

Bibliographical Information

Author: Lazarus Seaman

Title: The diatribe proved to be paradiatribe. Or, A vindication of the judgement of the reformed churches, and Protestant divines, from misrepresentations concerning ordination, and laying on of hands. Together with a brief answer to the pretences of Edmond Chillenden, for the lawfulness of preaching without ordination. By Lazarus Seaman

Imprint: London: printed by T.R. and E.M. for John Rothwell, at the Sun and Fountain in Pauls church-yard

Date: 1647

Physical description : [24], 96 p. ; 4⁰.

Reference: Wing (2nd ed.), S2174, Thomason, E.413[9], ESTC R203508

[Due to illegible portions in the original this text requires further editing including supplying illegible text, the insertion of Greek/Hebrew text and the addition of marginalia. An editable file can be supplied upon request for those wishing to make corrections or additions to this text.]

[Transcribed by Barry Waugh]

/**/

The ΔΙΑΤΡΙΒΗ
Proved to be
ΠΑΡΑΔΙΑΤΡΙΒΗ.
OR,
A VINDICATION
of the Judgement of the *Reformed*
Churches, and *Protestant Divines*,
From misrepresentations

Ordination, and
Concerning
Laying on of hands.

Together with a brief ANSWER to the
Pretences of *Edmond Chillenden*, for the
lawfulnesse of Preaching without
ORDINATION.

By *Lazarus Seaman*.

LONDON,
Printed by *T. R. & E. M.* for *John Rothwell*, at the
Sun and Fountain in Pauls church-yard. 1647.

/**/

[Blank Page]

/**/

TO THE
RIGHT HONORABLE,
Edward
Earle of Manchester, Viscount
Mandeville, Baron of Kimbolton.

My Lord,

MAY it please Your HONOUR to take this Dedication as an humble and gratefull acknowledgement of those many *favours* and *incouragements* which out of YOUR exuberant Goodnesse alone, and not for my desert, (*which is not*) have /**/ been vouchsafed to me: And as a token, that I would be thankfull, and duly respectfull, if I did know how to expresse either. These are Times, wherein *Truth* must learn to go alone, & to stand by her own strength: The *methods* and *depths* of *Satan*, with the *power* of *darknesse*, are all improved against *Light*; and an *arm of flesh* will prove a *broken reed* to those who trust in it. Yet I shall ever repute YOUR LORDSHIP among those who *have not the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ the Lord of glory, with respect of persons*, Jam.3.1.& who are willing [GREEK] *to contend earnestly for the maintenance of the faith once given unto the Saints*, JUDE.3. And therefore though I dare not presume, or in any wise expect to ingage You on my part in the debate about *Ordination* and *Laying on of hands*, which is presented in the ensuing Papers; yet upon experience of YOUR *naturall love* to Godly Ministers upon all occasions, I make bold to creep under the wing of YOUR Patronage, upon occasion of this Publication.

That *Honours* and *Dignities* are *slippery places*; These, stormy and blustrous times; /**/ And, that *Christ* owes none as being of his side, but those who are *Called, Chosen, and Faithfull*, Rev.17.14. YOUR LORDSHIP knows assuredly. And You need not be put in mind by me, that *they who do wickedly against the Covenant* (whether God's or Mans) *are such as are corrupted by flatteries*. Neither is htis without the bounds of YOUR consideration, That (*Without understanding, Covenant-breakers*, Rom.I.31.) are joyned together, in the sad Catalogue of those who are given up [GREEK] *to vile affections*, Rom.I.26. and [GREEK] *to a reprobate minde*, vers.28. As the words [GREEK] sound alike, so are the things thereby signified of like nature; and serve not only against *Covenant-breakers*, but against *Non-covenanters* if the sense of [???] be well observed. There's onely one thing which remains for me to be YOUR Remembrancer in; CHRIST's promise to the *Angel* of the Church of *Smyrna*, REV.2.10. *Be thou faithfull unto death, and I will give thee a crown of life*. Which *Grace*; *to be faithfull unto death*, that it may abide with You, and abound; and *Glory, to receive a Crown of /**/ of life*; That YOUR LORDSHIP may attain in *Heaven*, after fulnesse of dayes on *Earth*, is and shall be the prayer of

