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A P R E F A C E.

A S Baptistm is putting our Names to Him; be
Admitted as His Disciples; and a Publick Profession of His Do
trin: So the Renouncing of our Baptism, is as Publick a Disow
ing of Him; and a Formal Apostasy from His Religion.
Therefore the Devil has been most busy in all ages (but has pr
vailed most, in our latter Corrupt times) to Prejudice Men, bymany fai
Pretences, against this Divine Institution. Having been able to persuade
quite to throw it off, as Pernicious and Hurtful: Others to think it o
ly Lawful to be done, but to lay no great stress upon it, and fouse it, whe
it is Enjoined, as a thing Indifferent. Others deny it to Infants, up
this only Ground, That they are not supposed Capable of being Admitted in
the Covenant of God, which He has made with Men: For, if they are Cap
able of being admitted into the Covenant, there can be no Reason to de
them the outward Seal of it.

But this being Foreign to my present Undertaking, which is to De
monstrate to the Quakers the Necessity of an Outward or Water-Baptism
in the General (for as to Persons capable of it, we have no Contro
fie with those who deny it to All) therefore, I have not digress'd into an
other Subject, which is, that of Infant Baptism, in the following Discou

1. Yet thus much I will say of it, in this place, That Infants are Capable
being admitted into the Covenant, and therefore that they cannot be Exclu
from the outward Seal of it. The Consequence the Baptists cannot deny. A
that they are Capable, I thus prove. They were Capable under the Law, a
before the Law, of being admitted as Members of the Covenant in Chrift
come, made with Abraham, by the Seal of Circumcision, at the Age of Ei
Days: And therefore there can be no Reason to Exclude them from the sa
Privilege, to the same Covenant, now that Christ is come; unless Christ h
debarr'd them from it: The Law standing still, as it was, where He has a
Alter'd, or Fulfilled it. But He has not debarr'd them. Nay, on the contrary, H
has yet further confirmed their being within the Covenant. He called a Lit
tle Child, (Mat. xviii. 2, 3, 5.) and set him in the midst of His Apostles; a
Proposed him as a Pattern to Them, and to all Adult Christians. And said, Th
none should enter into the Kingdom of Heaven, except those who shou
become as little Children. And that whoever did Receive a Little Child
His Name, did Receive Christ Himself. And (ver. 10.) in Heaven, the
Angels (faith Chrift) do always behold the Face of my Father which is
Heaven. And therefore He bids us Take heed that we despise not one of the
Little Ones; by which term tho Adult Persons are sometimes meant, yet in t
Texts before quoted, it is expressly apply'd to Little Children. And what great
Despising of them can be, than to Reject them as no Members of Christ's Bod
and consequently unworthy of the outward Seal of His Covenant? Ch.
A Preface.

Not been Administered till the Restauration, 1660, that is, in some Churches for Ten, in for Twelve Years together.

1. These Presbyterians in Dublin, and in the South and West parts of Ireland, were sent in England, and had learnt the Contempt of this Sacrament there. Where, even in Oxford, it was not Administered in the whole University, from the Ejection of the Episcopal clergy, in the Year 1648, to the Restauration in 1660, as is observed in the Antiquitian. So that the Quakers have only taken that out of the way, which the Presbyterians worn into Dis-use.

II. And from all these Enemies, and the Subtle Inventions which they have broached in Sale of Christ's Holy Institution of Baptism, and likewise of the Lords Supper (for are slighted by the same Persons, and upon the same Grounds) it is to be feared, that severities of the Church of England, have been wrought, the not into a Dis-use, or downright lost, yet into a less Esteem, and greater Indifference as to these Holy Sacraments than ought; and consequently receive less Benefit by them; much less than if their Knowledge, their Faith were better rooted, and more sublime. Nay, there is not any Degree of indigency, but what is Culpable, in this Case; and may bring a Curse with it, instead of a Blessing: for, whatsoever, especially in Religious Worship, is not of Faith, is sin. And according to our Faith, it is ours, in all our Performances of Religion.

III. For all these Reasons, tho' this Discourse was wrote wholly on Behalf of the Quakers, I hope, it will not be un-useful to many others, to see the strong Foundation, Great Necessity, and Inestimable Benefits of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, when Duly Administered, and Received with Full Faith and Assurance in the Power and Love of God, that will not fail to assist His own Inventions, when we approach unto them, with sincere Respect, and undoubting Dependance upon His Promises. And many of the Objections after answered, tho' used by the Quakers, to Invalidate BAPTISM, are likewise insisted upon by several of the Sects, which I have named above, to Lessen and Disparage it. In which, the following Discourse, tho' it respects the QUAKERS Chiefly, yet not them Only, it contains the joint Arguments of all the several Sizes of the Opposers, or Contemners of Baptism.

III. But at the immediate Occasion, which engaged me in this Work, it was upon the point of a particular Person, who had been Educated from his Childhood in the Quaker Sect, and Communion. And the Objections which are here considered against Baptism, here which, at several Conferences with other Quakers, to whom that Person brought me, were insisted upon. At length, after more than Twelve Months consideration of this Subject, and diligently Reading over, and weighing every particular, which Rob. Barclay had in his Apology, against the Outward, or Water Baptism, it pleased God so to open his Eyes, and persuade the Heart of this Gentleman, that, having Informed himself in the Principles of the Christian Religion, as contained in our Church Catechism; he has it with great Joyfulness, and Satisfaction, Received the Baptism of Christ, as Administered in the Church of England. And it was his Desire, that this Discourse (the wrote for Private Use) might be made Publick, in hopes, that it may have the like Effects upon others, has had upon himself, by the great Mercy of God. And I knowing several others who of late been Convinced and Baptized, in the same manner, as this Gentleman; I have Rested his invitation to contribute my Mite towards the Recovery of so many Thousand as now for 46 Years, have thrown off the Sacraments of Christ's Institution: and there is one main Cause, have lost the Substance, even Faith in the Blood of Christ, outwardly for our Salvation, as I have else-where shewn. The Lord accept my mean Endeavours, to make them Instrumental to His Glory, and the Salvation of Souls. Amen.
A DISCOURSE PROVING
The DIVINE INSTITUTION OF WATER-BAPTISM.

SECT. I.

That Matth. xxviii. 19. was meant of Water-Baptism.

The Words of the Text are these: Go ye, therefore, and Teach all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

The Quakers will not own that the Baptism here mentioned was the Outward, or Water-baptism: Which I will endeavour to make very plain, that it was; and that in the first place,

From the Signification and Etymology of the word Baptize.

1. The word is a Greek word, and only made English by our constant usage of it: It signifies to Wash, and is apply’d to this Sacrament of Baptism, because that is an outward Washing.

To Wash and to Baptize are the very same; and if the word Baptize had been render’d into English, instead of, Go and Bap-tize, it must have been said, Go and Wash Men, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. So that the outward Baptism, with Water, is as much here commanded, as if it had been expressed in English words, or as we can now express it.
But because the word *Baptize* was grown a Technical Term, in other Languages, whereby to express the Holy Sacrament of *Baptism*, long before our English Translation, therefore our Translators did rightly retain the word *Baptize* in this Text, *Matth. xxviii. 19.* and in other Texts which speak of that Holy Sacrament.

But in other places they translate the word *Baptize*, as *Mark vii. 4.* *When they come from the Market μὴ βαπτίσωνται*, except they are *Baptized*, which we literally translate except they *Wash*. And in the same Verse, *βαπτίζοντος ποτηρίων*, &c. *The Baptisms of Cups and Pots*, &c. which we translate the *Washing of Cups and Pots*. And *Heb. ix. 10.* speaking of these Legal Institutions, which stood only in *Meats and Drinks, and divers Washings, and carnal Ordinances*, &c. the word which we here translate *Washings*, is, in the Original, *βαπτίζοντος*, *Baptisms: In Meats and Drinks, and divers Baptisms*. And in the Vulgar Latin, the Greek word is retained in both these Texts, *Mark vii. 4.* *Nisi Baptizentur, non Comedunt*. Except they are *Baptized*, *i.e.* *Wash* their Hands, they eat not. And *Baptismata Calicium*, &c. *The Baptisms of Cups*, &c. And *Heb. ix. 10.* *In Cibis & Potibus, & variis Baptismatibus*, *i.e.* *In Meats and Drinks, and divers Baptisms*. So that it is plain that the word *Baptism*, and the word *Washing*, tho' not the same word, have yet the self-same meaning.

2. It is true, that the word *Baptism* is often taken in a Figurative and Allegorical Sense, to mean the Inward Baptism, the Washing, or Cleansing of the Heart. But so is the word *Washing* also, as often, as *Jer.iv.14, &c.* And there is scarce a Word in the World but is capable of many Figurative and Allegorical Meanings. Thus *Circumcision* is very often used for the Inward Circumcision or Purity of the Heart. And *Fire* is taken to express Love, and likewise Anger, and many other things.

But it is a receiv'd Rule for the Interpretation of Scripture, and indeed of all other Writings and Words, that the plain Literal Meaning is always to be taken, where there is no manifest Contradiction or Absurdity in it; as when a Man is said to have a *Fire* burning in his *Breast*, it cannot be meant of the Literal *Fire*: so when we are commanded to *Wash* or *Circumcise* our *Hearts*,

Hearts, and the like. But, on the other hand, if any Man will take upon him to understand Words in a Figurative Sense, at his own will and pleasure, without an apparent Necessity from the Scope and Coherence, he sets up to Banner, and leaves no Certainty in any Words or Expressions in the World. Therefore I will conclude this Point of the natural Signification and Etymology of the word Baptize: And, unless the Quakers can shew an apparent Contradiction or Absurdity to take it in the Literal Signification, in this Text, Matth. xxviii. 19. then it must be meant of the Outward Washing or Baptism, because that is the only True, and Proper, and Literal Signification of the Word.

And it will be further Demonstrated in the next Section, that there can be no Contradiction or Absurdity to take it in a Literal Sense, because the Apostles, and Others thereunto Commissioned by them, did Practise it, in the Literal Sense.

---

**S E C T. II.**

I. That CHRIST did Practise Water-Baptism.

II. That the Apostles did it after Him. III. That the Catholick Church have done it after Them.

I. That Christ did Practise Water-Baptism. It is written, John iii. 26. And they came unto John, and said unto him, Rabbi, He that was with thee beyond Jordan, to whom thou barest witness, Behold, the same Baptizeth, and all Men come to Him.

That this was Water-Baptism there can be no Doubt, because,

1. The Baptism with the Holy Ghost was not yet given: For that was not given till the Day of Pentecost, fifty Days after the Resurrection of Christ, as it is Recorded in the Second of the Acts. This Spiritual Baptism was promised, John xiv. 16, 26. xv. 26. xvi. 7. And the Apostles were commanded to tarry in the City of Jerusalem till it should come upon them, Luke xxiv. 49. 2. The Quakers allow that John did Baptize with Water, and there is no other sort of Baptism here mentioned, with which
which Christ did Baptize; and therefore, these Baptisms being
spoke of both together, there can be no Reason to interpret the
one to be with Water, and the other not. It is said John iv. 1.
The Pharisees heard that Jesus made and baptized more Disciples
than John. How cou’d the Pharisees hear of it, if it was not an
Outward and Visible Baptism? For, as before is said, the outward
and miraculous Effects of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost were
not then given. And since it Was an Outward, it must be the
Water-baptism, for there was then no other.

Obj. But the Quakers start an Objection here, That it is said
John iv. 2. Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples.

1. Ans. Tho Jesus himself baptized not, yet it is said in the Verse
foregoing, that He made and baptized, i.e. those whom His
Disciples, by His Order, Baptized. For, if it had not been done
by His Order, it cou’d not be said that he had Baptized those
whom his Disciples Baptized. But because, He that doeth a thing
by Another, is said to do it Himself, therefore Christ himself is
said to have Baptized those, whom his Disciples, by his Order,
did Baptize.

2. Ans. That Baptizing, which Christ is said to have Admi-
nistered himself, John iii. 26. might have been at another Time
than that which is mentioned in the 4th Chapter: And then the
consequence will only be this, That, at some Times, Christ did
Baptize Himself; and at other Times, he left it to his Disciples.
Tho, as to our Argument, it is the same thing, whether he did
it Himself, or commanded his Disciples to do it. For, either way,
it is his Baptism, his Only; his Disciples did but Administer
what he commanded.

II. As Christ himself did Baptize with Water, and his Disci-
plies, by his Commandment, while he was with them upon
Earth; so did his Apostles, and Others, thereunto by them com-
missioned, after his Death, and Resurrection, by vertue of his
Command to them, Matth. xxviii. 19. after he was Risen from
the Dead.

What is said above of the Etymology and true Signification of
the word Baptize, is, of itself, sufficient to prove, that by Baptism
in this Text, the outward Baptism with Water is meant; especially
 till the Quakers can shew any Contradiction or Absurdity in hav-
ing the word, taken in the proper and literal Sense, in this, and
the other Texts which speak of it.
And this will be very hard to do, since, as it is just now proved, that Christ did Baptize with Water, as well as John. And what Absurdity, or Contradiction can be alleged, that his Apostles should Administer the same sort of Baptism, after his Death, as he had Practised and Commanded during his Life? Nay rather, what Reason can be given, why they should not be the same, since the same word, i.e. Baptize, is used in Both, and no new Sense or Acceptation of the word is so much as hinted? And therefore to put any new sense or acceptance of the word, must be wholly Arbitrary and Precarious.

But, as I promised, I will Demonstrate yet more fully and plainly, that the Apostles did Practise the Outward, i.e. Water-Baptism after Christ's death.

Acts x. 47. Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be Baptized?

Acts viii. 36. As they (Philip and the Eunuch) went on their way, they came to a certain Water, and the Eunuch said, See here is Water, what doth hinder me to be Baptized? — And (Verse 38.) they went both down into the Water, both Philip and the Eunuch, and be Baptized him: And when they were come up out of the Water, &c.

Acts xxii. 16. And now why tarriest thou? Arise and be Baptized, and wash away thy sins.

And, to save more Quotations, the Quakers do own that the Baptism of the Corinthians, mentioned 1 Cor. i. 14 & 17. was Water-baptism.

Therefore I will conclude this Point, as undeniable, That the Apostles did Practise Water-baptism.

And the Argument from thence will lie thus: The Apostles did Practise that Baptism which Christ commanded Mat. xxviii. 19. But the Apostles did Practise Water-baptism; therefore Water-baptism was that Baptism which Christ commanded Mat. xxviii. 19.

III. And, as the Practise of the Apostles is a most sure Rule whereby to understand the meaning of that Command which they put in Execution; so the Practise of those who immediately succeeded the Apostles, who were Contemporaries with them, and learned the Faith from their Mouths, is as certain a Rule to know what the Practise, and what the Sense of the Apostles were.
were. And thus the Practice of the present Age, in the Administration of Water-baptism, is an undeniable Evidence, that this was the Practice of the last Age; the same Persons being, many of them, alive in both the last and the present Age. For one Age does not go off the World all at once, and another succeed all of perfect Age together; but there are old Men of the last Age, and young Men and Children growing up to another Age all alive upon Earth the same time; and Mankind being dispersed into far distant Countries and Climates, who know not of one another, nor hold any Correspondence: It is, by these means, morally impossible for any Man or Men, to deceive us in what has been the Universal and Receiv'd Practice of the last Age, to which the present Age is so linked, that it is even a part of it: I say it is impossible for all the Fathers of the World, to be suppos'd willing, or if they were, to be capable of imposing upon all younger than themselves, namely, That they had been all Baptized, and that this was an universally receiv'd Custom; and of which Registers were always kept, in every Parish, of all who had been, from time to time, Baptized; and that such Registers were publick, and to be recurr'd to by all that had a mind to it: Every Man's reason will tell him that it is utterly impossible for such a thing to pass upon Mankind.

And as certainly as the present Age is thus assur'd of the Practice of the last Age, in a Thing of so publick and universal a nature; so certainly, and by the same Rules, must the last Age know the Practice of the Age before that; and so backward all the way to the first Institution, to the Age of Christ, and the Apostles.

The publick nature of this Water-baptism, as now practised, being an outward matter of Fact, of which Mens outward Senses, their Eyes and Ears are Judges; not like Matters of Opinion, which sort of Tares may be privately sown, and long time propagated, without any remarkable Discovery; And to this so publick matter of Fact, adding the universal Practice of it, through all the far distant Nations of Christianity: I say these two Marks make it impossible for the World to be impos'd upon, nor was it ever, or ever can be impos'd upon, in any such publick Matter of Fact, so universally practised. All this makes it undeniably plain, That the last Age did practice the same outward Water-baptism.
that the fame was, as certainly, practis'd in the Age before the last Age, and by the same Rule, in the Age before that; and so onward, as above said, to the Age of the Apostles. I have made more Words of this than needed, but I would render it exceeding plain, considering with whom I have to do. And I beseech them to consider, That all the Authority which they have to Over-balance all these Demonstrations, is the mad Enthusiasm of a Lay-Apostle, George Fox, a Mechanick so Illiterate, that he was hardly Master of common Sense, nor cou'd write English, or any other Language; and started up amongst us in the Year 1650, (the Age of Schism and Rebellion) and Damn'd, as Apostates, all Ages since the Apostles.

In all of which no One cou'd be found (before G. Fox) to bear their Testimony against this Water-baptism, tho' it was constantly and universally practised; and that Christians were then so Zealous as to contend against the least Variation or Corruption of the Faith, even unto Death, and the most cruel sort of Martyrdom.

Can any Man imagin, that if Water-baptism were a Human Invention, or Superstitiously either Continu'd or Obruited upon the Church, no One shou'd be found, for 1650 Years, to open his Mouth against it; when Thousands sacrific'd their Lives, for Matters of much les Importance?

But I have over-labour'd this Point, to any Man who will give himself leave to make use of his Reason. Therefore I will proceed to the next Section.

S E C T. III.

That Baptism must be Outward and Visible, because it is an Ordinance appointed whereby to Initiate Men into an Outward and Visible Society, which is the Church.

Here goes no more towards the proving of this, than to shew, 1st, That the Church is an Outward and Visible Society. 2dly, That Baptism was appointed and us'd for Initiating or Admitting Men into the Church.
That the Church is an outward and visible Society. Our Saviour calls it, *A City that is set on a Hill* (Matt. v. 14.) The Quakers themselves are an outward and visible Society; and so are all those who bear the Name of Churches upon Earth. They could not otherwise be Churches. For that implies a Society of People; and every Society in the World, is an outward and visible Thing.

And, as it is so, has an outward and visible Form of Admitting Men into it: For otherwise it wou’d not be known who are Members of it. Every Society is Exclusive of all others who are not of that Society; otherwise it cou’d not be a Society: for that supposes the Men of that Society, to be thereby distinguished from other Men: And that supposes as much that there must be some outward and visible Form whereby to Initiate Men, and intitle them to be Members of such a Society: otherwise it cou’d not be known who were Members of it, and who were not; and it wou’d thereby ipso facto cease to be a Society; for it cou’d not then be distinguished from the rest of Mankind: as a River is lost in the Sea, because it is no longer distinguished from it, but goes to make up a part of it.

From hence it appears, that the Church, being an outward and visible Society, must have some outward and visible Form to initiate Men, and make them Members of that Society.

2dly, That Baptism was that outward Form. All the several Baptisms that were before Christ’s, were all meant for Initiating Forms. The Jews had a Custom long before Christ, to initiate the Proselites or Converts to their Religion, not only by Circumcision, but by Baptizing, or Washing them with Water. The same was the meaning of John’s Baptism, to make Men his Disciples. And the same was the meaning of Christ’s Baptism, to initiate Men into the Christian Religion, and make them Disciples of Christ.

Hence Baptizing Men, and making them Disciples, mean the same thing. Thus John iv. 1. it is laid, That Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than John. That is, be baptized them Disciples, which was the Form of Making them such. If any will lay, that he baptized them to be Disciples to John, that will be answer’d Sect. VI. But as to the present Point, it is the same thing.
thing whose Disciples they were made; for we are now only to shew that Baptism, in the general, was an Initiating Form.

And when Christ practised it, as well as John, as this Text does expressly declare, no Reason can be given that he did not use it as an Initiating Form, as well as John; especially when the Text does express that he did make them Disciples, by baptizing of them, as above is shewn.

And pursuant to this, when Christ sent his Apostles to convert all Nations, his Commission of Baptizing was as large as that of Teaching, Matth. xxviii. 19. Go Teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c. i.e. Baptizing all who shall receive your word. And accordingly it is said, Acts ii. 41. They that received the word were baptized. Pursuant to what the Apostle had preached to them Verse 28. Repent and be baptized.

And accordingly we find it the constant Custom to baptize all that were converted to the Faith. Thus Paul, tho' miraclesously converted from Heaven, was commanded to be baptized, Acts xxii. 16. And he baptized Lydia, and the Faylor, and their Households, as soon as he had converted them, Acts xvi. 15, 33. And the Corinthians, Acts xviii. 8. And the Disciples of John, who had not yet been made Christians, Acts xix. 5. Philip did baptize the Eunuch, as soon as he believed in Christ, Acts viii. 37, 38. And Peter, immediately upon the Conversion of Cornelius, and those with him, said, Can any Man forbid Water, that these should not be baptized? Acts x. 47.

It would be endless to enumerate all the like Instances of Baptism, in the New Testament. And it was always us'd as an Initiating Form.

3dly, Baptism was not only an Initiating Form: But it serv'd for nothing else. For it was never to be repeated. As a Man can be born but once into this World, so he can be but once regenerated, or born into the Church; which is therefore, in Scripture, called the New Birth.

It is said of the other Sacrament (of the Lord's Supper) as often as ye eat this Bread, &c. I Cor. xi. 26. This was to be often repeated.

Baptism is our Admission, Initiation, or Birth into the Society of the Church; and accordingly once only to be administered. The
Lord's Supper is our Nourishment and Daily Food in it; and therefore to be often repeated.

And as of our Saviour's, so of other Baptisms, of John's, and the Jews, they being only Initiating Forms, they were not repeated. The Jews did not baptize their Proselytes more than once. And John did not baptize his Disciples more than once. So neither were Men twice baptized into the Christian Faith, more than they were twice Circumcised, or Admitted into the Church, before Christ.

Thus having proved, 1st, That the Church is an outward and visible Society. 2dly, That Baptism was the Initiating Form of Admitting Men into that Society. 3dly, That it was only an Initiating Form. I think the Consequence is undeniable, that this Baptism must be an outward and visible Form: Because otherwise it cou'd be no Sign or Badge of an Admission into an outward and visible Society; for such a Badge must be as outward as the Society.

Again, Acts of inward Faith are, and ought to be often repeated: Therefore this Baptism, which cou'd not be repeated, cou'd not be the inward, but the outward Baptism.

And thus having prov'd that Baptism commanded Matth. xxviii. 19. to be the outward, that is, Water-baptism: 1st, From the true and proper Etymology and Signification of the Word. 2dly, From the Practice of Christ, and his Apostles, and the whole Christian Church after them. And, 3dly, From the Nature of the Thing, Baptism being an Ordinance appointed only for Initiating Men into an outward and visible Society; and therefore never to be repeated: Having thus prov'd our Conclusion from such plain, ease, and certain Topicks; I will now proceed to those Objections (such as they are) which the Quakers do set up against all these clear Demonstrations. And shall accordingly, in the first place, take notice of their groundless Pretence in making that Baptism commanded in the Holy Gospel, and proved an Ordinance external and visible, to be understood only of the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, not with Water, but the Holy Ghost.
S E C T. IV.

Quakers say, 1st, That the Baptism commanded Matth. xxviii. 19. was only meant of the Inward and Spiritual Baptism, with the Holy Ghost.

They say this; and that is all. They neither pretend to answer the Arguments brought against them, such as these before-mentioned; nor give any Proof for their own Assertion. Only they say so; and they will believe it; and there is an End of it.

And truly there should be an End of it, if only Disputation, or Victory were my Design: For to what non plus can any Adversary be reduc’d beyond that of neither Answering, nor Proving?

But because the Pains I have taken is only in Charity for their Souls, I will over-look all their Impertinency, and deal with them as with weyward Children, humour them, and follow them thro’ all their Windings and Turnings; and submit to over-prove, what is abundantly proved already. Therefore, since they can give no Reason why that Baptism commanded Matth. xxviii. 19. should be meant only of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost; and would be content that we should leave them there, as obstinate Men, and pursue them no further; but let them perswade those whom they can perswade: By which Method (unhappily yielded to them) they have gain’d and secur’d most of their Proselytes, by keeping them from Disputing or Reasoning; and by perswading them to hearken only to their own Light within: To Rescue them out of this Snare, I will be content to undertake the Negative (though against the Rules of Argument,) and to prove, that the Baptism commanded Matth. xxviii. 19. was not the Baptism with the Holy Ghost. For,

1st, To baptize with the Holy Ghost is peculiar to Christ alone. For none can baptize with the Holy Ghost, but who can send and bestow the Holy Ghost. Which is Blasphemy to ascribe to any Creature.

C 2 Christ
Christ has indeed committed the Administration of the outward Baptism to his Apostles, and to Others by them thereunto ordained; and has promised the inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost to those who shall duly receive the outward Baptism.

But this cannot give the Apostles, or any other Ministers of Christ, the Title of baptizing with the Holy Ghost; though the Holy Ghost may be given by their Ministration. For they are not the Givers; that is Blasphemy.

And pursuant to this, it is observable, that none is ever said, in the Scripture, to baptize with the Holy Ghost but Christ alone: The same is he who baptizeth with the Holy Ghost, John i. 33.

And therefore, if that Baptism commanded Matt. xxviii. 19: was the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, it would follow that the Apostles could baptize with the Holy Ghost, which is Blasphemy to assert.

2dly, It is written, John iv. 2. That Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples. If this was not meant of Water-baptism, but of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost; then it will follow, That Christ did not baptize with the Holy Ghost, but that his Disciples did.

This, in short, may suffice in return to a meer Pretence, and proceed we next to consider, if their main Argument also prove as unsupported and precarious.

SECT. V.

The great Argument of the Quakers against Water-Baptism is this: John’s Baptism is ceased: But John’s Baptism was Water-Baptism: Therefore Water-Baptism is ceased. This their Learned Barclay makes use of. But,

It is so extremely Childish, that if it were not His, no Reader would Pardon me for Answering to it. Yet since they do insist upon it, let them take this easy Answer: That John’s
John's Water-baptism is ceased; but not Christ's Water-baptism. All outward Baptisms were Water-baptisms, as the word Baptism signifies, (See Sect. I.) The Jews Baptism was Water-baptism, as well as John's. And by this Argument of Barclay's, the Jews and John's may be prov'd to be the same. Thus, The Jews Baptism was Water-baptism: but John's Baptism was Water-baptism: therefore John's Baptism was the Jews Baptism.

And thus, Christ's Baptism was John's, and John's was the Jews; and the Jews was Christ's; and they were all one and the self-same Baptism, because they were all Water-baptisms.

So without all Foundation is this great Rock of the Quakers, upon which they build their main Battery against Water-baptism.

2ly. It will be proper here to let them see (if they be not willfully ignorant) What it is which makes the Difference of Baptisms: not the outward Matter in which they are administered (for that may be the same in many Baptisms, as is shewn.) But Baptisms do differ, 1. In their Authors. 2. In the different Form, in which they are administered. 3. In the different Ends for which they were instituted.

And in all these the Baptism of Christ does differ vastly from the Baptisms both of John and the Jews, 1. As to the Author: The Baptism of the Jews was an Addition of their own to the Law; and had no higher Author that we know of. But John was sent by God, to baptize, John i. 33. And it was Christ the Lord who was the Author of the Christian Baptism. 2. As to the Form: Persons were baptized unto those whole Disciples they were admitted by their Baptism. Thus the Prophets to the Jewish Religion, were baptized unto Moses. And Men were made Disciples to John, by his Baptism. But the Christian Baptism alone is administered in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. This is the Form of the Christian Baptism, and which does distinguish it from all other Baptisms whatever. 3. The End of the Christian Baptism is as highly distant and different from the Ends of other Baptisms, as their Authors differ. The End of the Jewish Baptism was to give the Baptized a Title to the Privileges of the Law of Moses. And the End of John's Baptism was to point to Him who was to come; and to prepare Men, by Repentance, for the Reception of the Gospel.
But the End of Christ's Baptism was to Inflame Us into all the Unconceivable Glories, and High Eternal Prerogatives which belong to the Members of his Body, of his Flesh, and of his Bones, Eph. v. 30. That we might receive the Adoption of Sons, Gal. iv. 5. Henceforth no more Servants, but Sons of God! and Heirs of Heaven! These are Ends so far transcendent above the Ends of all former Baptisms, that, in comparison, other Baptisms are not only less, but none at all; like the Glory of the Stars, in presence of the Sun; they not only are a lesser Light, but when he appears, they become altogether invisible.

And as a Pledge or Fore-taste of these Future and Boundless Joys, The Gift of the Holy Ghost is given upon Earth; and is promised as an Effect of the Baptism of Christ. As Peter preached, Acts ii. 38. Repent and be baptized every one of you, in the name of Jesus Christ, for the remission of sins, and ye shall receive the gift of the Holy Ghost. And Gal. iii. 27. As many of you as have been baptized into Christ, have put on Christ. This of the Gift of the Holy Ghost was not added to any Baptism before Christ's: and does remarkably distinguish it from all others.

S E C T. VI.

That Christ and the Apostles did not Baptize with John's Baptism.

This is a Pretence of the Quakers when they find themselves distressed with the clear Proofs of Christ and the Apostles having administered Water-baptism. They say that this was John's Baptism, because it was Water-baptism. And, as before observ'd Sect. IV. they only say this, but can bring no Proof. But they put us, here again, upon the Negative, to prove it was not.

As to their Pretence that it was John's Baptism, because it was Water-baptism, that is answered in the last Section.

And now to gratifie them in this (though unreasonable) Demand, I will give these following Reasons why the Baptism which
which Christ and his Apostles did practice, was not John's Baptism:

1st, If Christ did baptize, with John's Baptism; then he made Disciples to John, and not to himself. For it is before shewn Sect. III. Num. ii & iii. That Baptism was an Initiating Form, and nothing else, whereby Men were admitted to be Disciples to him unto whom they were baptized. Thus the Jews who were baptized unto Moses said, We are Moses's Disciples. John ix. 28. And those whom John baptized, were called the Disciples of John. And there needs no more to shew that Christ did not baptize with the Baptism of John, than to shew that the Disciples of Christ and of John were not the same, which is made evident from John i. 35, 37. where it is told that two of John's Disciples left him, and followed Jesus. And Matth. xi. 2. John sent two of his Disciples to Jesus. And the Disciples of Christ lived under a different Oeconomy, and other Rules than either the Disciples of John, or of the Pharisees, to shew that they were under another Master. And the Disciples of John were scandaliz'd at it, Matth. ix. 14. Then came to him (Jesus) the Disciples of John, saying, Why do we, and the Pharisees fast oft, but thy Disciples fast not?

