

1699

A Light Shining out of Darkness, or, Occasional Queries Submitted to the Judgment of Such as Would Enquire into the True State of Things in our Times

Henry Stubbe

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/quakerbooks>

 Part of the [Christianity Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Stubbe, Henry, "A Light Shining out of Darkness, or, Occasional Queries Submitted to the Judgment of Such as Would Enquire into the True State of Things in our Times" (1699). *Historical Quaker Books*. Book 4.
<http://digitalcommons.georgefox.edu/quakerbooks/4>

This Book is brought to you for free and open access by the George Fox University Libraries at Digital Commons @ George Fox University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Historical Quaker Books by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ George Fox University. For more information, please contact arolfe@georgefox.edu.

A
L I G H T
Shining out of
D A R K N E S S :
O R,
Occasional Queries

SUBMITTED
To the Judgment of such as would
Enquire into the *True State* of
Things in our Times.

The whole *Work* Revised by the Author, the
Proofs Englished and Augmented, with sundry
Material Discourses concerning the *Ministry*,
Separation, *Inspiration*, *Scriptures*, *Humane Learn-*
ing, *Oaths*, *Tithes*, &c.

With a Brief Apology for the *Quakers*, that
they are not Inconsistent with *Magistracy*.

By an Indifferent, but Learned Hand.

The Third Edition. H. Stalls
(?)

London, Printed and Sold by T. Sowle, in White-
Hart-Court in Gracious-Street, 1699.

T H E
Author's Preface

T O T H E
Second Edition, in 1659.

Reader,

I Know not whether I injure the former Editioner, by reviewing and augmenting a Book, in which he had too great a share, that I should call it mine: Yet is it true, that most of the Queries, as to their substance, the whole Design and Preface were from me, and many of the Proofs, tho' several of the latter were inserted by him, and several, which I had put down, omitted or transposed, and that so disadvantageously, that they might seem either false or impertinent; besides that, they were imperfectly cited often, so as not to yield satisfaction to any, who had not the Books at hand.

But

The Author's Preface, &c.

But in this Edition I think the Reader will not be at any loss, but what the Printer's Errors may create him. Some Queries are wanting here, which were in the former, as that of Toleration; which, with the very same Citations, is more largely and convincingly handled in the Defence of the Good Old Cause, published by H. Stubbe of Ch. Ch. in Oxon which Treatise I must recommend to thy diligent perusal.

An Advertisement to the Reader.

THis Discourse was writ by an Extraordinary Person, and has lain too long out of Print. Its *Learning* and *Usefulness* Challenge a place amongst the Best Tracts extant, where Primitive Christianity and Protestancy have their due Credit. It's Short, but Full; and seems the Contents of those Ages in which *Truth* shined with so much Luster.

Read, Think, and then Judge.

Adieu.

OCCASIONAL

OCCASIONAL

QUERIES,

SUBJECTED

To the Judgment of such as would Enquire into the true State of things in these Our Times.

I. *Whether there be any certain or peculiar Name in the New Testament that signifies a Minister? Or any Name whence an Officer may be convincingly inferred? If there be not (as there is just cause to doubt) whether the present Ministers are not to blame, while they pretend to an Office and Function grounded upon Divine Right, which hath no other Foundation, than the Hay and Stubble of Humane Conjecture?*

The words used in Scripture to signify a Minister, (as they are vulgarly applied) are ΔΙΑΚΟΝΟΣ, and ἑπισκοπῆς, and ΔΕΥΤΕΡΟΠΡΟΣ. Now none of these determinately signifies an Officer, but any one that performs such or such a Work, whether out of Duty or Charity. *Minister Executor merus est*, say the Civil Lawyers: Διάκονος signifies either a Deacon or Church-warden,

Acts 6. or else it may be taken in as large a Sense as hath been specified, *Philem.* v. 13. *ἵνα ὑπὲρ σέ διακονῶ μοι*, that he may minister to me in your stead. Was this an Office? So the *Civil Magistrate* is called *Διάκονος Θεοῦ*, the *Minister of God*, *Rom.* 13. 4. and *1 Cor.* 3. 5. Who is *Paul*? Who is *Apollo*? *ἀλλ' ἢ Διάκονοι δι' ὧν ἐπιστεύσατε*, but *Ministers* (or *Instruments*) through whom you have believed. And *Satan* (though he be a great Imitator of *Christ*) is not said to have a constituted *Ministry* by way of Office for his Service, yet he hath *Ministers*, *2 Cor.* 11. 15. *Satan* is said to transform himself into an *Angel of Light*. *Ὁὐ μέγα ἔνι καὶ οἱ Διάκονοι αὐτοῦ μετασχηματίζονται εἰς Διάκονοι Δικαιοσύνης* therefore it is no great thing if his *Ministers* be transformed as the *Ministers of Righteousness*. This is not meant of any peculiar Function or Office, but a general Performance of any thing, accordingly as an *Officer*, *Servant* or *Minister* would. In like manner is *λειτουργός* used in that general sense: *Magistrates* are said to be *λειτουργοὶ Θεοῦ*, *God's Ministers*, *Rom.* 13. 6. And *Paul* saith of *Epaphroditus*, that he was *λειτουργὸν τοῦ Χριστοῦ*, he did minister to his wants, *Phil.* 2. 25. yet was not he his *small Officer* that we know. So *ὑπηρέτης* is taken also, *Acts* 13. 5. *John* was the *ὑπηρέτης*, or *Minister*, or *Servant* of *Paul* and *Barnabas*. Yet doth it not appear that he was so by *Duty*, but *Respect*, see *Acts* 20. 30. and *Acts* 21. 24. Is it not then probable, (and that is all that is desired at present)

sent) that there was no distinct Office, because there is no distinct Name for *Ministers*? And is it not evident, that such an Office cannot be proved thence, the places being equivocal, and capable of a different sense than what is usually put upon them?

The Name of *Minister* hath been much quarrell'd at before any Civil Wars in *England*: Bishop *Andrews* was offended at it, as being a *Novelism*, in his Letters to *du Moulin*, saying, (Ep 1.) *The Name of Minister is altogether unknown; which the Ancients would never have understood to be spoken of any but a Deacon; as it is deriv'd indeed from no other Fountain but the Greek Διακονοι. But we must pardon you; you must speak the Language of your Church, which hath no Bishops; another kind of Presbyters [Elders they call them] another kind of Deacons; and I add, another kind of Calling than ever the Ancient Church acknowledged. [Calling is sometimes used for the Office, for Ordination never, saith that Prelate, nor doth du Moulin deny it] And in his third Epistle to du Moulin, he saith, It is strange, how it became lawful for French-men to put upon a Presbyter that name, which never any amongst the Ancients used, but for a Deacon. I speak not this otherwise, but that even among us too, that bad Fashion is taken up, of calling them Ministers and Pastors too. But these words were brought in by them, who best relish any upstart Fashion; but against their mind who reverence Antiquity; and, as they may disclaim these Usages.*

II. Supposing there were such a Name, yet would not such a Name be more general than that of Apostles; and comprehend not only them, but Prophets, Evangelists, Pastors, and all such as should labour in the Work of the Ministry of the Gospel? And is it not an Act of Arrogance in them who would be the Apostles Successors in ordinary, (though by the way it was something extraordinary that made an Apostle, and if that was wanting, then the Person was not an Apostle, but some other Officer: Besides, how did

Every one of the Names signifying a Minister, is attributed to the Apostles, *Διάκονοι* and *Διακονία*, *Acts* 1. 17, 25. *Acts* 6. 4. *Rom.* 11. 13. (and to Angels, *Heb.* 1. 14.) *Λειτουργία*, *Rom.* 15. 16. (and to Angels, *Heb.* 1. 14.) *ἑπηρέτας*, *Acts* 26. 16. yea Paul, Apollo and Cephas, as they are called *Διάκονοι*, *1 Cor.* 3. 5. Who then is Paul? and who is Apollo? and who is Cephas? but Ministers [*Διάκονοι*] by whom we believed? So likewise are they called *ἑπηρέται*. *1 Cor.* 4. 1. Let a Man so account of us as of the Ministers [*ἑπηρέτας*] of Christ. In fine, if there be different Ministries, as there are *1 Cor.* 12. 4. *διαφέρετε διακονίαν ἑαυτοῖς* There are differences of Ministries. How comes it to pass then, that there are not so now, but the name is appropriated to one?

the Pastors, or Teachers, or Presbyters succeed them who were their Contemporaries, and never resigned up, or deserted their Stations?) Ordinary Embassadors from the most High, to assume a Name of greater Latitude than that of Apostle or Embassador Extraordinary? Or at least, is it not as absurd, as if the Ant should assume the single name of Animal, and the Lacquey that of Servant?