YOUR HONOURS
humbly devoted
in the service of
CHRIST our Lord,
L.S.
/**/

To the READER

I Know not well how to appeare in Print, either with, or without an Apologie. To speak of mine own insufficiencie, expecially in matters of Controversie, (which will too much evidence it self) or to plead incumbrance by imployments otherwise; is but to put that Question into the mouths of others against me, Who required this at your hands? And seeing One hath already possessed the mindes or hands of many (as he pretends to prove) with [The Judgement of Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines concerning Ordination, &c] For me to adde more, may seem superfluous; And to contradict him, if his Evidence be true, and full, (whereof he seems to be confident) is at the least a rash adventure. I know not better how to extricate my self, and stand cleare with those who are to judge of all that is hereafter presented, but by this ingenuous account. It moved me not a little to finde in print some sheets pretending one way, and intending another. To shew the Judgement of the Reformed Churches; this way the Ivie-bush held out: /**/ and hereupon an Historicall collection out of their Confessions, or Agenda's, and Books of Discipline, might be expected; and yet nothing is to be found out of either: And that which is produced, is only Negative, concerning one or two particulars, to the sense of the Socinians and Anabaptists, rather then agreeable to the generall opinion of those who are Orthodox. Whereas Testimony was the fairest way to have proceeded in, that's waved for the most part, and a flouish of Arguments serv'd in in stead of it. I considered, on the one hand, the presumption of many, intruding into the work of the Ministry, and taking the profit, or ambitious of the credit of it; and how Some preach others out of the Calling, to preach themselves into it; and that of late, many Old Errors are revived, under the name of New Light, as by some others, soby many inordinate or umordained Preachers; and People, in stead of blesing God (as they ought to do) for that Ministry which is famous through all the Reformed Churches, and to which, as a meanes under God, Saints in England now living, or dead in this last Century, owe themselves & all that they are, do not withstanding withdraw themselves and /**/ separate from it. And on the other hand, that Both the Houses of Parliament had witnessed against those who Preach unordained: and one of them about the time of publishing of those Papers which I direct as Answer unto, was in a way of questioning those who Preached contrary to their Order: And that it is Ministers duty to strengthen the hands of Magistrates in well-doing, when they shew themselves to be (as they ought to be) Nursing fathers to the good, and a teror to the evill. And fearing also that the Diatribe was intended in opposition to those proceedings of the Parliament, or a least, that it might proved prejudiciall thereunto, I was inclined to consider of it; hoping, that as the sheets were not many, so the Animadversions which I should need to make upon them, would not be long. And because I had reson to think he looked not only forward, as if Ordination was not necessary for the future;but backward, as if it were nothing for the time past; I thought my self, with all other the Ministers of the Church of England, the more concerned in his Positions. And however some may be offended, that Papacie and Episcopacie should be both exploded, and yet, that that Calling in a way of Ordination, /**/ which is successively from both, or one at least, either in deed, or in shew, should be reteined full, and not renounced: though in my own particular I am moved at it no more, then to find Rahab and Thamar among those through whose loynes the naturall succession of our blessed Saviour is propagated from Adam, yet I have endeavoured in the following Answer; pag. 49. & 84. to remove that stone of stumbling, and rock of offence.

But whatever becomes of Calling to the Ministry in the manner used heretofore; I hope it will appeare, that for the time to come it ought to be (in part of least) by Ordination; and Ordination, by Laying on of hands: and that this is the Judgment of the Reformed Churches and

Protestant Divines. *Some will blame me for having said so much; and others say, they expected more. But if this may be of any use toward the cleare discovery and decision of the Question under debate, till those who are better able unite their strength and bring in their suppties, this labour is not lost.*

*But how comes it to passe, that those who maintain, That any one sufficiently gifted may Preach; and he whom the People /**/ accept of as a Minister to them, is thereby made a Minister, raise such a dust about the Calling of others, who have both their gifts received from God, and the Peoples acceptance to plead, as well as themselves; and do not rather quiet the People, by instructing of them, that disputes about the externall Calling may be laid aside, whereas the internall Call of God is evident, and a further reformation about the outward Calling is every day endeavoured? My hope was, to have at large examined that Position also, A man may lawfully preach the Word, who is not called ot be a Minister; which in the close of all, I call a Paradox, meaning a thing incredible, as it relates to the odinary practise of many in our times. But for the present, I have only hinted some heads of an Answer to another, who hath written since to the same effect; and desire a little respite for the rest.*

*Touching the Author of the Tract which I deal with, as he is to me uncertain, so would I haue been to him, if the Presse were not now under more restrictions then it was at the time of his writing; that there might be no occasion of digression from the matter, to either of our persons. /**/*

If any where I have mistaken his sense, fallen short in answering, or used any expression which proves displeasing, I shalbe willing to be rectified. So the Truth, and those who are studious in things of this nature, may gain any reall advantage, though more by him, and lesse by me, it shall not, I trust (through Him that strengthens me) be any grief of spirit to me, whose desire is (with the Italian Martyr) that Christ may live, though Idie; and that HE may increase, though all the Ministers of England decrease. For your part, who are to judge betwixt us both, you are intreated to weigh all things soberly, and without prejudice.

That God, who hath promised his Spirit to lead his into all Truth, guide us to the knowledge and love of Truth. Amen.

Imprimatur,
Edm. Calamy.

/**/

[woodcut]

Foure Propositions:

Whereof *three* are proved by the *Holy Scriptures*, and attested unto by the *Reformed Churches*, in their *Confessions of Faith*, and *Books of Discipline*; the *fourth* is a just Consequence from the rest. Very necessary for all men to consider of *in this juncture of time*, especially for those who have sworne to Reform *according to the Word of GOD, and the example of the best Reformed CHURCHES.*

PROPOS. I.

