimous, tho' never so well concerted, *Counsels, Votes, Determinations, Conclusions*. Compare §. 41, 42. Chap. 5. with §. 43, 45. where he talks much of the *Episcopal Licentia*, which he Interprets an *Absolut Power*, and of the *Episcopal Liberum Arbitrium*, making him full *Master of his Resolutions and Determinations*, and *Independent in his Government*, yea and such as had no Superior on Earth to whom he was accountable (a good Explication, no doubt, of the Title of *Pope* ascrib'd unto him), and that in his *Administrations* he was not bound to answer to any Man nor Societies of Men; Telling us, *Literis Majusculis* upon the Margent, that the Bishop had *Voluntatis suæ Liberum Arbitrium rationem actus sui Domino redditurus (soli scil.)* He ascribes to Prelats a Power to void all Votes, enervat all Consults, evacuat all Resolves, countermand and cast all Conclusions. He ascribes to them from the Term *Potentatus*, a *Dominion in its greatest Height and Elevation*. From the Term *Licentia*, he ascribes to them a *Despotick Power*, a Power Peerless, Uncontroul'd, Unconfind, and Sovereign, such as was competent to Roman Emperors. See pag. 221, 222, 223, 224, 225, 227, 228, 230. with pag. 219. §. 36. He talks also many things of the *Episcopal Vigour*, the *Episcopal Tribunitian Power*, that we may be sure they are of the Roman Order. Thus §. 34, 35, 36, 39, &c. See Chap. 5. §. 45.

3ly, To the same Scope, that we may know they are true Romans, and of the *Scarlet Colour* of that Clergy, he ascribes unto them a

Roman

Roman Censorian Power, and this of such a Degree and Extent, that whoever do withstand this Paramount Authority of theirs, be they Pastors never so Eminent, are no less than downright Rebels. And this Power and Authority of the Prelat, we must know, with respect to its Exercise, stands upon the Foot of his Lordship's *pro Libitu*, and regulable by his *Episcopal Licentia*. See Chap. 5. §. 40. 41, 42, 45, &c. Thus *ubi supra*, and §. 39, pag. 222, 223.

4ly, This Absolute and Paramount Power to all the Judgments or Votes of Presbyters, 'tis evident from what is said, he ascribes not to Cyprian only as his Prerogative; But this wonderful *Episcopal Licentia* and *Liberum Arbitrium* he stamps upon every Mitre: So that every Mitre'd Head is with him install'd in such a Dignity, *that he has no Superior on Earth to whom he is accountable*. See pag. 230.

But upon this point I must here take notice, 1. Of J. S's singular Modesty in a very worthy Limitation, he has put upon my Lord Bishop's Absoluteness. 2ly, Of his inconsistent Retraction with respect to our Scottish Prelats. First, His singular Modesty, when telling us, *They had no Superiour on Earth to whom they were accountable in their Ecclesiastick Determinations and Resolutions*, he has very wisely and discreetly excepted One Superior, *Oil. God in Heaven*, 2ly, His Inadvertency, in that he has fallen foul upon the Cause he pretends to plead: First, He cannot but know that in the late Edition of our Scottish Prelacy, his Most Reverend and Right Reverend Fathers were, by our Laws Establishing the same, declar'd accountable to his Majesty in all Ecclesiastick Administrations, as the Supreme Head and Lord whose Deputs they were, and from whom they deriv'd all their Church Power; So that they were but Administrators of His Majestie's Ecclesiastick Government. 2ly, In setting such an Unaccountableness upon every Mitre, asserting, *scil. That the Prelat has no Superior on Earth to whom he is accountable*, he has shatter'd and broken all in pieces the Unity of the Hierarchical Prelacy, *scil. The Bishops Subjection unto the Arch-Prelat, the Arch-Prelat to the Primat, over both whom he is as Absolute, as he makes the Prelat to the Pastors*; So that by this one dash of his rambling Head and Pen, he has given a deadly Wound both to the Scottish and English Hierarchy.

If it be said, that in pag. 230. cited, he speaks only of the Bishop's Power within his Districk; I Answer, that his Assertion immediately after subjoyned, that *the Bishop was such a Master of his Determinations, and Independent in his Government, as had no Superior on Earth to whom he was accountable*, compar'd with the Assertions of his Power formerly cited, doth exclude and cut off such a Restriction, or render it Non-

sense and Contradictory to former Assertions; Which shall appear in such a pretended Restriction afterward: So that this his after Extension makes the *whole Earth* his District, or else let him and his Friends save the Contradiction betwixt this Independency in *his own District only*, and such as is of that Nature as acknowledges *no Superior on Earth*, and is likewise a *Dominion in the highest degree and elevation*. The adjusting of J. S's Contradictions in this and many other points, is that wherein the Orthodox Adversary is not in the least concern'd, but the rolling of this *Sisyphus's Stone* is remitted to him and his Associates. Nor can it be rationally excepted, that in the premis'd Prerogatives he represents only *Cyprian's Mind*; For, besides that his Inferences are for most part palpably Wire-drawn, it is evident, that in the whole Series and Scope of his Pamphlet, he owns the thing it self, and presents his *Cyprianic* or Hierarchical Bishop cloathed with this pretended Authority as a Pattern to all the Churches.

5ly, Our Pamphleter will needs have the Hierarchical Prelat in this his Suppos'd *Paramount Power*, properly to *succeed the Apostles* in their suppos'd Priviledges, consequently to be the *Sole Governour of Pastors, the Churches great and only Steers-Man, and whose Hand only holds the Ballance of Government*. See Chap. 6. §. 13, 14, 31, 32. Yea he will have him properly the *Higb Priest*, §. 33, 34. And here this great Critick may be pos'd, why he fastens not this *Higb Priesthood* to the Bishop's First-Born as well as his Chair, since several of his Fellows, *scil. Dr. Monro*, and the Author of the late *Queries* will needs have the *Higb Priesthood* a standing Ordinance? Moreover, the Bishop, according to J. S. is the same in his Diocese that the King is in his Kingdom, thus §. 35, 41, 42, 43, &c. *To whom Majesty is properly ascribable*, thus §. 47, 48, 49. And to compleat the Carreer of this his slavish Flattery and Exaltation of Prelats, he makes a great bustle to prove, *that the Bishops had the Sole and Supreme Power of Sacraments*, thus §. 112, 113. Which he will needs have to be comprobated both by the Principles and Practices of *Cyprian*. And altho', saith he, ordinarily, that is, when it pleases his Lordship, (for he ascribes to him a *Licentia*, and a *quod libet licet*, upon which Ground he makes a great business of the *Episcopal Licentia*) he took along the Consent of Presbyters in his Determinations, yet it was still with an *Absolute Negative* over all their Suffrages or Counsels: And that there may be nothing wanting to an Insolent Antiscriptural depressing of the Pastoral office, he puts them into Synods and Consistorial Meetings upon the same Level with the common people, as having no Authority therein but what was competent to them. Thus Chap. 7. from §. 1. to 38.

But here, to discover this Man's inadvertent absurd Rambling: *First*, It may be enquir'd, how he can produce, in the Apostles Government and Exercise of their Power, such a Pattern of this Absolute Episcopal Primacy, or how he can reconcile it with that Authority in Church-Government ascrib'd to Pastors, and that Exercise not only of *Consultive* but *Decisive Authority* therein, clearly exemplified in Scripture, yea even in Association with the Apostles themselves in Council, *Act. 15. per totum. 1 Cor. 5. Act. 20. 28. 1 Tim. 4. 14. &c.* But of this again. *2ly*, Since he will have the Bishop the same to his Diocese, that the King is to his Kingdom, he doth herein assert an Absolute Independency, such as he will, no doubt, suppose competent to a King, who is, in his Government, subject to no other King, or Superior, under God: How comes he then, speaking of this *Liberum Arbitrium* of the Prelate, to Limit it to his District, which imports his owning of a Superior beyond the Limits of his District? Tho', in the next Extensive Expression, he doth, as I said, contradict it. But Contradictions are no Rarity in this Man's Rambling Discourses. Moreover, *C. 5. Pag. 230.* he seems to tie up the Bishop, in his Administration of Government, to the *Laws of God*, and *Canons of the Church*, what is then become of that *Absoluteness*, yea and *Kingly and Majestick Absoluteness* of the most Absolute *Roman Cæsars*, which he ascribes unto him?

Our Pamphleter, no doubt; allows the Vulgar, or common People, no Suffrage, either Consultive or Definitive, in Councils or Synods, and putting Presbyters or Pastors on the same Level, Monopolizing this Authority in the Bishop, he either fastens upon them an Antichristian Domination, or there was never such a Thing, and is guilty of an Antiscriptural Depressing the Pastoral Office, if ever any was; For, 1. That the Apostles had no Successors in their proper formal Office, is the Consistent Judgment of Protestant Divines; the Office being asserted Extraordinary, and gone off with that Exigence of the Church; And this being suppos'd, all the pretences of *Episcopal Paramount Power* over Pastors, from a deriv'd Apostolick Authority, falls to the Ground; Besides that no such Exercise of an Apostolick Power over Pastors, can ever be made appear in Scripture. For,

2ly, We find an Essential Intrinsic Authority in Government, in many pregnant Testimonies of Scripture, ascrib'd to the pastoral Office; Whereby, consequently, the Prelate, whom *J. S.* pleads for, is found chargeable with an Antiscriptural Invasion upon, and Ulurpation of their Authority. For,

1. The Authoritative Denominations and Titles of Pastors; and the Elogies, may I express it so, wherewith the Holy Ghost in Scripture honours this Office, do make this convincingly appear, such as ἡγούμενος which signifies a *Leader, Conduſter, or Captain*; By ſuch an Epithet, the Apoſtle deſcribes the Paſtoral Function, *Heb. 13. 17.* Of the ſame Import is the Title ἀρχιεπίσκοπος, *1 Tim. 5. 17.* importing Authoritative Rule, ſo ἐπίσκοπος, *Rom. 12. 8.* Thus the Term ἐπιτροπή importing *Authoritative Inſpection*, *Act. 20. 28. Phil. 1. 1.* Which ſhews the Sacrilegious Impertinency of J. S. and his Fellows, in robbing Paſtors of this their due Deſignation, and aſcribing it ſolely to the Hierarchical Prelate. Of a like Nature is the Term ἀποſτολὴς and ποιμὴν, as alſo διδάσκαλος, κυβερνήτης. This Argument drawn from the Scripture Titles and Deſignations of Paſtors, is Learnedly proſecuted (together with other Eminent Divines) by *Turretin, Loc. 18. de Poſeſt. Eccl. Quaſt. 29. Th. 9.* See for ſeveral other Authoritative Deſignations, *Eph. 4. 11. 1 Cor. 12. 28, Heb. 13. 17. 1 Cor. 4. 1. Rom. 10, 14. 2 Cor. 5. 19. Rev. 1. 20. and 2. 1.*

2ly, This Eſſential Authority of Paſtors in Government, as properly and immediately competent unto them, without ſuch a precarious Dependence upon the Prelate, as this Man forges, has its *Exercise clearly aſſerted and exemplified in Scripture.* Thus, *1 Theſ. 5. 12.* we have in the Church of *Theſſalonica* the ἐπίσκοποι, or Rulers, conſequently a Collegiate Society of Governing Paſtors aſſerted, to whom the Apoſtle enjoins Obedience by all the Church Members, *as Labouring in Word and Doctrine therein, and Governing this Church by joint Council and Authority.* The ſame Governing Society of Paſtors, as properly and by Intrinsic Authority Rulers and Governours of the Church, we find aſſerted *Ep. to the Hebr. 13. 7, 17.* Yea and that the higher Honour above Ruling is aſcrib'd to the Labourer in the Word and Doctrine, *1 Tim. 5. 17.* which the Particle *καί* (Eſpecially) doth emphatically expreſs, as is evident in ſeveral parallel places, *1 Tim. 4. 10. Gal. 6. 10.* So that 'tis evident, that the Apoſtle ſets the Preaching Paſtor in the higher Bench above his Hierarchical Ruling, or rather Over-Ruling Prelate. The Profeſſors of *Leyden* do fully aſſert this Authority of the Preacher of the Word from theſe Texts, *Matth. 18. 16. Act. 20. 29. Eph. 4. 11. 12. Synop. Diſp. 42. Theſ. 26.* So Orthodox Divines generally. The Paſſage, *Act. 15.* doth alſo clear this, where we find, that in that firſt General Council of the Chriſtian Church, the Exercise of the Dogmatick, Critick, and Didactic Power and Authority is aſcrib'd to Presbyters or Paſtors, in Conjunction with the Apoſtles themſelves. Of this alſo there's a notable Inſtance, *1 Tim. 4. 14;* where this Eminent Jurisdictional Act, the Ordination even of an

Evangelist

Evangelist *Timothy*, is ascrib'd to the Presbytery, or Consistorial Collegiate Meeting of Pastors, which the Apostles presence rather confirms than invalidates. That the Term *πρεσβυτεριον* imports a Collegiate Meeting and Court, *Camero*, whom our Episcopalians will needs have to stand upon their side, in this Debate, as also many others, hath fully prov'd, on *Matth. 18. 5.*

A 3^d notable Instance of this Essential Intrinsic Authority of Pastors in point of Church Government, exclusive of the Hierarchical Prelate's usurp'd Authority, and pretended paramount Inspection, we have in that notable place, *1 Cor. 5.* where the Authority of Excommunication is ascrib'd to the Presbyters or Pastors of the Church of *Corinth*. That this Church was subject unto the Presbyterial Government of Pastors in the same Function, Famous Divines have made appear in their Dissertations upon this Question, "From the Multitude of Members in that Church, *Act. 18. 7, 8, 9, 10.* From the considerable Number of Pastors Preaching the Gospel therein, *1 Cor. 5. 14.* From the Subordination of Prophets in their Exercises to the judicial Cognizance of their Fellow-Prophets, *1 Cor. 14. 29.* From the suppos'd Plurality of particular Congregations at *Corinth*, which the Apostle points out, when enjoying a *Decorum* in their publick Assemblies, he saith, *Let your Women keep Silence, in tais εκκλησιαις (in the Churches), 1 Cor. 14. 34.* Yet all these distinct Societies and Congregations are, by the Apostle, own'd and saluted as *One Church, Ch. 1. 1, 2. viz.* in respect of its Unity in Government, and the Consociation of Pastors Labouring and Ruling therein. When J. S. shall be better seen in this Controversie, he will find the frivolous Exceptions made against this Argument fully discuss'd by the Authors of the *Jus Div. Reg. Eccl.* besides many others. What is elsewhere objected, that the Term made use of *1 Cor. 14. 34.* will not necessarily import *Sacred* or *Church Assemblies*, or at least *Organiz'd Churches*, is sufficiently refuted by the Scope and Contexture, and such Parallels, wherein the Authority of Congregational Elderships is asserted. The Apostle, in *1 Cor. 5.* doth evidently Censure and Reprehend the Pastors neglecting their Duty, and not exercising their Authority in casting out the Incestuous Corinthian, and, *Epist. 2. 2, 12.* he calls this Censure a Punishment inflicted by many, *scil.* the Pastors of that Church, clearly asserting their Consistorial Authority herein. So that these great Actings of Ecclesiastick Authority, *scil.* Ordination, and Excommunication are found clearly ascrib'd to the Consistorial Meeting of Pastors, and competent *non Uni*, or Monopoliz'd in the Person of One Prelate, but *Unitati*, Inherent in the Consistorial Meeting of Officers; And therefore the standing

ing Duties and Intrinsick Priviledges, in point of Government; are here so asserted and establish'd, that there is not the least shadow of an Argument or Reason left, to fortify or plead for the Hierarchical Bishop's Supereminency.

From what is said, this Argument may be offered to J. S's Consideration: These *Governours* or *Rectors*, whom the Apostles plac'd as Chief in the first Constitution of the Churches, and whom in their Valedictory and last Exhortations to the Churches, they commend unto them, as their immediate proper Successors, these have no Superiour Governours over them, by Divine or Apostolick Authority: But so it is, that the Apostles, in the first Erection and Constitution of Churches, placed Pastors therein, as the Chief and highest Rectors and Governours, commending them unto the Churches in their last Exhortations, as their proper and immediate Successors; Therefore such Pastors or Governours have no superiour Ruler set over them in the Church, by Divine or Apostolick Authority. The *Major* is of undoubted Truth, and cannot be denied, without impeaching the Apostles Authority. The Assumption is no less evident from clear Texts of Scripture, *scil. Act. 20. 17, 28. 1 Pet. 5. 2, 3, 4. 1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 7, 17. &c.* Let J. S. consult, if he will, Interpreters upon these Texts, and he will find the Harmonious Consent in the Exposition given.

The Evidence of this Truth, J. S. might have found, did force Doctor Burnet, present Prelate of *Salisbury*, to such an ingenuous Confession anent the Authority of Pastors in point of Government, as baffles him, and cuts the Sinews of his Pleadings for the Hierarchical

Bishops Authority in this Pamphlet, yea, and upon the matter, yields the Cause to Presbyterians*. His words are these, *As for the Notion of the distinct Offices of Bishop and Presbyter* (Sure I am, J. S. makes these distinct

* Vindic. of the Church of Scotl. 4. Conf. P. 110, 111.

Offices to be warranted both by Scripture and Antiquity, which the Doctor makes but an Airy Notion) *I confess*, faith he, *the Notion is not so clear to me.* But let him hear his Reason subjoyn'd, which is this, "And therefore, since I look upon the Sacramental Actions as the Highest of Sacred Performances, I cannot but acknowledge those who are empowered for them, must be of the Highest Office in the Church. The Pastor, then, by Doctor Burnet's Acknowledgement, *as the Highest Officer in Church*, is impowered for, and has the same Essential Interest in the Administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, as the Bishop himself. Let J. S. if he can, reconcile this with what he asserts, *Cb. 6, S. 75, 76, 77:* and

Chap. IV. (*pretended*) Principles of the Cyprianic Age. 145
 and 88, anent the Bishop's *Sovereign Power* of Baptism, suppos'd by
Stephanians and *Cyprianists*, his having the same *Sovereign Power* of Bap-
 tism as of Confirmation, §. 81. which he ownes to be the Bishop's *Incom-*
municable Prerogative, §. 95, 97, 104, 105. The Doctor adds, " I do
 not alledge a Bishop to be a distinct Officer from a Presbyter, but a
 different Degree in the same Office, &c. His Work should be, to
 Feed the Flock by the Word and Sacraments, as well as other Pres-
 byters. (*N.B.*) If as well as they, then, sure, upon the same equal
 Official Authority with them in these Administrations. He adds,
 " And I the more willingly incline to believe Bishops and Presbyters
 to be the several Degrees of the same Office, since the Names of Bi-
 shop and Presbyter are us'd for the same thing in Scripture, and are
 also us'd promiscuously by the Writers in the two first Centuries.
 Let any unprejudicated Person judg, if this Bishop has not asserted,
 that the Scripture ascribes the same Official Authority to the Pastor,
 as to the Bishop, and asserts likewise, that this was own'd in the first
 two Centuries, and consequently has contradicted all J. S's Endeav-
 ours in this Pamphlet, and that both upon Ground of Scripture and
 Antiquity. For sure I am, the Antiquity of the First and Second
 Century, especially including that of the Scripture, which the Bishop
 alledges, is absolutely paramount to the Antiquity of the Third Cen-
 tury, or the *Cyprianic Age*, which is the only Basis of J. S's Plead-
 ings.

SECT. IV.

*The Argument taken from the Mystery of Iniquity, Acting and Work-
 ing since the Apostles Times, until the Antichrist arose to his full
 Power, further Improven against J. S. from an Instituted Compa-
 rison betwixt his Hierarchical Prelate and the Apostolical Bishop,
 the same with the Pastor, evincing, in Ten or Eleven Instances, the
 Opposition of the One to the Other.*

TIS a known Maxim, that *Opposita juxta se posita magis elucescunt* :
 And if, upon an Instituted Comparison, the Difference and
 Antithesis betwixt the *Apostolick Bishop*, describ'd and Authoriz'd in Scrip-

ture, and the Hierarchical Prelate, whom J. S. pleads for, can be made appear in clear Instances, J. S. must needs acknowledge, that, in this Laborious Pamphlet, he has been pleading for an Impostor and Counterfeit, not the true Bishop, and has therein oppos'd himself to the Scriptures of Truth, and the Apostolick Doctrine and Authority. To come then to this Proof,

The 1st Instance I exhibite is this. In the *Cyprianic* Bishop, whom J. S. would obtrude upon the Church, there appears a clear Difference in the point of *Inauguration*, or *Election*. As to the Prelate whom he describes, he owes no shadow of an Interest, in this point, competent either to Pastors or People. The Passages cited, yea the whole Series and Scope of his Pamphlet, wherein all Ecclesiastick Authority is absolutely taken from the Pastor or Presbyter, doth abundantly clear this. But so it is, that the Apostolick Bishop we find Inaugurated by the Consent and Call of the Church, and Ordination and Imposition of Hands of the Presbytery, when Churches were reduc'd to an Organick Form, and the Presbytery and Consistorial Meetings of Pastors therein erected. In this Principle, there is a large Consent of Orthodox Writers. Let the Commentators upon 1 Tim. 4. 14. be consulted, and this will be evident beyond Exception. See Professors of *Leyden*, *Disp* 42. de *Minist. Eccl. Tb.* 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, & *segg.* Mr. *Gillespie*, *Miscel. Quast. Eb.* 2, 3, 4. with 8. where this point will be found clearly asserted from Scripture and Antiquity. *Jus Div. Reg. Eccl. Ch.* 12, 13. *Rectius Instruendum*, Cap. 4. P. 31, 32. The Assembly of Divines at *Westminster*, in their Advice upon the point of Ordination.

II. Instance of a Difference I assign is this. That the Apostolick Bishop is describ'd with a special Respect to the People and Flock, whom he should Feed with the Word and Doctrine, and be an Example of an Holy Life unto them, and this Personally, Actually, and Immediately, 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2. *Act.* 20. 28. 1 Tim. 3. 1, 2. The Bishop must be apt to Teach. *Whittaker*, de *Eccl. Contr.* 2. Cap. 3. shews, that Antiquity disown'd them as no true Bishops for 600 Years, who either were not willing or able to Teach the People, adding, that all the Apostolick Bishops were such: And that, upon this Ground, the Apostle requires it of the Bishop, that he be *audax* (apt to Teach), *Non ejusmodi*, saith he, *qui curet tantum & det operam ut alii doceant, & hanc Auctoritatem docendi aliis tribuat, sed qui ipse sufficiat alios docere*, who is call'd and sufficiently able to Teach others. The Apostle, saith he, in that Passage, shewing how the Bishop must be Gifted before he be Chosen, and therefore we must understand therein a Personal Care and Ability, and not a Deputed Care, which he clears further from 2 Tim. 2. 2. where

where the Apostle enjoyns *Timothy* to commit what he had heard from him to Faithful Men, *qui essent in amor & stupor didācat*, who were themselves able to Teach others. Citing also *Occumenius* and *Chrysostom* upon the place, yea even the School-Men, *Aquinas*, *Cajetan*, *Carbarinus*, thus expounding the Text. To this purpose, the other Scriptures instanced are pertinently applicable. These Bishops whom the Apostle was Exhorting, *Act. 20. 28.* in his last Farewell, are enjoyn'd an immediate Inspection over the Flock, by the Word and Doctrine and Government thereof, without the least hint of a Superinspection of any one of them over another. Thus, *1 Pet. 5. 2.* he enjoyns *these Elders or Pastors to Feed the Flock of God which is among them*, taking the Oversight thereof, (or Exercising an Episcopal Authority over the same, not over one another, or one over the rest) neither *as being Lords over God's Heritage*, over either Pastors or Flocks, *but being Examples to them.* The 36 of the Canons, call'd Apostolick, appoints *the Bishop to be laid aside, who is not diligent in Teaching*, and the 39 intrusts *the Bishop with the Charge of the Peoples Souls.*

This being clear then in Scripture, yea and in Antiquity, the Contrariety of *J. S's* Cyprianic Bishop to this Apostolick Bishop is evident, 1. His Cyprianic Bishop is *Pastor Pastorum*, Exercising a Kingly Majesty over the Pastors. But of this again. 2ly, He has no Personal Inspection over any Flock, but the Administration of the Word and Sacraments in the whole Diocess is to be perform'd by his Deputes and Suffragans, who serve him as their Lord, and the Fountain of all their precarious Administration, and are assum'd by him *in partem tantum Solitudinis, non in Consortium Autoritatis, scil.* to serve him in some Deputed Administrations, not to share in any part of his Authority. That such is the Nature of the Cyprianic Bishop's Office, besides the Passages cited, is evident in the whole Strain and Scope of his Pleading. So that 'tis evident, that, in this respect also, he pleads for an Impostor, not the Apostolick Bishop. Which will be more clear in the next Instance.

III. Instance, The Apostolick Bishop we find instructed with no Despotick, Architectonick and Nomotick Power and Dominion over the Church of God, and in special over Pastors, but only with a Ministerial Service under Christ, the only Head and Lord of his Church, consisting in a Declaration of his reveal'd Will unto the People of God, and suitable Application thereof according to their various Cases; That whatever Authority is intrusted to Church Officers, 'tis Ministerial only, not Masterly or Dominative, or importing such a Dominion as is competent to Civil Magistrates. This is evident by our Lord's express Declarator, distinguishing expressly his Service, Ministerial Officiating of Pastors, and all Church Officers, and the Exercise of their

Office, from the Dominion of Princes, *Matth. 20. 25, 26.* discharging them a Masterly Power and Lordship, *Matth. 23. 7, 8, 9, 10. 1 Pet. 5. 3.* They are such Helpers of the Faith of God's People, as are, in that Sense, distinguish'd from such as arrogate a Dominion over the same, *2 Cor. 1. 24.* Stewards only and Dispensers of the Gospel Mysteries, who consequently have a Stewardly, not a Masterly Power, *1 Cor. 4. 1.* and have no Pre-eminence over their Fellow-Servants and Brethren, *3 John 9.* Peter and Paul, Famous Apostles of the Circumcision, and of the Gentiles, acknowledge themselves Fellow-Elders, Fellow-Servants, and Fellow-Souldiers with other Pastors, owning them also as their Fellow-Helpers in the Ministerial Office. *Epaphras*, the *Colossian* Faithful Minister, is own'd by *Paul* as his dear Fellow-Servant, *Colos. 1. 7.* *Tychicus*, another Faithful Minister, is own'd by him as a Belov'd Brother and Fellow-Servant of the Lord, the same is apparent, *1 Pet. 5. 1.* *Epaphroditus* is so own'd by the Apostle *Paul*, as his Companion and Fellow-Souldier, *Phil. 2. 25.* *Eleme* as his Fellow-Labourer, *Ch. 4. v. 3.*

But now, let us take a View of *J. S's* Cyprianic Bishop; We will find him busked up in such a Fastuous Pomp and Antiscrptural Dominion, as is *toto cælo* different from the Scriptural Bishop describ'd. 1. He is such a Bishop as has the Sole Definitive Voice in Council, to a total Exclusion of Pastors and Ministers: Thus, *Ch. 7. S. 19, 20, 21.* 2ly, The Cyprianic Bishop (according to *J. S's* Account) ownes no Pastors his Collegues, but as Inferiour Deputes only and Suffragans. 3ly, He makes them such Successors of Apostles, as were endow'd with Sovereign Power of Baptism. 4ly, In his Cyprianic Church Government, Pastors and Ministers were on the same Level with the Laick, and had no more Power than they, and every Bishop, by vertue of his Absolute Liberty and Power, can no more be judg'd by another, than he himself can judg another, another Bishop; *scil.* But they do all expect the Judgment of Christ, who only and solely has Power to promote to the Government of the Church, and to judge of their Administration, *S. 21, 27, 28.* Not to resume again what is before hinted, anent his ascribing to the Bishop a Magistratical Dominion and Absolute Negative over the Judgment & Suffrages of Pastors, yea a Kingly Majesty, and such a Legislative Power as he holds competent to Kings; That thus also the Bishop, whom *J. S.* obtrudes upon the Churches, is no true Bishop, but an Antiscrptural Usurper, is evident from what is premis'd.

IV. Instance is this, The Apostolick Bishop had adjoyn'd unto him in Government the Ruling Elder, or the Elder Inferior to the Pastor, The Divine Right of this Officer, as a Church Officer and Governour, (besides many others) is largely and Learn'dly prov'd by the Authors of

of that Elaborat piece, entituled, *Jus Divinum Regiminis Eccles.* Chap. 11. from pag 116, &c. as from that Passage, *Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8.* from which Text having largely and learnedly Reason'd the point, they thus sum up all. That this *οὐρανός*, or he that Ruleth, is, 1. A Member of Christ's Organick Body. 2ly, Hath an Office of Ruling in this Body. 3ly, That he is an Ordinary Officer, being reckon'd up in the List of Ordinary standing Officers. 4ly, That he is an Officer distinct from all other Ordinary Officers in the Church, every one of the Officers reckon'd up having their distinct Work, the Doctor and Pastor Teaches and Exhorts, the Deacon gives and shews Mercy, the Elder Rules, as his Title *οὐρανός* imports. 3ly, He stands distinguish'd in the distinct Specifications of the Manner, and right Discharge of the Office, and in the special Direction thereanent. The Teacher and Pastor is to be Exercis'd in Teaching and Exhorting, the Deacon must give with Singleness, shew Mercy with Chearfulness, the Elder must Rule *ἐν σπουδῇ* with Diligence, Studiousness. This same point is largely Reason'd from 1 Cor. 12. 28. where in this Enumeration of Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, the Apostle adds, *Miracles or mighty Works, Gifts of Healing, Helps, Governments, Diversities, of Tongues,* they do make appear that by Governments, we are to understand certain Officers fix'd in the Church of God, - that these Governments import Rulers therein and Church Officers, that they are distinct from not only all Governing Officers without the Church, such as the Political Magistrat, Heads of Families, and the like, but also from all other Officers within the Church, viz. from the five Extraordinary, and to continue but for a Season, viz. Apostles, Prophets, Miracles, or mighty Works, Gifts of Healing, kinds of Tongues. Three also mentioned being Ordinary and to be perpetuated in the Church, viz. Teachers, Governments, (i.e. Ruling Elders) and Helps, (i.e. Deacons who are to Help and Relieve the Poor and Afflicted). And tho' Evangelists are omitted in the List of Extraordinary Officers, and Pastors left out in the Roll of the Ordinary, which are reckoned up, *Eph. 4. 11. Rom. 12. 7, 8.* yet the Argument stands good, that they are plainly and distinctly recited as distinct kinds of Officers distinct from Apostles, from Prophets and Teachers, and all here mention'd. Thus the Text is Expon'd by Peter Martyr in 1 Cor. 12. 28. *Paræus in loc. Piscator, Beza, Calvin.* This point is also Argued largely and fully from that notable Passage, 1 Tim. 5. 17. *Let the Elders that Rule well be accounted worthy of double Honour, especially they that Labour in the Word and Doctrine.* In this place (as Mr. Rutherford has observ'd, *Due Rights of Presbytery, pag. 145.*) the Word Elder is a Genus, a general Epithet ascrib'd to them that Rule well.

well, and to those that Labour in the Word and Doctrine. That the Terms of *ἐπισκοπῆς* and *οἰκονομίας* are Terms importing Rule and Government is the consentient Judgment of Interpreters, Calvin, Beza,

Bullinger, Gualter, Arias Montanus, as is also evident in

* Aaron's Rod
Blossoming, Lib.
2. Cap. 9. Pag.
271.

parallels, 1 Tim. 3. 4. with 5. and 12. v. Mr. Gillespie * has made the genuine Signification of these Greek Terms appear from Dionysius Areop. and Plato. Again, these Elders vested with Rule in the Church are distinct

from all them that Labour in the Word and Doctrine, there being here a Genus (a General) Elders or Rulers. 2^{ly}, Here are two distinct Species or kinds of Elders, viz. *οἱ καλῶς οἰκουῦντες*, those that Rule well, there's one kind, *οἱ κοπιῶντες*, &c. those that Labour in Word, as the Pastors, and Doctrine, as the Doctors or Teachers, here is the other kind. 3^{ly}, Here are two Particles expressing these two Species or kinds of Elders, *οἰκουῦντες* Ruling, and *κοπιῶντες* Labouring. The one kind Rules only, that's all their Work, called therefore Ruling Elders, *non quia soli sed quia solum præsunt* : But the other do not only Rule, but over and besides do Labour in the Word and Doctrine. 4^{ly}, Here are two distinct Articles distinctly annex'd to the two Particles, *οἱ οἰκουῦντες* they that Rule ; *οἱ κοπιῶντες*, they that Labour, clearly pointing out distinct Persons and distinct Offices. Finally the Discretive Particle set betwixt these two kinds of Elders, these two Participles, these two Articles, clear this abundantly, scil. the Term *καί*, or specially, intimating that there were some Ruling Elders that did Labour in the Word and Doctrine, and that there were others that did Rule and not Labour in the Word : Both were worthy of double Honour, but specially they that Labour'd in the Word. That the Term *καί* or specially is such a Discretive Particle and Term as distinguishes thing from thing, Person from Person is clear'd by several Parallels, as Gal. 6. 10. Phil. 4. 22. 1 Tim. 5. 8. 1 Tim. 4. 10. Tit. 1. 11. 2 Tim. 4. 13. 2 Pet. 2. 10. Act. 20. 38. and 26. 3. The Exceptions of the Prelatick Party upon this and other Passages, the Authors forecited have largely scan'd. See also Rutherford's Due Right of Presbytery, Chap. 7. §. 7. pag. 145, 146, 147. See also Vindication of Presbyterian Government and Ministry, publish'd by the Ministers and Elders, met in a Provincial Assembly in the Province of London, November 2. 1649. from pag. 30. to 48: where 'tis made appear, That such an Officer was no stranger even in the Jewish Church, which they Dispute and clear from these Parallels, Jer. 19. 1. 2 Chron. 19. 8. Matth. 26. 57, 59. with 27. 1, 12, 16, 21. and 21. 23. Mark 14. 43. Luk. 22. 66. where they prove that these Elders were distinct from the Civil Magistrats, from Act. 4. 5. Judg. 8. 14.

8. 14. Deut. 5. 23. Josh. 8. 33. 2 Kings 10. 15. That the Jews had Elders of the People sitting and Voting in their Inferior Consistories, they prove from Act. 13. 15. Act. 18. 8, 17. Mark 5. 22. where we read of Rulers of the Synagogue who were neither Priests nor Levites, yet were Rulers in Church Matters, and had Power together with the Priests of casting Men out of the Synagogue, and of ordering Synagogue Worship, John 12. 42. Act. 13. 15. That this Association of the Elders of the People with the Priests in the Jewish Church Government was by Divine Appointment; they prove from this, that Moses first Instituted it, and afterward *Jehosaphat* restor'd it according as they were directed by God, Numb. 11. 16. 2 Chron. 19. 8. That it belong'd to the Jewish Church, not as Jewish, but as it was a Church, and therefore belongs to the Christian Church as well as Jewish, for whatsoever agreeth to a Church as a Church, agreeth to every Church. The premis'd Texts of the New Testament, we find by these Authors largely improv'd to the same Scope, in special by the Learn'd Mr. Gillepie in his Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland. See 1 Part, Chap. 1. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. Chap. 8, 9. he insists upon the point of Antiquity, vindicating several Testimonies of the Antients from the Exceptions of the Prelatick Party. Several Testimonies also of Antiquity may be found cited and improv'd by the foremention'd Authors; But the rehearal or Vindication thereof, being much out of our way, since our Work and Design herein is to evince, in this, as in other points, the Difference betwixt *J. S.*'s Cyprianic and the Apostolick Bishop, therefore we insist not upon it. Several other points of Truth in reference to the Ruling Elder may be seen clear'd in the foremention'd Assertion of the Government of this Church, and in special the Consent of Protestant Writers, together with the Confession of Adversaries themselves are exhibited, Chap. 10. In this point then, as well as in the preceeding, it is evident, that the Cyprianic Bishop represented by *J. S.* is cross to the Scripture Pattern, as excluding a necessary Officer of Divine Appointment.

V. Instance is this, The Apostolick Bishop in Ecclesiastick Courts and Judicatories is found Exercising only the Pastors part in Government, that is, Concurring in Consultation and Decisive Votes, by common Counsel, with his Fellow Pastors and Pre-byters, but Exercising no Paramount Authority therein, as is clear by the many forecited Scripture Testimonies. He is discharg'd an Over-ruling and Lordship in this point, 1 Pet. 5. 2. The Elders of the Church of Ephesus are enjoyn'd a joyn't Episcopall Ministerial Inspection over the Flocks, Act. 20. 28. I hope *J. S.* will not deny them to be Bishops properly so call'd to whom

whom the Holy Ghost enjoyns an *Episcopal Inspection*, and that these Bishops to whom the joynt *Episcopal Inspection* is enjoyn'd, were Pastors or Elders having a Relation to that Church of *Ephesus*, he must either acknowledge, or deny the plain Text asserting so much, v. 17, 28. compar'd. Thus also the Pastors or Bishops are found to have Labour'd and Rul'd joyntly, and are accordingly enjoyn'd a faithful Diligence therein, 1 *Thes.* 5. 12. *Heb.* 13. 7, 17, 24.

This then being evident in the Scripture Accounts, let us see how J. S's *Cyprianic Bishop* stands Antipode to the Scripture Bishop. 1. His *Cyprianic Bishop*, as is said, has an absolute Negative over all the Judgments, Determinations or Votes of Pastors, as might be clear'd in multiply'd Assertions in this Pamphlet, Chap. 5. §. 37, 38. He will not have Pastors so much as to interceed with the Bishop, with respect to the appointed time of Penance, yea and makes it an unaccountable presumption in *Felicissimus*. He makes them to be such *Roman Censors* as have a Resemblance in their *Vigour* and *Censure* to the *Great Judg* in the *Great Day*. Presbyters opposing in any measure the Bishops Statutes are, according to him, no less than *Rebels against their Authority*, §. 39. This Rebellion, yea or Opposition to the Bishops Power, which he owns as *Sovereign, Paramount and Peerless*, he will needs have to be according to *Cyprian*, the same with the Rebellion of *Gorab, Dathan, and Abiram*. Nay he will have such Opposers worse; These having not gone out, nor Erected another Altar, §. 42. He frequently, and particularly, §. 44. Exalts the *Sacerdotal Licentia* and *Sovereign Power* of Prelats, asserting peremptorily their *absolute Licentia*, and that they were intirely and absolutely Masters of their own Resolutions with respect to Pastors or Presbyters. Chap. 7. §. 4. The Bishop was free to determine matters relating to his own Church by vertue of his *Absolute and Independent Power*, might order and dispose the Affairs of his Church as he judg'd he could answer to God. I am sorry, our Prelats saw not an Encroachment upon the Bishop's Power, when they ascrib'd to King *Charles* a *Sovereign Authority* over this Church, to dispose of all the Concerns thereof as he should think fit.

In this Government he asserts the *Cyprianic Bishop* to be accountable to God only. Pray how were our *Scottish Prelats* accountable to King *Charles* in their Administration of Government? He tells us, he had the free Determination of his will in the Administration of his Church. And so much free power of his own Arbitriment, that he might do in his Diocese what seem'd good unto him, §. 4. 2ly, If we shall consider the Nature and Authority of our *Scottish Prelacy* with respect to Presbyters in the late Edition thereof, 'tis evident that in Parliament 1662. they were reintegrated

redintegrated to their Episcopal Function, Precedency in the Church, Power of Ordination and Censures, and all Church Discipline to be perform'd by them, with Advice (only) and of such of the Clergy (only) as they should find (they themselves being Judges) of known Loyalty and Prudence. They are also redintegrated to all their Privileges possessed by them in Anno 1637. when of themselves they fram'd the Book of Canons, establishing their Sole Power and Dominion, over all Church Judicatories, razing Classial Presbyteries and Parochial Sessions, and drew up the Liturgy and Book of Ordination, without the least shadow of Advice from this Church, Threatening Excommunication against the Opposers of their Course. So that 'tis evident, that the Prelacy lately existent with us, and the Cyprianic Prelat describ'd by J. S. stands, upon this Ground also, condemn'd as an Antiscriptural Imposture and Usurpation.

VI. Instance is this, *The Apostle Paul's Bishop is one Name and Thing with the Pastor*, as might be largely made appear from the Scriptures frequently cited: *Phil. 1. 1.* these Bishops are Saluted in the Plurality, as having a Pastoral Relation to that Church at *Philippi*, without the least hint of any Presbyters Subject to them in the Government thereof, which indeed were impossible, were they such Diocesans as this Man pleads for: And in the next place, the Apostle Saluting the Deacons, he must needs in the first Clause understand the Pastors of that Church. Thus *Act. 20. 28.* compar'd with *v. 17.* the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus* have a joynt *Episcopal Inspection* enjoyn'd them over that Church. *1 Pet. 5. 3.* the Elders are also enjoyn'd to Exercise the same joynt *Episcopal Authority* over the Flocks of God, and peremptorily discharg'd the Usurping a Prelatical Lordship over them. *Tit. 1. 7.* the Apostle having describ'd the Elder or Pastor, gives this Reason of his Description, *because the Bishop must be blameless, &c.* Which were no Reason, but false Reasoning, contrary to common Sense and Rules, if the Bishop were an Officer so highly Paramount to the Pastor as J. S. pretends. Thus *1 Tim. 3. 1.* the Apostle describes the Scripture Bishop by the *Pastoral Qualifications and Work*, and none else. So that 'tis evident from these Texts instanc'd, that the Bishop and Pastor, or Presbyter, are in the Scripture accounts all one, having the same Name, the same Office of Teaching and Governing the Flocks, the same Qualifications, the same Exercise of the Office, &c.

This being then evident, what a Spurious Brood the Cyprianic Bishop is, whom J. S. obtrudes, and how opposite to the premis'd Scripture accounts of the Bishop, is beyond all peradventure clear, since in all the foremention'd Respects he owns him as distinct from, and Superior to

the Pastor. 1. He owns his distinct Name and Epithet, *scil.* of a Bishop, through his whole Pamphlet. 2^{ly}, His distinct Office, as the Supremement, proper, Sole Guider and Ruler of the Diocese. 3^{ly}, His distinct Work, *scil.* to Inspect the whole Diocese, Pastors and Flocks, by his Supremement, Independent, Absolute Power and Authority, having the whole Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction Monopoliz'd and Centred in his Person, with such a Negative over all Pastors Judgments, as he may make what use of their Judgment and Advice he pleases. And, in a word, in Consequence of the whole, he must needs be suppos'd to have distinct Qualifications from the Pastor. So that, in all these respects, he is *toto genere*, to speak so, and *toto parais* of a Function and Office distinct from, and superiour to the Pastor. See Chap. 6. § 22, 23, 24. And consequently appears an Antiscriptural Monster, condemn'd in the Sacred Records, as opposite to the Rule thereof in point of Government.