Therefore the Disciples of Christ and of John were not the same: and therefore Christ did baptize Men to be his own Disciples, and not to be the Disciples of John: and therefore the Baptism of Christ was not the Baptism of John.

2dly, If Christ did baptize with John's Baptism, the more he baptized, it was the more to the Honour and Reputation of the Baptism of John: But Christ's baptizing was urg'd, by the Disciples of John, as a lessning of John, John iii. 26. Therefore the Baptism with which Christ did baptize cou'd not be the Baptism of John. Though it be said John iv. 2. That Jesus himself baptized not, but his Disciples: (For so the Apostles and other Ministers of Christ have baptized more into the Faith of Christ, than Christ himself has done:) Yet here is no ground of Jealousie or Rivalship to Christ, because the Administration of Christ's Baptism, is all to the Honour and Glory of Christ: And therefore Christ's baptizing more Disciples than John, cou'd be no Lessning of John, but rather a Magnifying of him so much the more, if Christ had baptized with John's Baptism.

3dly,
3dly, When John's Disciples had told him of Christ's out-rivaling him, by baptizing more than he, John answer'd, He must increase, but I must decrease, John iii. 30. But if Christ did baptize with the Baptism of John, than John still increased, and Christ decreased. For,

4thly, He is greater who institutes a Baptism, than those who only administer a Baptism of another's appointment: Therefore if Christ did baptize with the Baptism of John, it argues John to be greater than Christ, and Christ to be but a Minister of John.

5thly, All the Jews who had been baptized with the Baptism of John, did not turn Christians; therefore John's Baptism was not the Christian Baptism.

6thly, Those of John's Disciples, who turned Christians, were baptized over again, in the Name of Christ; of which there is a remarkable Instance, Acts xix. to v. 7. But the same Baptism was never repeated (as is shewn above, Sect. III. Numb. iii.) therefore the Baptism which the Apostles did administer, was not John's Baptism.

7thly, The Form of the Baptism which Christ commanded Mat. xxviii. 19. was, In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: But that was not the Form of John's Baptism: Therefore that was not John's Baptism. See what is before said Sect. V. Num. ii. of the Difference of Baptisms, as to the Author, the Form, and the End of each Baptism: And, in all these Respect, it is made apparent that the Baptism which was praefis'd by Christ and the Apostles, was not the Baptism of John.

To all these clear Arguments the Quakers, without answering to any of them, do still insist, That the Water-baptism which the Apostles did administer, was no other than John's Baptism. That they had no Command for it; only did it in Compliance with the Jews, as Paul circumcised Timothy, (Acts xvi. 3.) And purify'd himself in the Temple, (Acts xxii. 21, to 27.) But this is all Gratia Dictum; here is not one word of Proof: And they might as well say, That the Apostles Preaching was only in Compliance with the Jews, and that it was the same with John's Preaching; for their Commissions to Teach, and to Baptize were both given in the same Breath, Matth. xxviii. 19. Go ye - Teach all Nations, Baptizing them, &c.

Now why the Teaching here shou'd be Christ's, and Baptizing only
only John’s, the Quakers are desir’d to give some other Reason besides their own Arbitrary Interpretations; before which no Text in the Bible, or any other Writing can stand.

Besides, I would inform them, That the Greek word Μαθητεύω, in this Text, which we Translate Teach, signifies to make Disciples; so that the literal, and more proper reading of that Text is, Go, and Disciple all Nations, or make Disciples of them, baptizing them, &c.

If it be ask’d, Why we should Translate the Word Μαθητεύω, Matt. xxviii. 19. by the Word Teach, if it means to Disciple a Man, or make him a Disciple?

I Answer: That Teaching was the Method whereby to Perswade a Man, to Convert him, so as to make a Disciple of him. But the Form of Admitting him into the Church, and actually to make him a Disciple, to give him the Priviledges and Benefits of a Disciple, was by Baptism.

Now the Apostles being sent to Teach Men, in order to make them Disciples; therefore instead of Go, Disciple Men, we Translate it, Go, Teach, as being a more Familiar Word, and better understood in English.

Tho’ if both the Greek words Μαθητεύω and Βαπτίζω, in this Text, were Translated Literally, it would obviate these Quaker-Objections more plainly: For then the Words would run thus; Go and Admit all Nations to be my Disciples, by Washing them with Water, in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Διδάσκοντες, Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you.

Here the Word Διδάσκοντες, i.e. Teaching, is plainly distinguished from Μαθητεύω, to Disciple them; tho’ our English renders them both by the Word Teaching, and makes a Tautology: Go Teach all Nations — Teaching them.

But, as a Child is Admitted into a School before it be Taught: So Children may be Admitted into the Pale of the Church, and be made Disciples, by Baptism, before they are Taught. Which shews the meaning of these two Words, i.e. Discipling, and Teaching, to be different. Because, tho’ in Persons Adult, Teaching must go before Discipling; yet in Children (who are within the Covenant, as of the Law, to be Admitted at eight Days old, by Circumcision; so under the Gospel, by Baptism) Discipling goes
goes before Teaching: And that Discipling is only by Baptism.

But to return. The Quakers are so hard put to it, when they are press'd with that Text, Acts x. 47. Can any forbid Water, &c? That they are forced to make a Supposition, (without any ground or appearance of Truth) That these Words were an Answer to a Question. And that the Question was, Whether they might not be Baptized with John's Baptism? And that this proceeded from a Fondness the Jews had to John's Baptism. And that the Apostle Peter only Comply'd with them out of Condescension, as Paul Circumcis'd Timothy.

Ans. 1. Cornelius, and those whom Peter Baptized, Acts x. were Gentiles and not Jews: They were Romans, and therefore cannot be supposed to have had any Longing after John's Baptism; none of them having ever own'd it, or having been Baptiz'd with it.

2. The Gentile Converts to Christianity, refus'd to submit to the Jewish Circumcision, or any of their Law (Acts xv.) And therefore it is not to be imagin'd, that they would be fond of any of the Baptisms which were us'd among the Jews.

3. Even all the Jews themselves, no not the Chief and Principal of them, neither the Pharisees nor Lawyers did submit to John's Baptism, Luke vii. 30.

4. The Ethiopian Eunuch requested Baptism from Philip, (Acts viii.) And it cannot be supposed, that the Ethiopians had more knowledge of John's Baptism, or regard for it, than the Romans, or great part of the Jews themselves.

5. There is no ground to suppose that St. Peter's words, Can any Man forbid Water, &c? were an Answer to any Question that was asked him. The most forcible Affirmation being often express'd by way of Question.

6. Granting a Question was ask'd, and that Cornelius, as well as the Ethiopian, had desir'd Baptism, why must this be constru'd of John's Baptism? Especially considering, that Peter, in that same Sermon which Converted Cornelius (Acts x. 37.) told them that the Gospel which he Preached unto them, was that which was published, after the Baptism which John Preached. What Argument was this for Cornelius to return back again to John's Baptism? Or, if he had desir'd it, why shou'd we think that Peter wou'd have Comply'd with him; and not rather have reprov'd him, and carry'd him beyond it, to the Baptism of Christ: as Paul did (Acts xix.) to those who had before receiv'd the Baptism of John?

7. But as to the Complyance which the Quakers wou'd have to John's Baptism; and which they compare to Paul's Complyance in Circumcision Timothy: I will shew the great Disparity.

First, The Law was more universally receiv'd than John's Baptism: For many and the Chief of the Jews did not receive John's Baptism, as above-obser've'd.

Secondly, The Law was of much longer standing: John's Baptism was like a Flash of Lightning, like the Day-Star, which usher'd in the Sun of Righteousness, and then disappear'd: But the Law continu'd during the long Night of Types and Shadows, many hundreds of Years.

Thirdly, John did no Miracle (John x. 41.) But the Law was delivered, and propagated by many Ages of Miracles. 'Twas enjoyn'd under Penalty of Death, to them and their Posterities; whereas John's Baptism lasted not one Age, was intended only for the Men then present, to point out to them the Messiah, then already come, and ready to appear: And no outward Penalties were annexed to John's Law; People were only Invited, not Compell'd to come unto his Baptism: But to neglect Circumcision, was Death, Gen. xvii. 14. Exod. iv. 24.

The Preaching of John was only a Warning; let those take notice to it that wou'd:

Whereas the Law was pronounced by the Mouth of God Himself, in Thunder and Lightning, and out of the midst of the Fire, upon Mount Sinai, in the Audience of all the People: And so terrible was the Sight, that Moses said, I exceedingly fear
and quake, **Heb.** xii. 21. For from God's Right Hand went a Fire of Law for them, **Deut.** xxxiii. 2.

From all these Reasons, we must suppose the Jews to be much more Tenacious of the Law, than of John's Baptism; and to be brought off with greater difficulty from their Circumcision, which had descended down to them all the way from Abraham; 430 Years before the Law, (Gal. iii. 17.) than from John's Baptism, which was but of Yesterday; and never receiv'd by the Chief of the Jews. And therefore there was much more reason for Paul's Complying with the Jews in the Case of Circumcision, than in that of John's Baptism, as the Quakers suppose.

When Christ came to fulfil the Law, he did it with all regard to the Law, (Matth. v. 17, 18, 19.) He destroy'd it not with Violence, all at once; but fulfill'd it leisurely and by degrees: *Ut omne honore Mater Synagoga sepeliretur.* The Synagogue was the Mother of the Church; and therefore it was fitting that she should be burn'd with all Decency and Honour.

This was the Reason of all those Compliances with the Jews, at the beginning, to wear them off, by degrees, from their Superstitious to the Law.

Tho' in this some might Comply too far: And there want not those who think that Paul's Circumcising of Timothy, (Acts xvi. 3.) was as faulty a Compliancy, as that which he blam'd in Peter, (Gal. ii.) For that of Paul's is not Commended, in the Place where it is mentioned.

And now I appeal to the Reason of Mankind, whether Objections thus pick'd up from such obscure and uncertain Passages, ought to overballance plain and positive Commands, which are both back'd and explain'd by the Practice of the Apostles, and the Universal Church after them? All which I have before Demonstrated of Baptism.

8. But however the Quakers may argue from Paul's Compliancy with the Jews, the Reader has reason to complain of my Compliancy with Them: For, after all that has been said, there is not one single Word in any Text of the N. T. that does so much as hint at any such thing, as that Peter's Baptizing of Cornelius, or Philip's Baptizing of the Eunuch, was in any sort of Compliancy unto John's Baptism. This is a perfect Figment, out of the Quaker's own Brain, without any Ground or Foundation.
in the World: And therefore there was no need of Answering it at all, otherwise than to bid the Quakers prove their Assertion: That these *Baptisms* were in Complyance with John's, which they could never have done.

Whereas it is plain from the Words of the Text, (Acts xvi. 3.) that *Paul's Circumcising Timothy*, was in Complyance with the Jews: It is expressly so said, and the Reason of it given, because, tho' his Mother was a Jewess, yet his Father was a Greek; and therefore, because of the Jews which were in those Quarters (says the Text) he Circumcised Timothy, that these Jews might Hear and Receive him; which, otherwise, they would not have done. Now let the Quakers shew the like Authority, that the *Baptisms of Cornelius*, of the Eunuch, and of the Corinthians, Acts xviii. 8. (For that too they acknowledge to have been Water-Baptism, as I will shew presently) let the Quakers shew the like Authority, as I have given for the *Circumcision of Timothy* being in Complyance with the Jews; let them shew the like, ifay, that the foresaid *Baptisms* were in Complyance with John's, and then they will have something to say. But till then, this Excuse, or *Put-off* of theirs, is nothing else but a hopeless *Shift* of a desperate Cause, to suppose, against all sense, that these Gentiles, (Romans, Ethiopians, and Corinthians) desir'd John's *Baptism*, who rejected all the Laws and Customs of the Jews.

---

**S E C T. VII.**

The Quakers *Master-Objection* from 1 Cor. i. 14.

*I thank GOD that I Baptized none of you, but Crispus and Gaius.* And Ver. 17. *For Christ sent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel.*

From this Passage they argue, that *Water-Baptism* was not commanded by *Christ*, because here St. Paul says, *That he was not sent to Baptize*; and that he thanks God, that he *Baptized* few of them. But,
In Answer to this, I will first of all premise, That a bare Objection, without some Proof on the other side, does neither justify their Cause, nor overthrow ours: For when a thing is Proved Affirmatively, it cannot be overthrown by Negative Difficulties which may be Objected.

You must dissolve the Proofs which are brought to support it: Nothing else will do.

For what Truth is there so evident in the World, against which no Objection can be rais’d?

Even the Being of a God has been disputed against by these sort of Arguments; that is, by raising Objections, and starting Difficulties, which may not easily be Answer’d: But while those Demonstrative Arguments, which Prove a God, remain unshaken, a thousand Difficulties are no Disproof.

And so, while the Command of Christ, and the Practice of his Apostles, and of all the Christian World, in pursuance of that Command, are clearly Prov’d, no Difficulty from an obscure Text, can shake such a Foundation.

But I lay down this, only as a General Rule; because this Method is so much made use of by the Quakers (and others) who never think of Answering plain Proofs; but by raising a great Dust of Objections, would bury and hide what they cannot Disprove.

I say, that I only mind them at present, of this fallacious Artifice; for I have no use for it as to these Texts objected, to which a very plain and easy Answer can be given. And,

First, I would observe, how the Quakers can understand the Word Baptize to mean Water-Baptism, or no Water-Baptism, just as the Texts seem to favour their cause, or otherwise.

For there is no mention of Water in either of the Texts objected, only the single word Baptize. And why then must they construe these two Texts only, of all the rest in the New Testament, to mean Water-Baptism? Why? but only to strain an Objection out of them against Water-Baptism?

But will they let the Word Baptize signify Water-Baptism, in other places, as well as in these?

They
They cannot refuse it with any shew or colour of Reason. They must not refuse it in Acts xviii. 8; where the Baptizing of Crispus (mention'd in the first of the Texts objected) is recorded. And there, it is not only said of Crispus, that he was baptized, but that many of the Corinthians hearing, believed, and were baptized. By which, the Quakers cannot deny Water-Baptism to be meant, since they continue it so, 1 Cor. i. 14.

Secondly, We may further observe, that in the Text, Acts xviii. 8. Crispus is only said to have believed, which was thought sufficient to infer, that he was baptized; which cou'd not be, unless all that believed, were baptized: Which, no doubt, was the Case, as it is written, Acts xiii. 48. As many as were ordained to eternal Life, believed. And (Ch. ii. 41.) They that received the Word, were baptized. And (V. 47.) The Lord added to the Church daily such as should be saved.

So that this is the Climax or Scale of Religion. As many as are ordained to eternal Life do believe: And they that believe, are baptized: And they that are baptized, are added to the Church.

And to shew this received Notion, That whoever did believe was baptized, when Paul met some Disciples who had not heard of the Holy Ghost, Acts xix. 3. he did not ask them whether they had been baptized, or not? He took that for granted, since they believed. But he asks, Unto what were ye baptized? Supposing that they had been baptized.

Thirdly, Here then this Objection of the Quakers, has turn'd into an invincible Argument against them.

They have, by this, yielded the whole Cause: For if the Baptism, 1 Cor. i. 14. be Water-Baptism, then that Baptism, Acts xviii. 8. must be the same: And consequently all the other Baptisms, mention'd in the Acts, are, as these, Water-Baptisms also.

But, besides the Quakers Confession (for they are unconstant, and may change their Minds) the thing shews it self, that the Baptism mention'd, 1 Cor. i. 14. was Water-Baptism; because Paul there thanks God, that he baptized none of them but Crispus and Gaius. Would the Apostle thank God that he had baptized
To few, with the Holy Ghost? Or would he repent of baptizing with the Holy Ghost? Therefore it must be the Water-Baptism which was here spoke of.

Fourthly, But now, what is the Reason, that he was glad he had baptized so few with Water-Baptism? And he gives the Reason, in the very next words. (V. 15.) Lest any should say, that I had baptized in mine own Name. What was the occasion of this Fear? It is told from V. 10. That there were great Division and Contentions among these Corinthians, and that these were grounded upon the Emulation that arose among them, in behalf of their several Teachers. One was for Paul, another for Apollos, others for Cephas, and others for Christ.

This would seem, as if the Christian Religion had been contradictory to itself:

As if Christ, and Cephas, and Paul, and Apollos had set up against one another:

As if they had not all taught the same Doctrine:

As if each had preach'd up himself, and not Christ:

And had baptized Disciples, each in his own Name, and not in Christ's; and had begot Followers to himself, and not to Christ.

To remove this so horrible a Scandal, St. Paul argues with great zeal, (V. 13.) Is Christ divided? (says he) Was Paul crucified for you? Or were ye baptized in the Name of Paul? If thank God, that I baptized none of you but Crispus and Gaius; lest any should say, That I had baptized in mine own Name.

There needs no Application of this, the Words of the Apostle are themselves so plain.

He did not thank God, that they had not been baptized; but that He had not done it.

And this, not for any flight to Water-Baptism; but to obviate the Objection of his baptizing in his own Name.

Fifthly, By the way, this is a strong Argument for Water-Baptism: Because the Inward Baptism of the Spirit, cometh not with Observation and Shew, but is within us, Luk. xvii. 20, 21. Nor is it done in any Body's Name, it is an inward Operation upon the Heart.

But
But the outward Baptism is always done in some Name or other; in his Name whose Disciple you are thereby made and Admitted.

Therefore it must, of necessity, be the outward Baptism, of which St. Paul here speaks; because it was outwardly Administered, in such an outward Name. And he makes this an Argument that he had not made Disciples to himself, but to Christ; because he did not Baptize them in his own Name, but in Christ's.

Now this had been no Argument, but perfect Banter, if there had been no outward Baptism, that the People could have both seen and heard. How otherwise could they tell in what Name, or no Name they were baptized, if all was Inward and Invisible?

But I need not prove what the Quakers grant and contend for, that all this was meant of Water-Baptism; because otherwise their whole Objection, from this place, does fall.

VI. But they would infer as if no great stress were laid upon it; because that few were so baptized.

I Answer: That there is nothing in the Text which does infer, that few of these Corinthians were baptized.

St. Paul only thanks God, that he himself had not done it, except to a few, for the Reasons before given. But Acts xviii. 8. it is laid, That besides Crispus, whom Paul himself baptized, many of the Corinthians were baptized.

Nay, they were all baptized, as many as believed, as before is prov'd. And, in this very place, St. Paul taking it for granted, that all who believed, were baptized, which I have already observ'd from his Question to certain Disciples, Acts xix. 3. not whether they were baptized, but unto what, i.e. In what Name, they had been baptized? So here 1 Cor. i. 13. He does not make the Question, whether they had been baptized? That he takes for granted. But in what Name, were ye baptized? Which supposes, not only that all were baptized, but likewise that all who were baptized, were baptized in some outward Name; and therefore that it was the Outward, i.e. Water-Baptism.
VII. But the second Text objected, V. 17. is yet to be accounted for; where St. Paul says, Christ sent me not to Baptize, but to Preach the Gospel. This he said in justification of himself for having baptiz’d so few in that place; for which he blesses God, because, as it happened, it prov’d a great justification of his not baptizing in his own Name.

But then, on the other hand, here would seem to be a Neglect in him of his Duty: For if it was his Duty to have baptized them all, and he baptized but a few, here was a great Neglect.

In Answer to this, we find, that there was no Neglect in not baptizing them, for that, not a few but many of the Corinthians were baptized, Acts xviii. 8. that is, as many as believed, as before is shewn.

But then who was it that baptized those many? For St. Paul baptized but a few.

I Answer. The Apostle employ’d others, under him, to Baptize.

And he vindicates this, by saying, That he was not sent to Baptize, i.e. principally and chiefly; that was not the chief part of his Commission: But the greater and more difficult part was that of Preaching, to Dispute with, Persuade and Convert the Heathen World. To this, great Parts, and Courage, and Miraculous Gifts were necessary: But to Administer the outward Form of Baptism to those who were Converted, had no Difficulty in it; requir’d no great Parts, or Endowments, only a lawful Commission to Execute it.

And it would have taken up too much of the Apostles time, it was impossible for them to have baptized, with their own Hands, those vast Multitudes whom they Converted. Christianity had reach’d to all Quarters of the then known World, as far almost, as at this Day, before the Apostles left the World. And could Twelve Men Baptize the whole World? Their Progress was not the least of their Miracles: The Bread of Life multiply’d faster, in their Distribution of it, than the Loaves by our Saviour’s Breaking of them. St. Peter Converted about three Thousand at one Sermon, Acts ii. 41. And at another time about five Thousand, Ch. iv. 4. Multitudes both of Men and Women. Ch. v. 14. Many more than the Apostles cou’d have counted; much more
than they cou'd have baptized; for which if they had stay'd, they had made slender Progress. No. The Apostles were sent, as loud Heralds, to proclaim to all the Earth, to run swiftly, and gather much People; and not to stay (they cou'd not stay) for the baptizing with their own Hands, all that they Converted: They left that to others, whom they had ordain'd to Administer it. Yet not so, as to exclude themselves; but they themselves did Baptize, where they saw occasion, as St. Paul here did Baptize Crispus and Gaius, and the House of Stephanas, some of the Principal of the Corinthians. Not that he was oblig'd to have done it himself, having others to whom he might have left it: For he was not sent, that is, put under the Necessity to Baptize with his own Hands, but to Preach, to Convert others, that was his principal Province, and which he was not to neglect, upon the account of baptizing, which others could do as well as he.

But if you will so understand the Words of his not being sent, i.e. that it was not within his Commission, that he was not Impower'd by Christ, to Baptize, then it would have been a Sin, and great Presumption in him, to have baptized any body.

Nay more. This Text, thus understood, is flatly contradictory to Matt. xxviii. 19. which says, Go, Baptize: And this says, I am not sent to Baptize.

These are contradictory, if by, I am not sent, be understood, I have not Power or Commission to Baptize.

But by, I am not sent, no more is meant in this Text, than that Baptizing is not the chief or principal part of my Commission. As if a General were accused for Mustering and Lifting Men in his own Name, and not in the King's, and he should say, in Vindication of himself, that he had never lifted any, except such and such Officers; for that he was not sent to Must, or Drill Men, or to Exercise Troops or Regiments, but to Command the Army: Would it follow from hence, that he had not Power to Exercise a Troop or a Regiment, or that it was not within his Commission? Or if a Doctor of Physick should say, That it was not his Part to compound Medicines, and make up Drugs (that was the Apothecary's Business), but to give Prescriptions; wou'd any Man infer from this, that he might not Compound his own Medicines if he pleas'd?
Or if (to come nearer) a Professor of Divinity, or a Bishop, shou'd say, That he was not sent to Teach School; this wou'd not imply that he might not Keep School; nay, he ought, if there were no others to do it: So the Apostle of the Gentiles was not sent to spend his Time in Baptizing, Visiting the Sick, or other Parts of his Duty, (which others might perform) so as to hinder his great Work in Converting of the Gentiles: All of whom he cou'd not Baptize, nor Visit all their Sick: Yet both these were within his Commission, and he might and did Execute them where he saw occasion. As if all the Sick in London shou'd expect to be Visited by the Bishop of London; and all the Children shou'd be brought to be baptized by him; he might well say, That he was not sent to Baptize, or to Visit their Sick, but to look after his Episcopal Function: And send them for these Offices, to others, under him: And yet this wou'd no ways imply, that these Offices were not within the Episcopal Commission; or that he was not sent both to Baptize, and to Visit the Sick: But only that he was not sent principally and chiefly to Baptize, or to Visit the Sick.

And as to that Phrase of, being sent; we find it us'd in this same sense, to mean only being chiefly and principally sent. Thus, Gen. xlv. 8. Joseph said to his Brethren, It was not you that sent me hither, but God. It was certainly his Brethren who sent him, for they sold him into Egypt: But it was not They, principally and chiefly, but God, who had other and extraordinary Ends in it.

Adam was not deceived (says the Apostle, 1 Tim. ii. 14.) but the Woman being deceived, was in the Transgression. Adam was deceived, and fell as well as the Woman; but the meaning is, he was not first, or principally deceived.

Again. As for you who stick so close to the Letter (when it seemeth to serve your turn) Go ye and learn what that meaneth, I will have Mercy, and not Sacrifice, Matt. ix. 13.

By which it cannot be understood, that God did not require Sacrifice; for he commanded it upon Pain of Death. Yet he says, (Jer. vii. 22.) I spake not unto your Fathers, nor commanded them — concerning Burnt-Offerings, or Sacrifices: But this thing Commanded I them, saying, Obey my Voice, &c. according as it is written, (1 Sam xv. 22.) To Obey is better than Sacrifice.

By
By all which cannot be meant, that God did not Command the Jews concerning Burnt-Offerings and Sacrifices (for we know how particularly they were commanded) but that the outward Sacrifice was not the chief and principal part of the Command; which respected chiefly the inward Sacrifice, and Circumcision of the Heart.

Which when they neglected, and lean'd wholly to the Outward, then God detests their Oblations; Isa. i. 14. Tour new Moons, and your appointed Feasts my Soul hateth, I am weary to bear them. And he says, V. 12. Who hath required this at your Hand?

It was certainly God who had required all these things at their hands; but these outward Performances, (tho' the Neglect or Abuse of them was punished with Death) yet they were not the chief and principal part of the Command, being intended chiefly for the sake of the Inward and Spiritual Part: From which when they were separated, they were (like the Body, when the Soul is gone) a dead and a loathsome Carcass of Religion: And which God is therefore said, not to have commanded, because he did not Command them without the other: As he made not the Body without the Soul; yet he made the Body as well as the Soul.

VIII. And as there is Soul and Body in Man, so (while Man is in the Body) there must be a Soul and Body of Religion; that is, an outward and an inward Worship, with our Bodies as well as our Souls.

And as the Separation of Soul and Body in Man, is called Death; so is the Separation of the outward and the inward Part of Religion, the Death and Destruction of Religion.

The outward is the Cask, and the inward is the Wine. The Cask is no Part of the Wine; but if you break the Cask, you lose the Wine. And as certainly, whoever destroy the outward Institutions of Religion, lose the inward Parts of it too.

As is sadly experienced in the Quakers, who, having thrown off the outward Baptism, and the other Sacrament of Christ's Death, have, thereby, lost the inward thing signify'd, which is, the Personal Christ, as Existing without all other Men, and having so Suffer'd, Rose, Ascended, and now, and for ever,
Sitteth in Heaven, in his true proper Human Nature, Without all other Men. This the Quakers will not own, (except some of the New Separation) and this they have loft, by their Neglect of those outward Sacraments, which Christ appointed for this very End (among others) that is, as Remembrances of his Death: For it had been morally impossible for Men, who had constantly and with due Reverence, attended these holy Sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper, ever to have forgot his Death, so lively represented before their Eyes, and into which they were baptized; or to have turn'd all into a meer Allegory, perform'd within every Man's Breast, as these Quakers have done.

But the Enemy has perfwaded them to break the Cask, and destroy the Body of Religion; whereby the Wine is spilt, and the Soul of Religion is fled from them: And by neglecting the outward Part, they have loft the whole inward, and Truth of Religion; which is a true Faith in the Outward Christ, and in the Satisfaction made for our Sins, by his Blood Outwardly shed; and in his Intercession, in our Nature, as our High-Priest, at his Father's Right Hand, now, in Heaven; into which Holy of Holies, He has carry'd his own Blood of Expiation, once offer'd upon the Cross, and presents it, for ever, as the Atonement and full Satisfaction for the Sins of the whole World; but apply'd only by true Faith and Repentance, thereby, becomes fully Efectual to the Salvation of every Faithful Penitent.

This is the only true Christian Faith: And from this the Quakers have totally fallen; and that chiefly, by their Mad throwing off the Outward Guards, Preservatives, Fences, Sacraments, and Pledges of Religion. And those Outward Means of Grace, which Christ has commanded, and given us as the only Outward Grounds for our Hope of Glory. For how can that Man get to Heaven, who will not go the way that Christ has appointed; who came down from Heaven, on purpose to show and lead us the way thither; yet we will be wiser than he, find fault with his Institutions, as being too much upon the Outward; and think that we can and may Spiritualize them finer, and make the way shorter than he has done
IX. But to return, if the Quakers cou’d find such Texts concerning Baptism, as I have shewn above concerning Sacrifices, as if it were said, 'That God did not command Baptism; that he hated it, and was weary to bear it, that he would not have it, &c. If such Texts cou’d be found, How wou’d the Quakers triumph! Who wou’d be able to stand before them! And yet, if such were found, they wou’d prove no more against the outward Baptism, than they did against the outward Sacrifices, i.e. That if any regarded nothing else in Baptism, than the outward Washing, it wou’d be as hateful to God, as the Jewish Sacrifices, when they regarded nothing more in them but the Outward.

And it may be truly said, That God did not Command either such Sacrifices, or such a Baptism; because he commanded not the outward alone, but with respect unto, and chiefly for the sake of the Inward.

And, therefore, as all these, and other the like Expressions in the Old Testament did not at all tend to the Abolition, only to the Rectification of the Legal Sacrifices: So, much less, can that single Expression, 1 Cor. i. 17. of Paul’s saying (upon the occasion, and in the sense above mention’d) that he was not sent to Baptize, but to Preach, much less can this infer the Abolition of Baptism; being as positively commanded, as Sacrifices were under the Law, and as certainly practis’d by the Apostles, as the Sacrifices were by the Levitical Priests.

X. Now suppose that I should deny, that Outward Sacrifices were ever commanded; or, that the Jews did ever practis’e them: And thou’d Interpret all that is said of Sacrifices, only of the Inward, as the Quakers do of Baptism; and I shou’d produce the Texts above quoted to prove that God did not command Sacrifices, which are much more positive than that single one which is strain’d against Baptism: I say, suppose that I shou’d be so Extravagant as to set up such a Notion, what Method (except that of Bedlam, which, in that Case, wou’d be most proper) cou’d be taken to convince me? And suppose I shou’d gain as many Proselytes as G. Fox has done: And we shou’d boast our
our *Numbers*, and *Light within*, &c. would not this following Method be taken with us?