THE *Office of Ministers* is *alwayes necessary in the Church of GOD, as an ordinary meanes of His institution to effect the salvation of the Elect.*

Let these Scriptures be compared & weighed *Jer.3.15. Ephes.4.11,12. I Tim.3.1. I Cor.3.9. chap.4.1. 2 Cor.3.5,6. ch.5.20. ch.6.1. Mat.28.19,20.*

The judgement of the Reformed Churches touching this

The *latter Confession* of HELVETIA, *ch.18.*

“God hath alwayes used his Ministers *for the gathering and erecting up of a Church unto himself*, and for the *governing /**/ and preservation of the same; and alwayes will use them* so long as the Church remaineth on Earth. Therefore the first beginning, institution, and office of the Ministers, is *a most antient Ordinance of God himself*, not a new device appointed by men. Ministers are to be considered, not as Ministers *by themselves alone*, but as *Ministers of God*, even such as by whose means God doth work the salvation of Mankind.] *Harmony in Engl.* printed in 4. *Anne* 1643. *pag.233.*¹

The FRENCH Confess.

“Seeing that we are not made partakers of Christ, but by the Gospel: We believe *that that good Order which by the authority of that Gospel is confirmed*, ought to be kept sacred and invioalble. And that therefore *Pastors are necessarily required in the Church*, upon whose shoulders the burden of teaching the Word, and administring the Sacraments, doth lie. – *Therefore we detest all those fanaticall spirits, who, as much as in them lieth, desire that both this sacred Ministry, or Preaching of the Word, and the Administration of the Sacraments, were utterly abolished.*] *Harm.Eng.p.253.*²

PROPOS. II.

¹ Deus ad colligendam vel constituendam sibi ecclesiam, eandemq; gubernandam ac semper usus est Ministris, iisq; utitur adhuc, & utetur porro quoad ecclesia in terris fuerit. Ergo Ministrorum origo, institutio & functio vetustissima & ipius Dei, non nova aut hominum est ordinatio.—Proinde spectandi sunt Ministri, non ut Ministri duntaxat per se, sed sicut Ministri Dei, utpote per quos Deus salutem hominum operatur. *Corpus Conf. par. I. p. 56.*

² Credimus, quoniam non nisi per Evangelium simus Christi compotes, oportere sacram & inviolabilé [??] ejus autoritate in Ecclesia sancit[?] conservari: ac proinde requiri in ecclesia Pastores, quibus onus docendi Verbi, & administrandi Sacramentorum incumbat. —Itaq; fanaticos illos omnea [???...??] in se est, sacr[?] Ministerium, five prædicationem Verbi, & administrationem Sacramentorum, abolita cupiunt. *Corp. Conf. par, I. pag. 107.*

Besides the internall Call of GOD, and due qualification through the Spirit; an Externall mediate Calling by men (in the ordinary state of the Church) is necessary to put a man into the office of a Minister, and to enable him for the Work.

Proofs out of Scripture. *Jer.14.14. ch.23.21. I Tim. 3.2. Rom. 10.15. Heb.5.4. 2 Cor.3.1. Act.1.21,22.*

The FRENCH Confession, Art.31.

“We believe that it is not lawfull for *any man*, upon his own authority, to take upon him the government of the Church; but that *every one* ought to be admitted thereunto by a lawfull Election, so neer as may be, and so long as the Lord giveth leave.] *Harm.Eng. pag.253.&254.*³

The Augustane Confession, Art. I4.

“Concerning Ecclesiasticall Orders they teach, that *no man* should publicly in the Church teach, or minister the Sacraments, except he be rightly Called: according as *St. Paul* giveth commandement to *Titus, to Ordain Elders in every city.*] *Harm. Eng. p.258.*⁴

The latter Conf. of Helvetia, chap.18.

“Furthermore, *no man* ought to *usurp* the honour of the Ecclesiasticall Ministry, that is to say, greedily to pluck it to him by bribes, or any evill shifts, *or of his own accord.* We do here therefore *condemn all those which run of their own accord*, being neither chosen, sent, nor Ordained. *Harm.Engl. p.236.*⁵ /**/

The Conf. of Wittemberg, Art.20.

“Neither is it unknown, that Christ in his Church hath instituted Ministers, who should Preach his Gospel, and Administer the Sacraments. *Neither is it to be permitted* to every one, although he be a spirituall Priest, to usurp a publike Ministry in the Church, *without a lawfull Calling.* *Harm.Engl. p.265.*⁶

The ENGLISH Conf.

“Further we say, that the Minister ought lawfully, duly, and orderly to be preferred to that office of the Church of God; and that no man hath power to wrest himself into the Holy Ministry at his own pleasure. *Harm.Eng. p.255.*⁷

PROPOS. III.