Not only the High-Priests among the Jews, but the Prophets and Levites, upon whom the Office of Teaching lay, were called by the Name of Pastors, *Isa.* 56. 11. *Jer.* 10. 21. & 22. 22. & 23. 1, 2. *Ezek.* 34. 2. *Zach.* 10. 3. and (saith Bishop Andrews to *du Moulin*, Ep. 3.) 'He that shall accurately

' consider will find Princes in the State, and
 ' Magistrates often, nay oftner a great deal,
 ' to be called by the name of Pastors, than
 ' all the other put together. Yet do we not
 ' call Princes by the name of Pastors. Nor
 ' do I think, that at *Geneva*, he is called a
 ' Pastor who is chief Magistrate.

III. *Was not the Name of Minister brought
 in by the first Reformers, many whereof were
 Private Christians, who did assume that Title,
 either because they found themselves not rankable
 under the Name of any other Evangelical Offi-
 cers; or in opposition to that Romish Hierarchy
 and Priesthood, whence the Modern Episco-
 parians and Presbyterians derive their successive
 Ordination?*

Whether *Martin Luther* were the first who
 assumed the Title of *Minister*, and gave it
 unto others, I am not thoroughly informed:
 It is not to be denied that there is mention
 of the *Ministry* and *Ministers*, but that was
 not (before his time, I think) a distinguish-
 ing name of the *Office* and *Officers*, but
 did express their *Work*; for they were
 called *Priests*, and were ordained by the
Papistical Bishops amongst the *Bohemians*; but
Luther being degraded from being a *Priest*,
 and an *University Doctor of Divinity*, by the
 Papal Authority, he (lest he should be de-
 stitute of a particular Appellation) assumed
 the Title of *Ecclesiastes* and *Minister of God's*
Word at Witeberg. This account he gives
 of himself in his Book against the Order

*Luther adv.
 falso nomin.
 ord. episc.
 inter. op.
 edit. Wite-
 berg, l. 2.
 f. 306. c. 2.*

of Bishops, falsely so called, which begins thus: ‘ *Martin Luther, by the Grace of God*
 ‘ *Ecclesiastes (or Minister of the Church) at*
 ‘ *Witeberge, unto the Popish Bishops, Grace*
 ‘ and Peace and Repentance in Christ.

‘ *My Lords,*

‘ **I**F it seem unto you Folly, and a ridicu-
 ‘ lous Vanity in me, that I call my self
 ‘ by so high and magnificent a Title, as that
 ‘ of *Ecclesiastes (or Minister of the Church)*
 ‘ *by the Grace of God*; know that I do not
 ‘ wonder thereat at all. For it is no new
 ‘ thing for you to condemn the Gospel, to
 ‘ condemn the Ministers of the Word of
 ‘ God.----Behold (that you may no longer
 ‘ ignore it) *I call my self Ecclesiastes (or Mi-*
 ‘ *nister of the Church by the Grace of God,*
 ‘ *and I have honoured my self with this Title,*
 ‘ whom you with an Infinity of Revilings
 ‘ call *Heretick*, and (that you may not be
 ‘ ignorant thereof) *I do assume unto my self*
 ‘ *that Title*, out of defiance and contempt of
 ‘ you and Satan. And if I should name my
 ‘ self *Evangelist by the Grace of God*, I am sure
 ‘ I could sooner justifie my self therein, than
 ‘ you satisfie any of your being Bishops.
 ‘ For I am sure Christ himself doth *so name*
 ‘ me, and reputes *me* for an *Ecclesiastes (or*
 ‘ *Minister of the Church)* he (I say) who
 ‘ is the great Master of my Doctrine, and
 ‘ who, I doubt not, will bear me witness
 ‘ at the day of Judgment, that this Doctrine
 ‘ is not mine bur God’s, and his Spirits.----

‘ For

' For so much as I, thorough the Wrath of
 ' the Pope and Emperor, am deprived of
 ' all my Titles, and the *Character of the Beast*,
 ' mentioned in the Revelation, is by several
 ' Bulls taken away from me, so as that I
 ' am no longer stiled *Doctor of Divinity*, or
 ' any such like Humane and Papistical Crea-
 ' ture. I am not much appalled at the loss
 ' of such Honours; for I was always a-
 ' shamed before God, by reason of such
 ' *Cousenage* and such Persons; for I was as
 ' you are, a Blasphemer, Hypocrite—but
 ' God having enlightned me thorough his
 ' Mercy, and revealed unto me the know-
 ' ledge of his Son Christ Jesus, so as that I
 ' should *preach the Gospel unto others*, and in-
 ' structed me in his ways, that I am ascer-
 ' tained of my Doctrines, that they are the
 ' pure Word of God, *it did not become me to*
 ' *be destitute of a Title*, whereby I should
 ' commend and set off the Word, and the
 ' Ministry thereof, unto the which I have
 ' been called by God, and which I have not
 ' received from Men, but by the Gift of God,
 ' and the Revelation of the Lord Christ.

☞ To be a Do-
 'ctor of Di-
 'vinity the
 mark of the
 Beast.

The like is related by *Sleidan*, in his Hi-
 story of those Times at the Year 1522, where
 he says, that *Luther* wrote a Book against
 the Order of Bishops, falsely so called, in the
 Preface whereto, he did assume unto himself
 the Title of *Minister of the Church* at Witte-
 'berge [*in Prefatione sumit sibi titulum Eccle-*
 ' *siaestæ Wittebergensis*, — & ait cognomen hoc
 ' *Ecclesiaestæ sibi imposuisse ipsum*, — & quo-

niam à Deo sibi demandatum sit Evangelii docendi munus, æquum esse ut & ipse sibi titulum sumat, cum falsi doctores ejusmodi fucis adeo sese venditent.—]

IV. *Whether the Name of such as officiated in the first Centuries were not Presbyter, an Elder; and in after-ages, Sacerdos, a Priest? And whether that change were only of Names, or of the Nature of their Office, through the working of the Mystery of Iniquity, aggrandising himself, and turning the Lord's Supper into an Oblation? If the latter be true, where is Succession? How shall it be revived? Is it not in this case, as in the Adoption of Children, where a Lineage fails? Is it a Succession, where there hath been an Intercision and Discontinuance, or rather a Similitude and Resemblance?*

Those which officiated in the Primitive Churches (for the *Apostles*, saith *Salmasius*, under the name of *Walo Messalinus*, p. 19. are not to be recounted amongst them: It being inconsistent with the *Apostleship*, to fix in any City or Province, and teach in a settled way the People, without circuiting the World,) by way of Ministers, were at first called *Presbyters* or *Elders*; and afterwards, either out of a Compliance with the *Jewish Hierarchy*, or to allay the Objection of the *Heathens*, that the *Christians* were *Atheists*, having neither *Priesthood*, *Temple*, or *God*, they were advanced to the Dignity of *Priests*, though the reality thereof was the product of after-times, accordingly as the
opi-

opinion of the *Lord's Supper*, being a Sacrifice, did take root. ' The *Waldenses* did not
 own any Priesthood at all; and that justly (saith *Salmasius* or *Walo Messalinus*, p. 379. &c.) there being no such thing as Priests and Priesthood to be found in the Gospels or Apostolick Writings. Not the Apostles, not those whom they set in the Churches to Rule, neither the one, nor the other are so called, but *Bishops* or *Presbyters*. Where there is not so much as the Name recorded, why should we imagine the Thing it self to have been. Yea, the Apostles who first of all divulged the Gospel, seem to have made it their work, to abolish the Name and Memory of Jewish Sacrifices in the Places they converted? Where there were no Sacrifices, there ought to be no mention of a Priest or Priesthood. The name of *Altar* was not heard of in the Primitive Church established by the Apostles: It was a Table not Altar, whereat the *Lord's Supper* was celebrated and dispenced. Since therefore it is not read, that Christ, or his Disciples, who first planted the new Religion, did ascribe unto the Ministers, or Propagators thereof, the Appellation of Priest, but of Bishop and Presbyter; it is not likely that they would introduce or fix a Priesthood, however distinguished in Model from that which they went about to abolish. They were converted from being Jews, whose Laws and Ceremonies Christ did antiquate. In that
 Religion