1st. To see how *Sacrifices* are actually us’d now in those Parts of the World where they do *Sacrifice*. And being convinc’d that these do use outward *Sacrifices*, and understand the first Command to *Sacrifice*, in that sense, to inquire

2dly, Whether they did not receive this from their *Fathers*, so upward, to the first Institution? And is not this the surest Rule to find out the meaning of the first Command? viz. How it was understood and practis’d by those to whom the Command was first given; and from them, through all Ages since. Upon all which *Topicks*, the present *Water-Baptism*, now us’d, may be as much demonstrated to be the same which was practis’d by the *Apostles*, and consequently, which was commanded by *Christ*, as the outward *Sacrifices* can be shewn to have been, at first, commanded to the *Jews*, and practis’d by them.

**XI.** And as for that precarious Plea, before confuted, of the *Baptism* which the *Apostles* practis’d, being only a Complyance with the *Jews*; there is more Pretence to say, that the *Jewish* *Sacrifices* were in Complyance with the *Heathen Sacrifices*, which were long before the *Levitical Law*.

I say, there is more Pretence for this, but not more Truth. More pretence, because it has been advanced of late, by Men of greater Figure than *Quakers*, That the *Levitical Sacrifices* were commanded by God, in Complyance with the *Gentile Sacrifices*, which were before used.

But this is a Subject by it self. I now only shew the *Quakers*, that there is more ground to spiritualize away *Sacrifices* from the *Letter*, than *Baptism*; more pretence for it from *Texts of Scripture*, and from some odd *Opinions* of some Learned Men.

And if the Denial of *Outward Sacrifices* would be counted (as the like of *Baptism* was, when first started) to be nothing short of *Madness*, the continuance of that *Distraction* for 46 Years together (as in the Case of *Baptism*) might make it more familiar to us, but would abate nothing of the *Unreasonableness*.  

**XII.**
XII. I believe the Reader, by this time, cannot but think that I have taken too much needless Pains, in Answer to that Objection of St. Paul's saying that he was not sent to Baptize, but to Preach: But I speak to a sort of Men, who are us'd to Repetitions; and will not take a Hint (unless it be on their side) and therefore I enlarge more than I wou'd do, if I were writing to any others. But I think I have said enough, even to them, to shew, that the Meaning of the Apostle in this Text, was only to prefer the Office of Preaching, before that of Baptizing. But I must withal desire them to take notice, that the Preaching, that is, Publishing of the Gospel, at first to Heathens, was a very different thing, and of much greater Necessity, than those set Discourses, which we now call Preaching in Christian Auditories.

XIII. Let me (to conclude) add one Argument more, from this Text, 1 Cor. i. 17. why that Baptism, mention'd Matt. xxviii. 19. cannot be meant of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost. Because if when Christ sent his Apostles to Baptize, the meaning was (as the Quakers wou'd have it) to Baptize with the Holy Ghost; then the Apostle Paul said in this Text, 1 Cor. i. 17. That he was not sent to Baptize with the Holy Ghost. Which sense, since the Quakers will not own, they cannot reconcile these Texts, without confessing, that that Text, Matt. xxviii. 19. was not meant of the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, and then it must be meant of the Water-Baptism.

S E C T. VIII.

Objection from 1 Pet. iii. 21.

The Words of the Text are these. The like Figure whereunto (i.e. the Ark) even Baptism, doth also now save us, (not the putting away of the Filth of the Flesh, but the Answer of a Good Conscience towards God) by the Resurrection of Jesus Christ.
From whence the Quakers argue thus: That Baptism doth not consist in the outward washing, but the inward.

And so far they argue right, That the inward is the chief and principal part; and therefore, that if any regard only the outward washing of the Skin, in Baptism, they are indeed frustrated of the whole Benefit of it, which is altogether Spiritual.

And it has been observ'd Sect. VII. latter part of Numb. vii. That if only the outward Part of the Sacrifices, or Circumcision, and other Institutions under the Law, were regarded, they were hateful to God, and he rejected them; tho', at the same time, he commanded the Performance of them, under the Penalty of Death.

Thus it is in the Institutions of the Gospel. The Inward and Spiritual Part is the chief; and for the sake of which only, the Outward is commanded: But this makes the Outward necessary, instead of throwing it off; because (as it was under the Law) the Outward was ordained as a Means whereby we are made Partakers of the Inward: And therefore, if we neglect and despise the Outward, when we may have it, we have no Promise in the Gospel to Intitle us to the Inward: As he that neglects the Means, has no Reason to expect the End. It is true, a Miracle may do it; but it is Presumption, and Tempting of God, to neglect the Outward Means of God's Appointment, in expectation of his Miraculous Interposition, against the Method which he has commanded. As if provoking of God, did Intitle us the more to his Protection! Or, as if we were Wiser than He, to mend and alter his Institutions, and dispense with them, at our Pleasure!

Here let it be minded, that the Ark is put only as a Type of Baptism: Therefore Baptism is the more worthy, and more necessary. And to neglect Baptism, is to venture swimming in the Deluge, without the Ark.
SECT. IX.

The Quaker-Objection from, Eph. iv. 5.

I. The Words of the Text are these. One Lord, one Faith, one Baptism; whence the Quakers argue thus. That Water-Baptism is one Baptism, and the Baptism with the Holy Ghost, is another Baptism; because the one is the Outward, and the other the Inward Baptism; and outward and inward are two Things: Therefore that these must be two Baptisms: which, they say, is contrary to this Text, that says, the Christians have but ONE Baptism, as they have but ONE Lord, and ONE Faith.

II. I Answer. Outward and Inward are Two things; but yet they hinder not the Unity of that which is compos’d of Both. Thus Soul and Body are Two things, and of Natures the most different of any Two things in the World; yet they hinder not the Unity of the Man, who is compos’d of Both. Nay, it is the Composition of these Two that makes up the One MAN; insomuch, that when these Two are Divided, the MAN is no more; for it is nothing else which we call Death, but the Separation of Soul and Body.

And (as before shewn, Sect. VII. Num. VIII.) while there is Soul and Body in Man, there must be a Soul and Body of Religion, that is, an Outward and an Inward Part of Religion: And if we destroy the Outward, we shall lose the Inward; because the Outward was design’d for the Safety and Preservation of the Inward.

It is true, that the Inward is the Chief and Principal Part, as of Man, so of his Religion: But this does not infer, that the Outward is not, likewise necessary. We are commanded, Rom. xii. i. to Present our Bodies a living Sacrifice, and this is call’d our Reasonable Service. For, is it not Reasonable, that, since our Bodies are God’s Creatures, as well as our Souls, He should have the Adoration and Service of our Bodies, as well as of our Souls?
There is no Outward or Publick Worship but by our Bodies; we cannot otherwise express the Inward Devotion and Adoration of our Minds.

And this is so Natural, that whoever has a due Reverence and Awe of the Divine Majesty, cannot help to Express it Outwardly, by the Adoration of his Body, in his Approaches to God, even tho' in Private. As our Blessed Saviour, in His Agony, fell prostrate upon His Face to the Earth.

And whoever deny the Outward Worship to God, or perform it slovenly, and carelessly, it is a full Demonstration that they have no True and Real Devotion, or Just Apprehension of the Almighty.

Therefore the Outward Part of Religion must, by no means, be let go, because the Inward certainly dies, when the Outward is gone.

But the Outward and the Inward Worship of God are not Two Worships, but only Two Parts of the same Worship. As Soul and Body are not Two Men, but Two Parts of the same Man; so the Adoration of this One Man, Outwardly in his Body, and Inwardly in his Soul, is not Two Worships, but Two Parts of the Same Worship.

III. There is but one Faith, yet this Faith consists of several Parts. There is a Faith in God, of which the Heathens do partake: There is a Faith in Christ, which denominates Men Christians: Yet these are not Two Faiths in a Christian, but Two Parts of the Same Faith. There is likewise a Faith in the Promises of the Gospel; and that what is therein Commanded, is from God: And there are Degrees of this Faith, of which one Christian does partake more than another. And yet to Christians there is but One Faith.

The Belief of a God, and of Christ, are Two Faiths or Beliefs; because many do Believe a God, who do not Believe in Christ: Yet, in a Christian they are not Two Faiths, but One Faith; because the one, that is, the Faith in Christ, does suppose the other, that is, the Belief of a God; it only adds to it, and builds upon it. And this makes them no more Two Faiths, than building an House a Story higher makes it Two Houses.
IV. There is but One Lord, that is Christ; yet He consists of an Outward and an Inward Part, of Body and Soul. Nay more, of both the Divine and Human Natures. I might urge the different Persons in the One Divine Nature; but this will be no Argument to the Quakers, who Deny it. But they Deny not (seemingly at least) the Divinity of Christ; and therefore, as this Lord is but One, tho’ consisting of several Natures; and His Faith and Worship but One, tho’ consisting of several Parts; why may not His Baptism be likewise One, tho’ consisting of an Outward and an Inward Part?

V. There was an Outward and an Inward Circumcision, as well as an Outward and Inward Baptism; yet no Man will say, that there were Two Circumcisions under the Law. As little Reason is there to say, That there are Two Baptisms under the Gospel. See what is before said, Sect. VII. Num. X, & XI, of the stronger Presumptions to deny the Outward Sacrifices under the Law, than the Outward Baptism under the Gospel.

VI. Let me add, that Circumcision was discontinu’d 40 Years in the Wilderness (Josh. v. 5.) yet this was made no Argument against the Reviving and Continuance of it afterwards.

But Baptism has not been discontinu’d one Year, nor at all in the Christian Church, since its first Institution by Christ.

If the Quakers cou’d find such a Discontinuance of Baptism, as there was of Circumcision, they would make great Advantage of it; tho’ it cou’d be no more an Argument in the one case, than in the other.

But since they have not even this small Pretence against it, the Constant and Uninterrupted Practice of Baptism, in all Christian Churches, through all Ages, is an Irrefragable Argument against them; and shews them to be Dissonant from the whole Church of Christ.
SECT. X.

An Objection from Heb. vi. 1.

I could not have imagin'd that this shou'd have been made an Objection, if I had not seen it urg'd as such, in a Book printed this Year, 1696. Intituled, *John Baptist's Decreasing*, &c. By John Gratton. Where he urges mightily this Text, as a plain Prohibition to the further Continuance of Baptism. He lays great stress upon the Word *Leaving*. Therefore *Leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ*, let us go on unto Perfection. *Leaving* (faith he, P. 45.) *Mark, Leaving the Principles*, &c. And Baptism being nam'd in the second Verse, he infers, That the Apostle here Commands to *leave off* the Practice of Baptism, which, he says, had been Indulg'd to the first Converts to Christianity, with other Jewish Ceremonies. As to the supposed *Indulging of Baptism*, on account of its being a Jewish Ceremony, it is answer'd before, Sect. VI. Pag. 19, 20, 21. But now as to this Inference from *Heb. vi. 1*. John Gratton says, P. 47. That this word *Leaving* seems to entail the foregoing words in the Chapter before, where he (the Apostle) had been telling them of their Childishness (he mentions the Doctrine of Baptism, which cannot prove the Imposing of Water-Baptism, any more than all the rest) and was now for bringing them on to a further State, where they might know Perfection — And it seems clear to me, that there was some need for those things, they had so long lain like Children weak, and Babes in, to be left. Therefore leaving these, let us go on to Perfection; and faith further; This will we do, if God permit: But if they had been commanded by Christ, to have been used to the World's End, then why shou'd Paul have been so earnest at that Day, which was soon after Christ's Ascension, to have had them then to leave them? These are his words, and a great deal more to the same purpose. And in the same Page, he ranks Baptism with Circumcision, Passover, and other Jewish Rites.
II. But it is very wonderful, how any Man cou’d shut his Eyes so hard, as to oversee not only the whole Scope, but the very Words of this Text. Can such a Blindness be other than wilful? The Apostle was reproving some of the Hebrews for their slender Proficiency in the Knowledge of the Gospel. And that he cou’d not lead them to the Higher Mysteries, they hardly yet being well fixed in the very Rudiments and Fundamentals of Christianity: As if one shou’d say, That he would make an ill Doctor of Divinity, who had not yet learned his Catechism.

For the Apostle in the former Chapter having treated of the Mysterious Parallel 'twixt Christ and Melchisedec, he flops short, Ver. 11, upon the account of their Incapacity, of whom (that is, of Christ and Melchisedec) we have many things to say, and hard to be uttered, seeing ye are dull of hearing: For when for the time ye ought to be Teachers, ye have need that one teach you again, which be the first Principles of the Oracles of God. Then he goes on to provoke them to a further Proficiency in the words of the Text we are now considering, Therefore (says he) leaving the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, let us go on unto Perfection, not laying again the Foundation of Repentance from dead Works, and of Faith towards God, of the Doctrine of Baptisms, and of laying on of Hands, and of the Resurrection of the Dead, and of Eternal Judgment. And this will we do, if God permit.

Here is the Doctrine of Baptism placed in the very Heart of the Fundamentals of Christianity; yet the Quakers would filch it out from amongst all the rest, and refer it alone to the Ceremonials of the Law spoken of in the former Chapter. This was drop’d at a venture; for the former Chapter treats only of the Melchisedecal Priesthood, which was no Part of the Law; and there are none of the Legal Types, or Ceremonies so much as mention’d in it. Yet Baptism in the next Chapter must refer to them!

There cannot be a greater Confession to Baptism than this Objection of the Quakers; nor a stronger Proof for the Necessity of it, than to see it rank’d with these most-acknowledg’d Foundations of Christian Religion, and call’d one of the First Principles of the Oracles of God.

III. And
III. And as to the word Leaving, upon which this Author lays so great a stress, in this Text, as if it meant Forsaking and Abandoning, it is strange that he should bring in the Apostle Exhorting to Leave off, and Forsake the Principles of the Doctrine of Christ! But Leaving there is very plainly meant of leaving or intermitting (as the Vulgar renders it) to treat further at that time of these Principles, which the Apostle is so far from forsaking, that he fixes them as the Foundation; which he says he will not lay again, as supposing it laid already; but build further upon it, improve and carry up the Superstructure. So that this Leaving, is only leaving or ceasing to Discourse further upon these Principles, Intermittentes Sermonem, intermitting or breaking off the Debate. Which is literally, according to the Greek ἀπελέγον, leaving that Word or Subject of which he then spoke, he went on to discourse of other things.

The Reader could not forgive this Trifling in me, to prove things which are self-evident, if he did not see that I am forc’d to it.

However, this Advantage is gain’d by it, to see the very slender Foundations upon which the Quakers build their Objections against Baptism; which they must either grant to be one of the Principles of Christianity, or that Faith and Repentance are not.

IV. But indeed (it is frightful to say it, I pray God they may seriously consider of it) they have, together with Baptism, thrown off all the other Principles of the Doctrine of Christ, which are mention’d in this Text. 1. Repentance. Against this they have set up a Sinless Perfection, which needeth no Repentance. They never beg Pardon for Sin, supposing they have none; and mock at us for saying, Lord have Mercy upon us; and upbraid our Liturgy for having a Confession of Sin in it. Edward Burrough, p. 32 of his Works, printed 1672, says, That God doth not accept of any, where there is any failing, or who doth not fulfill the Law, and doth not Answer every Demand of Justice. 2. Faith towards God.

This
This is the Christian Faith; or Faith in God through Christ. But the Quakers say, That they can come to God immediately, without the Mediation of Christ, and therefore they do not Pray to Christ, whom they utterly deny to be that Person who suffer'd for them upon the Cross; as Mr. Penn in his Serious Apology, p. 146.

They make Christ to be nothing else than what they call The Light within; which, they say, is sufficient of itself, without any thing else, to bring us to God; and that whoever follows it, needs no other Help.

Now they say, That all the Heathen, every Man that is born into the World, has this Light within, that is, Christ; and, that this Light within is sufficient for his Salvation, without any thing else: Whereby they take away any Necessity of an Outward Christ to dye for our Sins, and make the Heathen Faith as good as the Christian: And therefore they have taken away that Christian Faith towards God, which is the Second of the Principles mention'd in this Text. The Third is Baptism, which they openly disclaim. The Fourth is, the laying on of Hands, that is, the Ordination, Confirmation, and Absolution of the Church, which are all perform'd by laying on of Hands. And how much soever the Quakers and others do despise them, yet the Apostle here reckons them among the Fundamentals: For the Government and Discipline of the Church are Essential to it, as it is a Society, it could not otherwise be a Society. The Sin of Korah was nothing but concerning Church-Government.

And Aaron's Rod that Budded, in confirmation of his Priesthood, was ordained to be kept for ever in the Ark, for a Token against the Rebels; so are they call'd, who Rebel'd against that Priesthood which God had then appointed by Moses; and the Sin cannot be less to Rebel against that Priesthood which Christ himself appointed. Which is shewn more at large in the Discourse mention'd in the Advertisement.

Now if Aaron's Rod, that is, Church-Government, was one of the Three sacred Depositums which were ordain'd to be kept in the Ark, why should we wonder to see it here placed among the Fundamentals of Christianity?

The Pot of Manna, Aaron's Rod, and the Tables of the Covenant, were all that was kept in the Ark.
Which shews Church-Government to be Necessary next to our Manna, the very Support of our Life; and the best Guard to preserve the Desalogue, i.e. our Duty to God and Man.

V. And tho’ the Quakers cry down Church-Authority in others, yet they magnifie it as much in themselves as any Church whatsoever.

The Ingenious W. P. in his Judas and the Jews, writing against some Dissenters amongst the Quakers, affrets the Authority of the Church very high, and the Power of the Elders in the Church, p. 13. and preseth that Text, Matth. xviii. 17. Tell it unto the Church, to extend to Matters of Faith and Worship, as well as to Private Injuries or Offences amongst Christians. That Christ (says he) as well gave His Church Power to Reject as to Try Spirits, is not hard to prove. That notable Passage, Go, tell the Church, does it to our hand: For if in case of private Offence betwixt Brethren, the Church is made Absolute Judge, from whom there is no Appeal in this World; how much more in any the least case that concerns the Nature, Being, Faith, and Worship of the Church her self?

But the Case was quite alter’d when he came to Answr that same Text, as urged against the Quakers by the Church; which he does in his Address to Protestants, p. 152, 153, & 154. of the Second Edition in Octavo, printed 1692. And then that Text does not relate at all to Faith or Worship, but only to private Injuries. For having deny’d the Authority of the Church in Matters of Faith, he puts the Objection thus against himself: But what then can be the meaning of Christ’s Words; Go, tell the Church? Very well. I Answr (says he, p. 153.) ‘Tis not about Faith, but Injury, that Christ speaks; and the place explains itself, which is this; Moreover, if thy Brother shall Trespass against Thee, go and tell him his fault, between thee and him alone. Here is Wrong, not Religion; Injustice, not Faith or Conscience concern’d; as some would have it, to maintain their Church-Power. — The words Trespass and Fault prove abundantly, that He only meant Private and Personal Injuries; and that not only from the common and undeniable signification and use of the words Trespass and Fault, but from the way Christ directs and commands for Accommodation, viz. That the Person wronged speak
to him that commits the Injury, alone; if that will not do, that he
take one or two with him: But no man can think, that if it re-
tated to Faith or Worship, I ought to Receive the Judgment of
one, or two, or three, for a sufficient Rule.—Therefore it can-
not relate to Matters of Faith, and Scruples of Conscience,
but Personal and Private Injuries.

Thus he. But tho' the Judgment of one, two, or three, is not
of itself a sufficient Rule, (none ever said it was) yet may not
one, two, or three admonish one another, even in Matters of
Faith and Worship, as well as of Private Injuries, and, in case
of Refractoriness and Obstnacy, bring the Cause before the
Church? Thou shalt in any wise Rebuke thy Neigh-
bours, and not suffer Sin upon him. Yet was not the
Judgment of every Man a sufficient Rule to his Neigh-
bours. And our Saviour's commanding to bring the Cause fi-
nally before the Church, shews plainly, that the Judgment of
the one, two, or three, was not meant for a sufficient Rule, that
is, the ultimate Decision.

But in Answer to Mr. Penn's Argument, That this Text,
Tell it unto the Church, was meant only of Private Injuries, I shall
repeat but his own words before quoted, and grant, that as it
was meant of Private Injuries, so, as Mr. Penn very well in-
fers, How much more in any the least Case that concerns the Na-
ture, Being, Faith, and Worship of the Church herself?

VI. But, to return. The fifth Article in that Enumeration
of Fundamentals, Heb. vi. 1, & 2, is, The Resurrection of the
Dead; which the Quakers do likewise deny; as it is fully
prov'd in The Snake in the Grass, Par. 2. Sect. 13.

The last is that of Eternal Judgment, which depends upon
the former, and may be made one with it; and is likewise
deny'd by the Quakers, that is, turn'd into Hymeneus and Phi-
letus's Sense, of an Inward only and Spiritual Resurrection, or
Judgment perform'd within us. I have frequently heard Qua-
kers say, that they expected no other Resurrection or future
Judgment, than what they had attain'd already, that is, the
Resurrection of Christ, or the Light; and the Judgment or
Condemnation of Sin, in their Hearts.
George Whitehead, in his Book call'd *The Nature of Christianity,* &c. printed 1671, p. 29, thus ridicules it: "Dost thou (says he to his Opponent) look for Christ, as the Son of Mary, to appear outwardly, in a Bodily Existence, to save thee? If thou dost, thou mayst look until thy Eyes drop out, before thou wilt see such an Appearance of him."

And now what Wonder is it, that these should throw off *Baptism,* who have likewise thrown off all the other *Fundamentals,* which are reckon'd with it in this Text?

VII. But let us hence observe, and beware of *Neglecting* or *Despising* the *Outward Institutions of God,* because these depending upon the Authority of God, no less than the *Inward* and *Spiritual,* rejecting of the one overthrows the *Obligation* and *Sanction* of the whole, and is a rejecting of God the *Institutor,* who, in His just Judgment, suffers those to lose the one, that think themselves too good for the other.

Men were made Partakers of Christ *to come,* by the *Sacrifices* which were appointed, as *Types* of Him, under the *Law:* So now are we Partakers of Him, *who is come,* by the *Sacraments,* which He has appointed in *Remembrance* of Him, under the *Gospel.*

And as those who *neglected* or *despised* the *Sacrifices,* when they might be had, from the *Legal Priests,* according to *God's Institution,* were made liable to *Death,* and did forfeit their *Title* to the Participation of Christ the *Architype:* So those who *neglect* or *despise* the *Sacraments,* which He has commanded as the *Means* of *Grace,* and of our *Inward Participation* of Him, under the *Gospel,* do thereby justly forfeit their *Title* to such Participation.

For, if we will not take *God's Way,* we have no *Promise* nor *Reason* to secure us in the following of our *own* Inventions.
SECT. XI.

The Quaker-Objection, That there are no Signs under the Gospel.

I. THE Quakers throw off all Outward Institutions, as not only Useless, but Hurtful to the Christian Religion; which, they pretend, consists not only chiefly (which is granted to them) but solely in the Inward and Spiritual Part. They say, That all Figures and Signs are Shadows; and that when Christ, who is the Substance, is come, the others cease of course. That they have attain'd to Christ the Substance; and therefore these Shadows are of no use to them. That Baptism and the Lord's Supper are some of these Shadows; and these were Indulged to the Early and Weak Christians, but that the Quakers, who have stronger Participations of the Spirit, are got beyond these Beggarly Elements, &c.

II. This is settl'd as a Foundation-Principle, That no Figures, or Signs, are perpetual; or of Institution, under the Gospel-Administration, when Christ, who is the Substance, is come; though their Use might have been Indulged to young Converts in Primitive Times.

Anf. i. To say they were not Perpetual, is one thing; but to say, That they were not so much as of Institution under the Gospel, seems a strange Assertion, when Christ gave the Institution out of his own Mouth, Matt. xxviii. 19. Go Baptize. And of his Supper, said, This do, Luk. xxii. 19.

2. The Reason why this shou'd not be Perpetual, is very Precarious, to suppose that the Holiness of any Person shou'd exempt him from observing the Institutions of God; whereas Christ himself submitted to them, and said, That it became him to fulfil all Righteousness, i.e. all the Righteous Institutions of God. This is the Reason which Christ gave.
Give for his Baptism; yet the Quakers think that their Holiness will excuse them from Baptism. Christ submitted to John's Baptism, saying, That we ought to fulfill all God's Institutions: Yet the Quakers will not submit to Christ's Baptism, saying, That they are got beyond it. All were required to submit to John's Baptism, during his Ministry, because he was sent from God to Baptize; therefore Christ also submitted unto it; and did receive his own Commission to Baptize, by the visible Descent of the Holy Ghost, upon his receiving the Baptism of John. All are yet more expressly commanded to receive the


Mar.xvi.15. Go ye into All the World, and Preach the Gospel to Every Creature: He that Believeth, and is Baptized, shall be saved. But the Quakers and Muggletonians excuse themselves, as being too Good for it; They truly feeling in themselves (as it is expressed in the Key before quoted, p. 26.) the very Thing, which outward Water, Bread and Wine do signify, they leave them off. But were they as Holy as they pretend, yet wou'd not this excuse them from observing the Institutions of Christ; nay, the greatest Sign of Holiness, and true Humility, is, not to think our selves above his Institutions, but obediently to observe them, after the Blessed Example of Christ our Lord. And it is the greatest Instance of Spiritual Pride, and the most Fatal Deception in the World, thus to over-value our selves; it betrays the grossest Ignorance of Spiritual things: For the more a Man knows of himself, and of God, the more he discovers of his own Weakness and Unworthiness; he appears less in his own sight, and frames himself the more Obsequiously, with the most profound Humility and Resignation, Dutifully and Zealously to observe every the least Command of God. They are Novices in the Knowledge of God, who are lifted up with Pride; and these fall into the Condemnation of the Devil, 1 Tim. iii. 6.

And what can be greater Pride, than to think our selves in an higher Condition of Perfection, than the Holy Apostles, and all those Glorious Saints and Martyrs, who were the First-fruits of the Gospel, called (in the Key above quoted) by the Lessening Stile of Young Converts, in Primitive Times?

St. Paul, though Immediately Converted, and Enlightened Miraculously from Heaven, was commanded to go to Ananias
nias to be Baptized. But our Quakers pass him off as a Young Convert, they have got beyond him, and think themselves more Highly Enlightened than he was: And, for that Reason only, not to need that Baptism, which was thought necessary for him.

And all the other Christians, from Christ to George Fox, were Young Converts! Then it was that a greater Light was given than ever was known in the Church of Christ before, to make the Outward Baptism cease; as of no longer use to those who had attain'd the Substance! Or otherwise none of the Primitive Christians knew their own Holiness; or were so Humble as not to own it, to that Degree as to place themselves above all outward Ordinances!

These are the Grounds and Reasons of the Quakers, why Baptism, and the Lord's Supper were not Perpetual!

Which, in the mildest word that I could frame, I have call'd Precarious. And they must appear to be such, till the Quakers can give some other Proof besides their own saying so, either that the Holiness of any Person can excuse him from the Observance of Christ's Institution; Or, that they have a greater Degree of Holiness than all others since Christ, who have been Baptized.

3. But the Perpetuity of Baptism, and the Lord's Supper, are fully expressed in the Words of the Scripture. When Christ gave Commission to his Disciples to Baptize, he promised to be with them, in the Execution of that Commission, even unto the End of the World, Matt. xxviii. 20. which shews, that the Commission was to descend after the Death of the Apostles to whom it was given. And it tells how long; Alway, even unto the End of the World. The like Perpetuity is annexed to the Institution of the Lord's Supper, 1 Cor. xi. 26. Till Christ come again. It was Instituted in Remembrance of him; and therefore to be continu'd till his Coming again.

III. I know the Quakers do Interpret this, not of Christ's Outward and Personal coming at the Resurrection, which (after Hymenæus and Philetus, 2 Tim. ii. 18.) they say is past already, that is, Inwardly performed, by the Spiritual Resurrection of Christ, or the Light in their Hearts. And they say, That the Institution
Institution of the Lord's Supper was only to continue till that Inward Coming, or forming of Christ in our Hearts; which they having obtain'd, (as they presume) therefore they throw off the Outward Supper.

But was not Christ formed in the Hearts of the Apostles, to whom Christ gave his Holy Supper, as much as in the Hearts of the Quakers now? Was he not Come Spiritually to Paul, after his Conversion? And before his Command, above quoted, of continuing the Practice of the Lord's Supper, till his Coming?

If they say, That this was only to have it continu'd to those weaker Christians, who had not Christ thoroughly formed in their Hearts.

First, Who can say, That Christ is thoroughly formed in his Heart? May there not be greater and greater Degrees of the Inspiration of Christ in our Hearts? And can we ever come to the End of it, so as to need no further Inspiration, or Coming of Christ within us? Therefore Christ's Inward Coming is always to be expected. His further and further Coming and Inspiration.

But if that Coming, which the Quakers wou'd make to be the Determination of the Outward Institution of the Lord's Supper, be the Least Degree of his Coming, then every Christian, nay, according to the Quakers, every Man in the World, not only is, but always was exempted from the Observation of that Institution; because the Quakers do own, That every Man in the World has, and ever had the Light within, which they make to be Christ, at least, an Influence and Inspiration from Christ; and so to be a Coming, or Presence of his in the Heart: And therefore, by this Rule, Christ is Come to every Man, in some Degree or other: And, if there be not some fleeting, or ascertaining of this Degree, then Christ was always so Come to All, as to make the Institution of the Lord's Supper useless, at all Times, to All. Nay, it was ended, before it began. For, if his Inward Coming does end it, it cou'd never begin, because he was always so Inwardly Come.

But if there are some Degrees of his Coming so weak as to need the Help of the Outward Institution, to which God has annexed the Promife of his Grace, when duly Administered, and Receive'd, then these Degrees must be known, else those may be depriv'd of
of the Benefit of it, who have most need of it: And those are they who think that they need it least.