³ Credimus nulli fas esse suapte autoritate invadere Ecclesiæ gubernacula, sed legitima [???], quoad ejus fieri po[??]est, & quamdiu Dominus ejus [???] potestatem satit, [???], adscisci unumquemq; oportero. *Corpus Conf. par.I.p.108.*

⁴ De Ordine ecclesiastico docent, quod nemo debeat in ecclesia publice docere, au[??] Sacramenta administrare, nisi rite vocatus. Illicut & *Paulus* præcipit *T[??]*, [???] in civitatibus *Presbyteros* constituat. *Corp.Conf. par. [??] p.16.*

⁵ Nemo autem honorem Ministerii ecclesiastici usurpare sibi, i.e. ad se largitionibus, aut ullis artibus aut arbitrio proprio rapere debet. –D[??] hic omnes quæ fua [???] currun[??], [???] [???] electi, missi, nec Ordina[??]. *Corp.Conf.par.I.pag.[??].*

⁶ Nec est obscurum qd. Christas instituerit in ecclesia sua Ministros, qui ad[??]t Evangelium suum, & dispensent Sacramenta ejus. Nec permittendum est cuivis, quamvis spirituali sacerdoti, ut sine legitimi[??]a vocatione usurpet publicum Ministerium in Ecclesia. *Corp. Conf. par.2.pag.164.*

⁷ Credimus Ministerium legitime vocati oportere, & rectè atq; ordine pr[??] ecclesiæ Dei; neminem autem ad sacrum Ministerium pro suo arbitrio & libidine posse se intrudere. *Corp. Conf.par.I. pag. 116. See also the 23 Art. [??] the 39. and Corp.Conf.p.131.*

In Calling to the Ministry, besides Election, Ordination is to be used, where it may be had. (Act.6.2. ch.I3.2. ch.I4.23. Titus 1.5. I Tim.5.22.) And besides the usuall way of Ordaining by Prayer, Fasting, and Imposition of hands; there is no other spoken of in any Confession of the Reformed Churches.

The Conf. of HELVETIA, quo Supra.

“And those which are chosen, let them be *Ordained* of the *Elders*, with publike prayer, and laying on of hands. We do here therefore condemn all those which run of their own accord—as before. *Harm.Engl.* p.236. See also the former Conf.of Helv. *Har.Eng.*p.242. *Corp.Conf.par.I.pag.90.* /**/

The SAXON Confession.

“We do retain in our Churches also the publike rite of Ordination, whereby the Ministry of the Gospel is commended to those that are truly chosen, whose manners and doctrine we do first throughly examine. *Harm.Eng.pag.225.*⁸

The BELGICK Confess. Art.3I.

“We believe that the Ministers, Seniors, and Deacons, ought to be Called to their functions, and by the lawfull Election of the Church to be advanced into those rooms; earnest prayer being made unto God; *and after the Order and manner which is set down unto us in the Word of God.* *Harm.Eng. p.258.*]⁹ Note here, that besides Prayer, they speak of an *Order and manner set down unto us in the Word of God*; which, for Ministers and Deacons, relates to laying on of hands, or Ordination, if I understand them.

The Confession of BOHEMIA, ch.9.

“But Ministers ought not of their own accord to presse forward in that Calling; but ought according to the example (*or commanded rather, for so its in the Latine, ex prascripto*) of the *Lord*, and the *Apostles*, to be lawfully appointed and *Ordained* thereunto—They teach also, that above all things they be proved and tryed by examination; and so afterward, Prayer and Fasting being made, they may be confirmed or approved (*or rather, as it should be translated, Let them be confirmed*; those words [*or approved*] have nothing to answer to them in the Latine) by laying on of hands.] *Harm. Eng. p.246.*¹⁰

Let the Reader observe, that he who published the /**/ Harmony of Confessions in *English*, was no friend to *Ordination* and *Imposition of hands*: as appeares, not only by his *Notes* upon every passage where *Imposition of hands* is mentioned; but by his Translation here. But that the sense of the *Bohemians* may be the better understood, I shall here adde the words of the *Waldenses* out of their most antient Confession, the first that ever was extant against Popery.

⁸ Retinemus igitur & in nostris eccles[??], public[??] ritum Ordinationis, quo comendatur Ministeriū Evangelii, verè electis, quorum mores & doctrinam prius exploramus. *par.2.pag.99.*

⁹ Credimus Ministros, Seniores, & Diaconos, debere ad functiones illas suas vocari & promoveri legitimi[??] Ecclesiæ electione, adhibet[??] ad ean[??] [??] Dei invocatione, [??]tq; eo ordine ac modo qui nobi[??] Dei verbo præscribitur. *Corp.Conf.par.I.pag.179.*

¹⁰ Docent Ministros Ecclesiæ, quibus administratio verbi & sacramentorum demandatur, ritè institutos esse oportere, ex Domini & Apostolorum præscripto. Atque hi probentur prius, tum demum à Senioribus, fact[??] precatione, per manuum impositionem confirmantur.

*Ad plenam Presbyteri gradationem, tria esse necessaria approbamus.*¹¹ Primum, probatio vita, fidei, donorum, fidelitatis quoque in exiliis negotiis creditis. Alterum, orationes cum jejuni [??]. Postremum, contributio potestatis, aptis ad hoc verbis, & manuum impositio, ad corroborationem.