Religion there were *Priests*, *High-priests*
 and *Levites*, whose Office and Ministry
 was so annexed to one Tribe, that it could
 not pass into another. They of other
 Tribes were called *Laicks* and private Per-
 sons, and were thereby distinguished from
 the Progeny of *Aaron*; from amongst those
Laicks were chosen the *Elders of the People*,
 ἄρχεσβύτεροι τῶν λαῶν, which were together with
 the *Doctors* and *Masters* in *Israel* (which
 were not limited to be of a Levitical Des-
 cent) to make up the Rulers of *Synagogues*,
 or *Assembly of the People*. Now where-
 as *Christ* might have constituted his *Dis-*
ciples according to the *Jewish Model*, to
 be *Priests*, and so to be called, as who
 were to offer up the *Sacrifice of his Body*;
 yet he did not do it. He made no *High-*
Priests nor other *Priests*, whose *Service* he
 might use in the *Propagation of the Go-*
spel. He called them *Apostles*, or such as
 were sent: An Appellation not unknown
 to the *Jews*, but given to such as being
Ministers of Synagogues, were sent by the
Patriarch to collect *Monies* from several
Synagogues, which they were to bring
 unto him, *Cod. Theod. leg. 6. 1. de Judæis.*
 The *Jews* term them שליחים *Selichim*.
 That the *Apostles* of the *Synagogues* had
 under their *Patriarchs* such an *Employ-*
ment, *Epiphanius* manifests in his account
 of the *History of the Ebionites*, where he
 speaks of one *Apostle Joseph*, who was
 sent into *Cilicia* by the *Patriarch*, to collect
 the

Mark this
 for no
 Priesthood
 no Tythe.

the Tenths and first Fruits. By this general
 name, and which was usually attributed
 in *Judea* to such like *Messengers*, or *Mitten-*
dary, as the more modern Latinists did
 word it, sent Christ his Disciples. He called
 them *Apostles*: שִׁלְחִים, a modest and
 humble Title. Nor would he call those
 his *Nuncio's*, or *Ministers* of the word, *Priests*.
 First, because in the new Law there was
 not any need of Sacrifices, which were
 requisite in the Old. And then again, be-
 cause that Name was too stately and mag-
 nificent, and no way agreeing with the
 condition of such as he had elected for
 Disciples, being of an inferior Rank, even
 Fishers. But amongst the *Jews*, as also the
Greeks, but especially the *Jews*, the *Priest-*
hood was an ennobling condition; so that
 only the *Priests* were the *Nobility*, the rest
 were esteemed of only as the *Commonalty*
 and private Persons. So *Josephus* in his
 Life, As amongst all other People there is
 some peculiar Character of the Nobility, so
 amongst us that of the Priesthood is received.
 Hence *Clemens* in his Epistle to the *Corin-*
thians, when he had recounted the several
 Orders or Degrees in the *Jewish Hierarchy*,
 made up of *High Priests*, and other *Priests*
 and *Levites*, he terms all the rest *Laicks*.
 The same *Clemens*, when he comes to speak
 of such as officiated in Christian Assem-
 blies, he calls not them *Priests*, *Chief Priests*,
 or *Levites*, but *Deacons*, *Bishops* and *Presby-*
ters, [*διακόνους & ἐπισκόπους quos & πρεσβυτέρους*
 nominat]

' nominat.] for which Names he seeks an
 ' Original in the Old Testament, in *Isaiab*,
 ' where they are mentioned. But he did
 ' not think these Names or Employments
 ' had any affinity with the *Jewish Priesthood*.
 ' For as Christ did send his Disciples to
 ' preach unto the Nations by the Title of
 ' Apostles, a Name borrowed from the
 ' *Jewish Synagogues*, so the Apostles, in their
 ' establishing of Churches, such as they set
 ' to Rule therein, they stiled Elders or Pres-
 ' byters, which Appellation they borrowed
 ' from the *Jewish Presbytery* or *Eldership*. As
 ' the Jewish Synagogue had its *Presbyters* and
 ' *Masters* or *Doctors*, so the Apostles placed
 ' in their Churches such an *Eldership*, where-
 ' in the same should be Pastors and Teachers,
 ' to rule and instruct the People. As the
 ' *Elders* and *Doctors* of the *Jews* were *Laicks*,
 ' nor had any affinity with the *Priests* and
 ' *Levites*, so the *Christian Elders* and *Bishops*,
 ' being no *Priests*, had no *Sacerdotal Acts*, or
 ' *Dignity*, whereby to be distinguished from
 ' the *Laity*. The Administration of the two
 ' Sacraments appointed by Christ, did not
 ' render them *Priests*: For *Baptism* might of
 ' old be administred by *Deacons*, who were
 ' no *Ecclesiastical Officers*; so *Philip* baptised
 ' the *Eunuch*, and so for a long time did that
 ' Custom continue in the Church. Yea *Lay-*
 ' *men* might Baptise in case of necessity, if
 ' no *Presbyter* or *Deacon* were present. This
 ' is evinced by an eminent passage in *Ter-*
 ' *tullian's Book of Baptism*, which runs thus;

The Chief Priest or Bishop hath right to administer Baptism; and after him, the Presbyters and Deacons; but yet not without Authority received from the Bishop, out of regard to the Honour of the Church, which being preserved entire, things continue peaceable. Otherwise [that is, saith Pamelius, if we set aside Considerations of the Honour of the Church] even Lay-men may Baptise by right; For that which is equally received, may be equally communicated, [of the same Judgment is Jerom] unless some Bishop, Presbyter, or Deacon may be had, since the Word of the Lord ought not to be concealed from any. Wherefore Baptism, which is equally the Treasury of the Lord, may be administered by all. [Mark this, that in his Judgment all may preach, as well as Baptise; and that it is but Church-respect that limits them, not any Gospel Precept or Inhibition.] But how much more ought the Laicks to be modest and discreet herein, since even the greatest are prohibited to usurp the Office of a Bishop? Emulation is the Mother of Schisms. The Holy Apostle said, all things were lawful, but not expedient. Let it suffice then, that in case of necessity you may use it, according as the Circumstances of Time, Place, and Person, require the performance. You see how it is lawful for Laicks to Baptise in case of necessity, when none in Orders are present. If this were an Act peculiar to the Priesthood, as it is a Priesthood, it could never be legitimately performed by a Laick; it having never been lawful

lawful for a private Person to discharge
 any such Act as was properly *Sacerdotal* ;
 nor could necessity ever excuse such At-
 tempts: Which is true according to the
 Rites of the *Gentiles*, as well as *Jews*. But
 a *Bishop* or *Presbyter*, yea and *Deacon* of the
 Christian Church, in that they administred
 the Sacraments of Christ, they did it not
 as *Priests*, but as *Lay-men*, chosen out of
 the multitude to perform such and such
 Duties. Thus a Magistrate may do some
 things, which a private Person may not.
Baptism (saith *Tertullian*) as it is the *Trea-*
sury of God, may be administred by any body.
 But that Schism, Emulation and Disorder
 might be taken away, or prevented, some
 out of the Commonalty were elected to
 such Performances. Yet were not they
 thereupon made *Priests*, [or equivalent to
 them] nor were they reputed for such,
 after they had been created by the Apo-
 stles: For they did not propose to them-
 selves the *Jewish Priesthood* for a Pattern,
 much less that of the *Gentiles*. As the *Ma-*
gistrate is so distinguished from the *Popu-*
lace, as to be also distinct from the *Priest-*
hood, he being but a more honourable
 Member of the Multitude: Such was the
 Condition of the *Primitive Presbyters* of the
 Church, who were ordained by the Apo-
 stles. The *Eucharist* or *Lord's Supper* is
 another part of the *Treasury of the Lord*,
 that too was in process of time so admi-
 nistred particularly by the *Presbyters*, as
 they

they were Presidents in the Church, and
 not Priests. Of this the same may be said,
 which *Tertullian* avowed of *Baptism*, viz.
As it is the Treasury of the Lord, it may be
dispenced by any body; and indeed so it was
in its first Institution: And afterwards,
when that Custom was altered, if the
Presbyters were absent, Lay-men did di-
stribute it, and consecrate it, and that law-
fully. Hence in the first Ages, according
to the original Prescript, it was celebrated
after Supper, and that too by each Master
of the Family in his House. Tertullian re-
ords it amongst such Rites as had been
introduced by a Deviation from Primitive
Constitutions, that in his time they re-
ceived the Sacrament from the hands of
the Presbyters or Presidents. In his Book
De Corona, he saith, The Sacrament of the
Eucharist being enjoyned at Supper-time, and
unto all, by the Lord; even in our Assemblies
before day-break, do we receive, and that from
no other hand than the Presidents. In the
African Church, that there might continue
some Memorials of the Ancient Practice,
anniversarily on a certain day after Supper,
they did communicate, and did in reality
celebrate the Lord's Supper. In many places
of Egypt, saith Sozomen, they assembled to-
gether on the Sabbath in the Church,
and did partake of the Lord's Supper, Παρά
ἃ Ἀιγυπτίοις ἐν πολλαῖς πόλεσι καὶ κώμαις, παρὰ τὸ
κοινῇ πάσαι νομομισμένον, πρὸς ἑσπέρην τῷ σαββάτῳ
συνίοντες ἡρισκότες ἦδη τῶ μυστηρίῳ μετέχουσι. In
several