Secondly, The Quakers do not always pretend, all of them, to the same Degrees of Perfection (if there be Degrees in Perfection) they must be sensible sometimes (at least others are) of the many Weaknesses of some of their Number: Why then do they not allow the Lord's Supper to those Weaker ones? Else they must say, That it was not intended for the Weak more than for the Strong. And so, that the Institution and Practice of it, by Christ and his Apostles, was wholly useless, and to no purpose. And that all those high Things said of it, That it is the Communion of the Body and Blood of Christ, 1 Cor. x. 16. And Christ's own Words, This is my Body: And therefore, that the receiving it unworthily, is being Guilty of the Body and Blood of the Lord: That therefore we should approach to it, with the greatest Reverence and Preparation, to Examine our selves seriously and diligently, that we may receive it with pure Hearts and Minds: And the Dreadful Judgments which do attend the Neglect, or Abuse of it, not only Vary Diseases, and divers kinds of Deaths, but Damnation, 1 Cor. xi. from Ver. 27. I say all these were Words thrown into the Air, of no Meaning, nor Import at all, if the Quaker Interpretation be true, which makes nothing at all of the Lord's Supper, but renders it wholly Precarious and Insignificant, even at the time of its Institution; and now to be hurtful and pernicious, as drawing Men from the Substance, to mere Shadows; for they make of it no more!

IV. But I would beseech them to consider how much more highly God does value it; and how Material a part of his Religion he does make it: For when St. Paul was taught the Faith immediately from Heaven, and not from those who were Apostles before him (as he tells us, Gal. i. 16, 17,) Christ took care to instruct him as to this of the Lord's Supper particularly. And he presses it upon the Corinthians, as having received it from God. For I have received of the Lord (says he, 1 Cor. xi. 23,) that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same Night in which he was Betrayed, took Bread, &c. and so goes on to relate the whole Institution of the Lord's Supper, and the mighty Consequences, the Benefits and Advantages of it; the Examination
mination preparatory to it; and the Vengeance both Temporal and Eternal, which was due to the Contempt of it.

This shews, that Christ did not Institute this Holy Sacrament by Chance. It was the last Act of his Life; and his Dying Bequest to his Church; fill’d with all his Blessings, and carrying with it, to the Worthy Receivers, the whole Merits, and Purchase of his Death and Passion, the Remission of our Sins, and full Title to Heaven! Brethren, I speak after the Manner of Men; tho’ it be but a Man’s Testament, yet, if it be confirmed, no Man disannulth, or addeth thereto. How much less then can any Man take upon him to disannul this last Will and Testament of Christ’s, which he has left to his Church; and Bequeathed it to her with His Dying Breath!

This was the Reason that it was not only so particularly Recorded by the several Evangelists in the Gospels; but when St. Paul was taught Immediately from Heaven, this most Material Institution was not forgot, but Christ Himself instructed him in it; to shew the great Stress and Value which He laid upon it.

And let this suffice, to have said in this place, concerning this other Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. Its Institution is as Plain and Express as that of Baptism. And the Practice of it, in the Days of the Apostles, and all Ages since has been as Universal. And what has been said of Baptism, is of Equal Force as to this: And the Quaker Arguments against this, are upon the same Foundation as those against Baptism; only they have not so many Objections against this: Therefore I have made Baptism the chief Subject of this Discourse; yet so, as likewise to Include the Sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. Therefore we will go on to consider what remains of the present Objection (which Militates equally against both) that there are no Signs under the Gospel.

V. And here let me observe,

First; That these Signs and Figures which the Quakers make Incompatible to the Gospel State, ought only to be understood of the Signs and Figures in the Law, which were ordain’d as Types of Christ. And of these it is truly argu’d, That when Christ, who is the Substance, is come, they must cease of course; which Argument the Quakers bring against the Signs and Figures which
which Christ did Institute under the Gospel. But how foreign this is from their purpose, let any one judge. For those Signs and Figures which were appointed by Christ, cou’d not be Types of Christ; because a Type is what goes before a Thing, and shews it to come. And therefore, when that which it foreshews is come, it ceases. But, as there were Types under the Law to foreshew Christ’s coming in the Flesh, and his Sacrifice upon the Cross, which therefore are ceased; so Christ has appointed other Types to foreshew his second coming to Judge the World; and which therefore must last till he shall so come, as the Types of his first coming did last, till he did so come. The Sacrifices under the Law, did foreshew the Death of Christ; but the Sacraments under the Gospel, were Instituted in Remembrance of it; as well as for Types of our future Union with him in Heaven. Therefore the same Reason which makes the Legal Types to cease, does infer, That the Evangelical Types must not cease, till they likewise shall be fulfilled; which will not be till we arrive at Heaven. Thus, as they are Types. And then,

Secondly, As they are Remembrances of what is past, they are to last as long as the Remembrance of that which they Represent ought to last with us. Christ did not Institute his Supper, that we shou’d thereby Remember his Death, a Day, or a Tear, but till his Coming again. His Death took his Personal Presence from us; and therefore till that Return, we must continue the Remembrance, that is, of his Absence, till the Glorious Return of his Visible Body, which was separated from us by his Death.

Thus no advantage can be brought to the Quaker Pretences against the Christian Sacraments, from the Sacrifices and other Signs or Figures under the Law.

VI. We come now to Examine, what they set up against any Signs or Figures under the Gospel, from another Topick; and that is, That the Gospel is all Substance, and therefore that there must be no Sign or Figure at all in it.

Answ. By Substance here they mean that which is Inward, or Spiritual, that every thing in the Gospel is Spiritual.

But this will overthrow all outward, or Bodily Worship. For that is distinguished from Spiritual, or Inward Worship.
And, in one sense, all Bodily Worship is a Sign or Figure of the Inward, or Spiritual; which is the Principal and Substantial Worship. Thus Bowing the Knee, or Uncovering the Head at Prayer, are Signs or Figures of the Inward Reverence and Devotion of the Heart.

And this the Quakers practice; therefore, by their own Argument, they have Signs and Figures as well as others; only they throw off those of Christ's Institution, and make new ones of their own.

It is impossible to be without Signs and Figures. For this whole World is a Figure of that which is to come. We ourselves are Figures of God, being Images of him: And what is an Image but the Figure or Sign of a Thing? Christ is a Figure of God, being the Express Image of his Person, Heb. i. 3. And we now have the Knowledge of God in the Face of Jesus Christ. God is a Light Inaccessible to Angels, as well as unto Men, without some Medium: His Essence cannot be seen or known Immediately, by any but Himself. All Creatures partake of him in Signs and Figures of him; each in their several Degrees; there are Higher and more Noble Figures; but all are Figures. And God has, in all Ages, through the World, Dispensed himself to Mankind in Signs and Figures; we could not otherwise apprehend Him. Christ is the most Noble and Lively Figure of God: Therefore his Dispensation is far beyond all others that went before him. Yet even now, We see through a Glass darkly, 1 Cor. xiii. 12. or, in a Riddle; as our Margent reads it, ἐν ἁλβήματι, in a Figure.

What is the Bible that we read, what are Words but the Signatures, the Signs or Figures of Things? We can see the Essence of no one thing in the World, more than of God. And what are all those Accidents of Colour, Quantity and Quality, by which we distinguish Things, but so many Figures, or Signs of them?

So very wild is that Notion, that there must be no Signs or Figures under the Gospel!

It would be much Truer, if they had said, That there are nothing else but Signs and Figures: There is nothing else without a Figure but God! For all Creatures are Figures of Him, Christ, the Highest.
But have the Quakers no Figures? G. Fox in his Saul's Errand, p. 14. says, That Christ's Flesh is a Figure. They call the Body of Christ generally, a Figure, a Vail, a Garment. Then either they have none of it, or they have Figures.

Richard Hubberthorn wrote, That Christ's coming in the Flesh was but a Figure: He meant of the Inward coming of Christ, or the Light in the Heart, which they call the Substance and the Mystery; of which Christ's Outward coming in the Flesh, they say, was but a Shadow, or the History (to use their own words.) G. Fox made a great Mystery, or Figure of his Marriage, which, he said, Was above the State of the first Adam, in his Innocency; in the State of the second Adam that never fell. He wrote, in one of his General Epistles to the Churches, (which were read, and valu'd by the Quakers, more than St. Paul's,) That his Marriage was a Figure of the Church coming out of the Wilderness. This, if deny'd, I can Vouch undeniably, but it will not be deny'd, tho' it be not Printed with the rest of his Epistles, but I have it from some that read it often. But why was it not Printed? That was a Sad Story. But take it thus. He Marry'd one Margaret Fell, a Widdow, of about Threescore Years of Age; and this Figure of the Church must not be Barren; therefore, tho' she was past Child-bearing, it was expected, that, as Sarah, she shou'd miraculously Conceive, and bring forth an Isaac; which G. Fox promis'd and boasted of; and some that I know have heard him do it, more than once. She was call'd, The Lamb's Wife. And it was said amongst the Quakers, That the Lamb had now taken his Wife, and she would bring forth an Holy Seed. And Big she grew, and all things were provided for the Lying in; And, being persuaded of it, gave notice to the Churches, as above obstroy'd. But, after long waiting, all prov'd Abortive, and the Figure was spoil'd. And now you may guess the Reason, why that Epistle which mention'd this Figure, was not Printed.

I would have brought nothing into this Discourse that looks like a Jest; but they have compelled me. And it may be of use to them, to shew them, that while they throw off the Sacraments of Christ's Institution, upon the Pretence that there must be no Signs or Figures under the Gospel, they, at the same time
time, make Ridiculous Signs and Figures of G. Fox, and his Fantaftical Marriage; and of several other things; every thing almost among them, is a Sign or Figure of something to come upon the World. How many of their Lying Prophets have call’d themselves Signs to the Men of their Generation, as the Holy Prophets were in their Day?

VII. There have been Outward Signs, in all the Institutions of Religion, since the beginning of the World; as well before, as under the Law, and now under the Gospel. Only they have been vary’d, or Ended according to what they prefigur’d. Thus those Signs which had no further Tendency, than to point out what Christ did or suffer’d upon Earth, are fulfill’d and therefore Ended.

But there were some Signs, which, though they pointed to Christ upon Earth, had yet a further Tendency: For Signs may be appointed to more Ends than one. Thus the Institution of the Sabbath was appointed for the Commemoration of God’s Rest from the Works of the Creation, Gen.i.i.3. and Exod.xx.11. and likewise the rest of the Children of Israel (who were the Type of the Church) from their Captivity and Slavery in Egypt, Deut. v.15. (which expresses the Servitude of Sin and Hell) and their final Rest in Canaan (the Type of Heaven) after their forty Years wandering in the Wildernefs, (which represent the Labours of this Life.) But this was not the Ultimate Rest, or Sabbath, Heb.iv.18. For if Joshua had given them Rest, then would not afterward have spoken of another Day; there remaineth therefore one Day, the keeping of a Sabbath (which signifies Rest) to the People of God. For he that is entred into his Rest, he also hath ceased from his own Works, as God did from his. Thus Christ, as he suffered the 6th Day of the Week, the same Day that Man was created, and fell; so, on the same Day on which God Rested from his Work of Creation, viz., the 7th Day, did Christ Rest in his Grave, from his Work of Redemption. And there is yet a farther Rest or Sabbath beyond this; and that is, the Eternal Rest in Heaven, Heb.iv.11. Let us labour therefore to enter into that Rest.

Now, though several Significations of the Sabbath are already past, as the Deliverance out of Egypt; the Entrance into Canaan;
Canasum; and the Rest of Christ, in his Grave: Yet there being one behind, that is the Sabbath of Heaven, therefore do we still keep the Sabbath as a Type of it.

But there is another Reason for the Continuance of the Sabbath; and that is, That it was not only ordained as a Type of Things to come; but as a Commemoration of what was past, viz. Of God's Rest from his Works of Creation. And, by the Alteration of the Day of the Sabbath, it serves likewise to us Christians, as a Commemoration of the Resurrection of Christ, and his Conquest over the Powers of Death and Hell. It was the first Day in which Light was created; and Christ (who is our True Light, of which the Visible Light is but a Shadow, and was ordain'd as a Type) Arose from the Dead, the same Day; and gave Light to those who sat in Darkness, and the Shadow of Death, by the Joyful Tidings of our Redemption from Hell, and Eternal Bliss in Heaven!

Now so long as the Works of our Creation and Redemption are to be kept in Memory, so long is the Sabbath to continue, as a Commemoration of these Inestimable Benefits.

And, by the same Reason, so long as we ought to commemorate the Death and Passion of our Lord; so long ought the Sacrament of it to continue; which he Instituted in Remembrance of it; and commanded it to be continu'd till his Coming again.

Thus you see that there are Signs under the Gospel; not only the two Sacraments of the Church (which flowed distinctly out of Christ's Side, after his Death, upon the Cross) but that the Gospel does still retain the Signs of Commemoration, which have descended down to us all the way from the Creation: And likewise such Signs or Types as have yet a Prospect forward, and are not wholly fulfill'd.

And 3dly, The Signs of Present Signification, as the outward Acts of Worship: To which we are as much, nay more strictly obliged under the Gospel, than they were under the Law. As St. Irenæus argues, (advers. Hæres. I. 4. c. 34.) That the manner of Worship, as of Sacrifices, is chang'd; but not the Worship abolished. Non Genus oblationis Reprobatum est, oblationes enim & illis, oblationes autem & hic: Sacrificia in Populo, Sacrificia & in Ecclesia; sed Species Immotata est t. c. The Kind
Kind or Nature of the Offering is not Abolished; for there were Offerings under the Law, and there are Offerings also under the Gospel: there were Sacrifices among the People of the Jews. There are Sacrifices likewise in the Church: but the Species or Manner of them only is changed, viz. That some Sacrifices under the Law were Bloody, as Praefiguring the Death of Christ: and therefore that Sort or Manner of Sacrificing is ceased, because Fulfilled in the Death of Christ: But their Un-bloody Sacrifices, and Oblations, as of Tythes, and other Offerings Remain still among Christians: and are Signs, as much as they were under the Law. The outward Worship of God must be by Actions proper and significant. Nihil enim Otiosum, nec sine Signo, nec sine Argumento apud eum. i.e. For there is nothing Empty, nor without a Sign, nor without Signification in the Worship of God. And, in the very next words, he applies this to Tythes. Et propter hoc illi quidem Decimas — — And for this reason the Jews paid Tythes, viz. as a Sign of their Dependence upon God, and having Receiv’d All from Him: And in Hopes of their Receiving More from Him. Sed nos omnia — But the Christians, instead of a Tenth Part, which the Jews gave, Give All that they have, because (says he) they have a Better Hope. And, ch. 27. shewing how Christ did Heighten the Law, as, instead of Adultery, to forbid Lust; instead of Murder, to forbid Anger; and, instead of giving the Tythe, commanding to fell All: And this, says he, is not a Dissolving of the Law, but Enlarging it. So that no Part of the Law is Destroy’d; and All is not Fulfilled; and since All must be Fulfilled, it follows, that what is not yet Fulfilled, must yet Remain: And Many of the Signs in the Law not being Fulfilled in Christ’s Death, nor ever to be Fulfilled while we Live upon this Earth, consequent do Remain, and must so Remain to the End of the World. So that the Gospel has Signs as well as the Law; and, in Great Part, the same Signs; with other Sacramental Signs added by Christ, which are those of which we now Treat, Baptism, and The Supper of The Lord.

VIII. And let us Reflect, that ever since God made outward Things, and gave us this Body, as the Soul does act by the Mediation of the Body; so has God ordain’d, that his Gifts and Graces
Graces shall be convey'd to us by Outward Signs and Means. Christ us'd outward Signs and Means for his Miraculous Cures; to shew, that tho' the Virtue did not come from the Means, yet that they were of Use, and not to be Despised.

But why do we say, that the Virtue does not come from the Means? We say so, when we cannot tell the Reason and Manner how the Means work their Effect, and can we tell it, in those which we call Natural Means? No surely, we know only by Observation, and Experience; and what often comes to pass, we call it Natural, as being the common Course of Things; not that we know the Reason of it, more than of those Occurrences which we call Miraculous and Extraordinary.

Man doth not live by Bread alone, but by every Word that proceedeth out of the Mouth of God.

Bread has no Virtue of its own to nourish; but only what it receives from God: And if he give his Virtue (for it is His only) to a Stone; or any thing else, it will nourish: And Bread will, and does cease to nourish, when he withdraws his Blessing from it.

Therefore the Spittle of Christ and the Clay, the Waters of Siloam and Bethesda, and the Brazen-Serpent had as great Virtue to Cure, when they were Appointed by God, as Bread has to nourish; and the Virtue came as much from Them, as it does from the Bread, in our Daily Food.

Now, if the Brazen-Serpent, which was but a Type of Christ, had Virtue to Cure the Body; shall we deny that the Bread, which Christ blessed, for the Remission of Sin, has Virtue to work that Effect?

He whose single Fiat made the Worlds, and whose Influence gives Power to all Things, and makes them what they are; he said of that Blessed Bread, THIS IS MY BODY. And his Holy Apostle said of it, The Bread which we break, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? And do we doubt, how it works this Effect? Dare we Reject it, because it seems strange to us, how it shou'd work this Effect, who know as little how our Daily Bread does nourish our Bodies? Do we object our Ignorance how a Man can be Born of Water and the Spirit, who can give as short an Account how we are formed, of a drop of Water, in the Womb; and by what Ligaments such different Nature
tures as Soul and Body, are compacted and linked together? How can we pretend to have Faith in Christ, and yet not believe his Words, because of the seeming difficulty to our Understandings (who know nothing) of the Method and Manner, how He can bring them to pass?

According to our Faith it will be unto us. Therefore let us Humble our Souls greatly, and imitate the Holy Angels (far more Enlightened than we are) who vail their Faces before God; and presume not to dispute his Commands; or pretend to understand all the Methods of his Power and Wisdom unsearchable! but desire to look into those Things, 1 Pet. i. 12. those Glorious Mysteries of the Gospel, which the Quakers despise, as below the Measure to which they have attain'd! And the Principalities and Powers in Heavenly places, do submit to learn the Manifold Wisdom of God, Ephes. iii. 10. from that Church, which the Quakers do vilifie and trample under their feet; as thinking it uncapable to teach them any thing, or to administer to them the Sacraments which Christ has commanded.

But because the Dispute will arise which that Church is, in the miserable Divisions of Christendom, and amongst the various sorts of the Pretenders to it, I have in the Discourse mention'd in the Advertisement, I hope, given a plain and sure Rule to guide all Honest and Disinterested Enquirers, in that most necessary and fundamental Point.
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Shewing the Necessity of Water-Baptism.

The Sum of what has been said, concludes in the great Necessity there is of Water-Baptism.

But before I say more of it, I will obviate an Objection, which may arise from the word Necessary.

If it be Absolutely Necessary, then none can be saved without it: Which sort of Necessity I do not plead for. This is plainly distinguished in the Catechism of our Church, where this, and the other Sacrament (of the Lord's Supper) are said to be Generally necessary to Salvation. Generally, that is, in the General and Common Methods which are prescribed in the Gospel. For no Body will pretend to Limit God; as if He cou’d not save by what Means and Methods He pleases. But we are ty’d up to those Rules which He has Prescribed to Us: Yet We must not Tie Him up to those Rules, to which He has Ty’d Us.

But who are they who have Reason to expect God’s Extraordinary Mercies, out of the Common Methods of Salvation; and to be made Partakers of the Inward, without the Outward Baptism?

I. Those who being conscientiously concern’d for the Outward, yet cannot obtain it, through the Want of a Minister of Christ, Lawfully Ordain’d to Administer it; as in Turkey, Africa, &c.

These are under an Invincible Necessity: And their Earnest Desires (I doubt not) will be accepted by God; and the Spiritual Baptism be confer’d upon them, without the Outward.

II. Those who have been Baptised by Persons, not lawfully Ordain’d, and consequently they have receiv’d no Baptism, having receiv’d it from those who had no Commission to Administer.
...eter it; but who were Guilty of the Highest Sacrilege, in Usurping such a Sacred Commission, not Lawfully Deriv'd to them by a Successive Ordination from the Apostles: But yet, through a General Corruption of the Times, such Baptisms are suffer'd to pass, whereby the Persons so Baptized, swimming down the Stream, do think their Baptism to be valid, and therefore seek not for a Re-Baptization from those who are truly Empow'ed to Administer it. I say, Where no such Re-Baptization is taught, and thereby the People know nothing of it; in such Case, their Ignorance is, in a Manner, Invincible; and their Sincerity and Devotion in Receiving No Sacraments, yet thinking them True Sacraments, may be Accepted by God, and the Inward Grace confer'd, and the Defects in the Outward and Visible Signs may be Pardoned.

But neither of these Cases does reach those, who neglect the Outward Means, upon Pretence of Inward Perfection without them. These Deny the Ordinance of Christ, and make themselves Wiser than He; as if He had appointed Means either Unnecessary, or Ineffectual to the Ends for which they were intened!

And I desire these to consider the Great Necessity there is for Water-Baptism, as before Explain'd.

1. Because it is ordain'd as the Means whereby the Inward Baptism of the Holy-Ghost is given, as I before quoted, Acts ii. 38. Be BAPTIZED, and ye shall Receive the Gift of the HOLY GHOST. By This Baptism, cou'd not be meant the Baptism with the Holy-Ghost, because This Baptism is Here propos'd as the Means whereby to Receive the Inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost.

Again, Ephes. v. 26. That He (Christ) might Sanctifie and Cleanse it (the Church) with the Washing of Water, by the Word. Here the Washing of Water is the Means, tho' the Operation and Virtue is from the Word: And therefore the Outward Washing or Baptizing (which means the same, as before told, Sect. i.) cannot be the same with the Word in this Text:

2. Christ having appointed this as the Means, you see what Stress He lays upon it; and how Necessary He makes it.

John iii. 5. Except a Man be Born of Water and the Spirit, he cannot Enter into the Kingdom of God. Here the Water and the
the Spirit are plainly Distinguished, and Both made Necessary to Salvation, the Outward as well as the Inward: As it is written, Rom. x. 10. For with the Heart Man Believeth, unto Righteousness; And with the Mouth Confession is made unto Salvation. The Belief of the Heart is Necessary unto Righteousness, i.e. to make Us Righteous before God: But the Outward Confession of the Mouth is likewise as Necessary to our Salvation. As Christ said, (Matt. x. 32.) Whosoever shall Confess me before Men, &c. We must Outwardly, and before Men, Confess to Christ, by the Due Performance of His Outward Ordinances; without which our Inward Belief in Him will not be sufficient to our Salvation: Baptism is an Outward Badge of Christianity, by being the Outward Form, appointed to admit Men as Members of the Church of Christ; and whereby they own themselves to be such, before Men: But those who will not wear this BADGE, as a Confession to Christ, before Men; Christ will not Confess them, before His Father, in Heaven.

Mark xvi. 16. He that Believeth and is Baptized, shall be saved: Here both the Outward and the Inward are join'd together, and both made Necessary; For, by Baptism, Here, cannot be meant the Inward Belief, that you'd make a Tautology of the Text, and mean thus, He that Believeth and Believeth— Thus it must be, if by Baptism, in this Text, the Inward Baptism, or Belief of the Heart be meant. But this being plainly meant of the Outward Baptism, the Consequence from this Text is plainly this, That he who doth not Believe, and is not Baptized, shall not be Saved. Of which I adjure the Quakers to Consider most seriously: For tho' they had the Inward Baptism as much as they Pretend to it, yet were the Outward necessary. Peter thought Water necessary to give Outward Baptism to those who had already Received the Inward Baptism of the Holy Ghost, Acts x. 47.

And the Doctrine of Baptism is reckon'd among the Principles and Foundations of Christianity, together with Faith and Repentance, &c. Heb. VI. 1, 2.

But the Quakers, like Naaman, flout at the Means, as too easy to be effectual; and call Baptism, in contempt, Water-Sprinkling. And I will answer them with Naaman's Servants, (2 Kings v. 13.) If Christ had bid thee do some great thing, wouldn't
wouldst thou not have done it? How much rather then when He saith to thee, Wash and be Clean? And as necessary as the Waters of Jordan were to the Cleansing of Naaman, so necessary are the Waters of Baptism to the Cleansing of our Souls. None dare say, that GOD cou’d not have Cleaned Naaman otherwise: But GOD having, by his Prophet, appointed that Means, if Naaman had neglected it, he had not otherwise been Cured. How much more, when GOD has appointed the Means of Baptism, by his Son, if we Neglect it, Shall we be S的食物d without it? He that Despis’d Moses’s Law, dy’d without Mercy: Of how much sorer Punishment, suppose ye, shall he be thought worthy, who hath trodden under foot the Institution of the Son of GOD, and counted it an unholy thing, doing Despight to it, Inventing Contemptible Names for it, and Ridiculing the Administration of it? But as the Spirit of God moved, at first, upon the Face of the Waters (Gen. 1. 2.) to Impregnate them, and make them Fruitful; and gave a Miraculous Vertue to the Waters of Jordan, of Siloam, and Bethesda, for Healing of the Flesh; Why should we Doubt that the same Spirit can and will Sanctifie the Waters of Baptism to the Mystical Washing away of Sin, having the Positive Institution and Promise of Christ for it? Acts II. 38. Repent and be Baptized, everyone of you, in the Name of Jesus Christ, for the Remission of Sins, and ye shall Receive the Gift of the Holy Ghost.

This was not the Extraordinary Gift of Miracles, which is here Promis’d, (and which all Baptized Persons did not Receive or Expect) but the Remission of Sins. And let me add, That the Ordinary Saving Graces of the Spirit, which work silently, without Observation or Show, are much Preferable, and more Desirable, than the Extraordinary Gift of Miracles, which, for a time, were Necessary, at the first Propagation of the Gospel; and held Men’s Eyes in Great Admiration: But were of Dangerous Consequence to the Possessors, and a Temptation often to Vanity; which had almost over-set the Great Apostle, 2 Cor. xii. 7, 8, 9. and threw others into the Pit of Destruction, Matth. vii. 22, 23, 1 Cor. xiii. 2. and therefore were not to be Pray’d for, or Desir’d: We must be totally Passive in this Case; and when sent, being for the Conviction of others, to Receive such an Extraordinary Gift, with Fear and Trembling, left it Hurt our
our weak Minds, not capable, but by as Extraordinary an Assi-
stance of Divine Grace, to Bear such mighty Revelations, and
not to let in with it a secret Pride in our selves; which spreads
our Sails so wide, that without a Proportionable Ballast of deep
Humility, we shall be driven from our Compass. The Enemy
throws in this strong Temptation, with thofe Miraculous Gifts;
which vain Men do Ignorantly Covet, and some falfly Pretend
to, to their own Destruction. But much more Valuable are
those Saving Graces, which we are commanded Daily to Pray
for, and Daily to Endeavour: Much more Available to us, and
Precious in the fight of God, than all Miraculous Gifts, is that
Gift of The Holy Ghost, the Remission of Sins, which is Pro-
mis’d to the Due Reception of Baptism, and enrolls our Names
in Heaven. Behold (said Christ to his Disciples, who Boasted, that even the Devils were subject to
them, through His Name) I give unto you Power
to tread on Serpents and Scorpions, and over all the Power of the
Enemy; and nothing shall, by any means, hurt you; notwithstanding
in this Rejoice not, that the Spirits are Subject unto you; But
rather Rejoice, because your Names are written in Heaven.

To be added to the End of Sect. VIII. p. 34.

But R. Barclay argues in his Apology, That the Baptism, of
which the Ark was a Type, cou’d not be the Outward, or Water-
Baptism, because that it itself is a Type, viz. Of the Inward or
Spiritual Baptism. And he supports this Notion by a Criticism
upon the Word 
\[\text{Avv\text{-}tv\text{-}vov}\] 
in this Text, which he says is not
rightly Translated in our English by The like Figure. Because,
he says, the Word \[\text{Avv\text{-}tv\text{-}v\text{-}v}\] signifies the thing Typify’d, and
not the Type.

But, by his leave, it signifies the quite contrary. \[\text{Heb.ix. 24.}\]
not the thing Typify’d, but only the Type: For there the Holy
Places made with Hands are call’d the \[\text{Avv\text{-}tv\text{-}v}\text{-}v\text{-}v\text{-}v\text{\text{-}v}\], the Figures or
Types of the True. And that Word is not to be found, except
in these two Texts, in the whole New Testament. And there-
fore if one of these Texts must explain the other, the Word Ἀντίτύπος, or Anti-Type, 1 Pet. iii. 21. must be taken in the same Sense, in which it is used, Heb. ix. 24. because there it cannot possibly be taken to mean the thing Typify’d, or the Archi-Type; therefore neither ought it to be so strain’d, as Barclay does, to mean the quite contrary, in the present Text. And our Translation is Justify’d, which renders Ἀντίτύπος the like Figure, as does the Vulgar, Similis forma. For both the Waters of the Ark, and of Baptism, are the outward and visible Signs, but not the thing signify’d, which is the Salvation of the Soul, by the Re-generation and Washing of the Spirit. And they are like Figures, both signifying the same thing, in a manner very like to one another. That as Noah, &c. were sav’d in the Ark by Water from Corporal Death, so are the True Believers sav’d by the Water of Baptism, from the Death of Sin and Hell. In which Sense the Ark was a Type of the outward or Water-Baptism, tho’ both were Types, but one nearer than the other. And because the Baptism mentioned in this Text, 1 Pet. iii. 21. is an Ἀντίτύπος, a Type or Figure; therefore it must be the Outward and Water-Baptism, which is here meant. For the Inward and Spiritual Baptism is not the Type or Figure, but the thing signify’d. And thus Rob. Barclay’s Argument and Criticism has turn’d into a full Demonstration of the direct contrary of that for which he brought it. And has thoroughly Established the Divine Institution of the Outward or Water-Baptism.
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THE

PREFACE.

THIS Discourse was Promis'd in that which I formerly Publish'd, proving the Divine Institution of Water-Baptism; And was intended to have been Annex'd to that, but some Delays prevented it.

I can give no good Reason why it has stay'd thus long, having made but little Addition to what was then done: But other things Interven'd, and, as it is usual in Delays, the first in Design proves the last in Fact.

The Subject of this has led me directly upon the larger Theme of Episcopacy; which having been so Elaborately and so Often treated of, I intend not in this to Branch out into so wide a Field; but in a short compendious Method, to lay before the Quakers, and others of our Dissenters,
The Preface.

ters from Episcopacy, the Heart of the Cause, so far particularly as it concerns our present Subject, the Right of Administering the Sacraments of Christ.

And to avoid the length of Quotations, when brought into the Discourse, and Dilated upon, I have, at the end, Annex'd a small Index of Quotations out of the Primitive Fathers and Councils of the first 450 Years after Christ, to which the Reader may Recur, as ther is occasion. And having them all in one view, may consider them more Intirely, and Remember them the better.