A VII. Instance of this Distinction I offer is this. *Paul's*, or the Scripture Bishop, is such a One, as is Ordain'd by the Presbytery. So was *Timothy*, our Episcopalian pretended Bishop, tho' cloath'd with Authority of Evangelist. Our Prelatists will needs have him the Pattern of an Hierarchical Bishop, so that the Argument is the stronger against them. Moreover we find, the Apostle *Paul* himself, whom they will needs have a great Bishop, ascribing the Ordination of *Timothy* to the Presbytery, or the Consistorial Meeting of Pastors, to whom he ascribes the *Laying on of Hands*, in this Great and Solemn Act. So that, by clear Consequence, *Timothy*, inferiour to an Apostle, could arrogate to himself no higher Power in Ordination, nor a Prelatical Absolute Dominion, or Negative over Presbyteries.

This being evident, 'tis, beyond all peradventure, clear, that the *Cyprianic* Bishop, whom J. S. obtrudes, stands Antipode, and in express Contradiction to the Scripture Bishop. For, 1. The Power of Ordination is his Sole and Incommunicable Prerogative, to which Pastors or Presbyters have not the least Shadow of a Right or Title: 2^{ly}, His *Cyprianic* Prelate is consequently to be Inaugurated, or Consecrated to his Office, by such pretended Prelates, as are of the same Paramount and Absolute Authority with himself; Whereas even a *Paul* had Imposition of Hands, a certain Badge of Authoritative Blessing, by Prophets and Teachers, *Acts* 13. See Chap. 6. § 81, &c. So that, upon this Ground also, J. S's *Cyprianic* Prelate stands condemn'd by the Scripture Accounts of the Bishop's Office.

VIII. Instance is this. The Apostle *Paul* himself (whom J. S. no doubt, will acknowledge a great and Eminent Bishop, since he, with all

all his Tribe, will needs derive the Episcopal Authority from the Apostles, and do hold Prelates their proper Successors in their Episcopal Office) this great Bishop and Apostle, we say, sets the Function and Office of *Preaching the Gospel*, which is the proper Work and Duty of the Pastor, in a higher Bench and Sphere, to speak so, above the *Rectoral Office of Ruling and Governing*, in it self considered, even altho' the Ruler acquit himself well in that Function, as is clear in that notable Passage cited, *1 Tim. 5. 17. The Elders that Rule well count worthy of double Honour, especially they that Labour in the Word and Doctrine.*

On the contrary, and in Contradiction to the Apostle, J. S. makes his *Cyprianic* Bishop to be, in this, of a higher and supereminent Authority above the Pastor, who Labours in the Word and Doctrine, that he has the supereminent Authority of Ruling and Government concentred in him; So that his Office, properly and formally, stands in this Ruling Power, as it is distinct from, and supereminent unto the Pastoral Teaching Office, which clearly inverts and overthrows the Apostles Rule and grand Statute premis'd.

IX. Instance, The pretended *Cyprianic* Bishop, obtruded by J. S. he, with his Fellows, will needs have properly to succeed the Apostles in their Formal Office, *scil. In a Supreme and Singular Ecclesiastick Authority over Pastors*, so that this their pretended Apostolick Office (in the Sense of our Episcopal Pleaders) puts the Ballance of Government *solely in their Hands*, sets them to the Churches Helm, as the only Steersmen. Thus, *Chap. 5. § 2, 3, 4, 5.*

But so it is, that the Scripture Bishop (if we will believe the Scripture Account of this Office) has no such Supremacy, no such Apostolick Authority and Succession, in a proper formal Sense, competent unto him; Since the Scripture Bishop, One in Name and Thing with the Pastor, is, in the Sacred Records, set on a Level with his Fellow Pastors or Presbyters in point of Government; Is, together with them, call'd to Feed and Govern the Flocks in such *Official Parity*, as is absolutely exclusive of this pretended *Apostolick Supereminency*: And 'tis clear, that, according to the Scripture Accounts of the Apostolick Office, in a proper formal Sense, no Ordinary Officer could be capable of succeeding them, since this supereminent Inspection over the whole Catholick Church planted and to be planted, whereof they were the Catholick Officers in *Actu Exercito*, joyn'd with their Infallibility in Doctrine and Government, rendered their Office absolutely incapable of a Succession. So that this *Cyprianic* Prelate of J. S's forging, since founded upon such an Antiscriptural Falshood, must needs, as an Impostor, evanish before the Scripture Light.

X. Instance, The Scripture Bishop, according to the Apostle Paul's Character and Description, is such a Prophet or Teacher, has such a Ministerial Authority in the Word and Discipline, as is subject unto the Judicial Cognizance of his Fellow Teachers, or Prophets; Which Judicial Authority and Cognizance, respects both his Life and Doctrine. The Prophets or Teachers in the Church of Corinth, had a joynt Official Inspection of this Nature and Mould, 1 Cor. 14. 29. *Let the Prophets speak two or three, and let the other judge.* And, as the Apostle here asserts a Judicial Cognizance of the Doctrine by the Collegiate Meeting of Prophets, so he subjoyns a Correspondent Subjection of every Prophet to this Collegiate Meeting, in all the Exercise of their Gifts, and by necessary Consequence, in all their Acts of Government, so that, in this one Church of Corinth, there is clearly suppos'd a Consistorial, Presbyterial Authority over all the Officers thereof, absolutely exclusive of a supererminent singular Prelatical Inspection in any Officer over his Fellows. To say, that these were Extraordinary Officers, renders the Argument more strong; For, if the Exercise of Extraordinary Gifts, wherewith Extraordinary Officers were endow'd, were thus subject to the Consistorial Cognizance of their Fellow Prophets, and even these Extraordinary Officers were to be subject thereunto, much more must Ordinary Officers be thus subject, as to their Life, Doctrine, or Government.

But so it is, that the Cyprianic Prelate pleaded for by J. S. is a meer Heteroclite to the Scripture Rule in this point; For he hath a Peerless, Supreme, Singular, Uncontroulable Authority, over all the Pastors of the Diocess. He is so far from being lyable to their Judicial Cognizance; that, in J. S's Principles, he has an Absolute Negative over them, as to all their Official A&ings; So that they are his Suffragans and Deputes, in whatever Duties are competent unto them, and, upon the Matter, are his meer Servants, or Slaves. Thus, Chap. 6. § 225, 226.

Let us suppose a Church Officer, Prophet or Bishop, had come to Corinth, pretending to such Authority over the Consistorial Meeting of Prophets, and this represented to the Apostle, what think we his Answer should have been in Decision of this Question. If we believe the Apostle's Infallible Doctrine here deliver'd, we must needs acknowledge the Apostle would have condemn'd him as an arrant Usurper; And, by the same Reason, the Cyprianic Prelate, whom J. S. obtrudes, stands condemn'd.

And now, ere I proceed further, I must needs challenge J. S's Reflections upon the premis'd Account of this Third Age's so exact Conformity to the Divine Pattern, as he is bold to affirm. Let it be consider'd,

der'd, that, 1. These Eminent Doctors mentioned, and whose Orthodoxy, or rather Heterodoxy is instanced, were, in his Esteem, and according to his Character, Stars of the first Magnitude in the Churches Horizon, especially his Infallible *Cyprian*, whose Judgment and Practice, consequently, (he will not doubt) had a very signal Influence, both upon Church Officers and Members, and (as the *Primum Mobile* to other Inferior Orbs and Spheres) directed and overrul'd their Motions. 2ly, It will not be deny'd by him, yea is clearly asserted, that they had the same Impressions of the Grounds mention'd by him, which, in his Sense and Pleading, could not but keep them close, in Principles and Practice, to the Purity of Divine Ordinances, and the Apostolick Institutions, both in point of Doctrine, Worship, and Government. He will not disowne it, that they were accurate Observers of any thing that look'd like an Innovation or Recess from the Apostolick Purity, that they found it in their Share, or their Privilege, their Expectation, or their Security, some thing, or other, some way, or other, that might oblige to have their Eyes upon't; That they were free of the Temptations of Secular Grandure; Had under Consideration Questions anent Schisms and Momentuous Points of Discipline; Were well acquainted with the Excellent Records of that Age; Yea enjoy'd Extraordinary Manifestations of the Spirit; That they were near to the Apostolick Times, and were well acquainted with the State of Government, in which the Apostles left the Churches; That they were bound, by Principle and Interest, to resist Innovations; By Principle, as holding, that the Apostles, acted by an Infallible Spirit, settled the Government of the Church; That all Aberrations from the Apostolick Institutions were Criminal; By Interest, with respect to the Enemies of Religion, who otherways would have fortified their Pretensions, that Christians were fanisful and peevish Fanaticks, as not adhering firmly to the Original Institution of their Founders, and thereupon have made this a Handle for their Persecution.

Now, in point of Fact, let there be a Reflection upon their instanc'd Principles, and therein we will have a clear *Vidimus*, how fully these grand Reasons and Grounds adduc'd by him, reach'd their Integrity and Purity, their exact Conformity to the Divine Rule. Should we trace this Conformity in point of Doctrine, the Scripture holds out Justification by Free Grace; How well they walk'd up to this Rule, we have heard. The Apostles affirm Man to be Dead in Sin, and these great Men own'd a Natural Strength of Free-Will. The Scripture speaks sparingly of Angels, and absolutely reprobates all Religious Addressing

Addressing them in Prayer; How well they walk'd up to this Rule, we have also heard. The Scripture speaks Honourably of Marriage; And how they have disparaged it, we have also heard. The Apostolick Doctrine concludes all Divine Chastisements tending to the Mortification of Sin within the Limits of this Life; How they walk'd up to this Apostolick Principle, we have also heard. The Apostles do reprobate all Religious Addresses to Saints departed in Prayer; We have also heard, how this was observ'd; As likewise, how the Purity of Apostolical Institutions, in point of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, was adher'd unto, or rather disown'd in the Superstitious Practices instanced.

But, in point of the Government of the Church, we see how the great Advantages mentioned by *J. S.* kept these great Lights of the Third Age streight and close to the Apostolick Institutions. 1. They walk'd up so closely to the Apostles Doctrine, in point of the Presbyteries Authority in Ordination, that, in *J. S's* Principles, they absolutely disown'd it. The Apostles deliver'd to the Churches this Doctrine, that the Episcopal Function hath a proper immediate Relation to the Flock; They adher'd so closely, in *J. S's* Principles to this Doctrine, that they own'd no such immediate Relation, but such an Episcopacy, as has an immediate Respect to Suffragan Presbyters. The Apostles enjoyn'd to all Ministers, or Bishops, a Ministerial Service exclusive of all Dominion; They adher'd so closely to this Apostolick Rule, that, in *J. S's* Principles they own'd and exercis'd a Kingly Absolute Dominion and Sovereignty over Church Officers and Members. The Apostles, in point of Church Government, do authorize Elders who Rule, and are distinguish'd from the Elders that Labour in the Word and Doctrine; They adher'd so closely to this Principle, that they absolutely disown'd such an Officer. The Apostles, in Doctrine and Practice, authoriz'd and own'd Pastors or Presbyters Essential Interest in Government; The *Cyprianic* Bishop, *J. S.* asserts to be such, as absolutely disownes any such Interest of Pastors in Government, and, in this point, sets them on a Level with the People, yea below them; So closely these great Lights of the Third Age adhered to this Apostolick Principle. The Apostolick Bishop is one, in Name and Thing, with the Pastor; These great Lights of the Third Age, in *J. S's* Principles, so closely adher'd to this Doctrine, that they fix'd many and Essential Differences betwixt them. The Apostle *Paul* presents Ordination even of an Evangelist, as perform'd by a Presbytery; The great Lights of the Third Age walk'd so closely up to this Rule, that in *J. S's* Principles, they own'd Ordination to be the Bishop's Sole Prerogative. The same great
Apostle

Apostle of the Gentiles (and, who will doubt, the same Harmonious Sense and Doctrine of all the Apostles) sets the Office and Function of Preaching the Gospel above that of Ruling, simply considered; The *Cyprianic* Bishop, in J. S's Principles, walk'd up so closely to this Apostolick Doctrine, that he own'd his Office properly to consist in Ruling, and that therein the Supereminency and Excellency thereof over the Pastor doth consist. The Apostles, in Doctrine and Practice, present their formal Office of Apostolate, as of such a Nature and Extent, and directed to such an immediate end, as it appears Extraordinary, and attended with such Privileges as can be competent to no Ordinary Officer, and therefore, in a proper formal Sense, could not be succeeded unto; The *Cyprianic* Bishop adher'd so closely to this Rule and Doctrine, that, in J. S's Principles, and in the Pleadings of his Fellows, they held an Office the same with that of the Apostolate, as succeeding thereunto in the full Extent of the Apostolick Power. The Apostles enjoyn'd all Ordinary Church Officers, none excepted, to be subject to the Collegiate Meeting of the Officers thereof; For, the Prophets cloath'd with Ministerial Authority of Administring the Word and Sacraments, as likewise of Discipline and Government, the Apostle would have subject to the Judicial Cognizance of their Collegue Prophets, both as to their Life and Doctrine, 1 Cor. 14. 29, 32. compar'd; The Bishop of the Third Age, in J. S's Principles, did so closely adhere to this Rule, that he exercis'd as Supreme, Singular, Uncontroulable Authority over all the Pastors of his District or Diocess, tho' never so large, and an Absolute Negative over all their Judgments or Votes, nay exercis'd so Absolute a Power over them, that he was not so much as oblig'd to ask their Advice in the Exercise of this his Dominion.

Now, here is a Mystery suiting J. S's Skill to Unriddle the same. These great Doctors and Lights of the Church in that Third Age, having all the Advantages instanced by him, together with a fix'd correspondent Resolution of Adherence to Divine and Apostolick Institutions, in point of Doctrine and Worship, and, in special, in point of Church Government; And he will, no doubt, owne their Design and Inclination accordingly; Yet, in the momentuous points instanced, clearly crossing and contradicting the same, and this both in Judgment and Practice. That the Scriptures instanced do condemn the premis'd Accounts of their Practice and Principles, is evident to any that will suitably consider the Scope and Sense thereof, as exhibited by all Orthodox Interpreters. So that, of necessity, J. S. must either impeach this genuine Sense, and make it regulable by the premis'd Principles and Practices of these great Men in the Third Age, (and thus owne

and assert a Principle evidently overthrowing the Scriptures Authority and Infallibility) or acknowledge the Insufficiency of the pretended Grounds instanced to reach his Conclusion, and consequently the Unsoundness of the Ground and Foundation of his whole Pamphlet.

Finally the Scripture Bishop stands so describ'd, that his Power appears *meerly Spiritual*, absolutely exclusive of *Civil Rule and Dominion*, or such as is like to that of *Kings of the Gentiles*, or is in any Measure involv'd in the Civil Affairs of this Life. Thus *Matth. 20, 25, 26*. The great Master of the House Discharges his Servants *all Prince-like Dominion over their Fellows*, or the Exercise of such Authority upon them as is of this Nature; Commending, in Opposition thereunto, Ministerial Humble Service and Diligence in the Pastoral Office. And the Apostle, *2 Tim. 2. 4.* enjoyns *Timothy* (our Prelatical Men's pretended Bishop) *not to intangle himself with the Affairs of this Life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a Souldier*. So that both places collated do clearly infer not only an absolute Discharge of Civil Rule to all Church Officers, but whatever Government hath in its Nature and Exercise an Affinity with a Regal or Civil Dominion.

But that the *Cyprianic* Bishop pleaded for by *J. S.* stands cross to these Scriptures, is evident two ways. 1. His *Cyprianic* Bishop is cloathed with a *Tribunitian, Censorian*, yea *Absolute Power*, *Chap. 5. § 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41*. Yea is the same to his Diocess, that a *King is to his Kingdom*, and hath a *Kingly Majesty* properly ascribeable to him, *Ch 6. § 46, 47, 48, &c.* Besides his *Sacerdotii Sublime Fastigium*, *§ 35. 2ly*, As he asserts these Prerogatives of the *Cyprianic* Bishop, so the *English* and *Scottish* Hierarchy which he pleads for, he cannot deny, hath a *Civil Rule* annex'd thereunto, our Prelates being *Peers in Parliament*, and such *Spiritual Lords* as make up a Third Estate, or Fourth, if he please, in *Scotland*, and, in his Judgment and Principles, are an Essential Part of that High Judicatory. That they do otherwise possess chief Offices of State, and are engag'd and involv'd in the grand Affairs and Counsels thereof, he cannot but grant, as to Matter of Fact, and ownes the *Fus* thereof.

Now let him reconcile this, if he can, with the premised Scriptures discharging all Church Officers the Intanglement of Civil Affairs, and that under the Terrible insinuated Punishment and Threarning of being disown'd and rejected by the Lord Jesus, as none of his faithful Servants and Souldiers. Let him reconcile it, if he can, with that Scripture, *Luk. 12. 13. 14.* where the Lord Jesus Christ, the true Head and King of his Church, *refused to Determine the Controversie between the two contending Brethren about the Inheritance*, yea or so much as to give

Advice

Advice in that Matter. Our Lord's Answer to the Man who importun'd him to speak to his Brother to divide the Inheritance with him, was this, *Man, who made me a Judge, or a Divider over you.* And if the Churches Head thus declin'd all Civil Judgment and interposing in Civil Affairs, these Court Prelates must be odd Monsters, whose pretended Episcopal Power goes beyond that of the Glorious Head and Saviour of the Body. I need not tell this Antiquary, how the Ancient Canons condemn such meddling, and what Censure is put upon the same by the Sixth of these call'd Apostolick, also by Can. 81, and 83. appointing *such Bishops to be depos'd, as medled in State Affairs.* Also *Con. Chal. Can. 3. Con. Carth. Can. 16. Can. 7. Concil. Chalced.* See *Balsamon Comment. in Can. Apost. Concil. & Patrum*, and in *Photii Nomo. Can.* Nor need I tell him, that, according to *Socrates, Lib. 7. C. 7.* *Cyril was the first Bishop in Alexandria, who had Civil Dignities conferr'd upon him,* from whom Civil Authority did descend upon succeeding Bishops. Whence the Custom came, saith *Nicephorus, Lib. 14. C. 14.* that, in *Ecclesia Alexandrina, Episcopi etiam profana negotia curarunt*: Bishops were involv'd in the Care of Prophane or Civil Affairs. Whereupon ensu'd this Consequence, *viz.* That *Orestes the Roman Governour* seeing his Power weakened by the Bishops interposing in Secular Affairs, hated the Bishop and this his usurped Power: *Socrates, Lib. 7. C. 19.* He should consider, that his beloved *Cyprian, Lib. 1. Epist. 66.* holds, that *Singuli Divino Sacerdotio Honorati non nisi Altari & Sacrificiis deservire, & Precibus atque Orationibus vacare debent, Molestiis Secularibus non sunt obligandi, qui Divinis Rebus & Spiritualibus occupantur.* That these who are devoted to the Sacred Ministry, ought to attend the Altar, Sacrifice and Prayer, and beware of Worldly Intanglements, as being exercis'd in Matters Divine and Spiritual. Nay the same *Cyprian* did judge *Bishops meddling in Secular Affairs* to have been one great Cause of *Persecution rais'd against the Church, de Laps. Sect. 4.*

Now let *J. S.* reconcile, if he can, his *Scottish* and *English* Hierarchy with *Cyprian*, and their *State Offices* with his *Absolute Aversion from the same.* So that he is put upon this hard Dilemma, or *Scylla* and *Charybdis*, either to disowne his so much admir'd *Cyprian* in this his Holy Judgment and Resolution, (which he cannot but acknowledge to be most consonant to the Scripture Rule) or condemn our late *Scottish* and present *English* Prelates, as gross Usurpers, and Prophaners of the Sacred Ministry, in their *State Offices* and *Employments*; Especially since their pretended Bishop *Timothy*, besides, what is above touch'd, to this purpose, is enjoyn'd by the Apostle, *1 Tim. 4. 15. Meditate upon these things, give thy self wholly to them, that thy profiting may appear to all.*

If he was to give himself wholly to Spiritual Employments, and if this Precept and Command reaches all Bishops, what Access is there, I pray, for State Offices and Employments? The great Apostle of the Gentiles, *Paul*, speaking of his Spiritual Employment and Office, *2 Cor. 2. 16.* saith, *Who is sufficient for these things?* Are our Prelates beyond his sufficiency, who can perform all Spiritual Duties to a whole Diocese, and manage State Affairs too? 'Tis remarked of *Augustin*, that he call'd a Bishop or Minister's meddling in Civil Affairs *Angaria*, or a Servile compell'd Drudgery *hindering Prayer and Spiritual Duties*, *Epist. 81.* But this Yoke is sweet and easie to our Spiritual Lords, which doth much discover what Spirit they are of, much of that Disposition with those tax'd by the Apostle, *Phil. 3. 19.* *Who mind Earthly Things*, to whom he thus opposes himself, and consequently Faithful Pastors, *For our Conversation is in Heaven, from whence also we look for the Saviour.* This gave occasion to a Godly Learn'd English Divine, *Mr. Banes*, to put upon that Set of Men this Character, *They are a Generation of the Earth, Earthly, and savour not of the Ways of the Lord.*

Having, in these Instances, evinced the uncontravertible Antithesis betwixt *J. S's Cyprianic* and the *Apostolick Bishop*, the palpable and clear Discrepancy of the One from the Other, when, upon the one hand, having heard from Scripture, the Character of the Divinely appointed Bishop, upon the other hand, having in view the Frame and Portraiture of the *Hierarchical Diocesan*, or pretended *Cyprianic Bishop*, as represented by *J. S.* The Question arises, but very easie and soon resolv'd, which of the Two we shall in this point prefer, the *Cyprianick* or *Apostolick*, the Bishop of the one Mould or the other, whether we shall listen to, and obtemper *Paul* and the other Apostles their Account and Description of the Bishop's Office, or *J. S's* Representation of a *Cyprianic* Bishop in the Third Age, or which of these Ancients is of greater Authority, *Divus Paulus*, *Divus Petrus*, *Divus Johannes*, *St. Paul*, *St. Peter*, *St. John*, or *St. Cyprian*; Whether the Doctrine and Practice of the first Apostolick Age, or of the Third Age, is to be preferr'd, in determining the Controversie of Church Government? The Determination and Answer of this Question is, no doubt, ready and easie with all who are of sound Mind, and owne the Authority of the Word of God. And from this Solution, another Question following thereupon is as easie resolv'd; Whether this new Bantering Pleader and Pamphleter, pretending to present unto all the Churches the true Samplar and Frame of Church Government, yea and this from pure and infallible Antiquity, has not, instead of suitable managing this Work, prov'd himself an ignorant Impostor, in presenting, under the

Notion

Notion of the *Cyprianic*, or truly Divine Bishop, a Prelate of such a monstrous Shape, as is above made appear to be, in so many respects, cross to the Divine Pattern?

S E C T. V.

Wherein is made appear, that J. S. has, in this Pamphlet, oppos'd himself unto the Doctrine of the Reform'd Churches, in Two Eminent Points of the Orthodox Faith, scil. The Fallibility of the Church in any Age after the Times of the Apostles, and the Perfection of the Holy Scriptures, in all Things to be Believ'd and Practis'd in Point of Religion.

CONCERNING the first Point, of the *Churches Fallibility in any Age after the Apostles*, and consequently the Unsoundness of this Argument from Antiquity, the Judgment of the Reform'd Churches themselves, and the Famous Divines thereof, might be produc'd in a Multiplicity of Testimonies, in debating and asserting this Point against the Popish Adversary maintaining an absurd Infallibility. Our Confession of Faith, *Chap. 25. Art. 5.* asserts *this Truth of the Churches being subject to Mixture and Error from 1 Cor. 13. 12. Rev. 2. 3. Chapp. Mat. 13. 24, 25, &c. Turretin, Loc. 18. de Eccl. Quæst. 11. de Infallibilitate Ecclesiæ, Th. 5.* proposes thus the Orthodox Judgment of the Protestant Churches (after he has explain'd the Objective and Subjective Infalibility of the Church Invisible), *viz.* "That the Church Visible gather'd together in its particular Assemblies through the World, whether consider'd Collectively or Representatively in its Governours, and these, whether they be consider'd singly or apart, or all of them jointly in Council, yet, in neither Sense, is she Infalible, but may fall into deadly Error, as well in point of Faith as Manners and Practice, and that both in Questions of Right and of Fact, and that the Privilege of Infalibility can no longer be competent to either Church or Person after the Times of the Apostles. This Judgment and Sentence, if true, does intirely overthrow the

Scope and Pleadings of J. S. and that pretended Infallibility he ascribes to the Cyprianic Age, yea Cyprian's Epistles and other Writings.

That his Pleading is of this Nature, needs no renewed Demonstration, beside what is already offer'd; Since, from these Writings, as is said, he pretends to give the Parting-Blow, and a final Decision of the main Controversie between Presbyterians and Episcopalians, yea and to stop their Mouths as to all their Reasonings from Scripture, and from these Writings, and the Practice of that Age, to evince the necessity of Episcopal Government, so that this *Sacred Interest of Episcopacy* renders them highly guilty, who disowne or separate from the same, as being a Government not only of Divine *Approbation*, but *Institution*, Thus, Chap. 10. last two §§.

These Assertions do clearly impute the premis'd Infallibility to that Age, both in the Question of *Fact*, and *Right*, as is evident to any that shall consider, that he founds this Charge, and the Divine Right mention'd, upon this Ground and Topick, That the Divine Right and Institution of Episcopacy *was an Article of their Belief in that Age*.

But to proceed with our Author last mention'd, we cannot stand upon a large Rehearsal and Account of the weighty and important Grounds, which he offers of the premis'd Judgment of the Reform'd Churches, taken from the Imperfection of Regeneration in this Life, and that we know and prophesie but in part, 1 Cor. 13. 9. from the tacite Condition of Perseverance in the Faith annex'd unto the Promises given unto the Church. John 8. 31. *If you abide in my Word, you shall be my Disciples indeed.* Thus, Chap. 14. 21. *He that hath my Commandments and keepeth them, he it is that loveth me; And he that loveth me shall be loved of my Father, and I will love him and manifest my self unto him, compar'd with v. 23. So Rom. 11. 22. Behold therefore the Goodness and Severity of God: On them which fell, Severity; But towards thee Goodness, if thou continue in his Goodness: Otherwise thou also shall be cut off.* He argues further from the Fallibility of all Pastors, Governours, or Members of the Church apart; From the Scripture's Silence of any such Infallibility; From the Apostle Paul's Warning the Church of Rome it self of the Hazard of Defection; From the Instance of the Fall of the Jewish Church, Rom. 11. 20. *Because of Unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by Faith. Be not High-Minded, but Fear.* V. 21. *For if God spar'd not the Natural Branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee.* He reasons from the Experience of all Ages of the Church of Israel, from their Defection together with Aaron himself, Exod. 32. and under the Judges, Judg. 2. and under their Wicked and Idolatrous Kings, from the Error of the Synagogue,

or chief Sanhedrim, in the Days of our Saviour, corrupting the Law of God by their manifold Traditions, making the same of no effect thereby.

Further, from the New Testament Prophecies, concerning the Desfection of the Christian Church, and the Inundation of Errors, whereby it was to be overwhelm'd, by the means of false Prophets, false Christs, and seducing Spirits, *Mat. 7. 15. and Ch. 24. v. 24. 1 Tim. 4. 1. 2 Pet. 2. 3. 2 John 18.* From the Tryal and Examination of the Doctrine enjoyn'd unto the Faithful, *1 John 4. 1.* and that we are call'd to the Law and to the Testimony (*Isa. 8. 20.*), as the only Infallible Rule, &c.

Nor must we here omit the Judgment of the Orthodox which he produces, upon the point of Antiquity, *Quæst. 13.* against the Popish Adversary, who pleads these grand Marks of the Church, *scil. The Name of Catholick, Antiquity, Duration, the Succession of Bishops, the Harmony of the Doctrine with the Ancient Church,* (the grand Topicks of *J. S.*) *Thef. 9.* after he has made appear, that *Antiquity* (so much idoliz'd by *J. S.* and his Associates) is neither an *Essential, Proper, nor Inseparable Mark of the Church*, he adds, that it is most obscure and fallacious. *Obscurissima*, saith he, *quia ejus Cognitio pendet ex accurata omnium seculorum Cognitione, quotusquisque autem est qui possit hanc Notitiam assequi, & certo scire quando hæc vel illa Doctrina & Ecclesia cæperit.* The Obscurity of this Note of Antiquity he proves, because the Certainty thereof depends upon the exact Knowledge of all Ages, but where is the Man, saith he, that is able to reach and attain this Knowledge, and infallibly to understand when this or that Doctrine or Church had its beginning. Unfortunate Men who had not the Happiness to Consult our great Doctor *J. S.* who could have taught him the Certainty of Antiquity from *Oral Tradition*, *Chap. 1 § 44. 45, 46, &c.*

But thus proceeds our Author in his second Charge, *viz. The Mark of Antiquity is fallacious.* And let us hear his Reason, *Nam ut Gabionitæ, saith he, simulata longa Profectione, deceperunt Israelitas, sic Antiquitatem multi mentiuntur, qui veri tantum aut nudius tertius orti sunt, & quorum inventa valde sunt recentia.* That, as the Gibeonites deceiv'd the Israelites, in feigning a long Journey, so there are many make a lying pretence of Antiquity, to cover Inventions that are but of yesterday. To this he adds, that the Pagans, in their Disputes against Christians, did always provoke them to alledg'd Antiquity. That *Justin, Apol. 2.* ascribes to the Heathens, that, in Debates, they had this Cant, *Bonum est veteres Consuetudines servare*, it is good to keep the old Customs. That *Justin* asserts, that to prefer Custom and Antiquity to Truth, is a

piece of the Madness of the Foolish. That Symmachus, in *Epist. ad Theodosium apud Ambros. Lib. 3. Epist. 30.* pleads thus, *Si longa Aetas Auctoritatem Religionibus conciliat, servanda est tot seculis fides, & sequendi nobis Parentes qui secuti sunt feliciter suos.* That if Antiquity conciliates Authority to Religion, we must owne and follow that Religion and Faith, which has been happily deliver'd from Father to Son. *Lactantius, Lib. 2. Inst. C. 2.* shews, *That Antiquity had such Authority with the Heathen, that they held it peculiar to examine what was thus deliver'd unto them.*

Several things to this purpose may be read, *Th. 9, 10, 11, 12.* He tells the Popish Adversary, that we answer them as the Ancients did the Pagans, that we must make an Estimate of Religion not from its Antiquity, but from its *Verity and Truth*, citing also that notable Passage of Cyprian, *Epist. 74.* that *Consuetudo sine Veritate vetustas Erroris est*, that Custom without Truth is but a Moolty Error. As also that other saying, *Epist. 63. Si solus Christus est audiendus, non debemus attendere quid alius ante nos faciendum putaverat; Sed quid, qui ante omnes est, Christus prior fecerit. Nec enim Hominis Consuetudinem sequi oportet, sed Dei Veritatem.* If Christ alone is to be heard, (and indeed such was the Father's Voice from Heaven, *Hear him*) we are not to heed what others before us have judg'd to be done, but what Christ hath done, who is before all. For we are not to follow the Customs of Men, but the Truth of God. Adding some notable Passages of his Master *Tertullian* to the same purpose, as in *Apolog. Ch. 47.* and *Lib. de Veland. Virgin. Cap. 1.* where he rejects the Length of Time, the Patrocinie of Persons, as unfit Pleadings in point of Truth and Religion. Thus, *Lib. 1. con. Marcion. Cap. 8.* Thus also, *Lib. 4. con. Marcion.* where he shews, that we must consider what's to be found deliver'd by the Apostles, what was Sacred in the Apostolick Churches, and thus seek Truth from that Original. Remarkable also is that Passage ascrib'd to Cyprian *ex Gregorio, Qualibet Consuetudo, quantumvis vetusta, quantumvis Vulgata, Veritati omnino est postponenda, &c. Jure Canon. 5. Verit. Dist. 8. & ex Gregorio.* Our Author adds, that since only the Scripture is Divine and Authentick, more Ancient than all other Writings, but the Writings of Fathers, whence the Adversaries draw their Antiquity, are, Comparatively, New, Humane and more Intricate, and, in a great measure, Dubious and Spurious; of necessity, the Scripture alone must be our Rule of Doctrinal Antiquity. Thus, *Thef. 12.* And, *Thef. 11.* he appositely rejects Antiquity, if understood with respect to Men, who are changeable and die, or with respect to Places and Temples, because a New Doctrine may sound in an Old Edifice, or with respect to Ancient Cathedrals or Episcop-

pal Chairs, because such as sit in them may change the Doctrine of their Predecessors. *Antiquity*, saith he, *must be measur'd only by the Doctrine flowing from the Holy Scriptures.*

Thef. 13, 14. He overthrows one main Ground and Topick of *J. S.* and his Fellows, which *Bellarmino* presented before them, *Lib. 3. de Eccles. Milit. Cap. 5.* who, in all signal Changes, will have the Author, the Time, the Place, demonstrable, who also impugn'd the Doctrine, &c. Our Author calls this a subtle Figment and meer Illusion, which he illustrates by this Similitude, *If one, saith he, shall find a Man fall'n in a Ditch, shall he doubt or deny, that he is fallen into it against the Sight of his own Eyes, unless he first understand when he fell into it, or by whom he was cast into the same.* If it can be demonstrated, saith he, that an Assertion is not deliver'd in Scripture, the Change of Truth into a Lie is thus sufficiently evident, altho' neither the Time nor Place of this Mutation, nor the Author of the Opinion is known. The Rule of Truth which God has given to us is the Word, not the History of Ages; True Antiquity therefore must be made good from Scripture. Behold all *J. S.*'s Suggestions, in point of Antiquity, blown away with a Breath.

Let that which he has *Thef.* 29. against the Argument drawn from the Succession of Bishops be duely pondered, which will evidently confirm what is said. He tells us of *Annas and Caiaphas Succeeding to Aaron in the Priesthood; The Scribes and Pharisees Succeeding to the Fathers and Interpreters of the Law; The Arrians Succeeding the Oribodox:* He instances also *the Greek Church boasting of an uninterrupted Succession of Bishops from the Apostles:* That local and personal Succession may be without the Succession of the Doctrine, and that it can not be a true Church which rejects the Apostolick Doctrine. To this purpose, many pregnant Passages might be cited from the Famous and Learn'd Dr. *Strang, de Interp. & Perf. Scrip. & de Jud. Contr. &c. Lib. 1. Cap. 16.* to prove that the Church is not *Infallible Judge* in Controversies of Religion. His first Argument runs thus, *Nullus Judex restrictus & alligatus, &c.* No Judge restricted to a Law or Rule, plac'd by a Superior, can be call'd absolutely *Infallible*. But the Church is thus restricted. *Ergo, &c.* The Minor he proves from *Ephes. 2. 20.* and *Deut. 5. 32, 18, 14. Josh. 23. 6. Is. 8. 20.* citing *August, de Unitate Eccl. Cap. 3.* who shews that we must search for the true Church in the Scriptures. The next Argument he draws from the Churches Mutability, which stands in opposition to *Infallibility*. Further, he thus Reasons, That if any Man or Company of Men were *Infallible Judge* in matters of Faith, then our Faith should depend upon a meer Humane Judgment;

ment; Proving, in another Argument that a Divine Faith cannot be resolv'd into a Humane Testimony. Several other things he hath in that Chapter, clearly overthrowing J. S's Principles.

The University of Saumer, *Syntagm. Thes. Loc. de Infalib. Eccl. Thes.* 33. do deny the Universal Church Visible to be *Infalible*, upon this Ground, that since it is an entire Body, made up of particular parts and Churches, and every particular Church is obnoxious to Error, as before had been demonstrated, thence they hold, it necessarily follows, that this whole Body is of such a Nature, as may lose its Integrity. That place, *Matth. 18. 20. Where two or three are gathered together in my Name, there am I in midst of them*, pleaded for the Infalibility of General Councils, they thus interpret and apply, *Nemo negare potest quin Promissio sit conditionata (istud enim in Nomine meo) conditionem includit, quæ Promissionis executionem suspendit.* That none can deny that the Promise is Conditional, since that Clause in My Name suspends the performance of the Promise. Adding, that our Lord, without doubt, accomplisheth the Promise wherever the Condition is performed: But unless the Condition be performed, this Promise can have no Accomplishment. Thus *Thes. 35.*

To the same Sense and Scope do the Professors of *Leyden* give their Judgment in this point, *Disp. 40. de Eccl. Thes. 44. & seqq.* Ascribing only *Infalibility to the Church in so far as adhering to the Divine Rule*, not otherwise.

* *Syst. Univers. Theol. Loc. 16. Thes. 56. & seqq.*

To this Sense also *Maresius **, telling us that *Aaron* Err'd in the Faith when framing the Golden Calf, and building an Altar before it, *Exod. 32. 2, 5. Urias* in making an Altar, according to the Similitude of that in *Damascus*, putting it in the place of the Brazen Altar, which was before the Lord, *2 King. 16. 18, 11, 12, &c. Caiaphas* when, in the great Council, he concluded and determin'd the Death of Christ, *John 11. 50.* adding, *Thes. 57.* that since Faith is to be perswaded out of the Scriptures, not Commanded by Authority of Men, 'tis sufficient for the Church of God that she has in the Scriptures an *Infalible Rule of Faith*; Nor is it requisite, that she have such Pastors as are beyond all hazard of Erring: Asserting further, that these places of Scripture, *1 Tim. 3. 15.* where the Church is call'd *The Pillar and Ground of Truth*, and that of *Mal. 2. 7. The Priests Lips should keep Knowledge, and they should seek the Law at his Mouth*, and that of *Matth. 18. 17. If he neglect to hear the Church, let him be unto thee as an Heathen and a Publican*; cannot at all be drawn to prove an *Infalibility in the Church*, since they do only point at the Duties of the Church and of her

her Pastors, and do therefore pronounce an Infallibility in so far as the Scripture is adher'd to, and in that respect only.

The Famous *Rivet* * gives thus the Sense of the Reform'd Church; The Adversary, saith he, (scil. the Jesuit *Bailius*, against whom he Disputes) denies that the Church can Err, scil. the Visible Church Militant, as he had before defin'd and explain'd the same. *Nos contra*, saith he, *ipsam & errare posse & sæpius errasse asserimus*. We on the contrary do assert both that the Church may Err, and often hath Err'd. *Ideoque dicimus ipsius sententiam Definitivam nec certam nec Fidei infallibilem Regulam esse posse*. And do therefore hold that the Churches Definitive Sentence can neither be a certain nor infallible Rule of Faith. ——— Adding, *Sola veritatis Regula cum sit Verbum Dei, &c.* That since the Word of God is the only Rule of Truth, wherein no Lie nor Imperfection can be found, every Church, and all the Members of the Church are to be brought to this Touchstone, and measur'd by this Rule. Thereafter he Answers to the premis'd Scriptures, to the Scope and Sense above touch'd.

* *Cathol. Or. rhod. Tract. 2. Quest. 3. Pag. 183.*

Chamierus, [*Panstr. Cathol. Tom. 5. de Natura Eccl. Cap. 14.* whereof the Title and Inscription is, *Ecclesiam in Religione errare posse & solere demonstratur*. He demonstrates, that the Church, both may err, and usually doth.] upon this Controversie, Whether the Church may err? proposes these three Conclusions, 1. *Ecclesia in his terris Militans potest errare*, that the Church Militant on Earth may err. 2. *Ecclesia Externa, seu Visibilis tota errare potest, & totaliter atque finaliter, h. e. non solum hæc vel illa particularis, sed etiam universalis Profutentium Turba, in rebus plurimis, imo sæpe in omnibus ad Religionem spectantibus omnino errare potest, & sæpius ipsa errat. Imo etiam interdum perniciosæ & fundamentalibus Erroribus obruta esse desinit. Tota inquam illa Visibilis Ecclesia errare potest fundamentaliter, at non totum illius, quatenus nempe immixtos habet Fideles, vel Ecclesia Visibilis tota potest errare in Fundamento, si sumatur Opposite, at non si sumatur Composite quatenus conjuncta est cum Invisibili*. That the whole External Visible Church may err, yea and totally and finally, that is, not only this or that particular Church, but also the Universal Multitude of Professors may, and often-times doth absolutely err in many things, yea and in all points of Religion. It may also disappear, being overwhelm'd with pernicious and fundamental Errors. The whole Visible Church, I say, may fundamentally err, but not absolutely, as to all that is included therein, in so far as the Faithful are mixed therein; Or thus, The whole Visible Church may err in the Foundation, if understood in a Sense Opposite to the Faithful and Elect

but not if we understand it in the *Compound Sense*, or as conjoin'd with the Church Invisible. 3. Conclusion is, *Ecclesia Interna seu Invisibilis, adeoque Catholica errare potest in rebus levioribus quæ non ita scitu vel observatu sunt necessaria.* That the Invisible and Internal Catholick Church may err in Matters of lesser moment, which are not so necessary to be known or practis'd. The first and second Conclusion he proves at large in this Chapter; Confuting fully, Chap. 15. the contrary Opinion of the Papists. It were a large and laborious Work, to recite the many other Testimonies of our Protestant Divines, asserting the premis'd Conclusions, nor were it needful to such as understand the Protestant Doctrine in this point.

But now, to apply and subsume upon what is said, If the Principles and Practice of the Church existing in the Third Age be, in point of Government, a certain Rule obliging all the Churches, and the Touch-stone of Rectitude therein, beyond all peradventure, the Churches Infallibility in this point must needs be laid down as *the Basis and Foundation* of such an Argument. And it is equally certain, that removing this fictitious denyed Infallibility, so repugnant to the Judgment and Sentiments of all the Reform'd Churches, the whole Frame and Fabrick of J. S's Laborious Pamphlet is overthrown and falls to the Ground.

That the Scope and Series of this large Fardel of Testimonies supposes this Infallibility, is obvious to any that shall read this Pamphlet, whereof we have hinted some Discoveries. We have said, that the Vain-glorious Epilogue puts this beyond all Debate, when triumphing in his great performances in this Work, he tells us, he has made appear, "That the Cyprianic Age might have had (he should say, must have had, if he speak Sense and to the point, as is evident from what he offers, Chap. 1. from § 20. to 51.) "certain Knowledge, yea full Assurance of that Form of Government the Apostles left in these Churches, whose Constitution they liv'd to finish, that, with the greatest Assurance, they did universally believe and profess it, as an unquestionable Point of their Faith, that Episcopacy was not only of Divine Approbation, but of Divine Institution, a Divine Ordinance as properly as any other whatsoever.

Moreover, let us see how he treats those who reject this Prelacy. "Let all Presbyterians, *saieth he*, and all other Sectaries (*bona verba*) who reject Episcopal Government, consider what a Presumption (this with J. S. is too low a Term, therefore he adds) 'or rather what a Demonstration (here's his strongest Topick and Argument) 'the Universal Faith and Practice of the Cyprianic Age is against them. Let all

‘all who are but for the Indifferency of Episcopal Government (and sure much more those whose Judgment is against it, and as they do judge upon solid Scripture Grounds) ‘weigh their Arguments over again, let them joyn them all together, and put them in the Ballance with the *Principles*, and the *Universal Belief* of the Christians of the Cyprianic Age, and ingenuously confess, that, all things considered, they are very light and of very little moment. See *Pag.* 535, 536.