For the Church of SCOTLAND:

In their *Second book of Discipline*, ch.2&3. The *Divines of that Church* speak clearly, fully, and most accurately to all the former propositions. To the *first* in the 2.*chap.* to the *second* and *third* in the 3.*chap.*

“Without lawfull Calling it was never leasome (*i.e.* lawfull) to any person to meddle with any function Ecclesiasticall. There are two sorts of Calling: one *extraordinary* by God immediately, as was of the *Prophets* and *Apostles*; which in Kirks established and well already reformed hath no place. The other Calling is *ordinary*; which, besides the Calling of God, and inward testimony of a good Conscience, is the lawfull approbation and outward judgement of men, according to Gods word, and order established in the Kirk. This ordinary and outward Calling hath two parts, *Election* and *Ordination*. Election is the choosing out of a person or persons, not able, to the office that vakes, by the *judgement* of the Eldership, and *consent* of the Congregation to which shall be the person or persons appointed.—Ordination is the *separation* and sanctifying of the person appointed to God and his Kirk after he be well tried, and found qualified. The Ceremonies of Ordination, are Fasting, earnest prayer, and Imposition of hands of the Eldership, /**/

Let it be observed here, that *Imposition of hands* is no otherwise made a ceremony, then *Fasting* and *earnest prayer*.

PROPOS. IV.

The practise of those in these dayes, who commonly Preach, and receive maintenance for so doing, refusing or neglecting to be Ordained; is not to be justified by the Scripture, or by the doctrine of, or approved example in any of the Reformed Churches; but forbidden in their Books of Discipline, and condemned by their Divines, as the opinion and practise of Anabaptists, Libertines, Arminians, and Socinians.

Towards the clearing of this, examine these *Quotations* following.

Crocus de Eccl. Pont. prajud. Dissert.6. num.9 pag.139. Synops. purl. Theol. disp.42.num.6.&seq. Joshua Stegman, Photinanis disp.53. qu.I.&2.p.608.613. Balthazar Menizerus, in Exegesi Augustana Conf. ad [ar].I4. pag 639 & seq. Fredericus Balduinus lib.4.cap.4. de casibus conscientia, [???, etc.]. Idern in brevi instit. Minist. cap. [???, etc.]. Johannes Gerhardus, L.C. in fol. de Minist. Eccles. cap.3. [???, to end of paragraph.].

Among the Ecclesiasticall Canons ratified in the last Synod of Dort, this is the Third. Ne[??]i fas este, quantumvis Doctori, Seniori, vel Diacono, ministerium Verbi & Sacramentorum exercere, nisi legitime ad ea vocato contra siquis f[??]o, & [??] admonitus non a[??]rit, penes Classem judicium esto, utru[??] schismaticus sit declarandus, an [??] quadam [??] coercendus. /**/

¹¹ [??] Wald. 10.1.p.14.

A brief Answer to the Pretences of
Edmond Chillenden, for the law-
fulness of Preaching without
ORDINATION.

“*ELdad* and *Medad* prophecied in the camp. *Moses* said, would God that all the Lords people were *Prophets*. *Numb.II*; from 26.to 30.

Ans. It is one thing, *to Prophecie*; another, *to Preach*. *Prophets* and *Preachers* are not convertible termes: because there are *Preachers*, who are no *Prophets*. *God hath set some in the Church; first Apostles, secondarily Prophets, thirdly Teachers*. *I Cor 12.28*. How shall they be distinguished, if they be the same? Yet those that can prove themselves to be *Prophets*, shall have liberty (for me) *to Preache Without Ordination*, and that not only *in the Camp*, but *elsewhere*.

“*Pag.8.] Jehosaphat* sent to his *Princes* to Teach in the Cities of *Judah*; and they taught in *Judah*, and had the book of the Law of the Lord with them, and went about through all the cities of *Judah*. *I Chron.17.7,8,9*.

Ans. Remember, none went to any city of their own head, but those whom *Jehosaphat* the supreme Magistrate /**/ sent. What *Jehosaphat* sent you, and such as you are? Here’s no mention of *Preaching*. If Teaching and Preaching be alwayes all one; then do our Judges (*though not Ordained*) Preach at every Aflize. In this sense, that of the *Princes teaching*, v. 7. is most properly to be understood. And that in the 9. verse, *They taught in Judah*, refers to the *Priests* and *Levites* spoken of in the 8. verse. It remains on your part to prove, that the *Princes* preached sermon-wise, or in the same manner and kind as the *Priests* and *Levites* did. However, here were none joyned with them but the *Princes*, ‘twas *Jereboam* only that made *Priests of the lowest of the people: Whosoever would, he consecrated him*. But mark what follows.—*And this thing became sin unto the house of Jeroboam, even to cut it off and to destroy it from off the face of the earth*. *I King.13.33,34*.

Out of the New Testament, the instances of the Scribes, “Pharisees, and Lawyers are brought; and with them are joyned the examples of *Christ*, *Paul* and *Barnabasi*, pag. 9.

Ans. The liberty given in the Jewish Synagogues, is no more a president for *Christian Churches* then their exercise of power. It would anger you, if any should say; They whipt and scourged in their synagogues such Teachers as they did not like: and therefore so should we do now. If none might preach among us *unordained*, but upon such tearms, and the standing Officers of our Congregations be the Judges; perhaps you might have occasion to complain with *St. Paul*, *Of the Jewes five times received I forty stripes save one, Thrice was I beaten with rods, once was I stoned*. *2 Cor. 13.24,25*.

“*A certain Jew named Apollos borne at Alexandria, an eloquent man, and mighty in the Scriptures, came to Ephesus &c. Act.18.from 24 to the end*.