I have Translated them for the sake of the English Reader, but have put the Originals in another Column, to justify the Translation; and for their sakes who may not have the Books at hand.
The CONTENTS.

SEC. I.
The Necessity of an Outward Commission to the Ministers of the Gospel. The Case is Stated, as to those Quakers, for whose satisfaction this is Intended. Page 1
I. Of Personal Qualifications requisite in the Administrators of the Sacraments.
II. Of the Sacerdotal Qualification of an Outward Commission, as was given to Christ by God.
III. By Christ to the Apostles, &c.
IV. By the Apostles to others.
V. Those others Impower'd to give it to others after them.

SEC. II.
The Deduction of this Commission is continu'd in the Succession of Bishops, and not of Presbyters.
I. Either way it operates against the Quakers.
II. The Continuance of every Society is Deduced in the Succession of the Chief Governours of the Society, not of the Inferior Officers.
III. This shewn, in Matter of Fact, as to the Church and the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles times to our Days; particularly here in England.
IV. The Presbyterian Plea consider'd, that Bishops were but single Parishes; and consequently, that every Presbyter was a Bishop; and their vain Logo-machy upon the words ἐντόνοσ and προσεχετ. a.
V. Argu'd from the Type of the Levitical Priesthood, which shewn to be the Method of Christ, the Apostles, and Primitive Fathers.

VI. When
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VI. Whence the Case of Korah and the Presbyterians shown to be the same. And the Episcopal Supremacy as Plainly and Fully Established, as was that of Aaron and his Successors.

VII. No Succession of Presbyters can be shown from the Apostles.

VIII. The Pretence of Extraordinary Gifts, no Ground or Excuse for making of a Schism.

S E C T. III.

Objection from the Times of Popery in this Kingdom, as if that did Un-church, and consequently break the Succession of our Bishops.

I. This shewn to be a Popish Argument.

II. That Idolatry does not Un-church. Prov'd

1. Because a Christian may be an Idolater.

2. From the Type of the Church under the Law.

III. Episcopacy the most opposite to Popery.

IV. Male-Administration does not Forfeit, but not Vacate a Commission, till it be Recalled.

V. Defects in Succession, no Bar to the Possessors, where there are none who claim a Better Right.

S E C T. IV.

The Assurance and Consent in the Episcopal Communion, beyond that of any other.

I. The Episcopal Communion of much greater Extent, and more Universal than all those who oppose it.

II. And than the Church of Rome, if joined with them.

III. The Dissenters from Episcopacy, all Deny the Ordination or Call of each other.

IV. If
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IV. If the Quakers receive Baptism from any of these Dif- 
fencers, they have no Reason to expect the same Allowan-
ces as may be given to those of their own Communions.
V. The Episcopal Ordinations, and consequently their Right to 
Baptize, is own'd by both Papists and Prerbyterians.

S E C T. V.

The Personal Sanctity of the Administrator of the Sacra-
ments, tho' highly Requisit on his Part, yet not of Ne-
cessity, as to the Receivers, to convey to them the Be-
nefits of the Sacraments: Because

I. The Vertue comes not from the Minister, but from God 
alone.
II. For this Cause (among others) Christ chose Judas to be an 
Apostle.
III. God's Power is Magnify'd in the Meaness of His Instru-
ments.
IV. St. Paul Rejoyc'd at the Preaching of Evil Men.
V. This confirm'd by dayly Experience.
VI. The Argument stronger as to the Sacraments.
VII. The Fatal Consequences of making the Personal Holiness 
of the Administrator Necessary towards the Efficacy of 
the Sacraments.

1. It takes away all Assurance in our Receiving of the Sa-
craments.
2. It renders the Commands of Christ, of none Effect.
3. It is contrary to the tenure of God's former Institutions;
   and puts us in a more uncertain Condition than they 
   were under the Law.
4. It was the Ancient Error of the Donatists; and Borders 
   upon Popery.
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VIII. As great Sanctity to be found in the Clergy of the Church of England, as among any of our Dissenters. 32
IX. There is, at least, a Doubt, in Receiving Baptism from any of our Dissenters. Which, in this case, is a Sin: Therefore security is only to be had in the Episcopal Communion.
X. The Advantage of the Church of England, by Her being the Established Constitution, ever since the Reformation.
XI. That therefore nothing can excuse Schism from Her, but Her Enjoying something, as a Condition of Communion, that is contrary to the Holy Scriptures: which cannot be shewn.
XII. Therefore to Receive Baptism from the Church of England, is the greatest security which the Quakers can have of Receiving it from Proper Hands.
XIII. An Answer to the Objection, That Baptism has not such Visible Effects amongst us, as the Quakers would desire.

The Supplement.

I. Some Authorities for Episcopacy, as Distinct from, and Superior to Presbytery, taken out of the Fathers and Councils in the first 450 Years after Christ.
II. That the whole Reformation; even Calvin, Beza, and those of their Communion, were zealous Asserters of Episcopacy.
A DISCOURSE

Shewing, who they are that are now qualify'd to Administer BAPTISM, and the LORD's SUPPER.

S E C T. I.

The Necessity of an Outward Commission to the Ministers of the Gospel.

Some Quakers having perus'd my Discourse of Baptism, think the Quaker Arguments against it sufficiently Answered: And they have but one Difficulty remaining, that is, who they are (among the various Pretenders) that are duly Qualify'd to Administer it.

And if satisfaction can be given to them herein, they promise a perfect Compliance to that Holy Institution.

The Chief thing they seem to stand upon is the Personal Holiness of the Administrator, thinking that the Spiritual Effects of Baptism cannot be convey'd by the means of an Unsanitis'd Instrument.

But yet they Confess, that there is something else Necessary, besides the Personal Holiness of the Administrator: Otherwise, they would think themselves as much Qualify'd to Administer it as any others; because, I presume, they suppose themselves to have as great a Measure of the Spirit as other Men.

This Requisite which they want, is that of Lawful Ordination.

But the Presbyterians, Independents, and Baptists do pretend to this. Therefore their Title to it is to be Examined.
And, that we may proceed the more clearly in this Matter, with Respect still to that Difficulty upon which the Quakers lay the Stress; we will Inquire concerning those Qualifications which are Requisite in any Person that shall take upon him to Administer the Sacraments of Christ's Institution. And,

These Qualifications are of two sorts, Personal or Sacerdotal.

I. Personal. The Holiness of the Administrator. And, though this is a great Qualification to Fit and Prepare a Man for such an Holy Administration, yet this Alone does not sufficiently Qualifie any Man to take upon him such an Admi-

II. But there is moreover required, 2ly. A Sacerdotal Qualification, that is, an Outward Commission, to Authorize a Man to execute any Sacerdotal or Ministerial Act of Religion. For, This Honour no Man taketh unto himself, but he that is cal-

led of God, as was Aaron; so also Christ glorify'd not himself to be made an High-Priest. But he that said unto him, Thou art my Son.—This art a Priest, &c.

Accordingly we find that Christ did not take upon Him the Office of a Preacher, till after that Outward Commission given to Him by a Voice from Heaven, at His Baptism; for it is written, Mat. iv. 17. From that time Jesus began to Preach. Then He Began; and He was then about Thirty Years of Age, Luke iii. 23. Now no Man can doubt of Christ's Qualifications, before that time, as to Holiness, Sufficiency, and all Personal Endowments. And if all these were not sufficient to Christ Himself, without an Outward Commission, what other Man can pretend to it upon the Account of any Personal Excellencies in Himself, without an outward Commission?

III. And as Christ was outwardly Commissionated by His Father, so did not He leave it to His Disciples, every one's Opinion of his own sufficiency, to thrust himself into the Vine-

yard, but Chose Twelve Apostles by Name; and after them, Seventy others of an Inferior Order, whom He sent to Preach.

IV. And as Christ gave outward Commissions, while He was upon the Earth, so we find that His Apostles did Proceed in the same Method, after His Ascension. They ordained them Elders in every Church.

V. But had they, who were thus Ordained by the Apostles, Power
Power to Ordain others? Yes, For this cause left I thee in Crete, that thou shouldst — Ordain Elders in every City. Lay hands suddenly on no Man, &c. St. Clement, in his first Epistle to the Corinthians, writing concerning the Schism which was then rife up amongst them, says, Parag. 44. That the Apostles, fore-knowing there would be Contests concerning the Episcopal Name (or Office) did themselves appoint the Persons: And not only so, lest that might be laid to be of force, only during their time. But that they afterwards established an Order how, when those whom they had Ordained should die, others fit and approved Men, should succeed them in their Ministry. Par. 43. that they who were intrusted with this work, by God, in Christ, did constitute these Officers.

But this Matter depends not upon the Testimony of him, or many more that might be produced. It is such a Publick Matter, of Fact; That I might as well go about to quote particular Authors, to prove that there were Emperors in Rome, as that the Ministers of the Church of Christ were Ordained to succeed one another; and that they did so succeed.

S E C T. II.

The Deduction of this Commission is continu'd in the Succession of Bishops and not of Presbyters.

But here is a Dispute, whether this Succession was preserved in the Order of Bishops, or Presbyters &; or whether both are not the same?

I. Answ. 1. This is the Contest between the Presbyterians and us: But either way it operates against the Quakers, who allow of no Succession deriv'd by outward Ordination.
II. Ans. 2. But because the Design of this Discourse is to shew the Succession from the Apostles, I answer that this Succession is preserv'd and deriv'd only in the Bishops: As the continuance of any Society, is deduc'd in the Succession of the Chief Governors of the Society, not of the Inferior Officers. Thus in Kingdoms, we reckon by the Succession of the Kings, not of Sheriffs or Constables; and in Corporations by the Succession of the Mayors or other Chief Officers; not of the Inferior Bailiffs or Serjeants: So the Succession of the Churches is Computed in the Succession of the Bishops, who are the Chief Governors of the Churches, and not of Presbyters, who are but Inferior Officers under the Bishops.

III. And, in this, the Matter of Fact is as Clear and Evident as the Succession of any Kings or Corporations in the World.

To begin with the Apostles, we find not only that they Constituted Timothy Bishop of Ephesus, and Titus of Crete, as in the Subscriptions of St. Paul's Epistles to them: But, in Eusebius and other Ecclesiastical Historians, you have the Bishops Nam'd who were Constituted by the Apostles themselves, over the then famous Churches of Jerusalem, Antioch, Rome, and Alexandria, and many other Churches; and the Succession of them down all along.

St. Polycarp, Bishop of Smyrna, was Disciple to St. John the Apostle; and St. Irenæus, who was Disciple to St. Polycarp, was Constituted Bishop of Lyons in France.

I mention this, because it is so near us; for, in all other Churches, throughout the whole World, where-ever Christianity was Plant'd, Episcopacy was every where Establish'd, without one Exception, as is Evident from all their Records.

And so it was with us in England, whither it is generally suppos'd, and with very good Grounds, that St. Paul first brought the Christian Faith. Clemens Romanus, in his First Epistle to the Corinthians, Paragr. 5: Says, that St. Paul went Preaching the Gospel to the farthest bounds of the West, Ἱππα τῆς ἔθνους τῶν ἔθνων, by which Term Britain was then Understood. And Theodoret expressly Names the Britains among the Nations Converted by the Apostles. (To. 4. Term. 9. p. 610.) And Eusebius in his Evangelical Demonstration, (l. 3. c. 7. p. 113.) Names likewise the Britains, as then Converted.
But whether St. Paul, or, as some Conjecture, Joseph of Arimathea, or any other Apostolical Person was the first who Preached Christ in England, it matters not, as to our Present Purpose; who Enquire only concerning Episcopacy; And it is Certain by all our Histories, that as far up as they give us any Account of Christianity in this Island, they tell us likewise of Bishops; and the Succession of this Church of England has been Deduced in the Succession of Bishops, and not of Presbyters. And particularly in the Diocess of London, which was the first Archi-Episcopal See, before Augustin the Monk came hither, after which it was Establish’d in Canterbury. And the Saxon Writers have Transmitted the Succession of their Bishops in Canterbury, Rochester, London, &c.

And in Countries so Remote and Barbarous as Island itself, we find the same care taken; Ara or Aras an Islandish Priest, Surnamed Himfræde the Learned, who flourisht in the Eleventh Century, and was 25 Years Old when Christianity was brought thither; in his Book of that Country written in Islandish, has Transmitted to Posterity, not only the Succession but the Genealogies of the Bishops of Skalholt and Hola (the two Episcopal Sees of Island) as they Succeeded one another in his Time. I mention this of Island, to shew that Episcopacy has Extended itself Equally with Christianity, which was carry’d by it, into the Remote Corners of the Earth; upon which account the Bishops of Skalholt and Hola, and their Succession, are as Remarkable Proofs of Episcopacy, tho’ not so Famous as the Bishops of Canterbury and London.

IV. If the Presbyterians will say (because they have nothing left to lay) that all London (for Example) was but one Parish; and that the Presbyter of every other Parish was as much a Bishop as the Bishop of London; because the words Επίσκοπος and Πρεσβύτερος Bishop and Presbyter are sometimes us’d in the same Sense; They may as well prove that Christ was but a Deacon, because He is so call’d, Rom. xv. 8. Δικαιούμενος, which we rightly Translate a Minister: And Bishop signifies an Overseer, and Presbyter an Ancient Man; or Elder Man; whence our Term of Aldermen. And this is as good a Foundation to Prove that the Apostles were Aldermen, in the City acceptance of the Word; or that our Aldermen are all Bishops and Apostles, as to Prove that Presbyter is
lyters and Bishops are all one, from the Childish Gingle of the Words.

It would be the same thing, if one should undertake to Confront all Antiquity, and Prove against all the Histories, that the Emperors of Rome were no more than Generals of Armies, and that every Roman General was Emperor of Rome; because he could find the word Imperator sometimes apply’d to the General of an Army.

Or as if a Common-wealth-man should get up, and say, that our former Kings were no more than our Dukes are now; because the Style of Grace, which is now given to Dukes, was then given to Kings.

And suppose any one were put under the Pennance of Answering to such Ridiculous Arguments; what Method would he take, but to shew that the Emperors of Rome, and former Kings of England, had Generals of Armies and Dukes under them, and Exercis’d Authority over them?

Therefore when we find it given in Charge to Timothy, the first Bishop of Ephesus, how he was to Proceed against his Presbyters, when they Transgressed; to Sit in Judgment upon them, Examine Witnesses against them, and pass Censures upon them, it is a most Impertinent Logomachy to argue from the Etymology of the Words, that notwithstanding all this, a Bishop and a Presbyter are the same thing. Therefore that one Text, 1 Tim. v. 19, is sufficient to silence this Pitiful Clamour of the Presbyterian; our English reads it, against an Elder, which is the Literal Translation of the word Presbyter, κατὰ πρεσβυτην, against a Presbyter receive not an Accusation, but before two or three Witnesses, and them that sin: Rebuke before all, that others also may fear. Now, upon the Presbyterian Hypothesis, we must say that Timothy had no Authority or Jurisdiction over that Presbyter, against whom he had Power to Receive Accusations, Examine Witnesses, and pass Censures upon him: And that such a Presbyter had the same Authority over Timothy—which is to Extravagant and against Common Sense, that I will not stay longer to Confute it; and think this enough to have said concerning the Presbyterian Argument from the Etymology of the words Bishop and Presbyter.
And this likewise Confutes their other Pretence, which I have mention'd, that the Ancient Bishops were only Single and Independent Congregations, or Parishes. This is a Topick they have taken up but of late (being Beaten from all their other Holds) and Launched by Mr. David Clarkson, in a Book which he Entitles Primitive Episcopacy; which has given occasion to an Excellent Answer, by Dr. Hen. Maurice, call'd A Defence of Diocesan Episcopacy, Printed 1691. which, I suppose, has ended that Controversie, and hindered the World from being more troubl'd upon that Head. And their other little Shift, and as Groundless, that the Primitive Bishops were no other than their Moderators, advanced more lately by Gilb. Rule late Moderator of the General Assembly in Scotland, has been as Learnedly, and with great Clearness of Reason, Confuted by the Worthy J. S. in his Principles of the Cyprianick Age, Printed 1695.

But, as I said, that Text, 1 Tim. v. 19. has made all these Pretences wholly useless to the Presbyterians: For supposing their most Notorious false Supposition, as if the Bishops of Jerusalem, Rome, Alexandria, or London, consisted but of one single Congregation, and that such Bishops had no Presbyters under them, but that all Presbyters were equally Bishops; I say, supposing this, then it must follow from what we Read of Timothy, that one Bishop or Presbyter had Jurisdiction over other Bishops or Presbyters, which will Destroy the Presbyterian Claim of Parity, as much as their Confession to the Truth, and plain Matter of Fact, that Bishops had Presbyters under their Jurisdiction; and that they were Distinct Orders: Notwithstanding that a Bishop may be call'd Διακόνος a Deacon, or Μητερίστης a Minister of Christ; and likewise πρεσβύτης, an Elder or Grave Man, which is a Term of Magistracy and Dignity, and not ty'd to Age. And a Presbyter may likewise, in a found Sense, be call'd a Bishop, that is, an Overseer or Shepherd, which he truly is over his Particular Flock; without denying at all his Dependance upon his Bishop and Overseer:

V. As under the Term of Priest, the High-Priest was Included, withoutDestroying his Supremacy, over the other Priests. Against which Korah and his Presbyters, or Inferiour Priests, arose. And if the Presbyterians will take his word, whom, of all the Fathers, they most Admire, and Quote often on their Side, that is, St. Jerome, he will tell them, in that very Epistle
pistle (ad Evagr.) which they Boast favours them so much, That what Aaron, and his Sons, and the Levites were in the Temple, that same are Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon in the Church.

And long before him, Clemens Romanus in his 1 Epif. to the Corinthians, makes frequent Allusion to the Episcopacy of the Levitical Priesthood, and argues from thence to that of the Christian Church. Thus Paragraph 40. To the High-Priest (lays he) were allotted his proper Offices; to the Priests, their proper place was assigned; and to the Levites their services were appointed; and the Lay-men were restrain'd within the precepts to Lay-men. And Paragraph 42. he applies that Scripture, Ha. LX. 17. to the Officers of the Christian Church, and renders it thus; I will constitute their Bishops in Righteousness, and their Deacons in Faith. The Greek Translation of the LXX has it thus. I will give thee Rulers (or Princes) δοσον τοις ἀρχιερετισιν τοις ἐφίλες, and thy Bishops in Righteousness.

It was the frequent Method of these Primitive Fathers to Reason thus from the Parallel twixt the Law and the Gospel, the one being an Exact Type of the other, and therefore being fulfill'd in the other. And in this they follow'd the Example of Christ, and the Apostles, who argu'd in the same manner, as you may see Matth. v. 1 Cor. x. the whole Epistle to the Hebrews, and many other Places of the New Testament.

VI. Now the Presbyterians are desir'd to shew any one Disparity betwixt their Case and that of Korah; who was a Priest of the second Order, that is, a Presbyter; and withdrew his Obedience from the High-Priest with other Mutinous Levites: For, ther was no matter of Doctrine or Worship betwixt them and Aaron; nor any other Dispute but that of Church-Government. And, by the Parallel betwixt the Old Testament and the New, Korah was a Presbyterian, who Rose up against the Episcopacy of Aaron. But this Case is brought yet nearer home; for, we are told (Jude xi.) of those under the Gospel, who perish in the gain-saying of Korah: And in the Epist of Clem. Rom. to the Corinthians, before Quoted, Paragraph 43. He plainly applys this Case of Korah, to the State of the Christian Church; shewing at large, that as Moses, by the Com-
Command of God, Determin'd the Pretensions of the Twelve Tribes to the Glory of the Priesthood, by the Miraculous Budding of Aaron's Rod, which was after the Schism and Punishment of Korah and his Company. So likewise, he says, the Apostles foreknowing, by Christ, that Dissentions wou'd arise also in the Christian Church, by various Pretenders to the Evangelical Priesthood, did Settle and Establish, not only the Persons themselves; But gave Rules and Orders for continuing the Succession after their Deaths, as I have before Quoted his Words. So that it is plain from hence, That the Evangelical Priesthood, is as Positively, and Certainly Established, and Determin'd, in the Succession of Ecclesiastical Ordination, as the Levitical was, in the Succession of Aaron. And consequently, that the Rebellion of Presbyters from under the Government of their Bishops, is the same Case as the Rebellion (for so it is call'd, Numb. xvii. 10.) of Korah and his Levites, against Aaron; who had as good a Pretence against him from the word Levite, which was Common to the whole Tribe; as the Presbyterians have against Bishops, from the Name Bishop and Presbyter, being us'd sometimes promiscuously, and apply'd to the Clergy in General; which is a Term that Includes all the Orders of the Church, as Levite did among the Jews.

VII. But, to leave the fruitless Contest about words, let this Matter be Determin'd, as other Matters of Fact are.

If I pretend to succeed any Man in an Honour or Estate, I must name him who had such an Estate or Honour before me; and the Man who had it before him; and who had it before him; and so up all the way to him who first had it; and from whom all the rest do derive; and how it was lawfully deduc'd from one to another.

This the Bishops have done, as I have shewn; and can name all the way backward, as far as History goes, from the Present Bishop of London, (for example) to the first Plantation of Christianity in this Kingdom: So, from the present Bishop of Lyons up to Irenæus the Disciple of St.Polycarp, as before is told. The Records are yet more certain in the Great Bishopricks of Rome, Antioch, Alexandria, and others, while they lasted in the World. And tho' the Records may not be Extant of every small Bishoprick, which was less taken notice of; as the Names of many Kings are lost, in obscure Nations; of many Mayors or Sheriffs, who, notwithstanding have as certainly
tainly Succeeded one another, as where the Records are Preserv'd. I say, tho' every Bishop in the World cannot tell the Names of all his Predecessors up to the Apostles, yet their Succession is cer-
tain: And in most Christian Nations there are Bishops who can do it; which is a sufficient Proof for the rest, all standing upon the same Bottom, and being Deriv'd in the same Man-
ner.

Now, to Ballance this, it is Desir'd, that the Presbyterians wou'd shew the Succession of any one Presbyter in the World, who was not likewise a Bishop, in our acceptation of the Word, in the like manner, from the Apostles.

Till when, their small Criticisms upon the Etymology of the Words, Bishop or Presbyter, is as poor a Plea, as if I shou'd pre-
tend to be Heir to an Estate, from the likeness of my Name to somebody who once had it.

And here I cannot choose but apply the Complaint of our Saviour, John v. 43. If any come, in the Name of Christ, that is, by a Commission from Him, deriv'd down all the way, by Regular Ordination, him ye will not Receive: Nay, tho' he be o-
therwise a Man without Exception, either as to his Life and Con-
versation, or as to his Gifts and Sufficiency for the Ministry; you make this his Commission an Objection against him: For that Rea-
son alone, you will not accept him. But, if another come in his own Name, that is, with no Commission, but what he has from himself; his own Opinion of his own worthiness; giving out that himself is some Great One, (Act. viii. 9.) him ye will Receive, and Follow and Admire him; Heaping to your selves Teachers, having Itching Ears, as it was Prophecy'd of these most degenerate Times, 2 Tim. iv. 3.

But as to those well-dispos'd Quakers, for whose Information Chiefly I have write this Discourse, I must suppose that their Inquiry is wholly concerning the several Titles of Bishops, Pres-
byterians, Independents, &c. to the true Succession from the Apo-
files: That it may thereby be known, to which of all these they ought to go for Baptism.

This I have shewn, in behalf of Episcopacy, and put the Presby-
terians to prove their Succession, in the Form of Presbytery, which they can never do: Because, as I have said before, the Chrono-
logy of the Church does not Compute from the Succession of the Presbyters,
Presbyters, but only of the Bishops, as being the Chief Governors of the Church. And therefore, tho' in many Bishopricks, the Roll of their Bishops is preserv'd from the Apostles to this Day; yet there is not one bare Presbyter, that is, the Minister of a Parish, and no more, no not in all the World, who can give a Roll of his Predecessors, in that Parish, half way to the Apostles, or near it: For, from the first Plantation of Christianity, the Church was Divided into Bishopricks; this was necessary for the Government of the Church: But it was not so early Sub-divided into Parishes. The Presbyters, at first, attending upon the Bishop, were sent out by him, to such Places, and for such Time as he thought fit; and Returning, gave Account of their Stewardships, or were Visited, and Changed by him, as he saw Cause: And therefore, tho' one might come after another, in the Place where he had Ministered before; yet they could not Properly be said to Succeed one another; as (to speak Intelligibly to the Quakers) many of them do Preach after G. Fox, yet none of them are said to Succeed him.

I have been thus long upon the Presbyterians, because they only, of all our Dissenters, have any Pretence to Succession. And what I have said, as to them, must Operate more strongly against the later Independent, Baptist, &c. who have not the Face to Pretend to Succession, but set up merely upon their own pretended Gifts.

VIII. But what are these Gifts, which they so Highly Boast? 1. An Inward, and more than Ordinary Participation of the Graces of the Holy Spirit.

2. A Fluency and Powerfulness in Preaching and Praying.

I know of no other Gifts that any of our Dissenters pretend to; unless they will set up for Miracles, as G. Fox, &c. And other Dissenters did likewise pretend to the same, at their first setting out, to amuse the People; but (as the Quakers) have let it drop afterwards, to stop any further Examination of it; having already serv'd their Turn by it.

But, as to these pretended Gifts, if we may trust to our Saviour's Rule, of knowing the Tree by its Fruits, we cannot think it the Holy Spirit of which these Men did partake, who fill'd these three Nations with Blood and Slaughter; and whose Religion was never otherwise Introduced, than by Rebellion, in any Country whither-soever it has yet come.
And as to that Volubility of Tongue, which they Boast, as the main Proof of their Missi.m, we have found it by Experience, that a little Confidence and Custom, will Improve very slender Judgments, to great Readiness in that sort of Talent.

And the Powerfulness which is found in it by some, who are affected with a Dismal Tone, Wray Faces, and Antick Gestures, is not more but less, if there be either Method or Sense in the Discourse: Which shews their Passion to proceed not from Reason, but Imagination.

The Scots Presbyterian-Elocuence affords us Monstrous Proofs of this; but not so many, as you may have from Eye and Ear-witnesses.

Such Course, Rude, and Naive Treatment of God, as they call Devotion; as in it self, it is the highest Affront to The Divine Majesty, so has it Contributed, in a very great Measure, to that wild Atheism, which has always attended these sort of Inspirations: It seeming to many, more Reasonable to Worship no God at all, than to set up one, on purpose to Ridicule Him.

But this sort of Enthusiasm presumes upon a Familiarity with God, which breeds Contempt, and Despises the Sobriety of Religion, as a low Dispensation. I Recommend to the Reader that Excellent Sermon, upon this Subject, of Dr. Hicks, call'd The Spirit of Enthusiasm Exorcis'd. And I desire those to consider, who are most taken with these seeming Extraordinary Gifts of Volubility and Nimbleness in Prayer, that the most Wicked Men are capable of this Perfection; none more than Oliver Cromwell; especially when he was about some Nefarious Wickedness: He continu'd most fluently in this Exercise, all the time that his Cut-throats were Murthering of his Royal Master. And his Gift of Prayer was greatly Admir'd. Major Weir of Edinborough, was another great Instance, who was strangely Ador'd for his Gifts, especially of Prayer, by the Presbyterians in Scotland; while, at the same time, he was wallowing in the most Unnatural and Monstrous Sins. See his Stupendous Story in Ravillac Redivivus.

There are many Examples of this Nature, which shew that this Gift is attainable by Art. Dr. Wilkins (the Father of the Latitudinarians) has given us the Receipt, in his Gift of Prayer.

Yet none of the Performances of these Gifted-men are any ways Comparable (as to the wonderful Readiness in which they Boast)
to the Extempore Verses of Westminster School, which Isaac Vossius cou'd not believe to be Extempore, till he gave the Boys a Theme, which was *fenes bis Pueri*, and he had no sooner spoke the Words, but he was immediately Pelted with Ingenious Epigrams from four or five Boys.

So that this Volubility in Prayer, which is the Gift our Dissenters do most Glory in, may be deduc'd from an Original far short of Divine Inspiration.

But suppose that they had really those wonderful Gifts which they pretend to, yet were this no ground at all to Countenance or Warrant their making a Schism, upon that Account.

This Case has been Rul'd in a Famous and most Remarkable Instance of it, which God was pleas'd to permit, (for the future Instruction of His Church) at the first setting out of the Gospel, in the very Days of the Apostles.

Then it was that Christ, having *Asceden up on High*, gave many and miraculous Gifts unto Men; which was necessary towards the first Propagation of His Gospel, in Opposition to all the Established Religions and Governments then in the World, and under their Persecution.

But these Gifts of Miracles did not always secure the Possessors from Vanity, and an high Opinion of themselves, to the disparagement of others; and even to break the Order and Peace of the Church, by advancing themselves above their Superiors; or thinking none Superior to themselves.

The Great Apostle of the Gentiles was not free'd from the Temptation of this; whom the Messenger of Satan was sent to buffet, lest he should be Exalted above measure, thro' the Abundance of the Revelations which were given to him, 2 Cor. xii. 7. Nay more, our Blessed Saviour tells of those who had miraculous Gifts bestow'd upon them, and yet should be finally *Rejected*, Mat. vii. 22, 23. Therefore He Instructs His Disciples not to Rejoice in those miraculous Gifts which he bestow'd upon them, but rather that their Names were written in Heaven, Luke x. 20. which supposeth, that they might have such Gifts, and yet their Names not be written in Heaven.

And when He taught them how to Pray, He added no Petition for such Gifts, but only for the Remission of their Sins, and the Sanctifying Graces of the Holy Spirit; which are, as most Profitable to Us, so most Precious in the sight of God.

Now
Now some who had these Miraculous Gifts made ill use of them, and occasion'd a great Schism (the first in the Christian Church) at Corinth. They were Exalted above Measure, in their own Gifts; and therefore Refus'd to submit themselves to those who were their Superiors in the Church (who, perhaps, had not such Gifts as they had) but set up for themselves, and drew Parties after them, who were Charm'd with their Extraordinary Gifts; thinking that the Participation of the saving Grace of the Holy Spirit must there Chiefly be Communicated, where God had bestow'd such wonderful Gifts. And they laid more stress upon the Personal Qualifications of these Ministers of God, than upon the observance of that Order and Constitution which He had Commanded; which was, in Effect, preferring Men to God, and trusting to the Instruments rather than to the Author of their Religion; as if thro' the Power and Holiness of the Administrators of God's Institutions, and not from Him alone, the Graces which were Promis'd to the due Observance of them, were convey'd. Act. iii. 12.