Now, from what is premis’d, let any of common Ingenuity or Candor judge, if *J. S.* has not ascrib’d an Infallibility to the Principles and Practices of that Age, and propos’d the same as a Samplar and Rule to all other Churches in point of Government. For, 1. That he doth, for this end, propound it, is beyond all Debate from what is said; And not offering the least Scripture Ground for the same, or as the *Regula Regulans* of these suppos’d Principles and Practice, of necessity it is, that these Principles and Practice themselves he propounds as this Rule, and therefore, by necessary Consequence, must suppose an *Infallibility*. 2ly, Whereas he alledges, they might have had most *certain Knowledge*, most *full Assurance*, what Form of Government the Apostles left in the Churches; If it shall be objected, and this Demur put to him *scil.* “They might not have had that certain Knowledge or full Assurance, or that even, upon Supposition of their *Knowledge*, there might have been a Byass in their Inclination: All the Refuge and Answer that this Man has, is, that Episcopacy practis’d in their time was believ’d, and by them receiv’d as a Divine Institution; And thus, all the Assurance we can have ultimately rests upon, and is resolv’d in the *Belief*, *Profession* and *Practice* of that Age in this point, without the least shadow of the Divine Warrant thereof, which, by an infallible Consequence, will impute an Infallibility thereunto. 3ly, This is yet convincingly apparent, in that he challenges all that are against the Divine Right of Episcopal Government to *weigh their Arguments over again*. Now he cannot deny they are *Scripture-Arguments*, and more than one or two, and they judge they are solidly founded on Scripture and Divine Reason: But he will have them to *weigh them over again*, supposing he can give a better Topick, and overturn all their Foundations: But how? By offering Counter-Arguments from Scripture? No such Matter: But they must lay down all their Weapons, and quite their Scripture Perswasion upon reading his Illustrious History of the *Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic Age*. Here is Infallibility with a Witness. Yet again, when all the Scripture Arguments are joyn’d together in their utmost Strength, *they must confess, that, when weigh’d, they are found wanting,*

wanting, they are (to use his Terms) found light, yea, very light, and of very little moment, and thus all that are contrary minded, must, of necessity, confess their Error in this point, unless they be disingenuous and Hypocritical, and harden'd against clear Conviction.

Now, I pray, what is that Ballance, or Touch-stone of Truth in this Controversie, that will give so exact a Determination, and thus baffle all their former Sentiments? Is it the Ballance of the Sanctuary? No such Matter; For, as I said, no Scripture Argument doth here appear. What then is that ponderous weighty thing in the other Scale of the Ballance, that doth so absolutely preponderate all Presbyterians Scripture Arguments against Episcopacy, so as to make them to be, yea and appear to be lighter than Vanity? J. S. will soon resolve the Doubt, and tells us, that the over-ballancing thing in the other Scale is the *Principles and Universal Belief of the Christians of the Cyprianic Age*. If this import not Infallibility, greater Nonsense was never spoken nor written, as in truth grosser Heterodoxy in this point cannot be readily assign'd. I remember, I have sometime seen, as an Hieroglyphick of the Lightness of Popish Traditions, a Ballance represented, having in the one Scale a great Number of Popish Superstitious Trinkets, and in the other a Bible out-weighting them all; But our honest J. S. inverts the Order, and, instead of the Book of God, gives us the *Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic Age*, putting that in the Scale to out-weight all contrary Sentiments in this point, even from the Scripture it self.

Many other things through his Pamphlet, and in this Epilogue, may be glean'd up to prove his imputing an Infallibility to this Third Age, which we need not here stand upon, the Matter it self being clear. We know what the Denomination of *Sectary* imports, *scil.* Persons deserting the Faith and Fellowship of the True Church. This Man puts such a Blot and Stigma upon Presbyterians, for deserting his suppos'd *Principles and Practice of the Third Age*, asserting thus the Objective and Subjective Certainty of that Age in point of Government. And, in further Confirmation hereof, he afterward, in a piece of Seditious Insolent Boldness, accuseth the Civil Government, with respect to the present Constitution of our Church, as proceeding only from Men drunk with Worldly Principles, exposing himself thus, as a Criminal, to the just Censure of our Laws.

Now what is the Ground (think we) of this Treasonable Seditious Accusation, and of such a gross Imputation upon our Parliament, that, in "the present Establishment, they pursue only Temporal Interest, and Unaccountable Humours, in Subserviency to Worldly Politicks? The great Ground of this weighty Charge lyes here, "They

“ They made bold with the Sacred Interest of Bishops, so that, in touching such Laws with the Scepter, they have oppos’d the Divine Prerogative of God Almighty. Well, this deep Charge and Imputation upon our Rulers and Government requires, no doubt, the Voice of God from the Divine Oracles to make it good, but we must know, instead of this, *J. S.* presents to our Rulers, to convince them of this Sacrilegious Usurpation, the *Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic Age*, so pure, so Holy, so Apostolick, yea so Divinely Inspir’d with *Extraordinary Manifestations of the Spirit* (as he asserts, *Ch. 1. § 34.*), that, to impeach the same, is as highly Piacular, as to withstand the Apostles themselves. Probably some ill-humour’d and Sarcastick Wits would make it here a Probleme, Whether this Man’s Folly or Seditious Humour did most predomine? Consequently, Whether the Pillory, the Fool’s Cape, or the Halter, were the most suitable Check and Punishment for such Unaccountable Insolency?

But, in further Proof, we may observe what Grounds of strong Consolation, and undaunted Courage in suffering for the Belov’d Hierarchy, he offers in this Epilogue to his Associates. He tells them, they may be fully assur’d, “ they suffer in a good Cause, for the sake of Righteousness, for the Testimony of a good Conscience, and that suffering in such a Cause ought to animate and inspire with true Christian Courage and Resolution to suffer patiently and perseveringly. No doubt, these are, in themselves considered, excellent Grounds of Incouragement, yea and Scripture Grounds. I remember the Psalmist, *Psal. 74. v. 22.* prays thus, *Arise, O God, plead thine own Cause, remember how the foolish Man reproacheth thee daily.* The Apostle Peter, *1 Pet. 3. 14.* pronounceth them happy who suffer for Righteousness sake. And the Apostle Paul, *2 Cor. 1. 12.* presents the Testimony of a good Conscience as a precious Ground of Rejoicing, *For our Rejoycing is this, saith he, the Testimony of our Conscience, that in Simplicity and Godly Sincerity, not with Fleshly Wisdom, but by the Grace of God, we have had our Conversation in the World.* Well, *J. S.* will readily acknowledge, that these Grounds, when applyed to any Person or Cause, must needs have a Divine Warrant, that they be not misapplyed to fortifie Delusions, and a groundless Hope, instead of solid Peace. The Cause, which is the Good Cause, must be, from the Word, instructed to be the Cause of God. And the same Word of God being the Great Rule of Holiness and Righteousness, suffering for the Sake of Righteousness, must have the same Foundation. And the Testimony of the good Conscience must needs be a joynt Testimony with the Spirit speaking in the Word, *Rom. 8. 16. The Spirit it self beareth Witness with our Spirit, &c.* And ’tis the Word only which is the

the Spirits Ministration, 2 Cor. 3. 8. Hence it will inevitably follow, if not in J. S.'s Acknowledgment, yet in the Acknowledgment and Sense of all sound Christians, that the *Good Cause*, *Good* because of the *Righteousness* and *Equity* thereof, and the Testimony of a *Good Conscience*, with respect to both, must needs have a sound and sure Foundation in the *Word of God*; Since Men pursuing Temporal Interests, Unaccountable Humours (to use J. S.'s Expression) and very bad Principles and Designs, may pretend these Grounds, when justly Punish'd and Suffering for a Bad Cause, for an Ungodly Cause, and with an Evil Conscience.

This being uncontrovertibly clear, what, I pray, are the Grounds assign'd by J. S. to prove the *Good Cause*, and to found the Testimony of the *Good Conscience* and true *Christian Courage and Resolution* in Suffering patiently and perseveringly? Here you have it in his own Words, 'Tis in adhering to Principles so universally receiv'd, so firmly believ'd, so religiously adher'd to in such a Glorious Age, scil. the Cyprianic, or third Age, which he thus Extolls: So that this *Glorious Age* is the only Authentick Ground and Proof of all the premises: In adhering to which, scil. in point of Episcopacy, he assures all his Associates they live in *Communion with God*, and with the *Lord Jesus Christ*, the Saviour. Now, take this Assertion in its complex Sense, and with respect to his Scope, and in special considering, that, a *capite ad calcem* of his whole Pamphlet, there is not the least hint of a Scripture Ground assign'd by him to Fortifie these big Words and bold Assertion, and the Principles of this Age so much admir'd by him, reflecting, withal, upon what is premis'd of the several gross Errors vident in that Age, own'd by the chief Doctors thereof, yea by Cyprian himself, and that he does not so much as pretend to offer any Reply to the Arguments pleaded for Presbyterian Government; May we not say, in Reading this Man's Epilogizing Audacity and Confidence upon such simple insignificant Grounds, *Quis talia fando, talia legendo, temperet ab admiratione, si non risu*, and with a well grounded Confidence affirm, that, as he has, upon the Ground assign'd, impeach'd the Protestant Doctrine, so he has outstript all his Fellows in a temerarious and unprecedented Audacity, wherein he shall be allow'd the Honour and Preference. Thus we pass to the next point.

The next great point of Truth, uncontrovertible with all the Reform'd Churches, which J. S. has impeach'd, is *The Perfection of the Holy Scriptures*, maintain'd and vindicated against the Popish Adversary, in opposition to Unwritten Traditions, asserted and vindicated against that fictitious Authority of the Church in point of Traditions which they do maintain.

tain. For, admitting once this Principle, for which J. S. contends in his whole Pamphlet, and which is the Fundamental Topick and Ground of all his Pleading, *viz.* That the Principles and Practice of the Cyprianic Age, in point of Church Government, are the Rule to which the Faith and Practice of the Church in this point is to be conform'd, 'tis then evident, that the great Protestant Truth and Principle, touching the Perfection of the Holy Scripture, as the sole Authentick Rule of Faith and Practice in point of Religion, and the great Rule and Judge in point of Religious Controversies, is entirely overthrown, it being beyond all Contradiction evident, that both the one and the other cannot be the Authentick Rule, and what is in this point ascrib'd to the one, is infallibly denied to the other.

It were a large Work, and in this place not necessary, to present a full account of the consentient Judgment of Protestant Divines upon this point, and of the many important Arguments whereby they assert the Perfection of the Scriptures against unwritten Traditions, and such pretended Authority of the Church thereanent, as the Popish Adversary pleads for. All do know, who are acquaint with the Protestant Doctrine and Principles, that Protestant Divines do reject even the Universal Practice of whatever Age after the Apostles as no part of the Divine or Authentick Rule in point of Religion.

Turretin * proposes thus the Question, *An Scriptura sit Regula totalis & adequata Fidei & morum, an vero partialis tantum & inadequata?* Nos primum, inquit, tuemur, Pontificii posterius statuunt, qui volunt Traditiones non scriptas pari pietatis & affectus reverentia cum Scriptura esse recipiendas.

* Loc. 2. Quæst. 16 de Perfectione Scripturæ, Thes. 9.

Whether the Scripture be the total and adequat Rule of Faith and Manners, or only a Rule in part? He shews, that the Protestant Churches maintain the first, the Papists the second, who do affirm that unwritten Traditions are to be receiv'd with the same Religious Reverence and Affection as the Scriptures themselves; Citing the Council of Trent, Sess. 4. Decreeing this. Also Bekarmin de Verbo Dei, Cap. 2, 3. Thes. 10. He tells us, That *Præiverunt in Traditionibus accipendis Pontificiis Judei qui Legem partiebantur in Scriptam & Orale*, &c. "That the Jews led the way to the Papists in this point of Traditions, who divided the Law in Written or Oral or Traditional, which Moses having receiv'd in Mount Sinai deliver'd to Joshua, Joshua to the 70 Elders, the 70 Elders to the Prophets, the Prophets to the great Synagogue, and so foreward till it was at last Written and Recorded in the Talmud. Hence flow'd, saith he, their manifold Traditions which our Lord rebukes, shewing that this was an Artifice of Sathan, whereby

whereby they were seduc'd from the Written Law and Word of God. Adding, *Eadem Arte effecit ut Pontificii duplex Dei Verbum finxerint, aliud Scriptum, aliud non Scriptum, &c.* "That the Papists make use of the same Artifice of Sathan, having feign'd, beside the Word Written, another Word or Scripture unwritten; As if Christ and his Apostles had Taught many things by Word, that were not committed to Writing. Hence arose the multitude of unwritten Traditions pleaded for by that Adversary, from which they draw their chief Strength and Arguments against the Protestant Faith, stuffing all their Controversial Writings with multiplied humane Testimonies of suppos'd Antient Writers.

In the same Method J. S. with his Associates deal with us in this Controversie, accosting and assaulting us with unwritten Conjectures, and *Oral Tradition* as from the Apostles. In which Method, with no small Confidence and Loquacity, we find J. S. pleading *Cap. 1. S. 44. 45, 46, &c.* heaping up a Number of Conjectures and foolish Elogies of that Age (whereof above) *scil.* "That it was an Age of great Men, affording many excellent Records, having the extraordinary Manifestations of the Spirit continued, that it was near to the Apostolick Age, so that they might have certainly known the Form of Government left by the Apostles, that so little time between John's Death and Cyprian's Promotion to the See of Carthage intervening, Alterations in the instituted Form of Government might have certainly been trac'd, and even by Oral Tradition.

And here we cannot but take notice of his Supposition produc'd *S. 44.* A fine Artifice, no doubt, to support the Papists unwritten Traditions by an *Oral Conveyance*, as likewise the Jews *Oral Conveyance* of their unwritten Law to their Talmud. He supposes, "Three Men of common Sense and Honesty attaining to 72 Years of Age a piece, the first of these Born in *Ann. 80*, the second *Ann. 132*, the third *Ann. 184*, thus Tradition might have been handed down securely. The second at the 20 Year of Age receiving a distinct account from the first, suppose of the Age of 20 Years, before the Apostle John died. So that the third at the Age of 20 might receive it from the second, and have been made Bishop in *Ann. 248.* (the Year in which Cyprian was made Bishop of Carthage) and to have continued in that Station for 8 Years, and died at the suppos'd Age of 72. A Noble Invention, no doubt, and a Demonstration no less than Mathematical, meriting a *Quod erat Demonstrandum* to be annex'd to it, whereof the Man is so confident, that he adds a suppos'd Proof from the

Chap. IV. (pretended) Principles of the Cyprianic Age. 177

the Instance of *Irenæus* and *Polycarp*. Let the Jews now exult upon the Ground of their Oral Tradition, so certainly receiv'd from *Moses* by the 70 Seniors, and from them deliver'd to the Prophets, from the Prophets to the great Synagogue, and (no doubt, at the first, at least) surely transmitted, in a short decurse of time : And here is a sure Topick overthrowing the Arguments of Protestant Divines, tending to prove the Uncertainty and Unsoundness of Oral Traditions in point of Religion. Concerning *Polycarp* our Pamphleter tells us, " That nothing is more certain in History, than that he was Consecrat-
" ed Bishop of *Smyrna* by the Apostle *John*. But let me ask this Gentle- man, Whether is the Faith and Truth of that History to be preferr'd to Scripture ? Whether is it to be measured by the Scripture ? Whether is the Scriptures Description of the Episcopal Function to be preferr'd to Historical Narrations, or this Historical Narration to be preferr'd to the Scripture ?

Irenæus * tells us, that he receiv'd by Word of Mouth (to render it in our Terms) from such as had it immediately from the Apostle *John* himself, that the Lord Jesus Christ Liv'd in this World above 50 Years. Behold an accurat Oral Tradition, more clear, because contain'd in shorter limits of time than in the Instance exhibited by J. S. I ask him then, is this Tradition certain ? He'll no doubt Answer, it is not, because contradicted by Scripture. Let him then upon this Concession retract his pitiful Jejune Argument from an Oral Tradition, since such a Tradition, of such apparent probable Certainty, is so clearly Reprobated by Scripture Light. And of necessity he must acknowledge this his Oral-Traditiona Argument, to be as light and unsound as the *unsoundest* Oral Tradition, until he shall give a solid Answer unto the Arguments drawn from Scripture against the Hierarchical Bishop's Office, which, no doubt, he will perform *ad Calendas græcas*.

Moreover, for what he has asserted of *Polycarp*, I would gladly know of him, whether he Judges that *Polycarp's* Office in the Church Government, and his Principles thereanent, were Antipods and Contradictory one to another. If he thinks they were not, but did well accord, then let him Reconcile his Oral Tradition anent *Polycarp's* Episcopacy, with his Doctrine and Principles in his Epistle to the *Philippians*, in which he makes two Orders of Ministry, *Bishops* and *Deacons*, correspondent to the Apostle *Paul's* Doctrine, *Phil. 1*. Exhorting the *Philippians* to be subject to their Presbyters and Deacons as to God and Christ.

* Narrat. Lib. 2.
Cap. 39.

But further, we may fright this Oral Tradition-Monger with a Gorgon's Head. The Story of *Eusebius* is known, *Lib. 5. Cap. 22, 23.* "Concerning the Celebration of the Feast of Easter, or the Christian Paschal, and the Schism arising thereupon in the Antient Church, viz. That the *Asiatick* Bishops would have it Celebrated on the 14 Day of the Moneth, after the Jewish manner, and they grounded their Principle and Practice upon *J. S's* Grand Topick and Argument, viz. An Oral Tradition, yea and that not only from *Polycarp* made a Bishop by the Apostle *John*, but deriv'd Originally from the Apostle *John* himself. Here was a sure Conveyance, no doubt, and (as he says of *Polycarp's* Episcopacy) as sure as the Historical Certainty can render such. But now let us see a contrary Oral Tradition upon the same Head. The Bishops of the Churches of the West Celebrated the Feast of *Easter* on the Day of Christ's Resurrection, and they grounded their Principle and Practice upon a Tradition deriv'd from the Apostle *Peter*. Now will *J. S.* assert both these Oral Traditions to be Infallible? Or will he Stage these two Apostles as in this point contradicting one another, and delivering to the Churches contrary Doctrines and Precepts? *Papias*, by *Eusebius's* Testimony, *Lib. 3. Cap. 39.* brought into the Church the *Millenary Error* under the Title and pretence of *Apostolical Tradition*. The indispensable necessity of Baptism (disown'd by all Protestant Churches) and of the Eucharist for all sorts of People, was made an Apostolick Tradition. *Augustin* *, *Basil* †, names four Customs as Apostolical Traditions, to wit, "Signing Men with the Sign of the Cross; Praying toward the East; Anointing with Oyl; Standing up at Prayers from *Easter* to *Whitsuntide*. 'Tis to this purpose observable, that Protestant Divines do assign this as one main Ground of the Lord's Teaching his Church no more by Tradition, but by his Written Word, that thus the Church might be guarded against the Impositions of Satan under pretence of such Tradition; For which the abridg'd Life of Man (far short of what it was while Oral Tradition might have a safe Conveyance) hath afforded considerable Advantage.

* *Lib. 1. de Peccat. Merit. & Remiss.*

† *De Spiritu S. Cap. 27.*

It were here too large a Work to represent the many Grounds and Arguments upon which the Orthodox plead for the Perfection of the Scripture, as the Sole Rule of Faith and Obedience, against the Popish Adversary. That known place, *2 Tim. 3. 16.* is improven to this purpose, *All Scripture is given by Inspiration of God, and is profitable for Doctrine, for Correction, for Instruction in Righteousness, that the Man of God may be perfect.*

perfect, and thorowly furnished to all good Works.] Thus also Deut. 4. 2. *Ye shall not add unto the Word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it.* Thus also Gal. 1. 8. *Though we, or an Angel from Heaven (this far transcends what a Cyprian, Irenæus or Polycarp may deliver) Preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have Preached unto you, let him be a Curse, or Anathema.* These Texts are also pleaded wherein Humane Traditions are rejected and forbidden in the point of Religion. Thus Matth. 5. from v. 4. to v. 10. Isa. 29. 3. *In vain they Worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men.* This Text our Saviour oppos'd to such as press'd Antiquity and Traditions, and were bold to reprehend his Disciples, for disobeying the same. Thus Isa. 8. 20. *The Faithful are call'd to the Law and the Testimony as the only Rule.* Thus the Apostle Paul, 1 Cor. 4. 6. will not have us to be *Wise* ~~et~~ *ἵστες* *above what's Written, or think of Men, or follow them beyond the limits of that Rule;* Therein Rebuking and fastening a sad Check upon J. S. who will have us to adhere to the Principles and Practice of the pretended Glorious Age of Cyprian in point of Church Government, without offering the least Ground from Scripture for the Divine Right thereof, yea and in opposition to the many Scripture Arguments to prove its Inconsistency with the Divine Rule.

This same Truth is also fortified by many illustrious Testimonies of the Fathers, of which above. Famous is that Testimony of Tertulian, contra Herm. Cap. 21. *Scriptum esse doceat Hermogenes, aut si non Scriptum est, timeat illud Væ adjicientibus.* Let Hermogenes shew that it is Written, and if it be not Written let him fear that Woe Threatned against them that add to the Word. I hope J. S. will allow us, with this Antient Father, thus to accost him; Let him shew the Cyprianic Bishop, whom he describes, to have his Patent Written in Scripture, and if he be not found there, let him beware of the Scripture Threatning against such as add to the Word. Notable is that Saying which he hath, De Præsc. adv. Hæret. *Cum credimus, hoc primum credimus, nihil esse quod ultra credere debeamus,* When we Believe, we do in the first place believe this, that we must believe nothing beyond the limits of the Word. For he had said before, *curiositate non est opus post Christum, nec inquisitione post Evangelium,* That after discoveries of Christ in the Gospel, there is not access for inquiring after new Truths or Duties. Thus Hierom on Matth. 23. asserts, *Quod de Scripturis Autoritatem non habet, eadem facilitate contemnitur qua probatur,* What has no Authority in the Scripture is as easily rejected as offered. Teaching us thus to contemn and reject the whole Pleadings and Scope of J. S's Pamphlet,

patch'd up of Humane Testimonies, to fortifie the Principles and Practice of the Third Age in point of Church Government, without the least Title of Scripture Authority to recommend the same. To the same purpose is *Augustin* cited, *de Doct. Christ. Lib. 2. Cap. 29. Irenæus, adv. Heres. Lib. 3. Cap. 1.* In that place *Irenæus* (of whom *J. S.* sometimes boasts) calls the Scriptures the Pillar and Ground of Faith.

The Professors of *Leyden, Diss. 3. Tb. 41.* having express'd a due Deference to the Creeds or Symbols of General Councils, such as that of *Nice, Constantinople, Ephesus, &c.* As also, to the Consistent Judgment of Ancient Fathers, they add and give this positive Judgment in the close, *Hæc tamen omnia ad primam Veritatem, Scripturam, scil. Sacram, referenda & exigenda esse censemus, a qua, ut Luna a Sole, Lumen suum & Fidem accipiunt.* That all Councils, all Writings of Fathers, are to be brought to the Scriptures, as the first Truth and Verity, and Examined by that Rule, from which they all receive their Faith, Authority and Light, as the Moon receives its Light and Influence from the Sun; Citing *Augustin, Lib. 3. cont. Maxim. C. 14.* Contemning thus all *J. S.*'s Pleadings, drawn allennarly from Humane Testimonies, as a meer misleading Wild-fire and counterfeit Light, without any Influence and Illumination from the Sun of Righteousness shining in the Holy Scriptures. Remarkable also is that which they offer, *Thes. 38. Dissut. 4.* After they had asserted in the close of the preceeding *These*, that even such Doctrines, as the Universal Church embrac'd without the Scriptures, in the very Age next to the Apostles, we are not oblig'd to believe, that they flow'd from the Apostles, rejecting and baffling thus all *J. S.*'s foremention'd pretences; *Chap. 1.* to render of infallible Certainty the Principles of the Third Age, *scil.* "That it was an Age next to the Apostolick, and had sure Oral Tradition, &c." The Professors next add, *Sed e contrario, propterea quod ab ea ejusque Doctoribus, sine Scripturæ Autoritate accipiuntur, ac retineantur, pro Traditionibus non Apostolicis sunt habenda.* So far it is, that we are oblig'd to receive, as proceeding from the Apostles; what the general Consent even of the first Ages does commend, that, on the contrary, we must reject as a Forge, and no Apostolical Tradition, what the Church and the Doctors have receiv'd and retain'd under the Notion of Traditions Apostolical, without the Authority of the Scripture. Thus blowing away, as it were, with one Breath all *J. S.*'s Pamphlet, who will needs, upon the Ground of this pretended Consent and Practice of the Church, obtrude upon the Churches a Government, without the least shadow of Scripture Warrant for the same. *Thes. seq.* They add, that the

the Roman Church arrogating a continued Succession from the Apostles, several erring with her, so as to judge, that all things necessary to Salvation are not contain'd in the Scriptures, they do fall also into that other Error, in judging some Doctrines to be Apostolick, which have not flow'd from the Apostles. In the next *Thes.* they prove this by Instance, *Cui rei Testimonio est Ecclesia Primitiva Apostolica Proxima*, that the Carriage and Practice of the Primitive Church next to the Apostolick Age, is a clear proof of this. For Illustration whereof, they adduce the forementioned Examples and Instances, *scil.* Papias bringing in to the Church the Error of the *Millenaries*, under the Title and pretence of Apostolick Tradition, as testifies Eusebius, *Lib. 3. C. 39.* and Irenæus, teaching from a pretended Tradition of the Apostle John, that Christ suffered about the 50 Year of his Age, *Lib. 2. Cap. 39, 40.* Adding, *In quibus illam Ecclesiam a suis Doctoribus deceptam fuisse ipsi quoque Pontificii consentuntur*, wherein 'tis so evident, that the Papists themselves must confess it, that the Church was deceiv'd by her Doctors and Teachers.

Here let *J. S.* observe, 1. That the Proximity or Affinity of an Age to the Apostolick, in the Judgment of this University, (wherein he dare not deny, that they are own'd by all the Protestant Churches) will not exexcuse the same from Error, rejecting thus all his forementioned pretences of Infallibility drawn from this Ground, which he recites, *Chap. 1. 2ly*, He may see, what a deceiving thing the pretence of Succession from Apostles is, when it is *Personal*, and not *Doctrinal*, this being the Temptation of receiving Humane Inventions under the Notion of Apostolick Traditions. *3ly*, He may see, that 'tis no such strange thing as he pretends, that "the Church is deceiv'd by her Doctors embracing Unsound Principles under pretence of Apostolick Traditions, notwithstanding that such Traditions have the fairest shew of being Apostolical, as being of such a near pretended Reception from the Apostles themselves, and that the Church, in the most early Times after the Apostles, was thus impos'd upon, and lead astray from the Scripture-Path.

Let us consider also what this University offers, *Diff. 40. Th. ult.* In rejecting the Popish Mark of the Church taken from *Antiquity, Succession, Name of Catholick, &c.* The Mark of Antiquity they reject, because, *jam tum Apostolorum tempore operabatur Mysterium Iniquitatis*, that even, in the Times of the Apostles, the Mystery of Iniquity was working. They reject that Mark of *Succession*, and *Name of Catholick*, because *Antichrist sits in the Temple of God*; And that anent the Multitude and Unity of Professors, because the whole World during Antichrist's prevalent Reign adores & wonders

wonders after the Beast. The Mark taken from *Miracles* they reject upon this Ground, That Antichrist comes with *Signs and lying Wonders*. Here let J. S. remark, that, in the Judgment of this University, neither *Antiquity* (so much magnified by him) nor *Succession*, nor *Name of Catholick*, nor *Multitude*, and *Unity of Professors*, that none of these apart, nor all of these together, will recommend a Principle and Practice as imitable without the Divine Warrant of the Word of God; Since the Mystery of Iniquity it self hath the Fig-Leaf Cover of all these pretences. Nay, we see, they hold these to be Rejectaneous Grounds in point of the Obligation of Posterity, tho' competent to the most Ancient Church, and nearest to the Apostolick Age. So that 'tis evident beyond all peradventure, that the Professors send all J. S's Arguments to recommend the Diocesan Prelate a packing, which were drawn from the Principles and Practice of the *Cyprianic Age*, as being of a *Humane Rejectaneous Mould*. Moreover, we see, how they improve our premis'd Argument taken from the *early Workings of the Mystery of Iniquity*, and the spreading Tincture thereof from the very Times of the Apostles.

The same we may find asserted by *Turretin* *, as by all our Protestant Divines upon this Question. To the same Scope of asserting the Scriptures Perfection, in Opposition to all unwritten Traditions, we have some remarkable Passages in the Learned *Rivet* †. After he has shown from *Tertullian* ||, that Hereticks had their Recourse to Tradition, when beaten by the Scriptures, he shews, that since *Traditiones suis initiis tam incertæ fuerunt, & tot Corruptionibus & Mendaciis obnoxie, quid judicandum est nunc post tot elapsa secula?* *An quod olim fuit Hereticorum refugium, poterit nunc esse vere Credentium Asylum, Norma veritatis & Fidei*, since Traditions were in their Original so uncertain, and lyable to so many Corruptions and Lies, what shall we think of them after so many elaps'd Ages? Shall these which were the Refuge of Hereticks, become now the Sanctuary of Believers, and the Rule of Faith and Verity? Adding, *Non pauci aliqui pii Viri recente adhuc Christianismo in varios Errores inciderunt, Traditionibus non scriptis nimium addicti*, that not a few otherwise Godly Men, when Christianity was yet recent, fell into divers Errors, being too much addicted to unwritten Traditions. Instancing *Papias* (of whom above), who would needs take in the Help of unwritten Traditions, to fortifie, as he imagined, the Scripture Rule.

Quest. 8. Pag. 78. In Opposition to his Jesuite *Bailins*, who would not have the Scripture to act the part of a *Judg* in the Church, he hath many things apposite to this purpose, telling us, *Christus Fratres damnati Divi-*

tis ablegavit ad Moſem & Prophetas quos audirent. Non dixit, habent Eccleſiam & Doctores quos audiant, nempe primo & ſine exceptione, ſed habent Moſem & Prophetas. Hujus ſupremi Judicis placitis adhaerendo, non ſolum licet ſed etiam injunctum eſt a Deo unicuique Fidei in Eccleſia, & toti Eccleſiae in communi, non quidem proprie Judicium ferre & discernere per ſe, cum Judicium ſit ſolius Dei ſed ſibi notum facere, & quaſi ſignificare Privatim (quod unusquiſque Fidelis ad propriam Aedificationem debet) aut publice promulgare (quod a veris Paſtoribus ſit ad publicam Aedificationem) id quod Deus ipſe Authoritate propria in ſuo verbo judicavit & decrevit. That Chriſt ſent the Brethren of the damn'd Rich Man to hear Moſes and the Prophets. He ſaid not, they have the Church and the Doctors, whom they may hear, to wit primarily and without Exception (as J. S. ſends all the Reform'd Churches to Cyprian and the Contemporary Doctors of the Third Age, to learn what Church Government is of Divine Right), but he ſaid, they have Moſes and the Prophets. Not only is it lawful, but commanded by God to the whole Church in general, and every Faithful one in the Church, to adhere to the Determinations of this ſupreme Judge, &c. Adding, that what the Paſtors do promulgate for the Edification of the People, is that Quod Deus ipſe Authoritate propria in ſuo verbo judicavit & decrevit, Cujus unius vox omnibus Controverſis terminandis ſufficiens, ſola audiri debet, ad faciendam Fidem indubitaram, Which God himſelf by his own Authority, has in his own Word judg'd and determin'd, whoſe voice and Sentence alone, as being ſufficient to end all Controverſies, ought only to be heard as the Foundation of an infaillible Faith. Citing after ward that Paſſage of the Apoſtle Paul, 1 Cor. 10. 15. I ſpeak as to wiſe Men, judge ye what I ſay. And that of the Apoſtle John, 1 Joh. 4. 1. wherein we are commanded To try the Spirits, whether they are of God; and that Paſſage of Cyrillus Hieroſ. Cath. 12. Wherein he will have even the Gatechumini, Not to receive by an Implicit Faith what he delivers, ſince therein they may be deceiv'd. Sed niſi Prophetarum de ſingulis acceperis teſtimonia, ne credas aſſertionibus, that no Aſſertion is to be believ'd, unleſs fortified by the Teſtimony of Scriptures. He after ward Sect. 2. ſhews, that all the Churches Declaration and Judgement is Miniſterial only; Otherwiſe, ſaith he, the Church Exercifeth a Tyranny, ſince GOD ſends his People to the Law and the Prophets, and aſſerts where this Rule is not adhered to, there is not ſo much as a Morning-Light to guide and direct. He after ward Cites a notable Paſſage of Clemens Alexandrinus, Lib. 7. Stromat. confirming effectually and judiciously, that The greateſt and moſt unanimous Teſtimonies from Men in point of Religion, are not to be reſted in without a Divine Warrant, ſhewing that the Divine Oracle is The only indemonſtrable Principle. Non absolute enunciantibus hominibus fidem habuerimus, quibus licet etiam enunciare contrarium

trarium; That our Faith must not meerly rest upon Mens Declaration, who may Assert the contrary. *Si autem non satis est solum absolute dicere, quod visum est, sed oportet etiam probare quod dictum est: Non expectamus Testimonium quod datur ab hominibus, sed voce Domini Probamus quod quaeritur, quæ magis est Fide digna quam quævis Demonstratio, vel potius quæ est sola Demonstratio.* That Men must not absolutely pronounce their own Sentiments in Matters of Religion, but prove what they say by a Divine Warrant. That we expect not Testimonies from Men, but by the Voice of GOD must make our Inquiry for Truth, which deserves more our Faith and Belief, than any Demonstration; or rather, which is it self the sole and proper Demonstration of Divine Truth.

Our Author infers from this these solid Conclusions. 1. That Man in himself, tho' Faithful, is not upon his own Authority to be believed, unless he prove from Scripture what he asserts. 2. That the Scripture is the Judg for finding out of Truth. 3. That it is alone the *Principium indemonstrabile*, the first and indemonstrable Principle, *quod iudicio opus non habet sed fide comprehenditur*, which is not liable to our Examination and Tryal, but to be receiv'd by Faith. 4. That from this Principle of the Scriptures alone, *solidas sumi demonstrationes*, solid Demonstrations of Divine Truths are to be drawn. Adding, that in this Testimony of *Clemens*, *quot sunt verba tot sunt jacula*, against his Jesuite, And we may truly apply, and say, there are as many Weapons against J. S's pleading in this Pamphlet, and that all these Conclusions strike against him.

Since, 1. In point of a proof of the Divine Right of Prelacy, and the imitableness of the supposed Diöcesan Pattern, in the third Age, he will have all the Churches to rest upon the Humane Testimonies thereof. 2. 'Tis also evident, that in order to the finding out of the Truth in this great Point, he brings not a jot from the Divine Oracles, and in so far has disown'd and Renounc'd that Great and Only Judg, 3. He would have us to found our Perswasion in this Point, upon the Principles and practice of that Age, as is above made clear, excluding thus such an Examination thereof by the Divine Rule, as all Humane Testimonies are liable unto; and thus impeaches the great Prerogative of the Scripture, which in the sense of *clemens*, yea of all the Fathers, as is above made good, in the Sense and Judgment of *Rivet*, and of all the Protestant Churches, is the sole and only *Principium indemonstrabile*, in the Testimony whereof our Faith is to be ultimately resolv'd. 4. Since all solid Demonstrations of Divine Truth are to be drawn only from this Principle, J. S. is palpably condemn'd, in bringing all his Demonstrations or Proofs for the Divine Warrant of the Hierarchical

Chap. IV. (pretended) Principles of the Cyprianic Age. 185
rarchical Prelat, and to engage all the Churches to a Reception of this Government, meerly and solely from the pretended glorious Age of Cyprian. So that, in the Judgment both of the Ancient and Protestant Churches, his Proofs and Demonstrations are nought, as wanting the only solid Principle thereof, and the true Scripture Topick to found their Solidity. It were superfluous, and would load much Paper, to offer the manifold Testimonies of Protestant Churches and Divines confirming this Point; Yet for further Confirmation, and fortifying this our Charge against J. S. take this little short Touch of the Judgment of the Reform'd Churches from their Confessions.

The *Helvetick* Confession in the first Article asserts, that the Canonical Scripture deliver'd by the Spirit of God to the Prophets and Apostles, and proposed by them, *Omnium perfectissima & antiquissima Philosophia, pietatem omnem, omnem vitæ rationem sola perfecte continet*, That the Canonical Scripture is the only perfect Rule of Faith and Manners, *Art. 2. Hujus interpretatio ex ipsa sola petenda est, ut ipsa interpret sit sui, charitatis fideique Regula moderante*, That the Scripture solely is its own Interpreter, &c. *Art. 3. A quo interpretationis genere quatenus sancti Patres non discessere ut Interpretes Scripturæ recipimus*, That the Fathers are receiv'd, in so far as in their Interpretations they have not gone aside from the Scripture Rule: *Art. 4. Per cetera de Traditionibus hominum, quantumvis speciosis & receptis, quæcunque nos abducunt vel impediunt, ut de inutilibus & noxiis, sic illud Domini respondemus: Frustra me colunt docentes doctrinas hominum.*

Here we find J. S. condemn'd in every one of these Articles. 1. He is here told, that the Holy Scriptures contain the most perfect and first Antiquity, which therefore he should have preferr'd, in the point of Church Government, to his so much boasted of Antiquity of the third Age. 2. Since he all along holds his Cyprianic Bishop to be the same appointed by the Apostles, and consequently must thus interpret the Scriptures, which speak of the Episcopal Office; The Confession tells him, he should have evinc'd and drawn this Interpretation from the Scripture it self, not from the Principles and Practice of that Age, or his slippery Conjectures of their holding what was Apostolical. 3. The Sense and Interpretation of the Fathers, and their Practice consequently, tho' never so unanimous, the Confession tells him, is still to be Examined by the Scripture, and not absolutely to be rested in, as the Rule and Direction of our Practice, without a due Scripture Tryal. Which condemns his obtruding the Principles and Practice of that Age, as the great and obliging Rule in point of Church Government, excluding all such Tryal thereof. 4. We see, the Confession rejects all
A a Doctrines,

Doctrines, tho' never so specious and universally receiv'd, if they be but *Humane*, and not warranted by the Word; And consequently, in their Sense, and upon the Scripture Ground mention'd by them, all that J. S. has offered to recommend and found Hierarchical Prelacy, (tho' the matter of Fact were admitted) doth amount to no more than to render it a *Traditional Humane Church Government*, not Divine.

Proceed we to the *English* Confession, drawn by the Convention of the Bishops and Arch-Bishops themselves, anno 1562. In Art. 6, concerning the Holy Scriptures, " 'Tis affirm'd, that all things necessary to Salvation, being contain'd in the Scriptures, nothing is to be requir'd or believ'd as necessary to Salvation, but what is either read in the Scripture, or may be prov'd from it. In Art. 19, 20. Having suppos'd the Churches Fallibility, they deny " The Authority hereof to reach the commanding of anything beside or contrary to the Word as necessary to Salvation, or the Exposition of any place of Scripture which crosses another. Therein clearly condemning J. S. who will needs commend unto, and obtrude upon all the Churches his Diocesan Prelacy, as the only Government appointed by GOD upon the Churches Practice, without offering any Scripture, or Scripture Consequence to fortifie the same.

The Scots Confession, Art. 19. asserts " The Perfection of the Scriptures, as able to make the man of GOD perfect, and such as derives its Authority from neither Angels nor Men. In Art. 20. " The most unanimous Consent and Determinations of Men, tho' even in lawfully conven'd General Councils (according to it) is not to be simply rest'd in, but Examin'd and Try'd by the Word of GOD, distinguishing thus the Voice of GOD, from the meer Constitutions and Doctrines of Men, shewing that several Councils have manifestly err'd, and that their great Work is to declare only the Mind of GOD from his Word. So that, according to this Confession, tho' J. S. had produced the Acts and Decrees of an entire General Council of the whole Christian Church through the World in the third Age, recommending and enjoyning Hierarchical Episcopacy, yet the Churches are not to receive the same, if in any measure found contrary to the Word of GOD; The Confession affirming, consequently, that he stands obliged to offer a Divine Warrant for his Hierarchical Prelat, and answer the Scripture Arguments brought against him.

The Confession of Saxony, in that Article *Qua bona opera facienda*, they affirm, *Vult Deus fidem & opera regi verbo suo*. And in the Article *de Traditionibus*, they shew, that for the Churches safety from the Devil's Stratagems

Stratagems, *Dedit ei Deus doctrinam expressam & certam*, &c. *quare necesse est considerare quales sint. leges seu ritus, & unde sint.* That GOD has given an express and certain Doctrine to his Church, comprehended in the Holy Scriptures, upon which Ground we must consider and Examine all Church Constitutions, and not blindly receive them. Adding several Rules to this Scope, whereof the first is this, *Nulli creaturæ, non Angelis, non hominibus, non Regibus, non Episcopis licet condere leges, aut ritus pugnantes cum verbo Dei.* That it is lawful for no Creature, Angels or Men, Kings or Prelates to make any Laws or Constitutions repugnant to the Word of God. Adding, that *Universaliter Regula servanda est, oportet Deo magis obedire quam hominibus*; That this is the standing universal Rule, *We must obey God rather than man* Rejecting thus all that J. S. has offered, to found the Churches Reception of Prelacy, till he shall Exhibit a Divine Warrant thereof from the Word.

The Confession of *Wittemberg* propos'd in the Name of the D. of *Wittemberg* by his Ambassadors, *January 24. Anno M. D. LII.* to the Congregation of the *Tridentin* Council, in the Article de *sacra Scriptura*, they assert, *Scripturam credimus & confitemur esse oraculum Spiritus sancti, cœlestibus Testimoniis ita confirmatum, ut si Angelus de cœlo aliud predicaverit Anathema sit. Quare detestamur omnem Doctrinam, Cultum & Religionem pugnantem cum hac Scriptura.* That the Scripture is the Oracle of the Holy Spirit, so confirm'd by cœlestial Testimonies; that if an Angel from Heaven should preach another Doctrine, he were accursed. The Perfection of the Holy Scripture in all points necessary to Salvation, they assert from these passages, *2 Tim. 3. 16. All Scripture is given by inspiration from God, and is profitable for Doctrine, &c.* Also from *John 15. 15.* Henceforth I call you not Servants, but I have called you Friends; for all things that I have heard of my Father, I have made known unto you. Adding, *Quæ autem Apostoli acceperunt a Christo, vulgaverunt Predicatione sua in toto orbe Terrarum, & tradiderunt ea posteritati Scriptis suis.* That what the Apostles receiv'd from Christ, they divulg'd in their Preaching through the whole World, and delivered the same to Posterity in their Writings. Adding, that hence it is manifest, that all things necessary to be known in order to Salvation, are contained in the Writings of the Prophets and Apostles.