Cod. Afric.
 Can. 41.

several Towns and Villages of the Egyptians,
 contrary to the Custom generally received, in
 the Evening of the Sabbath, they having supped
 already [so Salmasius renders it, *jam cœnati*]
 assemble and receive the Sacrament. The
 Laicks did also consecrate and dispence it
 to themselves, if the Presbyter or Presi-
 dent were not in the way. Of this we
 have a pregnant Testimony in Tertullian's
 Exhortation to his Wife, which is basely cor-
 rupted in former Editions: Are not we of
 the Laity Priests? It is written, He hath made
 us Kings and Priests to God and his Father.
 The difference betwixt Pastors and People [*in-*
ter ordinem & plebem] is but a Constitution
 of the Church, not of any higher authoritative
 Appointment, and an Honour which owes its
 Sanctity to the Ecclesiastical Session. Where-
 fore if there be no Ecclesiastical Order, you
 Baptise, you Communicate, and you are a Priest
 unto your self alone. But where there are Three,
 there is a Church, though of Lay-men. Yea,
 the Name of Church is attributed to the
 Assembly of the Faithful, as contra-distinct
 to their Pastors, even in the Acts of the
 Apostles, and the Constitutions of the
 Pseudo-Clemens. In Church-polity the Pres-
 byters and Laity [*ordo & plebs*] were so di-
 stinguish'd, as in the Civil Government of
 the Gentiles were [*ordo & plebs*] the Senate
 and People. And this distinction betwixt
 the Governours and Governed, [*inter ordi-*
nem Ecclesiasticum & plebem] was not, in
 the Judgment of Tertullian, of Divine In-
 stitution,

stitution, but the Appointment of the Church. The same Writer (as well as *Ambrose, Jerom and Austin*) in the fore-mentioned passage out of his Book of Baptism, avoweth that it was from the same reason that Bishops came to be superior to Presbyters, *propter Ecclesiae honorem; quo salvo, salva pax est.* Thus it is his Judgment [who was one of the most Learned, as well as Ancient Fathers] that the whole Ecclesiastical Order was a thing not of Divine, but Humane Constitution. But however the Order of Clergy and Laity (for the Greek Councils term the Laity an Order) are not so distinct as Priests and People, but as Prefects or Rulers, and those that are under Government. Doth Ordination, that is, Imposition of Hands, by which they are ordained, or ranked in order [*in ordinem co-optantur*] make them Priests? No, not at all, let them talk what they will of a Sacrament of Order; neither do they which confer it, confer it as Priests, nor are the Receivers by virtue of such Collation made Priests. There is not any Sacrament of Christ, the Administration whereof doth qualifie a Priest, because Christ instituted no Priesthood, nor did he constitute them Priests with whom he intrusted his Church. He ordained *Apostles*, and denominated them so from their being sent. The *Apostles* did afterwards ordain *Presbyters* or *Bishops* to rule and instruct the People. There was no

need of *Priests* to perform the Sacred Rites
 and Solemnities, after the Jewish Sacrifices
 are abolished, and those of the *Gentiles* dis-
 used. *Ordination* is the *Act* it self, where-
 by thorough certain Ceremonies and Rites,
 one is chosen and elected into an *Order*
 [*ordinem*] to be a Member of that Order,
 Body or Colledge into which he is chosen.
 An *Order* [*ordo*] is a certain number of
 Men which make up one Body or Colledge,
 each one obtaining place in the said Body
 accordingly as he was admitted; he who
 was first chosen, being the first; who second,
 second; and who last, being last. Hence
 came the Appellation of *Order* [*Ordo*.]
 Nor is there any Body, Colledge or So-
 ciety, which may not upon this account
 be termed an *Order*, [*Ordo*] or hath not
 been so. But sometimes by way of *Emi-
 nence*, καὶ ἐξοχίην, the principal Order or
 Colledge in the Republick, or City, was
 stiled the *Senatorian Order*, and so distin-
 guished from the People. Thus in the
 Church, the *Senate* or Colledge of *Presbyters*,
 amongst whom the *Bishop* did preside, was
 termed an *Order*, or the *Order*, as appears
 by that passage of *Tertullian* already cited,
inter ordineim & plebem. Otherwise all the
Bishops made up their own *Order*, after that
 they became distinct and superior to the
Presbyters: The *Presbyters* they constituted
 the second *Order*: The *Deacons* they did
 also make up their *Order*; and so forth,
 even to the *Door-keepers*. The *People* had
 their

their distinct Order from these other Ec-
 clestical ones, they being *one Body*, and
 frequently stiled in the *Greek Councils*, the
Lay-order, *λειτουργία*. The Prophets,
 whilst they lived in the Primitive Times,
 they made up the *Prophetical Order*, where-
 of mention is found in *Ruffinus*. From what
 hath been said, it is manifest to every one,
 how *besotted* they were, who from *Ordina-*
tion introduced a *Sacrament of Order*, or
Orders; whence proceeded those foolish
 and ridiculous Forms of Speech, *To take*
or enter into Orders; Expressions not to be
 found in purer Times, when Men were
 said to be chosen, or admitted into the
Order, or the like, at such time as they
 were Ordained, that is, admitted to a place
 in this or that Order. Now all *Ordinations*,
 Civil or Ecclesiastical, amongst *Jews* and
Heathens, were performed with certain
 Rites and Ceremonies: The *Christians* did
 derive theirs, which they used at the Or-
 dination of *Presbyters* or *Bishops*, from the
Jews: For they did ordain the *Elders* or
Presbyters of their Synagogue, and the
Doctors of their Law, by Imposition of
 Hands, which was called *שמיכה* *Semicha*,
 that is, *χειροθεσία*, *laying on of Hands*. This
 in the Old and New Testament, was used
 for the conferring of the Holy Ghost:
Imposition of Hands was likewise used for
 the promoting Men to the Degree of *Rab-*
bines or *Doctors*: And at the Collation of
 Juridical Power. From hence sprang that

Custom in the Church of Christ, that
 when any were designed to any publick
 Ministry or Magistry in the Church, they
 were so designed by this Jewish *Semicha*,
 or *Imposition of Hands*. And this Imposi-
 tion of Hands, howbeit it were of *Divine*
Right; yet such as were designed to a pu-
 blick *Magistry* or *Ministry*, to teach, rule,
 or serve in the Church, were not there-
 upon made *Priests*. In *Jury* it was per-
 formed by *Three*. In *Codice Sanedrin*, Cap. i.
 סמיכה וקנים it is rendered χειροθεσία
 προσβυτέρων, the *laying on of Hands of the El-*
ders, and is said to be performed by *Three*.
 From whence it is, that in the *Apostolick*
Canons and *Constitutions of Clemens*, it is
 appointed that a *Bishop* be ordained by
Three. But the fourth Canon of the first
Synod doth enact, that a *Bishop* be or-
 dained at least by *Three*, if all the other
Bishops of the Province cannot be present.
 It is called in *Codice Sanedrin*, ἐπίθεσις ἢ
 χειρῶν ἢ προσβυτέρων, or the *laying on of the*
Hands of the Elders. *Paul*, 1 *Tim.* 4. 14. calls
 it, ἐπίθεσις ἢ χειρῶν τῆ προσβυτέρου, the *lay-*
ing on of the Hands of the Presbytery, or *Elder-*
ship, which is all one. Since therefore that
 solemn *Imposition of Hands* among the *Jews*,
 when they created the *Elders* of the *Syna-*
gogue, or *Doctors*, did not make them
Priests, but only gave them Authority to
Judge and *Teach* the People: So neither
 did the *Laying on of Hands*, which out of
 Imitation of them was used among the
 Christians,

c *Christians*, to create *Presbyters* and *Teachers*,
 c imprint on them a *Sacerdotal Character*.
 c Even in the Old Testament, as well as New,
 c the Holy Ghost was conferred by Imposi-
 c tion of Hands: Thus *Joshua* the Son of
 c *Nun* was filled with the Holy Ghost, after
 c *Moses* had laid his Hands on him, *Deut. 34.9.*
 c And other Examples there are in Scrip-
 c ture. The Name of *Priest*, as it was ascri-
 c bed to the *Christian Presbyters*, and that of
 c *Chief Priests*, to be distinct from the *Laity*,
 c was introduced in the second Century,
 c and in the Age after the Apostles. For
 c when many came over from Heathenism
 c to Christianity, and several of the *Jews*
 c were converted, both of which, in the Re-
 c ligious which they deserted, had been in-
 c ured to *Priests* and *Chief Priests*; it was easie
 c for them so to accommodate things, that
 c in their newly-embraced Religion they
 c should either find or create *Priests*, espe-
 c cially in Name. And indeed they did ra-
 c ther create them, for there were none at
 c first amongst the *Christians*. Nor was this
 c change of Names opposed by such as re-
 c ceived the Converts, that so they might
 c gain more and more upon the *Jews* and
 c *Gentiles*, chiefly seeing the whole Contro-
 c versie seemed to be but a Word or Name-
 c quarrel. They did little think that such
 c temporizing and compliance in words,
 c would at last beget an Alteration in the
 c things themselves. That which they then
 c called a *Sacrifice*, was not esteemed of as a