Ans. This (as the former) is but an instance of the liberty given by the Jewes, or taken where as yet there was no Church in being. Take in all the commendations of the man, and in a like juncture of time others of like abilities may do the like: And yet this concession will nothing avail to prove the sense of your Position. /**/

“To that (*pag. 12*) of the *dispersed Disciples*, out of *Act.8.1,4.* compared with *Act.11. 9,20,24.*

I answ. In such a condition of the Church as that was, (these cases being much alike; *no Order established, and Order dissolved*) I should not oppose that *able men* should teach *in love*, as they are able, *though out of Office*. But under this pretence to plead for like liberty to every one that will assume it, in all places, and in all conditons of the Church; is as if one should argue thus:--*When there Was no King in Israel, every one did that which was right in his own eyes*: Therefore it is the liberty of the Subject for every one to do what they please, although they have a king.

Pag.15. The next Scripture that offers it self to be looked upon in this particular of Preaching without Ordination, is in *I Pet.4.10,11.* *As every one hath received the gift, even so minister the same one to another as good stewards of the manifold graces of God. If any man speak, let him speak as the oracles of God, &c.*

Ans. Every one is to use his gift with respect to the gift it self, and to his place and calling, and no otherwise: private persons, in a private way; and publike officers, publicly. And be a mans gift never so small, yet he must use it. For these words contain a precept. Not that every man is bound to be a Preacher, but his Text: but he that is a Preacher by office is bound to preach with all his might. Compare this Text with *Rom.12*, from the beginning of the 3. verse, to the end of the 8. it may help to understand it. But you will never prove, That both together, or either apart, do binde every Christian to preach publicly, as he conceives himself to be able, though he be no Officer. I say, *to binde*: for the Apostle speaks not of *a liberty* which we may use or disuse; but of *a duty* which we must performe. The duty of Preaching lies upon none but upon those that are Called. The ordinary regular way of Calling is by Ordination.

To all which is produced, *pag. 18*, concerning *Prophets* and *Prophecying* and using of *gifts*, out of *I Cor.12.7,89,10,11.* *I Cor. 14.3,39.* I answer summarily—/**/

It's granted, That all Orders, Officers, or Members of the Church, above Ministers, may preach as well as they, whether Ordained or Unordained: *Apostles*, and *Evangelists*, and *Prophets*. For *Prophets*, such as wee under the New Testament, they are alwayes placed next unto the *Apostles*, and before *Pastors and Teachers*. *I Cor.12.28,29.* *Act. 13.1.* yea, before the *Evangelists*, *Eph. 4.11.* In the Primitive times there were many such, yea many in one Church, as at *Antioch* and *Corinth*. Whether these were Ordinary, or Extraordinary, it is easie to judge by the continuance, or discontinuance of them in the Church in after ages, and at present. If there be any so gifted by the *Holy Ghost*, above Ordained persons, that they are worthy to take place of them and of *Evangelists*; let them by all meanes have the liberty of their gifts, and their proper denomination: I think Ordinary Ministers should give them the right hand both of fellowship & place.

As for any kind of *Prophets*, or *prophecying* in the publike Congregations, below Ministers, and their Ministry, there is none to be found in any enumeration of Scripture, either in *Rom. 12*, *I Cor. 12*, or *Ephes. 4.* where we were most like to find it. And therefore it is still with me resolved, that the *Prophets* and *Prophecying* which we read of in *I Cor.14.* was extraordinary. he that believes three kinds of *Prophets* under the New Test. let him distinguish them.

But of these things more particularly and at large, when
the Lord givest time and strength.

One writes for *Preaching without Ordination*; and might upon the same grounds have added, *without Election*. Another for *Preaching by him who is not Called to be a Minister*. Ordination is thought to be the weaker part; but Calling is the thing struck at. Yet I am not much solicitous about the necessity of the *Calling* that hath a strong promise to support it to one of the world [??] 28. [??]. I humbly offer my part, in the *Answer* following. /**/

Some Notes belonging to the *Treatise* hereafter answered,
Omitted by the *Printer*.

Adde therefore, *pag.11. lin.13.* to the margin—*Budaus. H. Steph. Thes. p.35.1.4. The[??]ing.Gra. Novum usum huic verbo tribuene. p.389.1.16. [GREEK], apup Eustach. Thes. [GREEK] [GREEK] tom. [??] 1732.C.&17[??]7.E.Carthwr. in Act.14.23. P.29.1 penult. these words should have been set down at large. Quicunque ad decendum idoneus eligitur & vocatur suffragio & voce Ecclesia, is verus est verbi Minister; siquidem vocatio & electio legitima facit Ministrum. Ordinatio vero est illius vocationis declaratio coram coetu Ecclesiae; [??]t non Coronatio faci[??] Regem, sed Electio: coronatio verb est sollemnis du[??]xat renunciatio, & declaratio regis. Ægid.Hun. contra assert. Atturi. Vocatio Propriè & essentialiter consis[??] in electione. Ames. Cas.Consl.4.c.25 sect.28. Ordinatio few consecratio, nihil aliud estquam legitima Electio. Voct.p.267.*

Errata's in the Marg. of the Answer.