Here then, 1. Presbyterians have this to say to J. S. That since their Judgment, in opposition to Prelacy, is founded upon Divine Warrant, he has taken a foolish and Antiscriptural way, to convince them from the Writings of Cyprian, but was obliged to offer a Scripture Conviction; Since the Opposition even of an Angel, much more of Cyprian and his Contemporaries, to Scripture Light, can signifie nothing can

import no Obligation to receive as the Mind of God, what is asserted, but doth rather expose to a Curse. 2. Since this Church professeth *To detaste all Doctrine contrary to the Word*, Presbyterians cannot but in like manner look upon themselves, as obliged to detaste this Hierarchical Prelacy, which they are upon Scripture Grounds perswaded to be contrary to the Divine Rule, till he shall from the same Rule, make the contrary appear. 3. Since the Confession pleads (to evince the Perfection of Scripture) that it is able to make *the man of God perfect, thoroughly furnished to all good works*, which must needs include Church Government, and all ministerial Duties ; Since also, in order to this Proof, they shew, that as our Lord deliver'd all necessary Doctrines to his Apostles, and the Apostles in their Writings deliver'd the same to the Churches, they do clearly and positively assert, that the Scripture contains an entire and perfect Scheme of Church Government, and by necessary consequence that we must look to the Scriptures primarily, yea solely, for the Knowledge and Discovery of the Pattern of Church Government shewed upon the Mount, which all the Churches are obliged to follow and imitate. So that, by further inevitable consequence, they do palpably condemn J. S's Pamphlet ; 1. As presenting to all the Churches, a Pattern and Sample of Church Government from the Principles and Practice only of *the third Age*, preferring it in so far, and in this point, to *the first Apostolick Age*. 2. In commending a church Government, as necessarily to be imitated by all the Churches, without offering any Divine Warrant for the same, and upon meer Humane Testimony and Practice, condemning thus the perfection of the Scriptures in this point ; Therein contradicting the Assertion of the Scripture it self, on the contrary.

The Confession adds several Testimonies of the Ancients to this Scope, such as *Chrysostom, Hom. 1. in Tit. Augustin on John cap. 11. Tract. 49. Hieronymus ad Titum cap. 1.* Who asserts, *Sine Auctoritate Scripturarum garrulitas non habet fidem*, That Men's talk in Divine things without Authority of Scripture, is meer Babbling. And may we not add without hazard of imputation of Banter, that *Jerom* puts under the same Character J. S's Pamphlet, viz. That 'tis made up of meer Prattle and Babbling, since he will needs perswade a Divine Truth, *scil.* That Prelacy is the Government appointed by our Lord, from meer Humane Writings, and the Testimony of the Third Age, without a jot from Scripture to fortifie his Pleading.

In further Confirmation of what is said, 'tis Remarkable, that in his vain Epilogue (whereof above) he not only Censures the Presbyterians, Exhorting them to look to his Grand Proofs and his goodly Scheme

Scheme of Church Government, presented to them as their great convincing Pattern, but he peremptorily Summons all those who are for the Indifferency of Episcopal Government, to look to it, and weigh their Arguments for it over again. So that Dr. Stillingfleet, and all of that Persuasion may be charm'd in his Sense, with a look of his goodly Scheme of Episcopal Government, and all their Arguments must vanish as Smoke before this Glorious Light. Thus he doth necessarily presume that he has in his Book evinc'd the Divine Right of Episcopacy. For if it be not Indifferent, then sure it must be Necessary; And if necessary, then sure as a Divine Ordinance, and upon a Divine Warrant, which he must needs acknowledge is to be evinc'd by Scripture Light and Authority, or else let him shew how the Divine Right of a Divine Ordinance can be prov'd by the humane Testimony and Practice of Men. To proceed,

The Confession of Boheme, *i. Art. de Scripturis Sacris* asserts, *Scripturas pro inconcusse veris certissimisq; habendas: ac quorumq; aliorum Scriptis, ut Sacra prophanis, & humanis Divina, per omnia præpositas iri debere.* That the Sacred Scriptures are to be esteem'd of immovable certainty, and such as are to be preferr'd to the Writings of all others, and that absolutely and in every thing, as Sacred things are preferable to Profane, things Divine to things that are only Humane. Adding that we may entirely and absolutely rest our Faith upon them, and from them only deduce all necessary Truths, whereby we may be built up in the Faith, and that we must esteem the Writings of the Ancient Doctors of the Church, *in so far furth only as they disagree not from the Holy Scriptures*, citing *Augustin in Prefat. Lib. 3. de Trinit.* who asserts, "That he would not have his own Writings, or these of *Ambrose*, to be any otherwise receiv'd than as they agree with Scripture. How far this Testimony concurs with the preceeding in condemning *J. S.*'s Method in his Pamphlet, I need not stay to subsume.

S E C T. VI.

The Antiscriptural Method of J. S. in his Pleading, further Illustrated from the Scriptures, giving a full and distinct Sound in the Point of Church Government, and Establishing Presbyterian Government in special.

THIS Truth and Principle in *Thesi J. S.* doth evidently assert, as is clear from what is above touch'd, since he will not have Episcopal

Episcopal Government to be Indifferent. And if he owne it, that the Scriptures do exhibite an entire Scheme and Form of Church Government, and in special of Episcopacy, how evidently is he Self-convicted and Self-condemn'd, in Writing so much in Defence thereof from meer Humane Testimonies and Practice, without the least hint of a Scripture Warrant. Could he imagine, that his Delineation of the pretended Principles of the Third Age could either perswade its Divine Right, to these that are for the Indifferency of Forms of Church Government, since they may Judg that *Stillingsfleet's* Historical Accounts, in his *Irenicum*. of the various State of the first Churches, has sufficiently expos'd this Historical Argument in point of Fact; And even admitting what he asserts therein, they may suppose, it cannot infer the Scriptures Determination of a Species of Government. Or could he imagine, that an Argument of this Nature could convince them that are for the Divine Right of Presbyterian Government, who found their Judgment upon Scripture Warrant.

However, we do first, in order to our Scope, propose this in general, that of necessity the Scripture must needs have presented a suitable and entire Scheme of Church Government, which is clear upon several important Grounds, such as, 1. That the Exercise of Christ's Kingly Office, as Political Head of his Church, doth necessarily plead for this, since his Political Headship which stands in Relation to the Church Visible, as such, must needs respect the Laws whereby she is to be Govern'd, and the Nature, End, and Duties of the Offices and Officers thereof, it being of infallible certainty, that the Exercise of Christ's Kingly Office must be absolutely as compleat and perfect with respect to its immediat proper Ends, as is his Prophetical and Priestly with respect unto theirs. To this purpose the many places may be adduc'd which speak of this Political Headship of our Lord: Thus he's call'd the Churches *Lawgiver* or *Statute-Maker*, *Isa. 33. 22. The Lord is our Judge, the Lord is our Lawgiver, the Lord is our King, he will save us.* *Isa. 9. 6. For unto us a Child is Born, unto us a Son is given, and the Government shall be upon his Shoulder: And his Name shall be call'd Wonderful, Counsellor, the Mighty God, the Everlasting Father, the Prince of Peace.* *Psal. 2. 6. He's the King set upon the Holy Hill of Sion.* *Eph. 1. 22. He is given to be Head over all things to the Church, which is his Body. He is the Head of the Church and Saviour of the Body.* *Verf. 30. We are Members of his Body, and of his Flesh, and of his Bones.* *Col. 2. 19. He is the Head from which all the Body by Joynts and Bands having Nourishment ministered, and knit together increaseth with the Increase of God.* Hence he's Represented, *Rev. 1: as walking amidst the Golden Candlesticks in his Kingly*

Kingly Robe, holding the Stars, that is, the Ministers, in his Hand, v. 12, 14, 15, 16. 2ly, If we hold the Perfection of Christ's Testament Seal'd by his Blood, this Conclusion will inevitably follow. For, upon Supposition that in this Testamentary Legacy to his Church, there is much spoken of the Offices and Officers of his House, of their Gifts and Duties, either these Descriptions and Discoveries must amount to a Description and full account of the Church Government in the particular Frame and Species thereof, or the Perfection of the Scripture, and the end of this Discovery is palpably impeach'd and denied.

This appears to be clearly pointed at in that notable place, *Eph. 4. 11, 12.* wherein, as the Effect of our Lord's glorious Accomplishment of the Work of Redemption, and Ascension, as Head of his Church, he is said, *v. 11, 12.* to have given, as Royal Mediatory Donations, *some Apostles, and some Prophets, some Evangelists, and some Pastors or Teachers;* For the perfecting of the Saints, for the Work of the Ministry, for the Edifying the Body of Christ. *v. 12. till we all come in the Unity of the Faith, and of the Knowledge of the Son of God, into a perfect Man.* Where 'tis evident, that Christ, as the Churches Head, has given Officers and Ordinances suited to her Edification and Growth, yea to the Accomplishment of her Warfare; And the Means being correspondent to the End, our Lord, in giving these Officers and Gifts, must needs have intended a fix'd Frame of Government, as is evident by the Parallel, *1 Cor. 12. 28.*

3ly, The Scripture holds out, that our Lord's Authority must needs interpose for the due and lawful Exercise of all Church Offices, as well as the Blessing and Success thereof, since all these Exercises are in his Name, such as the *Authoritative delivering of the Gospel Message, 2 Cor. 5. 20. Administration of Baptism, Matth. 28. 19. Censures, 1 Cor. 4. 5. &c.* And in a Word, since himself has declar'd that all such as anticipate his Call in Ecclesiastick Offices, are *Thieves and Robbers, John 10. 8, 9.* it must needs follow, that Christ being the Door by which we must enter, all Ecclesiastick Offices and Officers must have their Work, Duties, Qualifications describ'd in Scripture, else the Man of God could not in following his Duty be made thereby perfect; Especially since what's premis'd doth exclude all Addition, Detraction or Alteration of the Offices and Officers by him Instituted: And consequently, there must be a fix'd and Authoriz'd Frame of Government. For, that which the Church hath no Interest nor Authority to alter, diminish, or add thereunto, must needs have a fix'd, Divine and unalterable Constitution, otherways if it be asserted that Men are left to their

their Liberty herein, Independency, Anarchy, or Monarchy might be equally lawful. So that the Scriptures Establishing a distinct Species and particular fix'd Frame of Church Government, by Divine Right, appears evidently, when all are laid together, viz. *The sufficiency of the Scripture to Teach the Minister how to behave himself in the House of God, which is the Church of the Living God.* 1 Tim. 3. 15. and to make the Man of God perfect and thoroughly furnish'd to all good Works, v. 16. which is also Illustrated from this, that our blessed Lord Governs his Church outwardly and visibly as the Political Head thereof, by his own Authoriz'd Ambassadors, 2 Cor. 5. 20. Eph. 4. 11. His own Authoriz'd Assemblies of Officers, Matth. 18. 20. His own Laws directing them, Jam. 4. 12. Isa. 33. 22. His own Ordinances, Matth. 28. 19. 1 Cor. 11. 23, &c. His own Judiciary Censures, 1 Cor. 5. with Job. 20. 21, 22. Matth. 28. 18, 19, 20. The same Truth is also Fortified by this Ground, viz. That the immediat proper End of all these Institutions is, *the Edification and Salvation of all his Elect.* It being certain also, that the Spiritual Efficacy of instituted Means and Ordinances must needs suppose the necessity of a Divine Original, since Humane Institutions can produce but humane Effects.

Add to all this, that the Scripture is also full and clear, as to the enumeration of the Substantials of Government (as is clear from what is above offered) *scil.* The Church Officers who are to Officiat, viz. Pastors and Teachers, Eph. 4. 12. Matth. 18. 15. 1 Cor. 5. 5. Ruling Elders, 1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Rom. 12. 16. Deacons, Acts 6. 6. Phil. 1. 1. 1 Tim. 3. 8. Pointing also at their Qualifications and the Nature of the external Call, 1 Tim. 3. 2, to 13. Acts 6. 3. with 5. 6. 1 Tim. 3. 10. Acts 13. 1, 2, 3, and 14. 23. 1 Tim. 5. 22. and 4. 14. As also their several Duties and respective Offices, such as publick Prayer and Ministry of the Word, Acts 6. 4. The Reading of the Word, Acts 15. 21. and 13. 15. The Preaching of it, Matth. 16. 19. 2 Tim. 4. 1, 2. The Blessing of the People in the Name of the Lord, Numb. 6. 23. Luk. 24. 50. 2 Cor. 13. 14. Administration of Sacraments, Matth. 28. 19, 20. 1 Cor. 11. 23. Also of Censures, Tit. 3. 10. 2 Thes. 3. 14, 15. Matth. 18. 15, 21. 1 Cor. 5. 3. 2 Cor. 2. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. Distribution of Alms, Acts 4. 35. and 6. 2, 3. Acts 11. 29, 30. with Rom. 12. 8. 'Tis also clear, that the Scripture represents a Church, meeting in one place for Worship, 1 Cor. 14. 34. Rom. 16. 1, a Church consisting of divers Congregations, Acts 2. 41, 47. Acts 5. 4. Acts 6. 1. with 21. 20. And points out also Synods with Ecclesiastick Authority, together with Subordination of the lesser Judicatories to the greater, and Appeals thereunto, as is evident, Acts 15. with Dent. 17. 12, Matth. 18. 15, 16, &c. Yea the very

very Circumstantial of Government have general Rules directing them, viz. 1. *That all be done Decently and in Order.* 2ly, *That not only a due Decorum be observ'd in all Publick Administrations, but that Edification be mainly intended, and that great Design prosecuted.* The first of these Rules we have, 1 Cor. 14. 40. *Let all things be done Decently and in Order.* The second in the 26. v. *Let all things be done to Edifying.* A 3d. general Rule we have, 1 Cor. 10. 31. *Do all to the Glory of God.* And a 4th, we have, Rom. 14. 19. *Let us therefore follow after the things that make for peace.* So that here are precious Divine Limits and Land-Marks set down, in ordering all the Circumstantial of Government, and Rules discovering what is right or amiss therein, viz. *That whatever in the very Light of Nature is undecent and wants a due Decorum be eschew'd, and such a Comeliness be endeavour'd, as even Nature teaches,* 1 Cor. 11. 13, 14. *Judge in your selves, is it comely that a Woman Pray unto God uncovered, doth not even Nature it self teach you, that if a Man hath long Hair it is a shame unto him.* Again, *that whatever doth not Edify, and has no tendency to that end, is to be eschew'd, tho' otherwise lawful, that this be accordingly habitually intended, and all methods taken subservient thereunto, and by that Rule the Expediency of Actions hic & nunc be measur'd: This being the great End of all instituted Ordinances,* Eph. 4. 11, 12. 1 Cor. 14. 3. *The End, as likewise the Rule of our endeavouring after Peace and Unity,* Rom. 15. 2. with 14. 19. *The great End of all Ministerial Authority,* 2 Cor. 10. 8. with 13. 10. *The great Rule of the Exercise of all Gifts,* 1 Cor. 14. 17. *The great Design of Christian Communion and Fellowship, and the great Rule to discern the Expedience of things in themselves lawful,* 1 Cor. 10. 23. *That great Rule of doing all to the Glory of God doth discover and direct in the proper Means and Expedients leading to the foremention'd Ends, and shews that our last look must be sincere and single in all Church Administrations.* We have, finally, this Rule prescrib'd, *that true Peace and Unity is to be highly valu'd, and whatever tends to a Breach and Schism to be eschew'd; But that withall the Unity must be the Unity of the Spirit,* Eph. 4. 3. *And the Spiritual Peaceable Wisdom is in the first place Pure, not peaceable beyond the limits of Gospel Purity,* Jam. 3. 17.

In the second place, that the Scripture points out a clear Plat-Form of Presbyterian Government, and that the Perfection thereof in this point condemns J. S's Design in this Pamphlet, who sends the Church to the Principles and Practices of the Third Age for this Rule and Pattern, is abundantly evident. But, for further Elucidation, we

may here offer further to Consideration, 1. That all the Ordinances which we owne stand clearly represented in Scripture, such as are already hinted, "Publick Prayer, Praises, Reading, Preaching, Catechetical Expounding the Word, Administration of the Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper. Compare 1 *Tim.* 2. 1, 2. 1 *Cor.* 14. 14, 15. *Eph.* 5. 18, 19. *Col.* 3. 16. *Acts* 13. 15. *Heb.* 5. 12. 6. 1, 2. *Mat.* 28. 19, 20. 1 *Cor.* 11. 20, &c. Add to these, "Ordination of Ministers, Ministerial Judging and Discerning of Doctrine, Rebuke of Sinners, Rejecting the Incurable from Communion, and Receiving again. Compare 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. 1 *Tim.* 5. 22. *Acts* 14. 21. *Acts* 25. from v. 16. *per totum*, especially v. 24, 28. *Mat.* 18. 15, 16. 1 *Cor.* 5. with 2 *Cor.* 2. 6, &c. "The Relieving and Refreshing the Poor and Indigent, *Acts* 6. 2ly, The Officers we owne stand clearly exemplified in Scripture, such as the *Pastor, Doctor, or Teacher, Eph.* 4. 11. The *Ruling-Elder, 1 Tim.* 5. 17. 1 *Cor.* 12. 28. *Rom.* 12. 7, 8. The *Deacon*, who serves Tables and ministers to the Poor, *Acts* 6. 3ly, As the Officers, so the Judicatories we owne stand clearly exemplified and approv'd in Scripture, such as, 1. The *Congregational Eldership*, the Divine Warrant whereof our Writers have variously made appear, 1. Even from the Light of Nature, requiring lesser Matters to be judg'd in Inferior Judicatories, according to *Jethro's Advice, Exod.* 18. 26. from the necessary Subordination of Inferior to Superior Courts, supposing a Congregational Church, which must needs (as in that Capacity) have a Government, 1 *Cor.* 14. 1, 3, 4. 2ly, From the Scope and Tenor of our Lord's Institution in *Mat.* 18. where, 1. The Church, to which the Complaint is to be made, is suppos'd to be vested with a Power of Binding and Loosing. 2ly, This Binding and Loosing Power is suppos'd competent to two or three, or a small Number, consequently to the Eldership of a particular Congregation. Besides, that as the Scripture doth exemplifie both the greater Associated and Congregational Churches, 1 *Cor.* 1. 1. with 14. 34. *Acts* 8. 1. and 13. 1. *Rom.* 16. 5. 1 *Cor.* 16. 19. *Colos.* 4. 15. *Philem.* 2. So it is observable, that as in *Mat.* 18. 15. to 21. there is an Allusion to the Jewish Form of Government, since therein there was betwixt their Sanhedrim and their Synagogue the middle Ecclesiastick Court called *Πρεσβυτεριον*, *Luke* 22. 66. So there were in the Synagogues lesser Judicatories, *Acts* 26. 11. and *Acts* 9. 1, 2. *Acts* 18. 8, 17. This, with respect to the New Testament Church, is confirm'd from the Apostles Ordaining Elders Church by Church *κατ' ἐκκλησίαν*.

2ly, The Presbyterial Church, consisting of the Officers of divers Congregations therein represented, has been made good from clear Scripture

Scripture Instances, wherein Account is given of *Associated Elders* in Presbyterial Churches. These from *Antioch* intrusted with Alms to the poor Saints, *Acts* 11. 30. were sent emphatically to the *Elders* or *Presbyters* of the Church of *Jerusalem*. Thus, *Acts* 21. 18. Paul went in unto *James*, and all the *Elders* were present. That there was here an *Associated Eldership* presiding of several Congregations, is made good, 1. From the Multitude of Believers both before and after the Dispersion. Compare *Acts* 2. 46, 47. and 4. 4. with 5. 14. and 5. 6, 7. and 8. 1. and 9. 31. and 12. 24. and 21. 20. 2ly, From the necessary Connection betwixt the *Apostles* and many other *Preachers* suppos'd in that Church, and the *Plurality* of Congregations under this Associated Government. The *Apostles* Assiduous Diligence in Preaching, who gave themselves continually to that Work, *Acts* 8. 2, 4. puts it beyond all peradventure, that they Preach'd not all to one Congregation, else they could have Preach'd but seldom. Again, this is made good from the Diversity of Languages among the Believers mention'd, *Ch.* 2. and 6. See the same made good with respect to other Churches by the Authors of *Jus Divin.* Reg. *Eccles.* *Ch.* 14.

3ly, The Scripture doth also clearly hold out the Pattern of *Synods* of a superior Degree and Authority to *Presbyteries*. For Proof of which, several things are drawn from that notable Council, *Acts* 15. Since, 1. "Paul and *Barnabas* submitted to be sent to *Jerusalem*, importing, that Paul, at least, being an *Apostle*, neither he nor *Barnabas* needed have gone to *Jerusalem* for a Resolution, had they not here carried and acted as Members for the time of that *Presbytery* in *Antioch*: 2ly, "They were sent not only to the *Apostles* at *Jerusalem*, but also to the *Elders*, at that time not a few in that place, and therefore were not sent to the *Apostles* as Extraordinary and Infallible; For what needed the Advice of *Elders* for this, but as Wise and Holy Guides of the Church, and to set a Pattern to after Ages for removing Errors and Dissentions in the Church. 3ly, "The *Apostles* did not determine the Thing in Question and the Point controverted by Apostolical Authority, from immediate Revelation, but upon Stating and Debating the Question from Scripture in an ordinary way. 4ly, "The Decrees of the Synod run in the Name not only of the *Apostles*, but of the *Apostles* and *Elders*, *Acts* 15. 22, 23. *Acts* 16. 4, 21, 25. 5ly, "That here there were Ecclesiastick Acts binding the Churches, is evident also in the Context. This Judicatory tells the Churches, they will lay upon them no other Burden, *Acts* 15. 28. The Binding of Burdens is an Act of the Binding Power of the Keyes. And, *Acts* 16. 4. mention is made of the Decrees Ordain'd by the *Apostles* and *Elders*. And the

the Word *Agua* in the New Testament, is put for either Decrees or Laws, and so frequently made use of by the Septuagint. See this great Truth further prosecuted by that Piece, bearing the Title of a Vindication of the Presbyterian Government by the Ministers of the Provincial Assembly of London, from Pag. 20. and so foreward, where the notable Tendency of Presbyterian Government, both to Union and Edification, is convincingly made appear. Also by the Learn'd and Judicious Tractate, Entituled, *Jus Divin. Regim. Eccles.* As also, *The Vind. of Presb. Govern.* Mr. Rutherford's *Due Right of Presb.* from Pag. 219. and so foreward. Where, for evincing this Point from the same Scripture, there is a large Proof drawn, 1. From the Occasion of the Synod. 2ly, The proper Members of the Synod. 3ly, The equal Power and Authority exercis'd by all those Members. 4ly, The Way and Method of Ordering their Synodal Proceeding. 5ly, The Juridical Acts of Power put forth by the Synod; With the Issue and Consequent of all upon the Churches. See also Mr. Pagett's *Power of Classes and Synods*, Chap. 6. P. 63, &c. urging both *Act. 1.* and *Act. 15.* with the Consent of Writers generally for the Authority of Synods. To the foremention'd Scope also of the Nature and Subordination of Church Judicatories, J. S. if he please, may consult, with the Authors mentioned, the Piece, Entituled, *Affertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland by Mr. Gillespie*, Part 2, Chap. 4, &c. and his *Aaron's Rod Blossoming*, Lib. 1. Chap. 3. Pag. 8, to 38. *Camero, Praelect. in Matth. 18. 15.* Pag. 150, with others. As for the Warrant of the National Assemblies, and their Authority, it necessarily results from what is made appear, touching the Subordination of the lesser to the greater Church Judicatories, and is founded upon the same Scripture Grounds and Principles.

Now from the whole, we may offer to J. S's Consideration, 1. That we have made appear the Scripture's clear Assertion of a distinct Species of Church Government, and in special of Presbyterian Government, with respect to all the Ordinances, Officers, and Judicatories which we owne; So that we have the Voice of God, and the Laws of the Supreme Lawgiver, standing against him in all his Pleadings for the Hierarchical Prelate, so clearly cross and opposite thereunto. And further, we may appeal to J. S's Conscience, if it does not appear, that the Apostles of our Lord, in their Judicial Acting in Church Government, have not clearly condemn'd that *Absolute, Peerless, and Paramount Authority of Bishops over Pastors*, which he is bold to assert. 2ly, We may offer the same Appeal to all considering Persons, yea to the Consideration of J. S. himself, whether *this Divine Right* for Pastors or Presbyters

Presbyters Authority, and for Presbyterian Government, thus delineated in the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles, or *his suppos'd Factum*, the Principles and Practice of *Cyprian*, and his Contemporaries, ought to be preferr'd in the Churches Imitation and Practice? And whether this Ballance of the Sanctuary, or his Humane Ballance mention'd by him in his Epilogue, ought to be made use of for clearing and determining this point?

And finally, since he might have known, that there is so much to be said from Scripture for the Cause which we owne, Whether his pretending to stop our Mouths, and bear us down with a meer Account of the Principles and Practice of the *Cyprianic Age*, and Boasting so insolently thereupon, has not discover'd him to be a meer Fugitive from the Scripture Light, yea and an Opposer, in so far, of the Authority and Perfection thereof, for which he deserves the just Censure of all Sound Protestants?

CH A P. V.

Wherein is Examined J. S's Attacks upon the Author of the Treatise, Entituled, Rectius Instruendum, and of the Other, Entitul'd, The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim to a Divine Right, &c. Offering an Answer to his Criticisms and Accusation anent that Author's pretended Incongruous Citations of the Fathers, in the Tractate last mention'd especially; Refuting also his Charge anent the mis-stating of the Question, and bringing likewise unto the Touch-Stone of the Solid Principles of Logick, his Two Syllogisms which he vainly offers to the Two Principals upon the Point of the Ruling-Elder's Office; Discovering clearly, upon the whole, his Unsoundness, Ignorance and Self-Contradiction.

S E C T. I.

The Citations of the Fathers defended from J. S's Cavillations, and the Impertinency of this Charge made appear.

THIS New Advocate of the Episcopal Cause, who deserves the first place among his Fellows in point of vain insolent Loquacity, inveighs with Bitterness enough upon the Author of the premis'd Treatises, and has several Attacks upon him in the point of Citation of Authors: But whether he hath in this appear'd the *Momus* or *Thersites*, or both, shall evidently appear

appear in the Defence subjoin'd. This pitiful loose Disputant, who hath never attempted, in this his Laborious Nothing, to touch the Core of this Controversie, will needs make a great Bussle, and act the Impertinent Busie-Body, in cratching at the Shell of some Words and Phrases.

His first Attack is upon a Citation of *Clemens*, Chap. 2. Pag. 5. cited by that Author, Part 1. Pag. 19. in *Epist. ad Philip.* Whereas no such Epistle is extant. Which Criticism, together with others ensuing, will appear to be vain and impertinent, when it is considered in general, 1. That it is merely grounded upon the very common and usual Escape of the Transcriber, or Press, putting the Word *Philippians* for *Corinthians*, which being to be plac'd among the *Errata Typographica*, was, as other such like, remitted to the Readers candid Correction. The Author having observ'd many such, which, because of great Distance from the Press, had crept into this Impression, to avoid the tedious Work of filling up whole Pages with such Observations, determin'd to remit the same in a general Admonition, after some of the more obvious observ'd, to the Reader's candid Correction, having no thoughts that the Eyes of such an Idle *Momus* as this, should have fall'n upon that Book, who, instead of impugning the Author, dare only make a silly pitiful Assault upon some Verbal Escapes of the Press or Transcriber; Otherwise, a large Account of such Errors, which he had drawn up upon a Second and Third Reading, and had sent to *Edinburgh* to the Printer, had been printed with other *Errata*, which several did judge a fruitless Work, and not worth the while, the Treatise being then wholly printed off; But judg'd it rather adviseable, according to the usual manner, to remit this Correction to the Candid Reader's Discretion. 2ly, If such an Accusation were valid, and did infer such an Imputation upon that Author, as this pitiful *Momus* intends, beyond all peradventure, he might thus put an Ignominious Blot upon the most Famous Divines in Christendom, and accuse them of gross Ignorance in the Citations of the Sacred Scriptures themselves, wherein many such Escapes might be observ'd, and not only the Testimony wrong'd by wrong Pointing or perverse Reading, but the very Book it self miscited and misapplied. Who knows not, that a wrong Touch of either the Transcriber or the Press, as to either Word, Letter or Figure, may make an Error of a great Figure for a *Momus* to grate upon? Thus he might fasten his Teeth upon the Learn'd *Jerom*, who, speaking of *Ignatius's* Epistles, presents some things which is not in *Ignatius*, but commonly ascrib'd to *Barnabas*. When I had read in the Works of a Famous Divine, whose Praise is in all the Churches, the 27th of *John* cited,

ed, and if I mistake not, once and again, I presently apprehended what a Field there was here for our Learned *Momus* critically to expatiate in, had this Author been engag'd in Debate with him, and yet 'tis notorious, that this gross Typographical Error cannot, without extreme Impudence, be imputed to the Author, being nothing but a wrong Touch of the Transcriber or Press, in putting the 2 for the 1 Figure; consequently the 27 for the 17 *Cb.* The Author of that Treatise could have helped this *Momus* to many other such like Learn'd Observes. Thus, *Part 2. Pag. 94.* there is found cited the Book of the Learn'd *Rivet*, Entitled, *carholicus Orthodoxus, Tract. 28. Quæst. 23.* wherein there's no such thing to be found as is cited, the proper place being *Tract. 2. Quæst. 22.* A Correction whereof, with some others, the Author added with his Hand to the Margent. A wonder it is also, that, in *Part 1. Pag. 77. Mantitecla, Literis Magisculis*, being printed for these Words, *Mainly Teckla*, our *Momus* started not at this Hobgobling, and, having in view the preceeding with several other *Errata*, declaim'd not stoutly upon this important *Theme*. Doth not the Man deserve a Chair for a Famous Disputant, who spends his Elaborate Enquiries upon such Trifles.

In the second place, to shew more particularly his impertinent Folly in this Accusation, and to discover with what Cursory Inadvertency and Negligence he had read that Author, he might, upon turning over only some few Pages, have discover'd the Folly of this Criticism: For, *Pag. 38.* this Testimony of *Clemens* he might have seen restor'd to its proper place, *scil. Epist. ad Corinth.* Where also he might have seen the Passage of this Epistle explain'd, with respect to that Church. And, if not more concerning himself in such insignificant Quibblings, than solid Dispute and Inquiry for Truth, he might have found himself oblig'd to answer what is pleaded by the Authors of the *Jus Divin. Min. Evan. Pag. 105, 106,* besides several other Presbyterian Writers from several places of *Clemens's* Epistle, for proving his Sense of the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter. He might have found himself also oblig'd to answer what is offer'd by the Author whom he attacks (and in that same place where he thus acts the silly Critick) against the Truth of *Eusebius's* History, where he produces the Reasons of the Famous *Scaliger* to this purpose.

As to *Hegeſippus*, our *Momus* alleges, the Author had affirm'd, there's no part of him extant, whom he would needs refute, forsooth, out of the Fragments of *Hegeſippus* extant in *Eusebius*, in which Accusation he has rather vented his Malicious Ignorance, than any ways blotted that Author; For, *Part 1. Pag. 49.* cited by him, that Author distinguisheth

eth betwixt these parts of *Hegeſippus* which he denies to be extant, and these little Fragments and Remains, which by *Eusebius* are ascrib'd to him. So that his meaning palpably appears to be this, that there is no entire Book or Tractat of *Hegeſippus* extant, nor any part of a Tractat properly so call'd. But for these little Fragments mentioned, he judges them spurious and supposititious, according to the Sense thereof, exhibited by Learn'd Protestant Divines. So that J. S. bewrayed his own Ignorance in accusing this Author as Ignorant of these Fragments, since he makes mention of them oftner than once. What more?

The Author had also cited a Sentence of *Ambrose*, Pag. 52. viz. *Multorum Sacerdotum judicio constitutum*, &c. Upon this J. S. makes a Triumphant Buffle, Charging the Author with Ignorance in the Writings of *Ambrose*, this Sentence not being found in *Ambrose* but *Hilary*. Softly, Sir. Whether this Sentence is ascribable to *Ambrose* or *Hilary*, or the Book, or Treatise rather, is yet under Debate by Criticks. In this our Momus fastens his Teeth upon the Learn'd *Erasmus*, charging him with Ignorance, who set forth these Commentaries under the Name of *Ambrose*: Yea a whole German Synod, not to mention others, ascribe these Commentaries to *Ambrose* a whole Century of Years at least, if not more, before *Erasmus* was Born, So that this Author ascribing these Commentaries unto him gave them no other Title and Appellation than what by a considerable Prescription of Time was made common; Notwithstanding that they are commonly judg'd to be the Writings of *Hilary* the Deacon. 'Tis known that this Passage of *Hilary* in Cap. 4. *Epist. ad Eph.* is ascrib'd sometimes to *Hilary*, sometimes to *Ambrose*.

The Learn'd Authors of the Appendix to the *Jus Divin. Minist. Evang.* pag. 103. 104. citing this Commentary on *Eph. 4.* as probably ascribable to *Ambrose* represented a remarkable Passage which becomes J. S's Consideration, *Ideo non per omnia conveniunt Scripta Apostoli Ordinationi quæ nunc in Ecclesia est*, &c. *Nam & Timotheum Presbyterum a se creatum Episcopum vocat, quia primum Presbyteri Episcopi appellabantur*, &c. That the Order then in the Church was not every way consonant to the Apostolick Writings; Seing *Paul* call'd *Timothy* a Bishop whom he had Ordain'd a Presbyter. Whence they infer, that the Ordination that was in *Ambrose's* Days, was not in all things agreeable to the Apostolical Pattern. As for that simple Attack concerning *Hilary* and *Jerom*, whom that Author had taken promiscuously the one for the other: The Writings of both are of such a near Affinity, that tho' the mistake should be ascrib'd to the Author himself,

self, not to an escape of the Press or Transcriber (as upon the Ground assign'd it cannot reasonably be), it is of very little Moment, but the premis'd Answers are sufficient to wipe off this with his other Foolish Calumnies.

Proceed we to another Grand Accusation of our Momus, That the Author had cited *Hieronymi Epist. ad Nepotianum*, wherein he asserts, that what Aaron and his Sons were (*scil.* in the Church of the Jews) the same is the Bishop and Presbyter : Whereupon J. S. with great Confidence tells us, *That there is such a Sentence in Jerom's Epist. ad Evagrium, but no such Words in his Epist. ad Nepotianum.* Said you so, Sir? Let us consult *Jerom*, and let him give Sentence betwixt our Momus and that Author, and, I fear, *Jerom* shall pronounce him a Liar, and baffle his pretended Critical Skill. In that Epistle *ad Nepotianum*, a little after the middle, he hath these words, *Sacerdotis Christi Os, mens, manusq; concordent*, That the Mind, Word, and Hands of the Lord's Priests should be one and uniform. Let J. S. ponder this. Next he adds, *Illud etiam dico, quod Episcopi Sacerdotes sese esse noverint, non Dominos.* This also I assert, let the Bishops know that they are Priests or Ministers, not Lords. Here then *Jerom* sends the Spiritual Parliament Lords a packing with all their Temporal Pomp. But this on the by. Then a little after, he subjoyns these words controverted, *Quod Aaron & filios ejus hoc Episcopum & Presbyterum esse noverimus. Unus Dominus, unum Templum, unum sit etiam Ministerium.* If we acknowledge that what Aaron and his Sons were, that this also the Bishop and the Presbyters. We must own one Lord, one Temple and one Ministry. He also cites the Apostle *Peter's* Precept, 1 Pet. 5. Wherein the Apostle discharges Ministers Domination or Lordship. Now I hope that *actum est*, and *Jerom* has given Sentence for us against J. S. But that which makes the Man's petulant Inadvertency the more considerable, yea and inexcusable, is, the occasion of the Author's mentioning that Passage was his debating the Sense of it with Dr. *Scott*, who had cited the same Sentence in *Jerom's* Epistle *ad Nepotianum* *. So that he has beat with his blunt Staff this venerable Doctor and Associat of the Cause.

* *Christian Life.*
Part 2. Pag.
415. 416.

Follows another Grand Accusation of this our Learn'd Antiquary, wherein, it is like, he will have as pitiful an Exit, and come off as dishonourably as in the preceeding. The Author had cited the 10 Book of *Rufin's History*. Upon this J. S. Triumphs, charging him with no small Ignorance, because, saith he, *Rufin* wrote only two Books, where is then the 10 Book? But a short account of this

matter will discover this Man's precipitant Folly in this his gran Criticism. It is known, *Eusebius* Wrote 10 Books, carrying on th History to *Constantin's* 20th Year, which was in the 324 of *Christ* *Rufin* Translated *Eusebius's* History into the Latin Tongue, adding two Books of his own, which are the Supplement of the History, until the end of *Theodosius* his Reign; Taking great Liberty, after his manner, both of adding to and detracting from the History. For Instance, he wholly omits the 10 Book of *Eusebius*, yea, and in a great measure the 9 Book also. The 8 and 9 Book he Abridges into one. He adds unto the 7 Book, the History of the Miracles of *Gregory Thaumaturg*, which is not to be found in *Eusebius's* History. He adds also to the 9 Book, the History of *Lucian* the Martyr, which *Eusebius* has not. Moreover, he inverts the Order of the Chapters both in 6 and 7 Book.

Now, this History, thus egregiously Interpolated and Chang'd, doth with all Men, and ordinarily, yea justly bear the Name of *Rufin*, and is Entitled *his History*, so that the Author did very suitably cite the 10th Book of *Rufin's History*, that is, the Book which is the 10th in order in that History which goes under the Name of *Rufin*, which will by no Reason inter his asserting *Rufin* to be the Author of all these Books, as this Calumniating *Momus* asserts, who would fain seek a Knot in the Rush, and who by as Wise an Inference might accuse the Person citing the 5. Tome of *Alstedius's Panstratia*, as if he had pronounc'd *Alstedius* the Author of the whole *Panstratia*.

Yet another Criticism. The Author had cited a Sentence in *Gratian*, scil. *Ecclesia habet Senatum Presbyterorum*. Upon this J. S. thinks to fasten his Critical Animadversion, charging him as Ignorant of *Gratian* and *Jerom* both, these Words being the Words of *Jerom*, and not his. But how light and empty this Accusation is, will appear to any that do Read *Gratian*. For upon such ground, scarcely any thing in all the Decree must come under this Character, since it is wholly compacted and made up of Citations. Moreover, that Author had asserted, that the Distinction of the Clergy and Laick was Novel, and unknown to the purer Antiquity, whom our *Momus* will needs check from the Instance of *Clement*. His Animadversion on this point is like his preceeding, and no doubt, if there be any thing in *Clement* that seems to favour this Distinction, he may be probably judg'd to respect therein the Church of the Jews, rather than the Christian. But for his Judgment in this point he hath the Learn'd *Bucer* going before him in his Dispute against *Downame*. To this purpose we have a remarkable Passage of our Famous and Learn'd Mr.

Gillespie.

Gillespie *. The Distinction, saith he, of Clergy and Laity is Popish and Antichristian; And they who have narrowly considered the Records of Antient Times, have noted this Distinction, as one of the grounds, whence the Mystery of Iniquity had the beginning of it. For which he cites *Catal. Test. Verit. Lib. 2. Col. 98. Osiander Cent. 1. pag. 81.* Adding that the Name of Clergy appropriated to Ministers is full of Pride and vain Glory, and hath made the Holy People of God to be despis'd, as if they were Prophanes and Unclean, in comparison of their Ministers. Citing further Gerard, *Loc. Theol. Tom. 6. N. 37.* likening those, who take to themselves the Name of the Clergy, to the Pharisees, who call'd themselves by that Name, for that their Holiness did separat them from the rest of the Jews. The Learn'd Author does further mention some Councils discharging the Laity from presuming to enter within the Quire, or to stand among the Clergy near the Altar. Thus *Synod. Turon. 2. Can. 3. Synod Const. 6. Can. 69.* Shewing that the pretended ground of applying the name to Ministers, *scil.* because the Lord is their Inheritance, and that they are his Inheritance, is vain and groundless; Since there is none of the Faithful who may not say with David, *Psal. 16. 5. The Lord is the portion of my Inheritance.* The Apostle Peter giving this Name to the whole Church, *1 Pet. 5. 3.* Let us then, saith he, banish from us such Popish Names, and send them home to Rome. Bellarmin thought we had done so ere now, for he makes this one of his controverted Heads, *de Cler. Lib. 1. Cap. 1. Whether we may rightly call some Christians the Clergy, and others the Laity, or not?* Ascribing the Negative to Protestants, the Affirmative to the Church of Rome. Where he Notes also Bishop Hall's borrowing † a Gloss from Bellarmin and Gregory Valentia, while he holds that Peter charg'd his Fellow Bishops not to Domineer over their Clergy; So shutting out of the Text both the Duty of Pastors, because the Bishops only are meant by Elders, and the Benefit of the People, because the Inferior Pastors are the Bishops Flock according to this Gloss. See *pag. 4. 5.* Moreover, that Author, *pag. 90 and 98,* had affirm'd that Cyprian did profess, he neither could, nor would do any thing in point of Government without the Clergy, owning the Presbyters as his Collegues. Our great Critick fiercely assaults this Assertion. And it were here superfluous to insist in a Critical Debate with him on this point. As for Cyprian's owning Presbyters as his Collegues, as Learn'd Criticks, yea more and better seen in Antiquity than *J. S. scil. The Authors of the Appendix*

* *Affect. of the Govern. of the Church of Scotland, Pag. 3.*

† *Episcopacy by Divine Right, Pag. 212.*

to the *Jus Divin. Minist. Evang.* Together with *Smechynnus*, besides divers others, judg, they have made it good; And therefore I shall upon this Head only offer this to *J. S.* which, upon the matter, doth clear the Thing, that since in many places *Cyprian* is found to owne himself a Co-presbyter with the Pastors, and likewise, since 'tis made appear, that the Pastor was with him the highest Officer *jure divino*, it will clearly follow, that in point of Divine Right he own'd them as his Collegues.