' real and propitiatory one: Whom they
 ' called *Priests*, then were not reputed *truly*
 ' such, nor of a resembling Appointment
 ' to what was amongst the *Jews*. What
 ' they called *Altars*, were not deemed pa-
 ' rallel to what the Heathenish Rites and
 ' Sacrifices were performed at. In a word,
 ' after some space of time, as all things de-
 ' generate, so Men in the Christian Church
 ' began to think of real Altars, real Sacri-
 ' fices, real Priests, no less than the *Jews* or
 ' *Heathens*. Thereupon the Imposition of
 ' Hands, whereby they were ordained
 ' *Priests*, was held as a great *Sacrament*. The
 ' *Priests* began so to be distinguished from
 ' the *Laicks*, as the *Priests* and *Commonalty*
 ' amongst the *Jews*. In the Time of *Cle-*
 ' *ment*, this distinction betwixt the Sacer-
 ' dotal Order and Laity, was not intro-
 ' duced among *Christians*, being a distinction
 ' purely *Jewish*. He tells them at *Corinth*,
 ' that the Apostles did constitute in the
 ' Church *Bishops* and *Deacons*, and that not
 ' by any very extraordinary Dispensation,
 ' it having been long foretold in Scrip-
 ' ture, *καταθήσω τὰς ἐπισκόπους ἐν δικαίῳ μῆτι, καὶ*
 ' *τὰς διακόνους αὐτῶν ἐν πίστι.* I will appoint their
 ' *Bishops* in *Justice*, and their *Ministers* in
 ' *Faith*. If there had been any resemblance
 ' betwixt the Christian *Bishops*, and those
 ' of the *Jews*, he would have had re-
 ' course to the *Jewish Hierarchy*, and not
 ' to those *Bishops* and *Ministers* in *Isaiab*,
 ' that had no affinity with the former.
 ' The

The *Bishops* and *Presbyters* in those days were so far *Laicks*, as to be esteemed only the more honourable part of the People: And therefore it was, that several Laymen were chosen to be *Presbyters* and *Bishops*, without being promoted gradually thorough the inferior Orders. And that Custom did continue long in the Church. Thus *Ambrose* at *Millain*, *Nectarius* at *Constantinople*, and some-body else in *Syriaca*, all which had been civilly employed. And it is evident out of *Leo's* Epistle, that this was the Custom in several places of *Italy*, which he went about to abolish—These things being so (saith *Salmasius* to *Petavius*) why do you censure *Luther* and the *Waldenses*, because they denied all manner of *Priesthood*, believing, that an honest believing Layman might perform all those things and Ecclesiastical Duties in the Church of God, having been impowered thereunto by Imposition of Hands from the *Presbytery*, that is a Lay-call and not Ecclesiastical *Senate*? Certainly *Peter*, by whose Authority he proved his Assertion, did say that all Laymen were *Priests*: And styles the Christians universally (all that are to be living Stones in Christ) a *Royal and Holy Priesthood*.

See what the Judgment of *Luther* was hereafter.

From all this that hath been said by the most learned *Salmasius* (though even *Bellarmino* himself confessed that such as served Christ in the Ministry of the Gospel amongst

the first Christians, were not of a long time called *Priests*, but *Presbyters*) it is evident that there was a change of Names, and that the aforefaid change of Names did introduce a change in the substantial part of their *Function*; they who at first were looked upon only as *Lay-men*, maintained by the *free contribution* of the Believers, whose *Office* was meerly a *procuracion*, or not a *Dignity*, *Magistracy*, or *Authority*, or *Power* (as *Salmasius* proves at large thoroughout the sixth chapter of *Walo Messalinus* : As also doth the well-read Bishop of *Spalato*, where he deprives them of all *Jurisdiction*) these afterwards became, as well as were termed, *Priests*, as were *Aaron and his Sons*, together with the *Levites amongst the Jews in the Temple*; such were, and the same quality did the *Bishops, Presbyters, and Deacons challenge in the Church* : Yea afterwards gave them their *Courts and Apparitours*. *Tithes* became claimed and granted upon a *Divine Right*, and they who before were the *Peoples Creatures*, such as they did *Elect*, and could *Depose* or *Excommunicate*, and who could perform no *Church-act* without them, their employment being to oversee, not in a

Compulsive, but *Voluntary Way*, 1 Pet. 5. 2. *Dignity, Authority, Magistral Power*, were so much insisted on, as if he that desired a *Bishoprick*, had not desired a *Work*, a good *Work*; but an office with *Jurisdiction* :

Petrus omnem jurisdictionem adimit. Episcopis, ubi officium eorum vult esse ad ἐπιτοκρεῖν, ἢ ἀναγκασῆς, ἀλλ' ἐκασίως, hoc fit v. lentibus præcipiendo quod eis canducat, & consulendo, non jubendo quod libeat imperanti, nec cogendo nolentes. Jurisdictionis omnis ἀναγκασῆς est. V. Valo Messalio, c. 6. p. 460.

Jurisdiction: And the People were totally deprived in their right in the Governace of the *Church*. After that things have continued in this posture 1400 Years, for Men to start up, and without any new Power collated on them, to pretend to re-establish the *primitive* Presbytery, is such an attempt as could not enter into the thoughts of considering Men. There may be a resemblance betwixt the *Altar* at *Damascus* and that at *Jerusalem*, but they are not the same. The example of the *Levites* in *Israel*, if they reform from Idolatry, avails not here; because the Priesthood to them was a *Birth-right*, and did not depend upon Institution: The Descendants of *Aaron*, though consecrated Priests to *Moloch* or *Baal*, did not cease to be *Levites*; but it is not so with *Presbyters*: Or, suppose it were so with them who had been once *rightly* constituted, What is that to them who never were so? Can they give a power which they never had? Can they exercise a power which they never receiv'd? If out of Scripture it be proved that *Mas-Priests* should be *Presbyters*; out of their *Officialls* it is clear that they are not so: And consequently, in order to the discharge of such a Function, they are private Persons: And if they who ordained them were such, the Ordained could receive no other Institution than to be the *equivocating* Generation of *equivocal* Parents. But if we must have *primitive* *Presbyters*, what means the claim for *Jurisdiction*? Where is the power of the
 People

People to Elect? Where is their voluntary Maintenance? What do we with an enforced Maintenance of Tithes? Which, if they are due by the Law of Nature to the Priesthood, What availeth this them who are none? I desire them, who allow a succession deduced thorough Popery, to consider what God says by the Prophet Ezekiel,

Beza against Seravia (animadv. in c. II.) at the name of the Clergy cryeth out, Quam istum in Ecclesiis reformatis Clerum nunc esse definiemus? Nam aliquam eorum turbam, qui ex Papistici illius Cleri, ac praefertim ex Sacrificulorum, quos falso nomine Presbyteros appellant, sentina emerferint? VVhom shall we call the Clergy among the reformed Churches? Is it that Rabble-rout which came over from that Popish Clergy, and the number of those Priests who are falsely termed Presbyters?

ch. 44 v. 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. *The Levites (who were such by Birth, and not personal appointment) that are gone away far from me, when Israel went astray, which went astray after their Idols, they shall even bear their Iniquity. Yet they shall be Ministers in my Sanctuary, having charge at the Gates of the House, and ministering to the House: They shall slay the Burnt-offering, and the Sacrifice for the People, and they shall stand before them to minister unto them. Because they ministred unto them before their Idols, and caused the House of Israel to fall into Iniquity: Therefore have I lifted up mine hand against them, saith the Lord God, and they shall bear their Iniquity. And they shall not come near unto me to do the office of a Priest unto me, nor to come near unto any of my Holy Things, in the most Holy Place: But they shall bear their Shame, and their Abominations which they have committed. But I will make them keepers of the charge of the House for all the service*

vice thereof, and for all that shall be done therein. But the Priests, the Levites, the Sons of Zadok, that kept the charge of my Sanctuary, when the Children of Israel went astray from me, they shall come near to me to minister unto me, and they shall stand before me, to offer unto me the Fat, and the Blood, saith the Lord God. They shall enter into my Sanctuary, and they shall come near to my Table, to minister unto me, and they shall keep my charge. Conformable hereunto was the practise of good *Josiah*, 2 Kings 23. v. 9. After that he had extirpated Idolatry, and re-established the worship of God. The Priests of the High-places (notwithstanding what of plea our Ministers suggests for them, and whereof *Josiah* could not be ignorant) they came not up to the Altar of the Lord in Jerusalem, but they did eat of the unleavened bread amongst their Brethren.