Pag.3. for *essenti[??]m*, read *essentiam*. *p.5* *debeat*, r. *debet*. *p.6.* [??] [??]. *p.17.line.29.* *mancipitur*, r. *mancipatur*. *lin.32.* *ligere*, r. *eligere*. *p.[??].1line.penult.* *saltem*, r. *solum*. *p.20.line.13* after *praireenim*, adde *debent*. *lin.14.* *cum*, r. *cur*, *line.25.* *essensum*, r. *assensum*. *p. 14.* & *dominus*, r. *ut Dominus*. *p.44.* in stead of the words there found in the beginning, read thus: *Omnes illi a[??] qui pertinent ad vocatim[??]m, [??] [??] electionem, &c.*

In the *Answer* it self.

Pag.9 [??] after *es*, adde *pro*. *line.9.* after *that is*, adde *in*. *p.9.line.29* for [??] r. [??] *p.11.line.3.* *i[??]*. *line.9.* [??], r. [??]. *p.25.* *Lu[??]*. *Comitur*, r. *Committitur*. *p.34.line.13.* after [??], blot out *often*. *p.66.line.9.* *p[??]*, r. *p[??]m*. *p.77.line.[??]*. for *to Babylon*, r. *of Babylon*.

/I/

AN ANSWER
TO THE
TRACT bearing Title,
“*The judgement of the Reformed
Churches, and Protestant Divines,
concerning Ordination, Laying on of
hands in Ordination of Ministers, &c.*”

The words of the Treatise are here set down, without
adding, altering, or abridgement.

“ORdination is taken commonly for an act of Ministers or Elders, after Examination and Election.”

The ANSWER

I. IN the common acception of the word, Ordination includes Examination, and Imposition of hands; and is not a single act, but a complicate. So as all is to be taken in, which belongs to the Ordainer for the solemn*¹² constituting or setting apart, and making of him to be a Minister who was none before. *Ordinatio Apostolica triplici actione constabat: Primus ac[??] erat praparatorium, foil. /2/ junium; Secundus, preces; Tertius, manuum impositio.* Nico.Hunnius, *Demonstratione Minist.Lutheran*.p.271.

2. Whether the words *Ministers or Elders* be to be taken here *disjunctively* or *exegetically*, is uncertain, because they are sometimes taken for the *same*, and sometimes for *severall* sorts of Church-officers. That Ministers *alone* may Ordain without other Elders, when the Presbyterie is not integrated, is a received opinion; but how Elders who are *no Ministers* may act in Ordaining, is disputable.

3. As for *election and Examination*, whether you suppose them here as the acts of Ministers or Elders, or of the people antecedently, I know not, nor what kind of election you mean; for there are divers kinds:

1. *By way of desire*, with submission or reference.
2. *By way of acceptance*, or acquiescence.
3. *By way of choice*, out of many to pitch on one.
4. *By way of creation*, which is by choosing to make one what he was not before.

Ordination supposes no Election, on the peoples part, but that which is by way of desire with submission, and reference. This may precede the act of Ordaining, but is not simply necessary in all cases. Election by way of creation is included in Ordination, and is not far from the *formall reason* of it. That Ministers and Elders may ordain none, *de jure*, in any state of the Church, or in any case but those whom the People have first chosen, will not easily be proved.*¹³

¹² **Solemne est quod [??]t peri.*

¹³ *It is not of the substance of the calling to bee chosen by voices of the people. Dr. *Fulke* on Act 14. 23. *Vide Concil. Laodice[??]m, [??]* 5. The substance and essence of Ordination consisteth in the appointing of such for the holy Ministry by persons in office. *Ru[??] Dueright of Presbyteries*, p.1[??]6.3.[??].

4. Whereas you speak of Ordination *commonly so called*, you name neither Church nor Divine who state it as you do here, and I think you can name none. Be it an act of Ministers or Elders after Examination and Election, there must be something added to make it a definition or description. In stead of the *quid rei*, you give us only the *qu[??]*. If your proofs have no more strength, then your explication hath clearnesse and fulnesse, you may still conceale your name, and that will be your best advantage.

“*In that sence Ordination is not essentiall to the Calling of a Minister.*” /3/

Ans. I. This implies there is a Scripture-sence wherein Ordination is essentiall to the Calling of a Minister; or else you oppose it in all sences, and then what needs those words [*in that sence*]? If there be a sence wherein you, with the *Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines*, do grant it, why is that concealed?