But upon this point, that he resolv'd not to Act without the Clergy, there are sufficient Evidences produceable, which we need not insist upon. That passage is considerable concerning *Philomenus* and *Fortunatus* the Sub-deacons, and *Favarinus* the *Acolytus*, who had turn'd aside, and again return'd; The Clergy having written to him, to know his Judgment, behold the Answer, *Cui rei, faith he, non potui me solum Judicem dare, cum multi adhuc de Clero absentes sint, nec locum suum vel sero repetendum putaverint, & hæc singulorum tractanda sit & limanda plenius ratio, &c.* He shews, that in this point he could not be Judg Alone, since many of the Clergy were absent, &c. Surely *J. S.* can make no Sense of that *non potui me Solum Judicem dare*, if they be not Interpreted to the Sense and Scope instanc'd. The Marginal Note clears this, which runneth thus, *Nec de quorundam Clericorum lapsu inconsulto Presbyterio, inscia Plebe decernit, i. e.* That he doth Determine nothing concerning the Laps'd without consulting the Presbyterie, &c. in *Epist.* 6. which is, *Ad Clerum de cura Pauperum, §. 5.* he hath these words, *Ad id vero quod Scripserunt mihi Compresbyteri nostri, Donatus, & Fortunatus, Novatus & Gordius, solus rescribere nihil potui, quando a Primordio Episcopatus mei statuerim nihil sine Consilio vestro, & sine consensu Plebis mee, privatâ sententiâ gerere, &c.* Concerning that which our fellow Presbyters, *Donatus*, and *Fortunatus*, *Novatus*, and *Gordius*, have written to me, I could of my self give no Return, having determined since the beginning of my Episcopacy, to act nothing by my own private Judgment, without your Counsel, &c. Where was the Absolute Negative here, the Episcopal *Licentia* and *Liberum Arbitrium*, that Peerless Majesty and Principality, screw'd up by *J. S.* to the highest Pinnacle of absolute and incontrollable Power, rendring the Bishop's sole Act the Act of the Church? Sure, whatever Instances hereof he may pretend to produce, tend only to fasten upon his great *Cyprian* Self-contradiction, and most unaccountable Deceit and Unfaithfulness.

Upon this passage *J. S.* is bold to assert, that the word *Statui* insinuates only a voluntary Resolution, but no official Obligation. But the words cited compar'd with the other Passage instanced, and several others ad-
duceable,

duceable, do evince the contrary; It being evident, that he ascribes this Resolution to a clear sense of his Duty and Obligation, and that he could not without palpable breach of Trust have Acted otherwise. *Non potui*, saith he; And since in a moral sense it holds good, *id tantum possumus, quod jure possumus*, Cyprian's *Non potui* must needs express a *Non potui jure*. Moreover, I would gladly know of J. S. what doth hinder a Church-Officer (call him Bishop, or Pastor) to express his Resolution, with respect unto such necessary Official Duties, to the performance whereof he stands preoblig'd? When the Apostle said 2 Cor. 2. 1. *I determined with my self that I would not come again to you in heaviness*; And when he saith. 1 Cor. 2. 2. *I determine to know nothing among you but Jesus Christ, and him crucified*; Shall I add, that when the Church, according to her Ability, determin'd to send relief to the Saints, *Act* 11. 4. And when the Church of Antioch, *Act*. 15. 2. resolv'd, or determin'd to send Paul and Barnabas to the Apostles and Elders at Jerusalem; Who will alledge, if not such an absurd *Momus* and Triffler as J. S. that these *statuta*, or *resolves*, did not suppose a previous Obligation to Duty, and consequently, a sense thereof? The Author on whom he Criticises, had also cited the instanced passage of Gratian, the 4th Council of Carthage, condemning the Bishops Decrees, which were not fortified by the Sentence of the Clergy. He had also told him that in *Synodo ad Quereum* An. 403. It was brought as an Accusation against Chrysostom, that he had made Ordination without the Company and Sentence of the Clergy. That in 4 Council of Carthage Can. 20. It was Decreed, that the Bishop Ordain not Without the Clergy, and that All the Presbyters impose hands with him in Ordination.

And whereas our high Prelatits, together with J. S. allege, that this importeth no more than a Consent; He had told them, that their own Episcopal Dr. Forbes (our Countrey man) in his *Iren. Lib. 2, cap. 11*. peremptorily Asserts, That this was perform'd by Presbyters, *non tanquam duntaxat consentientes*, (ad consensum enim sufficiunt suffragia, & Plebs enim consentit, nec tamen est ejus manus imponere) sed tanquam Ordinantes, seu Ordinem conferentes, & ex potestate ordinandi Divinitus accepta, gratiam Ordinato hoc adhibito ritu apprecantes. i. e. That they impos'd Hands not only as consenting, (since People give their Consent, and yet impose not Hands) but as Ordaining, or conferring Orders by the Power of Ordination conferr'd upon them by God, praying for Grace upon him that is Ordained, using this appended Ceremony of the laying on of Hands. See several other passages cited to this Scope by the Author, Part. 1. pag. 89. 90, and 98. To which J. S. has made no Return. The Instance he did also Exhibite of the

Sentence

Sentence pass'd by *Syagrius* and *Ambrose*, and the Churches Approbation of that of *Ambrose*, as proceeding from him and his Fellow-Presbyters ; Whereas that of *Syagrius* was condemn'd, as being pronounc'd without Consent of any of his Brethren. He did also shew, that the very Admonition of Offenders was not perform'd by the Bishops alone, but by the Presbyters, *August. de Verb. Apost. Serm. 19.* Thus also *Origen contra Celsum Lib. 3.* Shewing also, that *Jerome* asserts (*Epist. ad Helion.*) that the Presbytery deliver'd unto Satan. So *Epist. ad Demet. They receiv'd and Absolv'd the Penitents.* He made also appear, that *Cyprian* (*Epist. 12.*) Asserts, that Excommunicated Persons returning unto the Church Fellowship, were not Admitted, till Hands were laid upon them by the Bishop and Clergy ; And writing to his Charge anent Laps'd Christians, he says, That after Confession, and laying on of the Presbyters Hands, they might be Recommended to God, *Exhomologesi factâ, & manu eis a vobis in Pœnitentiam imposita.* And such as return'd from Heresie, and were to be receiv'd in the Church at Rome, in the time of *Cornelius*, *Cyprian* tells us (*Epist. 6. compar'd with 46.*) they came before the Presbytery, and confessing their Sins, were receiv'd.

To the same Scope of asserting Pastors or Presbyters essential Interest in Government, and shewing that Sense the Ancients had thereof, in opposition to the pretended Prerogatives. and supereminent Power of Bishops, asserted by our new Episcopal Pleaders, the Author had cited the famous Testimony of *Jerome* in *Epist. ad Evagrium*, and in his *Comment. in Epist. ad Tit.* a Testimony which has inextricably involv'd, and Gravel'd our Episcopalians, in making some shift of Answer. *Jerome*, having by clear Testimonies of Scripture, Evinc'd and Demonstrated the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, upon the whole Cause and Controversie, gives this Judgment and Sentence: *Sciant Episcopi se magis consuetudine, quam dispositionis Divina veritate, Presbyteris esse superiores, & in communi debere Ecclesiam regere. i. e.* Let the Bishops know that by Custom rather, than by the Truth of Divine appointment, they are Superior to Presbyters, and do in common govern the Church. Moreover, in the passages cited (especially both being collated with respect to his Scope) he asserts, that through all the Apostolick Age, the Churches were govern'd *Communi Presbyterorum Concilio*, by the common Council of Presbyters. The Scriptures cited by *Jerome*, to prove the forementioned Identity, making this evidently appear.

To shake off this heavy Argument and Testimony, the Adversaries do pitifully turn and toss themselves, but with palpably fruitless Endeavours. Doctor *Scott*, against whom that Author Disputs, offers
no

no fewer than six Exceptions and Answers, all which he has scanned and Refuted at some length ; As likewise the Answers offered by the Author of that Pamphlet Entituled, *The Differences of the Times*, are scanned in the Treatise, Entituled, *Rectius Instruendum*. Yet J. S. offers not the least help to the Doctor, notwithstanding that, if these Testimonies of Scripture pleaded by *Jerome* be valid to infer his Conclusion, the Episcopal Cause lyes groveling in the Dust.

The Author also had cited *Augustin's* 19th Epistle *ad Hieronymum*. In this Epistle, towards the end, *Augustin* ascribes the Difference between a Bishop and Presbyter to *Ecclesiastick custom only*, Asserting thus the Distinction to be merely Nominal. The words of *Augustin* are these *Quamvis enim secundum honorum vocabula, quæ jam Ecclesiæ usus obtinuit, Episcopatus Presbyterio Major sit, tamen in multis rebus Augustinus Hieronymo Minor est*. Where in two Diminutives he excludes and depresses the Episcopal pretended Official Superiority in point of a Divine Right; First, in asserting the difference to have flowed only from *An Ecclesiastick custom*, which had gradually crept in, thus clearly distinguishing it from a *Divine Original Right*, therein according with *Jerome* in the place fore-cited. 2. In making this supposed Difference to dwindle into a meer distinction of Names, *Secundum honorum vocabula*.

Moreover, the Author, to the same Scope, for proving this Identity of Bishop and Presbyter, had cited the famous Testimony of *Chrysostom* in his Commentary on the first Epistle of *Paul* to *Timothy*, the Eleventh Homily on the 3d Chapter. In the beginning of the Homily *Chrysostom* proposeth the Question, wherefore the Apostle having described the Bishop, and given account of his Office, passeth immediately over to the Office of the Deacon, *Intermisso interim Presbyterorum ordine*, making no mention of the Order of Presbyters? To which Question he gives this Return, *Quia inter Presbyterum & Episcopum interest ferme nihil, & quæ Episcopo scripserat Apostolus eadem Presbytero conveniunt, quippe Presbytero quoque commissa est Ecclesiæ cura*. That betwixt the Bishop and Presbyter there is little or no difference ; And what the Apostle had ascribed to the Bishop, the same also are proper to the Presbyter ; Since to them also the Care of the Church is committed. Which quite baffles the many vast essential and official Differences, which J. S. in his whole Pamphlet fixes betwixt the Bishop and Presbyter.

Moreover, the Author Examines at large Doctor *Scott's* Citations from the Epistles of *Ignatius*, making evident the repugnancy of several Sentences drawn from these Epistles, unto the Holy Scriptures, and inferring thereupon, that the Epistles themselves are spurious, and not to be ascribed to this early and holy Martyr ; Shewing also herein the

Consent

Consent of Learned Protestant Divines, giving the same Judgment on these Epistles, offering also a Return unto what is alleged anent the Defence thereof by Doctor Pearson and Doctor Beverege. Moreover, the Author hath Examined the Conclusions drawn by Doctor Scott from these Epistles, and discovered the unsoundness thereof further in the Treatise Entitled, *Rectius Instruendum* (which J. S. from his Oracle pronounces unworthy of Answer, a short and sure Confutation, no doubt, wanting only the *Medium* of J. S's supposed Infallibility). The Author had demonstrated the difference betwixt our *Scottish* Hierarchy erected in this Church, and the Episcopacy which first obtained in the Churches, in no less than twelve Instances drawn from approved Authors. And in the other Treatise, the Authority of Pastors or Presbyters in Councils as constituent Members thereof, is made appear from the Acts of Councils themselves, *scil.* the Tenth Canon of the Council of *Antioch*, the 13th Canon of the Council of *Ancyra*, together with the 13th Canon of the 4th Council of *Carthage*.

Several other Testimonies of the Fathers, J. S. might have seen cited to this Scope in that Treatise he thus vilifies, (Pag. 89.) as that *Chrysostom*, *Hom.* 17. on *Matth.* calls Presbyters expressly *Christi Vicarios*, Christ's Vicars, or Deputies; Inferring therefrom their *Divine Authority* in Government, deriv'd from our Lord, in *Chrysostom's* Sense. And that *Cyprian*, *Lib.* 4. *Epist.* 8. asserts our Lord's setting apart Pastors to Minister in his Church. That *Ignatius*, in his Epistle to the *Trallians*, calls the Presbytery *Senatum Dei*, God's Court or Senate; Denying peremptorily, that Presbyters were Counsellors meerly of Prelates, and asserting, that they were their Authoritative Fellow-Associates in Government. That, in Correspondence to this Assertion of *Ignatius*, *Irenaeus*, *Lib.* 4. *C.* 44. calls them *Principes*, Princes, or Chief; Asserting clearly their Associated Chief Interest in Government. Thus *Augustin*, *Serm.* 6. calls the Brethren in *Eremo Patronos*, *Rectores Terræ*. The Assertion also of *Chrysostom* is cited on *1 Tim.* 1. *Hom.* 11. *scil.* " That Presbyters presided over the Churches as Bishops, and receiv'd, together with them, the Office of Teaching and Governing the Church. Upon the forecited Passage of *Chrysostom*, wherein he holds, that what the Apostle had said concerning *Bishops*, the same things also do agree to *Presbyters*; The Author did thus subsume and conclude. But so it is, that the Authority of Government, and the Enacting of Laws in Church Judicatories, is by the Apostle ascrib'd to the Scripture *Bishop*, whom he mentions: *Ergo*, the same Authority and Power is, by the Apostle, ascrib'd to *Presbyters*, in *Chrysostom's* Sense.

Now,

Now, upon the whole, let it be considered what Return *J. S.* hath made to the premised Accounts of the Episcopal Office, in point of Antiquity, presented by that Author in the forementioned Treatises; And it will be evident to any considering person, that, in a great measure, at least, if not wholly, he stands mute and silent, and in so far hath, in this Conflict, let fall his Standard, and yielded up his Cause; For, upon supposal of the Truth of what is premised in point of Antiquity, who sees not, that the Episcopal Cause and Pleadings fall to the Dust.

I said, in a great measure, at least, he stands mute and silent to what is above offered; I am sure, to the far greatest part thereof, he does not so much as offer an Answer, which will be obvious to any who shall peruse his whole Pamphlet. For, as for his Quibblings upon some of these Testimonies, I may appeal to the Judicious and Impartial who have perus'd the same, that either they appear a meer Distortion of the Author's genuine Sense, or else, if in his Sense admitted, do fasten a palpable Contradiction upon these Fathers, which, in a special manner, is applicable to the instanced Testimonies of *Jerom*, *Chrysostom* and *Augustin*, the exhibited Sense of the two first especially being in their Exposition of the Scriptures controverted, and consequently must needs preponderate and over-rule whatever Assertions in their other Writings seem to have a different Sense. Besides that the *Idea* that several Ancient Fathers intertain'd of the Pastor, or Presbyter's Subordinate Station to the Prelate *jure Humano* and *Ecclesiastico*, (which is evident in *Augustin's* instanc'd Testimony) doth very fitly accord any seeming Inconsistencies in their Assertions in this point; Since their Assertion of the Pastor's Authority in Government, as being of the same Office with the Bishop, hath evidently a respect to a *Divine Right*.

We shall therefore conclude this Section with these two or three Observes. *First*, It doth evidently appear, that *J. S.*'s Reproaches of that Author as a gross *Ignoramus* of Antiquity, are but the Eruption of his procacious Vanity, if not the Proclamation also of his own Folly and Ignorance; Since it is evident, that, in the Treatises mentioned, which *J. S.* professes to have read, he hath made no Offer of Answer to such clear passages of uncontroverted Antiquity, as all considering persons will acknowledge did call for his Consideration. He offers, in his Flaming Humour, to become Presbyterian, upon the proof of the Equality of Bishop and Presbyter from some passages of *Cyprian*, viz. His calling Presbyters his Collegues, and that he neither would nor could do any thing without them. But beside what is offered in the preceeding passages of *Cyprian*, to prove Presbyters Essential Interest in Government, the other instanced proofs from Antiquity will clearly

conclude this; And thus he must acknowledge, that, until he can solidly answer the same, and in special the assigned Difference between the Ancient Bishops & the *Scottish* Hierarchy, he stands obliged to forego his Episcopal persuasion. 2ly, There is, in this point, a Retortion he is lyable to, which, no doubt, he will judg very considerable; For, upon the pretended Mistakes of that Author, he draws this Conclusion, Chap. 2. §. 40. That he had never read one of these Ancients; For who could have blundered so, *sait* he, that had so much as seen them? Now, from what is instanced of his own Blunder in special, his ignorant Assertion in point of *Jerom's* Epistles, denying a Sentence to be found in the Epistle cited, which is clearly extant therein, and is obvious to all who do but look it over; May we not, upon J. S's Logick, affirm, and return him thus his own Sarcastick Imputation, *viz.* That he hath never read *Jerom*; For who could have blundered so as he hath done, who had so much as seen *Jerom*? And, no doubt, to have *never so much as seen Jerom*, this our great Antiquary will judg no small Imputation. 3ly, The Author whom he thus asperseeth, hath, in this piece of Suffering from vain Flanting Adversaries of Truth, the precedency of Great and Famous Divines, who have thus, when they had no better Arguments, fallen a Grating and Criticising upon Words and Expressions. The Learned Authors of the piece entituled *Smeethymnus* were so treated by the Author of the Remonstrance, who makes such a great Critical Rant upon a certain phrase used by them, *scil.* the phrase of *Areopagi*, telling them, he had thought this had been the Name of the Place, and not of the Men, and that it was an evil Sign they had thus stumbled at the Threshold. The Famous and Learned *Whittaker* Professor in Cambridge, whom *Bucer* glories in as his Master, is thus treated by his Adversary *Durie* the Jesuite, to whose Trivial Criticisms (much of a Kin with these of J. S. *scil.* far remote from the Cause and Point debateable) the Modest Doctor gives this Answer, *Bene habet hisce in rebus non vertuntur fortuna Ecclesiae.* It is well, that the Cause of the Church of God is not touched by such Assaults: To which we may add, that *Bene habet*, it is well, that granting the Truth of J. S's instanced Criticisms, the Cause of God and of this Church is not in the least thereby touched, nor the Arguments brought by that Author weakened; Who might say of some Typographical Escapes mentioned, as the Famous and Learned *Didoclarivius*, after reciting several such Errors of his accurate Work, *Hæc leviter percurrenti occurrebant menda, plura deprehendet Lector, sed quæ facile emendari possunt.* These Escapes upon a little Review did occur, the Reader will find more, but such as may be easily and readily corrected. So much upon this point, in Answer to our Officious *Momus* and Critick.

S E C T. II.

A Consideration of what J. S. offers against that Author, as to the State of the Question.

THE next Attack and Attempt of this Pamphleter is anent the State of the Question, and the Nature of the Bishop's Power, whether it be a Sole Power or not, or touching the Solitude of Power as J. S. terms it. Our *Momus* * will not have this to be the main State of the Controversie, acknowledging, notwithstanding, that it is taken so by Presbyterians, by the Synod of London, by *Smectymnus*, together with the Reverend Mr. Rule. Adding unto them the Author of the *Rectius Instruendum*, the Author of the Hierarchical Bishop's Claim, &c.

* Chap. 3.
P. 129. § 16,
17, 18, &c.

That I may succinctly Examine this Man's foolish and inconsistent Ramblings on this point; It is certain, that whatever other Subordinate or Collateral Questions belong to this Controversie, yet this Question anent a *Sole Power* hath always been judg'd one main point debatable: And it is equally certain, that tho' the Expression of *Sole Power* appear to J. S. and his Fellows a formidable Scar-Crow, whereof they are aware and afraid of a professed direct owning, yet, upon the Matter, they do both owne and plead for it, which is evident in the whole Series and Scope of their Reasonings upon this point. And, in special, this appears in the Pleadings of J. S. and the Monstrous Extension of the Episcopal Power asserted by him, whereof some Instances are already exhibited. But because the clearing of this is of considerable Importance, and to make it appear, that the Assertion of the *Sole Power* is that which J. S. (however, for Shame, he doth here dissemble it) has spent a great part of his Endeavours upon; And withal, to evince his Shameless Prevarication and Groundless Accusations in this point, we shall here again offer a compendious Review thereof.

The Bishop's Absolute Power being asserted by him, Ch. 5. S. 40, 41, &c. Their Episcopal *Liberum Arbitrium*, S. 45. He asserts the Bishop to be the Steersman of the Churches Ship; and that he *Solely* is at that Helm; That he *Only* holds the Ballance of Government; That he is the *Only* Judg, having a Power properly Kingly and Sovereign, both as to Ordination and Jurisdiction. Asserted by him, Ch. 6. S.

31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, &c. with 41, 42, 53, 63, 64, 81, &c. with Chap. 7. §. 31, 33, 34, 35, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, &c. He depresseth the Presbyters Power so far in Synods, that, with him, it stands on a Level with that of the People, who had neither a Decisive nor Consultive Suffrage therein. This he asserts, *Ch. 7. §. 30, 32, 33.* All these do either plead for a *Sole Power* or Nothing, and are but a Beating of the Air and Nonsense. Besides, in his first Pamphlet, Entitled, *The Principles of the Cyprianic Age*, he is clear and positive, in this Assertion of the *Sole Power*, asserting, that the Bishop's Deed is the Churches Act, *P. 24.* and that he is Subordinated to None, *P. 27, 28, 35.* Nay, to None upon Earth, as is evident in the Passage of this late Pamphlet cited above, that his Power is *Sovereign and Peerless, P. 65. Supreme and Unaccountable, P. 67.* He asserts his *Sole Power* in many Acts of Government and Discipline, and his *Negative* in all, *P. 37.* Let any make Sense of these Assertions, if it be not therein clearly owned, and avouched by him, that All Church Authority is so Concentred in the Bishop, (which is Bishop *Honyman's* Phrase) that there is No Association of Power reserved to Presbyters. Nay, so Absurd he is, as to assert, *Ch. 7. §. 31, 32.* "That the Management of Things in Synods by common Advice, (mention'd by *Cyprian, Epist. 14.* compar'd with 19.) is pointed at as an Honour due to the People, and no such thing is said concerning even Presbyters; And that, taking things strictly and literally, the People seem to have been more regarded than Presbyters themselves in the Constitution of Provincial Councils. He holds the Bishop to be "the Principle of Unity in the Church, Supreme in his Church, immediately subject to Christ. *Chap. 7. §. 4.* there is a large Bundle of these Assertions of the Bishop's Power, such as, His having Freedom to determine Matters relating to his Church by virtue of his *Absolute Independent Power*; That he is, in his Power and Government, *Accountable to God only*; That he may make Statutes as he thinks fit, and hath the *Free Determination of his own Will* in the Administration of his Church; That he hath so much the *Free Power* of his own *Arbitriment*, that he may do in his Diocese what seems good unto him: Adding, "That if G. R. had considered these very full Assertions of the Episcopal Power, he would not have had the Courage to question the Episcopal Sovereignty.

Moreover, in the beginning of this Paragraph, he professeth, from the pretended Testimonies asserting this Paramount Authority, thereby to assert the Bishops *Absolute Power.* Now, if *Sovereignty and Absolute Power* of giving Laws, a Power so Independent as the Person is therein Only answerable

answerable to God, a Power in the Exercise whereof a Man hath the free Determination of his own Will, and may do what seems good unto him, be not a Sole Power, surely nothing is.

Nay, §. 2. he hath these Words, having asserted that the Bishops Interest was Sovereign in making Laws for his Diocese, Yea, saith he, it was something more than Sovereign. And if to be more than Sovereign, will not amount to, and include Sole, surely nothing will. Besides, §. 5. he pleads, that in all Cyprian's Epistles Written in time of his Retirement, we will not find so much as one Carthaginian Presbyter with him all that while, and yet, saith he, during the same time of his Retirement, you may find him giving Laws to his Presbyters and Deacons, sometimes in matters of lesser Consequence, sometimes of greater. Here is then asserted either a Sole Legislative Power, or the words are Nonsense.

But to return to §. 4. it is pleasant to see, how J. S. would lenifie all with a Limitation, which he tells us, he will readily admit of, because he is assured Cyprian would. What is that? Why, "The Bishop had this Power only in matters Undetermined by the Word of God, or by the Canons, or Radicated Customs of the Catholick Church, or by the common Authority of the Province in which he had his Diocese. But he tells us, This Limitation can be of no use to G. R. to ty up the Bishop from making any Canon without the concurrent Voices of the Major part of the Presbytery.

But, first, whatever use he may suppose it to be of to G. R. it is, sure, of use to fasten a clear contradiction upon him in the premis'd Assertions. For, if the Bishop had these four Chains or Fetters upon him in the Exercise of his Episcopal Power, viz. First, the Determination of the Word of God. 2ly, The Determination of Church Canons. 3ly, Of the Churches Radicated Customs. 4ly, Of the common Authority of the Province in which he had his Diocese, Paramount to his Diocesan Authority; Then, first, the Absolute Authority is cut off: For, what Man of Sense will say, that Authority under all these Limitations in its Exercise is Absolute? Unless Contradictions can be Reconciled, these are, no doubt, Irreconcilable. Besides, who will say, that a Power Depending in its Exercise upon all these Superiors mentioned, is an Independent Power? 2ly, Who will say, that a Man left in the Exercise of his Power to his own free Determination can be in all these respects Predetermined? And in a Word, how can the Man under all these previous Rules, regulating the whole of his Actings, be said to have Authority to make Statutes as he thinks fit, and as seems good in his

own Judgment? Moreover, will J. S. deny, that the Bishop, in the Exercise of his Power, in his Diocese, is not only Regulated by the Word of God, but Answerable to the Canons, Answerable to the Radicated Customs of the Church, and in both respects Answerable to the Authority of the Superior Prelats set over the Province, or call the Person or Persons what he will, who had Authority in the Execution of these Canons and Radicated Customs of the Church? How then could the Person thus Regulated and Answerable be said to be *Accountable in his Administration in the Diocese to God only*? For he hath told us, *that every Bishop hath such a portion of the Flock to be Ruled and Governed by him, for which he is accountable to God only.*

Again, it may be enquired, whether the instanced Limitations stand Recorded in Cyprian's Epistles, and in special in the Passages thereof cited by him in this Paragraph, to prove Cyprian's Asserting and Exercising an *Absolute Power*? If the Answer be Affirmative, then I would know, first, How he comes to say, that Cyprian *would have admitted them*, since this doth suppose, they are not admitted in these Assertions, else he had said that Cyprian *hath actually admitted them*. And 2^{ly}, How can he plead these Epistles to prove an *Absolute Power*, wherein there are such Limitations put upon the Exercise thereof.

If the Answer be Negative, that these Limitations stand not in the places cited, or in any of Cyprian's Writings, (for I hope he will not say that Cyprian's Writings contradict one another, or that any other his Writings do cross that *Absolut Power* here asserted) then I would know, how he comes to deal so arbitrarily with Cyprian's Writings, which are with him so Sacred and Infallible, as to fasten a Limitation thereupon, and such Assertions in point of Power as they will not bear, nor are deduceable therefrom.

But if Cyprian's Words will bear no such Limitation, how comes he thus to restrict them? It may be, in the third place, demanded, what he means by this Limitation of *Radicated Customs*, as thus Qualified, and Distinguished from other Customs? He will, no doubt, acknowledge, that many bad Customs have been *Radicated*. And whether his *Radicated Customs*, or *Canons* must have the preference in *Determining the Exercise of the Bishops Power*? If they be both standing Rules, it seems they must both accord, yet he will find it hard Work to assert that no Canon could strike against a *Radicated Custom*, tho' eventually found never so unexpedient and hurtful to the Church.

To all which may be added, that since he asserts this Extensive Power of the Bishop *reaches only matters not determin'd by the Word of God,* and

and what is not determin'd by the Word of God must be made appear therefrom (since the Word of God fixes its own Limits), the premis'd accounts, and Scripture Assertions of Presbyters or Pastors Essential Interest and Authority in Government will entirely cut off this Arbitrary and Absolute Power of the Bishop, which he asserts; And that upon this very Ground and Limitation assign'd by him, until he shall be able to Answer our Scripture Arguments for the Power of Pastors, and make the contrary appear.

For further clearing this matter, and obviating what he further offers upon the State of the Controversie, we may here take notice of the solid and ordinary Distinction anent the Bishop's Power, exhibited in this point by Presbyterian Divines, which will fully remove & baffle this Man's pitiful Subterfuges, viz. That there is a Power, or rather a shadow of it, which may be call'd *Consultive*, and a power which is properly and of its own Nature *Decisive* and *Conclusive*, whereby the Majority of the Votes of Members of Judicatories have an *Authoritative* Influence upon a *Judicial Determination*, or *Juridical Sentence*.

The first certainly can import no Authority properly, especially if the person whom others are suppos'd to Advise, is at his Liberty whether to Advise them or not, to Act by, or without their Advice. That such is the Bishop's Power is so clearly asserted by J. S. that in the whole Series and Scope of his Pamphlet, it is written as with a Sun-Beam. The Bishop in his Diocese he makes so to be *Christ's Vicar*, as he is *subject unto none upon Earth*, has an *Absolute Legislative Power*, and *liberum Arbitrium* in Government. He who can Solely Act by himself as he needs not so much as seek the Advice of Pastors or Presbyters, has certainly such a *Paramount Power* over them, as renders any suppos'd Power of Pastors scarcely *Consultive*, and consequently a meer Shadow and Null. Nay J. S. is in this so peremptory, that he denies *Cyprian* ever to have express'd so much as a Resolution to act by the Advice of the Clergy, and as we heard before, he presses the word *Statui*, as importing his Authority to act either with, or without their Advice at pleasure. As for the other Branch of the *Decisive Power* explain'd, it is beyond all peradventure, that this is absolutely denied by J. S. to Pastors in the whole strain of his Discourse.

This being premis'd, let us hear J. S.'s Distinctions about the State of the Question, whereby he endeavours to bear off this frightening Charge of ascribing to the Bishops a *Sole Power*. He distinguishes *The Sole and Chief Power*, the Power *Superiour to all others*, and the Power *Exclusive of all others*; Finally, he distinguisheth betwixt a Power which none can act against, and the Power which destroys all others. The Clauses of Sole Power,
and

and *Exclusive* of all others, and *Destructive* thereof, we must suppose J. S. to deny and disown as not competent to the Bishop. But that, in palpable contradiction to himself, he ascribes such a Power to the Bishop, for whom he pleads, is convincingly evident from what is above adduc'd, and may be clearly demonstrated by these Instances, wherein it will be found, that he owes all that Power express'd in the premis'd Branches of the Distinction. 1. That the Sole Power properly taken, is by him own'd, and ascribed to the Bishop, is evident in the Application of his own Expressions. An *Absolute Power* is a *Sole Power*; A Power which is at its own *Liberum Arbitrium* in acting, is a *Sole Power*; A Power which only holds the *Balance of Government* is a *Sole Power*; A Power which admits not the *Concurrence and Advice* of Presbyters in making Laws is a *Sole Power*; A Power which is the *Center of all judicial Procedure*, and has all Judgment *Monopoliz'd* therein, is either a *Sole Power*, or it is a *Chimera* and nothing.

For the second Distinction, that he ascribes to the Bishop the Power which is *Exclusive* of all others, and not only such as is *Superiour* thereunto, is evident from what is above exhibited of his Assertions hereanent. He whose Deed is the Churches Act, destroys the Churches Power, and excludes the same. This must needs be palpable to all Men of common Sense. For, either Presbyters have an Authoritative Interest in Concurring with the Bishop in Acts of Government, or they have none: If they have none, who can be so impudent as to deny their Power to be clearly excluded; for what Power is imaginable where this is wanting? If they have an Authoritative Interest in Concurring or Consulting, how can the Bishop's simple Deed be their Act, even in it self considered? Nay, what can more palpably evince an Exclusion of Power, than to assert, *It is no more in Government, than that of the People, yea and less,* (as is above touch'd) *and that the Bishop is not so much as oblig'd to ask the Advice of Pastors in his Acts of Government.*

Nay, doth he not briskly contend, in the place cited, that Cyprian, in sending to the Church of Carthage his Decrees and Statutes, had not so much as one Presbyter with him, nor consequently did in the least stand in need of their Advice in the Exercise of this his *Nomothetick Power*. Chap. 7. §. 1. He reduceth the Acts and Power of Government to two Heads, *scil. Legislation and Jurisdiction*, he ascribes through the whole the Sole Power of both to the Bishops, as is evident to any that shall peruse the same.

For the last Distinction anent a Power which none can act against, and a Power destroying all other Powers, it is evident from what is said, that J. S. doth palpably ascribe (whatever he may pretend to the contrary) to

to the Bishop that Power which destroys all other Powers. For, what will he owe to be a destroying of Power, if that destroying Negative which he ascribes to the Bishop over Pastors most harmonious Judgment and Votes be not such, and especially when with this Negative we conjoyn what he asserts anent such a Power as needs not so much as their Counsel and Advice for its Exercise, but whose *Actings* and *Deeds* are, *eo ipso*, the *Actings* of these other Powers, and accounted *jure* the same with theirs. Can any Power or Authority be more palpably destroyed and swallowed up, than in such a case as this?

From what is said, 'tis evident beyond all Exception, that J. S.'s feign'd and frivolous Distinctions premis'd, when the Scope of his Pamphlet and Series of his Reasoning is considered, are meerly Chimerical, and but airy insignificant Shifts, such phantastical Distinctions as having but one Wing to flee with, must needs fall in the Dust, and vanish as Smoak; Since both pretended Members of his Distinctions, when compared with his Assertions, and his grand Topicks in this Pamphlet, do necessarily coalesce and soder into one. So that in the complex Sense and Scope of his Pleadings, *The Sole Power* and *Chief Power* are one and the same, *subjectively*, as both are ascrib'd to the Bishop: And, with him, the Episcopal Power is in such a manner *Superior to all others*, as it doth *absolutely exclude the same*, and, according to his Pleading, is in such manner irresistible, as it doth *intirely exclude* all Authority of Acting in Pastors or Presbyters, and thus doth *absolutely destroy the same*.

This being premis'd, let us more closely consider the Attack which J. S. has made upon the forementioned Author. He cites *Rectius Inst.* and *The Hierarchical Bishop's Claim* C. 4. P. 129. 211. endeavoring to shew an Inconsistency in his way of pleading against the Adversaries therein mentioned. Let us hear his Argument. Here it is. " [That by the acknowledgment of that Author, several of the Adversaries, Scots and English, plead for such a Prelacy as therein Presbyters do concur in Government, particularly that Bishop *Honnie-man*, one of these against whom he Disputes, pleads for an Episcopacy of this Nature, and yet in stating the Question with him, in that same place in which he asserts the Bishop to maintain such a Prelacy, he will needs have the Prelacy to be such as inhances and concentrates all the power of Pastors, and makes this to be the point controverted, How such a Power can be consistent with the Scriptures Description of Pastors essential Interest in Government.]

This Attack will easily appear to be like the Waves assault upon a Rock, and a proclaiming of the Man's own inadvertent Folly, when these few things are considered.

1. There's a great Difference betwixt what a Disputant may profess to hold *verbo tenus*, and what upon the matter he maintains, and the Scope and Series of his Arguments, in themselves considered, do conclude: And if there were no other, we have hereof a clear Instance in J. S. himself, who professing to Disown the Sole Power, and thus to state the Question, doth, notwithstanding, in the Series of his Arguing clearly assert the same.

2ly. In dealing by Dispute with any Adversary, 'tis, in the acknowledgment of all, solid Reasoning, to produce such Arguments, as do overthrow & strick against that Conclusion of the Adversary, which he stands oblig'd to maintain, both from the Series and Principles of his Defence and Cause, and from the nature of the thing it self, and point controverted; Such Arguments being, beyond all peradventure, of such a Nature as do touch the Cause and Point it self: For, certainly, the Impugner, to say so, *tangit rem actu*, when his Arguments overthrow the Connection and Series of the Adversaries Principles, and thus do evince their Inconsistency; For, an evinc'd Inconsistency solidly concludes a Falschood.

3ly. There is a great and signal Difference betwixt the Power that *de facto* persons or Governours do possess, and which they do also *de jure* arrogat to themselves and exercise, concerning both which the Controversie is stated, and such a Disguise and Extenuation of the same, as Pleaders for that Power may pretend to plead for, and, to eschew the Dint and Stroke of Arguments, present in the State of the Controversie and Dispute, which all will acknowledge to be a meer Sophistical Shift and falsification of the true Nature of the Question, and diverting the Dispute from its proper Scope, by obtruding that into the point which doth not belong to it. In this Case the Impugners of such persons and Pleadings are to hold them to the matter of Fact, or the Power *de jure* and *de facto* exercis'd by these persons anent whose Authority or Power the Question is stated. And thus the true Laws of Dispute are keep'd, when the Impugner's Arguments level against the These and Principle which the Defender undertakes, and is oblig'd to maintain, and is not to permit and suffer the Defender *Vagari extra oleas*, as the phrase is, and sophistically to go beyond the true Limits of the Question, so that the Arguments overthrowing the Power *de jure* and *de facto* exercis'd, which the Defender undertakes the patrocinie of, doth sufficiently conclude against him.

4ly. As there is a great difference betwixt an Argument *ad rem* and *ad Hominem* (as is acknowledg'd by J. S. himself, in his two Arguments after to be Examined), there being a difference betwixt such Arguments as level against the Cause it self, precisely controverted, and the

complex Principles of the Defender ; So likewise, when the Defenders of the same Cause take different Methods, and do not agree among themselves, either as to the State of the Question, or the Method of the Defence. For instance, when one of the Patrons of Prelacy professes to defend an Episcopacy or Prelacy of such a Nature as admits a *Concurrence of Presbyters in its Exercise*, another of these Proctors or Advocats neither acknowledges nor defends an Episcopacy of this Nature, but offers to Maintain and Defend such an *absolute and peerless Power of Prelats, as excludes all Concurrence of Pastors, or Presbyters in Government*. When the Case stands thus, I say, in dealing with, and Impugning this last Adversary, the Argument levels rightly against the Cause sustain'd by these Defenders, and against the Defenders themselves, when thereby the Impugner makes it appear, that such a Defender pleads for such an Episcopacy as the pleadings of his Associates do not admit of ; Since, as is said, a profess'd Contrariety of Principles, and Diverſion from the true State of the Question, evinc'd by the Impugner, sufficiently confounds the Defender, and convinces the Cause of Falshood.

These things premis'd, the above mention'd Charge of this Pamphleter will easily vanish into Smoak, since it can no otherwise be fortified, than by such a Phantastical and Chimerical Principle as this, *viz.* That the Discoverie of *Inconsistency* in Pleadings for any Cause, or in their Principles or way of pleading, will involve the Discoverer himself in this Inconsistency, and import and infer a Contradiction in his Pleading and Arguing, than which there can not be a greater Absurdity imagin'd, and will impeach, if admitted, J. S. himself in a gross Contradiction, in his pretended Discovery thereof in that Author, and thus destroy him with his own Weapon.

Doctor Scott being clear and positive in asserting this Sole Power of the Bishop, and in his whole Dispute and Arguments closely adhering to such a Scope and State of the Question, and therein dealing more ingenuously than J. S. (who pretends he had not seen Doctor Scott's Book ; But who will believe him, who appears such a Nomenclator of Writers on both sides ?) It was a suitable Argument *ad Hominem*, to shew the Doctor, that several of his Fellow-pleaders profess'd the contrary.

Next, As to the State of the Question with *Honnieman*, from what is premis'd, it is Answered, 1. That he, professing to plead for the Prelacy then existent and established by Law, it was suitable to all the Rules of Dispute, to state the Question with him upon such an

existent Prelacy, whatever his inconsistent and disguising pretences might be in his Method of Arguing.

That he both profess'd and stood oblig'd to plead for a Prelacy of such a Nature and Extent as was then Existent, none can in Reason deny, since otherwise he could not at all have answered the Scope of his Book, nor appeared to have given a suitable Reply to his Antagonist, who Impugn'd *the then existent Prelacy* in the Nature, and Exercise thereof. 2. The Prelate asserting the Power *contracted in a Bishop and diffus'd in a Presbytery* to be one and the same, and thereupon pleading that Presbyterians owning the second, cannot disown the first, it was suitable to the Rules of Dispute, to shew his disguising the true Scripture state of the Point in Question, which is anent the Scripture Determination of *the proper Subject of the Power, viz.* That the Scripture determining *the Subject*, as well as *the Power it self*, it was therefore an Impeachment of the Scripture Rule and Standard, to suppose the Power both in the dilated and contracted Sense, to be Scriptural. 3. As for that which J. S. seems to take advantage of in this Author, *viz.* The ascribing to *Honnieman*, the Inhancing and Concentring all Power in the Bishop, whereas he had before acknowledg'd, that *Honnieman* asserted such a Prelacy as was to be exercis'd with Concurrence of Presbyters, wherein he alleges that he is inconsistent with himself. It is answered, This is nothing else but a Discovery (with many the like) of his inadvertent Folly. For,

1. The Prelat falls into a palpable Contradiction in his first Position and State of the Question, in that he both pleads for the *Sole Power* in the strictest Sense, or a *Power Concentred in the Bishop*, (to use his own phrase) and likewise pretends a *necessary Consent of Presbyters in its Exercise*, which to all Men of Sense involves him in an evident Contradiction; And must the discovery of his Inconsistency import an Inconsistency in the Discoverer's Arguing? Who in his right Wits will imagine this?

2ly, In this Answer to *Honnyman*, and in Arguing thus against him, the Foundation is laid upon his own Words and express Assertion; The Author telling him (as J. S. has acknowledg'd), "That upon our Supposal of that Authority and Government ascrib'd in Scripture to Pastors, or Presbyters, and their Essential Interest therein, the true State of the Question betwixt Episcopalians and Presbyterians is this, How an Officer that is pretended to be distinct from them and Superior unto them, inhancing and concentring all their power in himself, can be consistent with Scripture prescriptions in point of Government?"

Now

Now, to shew how consistent this is to the Bishop's Sentiments and Words; After he had said, that Presbyterians held the Official Power to be seated in a College of Presbyters as in its proper Subject and Basis, in opposition thereunto he thus expresses his own and the Episcopalians Judgment, *viz. That the Episcopalians hold it to be concentrated in one person, that is in one person as in its proper Center*: And the Similitude of the *Manus aperta & clausa*, whereby the Bishop illustrates the matter, makes this evident beyond exception, and shews his inconsistency with himself in what he pretends about Presbyters *concurring in the Exercise*. For he neither could nor would say, (unless he would have expos'd himself to the hissing of all Men) That the Jurisdictional Power in the College of Presbyters (which is with him the *Manus aperta*) needeth any adventitious or extrinsick concurrence of others for its Exercise, and the Episcopal Power being, in his Sense, the same which he exemplifies and illustrates by the *Manus clausa*, the Author told him, he did most irrationally and inconsistently pretend such an extrinsick concurrence of others with the Bishop for its Exercise, or an extraneous Consent of Presbyters, both Powers being with him of the same Nature and State, and in this point the same Judgment is to be made of both.

The Author thus further argu'd against *Honnyman*, That in this he appear'd contrary to himself, in ascribing such a Power to the Bishop which could not be reduc'd into Act, which is repugnant to that known Maxim, *Frustra est potentia quæ non potest reduci in Actum*. He also impugn'd him with this *Medium*, That the Prelacy then existent and establish'd by Law was of such a Nature as requir'd no such Concurrence; Taking, at least, Concurrence as necessarily requisite in order to this Exercise of Episcopal Authority, such as the Bishop must needs have understood, if speaking consequently, and to the point; For, the Laws establishing Prelacy put such Limitations upon this Concurrence, as render it a meer deluding pretence; For, the Concurrence must be, says the Law, of such persons only, whom the Bishops shall find to be of known *Loyalty and Prudence*. And thus, besides that the general Term Concurrence may admit of such Ampliation and Interpretation as will allow to Presbyters nothing of an Interest in Government, the Ampliation instanced, both as to the Qualifications of the Persons concurring, and likewise the Judgment of these Qualifications, which is remitted *Solely* to the Bishop, renders this Concurrence a meer Nullity. And 'tis evident, that what our Laws *verbo tenus* seem'd to allow to Presbyters, and, to speak so, gave with
one

one hand, they did absolutely remove and take away with the other.