Though, setting aside this last consideration, I never think of the Ordination by laying on of hands insignificantly, continued now amongst the Presbyterians and Episcoparians, but I remember a passage of *Mountain about Tithes*, c. 3. p. 438. 'How Her-^{l. 4. p. 170.}cules was enfranchised amongst the Gods, and born by *Juno* again, as *Diodore* relateth (in some such sort, as amongst us, the Children of *John* of Gaunt by *Katharine Swinford*, are said to have been made legitimate by Act of Parliament) by a solemn ceremony, he coming from under *Juno's* Clothes.

V. *Whether the present Ministry (supposing them to be generally Presbyterians or Episcoparians) do not pretend to be Ministers of the Church Catholick? Whether there be any mention of such a Church in Scripture, or in any Ancient Creed of the first Ages? And whether Luther did not place instead thereof, in his Creed, the Christian Church? Whether any body can tell what is the determinate meaning of that word? Whether the Ordainers and Ordained now a-days deal conscienciously in giving or receiving, and acting really by vertue of a power from and over the Catholick Church, whilst the existence and signification thereof is so controverted amongst themselves and others?*

To say nothing of the *Episcopal Divines*, that the most insupportable *Presbyterian* makes this to be his claim, it is evident not only from *Dr. John Wallis* (Sub-Scribe in the *Westminster Assembly*) in his *Thesis* of the power of a Minister out of his particular Congregation: But also from the Contest betwixt the *Independent Ministers of Suffolk*, and *Dr. Collins of Norwich*, and *Mr. Pool of London*, who writes at the appointment of the provincial *Assembly* there, in whose late Books, against each other, this Question is largely debated concerning *Ministers* being proximately related to a *Catholick Church*, and with great advantage on the side of the *Congregational Men in Suffolk*. That there is no mention of a *Catholick Church* in Scripture, it is clear, no *Concordance* hitherto could shew it: And it is very strange that
the

the Holy Ghost in the Scriptures (which are able to make the Man of God perfect unto every good Word, no less than Work) should not once mention this visible Catholick Church, neither directly, nor by any equipollent Terms: That in the good thing which was committed unto *Timothy*, and in that Form of sound words which he had heard from *Paul*, and which he was to hold fast, there should not be any slight Intimation or Record thereof, renders its Existence very suspicious: Especially *Timothy* (according to the Fancy of the *Presbyterians*) being a Minister, and consequently participating of this Delegacy over the Catholick Church, and his immediate and most considerable Relation being thereunto, the Station he held in *Crete* being only Secondary: That *Paul* should tell the Elders of the Church at *Ephesus*, that he had kept back nothing which was profitable unto them; That he had not shunned to declare unto them all the Counsel of God, and yet should only bid them take heed unto themselves, and to all the Flock (not throughout the World, but at *Ephesus*) over which the Holy Ghost had made them Overseers, to feed the Church of God, which he had purchased with his Blood: All which the ensuing words evince to appertain to the particular Church of *Ephesus*, whereof (and not of the Catholick Church) they are called Elders, v. 17.) This creates in me an Apprehension that this Catholick Church, and Catholick-Church-Ministry, is neither a part of the

2 Tim. 3.
16, 17.

2 Tim. 1.
13, 14.

Acts 20. 29.
27, 28.

Counsel

Counfel of God, nor profitable to be known. That it is as little to be found in the ancient Creeds as in the Scripture, you may not only learn from Bishop *Usher* in his Treatise of the Creeds, p. 8, 9, 12. in several Copies, but more fully from *Vossius* in his Discourse of the *Three Creeds*, p. 27. §. 39. ' The
 ' *Aquilegian Creed* hath not the word Catho-
 ' lick, yet it is added thereto in the Edi-
 ' tion of *Pamelius*--but wrongfully, for the
 ' ancientest Books read it otherwise. And
 ' if *Ruffinus* had owned it, he had explained
 ' it, for it is not a passage of slight moment.
 ' But what wonder is it if it be not in
 ' *Ruffinus*, seeing *Austin* had it not? Who
 ' in his Explanation of the *Creed*, when he
 ' comes to the passage of *Holy Church*, he
 ' adds for Illustration sake, *To wit, the Ca-*
 ' *tholick*. And that is understood by *Holy*,
 ' there being none *Holy*, but the *Catholick*.
 ' Nay in the Apostles time it was not the
 ' Custom for Christians to be called *Catholicks*:
 ' As *Pacianus* wrote it in a Letter to *Sympho-*
 ' *rianus*, who lived in the time of *Ferom*.
 ' Whence [our *English*] *Whitaker*, in his Book
 ' of the Church, did collect, that the Ap-
 ' pellation of the *Catholick Church*, was not
 ' used in the Apostolical times. Yea, and
 ' *Franciscus Picus* did think that the Clause
 ' of the *Church Catholick* was introduced
 ' after the *Nicene Creed*, by way of opposition
 ' to the *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks*: Who,
 ' whatever *Truth* they held, did not possess
 ' (or were made to believe so) that *Univer-*
 ' *sality*

ality of Mankind, whereunto the others pretended. *Luther* is charged by the *Papists* to have placed in-

stead thereof the word *Christian*, in his little *Catechism*, fol. 12. and in the great *Catechism*, fol. 64.

as it is in the *Body of the Doctrine of the Saxon Churches*, published by *John Willeam Duke of Saxony* at *Jena* 1570. the *Heirs of Christian*

Rodinger printing it. Repeating it *Eine*

Heilige Christliche Kirche. Nor is this said to

have been denied by *Chemnitius*, in *Gerard's*

Common places of Divinity, but that he re-

plied to that Accusation, how *Luther* was

not the first who made that Variation, but

that before his time the *German Creed* had

it usually *Ich glaube eine heilige Chri-*

stliche Kirche, *I believe one Holy Church*.

As for the signification or meaning of the

word, it is very ambiguous. Three prin-

cipal Grounds are given, why the *Church*

should be termed *Universal* or *Catholick* :

First, From its *Universality of place*, it being

It is acknowledged that *Luther* could not endure the Name of *Catholick*, in so much as if that word were found in his *Writings* with Approbation, the Book or Passage was thereupon suspected by his *Scholars*, as not being his. See *Colloqu. Altemberg.* in resp. ad accus. Cor. 2. fol. 254. as *Brerely* in his *Protestants Apology* doth cite it.

Balth. Meisneri de Eccles. p. 314. Gerard. loc. Theolog. in fol. 1. 5. de Ecclesia, c. 2. Sect. 34.

professed

professed thereby, respecting God and the
 Creatures, things visible and invisible. From
 the *Universality of its Spiritual Care*, as to all
 manner of Sins. And lastly, From its *re-*
spective Universality, in regard of the *Jews*
 and *Hereticks*; the former being restrained
 to *Palestine*, and the latter being never like-
 ly to grow so numerous, but that the *true*
Church shall exceed them, though not in re-
 gard of some particular Country, yet in re-
 spect of the whole World. The *Universa-*
lity of the Church upon the Papistical grounds
 aforesaid, is audited by *Balthasar Maisnerus*,
 in his Book of the Church, *Sect. 4. c. 3.* whi-
 ther I remit the Reader, being loth to
 trouble my self with idle Enquiries. I only
 observe, that since words do not signifie
 naturally, but by the Institution of Man, in
 whose Language God is pleased to deliver
 himself: Since we cannot know what the
 meaning and intent of him or them was,
 who first imposed that Name, (which it is
 evident we cannot, it being not known who
 introduced it, or when it began to be used)
 all that we can do, is to know how this
 Appellation of Humane Original, if it must
 be retained, may be verified. The general
 meaning of the first Reformers was, That
 the Catholick Church of Christ was made
 up of his Elect, that had been, were, or
 should be, to the end of the World. Hence
Luther saith, the Holy Church in the Creed
 is invisible, and hid in the Spirit, and only
 believed, not seen. So the Learned and
 Judicious

Luther de
abrog. miss.
privat. inter
op. Witte-
berg. t. 2. f.