And this, as it turn'd Men from God, to Trust in Man, so, as a necessary Consequence of it, it begot great Emulations among the People for one Teacher against another, even (sometimes) when it was not the Fault of the Teachers. For People being once let loose from Government and Order, to follow the Imaginations of their own Brain, will run farther than their first Seducers did Intend, and will Carve for themselves.

Thus, in the Schism of the Church at Corinth, one was for Paul, another for Apollos, another for Cephas, &c. much against the Minds of these good Apostles; but having been once unsettled by the Pride and Ambition of Seducers, they Heaped to themselves Teachers, having itchy Ears; and made Divisions among themselves, Pretendingly in behalf of Christ and His Apostles, but in Effect, tending to Divide Christ and His Apostles, as all Schisms do.

Against these St. Paul Disputes with wonderful force of Reason and Eloquence; particularly in the xii Chap. of his first Epistle to these same Corinthians; wherein, from the Parallel of the Unity of Members in the same Body, he admirably Illustrates, That the many Different and Miraculous Gifts which were then Dispensed all from the same Spirit, cou'd be no more an Argument for any to Advance himself beyond his own Station in the Church, than for one Member of the Body, tho' an Eye or a Hand, the most Useful or Beautiful, to
to Glory it self against the inferior Members (who are all Actuated by the same Soul) or not to be Content with its Office and Station in the Body, and due Subordination to the Head. Thence the Apostle goes on, and makes the Application in the xiiiith. Chap. That the most Exalted Spiritual or even Miraculous Gifts cou'd not only not Excuse any Schism to be made in the Body, that is, the Church; But that if any who had such Gifts, did not employ them for the Preservation of the Unity of the Church, which is very properly Express'd by Charity, i.e. Love for the whole Body, such Gifts would Profit him Nothing, loose all their Virtue and Efficacy, as to the Possessor, and be rather an Aggravation against him, than any Excuse for him, to withdraw his Obedience from his lawful Superiors, and Usurp the Office of the Head; and to make a Schism in the Body upon the account of his Gifts; which tho' they were as great as to speak with the Tongues of Men and Angels; to understand all Mysteries, and all Knowledge; to have all Faith, even to Remove Mountains; and such a Zeal as to give all his Goods to the Poor, and his very Body to be Burned, yet, if it be done in Schism, out of that Love and Charity which is due to the Body, and to its Unity, all is Nothing, will profit him nothing at all.

And no wonder, when all that Heavenly Glory in which Lucifer was Created, cou'd avail him nothing, when he kept not his first Principality, but Aspir'd Higher, and made a Schism in the Hierarchy of Heaven.

How then shall they who have (as St. Jude expresses it) left their own Habitation, or Station in the Church, and advance'd themselves above their Bishops, their lawful Superiors, the Heads and Principles of Unity, next and immediately under Christ, in their Respective Churches, upon pretence of their own Personal Gifts and Qualifications, and thereby make a Schism in the Terrestrial Hierarchy of the Church, which is the Body of Christ, the Fulness of him who Filleth all in all: How shall they be Excus'd for this, whose pretended Gifts are in nothing Extraordinary, except in a Furious Zeal without Knowledge, and a Volubility of Tongue, which proceeds from a Habit of Speaking without Thinking; and an Assurance that is never out of Countenance for Ten Thousand Blunders, which wou'd Dash and Confound any Man of Sense or Modesty, or that consider'd the Presence of God, in which he spoke?
If those truly Miraculous Gifts, which were made a Pretence for the Schism at Corinth, were not sufficient to justify that Schism: How Ridiculous and much more wicked is the Pretence of our Modern Gifted-men, who have pleaded their Delicate Gifts as a sufficient Ground for all that Schism and Rebellion which they have Rais'd up amongst us? 

If the real Gifts and Inspirations of the Holy Spirit were Stinted and Limited by the Governors of the Church, to avoid Schism and Confusion in the Church: If the Prophets were Confin'd as to their Number, to Two, or at the most Three at a time, some ordered to hold their Peace, to give place to others; others to keep silence for want of an Interpreter; and the women (tho' Gifted or Inspir'd as many then were) totally silenc'd in the Church, or Publick Assemblies: What Spirit has Possess'd our Modern Pretenders to Gifts, that will not be subject to the Prophets, nor to the Church, nor to any Institutions whether Divine or Humane! But if their Superiors pretend to Direct them in anything, they cry out, what! will you stint the Spirit! And think this a sufficient Cause to break quite loose from their Authority, and set up an open Schism against them, upon Pretence of their wonderful Gifts forsooth!

That first Schism in the Church of these Corinthians was vigorously oppos'd by the Apostles and Bishops of the Church, at that time. They, like good watch-men, would not give way to it, knowing the fatal Consequences of it.

This produc'd Two Epistles from St. Paul to the Corinthians, and Two to them from St. Clement, then Bishop of Rome, which are prefer'd, and handed down to us. It was this same occasion of Schism, which so early began to Corrupt the Church, that led the Holy Ignatius (who flourish'd in that same Age) to press so Earnestly in all his Epistles to the several Churches to whom he wrote, the Indispensable obligation of a strict Obedience to their Respective Bishops. That the Laity should submit themselves to the Presbyters and Deacons, as to the Apostolical College under Christ: and that the Presbyters and Deacons, as well as the Laity, should Obey their Bishop, as Christ Himself; whose Person he did Represent: That therefore whoever kept not Outward Communion with his Bishop, did forfeit his Inward Communion with Christ: That no Sacraments were Valid, or Acceptable to God, which were not celebrated
brated in Communion with the Bishop. That nothing in the Church should be done, nor any Marriage Contracted without the Bishop's Consent, &c. As you will see hereafter.

These clear Testimonies for'd the Presbyterians (because they were not in a Temper to be Convinc'd) to deny these Epistles of St. Ignatius to be Genuine. But they have been so fully Vindicated, particularly by the most Learned Bishop of Chester, Dr. Pearson, as to silence that Cavil, and leave no Pretence remaining against Episcopacy in that Primitive and Apostolical Age.

SECT. III.

Objection from the Times of Popery in this Kingdom; as if that did Un-Church, and consequently break the Succession of our Bishops.

I must now Account for an Objection, which with some, seems a mighty one, even enough to overthrow all that I have said concerning the Succession of our Bishops: And that is, the long Mid-night of Popery, which has, in old Time, Darken'd these Nations.

Well. The Succession, of which I have been speaking, was no Part of that Darkness; and we have, by God's Blessing, recover'd our selves, in a great Measure, from that Darkness. But that Darkness was such, as, with some, to Destroy the Episcopal Succession; because, as they say, such great Errors, especially that of Idolatry, does quite Un-church a People; and consequently must break their Succession.

I. This, by the way, is a Popish Argument, tho' they that now make it, are not aware of it. For the Church of Rome argues thus, That Idolatry does Un-church; and therefore, if she was Idolatrous, for so long a time as we charge upon her, it will follow that, for so many Ages, there was no Visible Church, at least, in these Western Parts of the World. And Arianism (which is Idolatry) having broke in several Times upon the Church; if Idolatry did quite Un-church, and Break the Succession, then wou'd not be a Christian Church hardly left in the World. The Consequence
of which would be as fatal to the Church of Rome, as to us: Therefore let her look to that Position, which she has advanced against us; that Idolatry does not Church.

II. But that it does not Church, I have this to offer against those Papists, Quakers, and Others who make the Objection.

1. If it does quite Church, then could no Christian be an Idolater; because, by that, he would, ipso facto, cease to be a Member of the Christian Church: But the Scripture does suppose that a Christian may be an Idolater: Therefore Idolatry does not Church. The Minor is prov'd, 1 Cor. v. 11. If any Man that is called a Brother (that is, a Christian) be a Fornicator, or Covetous, or an Idolater—Nay, Eph. v. 5. a covetous Man is call'd an Idolater; and Col. iii. 5. Covetousness is Idolatry. So that, by this Argument, Covetousness does Church. If it be said, that Covetousness is call'd Idolatry, only by Allusion, but that it is not Formal Idolatry: I know no Ground for that Distinction. The Scripture calls it Idolatry, and makes no Distinction. But,

2dly, In the first Text quoted, 1 Cor. v. 11. both Covetousness and Idolatry are Nam'd; so that, you have both Material and Formal, or what other sort of Idolatry you please to fancy.

I grant, that, in one sense, Idolatry does Church; that is, while we continue in it, it renders us Obnoxious to the wrath of God; and forfeits our Title to the Promises which are made to the Church in the Gospel: But, so does Fornication, Covetousness, and every other Sin, till we Repent, and Return from it. But none of these Sins do so Church us, as to Exclude our Returning to the Fold, by sincere Repentance; or to need a second Baptism, or Admission into the Church: Neither does Idolatry. Do I then put Idolatry upon the level with other common Sins? No, far from it. Every Scab is not a Leprose; yet a Leper is a Man, and may Recover his Health. Idolatry is a fearful Leprose; but it does not therefore quite Church, nor throw us out of the Covenant. For, if it did, then would not Repentance heal it; because Repentance is a great Part of the Covenant. And therefore, since none deny Repentance to an Idolater; it follows that he is not yet quite out of the Covenant. Some of the Ancients have deny'd Repentance to Apostacy, yet granted it to Idolatry; which shews that they did not look upon Idolatry to be an absolute Apostacy; for every Sin is an Apostacy, in a Limited sense.

2. Let
2. Let us, in this Disquisition, follow the Example before mention'd, of the Apostles and most Primitive Fathers, to measure the Christian Church with its exact Type, the Church under the Law; which are not Two Churches, but Two States of the same Church, for it is the same Christian Church, from the first Promise of Christ, Gen. iii. 15. to the End of the World. And therefore it is said, Heb. iv. 2. That the Gospel was Preached unto Them, as well as unto Us. And these two States of the Church, before and after Christ, do Answer, like a pair of Indentures to one another; the one being, to an Iota fulfilled in the other. Matt. v. 18.

Now we find frequent Lapses to Idolatry in the Church of the Jews: Yet did not this Un-church them; no, nor deprive them of a competent measure of God's Holy Spirit; as it is written, Neh. ix. 18, 20. Yea, when they had made them a molten calf, and said, this is thy God—yet thou, in thy manifold Mercies, forsookeft them not—Thou gavest thy good Spirit to instruct them, &c.

And let it be here obvi'd, That tho' God sent many Prophets to Reprove the great wickedness and Idolatry, as well of their Priests as People; yet none of these Holy Prophets did separate Communion from the wicked Priests: They wou'd not joyn in their Idolatrous Worship; but in all other Parts, they joyn'd with them; and set up no opposit Priesthood to them. So little did the Prophets think that their Idolatry had either Un-church'd them, or broke the Succession of their Priests; or that it was Lawful for any, how Holy soever, to usurp upon their Priesthood, and supply the Deficiencies of it to the People. And apply to this, what I have before shewn, in the words of St. Clement, whose Name is written in the Book of Life, That the Evangelical Priesthood, is as surely fixed, in the Bishops of the Church; and its Succession continu'd in those Ordain'd by them, as the Levitical Priesthood was confirm'd by the Budding of Aaron's Rod, and to be continu'd in that Tribe.

III. And here let our Korahites, of several sizes, take a view of the Heinousness of their Schism; and let them not think their Crime to be nothing, because they have been taught, with their Nurses Milk, to have the utmost abhorrence to the very Name of a Bishop; tho' they cou'd not tell why. Let them rather consider seriously the misfortune of their Education, which shou'd make them Strangers, to all the rest of the Christian World but them-
themselves in a Corner; and to all the former Ages of Christianity.

They have been told that Episcopacy is Popery; because the Papists have Bishops.

So have they Presbyters too, that is, Parish Priests; They have the Creed likewise, and the Holy Scriptures; and all these must be Popish, if this be a good Argument.

But, are they willing to be undeceived? Then they must know that Episcopacy has none so great an Enemy as the Papacy; which would Engross the whole Episcopal Power, into the single See of Rome; by making all other Bishops absolutely dependent upon that, which only they call the Apostolical Chair. And no longer since than the Council of Trent, the Pope endeavor'd, with all his Interest, to have Episcopacy, except only that of the Bishop of Rome, to be declar'd not to be Jure Divino. By which non other Bishops could claim any other Power, but what they had from Him. But that Council was not so quite Degenerated as to suffer this to pass.

And the Jesuits, and Others, who Disputed there on the Pope's part, us'd those same Arguments against the Divine Right of Episcopacy, which from them, and the Popish Canonists and Schoolmen have been lick'd up by the Presbyterians and others of our Dissenters. They are the same Arguments which are us'd by Pope and Presbyter against Episcopacy.

When the Pope could not carry his Cause against Episcopacy in the Council of Trent, he took another Method, and that was, to let up a vast Number of Presbyterian Priests, that is, the Regulars, whom he Exempted from the Jurisdiction of their respective Bishops, and fram'd them into a Method and Discipline of their own, accountable only to Superiors of his, and their own contriving; which is exactly the Presbyterian Model.

These Uprisings upon the Episcopal Authority, made the Famous Archbishop of Spalato, quit his great Preferments in the Church of Rome; and Travel into England, in the Reign of King James I. to seek for a more Primitive and Independent Episcopacy. Himself, in his Consilium Profectionis, gives these same Reasons for it: And that this Shameful Depression and Prostitution of Episcopacy, in the Church of Rome, was the cause of his leaving her.
He observ'd truly, that the further we search upward in Antiquity, there is still more to be found of the Episcopal, and less of the Papal Eminency.

St. Ignatius is full, in every line almost, of the high Authority of the Bishop, next and immediately under Christ; as all the other Writers in those Primitive Times: But there is a profound silence in them all of that Supremacy in the Bishop of Rome, which is now claim'd over all the other Bishops of the Catholick Church: Which could not be, if it had been then known in the World. This had been a short and effectual Method, whereby St. Paul, or St. Clement might have quieted the great Schism of the Corinthians, against which they both wrote, in their Epistles to them; to bid them refer their Differences to the Infallible Judge of Controversy, the Supreme Pastor at Rome. But not a word like this. Especially considering that St. Peter was one, for whom some of these Corinthians strove (1 Cor. i. 12.) against those who preferred others before Him.

The Usurp'd Supremacy of the later Bishops of Rome over their fellow-Bishops, has been as fatal to Episcopacy, as the Rebellion of our yet later Presbyters against their respective Bishops.

And indeed, whoever would write the true History of Presbyterianism, must begin at Rome, and not at Geneva.

So very Groundless, as well as Malicious, is that popular Clamour of Episcopacy, having any Relation to Popery. They are so utterly Irreconcilable, that it is impossible they can stand together: For that moment that Episcopacy were Restor'd to its Primitive Independency, the Papacy, that is, that Supremacy, which does now distinguish it, must ipso facto cease. But enough of this, for I must not digress into various Subjects.

I have shewn, in Answer to the Objection of the Ages of Popery in this Kingdom, that all those Errors, even Idolatry itself, does not Unchurch, nor break Succession. And 2dly, I have Exemplifi'd this from the Parallel of the Jewish Church, under the Law. Then applying of this to our Case, I have vindicated Episcopacy from the Imputation of Popery. I will now go on to further Reasons, why the Succession of our present Bishops is not hurt by that Deluge of Popery, which once cover'd the face of this Land.

IV. The end of all Government, as well in the Church as State, is to preserve Peace, Unity, and Order; and this cannot be done,
if the Male-administration of the Officers in the Government, did
Vacate their Commission, without its being Re-call’d by those who
gave such Commission to them. For then, 1st. Every Man must
be Judge, when such a Commission is Vacated; and then no Man is
bound to obey longer than he pleases. 2dly, One may say it is
Vacated, another not; whence perpetual Contention must arise.

A Man may Forfeit his Commission, that is, do those things,
which give just Cause to his Superiors to take it from him: But
it is not actually Vacated, till it be actually Recall’d by those who
have lawful Power to take it from him: Otherwise their cou’d be
no Peace nor Certainty in the World, either in Publick or in Private
affairs. No Family cou’d subsist. No Man enjoy an Estate. No
Society whatever cou’d keep together: And the Church being
an Outward Society (as shewn in the Discourse of Water
Section 1. Baptism) must consequentially subsist by those Laws which
are indispensible to every Society. And tho’ Idolatry does justly
Forfeit the Commission of any Church, in this sense, that God’s
Promises to Her being Conditional, He may justly take her Com-
mission from her, and Remove her Candlestick: Now tho’ her Com-
mission be thus Forfeitable, yet it still continues, and is not actually
Vacated, till God shall please actually to Recall it, or take it away:
For no Commission is Void, till it be so Declard. Thus, tho’ the
Jews did often fall into Idolatry, yet (as before has been said) God
did bear long with them; and did not Un-church them, tho’ they
had justly Forfeited. And these wicked Husband-men, who slew
those whom the Lord sent for the Fruits of His Vineyard, yet con-
tinu’d still to be the Husband-men of the Vineyard, till their Lord
did Dispoisell them, and gave their Vineyard unto others.

And natural Reason does enforce this: If a Steward abuse his
Trust, and oppresses the Tenants, yet are they still oblig’d to pay
their Rent to him, and his Discharges are sufficient to them against
their Landlord, till he shall Supercede such a Steward.

If a Captain wrong and cheat his Soldiers, yet are they oblig’d
to remain under his Command, till the King, who gave him
his Commission, or those to whom he has Committed such an Au-
thority, shall Cashier him.

And thus it is in the Sacerdotal Commission, Abuses in it, do not
take it away, till God, or those to whom He has Committed such
an Authority, shall suspend, deprive, or degrade (as the fact requires) such a bishop or a priest.

And there is this higher consideration in the sacerdotal commission, than in those of civil societies; that it being immediately from God, as none (therefore) can take this honour to himself, but he that is called of God, as was Aaron; so can none take it way, but he that is as expressly and outwardly called thereunto, as Aaron was to be a priest. For this would be to usurp upon God's immediate prerogative, which is to constitute His own priests. Upon this foundation I argue.

V. As the necessity of Government, and the general commands in scripture, of obedience to government do require our submission to the government in being, where there is no competition concerning the titles, or any that claims a better right than the possessor: so where a church, once establish'd by God, tho' suffering many interruptions, does continue, her governors ought to be acknowledged, where ther is no better claim set up against them.

This was the reason why our Saviour and His apostles did, without scruple, acknowledge the high-priest and sanhedrin of the Jews in their time; tho' from the days of the Maccabees, ther had been great interruptions, and breaches in the due succession of their priests: and before Christ came, and all His time, the Romans, as conquerors, dispos'd of the priesthood as they pleas'd; and made it annual and arbitrary, which God had appointed hereditary and unmovable.

But ther was then no competition: The Jews did submit to it, because they were under the subjection of the Romans, and could have no other. No high-priest claimed against him in possession, but all submitted to him.

And our Saviour did confirm His authority, and of the sanhedrin, or inferior priests with him, (Matth. xxiii. 2.) saying, the scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses's seat. All therefore; whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do. And St. Paul own'd the authority of the high-priest, Acts xxiii. 5.

Many objections might have been rais'd against the deduction of their succession from Moses; But ther being none who claim'd any better right than they had, therefore their right was uncontroverted; and by our Saviour's authority was confirm'd.
Now suppose some interruptions had been in the Succession, or Corruptions in the Doctrine and Worship of our English Bishops, in former Ages, yet (as in the Case of the Scribes and Pharisees) that could have no Effect to Invalidate their Commission and Authority at the present.

S E C T. IV.

The Assurance and Consent in the Episcopal Communion, beyond that of any other.

I. The whole Christian World, as it always has been, so at this Present, it is Episcopal, except a few Dissenters, who, in less than Two Hundred years last past, have arisen, like a wart upon the Face of the Western Church. For little more Proportion do our Dissenters here, the Hugonots in France, the Presbyterians in Holland, Geneva, and thereabouts, bear to the whole Body of the Latin Church, which is all Episcopal. But, if you compare them with the Catholic Church all over the World, which is all Episcopal, they will not appear so big as a Mole.

II. If our Dissenters think it much, that the Church of Rome should be reckoned in the Lists against them, we will be content to leave them out: Nay more, if we should give them all those Churches, which own the Supremacy of Rome to be joyn'd with them (as they are the nearest to them) it will be so far from casting the Balance on their side, that the other Episcopal Churches will, by far, out-number them both.

Let us then, to these Dissenters against Episcopacy, add the Churches of Italy, and Spain entire, with the Popish Part of Germany, France, Poland and Hungary (I think they have no more to reckon upon,) against these we produce the vast Empire of Russia (which is greater in Extent than all these Popish Countries before-mentioned) England, Scotland, Denmark, Sweden, and all the Lutheran Churches in Germany, which will out-number both the Papists and Presbyterians before-mention'd. And this comparison is only made as to the Latin Church. But then, we have all the rest of the Christian World, wholly on the Episcopal side, against both the Supremacy
macy of Rome, and Parity of the Presbyterians. The whole Greek Church, the Armenians, Georgians, Mingrelians, Jacobites, the Christians of St. Thomas, and St. John in the East-Indies, and other Oriental Churches. Then in Africa, the Coptics in Egypt, and great Empire of the Abyssins in Æthiopia. These all are Episcopal, and never own’d the Supremacy of Rome: And over reckon, out of sight, all that disown Episcopacy, and all that own the supremacy of Rome with them.

III. Let me add, that among our Dissenters, every Class of them does Condemn all the rest; the Presbyterian Damns the Quaker, the Quaker Damns him, Independent, Baptist, &c. All Damn one another, and Each denies the others Ordination or Call.

So that, the Ordination of every one of them, is disown’d by all the rest; and all of them together by the whole Christian World. And if their Ordinations are not Valid, then they have no more Authority to administer the Sacraments, than any other Lay-men; and consequently, ther can be no security in Receiving Baptism from any of them.

IV. What allowances God will make to those who think their Ordination to be good enough, and that they are true Ministers of the Gospel; and, as such, do receive the Sacraments from them, I will not determine.

But they have no reason to expect the like allowances who are warned of it before-hand, and will notwithstanding venture upon it; before these Dissenters have fully and clearly acquit themselves of so Great and Universal a Charge laid against them; such an one, as must make the whole Christian World wrong, if they be in the Right! Not only the present Christian Churches, but all the Ages of Christianity since Christ. Of which the Dissenters are desir’d to produce any one, in any Part of the World, that were not Episcopal—any one Constituted Church upon the Face of the Earth, that was not Govern’d by Bishops, distinct from, and Superior to Presbyters, before the Vaudois in Piedmont, the Hugonots in France, the Calvinists in Geneva, and the Presbyterians thence Transplanted, in this last Age, into Holland, Scotland and England.

V. If it shou’d be retorted, that neither is the Church of England without Opposers; for, that the Church of Rome opposes Her, as do likewise our Dissenters.
None of them do oppose Her, in the Point we are now upon, that is, the Validity of Episcopal Ordination, which the Church of Rome does own; and the Presbyterians dare not deny it, because they would (thereby) overthrow all their own Ordinations; for the Presbyters who Reformed (as they call it) from Bishops, received their Ordination from Bishops.

And therefore, tho' the Episcopal Principles do Invalidate the Ordination by Presbyters, yet the Presbyterian Principles do not Invalidate the Ordination by Bishops: So that the Validity of Episcopal Ordination stands safe, on all sides, even by the Confession of those who are Enemies to the Episcopal Order; and, in this, the Bishops have no opposers.

Whereas, on the other hand, the Validity of the Presbyterian Ordinations, is own'd by none but themselves; and they have all the rest of the World as opposite to them.

Therefore, to state the Case the most Impartially; to receive Baptism from these Dissenters, is, at least, a hazard of many thousands to One; as many as all the rest of Christianity are more than they: But to receive it from the Bishops, or Episcopal Clergy, has no hazard at all, as to its Validity, even as own'd by the Presbyterians themselves.

---

**S E C T. V.**

The Personal Sanctity of the Administrator of the Sacraments, tho' highly Requisite on his Part, yet not of Necessity as to the Receivers, to Convey to them the Benefits of the Sacraments.

1. T H E only Objection of those Quakers, who are otherwise convinced of the Obligation of the Sacraments, is the Necessity they think there is of great Personal Holiness in the Administrators, without which, they cannot see how the Spiritual Effects of the Sacraments can be convey'd. But I would beseech them to consider, how, by this, instead of referring the Glory to God, and lessening the Performance of Man, which I charitably pre-
presume (and I am confident as to some of whom I speak) that it is their true and sincere Intention; but instead of that, I do, in great Good-will, invite them to reflect whether their well-intended Zeal has turn'd the Point of this Question—even to over-magnifie Man, and transfer the Glory of God unto His weak Instrument; as if any (the least Part) of the Divine Vertue which God has annexed to His Sacraments did proceed from His Minister. If this be not the meaning (as sure it is not) why so much stress laid upon the Sanctity of the Ministers? as it thron their power or holiness the Holy Ghost was given!  \\

II. To obviate this pretence, our Saviour chos a Devil (John vi. 70.) to be one of His Apostles; and he was sent to Baptize and work Miracles as well as the rest: And those whom Judas did Baptize, were, no doubt, as well Baptized, and did partake of the Communication of the Spirit (according to their Preparation for it) as much as any who were Baptized by the other Apostles; unless you will say that Christ sent him to Baptize, who had no Authority to Baptize, and that none shou'd receive Benefit by his Baptism, which wou'd be to Cheat and Delude the People; and is a great Blasphemy against Christ, and a distrust of His Power; as if it were Limited by the poor Instrument He pleases to make use of; whereas,

III. His Greatness is often most Magnify'd in the meanest of the Instruments, by which He works. Thus He destroy'd Egypt by Frogs and Lice; and the Philistines by Emerods and Mice; and sent His Armies of Flies and Hornets to dispossess the Canaanites. Out of the mouths of babes and sucklings hast thou ordained strength, because of thine enemies, that thou mightest still the enemy, and the avenger; i.e. That the Enemies of God might be confounded, when they saw His great Power exerted by such weak and contemptible Instruments. The Walls of Jericho (the Type of Spiritual wickedness) were thrown down by the blast of seven Rams Horns, when blown by the Priests whom He had commanded: And He rebuked the Iniquity of Balaam by the mouth of an Ass, to shew that no Instruments are Ineffectual in His Hands; and made use of the mouth of Balaam to Prophesie of Christ. For this cause, says St. Barnabas, in his Catholick Epistle, c. 5. did Christ choose Men who were Exceeding great Sinners to be His Apo-
postles; to shew the Greatness of His Power and Grace; and put the Inestimable Treasure of His Gospel into Earthen Vessels, that the Praise might be to God, and not to Men.

IV. St. Paul rejoiced in Christ being Preached, tho' not sincerely by those who did it, because God can bring Good out of Evil, and by wicked Instruments, Propagate His Gospel, turning their malice (even of the Devil himself) to the furtherance of the Faith: Otherwifc the Apostle cou'd have no cause to Rejoice in the Preaching of wicked Men, if none cou'd receive benefit by it. And he plainly supposes, 1 Cor. ix. 27. That a Man may have others by his Preaching, and yet himself be a cast-away.

V. And so far as we can know or judge any thing, we fee daily Experience of this; That God has touched Mens Hearts upon hearing the Truth spoken, tho' by Men who were great Hypocrites, and very wicked. And what reason can be given to the contrary: Truth is Truth whoever speaks it: And if my Heart be prepared, the good Seed receives no evil Tincture of the Hand that sowed it: And who can Limit God, that His Grace may not go along with me in this?

I have heard some of the now separate Quakers confess, that they have formerly felt very sensible Operations of the Spirit, upon the Preaching of some of those whom they have since Detected of gross Errors and Hypocrifyes; and they now think it strange. But this were enough to convince them, that the wind bloweth where it listeth: otherwise they must condemn themselves, and confess that, in all that time, they had no true Participation of the Spirit of God, but that what they mistook for it, was a meer Delusion: Or else confess that by the Truths which were spoken by these Ministers of Satan (for they speak some Truths) God might work a good Effect upon the Hearts of some well-disposed, tho' then ignorant, and much Deluded People. If not so, we must judge very severely of all those who live in Idolatrous or Schismatical Countries; ther were great Prophets and good Men among the Ten Tribes. And if the words, nay Miracles, of Christ, did render the Hearts of many yet more obdurate, even to sin against the Holy Ghost; which was the reason why He sometimes refus'd to work Miracles among them, because thereby they grew worse and worse; and if the Preaching of the Gospel, by the mouths of Apostles, became the favour of Death to wicked
and unprepared Hearts; why may not the words of Truth have a
good Effect upon honest and good Minds, the spoken from the
mouth of an Hypocrite, or of Persons, who, in other things, are
greatly Deluded?

I have before mention'd the Wizard Major Weir, who Bewitched
the Presbyterians in Scotland, since the Restoration, 1660, as much
as Simon Magus did the Samaritans: And yet I suppose the more
moderate of the Quakers will not rashly give all over to Destru-
tion, who blindly followed him, and admir'd his Gifts; or will
say but that some words of Truth, he might drop, might have a
real good Effect upon some well meaning, tho' grossly Deluded Peo-
ple, who followed him. Two of Winder's Witches (see The Snake
in the Grass, p. 300. 2d Edit.) were Preachers among the Quakers
for Twenty years together; and thought to be as powerful and
Affecting as any others.

VI. But the Argument will hold stronger against them, as to
the Sacraments, than in the Office of Preaching; because in Preach-
ing much depends upon the Qualifications of the Person, as to In-
vention, Memory, Judgment, &c. But in the Administration of an
Outward Sacrament, nothing is requir'd, as of Necessity, but the
lawfulness of the Commission, by which such a Person does Admi-
minster; and a small measure of natural or acquir'd Parts is sufficient
to the Administration.

Therefore let us lay no Stress upon the Instrument (more than
was upon the waters of Jordan to heal Naaman) but trust, wholly
upon the Commission, which conveys the Virtue from God, and
not from His Ministers: That all the Glory may be to God, and not
to Man.

'Tis true, the Personal Qualifications of the Instrument are Love-
ly and Desirable; but they become a Snare, where we expect any
part of the Success from them. This was the ground of the Co-
rinthian Schism (1 Cor. i. 11.) and, tho' unclean, of ours at this
Day.