Thus we have seen the ignorant Impertinency of J. S.'s Charge upon that Author, whom he Terms a *pleasant Fellow*. No doubt when ever he is dispos'd to a Melancholick Humor, he has a ready Cure at hand, in taking up for his Diversion J. S.'s Pamphlet. One thing I must not omit in this Charge of J. S. against that Author, *viz.* After he has told us he wrestles with three Adversaries, Dr. Scott, Dr. Monro, and B. Honnieman, he adds these Words, *I have not had the Opportunity to consider Dr. Scott; but sure I am, the other two were not Advocats for the Sole Power of Bishops.* For Dr. Scott, he did well to shift, by a pretended Ignorance, the Defence of him; And he had done as wisely to have shifted the Defence of the other two. For Honnieman, we have already heard how he makes Episcopal Power to be consented in the Bishop; Upon which that Author told him, he could by no means admit that Power to go beyond the Center. For Dr. Monro, it may be easily made appear, that upon the matter he pleaded for the same Power, not only from what he asserts of the standing Office of the High Priest, whom J. S. will, no doubt, acknowledg to be Sole and Singular in his Prerogatives, but likewise in his asserting, *pag. 107, 108* That in these several Instances of the Episcopal Authority ascrib'd to Timothy, *1 Tim. 5. 1, 19, 20, 22. 1 Tim. 3. 14, 15. 1 Tim. 2. 1.* relating *scil.* to Censures, Ordination, and (according to him) the ordering of the publick Worship and Liturgies of the Church, he asserts that the Charge and Authority is committed to him, *yea to him Alone*, excluding others, which is either an Assertion of a Sole Power, or 'tis Nonsense. Yea he asserts, *That the Instance of Timothy and Titus do prove that the Apostolical Authority was convey'd to single persons.* I hope J. S. will acknowledge an Apostolical Authority includes all the Power of Order and Jurisdiction, and if convey'd to single persons, as the proper Subjects thereof, who can evite the Consequence that these single persons were Sole in this Power? Yea doth he not assert, that the Seven Asian Angels, whom he compares to the Jewish High Priest, were Sole and Singular in all Exercise of Government?

But J. S. will needs have this Author to assert some things that are peculiar to him, *viz.* his confounding a Negative Voice, and a Sole Power, which after he will appear to lenifie; Adding, that, *at least, he makes them consistent*, for which he cites some places of *Rectius Instruendum, scil.* *Pag. 4. with 60, 65.* where the Author shews, that "the Diocesan Prelate has a Sole Power over the Diocese, with such a Negative Voice as includes the Sole Decisive and Conclusive Suffrage, Thus

Thus in the places cited compar'd with *Pag. 111, 112*. To which Accusation the Answer is easie and obvious. 1. 'Tis evident, that the Author explains this *Sole Power* by that of *the Sole Decisive and Conclusive Suffrage*, wherein that of *the Negative Voice* is palpably included. Why doth then J. S. quarrel the Conjunction, or the making them consistent? If *the Sole Power* doth include *the Negative Voice*, as the general Phrase the more restricted, who can quarrel the Conjunction? And 'ar less can the proper Explication be quarrell'd of *the Sole Decisive and Conclusive Suffrage*. 2ly, He contradicts himself in this Criticism, since 'tis evident, that, in more places than one, he ascribes *this Absolute Sole Power* to the Bishop, and likewise as frequently ascribes a *Negative Voice* to him; So that, nill he, will he, himself is found to have conjoyn'd them, and let him see to it, whether he has made them one or the same. He wil have this Assertion peculiar to this Author: But, besides that this Assertion is found his own, he can produce no Presbyterian Writer, who disowne the necessary Connection of the *Sole Decisive Power* with the Bishop's *Absolute Negative*, not only over the Judgments and Votes of Pastors, but respecting also their very Counsel and Advice, which he is not so much as oblig'd to ask in J. S's Principles, as is above made appear.

But, saith J. S. the Author has asserted, *Pag. 180.* that the Bishop has *the Chief and Sole Power in Ordination and Jurisdiction*; Thus confounding *Chief* and *Sole*. A silly Quirk, no doubt, this is; For who will doubt, that *the Sole Power* includes *the Chief*, tho' every *Chief* is not *Sole*, and that the Connection of such General and Restrictive Terms, very ordinary in common Speech, do import an Ampliation and Illustration of the one by the other; So that the Term of *Chief* being included in that of *Sole*, this last is, by the Copulative *and*, connected with the other, as an Amplification thereof, to this Sense and Scope, (as is above made clear) that the Bishop has *the Chief Power in Ordination and Jurisdiction*, which Episcopalians will not disowne, which *Chief Power* is of such a Nature, as is not only such, but also *Sole* and *Absolute*. Who knows not, that the Copulative *and* imports only such a Connection of Terms, as is suitable to the Subject Matter and Scope, where there may be a Discrepancy in point of Extent in the Terms themselves simply consider'd, while yet the one doth amplify and illustrate the other.

But J. S. *Pag. 132. § 21.* tells of *Mysterious Notions* of that Author about Power in his Examination of Dr. Monro's Pleadings. He says, *Pag. 93.* the Presbyterians hold, that the Apostles had a *Supreme* (tho' *Collateral and Equal*) and *Spiritual Power and Authority over Officers and Members*

bers of the Church. And adds these Words, "Yes, Sir, it was a Supreme Power, a Power over both Officers and Members, and yet it was but Collateral and Equal. What means this Query, and *Yes Sir*? I must say in Return, *Yes Sir Sciole*, The Apostolick Power, in the Judgment and Acceptation of all Orthodox Divines, yea of all Men of Sense, was both Supreme and also Collateral and Equal, i. e. every Apostle had such a Power, as was paramount and superior to all ordinary Church Officers, since it had a respect to the whole Catholick Church, whereof every Apostle was a *Catholick Officer in Actu Exercito*. This Power had all the Apostles conjunctly, and every Apostle severally, so that, as competent to every Apostle singly, it was Supreme, with respect to all inferior Offices and Officers, and yet, as respecting all the Apostles, it was Collateral and Equal, no Apostle having an Official or Apostolick Authority over another, nor depending upon another in the Exercise thereof. And whether this be not a congruous Sense of the Apostolick Office, let the Reader judg, and, consequently, of the Congruity and Sense of J. S's Censure of the same.

But J. S. * has found out another *Mystery* in that Author, *viz.* "That he demands a proof of *Timothy's* having a Sole and Singular Authority paramount to all Ordinary Officers in the Church, and exclusive thereof. Here our Bigot *Momus* fishes out wonderful Mysteries. Sole and Singular, saith he, are one and the same thing, here is *One Mystery*. But, from what is said, 'tis evident, that these Terms are of so near an Affinity, that, to make a Mystery of them, is *querere nodum in scirpo*. We all know, that a Defect of the Organ of Sight, or a Falsification, or Heterogeneous Nature of the Medium, may make common Objects Myste-
 132.
 rious, the straight Rod in the Water to be bow'd, or Two seem Twenty. But the greater *Mystery* with J. S. is, that there is asserted a *Singular Authority* Paramount to all the Ordinary Officers. Hence he infers this Absurdity, "That there are Ordinary Officers, in the Sense of that Author, besides the Bishop, who have Authority, else the Bishop's surely cannot be Paramount to theirs: if they have none, and yet whatever Authority they have, it is certain they have no Authority, for the Bishop's Authority is not only Paramount to theirs, but Exclusive thereof. J. S. is bold to impute Nonsense to such Assertions; For, saith he, "If the Bishop have the Sole Power, no other Body can have any Power, but if no other Body has any Power, how can the Bishop have a Negative Voice without relation to other Voices; How can there be other Voices, if there be no Power to produce them; and how can any Power be, if all Power be Solely in the Bishop?"

But,

But, to any attentive Reader, these Reflections will appear to be nothing else, but the phantastick Whimsies of his own Brain-sick Head, which will be evident by considering, 1. That the Author puts his Adversary to prove *Timothy's* Power to have been properly Episcopal, and of such a Nature as is above express'd, supposing therein, that no such thing could be prov'd. So that what Absurdity *J. S.* may allege imported in the premis'd Terms, or Exercise of Power, 'tis evident, that the Author draws the same as an Inference upon his Adversary's Assertion and Principle; And therefore, these suppos'd Inconsistencies, even in *J. S.* his Sense, lie nearer home, and are imputable to him and his Fellow Pleader. 2ly, As an Evidence of the Impossibility of the Thing, he puts the Adversary upon this impossible Task, viz. To prove, that the Authority wherewith *Timothy* stands in Scripture invested, is such as is Paramount unto, and Exclusive of that Divine Authority ascrib'd to Pastors in Government, insinuating still an Argument *ab Absurdo*, viz. That such a Power supposeable in *Timothy* would make the Scripture inconsistent with it self. 3ly, The Author doth clearly suppose, that tho' the Diocesan Prelate *de Jure* cannot, yet *de Facto* he Assumes and Exercises a Power Paramount unto, and in so far Exclusive of that Divine Authority in Government which Pastors are allow'd, and wherein in Scripture they stand invested. So that this weak Man's Fancied Inconsistency is pitifully Nonsensical, the suppos'd Inconsistency not being *ad idem* nor *eodem modo*. The Ordinary Officers, or Pastors, have an Authority *Jure Divino*; The Bishop Usurps a Paramount Power *Jure Humano*, or *Papistico*; The Bishop's Power is Paramount to theirs; That is, by *Humane Usurpation* he encroacheth upon their Divine Right, which Divine Right still existing, he is justly said to usurp upon their Authority, and yet, notwithstanding, upon Ground of this Usurpation, they may be said to have no Authority, viz. *de Facto*, and as to its Exercise, since this Usurpation doth intirely exclude the same.

The puerile Sophistry of *J. S.*'s Arguing in this point doth evidently appear in such Assertions or Predications, wherein the Subject of the Proposition hath a Denomination taken from its Pre-existent State to its present Connection with such an Adjunct, *scil.* the Connection asserted in the Proposition it self. Of which propositions and Assertions, this is still the clear suppos'd Sense, viz. That such an Adjunct affects the Subject, as denominated from its Pre-existent State; Which may be demonstrated in a Multiplicity of Instance, in the common Sense of Mankind, and usual Speech accordingly, wherein *J. S.*'s Objection could not but expose him, or any Man else, to Derision.

When we say, *A Parliament or Synod is dissolv'd*, or, *A Parliament is usurp'd upon by a Tyrant*, here the Subject of the Proposition, viz. *The Parliament, the Synod*, appear evidently denominated from their Native Power and Authority, which founds this Epithet of *Parliament*, or *Synod*; Thus the Subject is understood to be denominated from its Pre-existent State before this Usurpation or Dissolution, the Truth of the Proposition being clearly salv'd in the clearly suppos'd proper formal Ground of this Connection; And no person of sound Judgment will, in such Propositions or Assertions, understand the Co-existence of that prior State of the Subject, from which it is denominated, with the present Adjunct affecting the same, which were a meer *Implicantia in Adjecto*. In such Assertions therefore, we understand, that this Dissolution, or Usurpation, *V. G.* doth affect the Subjects, with a special Respect to the Case and Circumstances of both, but not that in the premis'd Instances the Subject of the Proposition is in the same State after this Dissolution or Usurpation. And thus in many such like Instances. So when we say, *A Man is kill'd*, is any so foolish as to understand this Assertion in such a manner as this, viz. That the Man is Existing, and a Man, after he is Kill'd? But the Subject of the Proposition is understood as denominated from its Pre-existent State, and thus we understand it, that the Occision or Killing Act affects such a Subject, *scil.* the Man in his then State and Condition, tho' after the Perpetration the Subject *Man* has still a Denomination relative to that Pre-existent State, as is above clear'd.

When we say in the Scripture Sense, *Sion is plow'd as a Field, Jerusalem is laid on Heaps* *. *The Temple is destroyed, has not one Stone left upon another*; Who is so Bruttish, as not to understand the Subject of such Propositions, viz. *Sion, Temple, Jerusalem*, to be denominated from their State and Condition antecedent to this Destruction; Or imagine, that such Propositions do import, that *Sion* was *Sion*, when plow'd as a Field, *Jerusalem* a City still, when laid on Heaps, or the *Temple* an Edifice or Temple, when not one Stone is left upon another? So that it is evident, that the Scope and Sense of such Assertions or Enunciations, is to point at the proper formal Ground, upon which such Adjuncts do affect the Subject.

Now if any, upon J. S's profound Topick, and Mysterious Logick, shall thus argue, and charge such Propositions with Incongruity, arguing after this manner, *If the Parliament be a Parliament, and a Synod a Synod, what Nonsense is it to say, that either the one or the other is dissolv'd? Can it be a Parliament or Synod, when it is dissolv'd? If* the

the Man be kill'd, how can he be said to exist, or be denominated a *Man*, when kill'd? If *Jerusalem* is become Heaps, how can it be call'd *Jerusalem*, when thus not existing, but destroy'd? Should any Person thus redargue, and accuse such Propositions and Assertions of Falshood, yea and think himself acute in such Reprehension, would he not deserve to have our common *Scottish* Sarcasm cast upon him, viz. *That his Head had much Wit about it*? Suppose one had pay'd a Sum to *J. S.* and thereupon demands the Cancelling of his Bond, which *J. S.* performs, yet afterward his Acute Topick presented here will allow him to deny the Cancelling thereof, and he will say, that this Assertion of this Debitor, *The Bond is cancelled*, is false, since, by his Confession, it is a *Bond still*; And if a *Bond*, how is it cancelled? Which petty Sophistry, whether it would impeach him of Folly or Knavery, or both, let himself judg?

In a word, by this Man's profound Logick, no Tyrant can be said to Inroach upon, or to Exercise a Power Paramount unto, and Exclusive of a Parliament and Peoples Authority and Laws; For thus will his doughty Horn'd Argument plead, They have Authority or Laws, else they could not be Usurp'd upon, nor could there be a Power Exercis'd Paramount thereunto, and yet they have none in this Assertion, since the Usurping Power is suppos'd Exclusive thereof.

But *J. S.* proceeds in his Elaborate Discoveries of further Absurdities of that Author, and gives us yet some more of his Sagacious Notions, or rather Nonsense, about the *Sole Power* and *Negative Voice*. "If no Body hath any power, saith he, how can the Bishop have a Negative Voice? How can a Negative Voice be without relation to other Voices? But the poor Man has forgot himself, and overthrows his own Assertion, who, (as we have heard) throughout this whole Pamphlet, ascribes a Negative to the Bishop over Presbyters, in their most Consentient Judgments; And what does that *Negative* relate to, if not to the *Votes or Voices of Presbyters*? as himself clearly asserts: For, notwithstanding of this Negative, he would not be thought absolutely to exclude all Pastors from any Concurrence in Government, tho' upon the Matter, he do so. So that he may see, if he understand himself, there may be a *Negative* over *Consultive Voices*, tho' not over such as are *Decisive* and *Conclusive*.

But how can there be other Voices, (saith *J. S.*) if there be no Power to produce them? Thus he baffles himself, and is bound to answer his Absurdity: How can the Bishops absolute Negative over Presbyters Consultive Voices consist, if they had no power to produce them? as indeed this Man holds they had none. So that he is here holden with a

Snare he hath fram'd for himself; For, as is said, when the Question is put to him, How the Bishop's absolute Negative over the Votes or Judgments of Pastors, consists with something of a Consultive Influence in Government, which he would appear to allow them; His mouth is stopp'd with his own Question, since neither in Legislation nor Jurisdiction properly he allows them (considering the intire, or rather inconsistent Mould of his Arguing in this Pamphlet) so much as Consultive Votes, as is evident to any that Reads the same: For, as to the Power Legislative, he hath told us, that *Cyprian gave Laws to his Diocess, without so much as owning one Presbyter in the Thing*; And as for the Jurisdictional Power, hath he not asserted, that the Bishop is free even so much as to Consult them or not? Matters, I say, standing thus, what can this Negative Voice relate to, since there is no Power in the Presbyters to produce any Votes at all? So that their suppos'd Votes is a meer Chimæra and Non-Entity: Whatever figment of pretended Power he may allege competent to Presbyters, 'tis evident as the Noon-day-light, that he with his Fellows make use thereof, as a meer Sham and Shift, to decline and evade the force of Arguments brought against them in this point.

But J. S. excepts further, that *the Chief Power hath necessarily a Respect to some Power subordinat thereunto*. I answer, J. S. himself is beaten with this Weapon, who, in the premis'd Distinctions which we have heard, would be thought to ascribe to the Bishop only a Chief Power, yet through the whole strain of his Discourses, makes this Chief Power *Absolute and Sole*, as we have above made good; So that, his Chief Episcopal Power being such as swallows up all Power in Presbyters or Pastors, this relative Term is, with him, such as hath no Correlat. So that, in whatever Sense he allows a Chief Power to have a Correlat, he has therein liberated that Author from his own Exception. But, besides that the Term *Chief* may have a Respect to that shadowing Consultive Power which J. S. pretends to allow to Presbyters, granting that the phrase of *Chief Power* hath such a necessary respect to *Subordinate Powers*, as he asserts, this Expression may well be judg'd to be made use of by that Author, while arguing *ad hominem* against him, or upon his own Principles, who, as we have heard, ascribes both the *Chief and Sole Power* to the Prelate; And he is no whit concern'd in clearing or dissolving the Difficulties and Absurdities wherein J. S. has involv'd himself.

But J. S. will yet make a further Inquiry, how a Superior can be conceiv'd without an Inferior? Truly not at all, if not in J. S. phantasy. Again, saith he, *How can we conceive a first without a second?* We need not.

not here repeat, in what sense the Bishop may be called *Supreme* with respect unto his Curats precarious Power. As for a *first* without a *second*, whatever Absurdity he may imagine deduceable therefrom, falls heavily upon himself, considering the instanced inconsistent Principles and Assertions presented by him in this Pamphlet, with respect to the Bishops Power, and that of Presbyters or Pastors. But absolutely considering the thing, or in what sense there may be a *First* without a *Second*, some would be apt to tell him, that had he read his Bible when he was poring on *Cyprian's* Epistles, he might have found Scripture Instances of the term *First*, and, in special, he might have read the *First-born* of the Virgin *Mary*; And it will be a puzzling Querie to him, *who was the Second-born*, or if ever any such did exist.

But our *Momus* hath yet more Questions, and poseth that Author with this great and important Querie, *If the Sole Power of Jurisdiction be competent to the Bishop, how can there be Judicatories distinct from him? How can Judicatories subsist without the Power of Judging?* Let J. S. digest this Absurdity, and Answer his Question, who upon the matter impeaches all Judiciary Power of Pastors in Government, or any other Power of Judging but what is lodg'd in the Bishop. But since he seems by his Querie to argue *ad Hominem*, passing this Retorsion, I do tell him, as above, *That the Bishops Sole Power over Judicatories*, is in such sense understood, as an Invalors usurping Power upon a Kingdom, or a Robber upon a Family, viz. the Usurpation takes away the Use and Exercise of the Power, Priviledges or Benefits of either; So that when we speak of the Judicatorie, as of the Family or Kingdom, we understand the Subject with respect to the Right and due Exercise, tho' now it be restrain'd and incroach'd upon, and in this Case appears not.

I find J. S. further quibbling * about Parity or Imparity as the true state of the Controversie, citing some Presbyterian Authors, amongst the rest Mr. *Jameſon*, and the Author of the *Hierarchicall Bishop*, &c. But how Impertinently has already been made appear, and is further obvious, when considered, That 1. It is one thing to produce what an Author is expressing about the Subject controverted, while answering an Adversary, or prosecuting his Arguments, another thing to say that he thus, or in these precise Terms states the Controversie. These are *toto cælo* different, as is obvious to the meanest Reflection; For in the *First* Case he may sometimes suppose the Adversaries Principles and Argue *ad Hominem*. Besides that, in the *Second* place, the Learned Mr. *Jameſon* having declared, that he abstracts from a Scripture Debate of the *Jus Divinum*, his Work being to shew, that during the Apostolick Age, in the prime

* Chap. 4. § 102.

Primitive Church, there was a Bishop for each Congregation, and an Identity of Bishop and Preaching Presbyters, he thence infers, that there was a compleat Parity among Ordinary Pastors. And for the Author of the *Hierarchical Bishop's Claim*, Part 2d. Pag. 6. He is only in that passage cited by J. S. shewing the Judgment of our Reformers against Doctor *Monro's* false Suggestions, viz. That they held the Pastor to be the highest Officer *jure Divino*, and asserting against him, that in their Judgment all Churches ought to be Govern'd by a Parity of Pastors; But that the Parity, or Imparity precisely taken, was the Sole or Chief State of the Question can not at all be inferred from what is there offer'd against Doctor *Monro*. Nay, that he doth otherways state the Controversie, than upon this meer Parity thus abstractedly considered, (in special with *B. Honnieman*) is acknowledged by J. S. himself, and consequently his inconsistent Folly in this foolish Criticism is apparent. Besides that the Assertion of an Official Parity in all ordinary Pastors, sufficiently overthrows the Prelates arrogated Sole Power, so that his Quibble about this different state of the Question, is palpably Impertinent.

S E C T. III.

Wherein are Examined J. S's Attacks upon the Reverend Mr. Rule, and the foremention'd Author, anent the Ruling Elders Office, and, in special, his two grand Syllogisms upon this Point offered to the two Principals, are fully scanned, and therein his Childish Sophistry and gross Ignorance of the common Elements of Logick is made appear.

THIS Sacred Office of the Ruling Elder, tho' fully asserted by Prebyterian Writers, both from Scripture and Antiquity, has always been an Eye-sore to our licentious Prelatists, as being a notable Curb upon that Arbitrary Dominion in Church Government, which Prelats do so much affect. And altho' this our Momus and Critick has not dar'd to engage in a Scripture Disput upon this point, and grapple with the pungent Arguments produc'd for the Divine Right of this Officer, yet he will needs try his Critical Skill in grating upon some Expressions of the Reverend Mr. Rule and the other Author in this point.

1. Mr. Rule having asserted, *That the Ruling Elders cannot in their Meetings Act without the Preses, scil. the Pastor, excepting Extraordinary Cases, and that the Paroch Minister has in so far Authority over the Ruling Elders.* From this J. S. thinks the Negative Voice which he ascribes to the Bishop is Patronis'd, which he explains to be *such a Power as none can Act against*, so that he fancies, he must either disown this Power of the Pastor, or reject and disown the Presbyterian Argument against the Bishop's Sole Power.

The Reverend Mr. Rule had said, that upon J. S's Supposition and Principles, Pastors must follow the Bishop's Light, and in this point J. S. thinks he has the Advantage of a palpable Retorsion. But how palpably Absurd and Inconsequential this Argument is, will evidently appear when it is consider'd, that neither doth the Word of God, nor the Practice and Principles of our Church allow such a Negative to the Pastor, as he pretends, nor can any such Consequence be drawn from what the Reverend Mr. Rule asserted. For, whatever Deference of a constant Presidency in the Parochial Church Judicatory or Session, the Pastor's higher Order and Office does allow him, yet in case of difference of Judgment betwixt him and the Session, the Matter is to be brought before the higher Judicatory, to be Cognosc'd upon and Determin'd, which is *toto cælo* different from reaching any Patrociny unto the Prelats Sole Power or Negative Voice.

Let J. S. assign, if he can, any Presbyterian who hath asserted, "That the Pastor's Sole Act or Judgment is the Deed of the Session or Eldership, Or, that he can with an Absolute Negative Determine against all their Judgments, that his Personal Sentiments do so swallow up all their Votes, as that, in giving Rules of Government, or Enacting Sessional Acts, he is at his own Arbitriment, whether he will so much as require their Judgment or not. All which he ascribes unto the Prelat. Nay, can he deny, that our Church hath Enacted, that no Pastor shall assume such a Negative in the Parochial Session?"

Our *Momus* hath another Quibble anent the Dichotomy of the Clergy into *Rulers* and *Deacons*, asserted by *Blondel*, together with other Divines, in none of which branches he alleges the *Ruling Elder* is contained. It is Answered, 1. 'Tis evident, that *Blondel*, taken entirely in the whole Series and Scope of his Reasoning on this point, has own'd the *Ruling Elder*, yea his Divine Right. He holds the practice of the protestant Churches in admitting *Ruling Elders* in Church Judicatories, as constituent Members thereof, particularly of the Church of *Scotland*, to be a Practice truly Apostolick, or founded upon

upon Apostolick Authority. Thus pag. 262. Edit. Francfort. 1690. Yea moreover, he inveighs severely against such as disown this Divine Order, such as *Downname, Laud, &c.* Thus pag. 257, 258. 2^{ly}, Whatever J. S. can allege as touching the contrary Judgment of some Divines, yet 'tis beyond all peradventure, that as the generality of all the Antient Fathers have own'd this Officer, so there is a large consent of Protestant Writers, besides the Practice of the Reform'd Churches, adduceable in proof of the Divine Warrant of this Officer. The Reader is referr'd to the Famous Mr. *Gillespie's* Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, Part 1, Chap. 9, 10. Besides what may be easily made appear from several Episcopal Divines, such as *Jewel**, *Whitaker †*, *Willet* ||. 3^{ly}, If J. S. do hold, that in the first Branch of the Dichotomy instanced, one precise Order is included, and in an Exclusive Sense to all others, he contradicts, and deals Strokes with his Fellow Pleaders, Bishop *Honnyman*, who will have both the Superior and Inferior Bishops, or of the first and

* Defence of the
Apolog. Part. 1.
Pag. 21.

† De Conciliis,
Quest. 3. Cap. 3.
|| Contr. 3. Quest.
4. Pag. 110.

second Order to be therein included; Thus also the Author of the three Dialogues. And do not their whole Tribe thus expound the Apostles Dichotomy, *Phil. 1.* in Saluting the Bishops and Deacons? which Sense and Pleading sure J. S. will not disown. Yea, does not Dr. *Monro* earnestly plead for a Subdivision of the Dichotomy? We might instance such a Subdivision clearly insinuated by the *Belgick* Divines upon the place, by *Diodat, Calvin*, with many others, yea the generality of all Protestant Interpreters on *1 Tim. 5. 17.* such as *Bucer, Disert.* pag. 150. *Beza, de Grad. Cap. 13. Sect. 2. Soppingius ad bonam fidem Sibrandi,* pag. 268. *Melvin* in MSS. contra *Downname, Danaus* on *1 Tim. 5. 17.* *Pet. Martyr, Piscator, Salmeron, Gerardus de Ministerio.* So that, if J. S. shall disown the Division and Extension mention'd, he will needs fall foul upon the generality of Famous Divines, yea and of his own Party.

For what he alleges, that in our Arguing from the Dichotomy *Phil. 1.* we make all that stand in opposition to Deacons to be of one Order, excluding a Distinction betwixt Bishops and Presbyters. I Answer, he hath no shadow of an Inference to his Scope from this our Arguing: For besides that, as I shall shew, we own a Subdivision of the Dichotomy, and of this first Branch, wherein we have the Harmonious Consent of Orthodox Divines, the design of the Arguments from the Dichotomy in the place instanced, is, first, to prove, that the Overseeing Pastor is an Officer of the highest Order which sufficiently excludes

excludes the Overruling Prelat, as a specifical distinct Officer Superior to the Pastor; And the place and Circumstances of the Text do clearly evince this, since a plurality of Bishops are suppos'd to be fix'd Officers in this Church. 2ly, The Argument is adduc'd to prove that in this Capacity the Pastor-Bishop stands in opposition to the Officer that Rules only (whose Office is clearly pointed at, 1 Tim. 5. 17. with the Parallels already instanced) and the Deacon; Which Inference and Argument doth equally overthrow the Diocesan Bishop, and Establish the Ruling Elder.

But to make this clear, and further to discover the petulant obstinate Folly of this Pamphleter, in his ludicrous Banterings against this Sacred Order, which he is bold to tell us, *he has sent a packing*, I will offer these Considerations.

I. The Divine Right of this Officer being fully made appear by many Learn'd Orthodox Divines, particularly by the Authors of the *Jus Divin. Regim. Eccles.* who have largely Debated this point, Answering all the Exceptions of the Prelatic Party, which, both of old and of late, have been made against the Divine Warrant of this Officer, to no fewer than the Number of Twelve; Can any rational Man but acknowledge, that this Person, who boasts of effectually Impugning the Divine Right of this Officer, stood oblig'd to have Answered what is thus so convincingly and effectually pleaded for him from the Divine Oracles? And since he has not done so, the Divine Right of this Officer, Presbyterians must needs suppose, doth stand good and inviolable upon the Scripture Basis, and that this Foolish petulant Banterer has in this, as in the point of Prelacy, prov'd himself a Fugitive from the true Scripture Dispute, and State of this Controversie; In this point also stating himself an Opposer of the Divine Truth.

II. We can produce clear Scripture Instances of a Subdivision of a general Dichotomy into Subordinat Branches, and such as do clearly include the Office of a Ruling Elder. And if such a Divine Account and Subdivision can be exhibited, he must needs acknowledge, that this Scripture Scheme and Extension of the Dichotomy both Establishes the Ruling Elder, and in point of the Dichotomy sends his pretended Testimonies a packing.

For proof hereof, let this one Text serve for all, *Rom. 12. 4, 5, 6, &c.* The Apostle having said, *That as we have many Members in one Body, and all have not the same Office: So we being many are one Body in Christ, &c.* He adds, *v. 6. Having then Gifts different according to the Grace that is given to us, whether Prophecie, let us Prophecie according to the proportion of Faith.*

Faith. v. 7. Or Ministry, let us wait on our Ministry, or be that Teacheth on Teaching. v. 8. Or be that Exhorteth, on Exhortation: He that giveth, let him do it with Simplicity; He that Ruleth, with Diligence; He that sheweth Mercy with chearfulness. The Apostle in the Sense of Orthodox Interpreters, from v. 3. to 9. is delineating the Duties proper to Ecclesiastick Officers, pressing this, first, From the Frame and Constitution of the Church, which is as a Natural Organick Body, wherein the Members have their several peculiar Offices; Thus the Members of Christ's Mystical Body have their several Gifts and Offices for the good of the whole. 2ly, He presses this from the Distribution or Enumeration of the several kinds of ordinary standing Officers, Exhorting them severally to the Duties specially requir'd of them. These Offices are by the Apostle reduc'd, first, to two general Heads, viz. Prophecie, (not the Extraordinary Gifts of foretelling future Events, but the Ordinary, in the Right Understanding, or Interpreting the Scripture, the Apostles Scope being to delineat the Churches necessary standing Officers, such as is not that of Prophecie in the stricter Acceptation). The second general Head is Ministry. Then these general Heads are Subdivided into the special Offices contain'd under them. Under Prophecie are contain'd, first, *he that Teacheth*, i. e. the Doctor, or Teacher. 2ly, *He that Exhorts*, i. e. the Pastor, v. 7, 8. Under Ministry are compris'd, 1. *He that giveth*, i. e. the Deacon. 2ly, *He that Ruleth*, i. e. the Ruling Elder. 3ly, *He that sheweth Mercy*, i. e. such as were to entertain Strangers, relieve the Sick, &c. v. 8. For this account of the Text exhibited, see Piscator, Mr. Dickson, Paræus, &c. Paræus upon this Clause, *He that Rules with Diligence*, makes this place Parallel with 1 Cor. 12. 28. where he Expounds *κυβερνηται* of the Office of these Presbyters who were joyn'd to Pastors for the Exercise of Discipline, distinguishing thus the two kinds of Elders or Rulers. That here the Ruling Elders Office is pointed at, as distinct from others, Presbyterian Writers, and especially the Authors mentioned have convincingly made appear from several important grounds, viz. That this Officer is pointed out as a Member of Christ's Organick Body, having an Authoritative Office of Ruling, and that not Extraordinary, but Ordinary, being such a *πολιτευόμενος* or Ruler as stands distinguish'd from all other Ordinary Officers in the Church of Christ, and is in none of the Branches of J. S's Dichotomy, scil. neither Priest nor Deacon; Having, first, a distinct Name, *He that Rules*. 2ly, A distinct Work appropriated to him. The Doctor *Teacheth*, the Pastor *Exhorts*, the Deacon *gives*, and *shews Mercy*, this Elder *Rules*, as the very Name *πολιτευόμενος* signifies. Finally, he has his distinct

distinct particular Direction. The Doctor must be Exercis'd in Teaching, the Pastor in Exhortation, the Deacon must give with singleness, and shew Mercy with Chearfulness, and the Elder must Rule with diligent Studiousness. But of this above. Let the Reader look again, for Proof of this Subdivision, *Beza in loc. in Annot. Min. Piscator in Rom. 12. Pareus in Rom. 12.*

III. J. S. will not be bold to assert, that the Antients, to speak so, are by the Ears, and do Cross and Contradict one another in this point of the Dichotomy of the Elders and Deacons, or the instanced Scripture Subdivision thereof: And therefore, if he own that there is an Harmony, and an Harmony in his Sense, he is oblig'd to try his Critical Skill in Answering many Testimonies of the Antients for the Ruling Elders Office cited by Presbyterian Writers, such as that of *Ambrose* on *1 Tim. 5.* who complains of the Disuse of this Officer in his Time. His Assertion in this point is this, *Unde & Synagoga & postea Ecclesia Seniores habuit quorum sine Consilio nihil agebatur in Ecclesia; Quod quae negligentia obsoleverit nescio, nisi forte Doctorum desidia, aut potius superbia, dum soli volunt aliquid videri.*

Several others of the Antients are cited and improven for the Divine Right of this Officer by Presbyterian Writers, in special by the Ministers of the Province of London their Vindication of Presbyterian Government, and Mr. Gillepie's Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, Chap. 89. We need not here cite what is to this Scope pleaded from *Augustin's* Direction, *Epist. 139. Dilectissimis Patribus, Clero, Senioribus, & Univerſae Plebi, Ecclesiae Hipponensis:* Also *Lib. 3. contra Cresc. cap. 56.* where we have a clear Distinction of the *Seniores* of the Church from the *Presbyter*. The same Distinction is pointed at, *Serm. 19. de Verbis Dom.* and in several others, as in *Epist. Synod. Conc. Carbarsussitani apud eund. Enarrat. Pl. 26.* Also in *Greg. Magn. Lib. 11. Epist. 19.* and in *Actis purg. Cæciliani & Felicis. Clerici & Seniores* Sirthenſium. Several Letters were produc'd and Read in the Conference, one Directed, *Clero & Senioribus*, another, *Clericis & Senioribus*. The Letter of *Purpurius* to *Silvanus* speaks thus, *Adhibete Conclericos & Seniores Plebis Ecclesiasticos viros, & inquirant diligenter quæ sint istæ diffensiones.* See the Council of Carthage, held Anno 406. Canon 6. *Voëtius Diss. 2. de Senioribus. Justellus in Annot. & notis in Cod.* The large Consent of Protestant Writers may be seen Chap. 10. of Mr. Gillepie's Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, above cited, accorded also by the Confessions of the French, Belgick, and Helvetian Churches.

I may not here stand to scan the fouldsom Banterings and other simple Sarcasms, which J. S. has cast upon this Sacred Office, in his 8th Chapter. The sum of what he offers may be reduc'd to two points, 1. That the Assertion of the Divine Right of this Officer is not consistent with that which Presbyterians plead from the Dichotomizing of Church Officers into *Elders* and *Deacons*, which we have already remov'd in the Scripture Account of the Subdivision of these Branches acknowledg'd even by the Prelatic Party themselves.

A second Subterfuge, which, I find, he insists upon, is, that the Term *Seniores* is of too large an Acceptation and signification, to admit of such a Restriction as to point only at the Office of Ruling Elder. But whatever Cloud of apparent Obscurity this way he might cast upon some adduc'd Testimonies of the Antients; Yet, as this appears to be a meer Distortion, so the palpable and clear Distinction of the *Seniors* from *Presbyters*, in several Testimonies of the Antients, do palpably exclude this Evasion.

As for what he further adds, that sometimes these *Seniores* are post-pon'd to Officers whom we acknowledge of Inferior Order, such as Deacons. This Evasion will be found nought, when we consider, that it may be made appear, that the Spirit of God in Scripture recitations (and even of this Nature) does not always observe Priority of Order, or Dignity; As for Instance, the Pastor is sometimes put before the Teacher, as *Eph.* 4. 11. sometimes the Teacher before the Pastor, as *Rom.* 12. 7, 8. *Priscilla* a Woman is Nam'd before *Aquila* a Man, and her Husband, *Act.* 18. 18. *Rom.* 16. 3. yet is not prefer'd before him; For sometimes *Aquila* is set before *Priscilla*, *1 Cor.* 16. 19. *Peter* is first Nam'd of all the Apostles, *Matth.* 10. 2. and *Act.* 1. 13. and is again yet in Order after the Apostle *James*, *Gal.* 2. 9. Now if there be such a Reckoning and Order in the Sacred Records of Church Officers and others, as will not bear J. S.'s Conclusion, why may not the same be said as to some such recitations found in the Antients?

If it be alledg'd, that Mr. *Jameson* has pals'd from some of those Testimonies, particularly that of *Tertullian* and *Origen*; It is Answered, 1. Tho' it were granted that Mr. *Jameson* judg'd these Testimonies not so clear, as to express mention of the Ruling Elder, yet he clearly asserts the validity of other Testimonies to this Scope, such as that of *Hilarie*, *Optatus*, that notable Testimony of *Augustin* in the 137 Epistle, mentioning the Brethren, the Clergy, the Seniors, or Elders, and the whole People of the Church of Hippo. Likewise his third Book against *Cresconius*, Chap. 29. Also the Acts of the purgation of *Cecilian*, elder, saith he, than the Council of Nice, wherein Elders are expressly mention'd

mention'd as contradistinct from Priests and Deacons. 2ly, It is evident, that altho' not in the common Road and Method, yet he directly pleads for the Divine Right of the Ruling Elders, and the Divine Institution of this Office. Thus Chap. 6. Asserting the Apostolick Churches Practice in this point, and the correspondence of after Ages.

From what is said, 'tis evident, that J. S. instead of involving, as he pretends, the Reverend Mr. Rule in Contradictions, in owning the premis'd Dichotomy, or having engag'd him to part with the Ruling Elder upon this Ground, has insnar'd himself in palpable Inconsistencies, and hath both disown'd clear Scripture Light in this point, to which he dare not bring his Sentiments about the Ruling Elder to be try'd, as also aspers'd the Ancients, and involv'd them in Contradictions; So that 'tis evident, in this Wrangling, he hath both cross'd Scripture and Antiquity.

It were but a fruitless Work, to scan this Person's foolish malicious Banter which he useth against this Sacred Office, telling us of *the Weaver in the West-Church, and Cobler in Currie*. Only I may be bold to assert, there have been, yea and are, Ruling Elders in this Church, able to Teach him solid Divinity, yea and such Mechanicks in this Office, as have far out-strip'd him in solid Christianity; And that such Weavers and Coblers as he mentions, do Exercise a more honest Employment, than this his Pamphletting Trade will ever amount to.

Let us now come to consider the two great *Achilleian* Arguments ad *Hominem*, and levell'd against the Two Principals, which J. S. has produc'd. As a Preparation to his grand Arguments, he tells us, that G. R. has acknowledg'd, or (as the Reverend Mr. Rule express'd it) that he would not contest about it, That Church Power, and Government and Discipline, is founded on the Power of Sacraments. In Correspondence to which Assertion he tells us, "That T. F. in his 'Review of Doctor Scott's Pleadings, holds the Governing Power to be appendent upon, and consequent unto the Power of Order, and Preaching, and Administ'rating the Seals of the Covenant. Then he adds, "Dare I adventure to entertain the Two Principals with a Syllogism or Two? Why, saith he, what is the Hazard? And I do here undertake to make appear a Threefold Hazard, 1. The Hazard of proving himself an *Ignoramus* in the Nature and Rule of Syllogisms, or the common Standart thereof, to use his own Expression. 2ly, The Hazard of Contradicting and Baffling his own Principles. 3ly, The

The Hazard of a Seditious Impeachment of the Government, by Espousing such *Mediums* as do overturn it.

The Syllogisms then are thus,

None can have the Power of Church Government and Discipline, but those who have the Power of Preaching and Administering the Sacraments:

But Ruling Elders have not the Power of Preaching or Administering Sacraments;

Ergo, They can have no Power of Church Government and Discipline.

The Second Syllogism is thus,

Those who have no Power of Church Government and Discipline are no Church Governours:

But Ruling Elders have no Power of Church Government and Discipline;

Ergo, They are no Church Governours.

This Reasoning J. S. tells us will be found *ad Rem*, as well as *ad Homines*.

To the First Syllogism I Answer, by denying the Major Proposition, which is most false, and which J. S. can no more draw from our premis'd Doctrine, than Water from a Flint.

For clearing our way herein, and our first Charge offered against him of Ignorance of the True Standart and Principles of Arguments, two things are to be consider'd. 1. That the Two Officers, the Preaching and Ruling Elder, are by Presbyterians held to be, yea and proven to be specifically distinct. We need not here again repeat what has been offer'd from Scripture, to prove the Specific Distinction of these Two Officers, and in special from that pregnant Text, 1 Tim. 5. 17. Where it is made appear, that there is a *Genus* or General, *πρεσβυτεροι* or Elders. And, 2ly, This distinguish'd in Two *Species* of Elders, *viz.* The *ἑι καλως πορευομενοι* these that Rule well, there's one Kind; Then there is *ἑι κοπιωντες ἐν λογω & διδασκαλια* that Labour in Word and Doctrine, here's another Kind or *Species*. How these Two *Species* are otherwise clearly distinguish'd in the Text, we have heard above, and need not here repeat.

The 2d thing to be considered is, That J. S. professes to give us Two Arguments *ad Homines*, and consequently must, of necessity, suppose our Principle and Hypothesis of these Two distinct *Species*; So that if we can demonstrate from our Principle (which he is not able to overturn) the Falshood of his Argument both in Matter and Form, it quickly falls to the Ground.

This

This being premis'd, the sottish Ignorance of the first Proposition and the whole Structure of the Argument, appears in this, that, in the first Proposition, he foolishly supposes, that the Predication of a *Genus*, or General of its *Species*, will infer an Absolute Denyal of the Predication of the same *Genus* of another *Species*. Thus, when we say, *the Preacher, by Office*, has necessarily appendent upon his Office, *that of Ruling*, we assert only the Connection of this Office of Preaching and Administrating the Sacraments with the General Office of Ruling, and we do consider this General Office of Ruling, as restricted to such a *Species* in a Complex Sense, and with its Essential Specifick Difference. Or shortly, we consider such a Governour, as specifically distinguish'd from the other, and do so understand such a Connection betwixt *Ruling* in its General Sense, and *the Teaching Office*, as there is betwixt the *Species* and its *Genus*.

But, from such an Assertion, to infer a Negative Proposition, excluding and denying the Predication of the same *Genus* of the other *Species*, bewrays such Blockish Ignorance of the common Principles of Logick, is so palpably Nonsensical and Illogical, as the meanest *Tyro* may mock at it.