Judicious *Sadeel* against *Turrianus's* Sophisms
 (p. 566. *Oper. in Fol.*) 'We, by the Name
 ' of one Catholick Church, understand the
 ' *Invisible Church of the Elect*, whose Head is
 ' Christ; and we presume upon certain
 ' Testimonies in Scripture, *Colos. 1. Ephes. 4*
 ' and 5, &c. And, if we will speak pro-
 ' perly, then will the Church Catholick be
 ' compleat, when Christ shall come to judge
 ' the Quick and the Dead.— And in his
 Animadversions upon the Articles of the
 Monks of *Bourdeaux*, he saith, The Catholick
 Church consists only of the Faithful and
 Elect, and that it is Invisible, as compre-
 hending the Saints in Heaven. For do not
 they belong to the Catholick Church? If
 so, then you must either make two Catho-
 lick Churches (contrary to the *Nicene Creed*,
 of *one Catholick and Apostolick Church*) one *Vi-*
sible, the other *Invisible*; or confess that that
 which is *one*, is *invisible*. He tells us there,
 and elsewhere, that particular Churches are
one only by Religion, and Profession of the
 same Doctrine, they are otherwise *Indivi-*
duals, of which the Name of Church is pre-
 dicated, as the Church of *Corinth*, *Ephesus*,
Philippi, &c. These, he saith, are visible
 Churches, because they retain the exterior
 Order and Face of Churches; they are
 made up of Believers and Unbelievers, and
 are called *Churches of Christ*, only from the
 mixture of the Elect, and their *Profession of*
him. In the Controversie, now in *England*
 on foot, besides the terming the *Christian*

Vide Sibrac-
dum Lubert-
tum de Ec-
clesia, l. 2.
c. 6. p. 82.
 &c.

Anton. Sa-
deel, p. 523.

Church, Catholick, in opposition to the *Jewish Church*, which was confined to *Palestine*, whilst this may subsist any where. (In which signification *Catholicism* may be attributed to *Paganism* or *Mahometanism*; and *Christian Catholicism* to any Church, *Socinian*, *Popish*, *Anabaptistical*, or otherwise opionated, *professing Christ*, in a way which they do avow for Truth, though others call it *Hereste*) or taking it for the *Universality* of *Christians* scattered over the face of the whole Earth (in which sense *Catholick* is *terminus minuens*, or a term which overthrows the subject upon which it is predicated; for since a *Church* is, by general acknowledgment, a *Congregation of Men thus and thus regulated*; a *Catholick Church*, in the Sence specified, is *no Church*, but one that is scattered and unchurched; and a *Minister* of such a *Church*, would be like a *Jew* in *Amsterdam*, who should pretend to be, or ordain an Officer for the *Ten Tribes*, carried into Captivity no body knows where. Besides these Acceptations, there are *two* more commonly insisted on; *The one*, that the *Catholick Church* is an universal Term in *Logick*, and the *Ministers* are *Ministers* of such a *Church*. This is the Judgment of *Dr. Collins* of *Norwich*, in his *Discourse* of the *Ministry*, as it is reported by his *Antagonists* of *Suffolk*, in the *Defence* of their *Preface* to the *Preacher Sent*. But as this is denied and refuted by them very well, so it is rejected by *Mr. Hudson*, a *Presbyterian*, as they likewise

likewise say. However it is Non-sence: For if the Church be such an Universal, and such Universals do only subsist in Particulars, (being, *aut nihil, aut quid posterius*) the *Presbyterians* do very ill to ordain Ministers of an Universal Church, that they may be after preferred to Particular ones, for they ought rather to ordain Ministers of Particular Churches, that so they might be found within the compass of the Imaginary Universality, which is either nothing but a word (and so they only Nominal Ministers) or else only an Essential Similitude or Resemblance betwixt one Church Particular and another; and so they who are no Ministers of a Particular Church, participate not of this Catholicism: And likewise they who are Ministers of such a Particular Church, have no power beyond that Church, by vertue of their Ministry, which is not Catholick, though their Churches be. Another acceptation of the word amongst us, is, That the severall Churches professing Christ, make up one Body of Christ, of which he is Head, and they his Stewards, actually confined to one Church, but authoritatively designed to all: So that every Presbyterian Minister is by his Ordination constituted a Pope, an Universal Ministerial Head of the Church, by way of Divine Mission; but by way of Prudential and Humane Condescension, they are content to admit of a Government shut up within Parochial Precincts. But if this be so, if by vertue of

that Delegation, *As the Father sent me, so send I you*; they have so universal a Mission every one to the whole Body of Christ, I do not see how in Conscience they can sit down with these narrow Boundaries (they being able to extend their Preaching further, as often as the usual Allotments do not afford sufficient Maintenance for their Luxury; which is visible in their Pluralities, and Incorporations of Parishes) since Christ seems to argue them into another Practise, *Luke 4. 42, 43, 44. And when it was day he departed, and went into a desert place: And the People sought him, and came unto him and stayed him, that he should not depart from them. And he said unto them, I MUST preach the Kingdom of God to OTHER Cities also: for THEREFORE am I sent. And he preached in the Synagogues of Galilee.* But to proceed: It is evident that all this Plea is meer Couzenage: For first, It is not imaginable what Union intercedes betwixt the several Churches professing Christ upon the face of the Earth: It is not known how far there is a Doctrinal Union or Consent among them, and if it were, yet would not that render them one visible Body, no more than the Book of the *Harmony of the Confessions of the Reformed Churches*, doth embody them; for Identity of Laws, or way of living, doth not make two Republicks to be one; since *Norimberg* in *Germany* is said to have sent to *Valenciennes* in *Flanders*, and to have derived its Platform of Government thence;

thence ; yet did not it thereby incorporate it self with *Valenciennes*, no more than *Rome* became a part of *Greece*, when they fetch'd thence their Laws of the *Twelve Tables* : So several Colledges in *Oxon*, have the same Statutes and Form of Government, yet do they not thereby become one Colledge : Nor in any of these cases is it said, that the Officers chosen here, or there, are Universal Officers, or Officers to the several Parties resembling. A common Meeting of all Christians at the Throne of Grace, is as weak a Proof to the effecting of an Union, as of a Visibility : For he who shall consider (not only that this is an invisible Meeting, and only of the Elect the Expression is warrantable from Scripture, but) that in the difference of Climates, varying accordingly Nights and Days and times of Worship, it is impossible there should be any joynt Meeting at the Throne of Grace, of these several Churches in several Situations, will never grant such parcel Meetings to be an universal Assembly ; much less that this is the Act of an Organical Body, it not being done by any mutual Entercourse, Correspondence, or Appointment, no nor Knowledge of each other : Now it is certain, that in an Organical (or indeed any Integral) Body, the Parts have no determinate particular Acts of their own ; no part doth this, or that, but the whole doth this or that by the part. *Actiones sunt Suppositorum*. And when any part is in such a Condition, that

its own *Archæus* (as I may call it) doth form its Operation; then it is but equivocally a part, no though joyned to the whole by Colligation, as in a rotten Bough, or gangrened Leg. In a word, since the Universal Church pretended, hath no Officers acting in an Universal way, nor is visible in it self by any Universal Actings, I leave these conceited Ministers of an ideated Church, to perswade us (for there is as good reason) that all the Kingdoms of the Earth are one Universal Kingdom, and that the Kings of *Spain, France, &c.* are Primarily Kings (or what name else they will afford them) of the Universal Kingdom, and Secundarily of the Kingdoms specified. He that will further enquire into this Controversie, may satisfie himself in the *Suffolk Ministers Preacher Sent*, and their late Defence thereof. But it is further considerable, that all particular Churches are only Churches of Christ by Profession, not by any relation to him, as *Spouse, Flock, or Body*: These are Assemblies of a mix'd Nature, Fields in which the Tares grow up with the Corn, Bodies wherein corrupt (however disguised) Humours and Excrements are contained, and some whereof shall never have any part in that Church which is (according to God's Predestination and Intent) without Spot, and without Wrinkle. Their Combination or right of Assembling, is founded in Nature, not any new command of Christ, and hath no other rise than

than the Heathen Worship had; Examples are no Institutions; and those general Precepts, of *doing all things according to Order, Decency, for the Glory of God, and Edification of others*, these are but the Dictates of Nature transcribed into the written Word of God. For if it were otherwise (to pass by the Arguments used by the Reformed Divines against *Bellarmino*; that the Church, which is the Mystical Body of Christ, consists only of the Predestinate) however conjugal Relations, or the like, should not multiply in Christ, yet would it be undeniable that such a number of particular Churches would increase to a multitude of *Spouses, Bodies, &c.* Yet doth the Scripture never mention more Mystical Bodies, &c. than one, though many Churches be mentioned, as *Corinth, Ephesus*, and those others in *Asia*.

Vid. Sibrand.
Lubbert. de
Eccl. l. 2. c. 6.
p. 82. &c.