VII. And the consequences of it, are of manifold and fatal
Destruction.

1. This unsettles all the Assurance we can have in God's Promise
to assist His own Institution; for, if the Virtue, or any part of it,
lies in the Holiness of the Instrument, we can never be sure of the
Effect.
Effect, as to us; because, we have no certain knowledge of the Holiness of another. Hypocrites deceive even good Men.

2. This would quite disappoint the Promise Christ has made; Matt. xxviii. 20. To be with His Ministers, in the Execution of His Commission; to Baptize, &c. always, even unto the end of the world. For, if the Holiness of the Instrument be a necessary Qualification, this may fail, nay always must fail, so far as we can be sure of it; and consequently Christ has commanded Baptism and His Supper to continue, to the end of the world, till his coming again; and yet has not afforded means whereby they may be continued, which He has not done, if the Holiness of the Administrator be a necessary Qualification; and that He has not left us a certain Rule, whereby to judge of the Holiness of another: And thus have you rendred the Command of Christ of none Effect, thro' your Tradition.

3. This is contrary to all God's former Institutions. The wickedness of the Priests, under the Law, did not excuse any of the People from bringing of their Sacrifices to the Priests: The Priests were to Answer for their own Sin, but the People were not answerable for it, or their Offerings the less accepted.

But we were in a much worse condition, under the Gospel Administration, if the Effect of Christ's Institutions, did depend either wholly, or in part upon the Personal Holiness of His Priests. This would put us much more in their Power, than it is the Intention of those who make this objection to allow to them: This magnifies Men, more than is due to them; therefore I will apply the Apostle's words to this Case; Let no man glory in men; 1 Cor. iii. 21. who is Paul? and who is Apollo? but ministers—so then, neither is he that planteth any thing, neither he that watereth; but God who giveth the increase.

4. This was (with others) the Error of the Ancient Donatists: those Proud and Turbulent Schismatics, the great Disturbers of the Peace of the Church, upon an opinion of their own Sanctity, above that of other Men; For which reason, they rejected all Baptisms, except what was performed by themselves; and Re-baptized those who came over to them, from the Church; for, they said that the Holiness of the Administrator was necessary towards conveying the Spiritual Graces of Baptism: Thus they argued; Qui non habet quid Det, quomodo Dat: i.e. How shall a Man give that
to another, which he has not himself. But Optatus Answers them, that God was the Giver, and not Man, Videte, Deus esse Datorem. And he argues that it was preferring Themselves before God, to think that the Virtue of Baptism did come from Them; that they were nothing but Ministers or Work-men; and that, as when a Cloth was Dyed, the charge of the Cloth came from the Colours infused, not from the virtue of the Dyer. So that in Baptism the Change of the Baptized, came from the Virtue of the Sacrament, not from the Administrator: That it was the Water of Baptism, which did wash, not the Person who applied it to the Water. That the Personal Sanctity of the Administrator signifiesd nothing to the Efficacy of the Sacrament; Therefore, says he, Nos operemur in ille det, qui se daturum esse promisit, i.e. Let us work, that God, who has promised it, may show the Effect: And that when we work, Humana sunt opera, sed Dei sunt Munera, i.e. The Work is Man's, but the Gift is God's. And thence he exposes that Jam illud quæam, Ridetulum est, Ridiculous Principle of the Donatists, which they advanced to gain Glory to Themselves; that the Gift in Baptism was of the Recipient: p. 89.

Administrator, and not of the Receiver: But he shews, that the Gift was conferred by God, proportionably to the Faith of the Receiver, and not according to the Holiness of the Administrator.

The Discourse is large, to which I refer the Reader. I have given this Tast of it, to let these see to whom I now write, that they have (tho' unaware) stumbled upon the very Notion of the Donatists, which divided them from the Catholick Church, and which, with them, has been, long since, Exploded by the whole Christian World; and I hope this may bring them to a more sober mind; to consider from whence, and with whom they have fallen; and to return again to the Peace of the Church, and the Participation of the Blessed Sacraments of Christ; and the Inestimable Benefits which He has promised to the Worthy Receivers of them.

Lastly, Let me observe that this Error of the Donatists and Quakers, borders near upon Popery; nay rather seems to exceed it. For the Church of Modern Rome makes the Validity of the Sacraments to depend upon the Intention of the Priest; but his Intention is much more in his own Power; and there are more evident Signs of it than of his Holiness.
VIII. I wou'd not have the Quakers imagine that any thing I have said was meant in excuse for the ill Lives of the Clergy of the Church of England; as if the Dissenters were unblamable, but our Clergy wholly Prostitute to all wickedness; and that for this cause, we plead against the Sanctity of the Administrator, as Essential to the Sacrament.

No, That is far from the Reason: I do not love to make comparisons, or Personal Reflections. If all Men be not as they shou'd be, pray God make them so. But I think ther is no modest Dissenter will be offended, if I say, that ther are of our Bishops and Clergy, Men, not only of Learning, and moral Honesty, but of Devotion, and spiritual Illumination; and as much of the Sobriety of Religion; and can give as many Signs of it, Equally at least (to speak modestly) as any of our Dissenters, of what Denomination soever.

IX. And I hope, that what I have said will, at least, hinder the Succession of the Bishops from the Apostles, to be any Objection against them: And they being posse'd moreover of all the other Pretences of our Dissenters, the Ballance must needs lie on their side; and security can only be with them; because ther is doubt in all the other Schemes of the Dissenters, if what I have said can amount but to a Doubt. If the want of Succession and outward Commission, upon which Christ and His Apostles, and the whole Christian Church, in all Ages, till the last Century; and in all Places, even at this Day, except some Corners in the West; and the Mosaic Institution before them, did, by the Express Command of God, lay so great a stress; if all this make but a Doubt (it is strange that it shou'd, at least, that it shou'd not) in the mind of any considering Persons; then can they not, with Security, Communicate with any of our Dissenters; because, if he that Eateth and Doubteth is Damned, much more he that shall do so in Religious matters; wherein chiefly this Rule must stand, that whatsoever is not of Faith is sin.

X. But now, to argue a little, ad hominem, suppose that the Succession of our Bishops were lost; and suppose, what the Quakers and some others wou'd have, that the Thread being broke, we must cast a new knot, and begin again, and make an Establishment amongst our selves, the best we can. Well; When this is done, ought not that Establishment to be preserved? Ought every one to break in upon it, without just cause? Should every;
one take upon him (or her) to Preach, or Baptize, contrary to the 
Rules Establish'd: This, I think, no Society of Men will allow; 
For, the Members of a Society must be subject to the Rules of 
the Society, otherwise it is no Society: And the Quakers of Grace-
church-street Communion have contended as Zealously for this 
compliance as any.

Now then, suppose that the conscientious Quakers to whom I 
speak, shou'd lay no stress at all upon the Succession of our 
Bishops; and consider our Constitution no otherwise than of an Estab-
lishment by agreement amongst our selves; yet even so, by their 
own Confession, while they can find no fault with our Doctrine or 
worship, they ought not to make a Schism in this Constitution, which 
they found Established; and they ought to return to it; and if a 
new Knot was cast upon the broken Thread of Succession, at the 
Reformation from Popery, that Knot ought not to be un-loosed, with-
out apparent and absolute Necessity; lest if we cast new Knots eve-
ry Day, we shall have no Thread left un-knotted; and expose our 
selves to the Derision of the common Adversary.

XI. Consider the grievous Sin of Schism and Division; it is no 
less than the Rending of Christ's Body; and therefore great Things 
ought to be born, rather than run into it; even all things, except 
only that which is apparently sinful; and that by the Express Words 
of Scripture; and not from our own Imaginations, tho' never so 
strong. And tho' ther are some Imperfections in our Reformation, 
as to Discipline, and all the High Places are not yet taken away 
(the Lord, of His Mercy, quickly remove them) yet I will be bold 
to say, that in our Doctrine, Worship, and Hierarchy, nothing can 
be objected that is contrary to the Rule of Holy Scripture, or any 
thing Enjoyn'd, which is There Forbid to be done: And nothing 
less can warrant any Schism against our Church.

XII. Now, to come to a Conclusion, upon the whole matter. 
If you cannot get Baptism as you would have it, take it as you can 
get it. If you cannot find Men of such Personal Excellencies as the 
Apostles, take those who have the same Commission which they had, 
deriv'd down to them by regular Ordination; who Reform'd from 
Popery, and have been the Established Church of this Nation, ever 
since: And moreover are as un-exceptionable, in their Lives and 
Conversations, as any others. These are all the securities you can 
have (without new Miracles) for Receiving the Sacraments from 
Proper hands. And therefore ther is no doubt but God will accept
of your Obedience in Receiving them from such hands; much rather than your Disobedience of His Command to be Baptized, because you are not pleas’d with those whom His Providence has, at this Day, left in the Execution of His Commission to Baptize; as if the weakness of His Minister cou’d obstruct the Operations of His Spirit, in making good His part of the Covenant, which He has promised.

XIII. Ther is an Objection against Baptism, which is not worth an Answer; but that I wou’d condescend to the meanest, and leave nothing behind which might be a stumbling block to any.

I have heard it urg’d, that ther is no visible Effects seen by our Baptisms; that Men remain wicked and loose notwithstanding; and therefore some do conclude that ther is no virtue in Baptism.

Ans. To make this Argument of any force, it must be prov’d that none do receive any Benefit by it. For, if some do receive Benefit by it, and others do not, this must be charg’d upon the Disposition of the Recipient; according to the known Rule, that whatsoever is receiv’d, is receiv’d according to the disposition of the Receiver. Thus the same Meat is turn’d into good Nourishment in an healthy, and into noxious Humors in a vitiated Stomach. Simon Magus receiv’d no Benefit by his Baptism; and after the Sop the Devil entred into Judas; yet the other Apostles receiv’d great Benefit by it: To some it is the favour of Life, even the Communion of Christ’s Body and Blood; to others of Condemnation, who discern not the Lord’s Body in it, but receive it as a common thing: Therefore we are commanded to examine our selves, to prepare our Hearts for the worthy Receiving of it.

But some lay, as the Jews to Christ, shew us a sign: They wou’d have some Miraculous Effects, immediately to appear. These are Ignorant of the Operations of the Spirit; and to these I say, in the words of Christ, Joh. iii. 8. The wind bloweth where it listeth; and thou hearest the sound thereof, but canst not tell whence it cometh or whither it goeth; so is every one that is born of the Spirit. It works silently, but powerfully; and its Progress, like the growing of our Bodies, is not all at once, but by Degrees; whose motion is Imperceptible to humane Eyes.

The true use that is to be made of this Objection, that so few (and yet they are not few who) receive the Inestimable Benefits which are convey’d in the Sacraments of Christ’s Institution, is this,
Take the greater Care, and the more Earnestly to beg the Assistance of God's Grace, to fit and prepare us, for the worthy Receiving of them; but by no means to neglect them: For those who refused to come to the Supper were Rejected, as well as he who came without a Wedding Garment.

A SUPPLEMENT.

The stress of this Discourse being Founded upon Episcopacy; and long Quotations being improper in so short a method of Argument as I have taken; to supply that Defect, and, at the same time, to make it easier to the Reader, I have added, by way of Supplement, a short Index or Collection of Authorities, in the first 450 Years after Christ, for Episcopacy, with respect to the Presbyterian Pretences, of making a Bishop all one with a Presbyter, at least with one of their Moderators: And, in the next place, I have shewn the sense of the Reformation, as to Episcopacy. Take them as follows.

Some Authorities for Episcopacy, as distinct from and Superior to Presbytery, taken out of the Fathers and Councils, in the first Four Hundred and Fifty Years after Christ.

Anno Domini 70. St. Clement Bishop of Rome, and Martyr, of whom mention is made Phil. iv. 3. in his 1st. Epist. to the Corinthians, N. 42. p. 89. of the Edition at Oxford, 1677.

The Apostles having Preached the Gospel, thro' Regions and Cities, did Constitute the first Fruits of them, having prov'd them by the Spirit, to be Bishops and Deacons of those who shou'd
believe; and this, not as a new thing, for many Ages before it was written concerning Bishops and Deacons; for, thus faith the Scripture, in a certain place, I will constitute their Bishops in Righteousness, and their Deacons in Faith.

What wonder is it then, that those who were Intrusted by God, in Christ, with this Commission, should constitute those before spoke of?

Kai τί δεύτερον, εἰς εὖν Χριστός πιστεύειται ὡς ὁ Θεὸς ἔρχεται τοιαύτη, καταστῇ τῆς ἀμώμου, καὶ τὸς Δανίης αὐτῷ ἐν αὐτῷ.

Therefore those that were Constituted by Them, or afterwards by other approved Men, with the Consent of all the Church, and have Administered to the Flock of Christ unblamably, with Humility and Quietness, without all stain of filth or naughtiness; and have carry’d a good Report, of a long time, from all Men, I think cannot, without great Injustice, be turn’d out of their Office: For, it will be no small sin to us, if we thrust those from their Bishoprics who have Holily and without Blame offer’d our Gifts (and Praises to God.) Blessed are those

Τὸς ἐν καταστάσεως ὡς ἀμώμου, ὁ μεταξὺ ἐντὸς ἐκλογομένων ἀνδρῶν, συνεδριάσομαι τὸ ἐπισκοπήσαν τοὺς ἐπίσκοπους τὴν παροικίαν ἐν τῇ κακίᾳ, καὶ παντὸς παρακάτων, τὸν τᾶς κεφαλῆσθαι καὶ τοὺς ἐκκλησίας τὰς καταστάσεις τὴν ἐπισκοπὴν ἐν ἀληθείᾳ καὶ λειτουργίᾳ. ἀμαρτίας ὑμῶν ἑσθε, ἐὰν τὰς ἀμώμους καὶ ἐνδοτικοὶ ἑαυτῶν ἀρχηγοὶ μετατίθενται τῇ δέους ἐν ἐπισκοπῇ ἀντιλαβωμένοι. Μετατιθεὶς εἰς τοὸς ἐπεξερχόμενος τὰς ἐκκλησίας, εἰς τὰς ἐκκλησίας τὸς ἐπισκοπήν ἀντιλαβώμενος. Οὐκ ἦν ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μη τις αὐτῶν μετατίθη ἐντὸς ἀμώμου. ὡς ἐν ἐκκλησίᾳ μη τις αὐτῶν μετατίθη ἐντὸς ἀμώμου.
Priests who are happily Dead, for they are not afraid of being Ejected out of the Places in which they are Constituted. For, I understand that you have Depriv’d some, from their Ministry, who behaved themselves un-re-provable amongst you.

Par. 40. To the High-Priest his proper Offices were appointed; the Priests had their proper Order, and the Levites their peculiar Services, or Deaconships; and the Lay-men, what was proper for Lay-men.

This, as before shewn, St. Clement apply’d to the Distribution of Orders in the Christian Church; Bishops, Priests, and Deacons. And the Office of the Levites, is here call’d by the Word Diaconiu, i.e. the Office of Deacons.

A.D. 71. St. Ignatius, a Glorious Martyr of Christ, was Constituted, by the Apostles, Bishop of Antioch, and did thereby think that he succeeded them (as all other Bishops do) in their full Apostolical Office. Thence he salutes the Church of the Tgalians, in the Fulness of the Apostolical Character; and in his Epistle he says to them,

Be subject to your Bishop as to the Lord—

And to the Presbyters, as to the Apostles of Christ—Likewise the Deacons also, being Ministers of the Mysteries of Christ, ought to please in all things—Without these ther is no Church of the Elect—He is without, who does anything without the Bishop, and Presbyters, and Deacons, and such an one is Defiled in his Conscience.

In his Epistle to the Magnesians, he tells them, That they ought not to despise their Bishop for his youth, but to pay him all manner...
of Reverence, according to the Commandment of God the Father. And as I know that your Holy

Therefore as Christ did nothing without the Father, so neither do ye, whether Presbyters, Deacon, or Laick, any thing without the Bishop.

Some indeed call him Bishop; yet do all things without him, but these seem not to me to have a good Conscience, but rather to be Hypocrites and Scorners.

I Exhort you to do all things in the same mind of God, the Bishop Presiding in the Place of God; and the Presbyters in room of the College of the Apostles, and the Deacons, most beloved to me, who are intrusted with the Ministry of Jesus Christ.

He directs his Epistle to the Church at Philadelphia, to those who were in Unity with their Bishop and Presbyters and Deacons.

And says to them, in his Epistle, That as many as are of Christ, these are with the Bishop; and those who shall Repent, and Return to the Unity of the Church, being made worthy of Jesus Christ, shall partake of Eternal Salvation in the Kingdom of Christ.

My Brethren, be not deceived, if any shall follow him that makes a Schism; he shall not Inherit the Kingdom of God.

I Exhort you to partake of the one Eucharist: for there is one Body of the Lord Jesus, and one Blood of His, which was shed for us; and one Cup— and one Altar, so ther

εγνών καὶ τῶν ἁγίων πρεσβύτεων"—

Presbyters do—

"Ωσπερ εὖν ὁ Κύριος οὖν ἔτι Πατρὸς ὦθήσεται, ἧττα καὶ ὑμεῖς ἀνω τῆς Ἐπισκόπης, μηδὲ πρεσβυτέρας, μηδὲ Διάκονος, μηδὲ Λαικοὶ.

Εἰ τινὲς Ἐπισκόπων μηδὲ Ἀρχιεπίσκοποί, μηδὲ τὸν Κύριον ὑποτάσσων—οἱ μὲν τοιούτοι οὐκ ὀνείρευμεν, ἀλλὰ εἰσφέροντες τις καὶ μορφώνες εἰς τοὺς Φίλους ὑμῶν.

δεικνύει, ἐν ὑμείνα πάντως παντέλειον, πανεὐφανέοις τοῖς ἑπεκτεινομένοις τοῖς ἑπεκτεινομένοις τοιούτως, τὸ εἰμι γιατὶ τῶν ἐκκλησιῶν, τὴν αὐθεντικὴν οἰκουμένην, πεποιθημένην Διακόνων Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

Ἐν ἔννοια συμφωνεῖν τῷ Ἐπισκόπῳ, καὶ τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις, καὶ Διακόνοις.

Οὕτως ἐγὼ Ἰησοῦς ἔδωκεν, ὥς καὶ σὺ τῷ Ἐπίσκοπῳ εἴπαι, καὶ σὺν μεταφορέσθω τῇ ἐκκλησίᾳ ἡδίν ταῖς ἐνωπίοις τῆς ἐκκλησίας τοῖς ἑπεκτεινομένοις τοῖς ἑπεκτεινομένοις τοιούτως, τὸ ἐν τῷ βασιλείῳ τοῦ Χριστοῦ.

'Αδελφοί, μὴ παρακατεύετε εἰς τὸν Χιλιούδαν ἀναλοθῆς, Βασιλείων Θεοῦ καὶ κυρίου ὑμῶν.

παρακάλεσιν ὑμᾶς μετὰ Εὐχαριστίας γενόμενην μετὰ τῶν ἑαυτοῦ τοῦ Κυρίου τῶν Ἐστω καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ ἀναλοθῆς τῇ ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐκμετάλλευσιν εἰς καὶ ἀριτῆς τῶν πάνω ἐνθρόνων—ἐν ἡμισίριον
is one Bishop, with his Presbytery, and the Deacons, my Fellow Servants.

Give heed to the Bishop, and to the Presbytery, and to the Deacons——Without the Bishop do no-thing.

In his Epistle to the Smyrneans, he says, Flee Divisions as the beginning of Evils. All of them follow their Bishops, as Jesus Christ the Father, and the Presbyters, as the Apostles, and Revere the Deacons as the Institution of God. Let no man do any thing of what appertains to the Church, without the Bishop. Let that Sacrament be Judged as effectual and firm, which is Dispensed by the Bishop, or him to whom the Bishop has Committed it. Wherever the Bishop is, there let the People be; as where Christ is, there the Heavenly Host is gathered together. It is not lawful, without the Bishop, either to Baptize, or celebrate the Offices: But what He approves of, according to the good Pleasure of God, that is firm and safe, and so we do, every thing securely.

I salute your most worthy Bishop, your venerable Presbytery, and the Deacons, my Fellow Servants.

In his Epistle to St. Policarp, Bishop of Smyrna, and Martyr, who, together with himself, was Disciple to St. John the Apostle, and Evangelist. He gives these Directions:

If any can remain in Chastity, to the glory of the Body of the Lord, let him remain without Boasting, if he Boast, he Perishes; and if he pretends to know more than the

Εἰ τις δείξῃ ἐν ἄνευς μὲνεν, εἰς πιστεὶ πορεύθης τῷ Κυρίῳ, ἐν δὲ καὶ γνωσία μενεντὶ καὶ γνώσθη, ἀπολέσθη καὶ ἐκ γνώσθη ἀλλὰ τὸ Ἐνιούχον, ἐφ᾽ ἐκείνω. Πρέπει δὲ τὸν Βίσχοφον.
Bishop he is corrupted. It is the duty both of Men and Women that Marry, to be joyn'd together by the Approbation of the Bishop, that the Marriage may be in the Lord, and not according to our own Lusts. Let all things be done to the Glory of God.

Give heed to your Bishop, that God may Harken unto you: My Soul for theirs, who subject themselves under the Obedience of their Bishop, Presbyters, and Deacons; and let me take my Lot with them in the Lord.

And he says to Bishop Polycarp, Let nothing be done without thy sentence and approbation.

A.D. 180. St. Irenæus, Bishop of Lyons, in France, who was Disciple of St. Polycarp; he flourish'd about the year of Christ 180.

Advers. Hæreses. l. 3. c. 3.

Habemus municare qui ab Apostolis Instituti sunt Episcopi in Ecclesias, & Successores eorum usque ad nos. Et si Recordita mysteria Sessent Apostoli, vel his maxime tradent ea, quibus etiam ipsas Ecclesias committerebant; quos & Successores relinquebant, suum iporum locum Magisterii tradentes.

We can reckon those Bishops, who have been Constituted by the Apostles, and their Successors all the way to our times. And if the Apostles knew hidden Mysteries, they would certainly deliver them chiefly to those, to whom they committed the Churches themselves; and whom they left their own Successors, and in the same Place of Government as themselves.

We have the Successions of the Bishops, to whom the Apostolic Church in every place was committed. All these (Heretics) are much later than the Bishops, to whom the Apostles did deliver the Churches.

L. 4. c. 6. Agnoscinus est. Apostolorum Doctrina, & Antiquus Ecclesiae Status, in univerfo Mun-do, & Character Corporis Christi secundum Successiones Episcoporum, of
of Christ, according to the Succession of the Bishops, to whom they committed the Church that is in every Place; and which has Descended even unto us.

Tertullian, A.D. 203. of the Prescription of Heretics.

Edant ergo Origines Ecclesiaram suarum; evolvant ordinem Episcoporum suorum, ita ut per Successionem ab initio decurrentem, ut primus ille Episcopus aliquem ex Apostolis, vel Apostolicis viris, qui tamen cum Apostolis perseveraverit, habuerit Autorem & Antecessorem. Hoc enim modo Ecclesia Apostolica census suas deferunt: sicut Smyrneorum Ecclesia Polycarpu ab Johanne consecratum refert; sicut Romanorum, Clementem, & Petro ordinatum itidem, Perinde utique & Cetera exhibent quos ab Apostolis in Episcopatum Constitutos Apostolici seminis traduces habeam.

Percurre Ecclesias Apostolicas, apud quas ipse adhuc Cathedra Apostolorum suis locis President. Corinthi, Philippi, Ephesius, Thessalonica, &c.

Of Baptism, c. 17.

The High-Priest, who is the Bishop, has the Power of conferring Baptism; and under him the Presbyters and Deacons; but not without the Authority of the Bishop.

Dandi (Baptizmum) just habet summiss sacerdos, qui est Episcopus, dehinc Presbyteri & Deconi, non tamen sine Episcopi Authoritate.


quibus illi eam quam in unaquoq; hoc est Ecclesiam tradiderunt, qua pervenit utique ad nos.
tsr
and Deacon. Such a Bishop (says he, speaking of one who sought vain glory, &c.) doth not desire a good Work—and the same is to be said of Presbyters and Deacons. The Bishops and Presbyters who have the Chief Place among the People.—The Bishop is called Prince in the Churches: And speaking of the Irreligious Clergy, he directs it to them, whether Bishops, Presbyters, or Deacons.

St. Cyprian Arch bishop

Our Lord, whose Commands we ought to reverence and Obey, being about to Constitute the Episcopal Honour, and the Frame of His Church, said to Peter, Thou art Peter, &c. From thence the Order of Bishops and Constitution of the Church doth descend, by the line of Succession, thro’ all Times and Ages; that the Church should be built upon the Bishops. It is Established by the Divine Law, that every Act of the Church should be Govern’d by the Bishop.

To Cornelius, then Bishop of Rome.

We ought chiefly (my Brother) to Endeavour to keep that Unity which was Enjoy’d by our Lord and His Apostles to us their Successors, to be carefully observ’d by us.

The Deacons ought to remember that it was the Lord who chose the Apostles, that is, the Bishops. Christ said to the Apostles, and by that, to all Bishops or Go-
\(\text{vernors of His Church, who succeed the Apostles, by vicarious Ordination, and are in their stead, He that heareth you, heareth me.}\

For from hence do Schisms and Heresies arise, and have arisen, while the Bishop, who is One, and Governor of the Church, by a proud Presumption is Despis'd, and that Man who is Honour'd as Worthy by God, is accounted unworthy by Man.

Nor are Heresies sprung up, or Schisms arisen from any other Fountain than from hence, that Obedience is not paid to the Priest of God; and that ther is not one Priest at a time in the Church, and one Judge for the time in the Place of Christ. To whom, if the whole Fraternity did obey, according to the Divine Oeconomy, none would dare to move any thing against the Sacerdotal Colledge——It is necessary that the Bishops shou'd exert their Authority with full Vigor——But if it is so, that we are afraid of the Boldness of the most Profligat; and that which these wicked Men cannot compass by the Methods of Truth and Equity, if they can accomplish by their Rashness and Despair, then is there an end of the Episcopal Authority, and of their Sublime and Divine Power in Governing of the Church. Nor

\(\text{per hoc, ad omnes Praepostos, qui Apostolis vicaris ordinatione succedunt, Qui vos audit, me audit.——}

\(\text{Ibid.}

\(\text{Inde enim Schismata & Heresies ortae & orintur, dum Episcopus qui unus est, & Ecclesiae Praestat, superba Presumptione contemnitur, & homo dignatione Dei honos, Indignus hominibus judicatur.}

\(\text{Ep. LIX. Cornelio.}

\(\text{Neque enim aliunde Heresies oborta sunt, aut nata sunt schismata, quam inde quod Sacerdoti Dei non obtemperatur, nec unus in Ecclesia ad tempus Sacerdos, & ad tempus Judex vice Christi cogitatur: Cui si secundum Magisteria Divina obtemperaret Fraternitas universa, nemo adversus sacerdotum Collegium quicquam moveret——vigore pleno Episcopos agere oportet——quod si ita res est ut Nequissimo rum timeatur Audacia, & quod Mali vere atque equitate non possunt, Temperitiae & Desperatione perseveriant; ac tum est de Episcopatus vigore, & de Ecclesiae gubernanda sublimi ac Divina Poteestate. Nec Christiani ultra aut durare aut esse jam possumus, si ad hoc ventum est, ut Perditorum Minas atque Insidias pertimescamus——}
can we remain Christians any longer, if it is come to this, that we shou’d be afraid of the Threats, and Snares of the wicked—

— The Adversary of Christ, and Enemy of H.s Church, for this end strikes at the Bishop or Ruler of the Church, with all his Malice, that the Governor being taken away, he might Ravage the more Violently and Cruelly upon the Ship-wreck of the Church—

Is Honour then given to God, when the Divine Majesty and Censure is so Despised, that these Sacrilegious Persons say; do not think of the Wrath of God, be not afraid of His Judgment, do not knock at the Door of the Church; but without any Repentance, or Confession of their Crime, Despising the Authority of their Bishops, and trampling it under their feet, a False Peace is Preach’d to be had from the Presbyters (Scilicet) in their taking upon them to Admit those that were Fallen into Communion, or the Peace of the Church, without the Allowance of the Bishop.

They imitate the coming of Anti-Christ now approaching.

Valerian (the Emperor) wrote to the Senate, that the Bishops, and the Presbyters, and the Deacons shou’d be prosecuted.

The Power of Remitting Sins, was given to the Apostles, and to the Bishops, who have succeed-ed them by a vicarious Ordination.

--- Chriſti Adversarius & Eccleſiae ejus Inimicus, ad hoc Eccleſiae Praepotitum sui Infestatio-ne persequitur, ut Gubernator ενε γετολάτο, atrocius atque violentius circa Eccleſiae Naufragia grasse-tur.—

Honour ergo datūr Deo, quando sic Dei Majestas & Censura Contemniatur—— ut proponeatur à Sacrilegis atque dicatur; ne ita cogitetur Dei, ne timeatur Judicium Domini, ne pulsetur ad Eccleſiam Christi, sed subla-ta Pænitentia, nec ullæ Exomologi-gæ Criminis factæ, Despectis Epis-copis atque Calcatiæ, Pax e Presbyteris verbifallacibus Pre-dicetur?

The Presbyters (Scilicet) in their taking upon them to Admit those that were Fallen into Communion, or the Peace of the Church, without the Allowance of the Bishop.

Ibid.

Antichristi jam propinquantibus adventum Imitantur.

Ep. LXX, Successo.

Rescripte valerianum ad Senatum, ut Episcopi, & Presbyteri, & Diacones in continentis animadvertantur.


Poteſtas ergo Peccatorum remittendorum Apostolis data est—— & Episcopis qui eis Ordinatione vicaria successerunt.
What Danger ought we to fear from the Displeasure of God, when some Presbyters, neither mindful of the Gospel, nor of their own Station in the Church, neither regarding the future Judgment of God, nor the Bishop who is set over them, which was never done under our Predecessors, with the Contempt and Neglect of their Bishop, do arrogate all unto themselves? I cou’d bear with the Contempt of our Episcopal Authority, but ther is now no room left for Dissembling, &c.

Optatus Milevitanus, Bishop of Africa. A.D. 365.

In his 2d. Bock against Parmenian. The Church has her several Members, Bishops, Presbyters, Deacons, and the Company of the Faithful.

You found in the Church, Deacons, Presbyters, Bishops, you have made them Laymen; acknowledge that you have Subverted Souls.