Let us see it exemplified in a common Instance. I suppose I pronounce such a Proposition, [*Whatever Creature Exerciseth Reason by Bodily Organs, hath necessarily connected with this Use of Reason (or the Rational Soul) the Sensitive or Animal Life*]. Now, upon this Assertion, I suppose One takes up *J. S's* Weapon and Topick, and will thus overthrow the Proposition, arguing thus against it. [*That Creature which doth not Exercise Reason by Bodily Organs, hath no Sensitive nor Animal Life. A Horse, or Brute, useth not Reason by Bodily Organs. Ergo, the Horse, or Brute, hath no Sensitive nor Animal Life.*] Behold the Major Proposition equivalent to, and of the same Nature with that of *J. S's* and founded upon the same Principles, or Errors rather. But what a long Tract and Train of gross Absurdities, such a Topick and Reasoning draws along therewith, may be demonstrated by an Hundred Instances.

Again, in the next place, in Despite of all Rules of Reasoning and Logick, he will have a Proposition in such manner convertible, which utterly rejects such a Conversion, or Inversion, it being evident, that this his Negative Inference doth necessarily infer such Convertibility in the Proposition.

But, to set this in a little clearer Light, amongst several other Principles and Canons, whereby the Logicians do measure and examine the Rational Lawful Inference of one Proposition from another, I shall offer this signal one, against which *J. S.* in this his great Argument,

gument, has grossly err'd, and discover'd his Ignorance thereof.

The Rule or Canon is this, *Universalis affirmans non convertitur simpliciter*, An Universal Proposition affirmative is not simply or absolutely convertible As when we say, *Omnis Adulator Blandus*, every Flatterer is pleasing or fair-spoken: The Inference is base and unsuteable, *Ergo, Omnis Blandus est Adulator*, Therefore, every one that is pleasing, or fair-spoken, is a Flatterer. Or, in the Negative Sense, which comes to the same Issue, *Ergo, qui non est adulator non est blandus*, i. e. Therefore the Man who is not the Flatterer is neither pleasant nor fair-spoken. After the same manner, when Presbyterians affirm, that every Preacher and Administrator of the Sacraments is also a Ruler and Governour of the Church, J. S. Makes such an Inference, Therefore every Governour and Ruler of the Church is also a Preacher and Administrator of the Sacraments. Or in his Negative Mould thus, *Therefore he who is not a Preacher and Administrator of the Sacraments, is not a Church Ruler or Governour*; Since this Negative Inference, as I said, doth necessarily suppose the universal Affirmative Proposition to be convertible: Which is all one as if J. S. should thus conclude and argue, to the Derision even of School Boys, *Omnis homo est animal, Ergo, omne animal est homo*, Every Man is a living Creature, Therefore every living Creature is a Man. Or in his Negative Method, Therefore that which is not a Man is not a living Creature. How many and palpable Absurdities will this draw upon our great Episcopal Chifran. Yea, thus we might prove him the greatest Fool, his Pamphlet a meer Fardel of Lies. But to proceed,

Some would be apt to add a second Rule or Canon, against which J. S's silly Sophistry is pitifully peccant, scil. *Ex universali affirmante non recte infertur Universalis negans, nisi per Contrapositionem*. i. e. From an universal affirmative Proposition, there cannot be interr'd an universal Negative, unless by a Counterposition; As is clear in this Instance and Example, when we say, *Quicquid genitum est habet principium*, whatever Thing or Creature is begot hath certainly a Principle or Beginning; The Inference is very bad and unsound, *Ergo quod non est genitum, non habet principium*, Therefore what is not begotten, hath no Principle or Beginning; For thus the World shall have no Beginning, the Rational Soul shall have no Beginning, and many such. Altho' the Inference is good by a Counterposition, inverting thus the Attribute of *having a Beginning* in a Negative Sense, thus we say rightly, *That which hath not a Beginning is not begot*. Now J. S's Ignorance and Impeachment of this Rule, will appear in the very first view of his wise Inference. The Proposition asserted by the two Principals, and against which he
lays

lays the formidable Batterie of his Achillean Syllogism, is this, *Every Preacher by Office, and Administrator of the Sacraments, is also by Office a Church Ruler and Governour*. Here is our Universal Affirmative; From which J. S. draws thus an Universal Negative, "Therefore whoever is not a Preacher and Administrator of Sacraments, is not a Church Ruler or Governour: For thus his Syllogism runs before-mentioned, "None can have the power of Church Government and Discipline, but those who have the power of Preaching, & Administring the Sacraments: But Ruling Elders have not this Power; Ergo, they can have no Power of Church Government and Discipline. How many gross Absurdities might be drawn upon our puerile Sophister, from this his Topick and Inference, is obvious to the meanest Reflection, tho' it be supposed that the Proposition would bear this Inference by a Counterposition, *He who is no Church Governour has no Right to Preach and Administer the Sacraments*.

I said, *some would be apt to add this Rule or Canon unto the first*: And certainly whatever truth or strength appears in it, 'tis evident that it affronts J. S.'s Arguing, and convinces him of Folly and Ignorance. It is plac'd among these Canons by *Burgesdic* in his *Logical Institutions*, and others who have digested *Aristotle's Rules*; But because it appears contain'd in the first Rule or Canon, and not so properly distinct from it, therefore we shall not insist upon it. Our Moderns do here tell us, That if an Universal Affirmative Proposition cannot be Converted *simpliciter*, then it cannot be Converted either into an Universal Affirmative or Negative, since the Notion of *Simplex & absoluta Conversio*, that Conversion which is simple and absolute is (according to them) *quando ubique eadem retinetur quantitas*, or when both Propositions retain the same quantity. They hold moreover, that the very Nature of Conversion of one Proposition into another, strictly taken, will not allow that an Affirmative Proposition should be Converted by a Negative, since 'tis ordinarily held as a fixed Rule, that *Eadem retinenda est qualitas in Propositione convertenda & conversa*, *The same quality is to be retain'd of the Proposition that is to be Converted, and in the Proposition which is Converted*; That is, an Affirmative Proposition is Convertible into an Affirmative, and a Negative into a Negative. Hence it is that our Moderns disapprove of *Conversio per Contrapositionem*, or by Counterposition. But Critically to scan and dip into this further, were but a fruitless Diversion from our Scope and Purpose: Leaving therefore to the Gentlemen of that Profession to determine and make the choice in this point, since what is offered is sufficient to expose the Folly and Ignorance of our arguing Pamphleter, I proceed.

When we exactly ponder J. S's Scope and Method of Arguing against the two Principals, upon their Hypotheses anent these two Species of Rulers, the structure of his first Syllogism is of this Nature :

The Elder who is Cloath'd and Instructed with Authority of Preaching and Administ'ring the Sacraments, hath necessarily annexed therewith the Authority of Ruling, or of a Church Government :

But the Elder, whom we call the Ruling Elder, is not Cloath'd and Instructed with Authority of Preaching and Administ'rating the Sacraments ;

Ergo, He is not Instructed or Cloath'd with Authority of Government.

Now, in this Argument or Syllogism, besides its other Defects, upon the premis'd Hypothesis, which J. S. supposes, of the two distinct Species of these Elders (since he professes to argue *ad Homines*, and to suppose the same), since the *Major* Proposition points at one Species of the Elder, viz. *The Elder that Preaches and Administ'rats the Sacraments, and likewise Rules* ; The *Minor* points at and respects the Elder *that Rules only, or the Ruling-Elder* ; By this means, the *Subject and Medium* being *Ambiguous*, and not one and the same ; The Syllogism Labours of the deadly Disease of four *Termini*, which J. S. with his Associates will never Cure.

Sure I am, should any infer from the necessary Connection of *Risibilitie v. g.* with the Nature of J. S. *That none has Risibilitie who is not J. S.* he would think the Person such as had a Crack in his Intellectuals. He might have Learn'd at the Schools, that *Ubi diversa extensionis sunt Attributa, non reciprocatur existendi consecutio.* i. e. Where Adjuncts or Attributes are of a diverse Extension, there is no reciprocal Consequence in point of Existence. He should have also Learn'd and understood, that *Attributa minoris extensionis involvunt ea quæ sunt majoris, sed non e contra.* i. e. The Attributes or Properties of the *Minor* extension include these of the greater, but not contrarily. For Instance, the Inference holds good, *Si sit homo est animal, est vivens, substantia, ens dependens, &c.* And thus ascending up the Metaphysical Gradation. It it be a Man 'tis a living Creature, 'tis substance not accident, has a dependent being, &c. and so upward in these Degrees. But from hence the Inference is very bad and base in the Negative of J. S's Mould : Substance or a depending Entity has a necessary Connection with Man ; Therefore that which is not a Man is neither the living Creature, substance, nor dependent Being. But such Inferences were good, admitting J. S's wife Topick ; For thus there should be no Metaphysical

physical Degrees or Attributes of a diverse Extension, since in their intire Scale and Degrees above-mention'd, they are Connected with the Nature of every Individual. Nay, thus it would follow, that the Attributes and Degrees fore-mention'd had not Extension at all, the Contrary whereof is acknowldg'd by any who have the least taste of Logical Principles. Thus I have made good my first Charge, and J. S. has staged himself an *Ignoramus* in the common Principles of Logick or Arguing.

My second Undertaking against J. S. in point of his two Syllogisms, was, to make it appear, that he has therein contradicted himself, and overthrown one of the main Principles of his Pamphlet. For managing which Charge, we need only Represent what he is found clearly to assert in point of the Bishop's Office, which we may take up in these Three Principles.

1. He evidently holds the Bishop to be a Church Officer, specifically distinct from the Pastor or Presbyter. The whole Series and Scope of his Reasoning doth so clearly point out this, that there needs no Recapitulation of what is already offer'd to make it good. What he asserts of the Bishop's Power and Office in point of Legislation, Ordination, Jurisdiction, doth every way so distinguish him from the Presbyter, as J. S. neither can, nor will disown this Assertion and Principle.

2ly. He doth as evidently hold, that all Power of Government and Jurisdiction is necessarily appendent upon, and included in his Official Authority of Ordination, wherein he asserts him to be Sole and Singular, as is convincingly evident in his whole Discourses. He will have him to be the Principle of Union in the Diocese, and the Center of Government. Let what he has asserted anent the Episcopal Actus, the Episcopal Discipline, Episcopal Vigor, Tribunitian, Censorian Power, the Episcopal absolute Licentia, & Liberum arbitrium, &c. be duly pondered, together with what he, and all his Fellow-pleaders do hold, anent a Succession to Apostles in their supreme Power Ecclesiastical, as in an exclusive sense proper and peculiar to the Bishop, and this will be evident beyond exception. The Apostles singular Power in Ordination J. S. will not deny, and by Consequence the Bishop's Succession therein unto them. Thus above Chap. 5. 6.

3ly. Notwithstanding whereof, he professes to hold the Presbyter or Pastor to have an Interest in Government, and peremptorily disowns the Assertion of a Sole Power in Government ascribed to the Bishop, Censuring with might and main the two Principals imputing to him such an Assertion. This is convincingly evident from what is premisd. But over and above all other Proofs of what is asserted, let his own

peremptory Assertion stand good for all, to clear this point, *Chap. 4. S. 11.* His words are, *But do not I expressly say, pag. 38. That a Bishop in St. Cyprian's time had the Sole Power of Ordination? I said so, but where did I say, he had the Sole Power of Jurisdiction?* Here's an Assertion of the Principle I am imputing unto him as clear as the Noon-day Light, viz. *The Bishop hath the Sole Power of Ordination, but not the Sole Power of Jurisdiction,* Presbyters having a share and interest therein, together with the Bishop.

Now upon the whole, I offer unto him his own *Medium*, overturning this his Assertion anent Pastors or Presbyters Interest in Government or Jurisdiction. Thus then I argue:

The Power and Authority of Ordination hath necessarily connected with it, and appendent upon it, the Authority and Power of Jurisdiction and Government:

But the Pastor or Presbyter has no Authority in Ordination, nor is Cloath'd with any such Power;

Ergo, He has no Authority and Power in Jurisdiction and Government.

The two Propositions are J. S's. own Assertion, the Conclusion is drawn out in his own Method, and a direct Contradiction of what he asserts in this point, yea and of the Assertion and Sentence immediately premis'd. The same Consequence is clear, when the *Major* Proposition and the whole Argument is intirely cast into his Mould, after this manner.

Those who have no Interest and Authority in Ordination, have no Interest and Authority in Jurisdiction and Government:

But, so it is, that the Pastor or Presbyter hath no Interest and Authority in Ordination;

Ergo, He has no Interest and Authority in Jurisdiction.

Or, to come yet nearer to the visage of his goodly Argument, thus it may be propos'd,

None can have the Power of Church Government and Discipline, who have not the Power of Ordination:

But, Pastors or Presbyters have not the Power of Ordination;

Ergo, They have not the Power of Jurisdiction, or Church Government.

'Tis certain, that according to the Mould of his pleading in this Argument, Presbyters are as entirly excluded from the one as from the other. Thus, I hope, my second Charge is made evident enough, and J. S's Argument sufficiently improven against him, as in this Arguing Contradicting himself, and overthrowing one of his chief Principles;

So

So that this his formidable Culverin has pitifully fir'd back, and destroy'd our Episcopal Champion.

Come we to the Third thing I Charg'd upon him, *viz.* To make it appear, *That by this Argument he involves himself in a Seditious Impeachment of the Civil Government.* To make which evident, there needs no more than proposing that clear and generally acknowledg'd Truth and Principle, and which J. S. will, no doubt, own and assert, *viz.* That every one Cloath'd with Regal Authority has a necessary and essential (J. S. will say the Chief, tho' probably not the Sole) Interest and Authority in making Laws, or the Legislative Power ; As in the point of Ordination and Government he asserts in the Case of the Bishop. Now let us hear J. S's grand Syllogism levell'd against him and Arraigning him of Sedition. Thus it is,

The Person Cloath'd with Royal and Kingly Majesty and Authority has necessarily appendent upon and included in this Royal Authority a Power Legislative, or of making Laws :

The Nobles, Officers of State, yea and Parliament are not cloath'd with the Regal Authority;

Ergo, They have no Authority and Interest in Government, and in the Legislative Power, or of making Laws.

Here is a dangerous Impeachment, none will doubt, of the Nation's Authority and Fundamental Laws. Or, bring we the Syllogism again nearer to his Mould. Take it thus,

None can have Authority and Interest in the Legislative Power, or of making Laws, who are not cloath'd with the Regal Authority:

The Officers of State, Nobles, Parliament, are not cloath'd with the Regal Authority ;

Ergo, They have no Interest in the Legislative Power, or of making Laws.

This being the intire Mould of J. S's Arguing, and in special the Visage of his goodly Syllogism, whether he deserves the severer Censure of the Schools for his Phantastick Sophistry, or of the State for his Seditious and Government-disturbing Notions, is left to the Readers to Judg.

'Tis not unpleasant to observe J. S's Foolish Queries which he subjoyns to his Syllogisms, upon the suppos'd wonderful Advantage he has in the premis'd Assertion ascrib'd to the Principals, anent the Connection betwixt the Power of Preaching and Administrating the Sacraments, and that of Government, and the other Assertion, that Ruling Elders have not the Power of Preaching and Administrating of Sacraments. I dare not, saith J. S. adventure on more Syllogisms. And no Wonder, his

his Adventure hath been of such dangerous Consequence, as is above made good; So that the old Sarcasm in our Witty Scot's Poëm may be cast upon him,

*Go Lear yet, a Tear yet, your Logick at the Schools,
You may then, I say then, pass Master with the Mules.*

But together with this Cautious Resolution of not daring to adventure on more Syllogisms, he would do well not to dare to adventure on Writing any more Pamphlets of this Nature, which, no doubt, has the same Success and Issue with his Syllogisms.

But J. S. will adventure upon One or Two Questions, viz. *Seeing the Powers of Preaching and Government are inseparable, how can Ruling Elders have the latter, when 'tis confess'd they have not the former?* Unto which Querie (upon our foremention'd Hypothesis acknowledg'd by him) the meanest Tyro in the Logicks might twit him thus, and give such a Return, *Since Animality and Rationality are inseparable in J. S. how can his Horse have Animality since he is not J. S. himself?* Or take it in the Species as they are inseparable in homine, it grounds alike Retorsion thus, *How can the Brute have Animality that is not homo, or Man?* But to give the more Theological Answer *ad Hominem*, *Seeing the Power of Ordination and Jurisdiction are inseparable in the Bishop, how can the Pastor or Presbyter have an Interest in the latter, since by J. S's Confession, he has no Interest in the former?*

His next Querie is, *Whether one Power is appendent upon and consequent unto another, how can it exist or subsist without that other, to which it is appendent, and on which it is consequent?* To which formidable Querie the same Answer and Retorsion is evident, *Since J. S's Rationality, or State, as a Man, has necessarily appendent upon, and consequent unto it Animality, or the Sensitive Life, how can Animality or Sensitive Life, necessarily appendent upon, and consequent unto J. S's Rationality as a Man, subsist or exist in any other than J. S. himself?* Or take it with respect to the Species, it has the same force as is above express'd.

Again, *Since the Power of Government and Jurisdiction is necessarily appendent upon, and consequent unto the Bishop's Power of Ordination, how can this Power of Jurisdiction or Interest in Government exist or subsist in any other than the Bishop?* For what he adds of the Reverend Mr. Rule his owning this Principle of the Inseparability of Teaching and Ruling, and asserting, notwithstanding, the Separability in Critical Interims, or *turbato statu Ecclesie*, upon which J. S. founds a wise Querie, *Has the Church been always in turbato statu?* must the two Powers have been in a constant state of Separation since our Saviour's Days? If there were Ruling Elders, who had the one without the other, did our Lord or his Apostles institute

an Order of Officers who could have no Power without offering Violence to Nature, &c. From what is said, 'tis Answered, These Queries are founded upon the same Phantastick Ground with his Syllogism, and do easily vanish, when he is told, that when we speak of Teaching and Ruling as Inseparable, we do still understand them with respect to the Pastoral Office. 2ly, The Separability of Ruling, i. e. Sole Ruling, we understand with respect to the Ruling Elder as such, whom we own to be an Officer of a Distinct Species. 3ly, The Restraint of the Exercise in several Cases, and these instanced by G. R. doth very well consist with the existence of the Radical Power and Authority it self, and, consequently, the Separability as to an actual Exercise of Ruling in *Critical Interims* is very well consistent with the Inseparability of the Powers of Teaching and Ruling in themselves considered.

But 'tis now time to consider J. S.'s second Syllogism, which runs thus,

Those who have no Power of Church Government and Discipline, are no Church Governours :

But, Ruling Elders have no Power of Church Government and Discipline ;

Ergo, they are no Church Governours.

To this Syllogism the Answer is easie and obvious, *viz.* That the Assumption or Minor, being founded upon the ruinous Ground of the Conclusion of the prior, does *prima fronte* appear to be false and unsound, and J. S. hath offered no shadow of a Proof to Fortifie the same, nor will he, with the Assistance of all his Tribe, ever make it good. So much for our Episcopal Champion's grand Syllogisms.

I find little or nothing in his Pamphlet further worth noticing with respect to the Author mentioned ; Except that, Chap 9. §. 11. He Charges him with a groundless Imputation upon Dr. Monro's Interpretation of that Passage, *Matth.* 20. 25. *viz.* That the Dr. therein embraces the Popish Notions and Evasions, among which Evasions and Answers this is one which J. S. takes notice of, *viz.* " That ' the Doctor had said, this makes not for Presbyterian Parity, because ' our Lord did that himself among his Disciples, which now he ' Commanded them to do one to another, and therefore the doing of ' it towards one another in Obedience to our Saviour's Command ' could not infer a Parity, unless it be Blasphemously infer'd that Christ ' and his Apostles were equal. The Charging Dr. Monro with a Popish Interpretation is all that J. S. has to Censure, and because it is alleg'd, " The

"The Doctor was beholden therein to his Popish Masters, that the Pope would approve such a Commentary. Upon this J. S. Reproaches him, *as using Billingsgate-Language, and as saying Nonsense as ever disgrac'd the Press*, and tells us further, that *this is all that's comprehensible in that Answer to the Doctor's Argument*. Now, that this Man's Truth, or rather Falshood, may evidently appear, let any Read what is offered from *pag. 10. and forward to pag. 20. and 23.* and what is Charg'd upon the Doctor will be found to convincingly evident, as truly the Man's Confidence, or rather Impudence, is admirable. For, Representing this Scripture cited by Dr. *Monro* as the Ground of our Argument, as also the Doctor's Disguise instead of the true Argument deducible therefrom, before the Doctor's Answer is scan'd, 'tis first made appear, what it is we plead from it, and next the Consonancy of what we plead with the Judgment of sound Divines, and even in their Reasonings against the Papacy, such as *Whittaker, Chamier, Turretin, the Belgick Divines, Diodat, Paræus*, and then the Doctor's three Answers are scan'd, whereof that which J. S. mentions is only the third.

And, to shew this person's trifling Prevarication, who is bold to assert there is nothing else offered upon the Doctor's Answer, but what he has represented, let any read these *Pages, scil. 18, 19, 20.* and they shall be forc'd to acknowledge, that there are Answers return'd, or rather such Confutation of the Doctor's Answer, from Scripture, from Divine Reason, as must needs engage the Assent of such as are Sound. Particularly in that passage cited by J. S. wherein 'tis asserted, that the Pope's Holiness had a fair Plea from the Doctor's Sense of that Text; This Inference is made, That our Lord Exercising a Supremacy over his Church, and the Doctor's Answer running to this Issue, and exhibiting this Sense of the Words, *viz. That which I command you I have done, and therefore that which I command you is consistent with a Supremacy over my Church, which I have exercis'd and exemplified*; That the Pope's Holiness had a fair Plea, his Gloss being the very same with that of *Bellarmin* and other Popish Pleadars.

Next, a more direct Answer is return'd to the Doctor, that the Lord's Scope being, to antidote their inward Pride, in proposing his own Exemplary Humility, this his first Argument runs *a fortiori* thus, If I your Lord and Master be such a Pattern of Self-Denyal and Humility among you, much more ought you to study Humility, and to guard against all usurped Dominion one over another, who are Fellow Disciples and Servants, as he reasons *John 13. If I your Lord have washen your Feet, much more ought you to wash one anothers Feet.*

Again;

Again, there is notice taken of a Twofold Inadvertency of the Doctor in this Answer, 1. In that he asserted the Lord's Precept and Prohibition to be levell'd against an *Ambitious Principle or Design*, but not at all to reach, but rather allow that *Effect and Expression thereof*, which he doth in down-right Terms prohibite, viz. the *Dominion* they were contending about; Forgetting the common Maxim, *Subordinata non pugnant*, and as if a *bad Principle* could fall under a Prohibition, and not the *bad Practice*, the Issue thereof. 2ly, In that he suppos'd the Lord's Argument of Humility drawn from his Practice, while dehorting his Apostles from Unlawful Dominion, will infer his Arguing *a pari*, and a Supposition of his Equality with them, if his Hypothesis of a Warrantable Supremacy were excluded, which, the Doctor is told, was a very Irrational Imagination, the Argument running clearly *a majore ad minus*, from the greater to the less, and the very Basis and Topick of it supposing and inferring the quite contrary Conclusion. So that his Arguing, that, upon this Ground, as above Sens'd, *Presbyterians would make Christ and his Apostles Equal*, has no more Twist of Reason in it, than if one should infer from our being dehorted from Strife and Vain-Glory, and enjoyn'd Humility and Love, because Christ made himself of no Reputation, and humbl'd himself to Death, the absurd Conclusion of *the Equality of his Disciples and Members with himself*.

The Doctor is further pos'd with this Query, *Whether our Lord did not command an Equality of Official Authority amongst the Apostles, or if he did think, that our Lord own'd in this respect a Prince or Supreme over the rest?* If the Doctor did hold this last, the Appeal is made to all Protestants, whether he had not left our Camp, and had gone over to the Tents of the Papists. If he own'd, that the Lord enjoyn'd an Authoritative Official Equality of Power among the Apostles, in this Case demanded, the Doctor's Sense is demanded of our Lord's Argument, pressing and recommending this Equality from *his own Example*, and whether his Assigning this Sense, and giving this Account of our Lord's Reasoning, will fasten upon himself his own Absurdity, and Blasphemously infer, *That Christ and his Apostles were Equal*. Hence the Doctor is told, that he must either quite this Sense of our Lord's Words, and consequently the Sense exhibited by Protestant Divines, or acknowledge the Absurdity and Futility of his own Argument and Answer, and that he falls by the Rebound of his own Blow and Weapon.

This being the Reply offer'd unto, and Reflection upon that Third Answer of the Doctor's, I leave it to all Men to judg of the Fidelity and Ingenuity of J. S. who is bold to assert, in the place cited, that

Flat Billingsgate Stuff is all that's comprehensible in the Answers offered to the Doctor's Argument; And that it is as Robust and Staring Nonsense as ever disgrac'd the Press. And whether such Language which he here presents, being all his Answer to the premis'd Replies, has not prov'd him a *Billingsgate* Disputer and nothing else.

J. S. tells his Reader, in the next place, that he has given Three Samples of the Abilities of the Doctor's Antagonist, one of his Skill in Antiquity, another of his Dexterity at Stating the main Controversie, and now a third at his Nimbleness at Reasoning. And how he has acquit himself in all the three, and whether the Acquittances and Abilities, upon which he fastens this Charge, or his Insignificant Attacks be more obvious and conspicuous, let the Reader judg from what is above offered.

And now, Mr. Sage, having, in what is premis'd, discovered sufficiently the Unsoundness of this your Laborious Pamphlet, let me offer to you this short Epilogizing Address. Pray what did you intend in this Famous Piece of Work? What doth your Arguing reprove? Could you imagine to satisfie either Friends, or Adversaries, in this Debate? As for Presbyterians, do not all Men of Sense (as well as those of that Perswasion) who read your Pamphlet, *prima fronte* discover, that you have therein expos'd your self, and laid open your Nakedness, in your many Wier-drawn Inferences, pitiful Paralogisms, palpable and frequent Contradictions, wherewith your Pamphlet is stuff'd? They see, that as you have fled from the true State of this Question, and the Scripture Debate thereupon, so you have discover'd your self in such manner frighted and beaten with Presbyterian Weapons, that you have been forc'd to flie to inconsistent pitiful Refuges, in point of the *Bishop* you plead for; And, in the Series and Contexture of your Pleading, have made a meer Versatile Proteus of him, such an Amphibion, or rather Chimerical Nothing, as evidently demonstrates, that your self knew not, what State, Posture, or Function to fix him in, or what to hold of him; One while setting him in the highest Pinacle of Absolute Dominion, as much as any Monarch was ever capable of, or Exercis'd. none of the most Absolute *Cæsars* excepted, with a *Licentia, Liberum Arbitrium, Potentatus*, yea a *quod libet licet* fix'd upon his Mitre; Other while, in point of Government, making him a meer Nothing, content with the least Degree or Atome of Imparity, subject to *Judicatories*, as to his Life or Doctrine, a meer fix'd *Præses*, and no more.

And as for your Episcopal Friends, who sees not, that you have palpably Affronted them, and betray'd their Cause, which may be made evidently

evidently appear in several clear Instances. They pretend to deduce the Original and Warrant of Episcopacy from Apostolick Doctrine and Practice; You take your first Measures from the Principles and Practice of *Cyprian*, with his Contemporaries, and will needs have these to countervail and outweigh all that can be pleaded from Scripture for Presbyterian Government; Therein palpably giving the whole Tribe of your Episcopal Pleaders the Lie. Your Friends appear Zealous for the Divine Warrant of the present *English* and late *Scottish* Hierarchy, wherein the Bishop is subject to the Arch-Bishop, and he to the Metropolitan, or Primate; You, in Contradiction to them (yea and to your self) set all your Prelates on a Levell, making every one of them a Pope, or High-Priest, in his District. They reject the Ruling Elder, as having no Warrant to Officiate in Judicatories, or Rule in the House of God; You have also appear'd brisk against him, tho' with a blunt Wooden Weapon, having not the least Grain of Scripture Edge, or Steel; Yet you have so far affronted them and your self, as to owne the Parochial Sessional Judicatories in *Scotland*, made up of such Officers, yea and their Acting without Consulting the Bishop.

And here, *Sir*, to your other Inconsistencies above instanced, and proof of your Crossing and Contradicting the Principles and Pleading of your Party, I must add this signal Discovery and Demonstration in point of the Office of the Seventy Disciples. You assert, *Ch. 6. § 9.* That it is impossible to make it appear so much as probable (in *Cyprian's* Sense, and your own) that *St. Cyprian* believ'd the Seventy, as making a distinct College from that of the Twelve, to have had any standing Office in the *Christian Church*, in which they were to have a constant Line of Successors. Yea you contend, That the Commission recorded, *Luke 10.* did constitute them only [Temporary Missionaries] and that for an Errand which could not possibly be [more than Temporary]. Wherein you have contradicted *Doctor Scott*, and clearly overthrown his grand Argument for Episcopacy. The Doctor's first Argument * for the Divine Right of Prelacy, is drawn from our Saviour's Institution, which he thus presents, That *Christ*, in his Lifetime, instituted two Orders of Ministers, viz. that of the Apostles, and the Seventy Disciples, whose Office he proves to be Subordinate to that of the Apostles, from this Ground, that they are mention'd apart as distinct. And the standing of this Subordinate Office he endeavours to prove both from Scripture and Antiquity. Nor is the Doctor alone in this Arguing, for it is known to be the common Method of your Episcopal Pleaders. Your notable Querist. in special, and your new Arguer, do both plead this grand Topick; The one, *Ch. 6. Quen 3.* The other in

Christian Life, Part 2. Pag. 388, 389, &c.

the Query turn'd to an Argument, Pag. 20. Now, Sir, 'tis evident; that either you, or your grand Pleaders, do walk in Darkneſs, and do imbrace a groſs Error, in this point of ſo high Importance to your Cauſe. Either they have laid for the Foundation of their Pleading a meer Impoſſibility, in the Senſe of your *Divus Cyprianus* and your own, and which has not ſo much as a Probability, or you have Slandered, and put a falſe Imputation upon your chief Arguers in a great and Fundamental Topick of their Pleading, which you have thus raz'd and overturn'd.

Befides, have you not, in the many great Prerogatives aſcrib'd to your *Cyprianic* Biſhop, which you will needs have deriv'd from Apoſtles, Affronted the more Modeſt and Ableſt of Episcopalian Pleaders,

* On Tir.

1. 5.

† *Iran.*

|| *Apol. Part*

2. Ch. 9:

* *Cathol. Apol.*

Part 1. Ch. 33.

† *Againſt Seminaries, Lib.*

1. Pag. 318.

ſuch as Doctor *Fulk* *, Doctor *Forbes* †, &c. Yea and Biſhops themſelves, ſuch as Biſhop *Jewel* ||, Biſhop *Morton* *, Biſhop *Biſon* †, who, with ſeveral other Episcopalianſ, hold, that by Apoſtolick Doctrine and Practice, yea and in the Senſe and Judgment of both *Greek* and *Latine* Fathers, Biſhop and *Presbyter* are intirely Identified, one and the ſame Office. Again, your admired Patron and Pattern *Dodwell* makes *Peter* ſuch a Primate and Prince of Apoſtles, as all the reſt were but private Men compar'd to him;

You, in your Levelling Doctrine as to all Biſhops, have given him the Lie, ſince you hold, they ſucceed to the Apoſtles, and conſequently you aſſert their Official Equality. Thus you have croſs'd your Admirable Extraordinary Champion; Admirable like your ſelf in Antiſcriptural, Phantaſtick, Popiſh Dotages, who hath Brutified and Mortaliz'd the Souls of all who are not of the Episcopalian Communion, and therein has put fair to Immortalize his Infamy. Sir, Poſe your Conſcience, did you Eye God, his Glory, in this your Attempt? Did you conſider, that his Eyes are upon the Ways of Man, and that he ponders all his Goings, that he will bring every Work into Judgment, that the Fire will declare every Man's Work, that not he that commends himſelf, who catches at, yea and reaches the Applauſe of poor Creatures, is commend-ed, but whom the Lord approves? Theſe things, together with what is now offer'd unto you, I remit to your Reflections and Search of your Conſcience; And, for your further Improvement in this Search, do preſent unto you, in Oppoſition to your pretended Principles of the *Cyprianic Age*; theſe enſuing Solid Scripture Principles, I ſhall not ſay of the *Presbyterian Age*, but of this True Organick Church of Scotland.

APPENDIX.

Exhibiting a brief Scripture Account and Assertion of Presbyterian Principles, in point of Church Government and Gospel Worship.

I. P R I N C I P L E.

THE Standing Officers of Divine appointment are, The Pastor, or Teacher, by God set in the Church for the great End of the Edification thereof, 1 Cor. 12. 28. Ephes. 4. 8, 11. Rom. 12. 6, 7, 8, 16. Act. 20. 28. Whole Office is to Administer the Word and Sacraments, and hath an Essential Interest in Discipline, Act. 20. 1 Tim. 3. Tit. 1. 1 Pet. 5. Matth. 28. & 18. & 17. Act. 20. 36. The Doctor's Office also mention'd, hath no Essential Difference from this in the Judgment of Learn'd Divines, in special the *Belgie*, who upon Ephes. 4. 11. Observe, that the Term [*Some*] doth not stand betwixt the two Names of Pastors and Teachers here, as in the foregoing several Callings; And that these two Names stand together, to shew that all Pastors must also be Teachers: Even as these two Names are often put one for the other

in the Scripture. And *Paul* joyns these two things together in the trying of Ministers, *1 Tim.* 3. and *Tit.* 1. The next Officer is the Ruling Elder, or the Elder who Rules only, and is also a distinct and standing Officer, as is evident from *Rom.* 12. 6, 7, 8. where he that Ruleth is distinguish'd from the Teacher, Exhorter, the Deacon, having a distinct Name from other Officers, a distinct Work, and a distinct special Direction. *1 Cor.* 12. 28. [*Governments*] points at this Officer evidently, and are distinguished both from the Deacon, Pastor, or Teacher. Thus *1 Tim.* 5. 17. We find distinguished Elders, that Rule, and Elders that labour in the Word and Doctrine. The Deacons Office is clearly asserted, *Act.* 6. and in several of the Passages cited. Likewise *Philip.* 1. 1. *1 Tim.* 3. 8.

II. PRINCIPLE.

THE Extraordinary expir'd Officers under the New Testament are, Apostles, who were Universal Messengers, to lay every where the Foundation of the Catholick Church, sent immediately by Christ, above, and beyond the ordinary Method of ordinary Teachers, fortified with Infallibility in Doctrine, and the Gift of Miracles for Confirming the same, *Matth.* 28. 20. & 10. 1. *1 Cor.* 3. 10, 11. *Job.* 16. 13. *Act.* 2. 2, &c. Likewise Prophets, adorn'd with the Gift of Fore-shewing future Events, and Explaining difficult Scriptures by extraordinary Instinct, *Act.* 11. 28. & 20. 10. & 13. 1. *1 Cor.* 14. 29. Evangelists, as distinguished from the Writers of the Gospel, were Extraordinary Officers and Attendants of Apostles, whose Work was to Water their Plantations, to bring Instructions from the Apostles to Churches, and Reports of the Churches state to the Apostles; Such were *Barnabas*, *Silas*, *Timotheus*, and *Titus*, whose Planetary Motion and Office in this nature is pointed at in the Epistles, who being fix'd to no particular Church, and their Work and Office being such as is not proper to Ordinary Officers, neither they, nor Apostles could admit of any Successors. *Proless. Leid. Disp.* 42. *Thes.* 21. 22, 23, 24. *Proless. Salmur. Thes. Theol. de Div. Minist.* Grad. pag. 281. *Thes.* 6. 7, 8, 9, 10.

For the other Gifts and Offices mention'd, *1 Cor.* 12. 28. such as that of *Miracles*, *Gifts of Healing*, *Diversities of Tongues*; none doubts but they are expir'd as peculiar to the first Apostolick Church.

III. PRINCIPLE.

THE Prelat's suppos'd Office, which inhances all Ecclesiastick Authority in his Person, with respect to his Diocese, to be by him deriv'd

giv'd to Pastors, who are not properly the Subjects of Church Government, according to this Mould thereof, is Cross to the Scripture Rule, as being opposite to that Immediat Essential Interest in Government competent to Pastors; Which Essential Interest appears, 1. In the Names and Titles of Authority ascrib'd to them, such as these of *Rulers, Governours, Overseers, Bishops*, and the like, *1 Tim. 5. 17. 1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 17. Act. 20. 28. 1 Cor. 4. 12. Tit. 1. 7. 1 Cor. 12. 28. 2ly.* The Exercise of this Official Power in Government is ascrib'd to them, without the least shadow of a precarious Dependence upon a Prelat, *1 Thes. 5. 12. Heb. 13. 7, 17.* compar'd with *1 Tim. 5. 17.* The same Essential Interest appears in their Concurrence with the Apostles in that great Council, *Act. 15.* Their Essential Interest in the highest Act of Jurisdiction, even the Ordination of an Evangelist is asserted *1 Tim. 4. 14.* and own'd by the Current of Protestant Divines upon the place, *Vatablus, Bullinger, Diodat, Belgick Divines, English Annotations, Poole's Annotations*, second Part, with many others. *Camero*, commenting on *Matth. 18.* Expounds this passage to the same purpose. Their Interest in Excommunication appears in that pregnant passage *1 Cor. 5.* where is evident the Presbyterial Inspection of an associated Ministry over that Church, from the multitude of Believers therein, *Act. 18. 7, 8, 9, 10, 11.* The plenty of Preachers therein, *Ibid.* with *1 Cor. 3. 10.* and *5. 14.* From the Subordination of Prophets to Prophets, as to a judicial Cognisance upon their Exercises, *1 Cor. 14. 29.* From the intimated plurality of Churches in that City, which notwithstanding are pointed out in the Inscription of the Epistle, as one Church, in respect of Government, *1 Cor. 1. 2. with G. 14. 34.* *Paul's* objected Direction in this point, is clearly *cumulative* unto, not *privative* of the Essential Interest of these Church Officers in this Church, as is evident in all other Apostolick Directions, whether to Members or Officers of the Church. All which is further confirm'd from the Apostles committing the Government of Churches to Pastors, in their last Farewells, as the highest Officers, and their ordinary proper Successors in Government. Thus the Apostle *Paul*, *Act. 20. 25, 27, 28, 29.* in his last Exhortation to the Church of *Ephesus*, when never to see their Face more. And the Apostle *Peter*, *1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3, 4.* with *2 Pet. 1. 13, 14.*

IV. PRINCIPLE.

THERE is nothing like a Diocesan Episcopacy can be inferr'd from the Scripture Accounts of *Timothy* and *Titus*. I. The Scripture stands Cross to the Hypothesis of their fix'd Instalment in these Churches of

Crete and Ephesus. (1.) In pointing at their transient occasional Employment therein, *1 Tim.* 1. 3. *Tit.* 1. 5. (2.) They are found actually recall'd from these Posts, and no where in Scripture have we an Account of their Return thereunto, *2 Tim.* 4. 9. with *21. Tit.* 3. 12. II, The subject Matter of the Epistles confutes this Hypothesis, wherein the Office and Qualifications of the Bishop & Presbyter are Identified. Besides that *Timothy* is instructed how to behave himself in the House of God in general, *1 Tim.* 3. 5. Not at *Ephesus* only, as his fix'd Post. He is said to have his Ordination *by the laying on of the Hands of the Presbytery*, *1 Tim.* 4. 14. And therefore could have no Paramount Authority over them. The Labourer in the Word and Doctrine is pointed at, as an higher Officer above the Ruler only, consequently the Preaching Pastor is set above the Ruling Prelat. He is enjoyn'd to commit to a plurality of Successors, called *Faithful Men*, not to One Prelat, what he had heard of *Paul*, *2 Tim.* 2. 2. enjoyn'd to give Attendance to Exhortation, Reading, and Doctrine, *till the Apostle* came unto him, *1 Tim.* 3. 14. We read of these Evangelists transient Visits and Commissions to several Churches, of *Timothy* in special, but nothing of his return to *Ephesus*, and in the Apostle's Epistle to that Church, there's no mention of him, either in the Salutation, the Epistle it self, or the Conclusion.

V. P R I N C I P L E.

THERE is nothing like a Diocesan Episcopacy in the Scripture Accounts of the seven *Asian* Angels, since it cannot be made appear that one Individual Person is pointed at by this Angel; It being evident, that, in the Stile of this Book, many singular Terms are to be understood in a *Collective Sense*, such as these of *Woman*, *Whore*, *Beast*, *Dragon*, and do signifie a Collection of many Individuals. All Church Officers and Members are Represented by One Candlestick. Which is further confirm'd from this, that the Church of *Ephesus* first here Saluted, had many Elders of Equal Authority, *1 Tim.* 5. 17. who all had the Denomination, the Name and Thing of the Scripture Bishop, *Act.* 20. 27, 28. 29. The admitting the Angel a single Person, is absolutely short of proving him a Prelat, since (1.) 'Tis evident in the Context and in parallel Scriptures, that even upon this Hypothesis, he is but the *Angelus Præses*, or Moderator, since he is said to have no Jurisdiction and Superiority over Pastors, nor has any Duty enjoin'd him with respect to them, as inferior Officers subject to him. (2.)

Nothing

Nothing is requir'd of him, but that which is the common Duty of all Ministers or Pastors.

VI, PRINCIPLE.

PRESBYTERIAN Government in all its Courts and Judicatories, such as *Congregational Elderships, Presbyteries, Synods, and General Assemblies* in a National Church, stand upon a Divine Basis, and have clear Scripture Warrant. 1. The *Congregational Eldership* appears fortified by several clear Scripture Grounds, 1. What was competent to the Church of the Jews, as a Church, is certainly applicable to the Christian Church; In that Church we read of Synagogues or Congregational Meetings, wherein there were Discipline, and Punishments, or Censures Inflicted, *Acts* 9. 1, 2. 26. 11. compar'd with *Luk.* 22. 66. *Act.* 22. 5. 24, The Apostolick Practice clears this, since we read of Christ's Body being Denominated the Church in general, *Mat.* 16. 18. 1. *Cor.* 12. 28. and of particular Members of that Church call'd also Churches, as the Church of *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 8. 1. the Church of *Antioch*, *Act.* 13. 1. of *Ephesus*, *Rev.* 2. 1. Thus also the same Spirit of Christ is pleas'd to stile single Congregations, Churches, *Let your Women keep silence in the Churches*, 1 *Cor.* 14. 34. And if Churches, in Name and Nature, then surely they had ordinary standing Church Officers, such as *Pastors, Teachers, Elders, Deacons*; The Apostles being Diligent to Ordain Officers in every Church, *Act.* 14. 23. Besides what may be pleaded from the very Light of Nature, directing smaller Societies, Political or Ecclesiastical, to compose smaller, or privat Differences or Offences, and Order such particular Concerns as are competent thereunto, according to *Jethro's Advice to Moses*, *Exod.* 18 26. suppos'd also by our Saviour in the Gradation mention'd, *Matth.* 5. 22. wherein he insinuates their Inferior Courts, for Inferior Causes.