VI. *Whether Ecclesia (which is a word signifying a Church) be not a Law-term deduced from Free-States, in which Common-wealths the supreme popular Assembly acted and organised by the Archon and Proedri (as a Church form'd and Presbyterated by a Minister and Elders) which did not Rule but Preside?*
(a) *Whether any other sense but that, can be a Foundation of Argument? since no Term can be the subject of a rational Discourse, whose meaning is not agreed on; but of a figurative Speech, no Man (none but the Spirit that gave it out at first) can determine satisfactorily to*

others, how far the Analogy extends; how far the Cords may be stretched, and what is the just and full Scope of the Holy Spirit there.

(a) This is so evident, that he must not have conversed in any Greek Story, who denies it. They who have not read *Thucydides*, nor *Aristophanes*, may satisfy themselves about it out of *Sigonius de Rep. Athen.* and *Ubbo Emmius vetus Græcia Illustrata*.

VII. Whether such a Sense of the Word *Ecclēsia*, or *Church*, doth not Un-Church all the Parochial Churches in England, and Un-Minister all their Ministers?

As for the Unchurching the Parochial Churches, it is no such strange thing, the Independents have done it over and over; particularly Dr. Owen in his Book of *Schism*, where he sheweth them to be of *Humane Institution*, and calls (if we may believe Mr. *Cowdrey*) their *Ministers, Parish-Priests*: He overthroweth their *Succession*, as it is derived from or thorough the *Papacy*; and acknowledgeth them to be *Ministers of Christ* upon another account only, than they will own, viz. The Call of some of their *Parish*, to whom only they are (in his Judgment) *Pastors*, and to the others but *Lecturers*. One would have thought this Man should not have of late contended so earnestly in the behalf of *Tythes* and *Tythe-taking Ministry*, against whom he had so vigorously disputed; it had not become him to connive,

in

in the Station he is, at the Cheat of a National Ministry of Christ, (for, according to his Principles, it is a Coufenage, they being only *Ministers of Christ objective*, and as they teach him; not *constitutive*, and by his appointment) but to have undeceived the *Magistrates* and *Army* herein. It is true indeed, some *Independents* do retain a *Communion* with, and own the *Presbyterians* for true Churches in *England*, because they suppose them to have been once gathered rightly: And they say, they need only to be rectified, and not established a-new; they are like a *Garden full of Weeds*, which is not to be new contrived, but weeded. I must confess this sort of Men to deal much with Similitudes; and after a confident Assertion, the Confirmation is but an Allegory out of Scripture, or a Simile. But here it is very gross (if they deceive themselves only, and not others) to think the Churches in *England* now are true Churches and rightly gathered (for it is that, and not Profession of one common Doctrine, that makes a Church) as to Substance, because *Simon Zelotes*, or *Joseph of Arimathea* did convert some in *Scotland* 1600 years ago: But whether he ever were there, or whether his Preaching there doth infer an Establishing of a Church, I must have better proof than *Legends Ecclesiastical*. As for *Austin* the Monk, it is unquestionable that he did not gather Churches as to Matter or Form, in such a way as the *Independents* call right. But suppose they were
once

once gathered rightly, which the most fond Supposal cannot extend beyond a few Churches; Can any tell where they were, that were so gathered? And were they not *Churches of Persons*, not *Churches of Places*? If so, What is this to Parochial Churches? And if they were so gathered, what necessity is there they should have continued so in substance till now? If these Men were to write Politicks, they would prove to us, that notwithstanding the alteration of the *Saxon Heptarchy* to *Monarchy*, and all the Changes brought in since by the *Conquest*, and after-times, even this present Constitution of a *Republick*, that we were still the same *Government*, and the same *Model* under *accidental Changes* only. I speak sincerely, that upon the most Impartial Enquiry that I yet could make into Church-Constitution, which is thought (by them) to have been introduced by the Apostles, and the variation brought about by Popish Usurpation, together with the Posture of things under *Queen Elizabeth*, and later days, I cannot but think the *Civil Changes* that have happened amongst us and our Predecessors to have been the lesser, and yet I have not seen that Man, who esteemed the *Change* in the *Common-wealth* to be but a *Change* in Circumstances, an accidental Alteration, like to the over-growing of Weeds; nor do I think there is any who could excuse now to the State, his endeavours to re-establish a single Person, by a
Plea

Plea of not subverting or altering the Government, but only weeding the same Republick. A Garden may in time be so overgrown with Weeds, as to cease to be a Garden, though it should be still out of doubt that it once was one.

VIII. *Whether the Ministers do well to derive their Succession unto Christ by the means of Antichrist? Whether they can in any reason deduce themselves from the Popish Clergy, since they do not ordain Ministers of the Gospel, but Massing Priests, with whom to preach, and that publickly, is no Ministerial Act, though the main Act of our Ministry? Whether the Reformed Divines from the several parts of France, the Palatinate, Switzerland, and Geneva, being solemnly met to confer at Poissy before the King and Nobility of France, did not reject such Ordination? As also Martin Luther, and Anthony Sadeel? (a) Whether ours do not ill to impose upon them a Call and Ordination which they disowned? (b)*

At Poissy there was a Conference betwixt the Papists and Protestants, whose Delegates there, were Augustinus Marloratus, Franciscus a Pauli Fano, Jo. Raimondus Merlinus, Joannes Malo, Franc. Morellus, Nic. Tobias, Theodorus Beza, Claudius Bossenius, Jo. Boquinus, Jo. Viretus, Jo. Turrius, Nic. Gallacius, Jo. Spina,

Bucer also was of the same Judgment, as we may gather out of Sadeel de voc. Minister. And Brerely in his Protestants Apology (p. 361.) informs us of more of that Opinion.

Du Serres in his History saith, there were there Twelve Ministers, and Twenty two Deputies of the Protestant Churches, ad. ann. 1560.

and

and *Peter Martyr* of *Zurich*, these being deputed and met at *Poissy* to confer about Religion, being asked (as it is usual now a-days) out of *Tertullian*, *Qui estis? Unde venistis? Quid agitis in vineâ meâ?* Who are you? Whence come you? What do ye in my Vineyard? A Question which the *Papists* would not ask, if they had sent them: The Protestant Delegates (for I no where read that any of them did dissent from *Beza* who gave the reply) did avow their Call not to have been from the *Papists*, who were there ready to disprove any such answer, but Extraordinary. The whole Story is thus recorded by *Thuanus Histor. t. 2.*

l. 28. p. 45. Which I shall set down at large, that the good People of this Nation may see out of whose Quiver the Arrows are fetched wherewith they are wounded; nor is there an Argument or Reply in the whole

Controversie about the Call of the Ministry, as it is Judiciously managed on both sides in *England*, which is not to be found in the *Popish* and *Protestant* Writers near the time of the *Reformation*.

‘ *Claudius Espencæus*, a learned Man, and peaceable, being commanded to speak by the Cardinal of *Lorrain* ---- said, That he often used to admire by what Authority, and

Beza was appointed by common consent to reply, as *Anton. Faivus* reports it in his *Life*, p. 23. edit *Geneva. 1606. 4to.* the Ministers did not only come from several parts of *France*, but *Peter Martyr* was sent from *Zurich*, and *Michael Dillerus*, and *Petrus Boquinus* from the *Palatinate*: So that it is to be looked on as all their Judgment, *Anton. Faivus in vit. Bezæ p. 22. & 40.*

and Call, the Protestants became *Ministers* ;
 and since they did not alledge any [mark
 as to matter of fact, the procedure of the
 Protestants' in those times, 1561.] from
 whom they had received *imposition of Hands*,
 how they could be esteemed of as lawful
Pastors, it being manifest thereby that they
 were destitute of any other ordinary Call ;
 and seeing that the performance of Mira-
 cles was necessary to evince an extraordi-
 nary Call, and that the Protestants did
 not atchieve any, it did by necessary
 deduction follow that they were entred
 into the House of God, by a way neither
 ordinary nor extraordinary. — *Beza* did
 hereupon reply, That as to a legitimate
 Call, the *Imposition of Hands* was no necessary
 note thereof ; the Chief and Substantial
 Tokens thereof, were good Life, sound
 Doctrine, and Election of the People :
 Nor was it any wonder if they had not
 received *imposition of Hands* from the Or-
 dinary [*ab iis qui vulgò ordinarii appellantur*]
 For how could that be, they being to
 reprove their corrupt Life, Superstition,
 and false Doctrines ? Or could it be ex-
 pected that they should ever be allowed
 of them, who were Enemies to the Truths
 which they defended ? Neither on the
 other side were Miracles necessary to an
 extraordinary Call ; as he proved by the
 Examples of *Isaiab, Daniel, Amos, Zacharias,*
 and *Paul*. Thus *Thuanus*.

Ibid. p. 46.

The same
 answer of
Beza is re-
 corded in his
 Life by *An-
 ton. Faivus*,
 p. 31.