St. Ambrose Bishop of Milan. A.D. 370. upon Eph. iv. 11. Speaking of the several Orders of the Church. And he gave some Apostles, and some Prophets, and Evangelists, &c. Says, that by the Apostles there were meant the Bishops; by Prophets, the Expounders of the Scriptures; and by the Evangelists, the Deacons. But says that they all met in the Bishop; for that he was the Chief Priest, that is,


Quod enim periculum metuere non debemus de offensa Domini; quando aliqui de presbyteris, nec Evangeliis, nec Loci sui memorabar, sed neque futurum Domini Judicium, neque sibi prepositum Episcopum cigitantes, quod nunc omnia sub Antecessoris habuit est, cum Contumelia & Contemptu Prepositit totum sibi revindicet: Contumeliam Episcopatus nostri dissimulare & ferre posse——

sed dissimulandi nunc locus non est.

Mileve, or Mela in Numidia in A.D. 365.

1. 2. Contra Parmenianum.

Certa Membr a tua habet. Ecclesia, Episcopos, Presbyteros, Deaconos, & turbam Fidelum.

Inveniflis Diaconos, Presbyteros, Episcopos, fecistis Laicos: agnoscite vos animas eventisse.

Quoddam de lit Apostolos, quia

divi Prophetae, &c. Apostoli,

Episcopi sunt: Prophetae Explana-tores sunt Scripturum sicus Agabus——Evangelista; Diaconi sunt, sicut sibi Philippus——Nam in

Episcopo omnes ordines sunt, quia Princeps Sacerdos est, hoc est, Princeps est Sacerdotum, et

Propheta, & Evangelista, &

Cetera adimptenda officia Ecclesie in Ministerio Fidelis-

um.
(says he) the Prince of the Priests, and both Prophet and Evangelist, to supply all the Offices of the Church for the Ministry of the Faithful.

And upon 1 Cor. xii. 28. says Caput in Ecclesia Apostolos po-
that Christ Constituted the Apo-
stes Head in the Church; and that these are the Bishops.

And upon v. 29. are all Apo-
This is true (says he,) because in the Church ther is but one Bi-

And because all things are from one God the Father, there-
Bishop shou'd Preside over Each Church.

In his Book of the Dignity of the Priesthood, c. 3. he says, That there is nothing in this World to be found more Excellent than the Priests, nothing more Sublime than the Bishops.

And speaking of what was Incumbent upon the several Orders of the Church, he does plainly distinguish them: For, says he, in the same place;

God does require one thing from a Bishop, another from a Presbyter, another from a Deacon, and another from a Lay-man.

St. Jerome, A.D. 380. In his Comment upon the Ep. to Titus.

When it began to be said, I am of Paul, I of Apollos, &c. and every one thought that those whom he Baptized, belong'd to himself, and not to Christ; it was Decreed thro' The whole Earth, that one Chosen from among the Presbyters shou'd be set over might be taken away.

In his Epis. to Evagrius.

From Mark the Evangelist to Heraclas, and Dionysius the Bishops, the Presbyters of Egypt have

A Marco Evangelista ad He-
raclum nfg; ad Dionysium Episco-
pos, Presbyteri Agypti semper a-
um ex se Eleuthem, in Clefsori Gra-
always choose[d] out one from among themselves, whom having plac’d in an higher Degree Bishop.

He that is Advanc’d, is Advanc’d from less to greater.

The Greatness of Riches, or the Humility of Poverty does not make a Bishop greater or less, seeing all of them are the Successors of the Apostles.

That we may know the Apostolical Oeconomy to be taken from the Pattern of the Old Testament, the same that Aaron, and his Sons, and the Levites were in the Temple, the Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are in the Church of Christ.

To Nepotianus.

Be subject to your Bishop or Chief-Priest; and receive him as the Father of your Soul.

Against the Luciferians.

The safety of the Church depends upon the Dignity of the High-Priest, to whom unless a sort of absolute and eminent Power be given above all, ther will be as many Schisms in the Church as ther are Priests. Thence it is, that without the Command of the Bishop, neither a Presbyter, nor a Deacon, have Power to Baptize—And the Bishop is to impose his Hands upon those who are Baptized by Presbyters or Deacons, for the Invocation of the Holy Spirit.

And Comforting Heliodorus, a Bishop, upon the Death of Nepo-
In publico Episcopum, domi pa-  
trim novavit—Inter Presbyteros  & Co-equalis, primus in opere,  
&c.  
ther. But among his Presbyters  
and Co-equalis, he was the first in 
his Vocation, &c.  
Principes futuros Ecclesie Epil-  
copos Nominavit.

In script. Ecclesiast. De Ja-
cobo.

Jacobus post Passionem Domini  
statim ab Apostolis Hierosolimorum.  
Episcopus est ordinatus.  
first Bishops of other Places.  
Ep. 54, contra Montanum.  
Apud nos Apostolorum locum  
Episcopit teneret.

In Africa, A. D. 420. Epistle 42.  
Radix Christianae Societatis per  
se des Apostolorum & Successiones  
Episcoporum certa per orbem Pro-
pagatione diffunditur.

Nemo ignorant Salvatorem Epis-
copos Ecclesias Instituisse; Ipse enim  
primus quam Carolos Ascenderet, impo-
nens Manus Apostolorum ordinavit  
cos Episcopos, Quod dixit Clarus  
à Muscula in Concilio Carthag. Re-
petit August. de Baptismo contra  
Donatist.

Manifesta est sententia Domi-
ni nostri Jesu Christi Apostoloros  
sus mittentis; & ipsis solis  
Poteslatem à Patre sibi tradi-
tam permittentis; quibus nos  
ther;
Father, to whom we have succeeded, Governing the Church of God by the same Power.

Ep. 162. Speaking of the Bishops being called Angels. Rev. 2. he says, Divina voce sub nomine Angeli Laudatur Prospitus Ecclesiae.

Of the words of our Lord, Serm. 24.

If He said to the Apostles alone, he that despiseth you, despiseth me, then despise us: But if those words of His come down even unto us, and that He has Called us, and Constituted us in their Place, see that you do not despise us.

Against Faustus.

We embrace the Holy Scripture, which from the Times of the Presence of Christ himself, by the Disposition of the Apostles, and the Successions of other Bishops from their Seats, even to these Times, has come down to us, safely kept, commended and honoured through the whole Earth.

Against Petilian.

What has the Chair of the Church of Rome done to thee, in which Peter sat, and in which, at this day, Anastasius sits; or of the Church of Jerusalem, in which James did sit, and in which John does now sit.

Against Julian.

Irenæus, Cyprian, Reticius, Olympius, Hilary, Gregory, Ba- nos Successimus, eadem Potestate Ecclesiam Domini Gubernantes.

Lib. 2. contra Literas Petilianoi

C. 51.

Cathedra quid tibi fecit Ecclesiae Romanæ in qua Petrus sedit; & in qua hodie Anastasius sedet; & aut Ecclesiae Hierosolimitanae in qua Jacobus sedet, & in qua hodie Iohannes sedet. [Vid. contra Crescon. I. 2. c. 37.]

Contra Julianum, l. 2, cap. ult.

Irenæus, Cyprianus, Reticius, Olympius, Hilarinus, Gregorius, Irenæus, Cyprianus, Reticius, Olympius, Hilarinus, Gregorius, H
fil, John, Ambrose—these were Bishops, Grave, Learned, &c.

Questions upon the Old Testament. Quest. 35.

The King bears the Image of God, as the Bishop of Christ. Therefore while he is in that Station, he is to be Honour'd, if not for himself, yet for his Order.

Let this suffice as to the Testimonies of particular Fathers of the Church, tho' many more may be produc'd, in that compass of time, to which I have confin'd our present Inquiry. And now (that no Conviction might be wanting) I will set down some of the Canons of the Councils in those times, to the same purpose; whereby it will appear, that Episcopacy, as distinct from, and superior to Presbytery, was not only the Judgment of the first Glorious Saints and Martyrs of Christ; but the current Doctrin, and Government of the Church, both Greek and Latin, in those early Ages of Christianity.

In the Canons of the Apostles, the distinction of Bishop, Presbyter, and Deacon is so frequent, that it is almost in vain to give Citations. The 1st. and 2d. Can. shew the difference to be obser'd in the Ordering of them.

Let a Bishop be Consecrated by two or three Bishops.

Let a Presbyter and Deacon be Ordained by one Bishop.

See the same Distinction of these Orders. Can. 3. 4. 5, 6, 7, 8. 17, 18. 25. 27, 28, 29. 32, 33. 36. 42. 44, 45. 51, 52, 53. 63. 68, 69, 70. 83. Can. 15. shews the Jurisdiction of the Bishops over the Presbyters and Deacons.

If any Presbyter or Deacon, or any of the Clerical Order, shall leave his own Parish, and go to another, without the Bishop's leave, he shall officiate no longer; especially if he obey not the Bishop, when he exhorts him to Return, persisting in his Insolence.

Basilius, Ioannes, Ambrosius, iste erant Episcopi, Docti, Graves, &c. in Ecclesiæ Régimine Clari.

Quest. ex vet. Test. eu. 35.

Dei enim Imaginem habet Rex; scit Episcopus Christi. Quamdiu ergo in ea traditione est, Honorandus est, si non propter se, vel propter Ordinem.

'Spícrn, Χριστοῦ Τελειώτως ουκ Επισκόπων δύο ή τελειώτων.

'Επισκόπων μόνου τελειώς 'Επισκόπων τελείως, ει Διδακτην.

'Ει τις πρεσβύτερος, διδακτή, τα καθό τον Κληρικόν εκπλήθει, ουκ έσται απόλυτη, καθή τινα διευθέσθαι διανειμάθειν έν άλλη παροικία της τούτων υπομνήματι καί η δια Επισκόπως της τού κελευθερώς μεταδέται, καί μελλων τοις καλεμένοις αυτών το Επιστάμενον. Αίτηται καί
and disorderly Behaviour, but he shall be reduc'd there to Communicate only as a Lay-man.

And Can. 31. If any Presbyter, despising his own Bishop, shall gather Congregations apart, and erect another Altar, his Bishop not being Convict of Wickedness or Irreligion, let him be Depos'd as an Ambitious Person; for, he is a Tyrant: And likewise such other Clergy or Lai ty, who shall joyn themselves to him shall be Excommunicated. But, let this be after the first, reduc'd there to Comtv, adjourn'd to, and communicated only as a Layman.

And Ca. 39. Let the Presbyters and Deacons do nothing without the Consent of the Bishop; for it is He to whom the People of the Lord are committed, and from whom an account of their Souls will be Requir'd.

Can. 41. We Ordain the Bishop to have power of the Goods of the Church—And to Administer to those who want, by the hands of the Presbyters and Deacons.

Can. 55. If any Clergyman shall Reproach his Bishop, let him be Depos'd: For, Thou shalt not speak Evil of the Ruler of the People.

After the Canon of the Apostles, I produce next a Great Council of 87 Bishops held at Carthage, in the Year of Christ 256, under St. Cyprian, Archbisp of that Place, which is Published in St. Cyprian's Works before quoted, p. 229, where he tells us, That besides the Bishops, ther epioceti plurimi omnem Presbyterum met there both Presbyters and Deacons, and great Numbers of the Lai ty,
The Council of Eliberis in Spain, about the Year of Christ 305.

Cap. 18. and 19.

Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons are Nam’d distinct. And c. 32. Presbyters and Deacons are forbid to give the Communion to those who had grievously offended, without the Command of the Bishop.

c. 75. Of those who shall falsely accuse a Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon.

The Council of Arles in France, about the Year of Christ 309.

c. 18. It is ordain’d that the Deacons shou’d be subject to the Presbyters: And c. 19.

That the Presbyters shou’d be subject to their Bishop, and do nothing without his consent.


c. 1. and 2. Having Prohibited those Presbyters and Deacons who had, in times of Persecution, Offer’d to Idols, from the Execution of their Office, says, that notwithstanding the Bishop fees their Repentance sincere, the Bishop.

The Council of Laodicea, A. D. 321.

Can. 41. That no Clergy-man ought to Travel, without the content of his Bishop.

Can. 56. That the Presbyters ought not to go into the Church, and sit in their Stales, till the Bishop come, and to go in with the Bishop.
The First and Great Council of Nice, A. D. 325.

Can. 16. That if any Presbyters or Deacons leave their own Churches, they ought not to be receiv’d into another Church: And that if any shall ordain such in his Ch. as belong to another, without the content of his proper Bishop, let such Ordination be void.

The Council of Gangra, 326.

Can. 6. If any have private Meetings out of the Church, without their Presbyter, let 'em be Anathematiz’d by the Sentence of the Bishop.

Can. 7. If any will take or give of the Fruits offer’d to the Church, without leave of the Bishop, let him be Anathema.

The Council of Antioch, A. D. 341.

Can. 3. If any Presbyter or Deacon, leaving his own Parish, shall go to others; and refuse to return, when his own Bishop shall summon him, let him be Depos’d.

Can. 4. If any Bishop, being Depos’d by a Synod, or a Presbyter or Deacon being Depos’d by his own proper Bishop, shall presume to exercise his Function, let no room be left them, either for Restauration or Apology.

Can. 5. If any Presbyter or Deacon, despising his own Bishop, shall separate himself from the Church, and gather a Congre-
Can. 59. That one Bishop may ordain many Presbyters; but that it was hard to find a Presbyter who was fit to be made a Bishop.

Can. 65. That a Clergy man, being Condemned by the Bishops, cannot be deliver’d by that Church to which he did belong, or by any Man whatsoever.

Can. 126. That Presbyters and Deacons may Appeal from their own Bishop to the Neighbouring Bishops, chosen by content of their own Bishop, and from them to the Primate or Provincial Synod; but not to any Transmarine or Forraign Jurisdiction, under pain of Excommunication.

The Council of Chalcedon, being the Fourth General Council A.D. 451.

Can. 9. If any Clergy-man have a Cause of complaint against another Clergy-man, let him not leave his own proper Bishop, and have Recourse to the Secular Courts—Whoever does otherwise shall be put under the Canonical Censures.

Can. 13. That a Forreign Clergy-man, and not known, shall not officiate in another City, without Commendatory Letters from his own Bishop.

A.D. 451.

Can. 9. If any Clergy-man have a Cause of complaint against another Clergy-man, let him not leave his own proper Bishop, and have Recourse to the Secular Courts—Whoever does otherwise shall be put under the Canonical Censures.

Can. 13. That a Forreign Clergy-man, and not known, shall not officiate in another City, without Commendatory Letters from his own Bishop.
Can. 18. If any of the Clergy shall be found Conspiring, or Joyning in Fraternities, or Contriving any thing against the Bishops, they shall fall from their own Degree.

Can. 29. To reduce a Bishop to the Degree of a Presbyter, is Sacrilege.

These Authorities are so plain and full as to prevent any Application, or Multiplying of further Quotations, which might easily be done: For, if these can be answer'd, so may all that can possibly be produc'd, or framed in words.

And ther is no Remedy left to the Presbyterians, and other Dissenters from Episcopacy, but to deny all these by whole-sale, to throw off all Antiquity, as well the first Ages of Christianity, even that wherein the Apostles themselves Liv'd and Taught, as all since; and to stand upon a New Foundation of their own Invention.

- But this only shews the Desperatness of their Cause; and the Impregnable Bulwork of Episcopacy; which (I must say it) stands upon so Many, Clear, and Authentick Evidences, as can never be overthrown, but by such Topicks as must render Christianity itself Precarious.

And if from the Etymology of the Words Bishop and Presbyter, any Argument can be drawn (against all the Authorities Produc'd) to prove them the same, we may, by this way of Reasoning, prove Cyrus to be Christ, for so he is call'd, H.a. xlv. 1.

Or if the Presbyterians will have their Moderator to be a Bishop, we will not Quarrel with them about a word. Let us then have a Moderator, such as the Bishops before describ'd, viz. A Moderator, as a standing Officer, during Life, to whom all the Presbyters are to be obedient as to Christ, i.e. to the Moderator, as Representing the Person of Christ: That nothing be done in the Church without Him: That He be understood as the Principle of Unity in His Church; so that, they who unjustly break off from his Communion, are thereby in a Schism: That he shew his Succession, by Regular Ordination, convey'd down from the Apostles. In short, that He have all that Character and I

Autho-
Can. 59. That one Bishop may ordain many Presbyters; but that it was hard to find a Presbyter who was fit to be made a Bishop.

Can. 65. That a Clergyman, being Condemned by the Bishops, cannot be deliver'd by that Church to which he did belong, or by any Man whatsoever.

Can. 126. That Presbyters and Deacons may Appeal from their own Bishop to the Neighbouring Bishops, chosen by consent of their own Bishop, and from them to the Primate or Provincial Synod; but not to any Trans-marine or Foreign Jurisdiction, under pain of Excommunication.

The Council of Chalcedon, being the Fourth General Council A. D. 451.

Can. 9. If any Clergy-man have a Cause of complaint against another Clergy-man, let him not leave his own proper Bishop, and have Recourse to the Secular Courts—Whoever does otherwise shall be put under the Canonical Censures.

Can. 13. That a Foreign Clergy-man, and not known, shall not officiate in another City, without Commendatory Letters from his own Bishop.
Can. 18. If any of the Clergy shall be found Conspiring, or Joyning in Fraternities, or Con- triving any thing against the Bishops, they shall fall from their own Degree.

Can. 29. To reduce a Bishop to the Degree of a Presbyter, is Sacrilege.

These Authorities are so plain and full as to prevent any Application, or Multiplying of further Quotations, which might easily be done: For, if these can be answer’d, so may all that can possibly be produc’d, or framed in words.

And ther is no Remedy left to the Presbyterians, and other Dissenters from Episcopacy, but to deny all these by whole-sale, to throw off all Antiquity, as well the first Ages of Christianity, even that wherein the Apostles themselves Liv’d and Taught, as all since; and to stand upon a New Foundation of their own Invention.

- But this only shews the Desperatness of their Cause; and the Impregnable Bulwork of Episcopacy; which (I must say it) stands upon so Many, Clear, and Authentick Evidences, as can never be overthrown, but by such Topicks as must render Christianity it self Precarious.

And if from the Etymology of the Words Bishop and Presbyter, any Argument can be drawn (against all the Authorities Produc’d) to prove them the same, we may, by this way of Reasoning, prove Cyrus to be Christ, for so he is call’d, Isa. xliv. 1.

Or if the Presbyterians will have their Moderator to be a Bishop, we will not Quarrel with them about a word. Let us then have a Moderator, such as the Bishops before describ’d, viz. A Moderator, as a standing Officer, during Life, to whom all the Presbyters are to be obedient as to Christ, i.e. to the Moderator, as Representing the Person of Christ: That nothing be done in the Church without Him: That He be understood as the Principle of Unity in His Church; so that, they who unjustly break off from his Communion, are thereby in a Schism: That he shew his Succession, by Regular Ordination, convey’d down from the Apostles. In short, that He have all that Character and I
Authority, which we see to have been Recogniz'd in the Bishops; in the very Age of the Apostles, and all the succeeding Ages of Christianity; and then call Him Moderator, Superintendent, or Bishop: For, the Contest is not about the Name, but the Thing.

And if we go only upon the Etymology of the Word, how shall we prove Presbyters to be an Order in the Church, more than Bishops? as Athanasius laid to Dracontius of those who persuaded him not to accept of a Bishoprick.

Why do they persuade you not to be a Bishop, when they themselves will have Presbyters?

I will end this Head, with the Advice of that great Father to this same Dracontius.

If the Government of the Churches do not please you; and that you think the Office of a Bishop has no Reward, thereby making your self a Despiser of our Saviour, who did Institute it; I beseech you surmise not any such things as these, nor do you Entertain any who advise such things; for that is not worthy of Dracontius: For what things the Lord did Institute by His Apostles, those things remain both good and sure.

II. Having thus Explain'd those Texts of Scripture which speak of Episcopacy, by the Concurrent sense of those who liv'd with the Apostles, and were taught the Faith from their Mouths; who liv'd zealous Confessors, and dy'd glorious Martyrs of Christ; and who Succeeded the Apostles in those very Churches where themselves had sat Bishops: And having deduc'd their Testimonies, and of those who Succeeded them down for Four Hundred and Fifty Years after Christ (from which time, there is no doubt raised against the Universal Reception of Episcopacy) and this not only from their writings apart, but by their Canons and Laws, when Assembl'd together in Council; which one would think sufficient Evidence, against none at all on the other side, that is, for the Succession of Churches.
Churches in the Presbyterian Form, of which no one Instance can be given, so much as of any one Church in the world so Deduc'd, not only from the days of the Apostles (as is shewn for Episcopacy) but before Calvin, and those who Reform'd with him, about 160 Years last past: I say, tho' what is done is sufficient to satisfy any Indifferent and Un-biass'd Judgment, yet there is one Topic yet behind, which, with our Dissenters, weighs more than all Fathers and Councils; and that is, the late Reformation, from whence some Date their very Christianity. And if even by this too Episcopacy shou'd be Witenessed and Approv'd, then is there nothing at all in the World left to the Opposers of Episcopacy, nothing of Antiquity, Precedent, or any Authority but their own wilful will against all Ages of the whole Catholick Church, even that of the Reformation as well as all the Rest.

Let us then Examine. First, for the Church of England, that is thrown off clearly by our Dissenters, for that was Reform'd under Episcopacy, and continues so to this day.

And as to our Neighbour Nation of Scotland, where the Presbyterians do boast that the Reformation was made by Presbyters; that is most Clearly and Authentically Confuted by a Late Learned and worthy Author (already mention'd) in his Fundamental Charter of Presbytery, Printed 1695. so as to stop the Mouths of the most Perverse, who will not be Persuaded tho' they are Persuaded.

Go we then abroad, and see the State of the Reformed Churches there.

The Lutherans are all cut off, as the Church of England; for they still Retain Episcopacy, as in Denmark, Sweden, &c.

There remains now only the Calvinists. Here it is the Presbyterians set up their Rest! This is their strong Foundation!

And this will fail them as much as all the other: For, be it known unto them (however they will receive it) that Calvin himself, and Beza, and the rest of the Learned Reformers of their Part, did give their Testimony for Episcopacy as much as any. They counted it a most-unjust Reproach upon them, to think that they condemn'd Episcopacy; which they say they did not throw off, but cou'd not have it there, in Geneva, without coming under the Papal Hierarchy: They highly Applauded and Congratulated the Episcopal Hierarchy of the Church of England, as in their several
eral Letters to Q. Elizabeth, to the Arch-bishop of Canterbury, and others of our English Bishops: They Pray’d heartily to God for the Continuance and Preservation of it: Bemoan’d their own unhappy Circumstances, that they cou’d not have the like, because they had no Magistrate to Protect them; and wished for Episcopacy in their Churches, the want of which they own’d as a great Defect; but call’d it their Misfortune rather than their Fault. As the Learned of the French Hugonots have likewise pleaded on their Behalf.

As for their Excuse. I do not now meddle with it, for I think it was not a good one. They might have had Bishops from other Places, tho’ ther were none among themselves, but those who were Popish: And they might as well have had Bishops as Presbyters, without the Countenance of the Civil-Magistrate. It might have rais’d a greater Persecution against them; but that is nothing as to the Truth of the thing. And if they thought it a Truth, they ought to have suffer’d for it.

But whatever becomes of their Excuse, here it is plain, that they gave their Suffrage for Episcopacy; which who so pleases may see at large in Dr. Durell’s View of the Government and Worship in the Reformed Churches beyond the Seas, (who was himself one of them) Printed. 1662.

So that our Modern Presbyterians have departed from Calvin as well as from Luther, in their Abhorrence of Episcopacy, from all the Christian World, in all Ages; and particularly from all our late Reformers, both of one sort and other.

Calvin would have Anathematized all of them, had he liv’d in our times. He say’s ther were none such to be found in his time, who oppos’d the Episcopal Hierarchy, but only the Papal, which Aspired to an Universal Supremacy in the See of Rome over the whole Catholic Church, which is the Prerogative of Christ alone. But, says he,

If they would give us such a Hierarchy, in which the Bishops should so Excell, as that they did not refuse to be Subject to Christ, and to depend upon Him, as their only Head, and refer all to Him; then I will confess that they are worthy of all Anathemas; if any such shall be

Talem si nobis Hierarchiam exhibeant, in qua sic Eminent Episcopi, ut Christo subesse non Recusent, & ab illo tanguam unico Capite pendeant, & ad Ipsum referantur, &c. Tum vero nullo non Anathematice dignos faterar si qui erunt qui non Eam Reverantur, Summamque Obedienciam.
found, who will not Revere it, and Submit themselves to it, with the utmost Obedience.

See, he says, if any shall be any such, which suppose that he knew none such; and that he own'd none such amongst his Reformers: And that if ever any such should arise, he thought there were no Anathemas which they did not deserve, who should refuse to submit to the Episcopal Hierarchy, without such an Universal Head, as Excludes Christ from being the only Universal Head; for if there be another, (the Substitute) He is not only. Thus He is called the Chief Bishop, but never the only Bishop, because there are other deputed under Him. But He calls no Bishop the Universal Bishop or Head of the Catholick Church, because He has appointed no Substitute in that supreme Office; as not of Universal King, so neither of Universal Bishop.

And Beza supposes as Positively as Calvin had done, that there were none who did oppose the Episcopal Hierarchy without such an Universal Head now upon Earth; or that opposed the Order of Episcopacy; and condemns them as Mad-men, if any such could be found. For thus says he,


And particularly as to the Church of England, and her Hierarchy of Archbishops and Bishops, he says, that he never meant to oppugne any thing of that; but calls it a singular Blessing of God, and wishes that she may ever enjoy it.

Fruatur sane ista singulari De beneficentia, que utinam sit illa Perpetua. Ibid. c. 18.

So that our Modern Presbyterians are disarm'd of the Precedents of Calvin, Beza, and all the Reformers abroad; by whose Sentence they are Anathematiz'd, and counted as Mad-men.

Here then, let us consider and beware of the Fatal Progress of Error! Calvin and the Reformers with him, let up Presbyterian Government, as they pretended, by Necessity; but still kept up and }
Profess'd the highest Regard to the Episcopal Character and Authority: But those who pretend to follow their Example, have utterly Abdicated the whole Order of Episcopacy, as Anti-Christian and an Insupportable Grievance! While, at the same time, they would seem to pay the greatest Reverence to these Reformers; and much more to the Authority of the First and Purest Ages of Christianity; whose Fathers and Councils spoke all the High things, before Quoted, in behalf of Episcopacy; far beyond the Language of our later Apologists for that Hierarchy; or what durst now be Repeated, except from such unquestionable Authority.

In this they imitate the hardness of the Jews, who Built the Sepulchers of those Prophets, whom their Fathers slew; while, at the same time, they Adher'd to, and out-did the Wickedness of their Fathers, in Persecuting the Successors of those Prophets.

**ERRATA.**

Pag. 3. col. 2. l. 11. r. κοινωνίαν... p. 39. col. 1. l. 10. 11. r. All of you follow your Bishops. col. 2. penult. r. ἡδύ... p. 40. l. 16. A. D. 180. shou'd be on the Margent; p. 42. col. 2. l. 3. dele——after Πρεσβυτέρων. and r. ἀγάλ... p. 44. col. 2. l. 14. r. Ἰω... p. 45. col. 2. l. 28. r. συνώνυμων... p. 47. col. 2. penult. r. ad Heliodorum. p. 51. col. 1. l. 11. 12. 13. 14. r. As likewise such other Clergy, and as many as shall join with him: but the Lay-men shall be Excommunicated.
Whereas I have plac’d the Apostolical Canons in the Front of the Councils before quoted, I thought fit (to prevent needless Cavil) to give this Advertisement, that I do not contend, they were made by the Apostles themselves, but by the Holy Fathers of the Church, about the end of the second and beginning of the Third Century, as a Summary of that Discipline, which had been transmitted to them, by Un-interrupted Tradition, from the Apostles; whence they have justly obtain’d the Name of The Apostolical Canons; and, as such, have been Receiv’d and Reverenc’d in the succeeding Ages of Christianity.

The Councils quoted after these Canons, bear their Proper Dates; and there can be no Contest about them.

And what is quoted of St. Ignatius and the other Fathers, is from the most Uncontroverted Parts of their Works, to obviate the Objection of Interpolations, and Additions, by the Noise of which our Adversaries endeavour to throw off, or enervate their whole Authority; and quite to dis-arm us of all that Light which we have from the Primitive Ages of the Church; because it makes all against them. Though they fail not to Quote the Fathers on their Side, whencesoever they can Screw them to give the least seeming Countenance to their Novelties and Errors: Yet Boldly Reject them All, when brought in Evidence against them, and that they can no otherwise struggle from under the weight of their Authority.


The Snake in the Grass: Or, Satan transform’d into an Angel of Light. Discovering the Deep and Unsuspected Subtilty which is couched under the Pretended Simplicity of many of the Principal Leaders of those People call’d Quakers. The Second Edition, with Additions.
Some Seasonable Reflections upon the Quakers Solemn Protestation against George Keith's Proceedings at Turner's-Hall, 29. April 1697. Which was by them printed, and sent thither, as the Reasons of their not Appearing to defend themselves. Herein annex'd Verbatim By an Impartial Hand.

Satan Dis rob'd from his Disguise of Light: Or, the Quakers Last Shift to Cover their Monstrous Heresies, laid fully open. In a Reply to Thomas Ellwood's Answer (Published the End of last Month) to George Keith's Narrative of the Proceedings at Turner's-Hall, June 11. 1696. Which also may serve for a Reply (as to the main Points of Doctrine) to Geo. whitehead's Answer to The Snake in the Grass; to be Published the End of next Month, if this prevent it not.

A Discourse proving the Divine Institution of Water-Baptism: Wherein the Quaker-Arguments against it, are Collected and Confuted. With as much as is needful concerning the Lord's Supper. These Four Books are Written by the Author of The Snake in the Grass.

The Quakers set in their True Light, in order to give the Nation a clear sight of what they hold concerning Jesus of Nazareth, the Scriptures, Water-Baptism, the Lord's Supper, Magistracy, Ministry, Laws, and Government: Historically collected out of their most approved Authors, which are their best Constructing-Books, from the year of their Rife 1650, to the year of their Progress 1696. By Francis Bugg, Sen.

An Essay concerning Preaching: Written for the Direction of a Young Divine; and useful also for the People, in order to Profitable Hearing.

Crums of Comfort, and Godly Prayers; With Thankful Remembrances of God's wonderful Deliverances of this Land.