As for the greater Courts, or *Presbyteries*, made up of a competent Number of single Congregations Represented in their Officers, their Divine Warrant stands clearly fortified by Scripture Grounds. 1. This may be largely clear'd from, not only the plurality of Associated Presbyters for Government of the Church, clearly pointed at in Scripture, as in *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 11. 27, 28, 30. compar'd with *Chap.* 21. 17, 18. in *Ephesus*, wherein we Read of a plurality of Elders Associated, who all had a Ministerial, and, in the Scripture Sense, an Episcopal Inspection over that Church, *Act.* 20. 17, 18. But moreover, we do also *in terminis* read of a Presbytery putting forth the high Act of *Ordinati-*

on, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. Neglect not the Gift that was given thee by Propheſie, with the laying on of the hands of the Presbytery. Of the Presbytery, not of the Presbyters, plainly denoting the whole Body of Presbyters Associated; The Term wherever us'd in Scripture denoting a Society or Body of Associated Elders. Again, That Church Unity before hinted in the Designation of the Church of *Ephesus*, and consequently competent to others of that Nature clears this point; For the Denomination of one Church must needs import, as the ground thereof, such an Unity as has a special respect to Government, but so as to distinguish the same from such ground of Unity as is competent to single Congregations in the restricted or exclusive Sense, and therefore must needs respect a Presbyterial Unity in point of Government, or a joynt Administration of Church Government by one common Presbytery, or College of Elders. 2ly, As we find in every such Presbyterial Church Ecclesiastick Rulers, who are Represented as Officers thereof, standing in such a Relation thereunto, such as that of *Jerusalem*, *Act.* 11. 27, 30. and 15. 2. of *Antioch*, *Act.* 13. 1, 2, 3. of *Ephesus*, *Act.* 17. 28. of *Corinth* 1 *Cor.* 1. 12. and 4. 15. So we find such Presbyterial Churches Meeting together for Acts of Government, viz. To Ordain, Appoint, and send forth Church Officers, *Act.* 6. 2, 3, 6. and 13. 2, 3. to Excommunicat notorious Offenders, 1 *Cor.* 5. 4, 5, 7, 13. compar'd with 2 *Cor.* 2. 6. and to restore again Penitent Persons to Church Communion.

The Divine Warrant of Synods, or Synodal Assemblies, differing in some respects from Classical Presbyteries, as being more ample and extensive Assemblies than Classical Presbyteries, tho' for substance and kind their Power is the same, is largely asserted (as also of the lesser Judicatories instanc'd) by Presbyterian Writers; *Prof. Leid. Disp.* 49. per totum. *Jus Divin. Regim. Eccles.* Chap. 14. Assertion of the Government of the Church of Scotland, Part 2. Chap. 4. The Assembly of Divines in their Advice to the Parliament, upon that Head of Synodical Assemblies. The great Proof is drawn from *Act.* 15. where we Read of that which is the proper occasion of a Juridical Synod, scil. the broaching of false Doctrine by such as come down from *Judea*. 2ly, We Read of an Authoritative Mission to delegated Officers from the Church at *Antioch*, which was Presbyterial, to this Superior Synodal Assembly; They are sent to *Jerusalem*, where was a Presbyterial Church. And if we consult v. 23, 41. we will find it clear, that there were Deputed Officers from *Syria* and *Cilicia*. 3ly, That there were Officers or Delegats of divers Presbyteries, or Presbyterial Churches, appears evident in the Contexture and Scope; For besides,

besides the clearly suppos'd Presbyterial Churches of *Jerusalem* and *Antioch*, and the joynt Associated Meeting of both these Presbyteries (compare *Act*. 15. v. 2, 6, 12.), we have clear Intimation of Church Officers of a larger Extension in this Synodal Meeting, since we Read of *the whole multitude*, of an Association of the Apostles and Elders with *the whole Church* in this Assembly. We Read of Apostles, Elders and Brethren, yea of *the whole multitude, of the whole Church, and Brethren*, v. 12, 22, 23. which cannot be extended to every Individual, who cannot be suppos'd to Meet in one privat House : And the instanced Nature, Scope, and Intent of this Judicatory will appear, if it be considered, that the Dissension and Trouble giving occasion to this Meeting, reached not only the Brethren of *Antioch*, but likewise those of *Syria* and *Cilicia*, who were troubl'd with this Question, v. 23, 24. and therefore must needs be suppos'd to have met there by their Deputed Commissioners ; So that the premis'd extensive Expressions of *the whole multitude*, and *whole Church*, must needs import : *the Church Representative*, or the *Synodal Multitude*. 4ly, That here is an Example and Pattern of Synodal Assemblies, such as is recommended as of constant use and necessity, and not such an extraordinary Meeting, or Synod, as admits of no Succession, appears evident in the Context and Scope : For altho' the Apostles Meeting here were Extraordinary Officers, of Supreme and Infallible Authority, yet that they Acted not here as in that Capacity, is evident from the manner of Procedure, and the Authority (Ministerial, we mean) ascrib'd to the other Members of this Meeting ; For the Question was Stated and Debated in the ordinary way of Disputation ; Light and Evidence, in this Controversie, was brought from Scripture, as is evident from v. 22. to 30. Again, the Elders appear the same Authoritative Members in this Synod as the Apostles. There were other Delegats sent from *Antioch* with *Paul* and *Barnabas*, v. 2. They were sent to the Elders as well as to the Apostles at *Jerusalem*, *Ibid*. They were receiv'd at *Jerusalem*, as well by the Elders as the Apostles. The Elders as well as the Apostles considered the point, v. 4, 5, 6. They joyntly with the Apostles brand the false Teachers, as Subverters of Souls, v. 23, 24. Together with them they assert, *It seemed good to the Holy Ghost and to us*, v. 28. Together with the Apostles they impos'd the Decrees upon the Church, *Ibid*. and concurr'd in the Decretal Epistle, &c. Other Arguments may be drawn from the Light of Nature, Directing and Constituting thus the Joynts and Nerves (as it were) of Societies in Political Bodies ; From the binding Force and Obligation of the Jewish Sanhedrim consider'd in this Capacity, &c.

For *National Assemblies* in a National Church, made up of a competent Number of Delegates from all the Subordinated Synods, since they have the same Ground and Foundation with the *Synodal*, there needs no new Scripture Proof for them, as having the same Scripture Warrants which the National Church has, *When the Kingdoms of this World become the Kingdoms of the Lord, and of his Christ, that he may Reign in them.*

VII. P R I N C I P L E.

WE disown the Erastian Mould of Church Government, such as was the late Prelacy in this Nation, as is evident by many clear Proofs in the 1. Parliament of *Charles II.* *Sess. 2. Act. 1.* "It is asserted, that the Ordering and Disposing the External Government and Policy of the Church doth properly belong unto His Majesty, as an inherent Right of the Crown, by vertue of his Royal Prerogative, and Supremacy in Causes Ecclesiastical. And it is declar'd, that whatever shall be Determin'd by His Majesty, by Advice of the Arch-Bishops and Bishops, and such of the Clergy as shall be Nominated by His Majesty, in the External Government and Policy of the Church, (the same consisting with the standing Laws of the Kingdom) shall be valid and effectual. This is also evident in the Act Restoring Episcopacy, in the Act for the National Synod, &c.

This Mould of Government asserting the Political Magistrat to be the proper immediat Subject of Ecclesiastical Discipline and the power of the Keyes, Impeaching thus the clear Distinction betwixt the Civil and Ecclesiastick Sanhedrim, Exemplarly pointed out in the Jewish Church, and asserted by many of the Learn'd, as likewise the Distinction of the Gospel Church Government from the Civil, clearly asserted in the New Testament; It being evident, that as a Visible Church is Christ's Visible Kingdom as Mediator, and that its Officers, Laws, and Censures fall within the Compass of his Mediatory Appointment and Inspection, *Matth. 16. 19. and 28. 19. Job. 18. 34. 1 Cor. 12. 28. Eph. 4. 11, 12.* So the Gospel Church was compleated in her Being and Essence, both as to Rulers and Ruled, and directed accordingly in the Exercise of her Government when no Magistrat was so much as a Church Member. Again, these Precepts anent the Exercise of her Power are injoynd to the Church, and her Officers, as such, with the same Freedom and Independency upon the Civil Power as at the first, in our Lord's great Commission anent Church Government, and the Exercise thereof, we find it intirely and exclusively Attributed

to his own Church Officers, without the least Restriction or Limitation in case of the Magistrats becoming Christian; For we find that in all the Precepts respecting Church Government and the Exercise thereof, the Grounds are Moral and perpetual, pointing out the Churches Duty, as a Church, whether the Magistrat be Friend or Enemy. We find, *Eph. 4.* that the great Work of the Ministry respecting the Scope and End thereof, and its necessary Administrators, stands the same Unchangeable and Inviolable until the Coming of our Lord, to perfect his Church, and accomplish her Warfare. Besides that there are very gross and dangerous Consequences clearly deducible from this Erastian Principle and Practice in point of Government, such as the putting this Imputation upon the Exercise of Church Government in the First and purest Ages, without the least Dependence upon the Civil Magistrat, *That it was a gross Encroachment upon that Ordinance of God, and of the Magistrats Right,* 2ly, This Principle introduces a Dominion, and (according to the late Mould of our Erastian Prelacy) an Arbitrary Power upon her Government, ascribing to the Magistrat a Sole Decisive Suffrage, in Causes falling under Ecclesiastick Cognisance. 3ly, The Assertion, that the Magistrat is a necessary and standing Church Officer, is a gross Imputation upon our Lord's Wisdom and Faithfulness, in giving this Commission and the Power of the Keyes to his own Church Officers, and not to the Magistrat. Besides several such Absurdities attending this Principle and Mould of Government, as, That Heathen Magistrats might be formally Church Governours, who are not Church Members; That a person may be Born under the Gospel Dispensation a chief Church Ruler; That Children and Women, who may have a legal Right to be Magistrats, may be Church Officers, &c. That all Church Officers are not set in the Church: contrary to what is asserted, *1 Cor. 12. 28.* For this supposes the Person must be a Church Member, but so it is that a Heathen Magistrat, or of a contrary Religion to the true, may, according to the premis'd Principles and Frame of Government, be a Chief Church Officer, who in respect of his Personal Incapacity in point of Religion can be no Church Member. See several other Arguments to this Scope in *Apolonius, Jus Majestatis circa Sacra, pag. 35, 36. Jus Divin. Reg. Eccles. pag. 78, 79, 80, 81, &c. Aaron's Rod Blossoming, Lib. 2. Chap. 6. 7.*

VIII. P R I N C I P L E.

IN Opposition to the Prelatical Constitution, we assert the Peoples Power and Interest to Call their Pastor. 'Tis evident, that prelatisms disown.

disown this Power in the People and Congregation; For in this Government the Ministers Mission, Call, Ordination, and Relation to such a People over whom he is to Officiat flows all from the Prelat, and the Congregational Eldership is robb'd of its Interest therein. Hence Prelacys late Erection was attended with the removal of this Priviledge, and the Restoration of Patronages. This is clear by comparing the Act of Parliament 1649, removing Patronages, with the Act of Parliament 1662, Ordaining Ministers, who entred since *An.* 1649, to obtain a Presentation from the lawful Patron, and a Collation from the Bishop.

This Right of the People to Call their Pastor, Presbyterians have made good from several clear Scripture Grounds; As, 1. It appears from *Act.* 14. 23. and *Tit.* 1. 5. That the Ordination of Pastors did necessarily import, and was attended with the Peoples consent, because, not to insist upon the Term *χειροτονειν*, or the *τῶ χειρ. τινα*, clearly importing a Hand-Suffrage, the Ordination appears to have been perform'd in the Church, and therefore, by necessary Consequence, such a performance in the Church could not but be attended with, and necessarily import the Peoples deliberat Choice and Consent. 2ly, There is an Argument *a fortiori* thus improven from *Act.* 6. The Infallible Apostles in point of the Knowledge of Gifts and Qualifications would not Ordain the Deacons, but upon the Peoples Choice and Selecting of the Persons, tho' the Office had a respect only to the disbursing of their Alms or Charity; And if such a Trust of even disbursing Alms, the Apostles judg'd, did necessarily require the Peoples Consent and Choice of the Persons, the far greater Trust of the Soul's conduct must, *a fortiori*, require such a Consent. Nay the very Persons, one of whom was to be immediatly Ordain'd an Apostle by God himself, were presented and chosen by the Church. 3ly, The Right and Warrant of a Congregational Eldership, which cannot be denied, since Congregations are Term'd *Churches*, and consequently, must needs be suppos'd to have Teaching and Ruling Officers or Elders, (compare *1 Cor.* 13. 34. with *Act.* 14. 23. *Tit.* 1. 5. *Rom.* 12. 8. *1 Cor.* 12. 28. *1 Tim.* 5. 17.) will clearly import this their Right and Authority; For if they have an Eldership to Represent them in Matters Ecclesiastical, their Choice of the Pastor, or Chief Elder, must needs fall within the compass of their Right and Authority: Besides what is Rationally, and in Divine Reason pleaded from that near and Marriage-like Relation between the Pastor and Flock, which must needs import a voluntary Consent; That Judgment of Discretion of Trying and Discerning the Spirits, which is allow'd,

yea

yea and enjoyn'd to the People of God, 1 Cor. 10, 15. 1 Job. 4. 1, 2. That necessary Acting in Faith, Rom. 14. ult. which must needs take place, and be admitted in such a weighty case as this is. If Christ's Flock and Sheep have this Character, *That they know the true Shepherd and discern his Voice, and will flee from the Hireling*, John 10. 4, 5. then their Consent must interveen in order to their Acceptance of, and Subjection to their Shepherd. The extraordinary Case is still excepted of the *Ecclesia constituenda*, or the Obstinacy, Error, Schisms or such like inevitable Impediments in the state and condition of a Congregation, wherein, according to Gospel Rules, the Authority of Superior Judicatories, must interveen for redress; For as in the Civil Policy *the Salus Populi is the Suprema Lex*, and to be principally intended, so in the Church Government, the *Majus bonum Ecclesie* is acknowledg'd to be the Pole-Star of Church Governours, and the Leading Rule in all their Motions and Acts of Government.

IX. P R I N C I P L E.

WE Condemn, as contrary to Scripture Rules, and the Office of the Ministry, Church Mens Acting in Civil Affairs, as stated Official Civil Rulers, or constant constituent Members of Civil Judicatories, higher or lower, such as of *Parliament, Council*, and the like; And this upon the Apostles Grand Rule, 2 Tim. 2. 4. *No Man that Warreth intangles himself with the Affairs of this Life, that he may please him who hath chosen him to be a Souldier*; compar'd with 1 Tim. 4, 13. *Give attendance to Reading, to Exhortation, to Doctrine*. And v. 14. *Neglect not the Gift which was given thee, &c.* And v. 15. *Meditat on these things, give thy self Wholly to them*, *sis Totus in his, that thy Profuing may appear to all*, compared with 2 Tim. 4: 2. *Preach the Word, be instant in season, and out of season, Reprove, Rebuke, Exhort, with all Longsuffering and Doctrine*. Wherein 'tis evident that the Minister of Christ (and, in the Sense of our Episcopallians, the Bishop, such as *Timothy* is suppos'd to be) is enjoyn'd an intire Sequestration from the concerns of this Life, and as a *Souldier* to attend the Commands and Orders of our Lord the Captain of Salvation, which he cannot do, and please him, if entangl'd in other Employments. And the Ministry is held out to be such an assiduous laborious Work, as must entirely take up the whole Time, Pains, and Endeavours of the Man of God, for compassing the great and glorious Designs thereof, the Salvation of Souls and the Glory of Christ therein. Besides several other clear Grounds drawn from Scripture and Divine Reason clearly condemning this Practice, such

as the Unfufficiency of the best, for managing the great Trust of the Gospel Ministry, in it self considered, acknowledg'd by the great Apostle of the Gentiles, 2 Cor. 2. 16. The nature of Christ's Kingdom, and the Officers thereof, asserted *not to be of this World*, Joh. 18. 36. consequently to move in a higher Sphere than Worldly Concerns. The Reason offer'd by the Apostles, *Act. 6. 2.* why they were not to be diverted from their Ministerial Employments, by meddling in that which was proper to the Deacons, *It is not fit that we should leave the Word of God.* And *v. 4. We will give our selves Continually to Prayer, and to the Ministry of the Word.* Wherein we see their absolute Aversion from the least Intanglement in worldly Affairs, in order to the assiduous prosecuting of the great Ministerial Work instanced. To which may be added our Saviour's declining so much as to give Advice in a Civil Cause, *Luk. 12. 13, 14.* His Answer to the Man, who desir'd him to speak to his Brother, that he might divide the Inheritance with him, was with his peremptory Refusal, *Man, who made me a Judge, or a Divider over you?* What is pleaded from the extraordinary Old Testament Instances, and Examples of *Eli, Samuel*, and the like, will as well plead for Ministers being Supreme Governours or Kings; And, thus proving too much, prove nothing. And however such Arguing will please the Pope (with his *Ecce duo gladii*) and his Parasites, yet Royalists will disowne and be asham'd of it.

X, P R I N C I P L E.

WE hold that the Plea from Antiquity, is unsound and utterly insufficient in the Episcopal Cause, 1. 'Tis the consentient Judgment of all the Protestant Churches, that not Antiquity or the humane Testimony of Men, but the Scriptures of Truth allanerly, are the Judge and Rule in all points of Religion, of all *Credenda, facienda, and petenda*. The Scriptures pronouncing themselves sufficient to make, not only the private Christian, but even the *man of God*, the Minister of God, *perfect, thoroughly furnish'd to all good works*, 2 Tim. 3. 16, 17. 2ly. The setting up of Antiquity for the Rule in this point, makes the Scriptures Sense and Authority, and consequently our Faith, to depend upon a humane Testimony; Since thus we must believe no otherways concerning the Scriptures pointing at the Nature of Church Officers, their Office, Qualifications and Government, than according to the suppos'd Testimonie and Practice of the Ancients, which thus becomes the *Norm*, the demonstrative Ground of our Certainty in this point, and this humane Testimonie exercises thus a Dominion over
our

our Faith, it doth thus degenerate from a *Divine Faith* to a *humane Credulity*, and stands in the *wisdom of man*, not in the *Power of God*, 1 *Cor.* 2. 5. compar'd with 2 *Cor.* 1. 24. The Scripture also thus becomes of a *private*, or *humane Interpretation*, 2 *Pet.* 1. 20, 21. 3^{ly}. Such a Principle doth further Impeach Two great points of our Protestant Profession. 1. The Fallibility of the Church in any Age, since the Apostolick, maintain'd by all Protestant Churches and Divines, against the Pope, and Popish Churches pretended Infallibility. (2.) The instanc'd absolute Perfection of the Scriptures, wherein we have God's Decision in the lively Oracles, touching all matters of Faith and Religion. Finally, as many of the Fathers, both *Greek* and *Latine*, do owne the Identity of Bishop and Presbyter; So they disowne a Decisive Judgment ascribable to any humane Writings in point of Religion. Optatus Milevit. (*contra Parmen. Lib. 5.*) tells us, *Our proper Judg is he who speaks in the Gospel*, Augustin (*Epist. 19. in Answer to Jerom*) who had cited several Fathers for his Opinion, tells him, *That he appeals to the Apostle Paul*, who is above them all. To the same purpose he speaks, *Epist. 3. Fortunatiano. Lib. 2. contra Crescon. C. 32.* He shews, *That he holds not even Cyprian's Epistles to be Canonical. Cap. 31.* He shews, *he does him no injury when distinguishing his Writings from the Canonical Scriptures.* Many more might be cited to this purpose, such as *Jerom* on *Matth. 23.* and on *1 Eb. of Haggai*. But I insist not.

XI. P R I N C I P L E.

Upon the point of Worship we hold that,

I. THE Imposing of fix'd set Forms of Words in Prayer or Preaching, and astringing Pastors thereunto in their publick Officiating, is Sinful and Unwarrantable, (1.) In general, as wanting a Divine Institution, consequently Promise, as all parts of Divine Worship must have, *Deut. 12. last, What thing soever I Command you, observe to do it; thou shalt not add thereunto nor diminish from it.* Compar'd with parallels *Chap. 4. 2. Prov. 30. 6. Rev. 22. 18. Isa. 29. 13. Matth. 15. 8, 9.* (2.) In special, this Practice is destitute of the Warrant of either Apostolick Precept or Example, or of the Apostolick Church; There being nothing in the Scriptures of the New Testament, which either directly or indirectly, expressly or explicitly, and by good consequence can infer and legitimat the same.

For what is pretended in point of the prescrib'd Form in the Lord's Prayer, 'tis evident, that our Saviour never intended to prescribe the

Repeating these Words, as essential or necessary to Prayer; Since (1.) Collating the two Evangelists Account thereof, 'tis evident, that there is a signal Variety therein. 1. The Conclusion in *Luke* is intirely omitted, who expresse the Precept thus, *When ye pray, say*; Which seems to cast the most favourable Aspect upon Prescribing the Words; But the Prayer is intire in *Matth.* who expresseth the Precept thus, *After this manner pray ye*, i. e. In this Method, and to this Scope: 2. There is a considerable Variety in the Expression, as Represented by the two Evangelists. The Authors of the 2d Part of *Poole's Notes* have observ'd this variety, viz. for *σήμερον*, in *Matth.* is *αὐτὸ ἡμέραν*, in *Luk.* for *ἡμετέρας* in *Matth.* *Luke* hath *ἁμαρτίας*; for *ὡς καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀφιστάμεθα τοῖς σφαιλαῖς ἡμῶν*, in *Matth.* *Luk.* hath *καὶ ὡς αὐτοὶ ἀφίστανται παντὶ σφαιλοντι ἡμῖν*; Whence it plainly appears, say the *Annotators*, that our Saviour did not intend to oblige his Disciples to the same syllabical words, but only to words of the same import, &c. Other differences are observ'd by others, which we need not here stand upon. (2.) We do not find, that the Apostles ever repeated this Prayer *Verbatim*, nor have we such an Instance or Example in all the New Testament Accounts of the Apostles Prescription or Practice in point of Prayer; Nor do we find this practice in any of the Recorded Prayers of the Church and People of God. For what is pretended as to the Excellency and Comprehensiveness of this Prayer, to infer the foresaid practice of a necessary Verbal Repetition, it will no more plead for a necessary Repetition of these words, as essential to Prayer, than for a Repeating of the Decalogue (the most precious and comprehensive Sum and Rule of Moral Duties, uttered by God's Voice from Heaven) in all Sermons, as Essential to the Duty of Preaching.

In the Third place, Imposing of, and Astringing to such set Forms, is a Sinful Limiting of the Spirit of Prayer, and the due Exercise of the Gift & Graces of Prayer, in the Person Authorized to be God's Mouth to the People, & the Peoples Mouth to God: For, 1. God's Spirit is promis'd to all who ask, *Luke* 11. 13. and given to all true Members of Christ's Mystical Body, fitting them for their Duty according to their several Stations, *1sa.* 59. 20, 21. *Colos.* 2. 19. *Eph.* 1. 13, 14. And in special for the Exercise of the Gift and Grace of Prayer, *Zach.* 12. 10, 11. *Rom.* 8. 26. 27. Hence, as it must be Rationally suppos'd, that the Person according to Gospel Rules set apart and Authorized, as a Minister of Christ, to be his Ambassadour and Mouth to the People, and theirs to God, and whose Gifts this way have come under the Tryal and Judgment of the Prophets in Church Judicatories, according to the Rule, 1 *Cor.* 14.

29th is both Call'd of God, and Fitted, as to the Expressive Faculty, to Represent their case to God; This being the Spirit's special Gift to Fit and Sanctifie, as the Conceptions, so the Expressive Faculty for the Duties of this Function; The Apostles *Act. 2. 4.* spoke as the Spirit gave them utterance; And if the Spirit was given in that manner to the Apostles, to fit them for their work of Prayer and Preaching to all Nations, therefore to Pastors for the great end of their Function. Hence the *abounding in Knowledge and Utterance* are conjoyn'd, as the Spirit's united Gifts to the People of God, *1 Cor. 1. 5.* And this Gift of Utterance we find joyn'd with Knowledge, Faith, and Love, *2 Cor. 8. 7.* And Pastors in special have Utterance given them, and a Door of it opened, *Eph. 6. 19. Colos. 4. 3.* And if God's Spirit fits all in whom he dwells, then surely, and in special manner the Pastor for every good Word and Work. Compare *2 Thes. 2. 17.* with *1 Tim. 4. 12. 3 Sam. 23. 2. Isa. 32. 4.*

II. WE condemn Symbolical Ceremonies in Worship, *viz.* Such as upon Man's meer Appointment, do signifie and represent Spiritual Mysteries, as grossly Incroaching upon the Nature of Sacraments, and God's Authority therein, it being his Prerogative to prescribe any representing thing in Worship; Since it must be suppos'd 1. A part of Worship, consequently must fall under his Command and Institution, else 'tis Superstition and Will worship, *Colos. 2. 23.* (2.) The Symbolical Sign or Ceremonie in point of Worship or Religion, must needs have respect to a Blessing, consequently to an annex'd Promise, which God only can give; Hence there can be no performance of such Ceremonies in Faith, as all instituted Worship is upon this Ground so perform'd.

Of this sort we hold to be, 1. The Sign of the Cross in Baptism. 2. Kneeling in the Act of Receiving the Sacramental Elements in the Lord's Supper. The first is condemn'd not only upon the general Ground offer'd, but likewise as Encouraging and Symbolizing with the horrid Popish Superstition; and abuse of this Ordinance, condemn'd by Protestant Divines, together with the other Superstitious Rites and Ceremonies of Hards, Oyl, and the like, as representing the Roughness of the Law, and Softness of God's Mercy.

The second is condemn'd in that, (1.) 'Tis contrary to the instituted Table posture observ'd by our Lord and his Apostles, as suiting the great Design of this Ordinance, which represents our Eternal Communion, our Eating and Drinking with him at his Table in his Kingdom, *Luke 22. 30.* (2.) We condemn this posture in the Act of Re-

ceiving, as being in its Nature a relative Coadoration of the Elements themselves, and thus Idolatrous; The Prostration or Kneeling being in this case a Religious Ceremony, or posture of Adoration, and from the Nature of the Ordinance, respecting the sacred Symbols or Elements, as the immediat Object thereof, must needs import the relative Coadoration mentioned.

Upon the same Ground of the want of a Divine Institution and Promise, we condemn Holy Days, that is, the setting a part Anniversary Days, as relative to sacred Holy Duties, and thus relatively Holy, with a special respect to some suppos'd mystick Signification in the Days themselves, the Duties being annex'd upon the Ground of this Mystick Signification, and therefore especially suited to the Day it self, the Observation also of the Day being *a part of the Worship*, and attended and Celebrated with an intire Cessation from work thereupon. Such a Dedication and Observation of Days, must needs *toto calo* differ from a Deputation, either of a Day for Religious Duty upon occasional Emergencies, which passeth off with that exigent, and this whether with respect to Fasting or Thanksgiving, and has clear Scripture Warrant, *Joel* 2. 15. 16. *2 Chron.* 20. 3, 4. with *ver.* 26. Or the ordinary Deputation or Designation of such and such Days of the Week, or rather Parts thereof for Sermon: The difference of the Days or Times last mention'd, from the Holy Days instanced, is evident, in that, 1. In these Days last mentioned, there's no Cessation from ordinary Employment, as is observ'd in the Holy Days. 2. In these Days the Time is as *a fit Circumstance suited to the Worship*; In the Holy Days, *the Worship is suited to the Time*, which is not a meer Circumstance thereof. 3. In the Days & Times last instanc'd, there's a Liberty *to alter the same to other Seasons and Times*; But not so in the case of the Holy Days, which are *fix'd and unalterable*, upon the suppos'd Mystick Signification instanced. 4. In the case of Holy Days, the Time or Day is Celebrated as *a part of the Worship*; In the other case 'tis only *an alterable Circumstance*.

That these Days are observ'd as relatively Holy, and upon a suppos'd Mystick Signification, yea and that the Observation of the Day is esteem'd a part of the Worship, is evident in the Practice of the Observers, and the Arguments of the Chief of such as are Pleaders, & have acted the Proctors for them. Thus *Hooker Eccles. Policy. Lib. 5. l. 70.* *Ibid Sect. 65.* with 69. In which places he calls the Days, *Hallowed and Sanctified*, and owns them as a part of Worship, and even *ratione medii*. To this purpose *Dr. Burgess, ch. 3; Lawfulness of Kneeling.* Thus also *ch.*

15. Page 42. Likeways Dr. Forbes, *Irenicum Lib. 1. c. 5. Sect. 66.* and *ch. 7. Sect. 7.* Bishop *Lindsay's Epistles to the Pastors of the Church of Scotland.* Page 24. Downam in *Quartum Præcept.* Bishop Andrews in his Holy Days Sermons, hath many Assertions to this purpose. In his Sermon on *Psal. 85. 10, 11.* He says of *Christmas,* That *Mercy and Peace, Righteousness and Truth, meet most kindly on that Day.* In his *Christmas Sermon* on the 2d *Psal.* he says, That the Law is most kindly Preach'd and suitably Practiced on this Day. In his Sermon on *Heb. 12. 2.* which is suited to Good-Friday, he saith, Let us turn unto him, scil. to God, and beseech him by the sight of this Day. The *Psalmist* has a Suit, *Pf. 84. 9.* Behold, O God, our Shield, and look upon the face of thine Anointed, but the Bishop in this phrase substitutes Good-friday in place of Anointed, imploring God's Mercy upon the sight of that Day. In his Sermon on *Colos. 3. 1.* he asserts, That no Day in the Year is so fit to rise with Christ, and seek the things that are above, as Easter-day. I humbly conceive, he might have excepted the Christian Sabbath. In his Sermon on *John 2. 19.* he asserts, That the receiving of Christ's Body is at no time so proper as this very Day. Many other Instances may be seen in that Elaborat Piece Entitled, *A Dispute against the English-Popish Ceremonies obtruded upon the Church of Scotland,* pag. 127. 128.

Now to give a little Touch as to the Unlawfulness of this Observation instanced, take this short Account, 1. That which necessarily supposes an Institution, is Unlawful without it; But the Observations instanced have no Divine Institution. For the *Minor* and Assumption, 'tis evident, in that the Adversaries have never been able to produce either Express or Consequential Institution, tho' often Challenged to it as Affirmers. For the *Major Proposition,* 'tis evident in that, 1. Every piece of Religious Worship requires Divine Institution, *Deut. 12. 32. Mat. 15. 8, 9.* (2.) In special, the Dedication of Days requires this: For, besides that all the Dedicated Days under the Old Testament had God's special Appointment, we have a special Instance of the Unwarrantableness of a humane arbitrary Dedication, in the case of *Jeroboam* his Dedicating the 15th Day of the 8th Moneth for the Feast of Tabernacles, in stead of the 15th Day of the 7th Moneth instituted by God *Levit. 23. 34.* which is Charg'd upon him as a Wicked Invention, *1 King. 12. 32.* (2ly.) We find the Dedication instanc'd Condemn'd by the Apostle, *Gal. 2. 10.* compar'd with *Colos. 2: 16.* For 1. The Apostle Argues the Unlawfulness of the Observation of the Antiquated Jewish Days, from an *obsolete Institution,* and consequently from a *Non-Institution,* he infers the same Unlawfulness of Dedication or Observati-

on of Days, else the Argument were not good, if *Ecclesiastick Institution* of this Nature were Lawful, and might stand good in place of that which is *Divine*.

2ly, The Apostle condemns the Observation of Days as encroaching upon Christian Liberty *Gal. 5. 1.* 'Tis true, there's no Liberty allow'd either from God's Command, or the lawful Commands of Superiors, *Rom. 13.* But there is a Christian Liberty, which our Lord has purchas'd, whereby we are delivered from the Power of Sin, *Rom. 6. 14. 2 Tim. 2. 5.* and from the Curse of the Law, *Gal. 3. 13.* And another part of this Liberty is our Deliverance from the shadowing Ceremonial Law, *Colos. 2. 14.* and therefore much more from subjecting the Conscience to Rites, Doctrines, and Laws of Men in Matters of Worship, *Colos. 2. 20.* The Apostle censures Subjection to *Ordinances after the Commandments and Doctrines of Men.* Thus Protestant Divines generally, and our Confession of Faith, *Ch. 20. Art. 2.*

3ly, The Observation and Dedication instanced reflects upon the Wisdom of God, 1. In point of the Scriptures Perfection, and tying us thereunto as our only Rule in point of Worship, as is clear in the Scriptures frequently cited, *2 Tim. 3. 16. 17. Prov. 30. 6. Rev. 22. 18. Psal. 19. 7. Matth. 15. 9.* 2ly, In declaring his Church free from the Yoke of the Ceremonial Law of his own Institution, proclaiming Liberty in a Gospel Jubile; Yet, in Opposition both to this, and the preceeding Ground, giving Men a Liberty of imposing a Yoke of Ceremonial Observances of their own devising.

Particularly in the point of *Christmas Day*, we hold, that it is a gross Impeachment on the Divine Wisdom to assert, that God has tyed and obliged us to keep the Birth Day of our Saviour Holy, while, notwithstanding, there is not the least Shadow or Vestige of a Command for it in the Word, but likewise the Scripture is absolutely silent as to that Day. As for the Conjecture thereanent drawn from the time of *Zacharie's* Offering Incense, as if he had been the High-Priest, it is palpably groundless. He was of the Course of *Abia*, *Luke 1. 5.* which was the 8th Course of the Priests, *1 Chron. 24. 10.* The High-Priest was one, and not within the Courses of the Priests; Hence it follows, that his Burning Incense mention'd, *v. 9.* is to be understood of the ordinary Incense appointed, *Exod. 36. 7.* not the Solemn Incense in the Yearly Day of Expiation instituted *Levit. 16. 11, 12, 13, 14. &c.*

4ly, The Observation instanced encroaches upon the Authority of the 4th Command, in point of the Six Days Labour therein enjoyn'd, except

except in Cases which God, the Bless'd Lawgiver, has excec'm'd and excepted from the Compass of this Obligation and Command, such as Occasional Fasts, Feasts, and the like, whereof above.

To this purpose 'tis observable, 1. That we find a Labour commanded in the State of Innocency. 2ly, We find Cessation from Labour comes under a special Command in God's instituted Holy Days, pointing at the Necessity of a Divine Warrant for this Cessation; For the Cessation is enjoyn'd as a part of the Religious Duty, or at least, a suitable Means subservient thereunto: Thus, *Lev. 23. 7. So v. 8, 21, 25, 35, 36. Numb. 28. 18, &c.*

Finally, this Oblervation has a mischievous Tendency. 1. To introduce all Jewish Antiquated, or innumerable other Superstitious Days, upon smooth pretences of Decency, Unity, Order, Ecclesiastick Constitution, or the like. 2ly, To harden rapists in their Idolatrous Abuse of such Dedication of Days. 'Tis a sure Rule, *That such things or Rites, as neither the Law of God or Nature has made necessary, are to be remov'd from Worship, when thus abus'd, and of such a Scandalous Tendency.* God did forbid several things, otherwise lawful, upon this Ground of Hardening Heathens, and lest Homologating with them and Conformity in lesser things, should introduce Conformity in greater Matters. Thus, *Isa. 30. 22. there is a Command, Ye shall defile also the Covering of thy Graven Images of Silver, and the Ornament of thy Molten Images of Gold, thou shalt cast them away as a Menstruous Cloath, thou shalt say unto it, get thee hence; Compar'd with Ch. 31. v. 7. Such like Commands we have as to Sowing with different Seeds, Plowing with Ox and Ass, Rounding the Corners of the Head and Beard, Wearing the Garment of Linen and Wollen. See Deut. 22. 9, 10, 11. Lev. 19. 19, &c.*

For what is pretended anent the Days of *Purim*, two things do remove the Objection, 1. That they cannot be parallel'd with the Holy Days instanced, being only Days of Civil Mirth and Solemnity, as is evident, *Esth. 9. 17, 18, 19.* 2ly, Giving, not granting, the Observati-on had been Religious, they had therein the Direction of *Mordecai* a Man of God, who was in this Case the Mouth of God unto them; Both which excec'm'd them from the Compass and Touch of the preceeding Arguments. See both these points at large discuss'd in the Dispute against the *English Popish Ceremonies, Part 3, Ch. 6.* Likewise the *Altare Damasc, Pag. 680, 681, 682, 683, 684, 685, &c.*

By both which Authors also, the Argument from the Feast of Dedication, mention'd *John 10. 22, 23.* is discuss'd, there being nothing in the Text pointing at our Lord's Observati-on of this Feast, the Evangelist

gelist only mentioning this Winter Season, as the Occasion of our Lord's commodious Walking in that Porch. And even granting his Attendance on that Solemnity, for spreading the Gospel Net among the great Multitude then assembled, it will no more prove our Lord's owning of this Feast, than *Paul's* hastening to be at *Jerusalem* against the Day of *Pentecost* for the end mentioned, will prove his owning and Celebrating that Antiquated Feast.

XII. PRINCIPLE.

IN Opposition to *Independents* we maintain, 1. A Subordination of lesser to larger Church Judicatories, evident by the Light of Nature. What Nature's Light dictates as Essential to all Government, in it self consider'd, must needs be applicable to this; That particular Parts be subject to the Whole, for the Good of the Whole. is necessary both in Bodies Natural and Politick. 2ly, We find Subordination was in the Jewish Church Government, particular Synagogues among them being subject to the Sanhedrim at *Jerusalem*, *Deut.* 17. 8, 12. *2 Chron.* 19. 8, 11. *Exod.* 18. 22, 26. And what was in their Government grounded upon common Equity, the Principles of Reason and Nature, and had no Typical or peculiar Respect to the State of their Church, is, no doubt, still obliging. Again, this Subordination appears in the Institution of our Saviour in the point of Gradual Appeals, *Matth.* 18. 17, 18. The Offending Brother is first to be Reprov'd in private, then Admonish'd before Two or Three Witnesses, and last of all to be Complain'd of to the Church. The Strength of the Argument appears by the Rule of Proportion, by the same Rule that a Person is subject to a particular Church, that Church is subject to a Provincial or National Assembly: And by the same Proportion, that one Congregation is govern'd by the particular Eldership representing it, by the same Proportion are Ten or Twelve Congregations governed by a Classial Presbytery representing them all. 2ly, This appears from the Sufficiency of the Remedy prescrib'd by our Lord, with Respect to all the Churches Exigences, since Offences may arise between Two Congregations in the same Church, as well as between Two Persons in the same Congregation; And our Bless'd Lord has appointed the Remedy of Appeal to the more General Judgment for Redress, &c. See several other Grounds and Reasons, *Jus Div. Reg. Eccl. Pag.* 234, 235, 236, 237, 238, &c.

2ly, In Opposition to such, we also assert, That the Community of the Faithful, or Body of the People, are not the proper immediate Subject of Church Government. For, 1. This Power was neither given by our Saviour in *Ecclesia Constituenda*, nor by the Apostles in the first Framing of Churches, or in the after Establishment and Growth of them under the Apostles Ministry. Not the first, for then the Apostles themselves had derived their Power from the Fraternity, or Community of the Faithful, contrary to the Scripture Account of their Commission, Qualification, and Designation of their Persons, contrary to many Scriptures, *Gal. 1. 1. Matth. 28. 18, 19, 20. John 20. 22, 23. Luke 6. 13, &c.* Not the second, for the Power committed after the Apostles has still a Respect to their Successors in that Succession. Altho' the Designation to their Office be by the Church, yet the *Donation* and *Derivation* of their Office is only from Christ, as being his *Ministers, Stewards, Ambassadors*, Acting in his Name, and to give an Account to him, *1 Cor. 4. 1. 2 Cor. 5. 19, 20. Matth. 18. 19. 1 Cor. 5. 4, 5. Heb. 13. 17, 18. Luke 12. 41, 42.* Besides that the Promises, with Respect to a Ministry, never respect the whole Community, but the Church Guides. See *John 20. 21, 22, 23. Matth. 28. 19, 20, &c.* And moreover, the Spirit of a Ministry, and necessary Gifts for Government, are no where promis'd to the Community of the Faithful, but to particular Persons of the Visible Body of Christ. Compare *1 Cor. 12. 8, 9.* (where, by the Spirit, the Word of Wisdom is said to be given to one, the Word of Knowledge to another, not to all) with *1 Tim. 3. 5. If a Man know not how to Rule his own House, how shall he take Care of the Church of God?* The Hypothesis insinuates, that all Men have not Gifts and Skill rightly to Rule their own Houses, much less to manage the Government of the Church. Besides that the Relative Designations of *Stewards, Ministers, Shepherds, Ambassadors, &c.* should thus be absurd, as not having a Correlate or Object of such Rule and Government: For if the whole Church be the Dispenser of the Mysteries of God, and all the Members come under such Designation, what shall be the Object of this Dispensation? See *spanhem. Epist. Class. 2. Pag. 51.* Several other Arguments are to be seen in *Jus Div. Reg. Eccl. Pag. 103, 104, 105, 106, 107.*

3ly, In Oppposition to such, we maintain, That the Formality of Church Membership doth not necessarily require Saving Conversion; But a Visible Profession, with Moral Evidences of Sincerity, and Subjection to Ordinances constitutes a Member of the Visible Church according to the Gospel Rules. This Assertion is largely made good
M m by

by Presbyterian Writers, in special by Judicious Mr. *Wood* against *Lockier* the Independent. The Visible Church of Christ being in Scripture thus describ'd, as having in it those who are call'd, tho' not Chosen, *Matth.* 20. 16. (as certainly all Sincere Converts are) and as a Field, wherein there will be still Tares as well as Wheat, till the great Day of Separation of the one from the other, *Matth.* 13. 24, — 31, as a Floor wherein there is Corn and Chaff mix'd, *Matth.* 3. 12. Besides the several Instances of Reception of Church Members into Church Fellowship, upon the premis'd Profession and Moral Evidences of Sincerity, without any Enquiry into the Marks of Saving Conversion. Thus by *John* the Baptist, *Matth.* 3. by the Apostles, *Acts* 2. 41, 42. &c. and 4. 34, 35, 36, 37. compared with *Ch.* 5. *ab init.* *ad v.* 12, *Acts* 8. 12, 13, 14. with *v.* 21, 22, 23. with *Ch.* 14. 21, 22, 23. Which is also convincingly evident from this, That as the Word is to be Preach'd to all Visible Church Members, so with Respect to the great End of Conversion, and the Forming of Christ in the Soul, *Gal.* 4. 19. with *Psal.* 19. 7. *Rom.* 10. 17. The Begetting of Faith, as well as the Confirmation and Growth of those that are already Converted, and who have Faith in the Habit. But if all Members be suppos'd Believers, Converts, and to have Faith, then this great Design and End of the Word is cut off and excluded.

FINIS.

01

10/1/59

L/a