2. If your Thesis had been intirely expressed it would run thus. *Ordination as it is commonly taken for an act of Ministers or Elders after Examination and Election, is not essentiall to the calling of a Minister.* Put then what’s the meaning of it? That no act of Ministers and Elders about the calling of a Minister is essentiall thereunto, or none but Examination and Election? I suppose it is not your sence, that Examination and Election by Ministers or Elders is essentiall to the calling of a Minister, and that these together are commonly calld Ordination. That no act of Ministers or Elders whatsoever is essentiall to a Ministers calling, will not be found to be the judgement of the Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines, and that without limitation and restriction, which yet in your Title you pretend unto.¹⁴

3. The word *essentiall* may prove *a blind* to some readers, being *a term of art* which learned ones agree not about. That *forme gives being*, and yet *matter is part of the quiddity*, as also the distinction of *essentiall* into, 1. *antecedent*, 2. *constituent*, and 3. *consequent*, is common in the *Schooles*: yet in a learned company I have heard it to be, by one of them, little lesse then hissed at. One *Heizo* propounding this argument against *Piscator*.—*The essence of a thing may be without that which doth not constitute it, Proper adjuncts do not constitute the essence, Therefore the essence may be without them, and consequently they are not to be called essentiall.* *Rodolphus Goclenius* Professor at *Marpurg*, answers for *Pisc.* *No Philosopher in all the world will grant the Major.* So as if Ordination were not constitutive, yet if it did necessarily follow upon that act which doth, as suppose Election by Ministers or Elders with the consent of the Church, it might be called essentiall.¹⁵ /4/

What think you of this, Whether Ordination be not at least an integrall part of a Ministers calling? and whether some *integrall parts* be not essentiall to an *integrall whole*? and Ordination such a part of Calling?¹⁶

4. In plain words, I suppose this to be your meaning: No man who desires to be a Minister, need be Ordained; and if he be, he is not thereby made a Minister. And this you assert without any distinction of time or state of the Church, or of Calling, whether it be mediate or immediate, ordinary, extraordinary, or mixt. You might as well say, Mariage, as an act of Ministers or Magistrates, after the consent of the parties, is not essentiall to the calling of man

¹⁴ *Forma [??] Materia est pars quidditain. Quod essentia am[??] non constituit, sine co essentia reialva esse potest. Propria adjuncta non constituunt essentirai. Ergo sine iis essentia reialva esse potest, & [??] consequenti n debent vocari essentialia* Heiz. *Nullus Philosophorum in toto orbe terra[??] dabit tibi Majorem.*

¹⁵ *Rod.Gocle[??]d Pis[??]. Piscator in Thesibus, p.604.*

¹⁶ **Zanc.* makes Election and Ordination parts of Caling So Ames If [??], then essential, or integrall.

and wife, none need to be so married, and if they be, they are not thereby made man and wife. Wise men would soon preceive that your word *essentiall* would not be a sufficient *salve* against the danger of such a position; families are likely to be destroyed by it notwithstanding. He that sayes no act of Ministers or Elders is essentiall to a Ministers call, will say as much with fairer pretence of Magistrates; and then either nothing is essentiall, or something to be done by the people, or something immediately on Gods part: what followes upon this, but either *Erastianisme*, that there is no Church-power or Order; *Brownisme*, that all power is in the body of the people; or *Enthusiasme*, that every man is to act [*in fasaerisris*] as he is led by inspiration, without respect to politie.

If this be your judgement, yet methinks it sounds not like the judgement of the Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines. Papists use to impose such a sence upon them, and they use to disclaim it. Yet I do not wonder that you are thus bold with them, seeing you begin with First, Second, and Third, &c. which must be understood either of Scripture or Reason, or both, as if *right reason*, and *that Spirit which leadeth into all truth*, were fully on your side in this cause, whereas I fear they are not.

5. As to your position in your own terms, *Ordination is not essentiall to the calling of a Minister*; the Reader (who is to judge betwixt us both) must observe this mysterie. Ordination is taken two wayes in the Reformed Churches among Protestant Divines. /5/

1. First and most frequently for the rite of imposing hands, which is the last act whereby a Ministers calling is consummated. This (because they call it a rite) they do not count essentiall, that is, alwayes and in all cases absolutely necessary (expecially as appropriated unto Bishops, distinct from Presbyters *jure divino*) but they hold it to be lawfull and more or lesse necessary in a settled and well-ordered Church.

2. Ordination signifies that act wherein and whereby Church-governours do in the name and stead of Christ set apart one to be a Minister, and by such separation make him one, with Prayer, Fasting, and either with or without Imposition of hands. Here they distinguish of the time and state of the Church; and though (in my observation) the terme [*essentiall*] be used sparingly, yet the necessity of this thing in the substance of it, in a mediate calling, and regular state of the Church, is every where asserted.*¹⁷

You in all your *Exercitation* confound those things; and whereas your Position, as you state it and explain it in the beginning, runs upon this latter sence, those Authors which you cite speak of the former only. So as if your sense, and the Reformed Churches be cleerly held forth, you and they will be found opposites.

Nothing to be done by Ministers or Elders at any time, or in any state of the Church, or in any case which may befall a Minister in his calling, is essentiall thereunto. That's your sense.

Unto the ordinary mediate calling of a Minister in the regular state and condition of the Church, it is necessary or essentiall that those who are already Ministers do try, examine, approve, and actually set apart those who are to succeed them in the same kind of Calling; and this uses to be by prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands.

This latter I believe will appear to be the judgement of the Reformed Churches and their Ministers, at least wise for any thing that you have yet produced unto the contrary; which what it is, comes now to be considered. /6/

1. Arg. *Treat.p.5.*

¹⁷ **Nemo ad ordinariam in Ecclesia functionem admitti debeat nisi legitime vocatus, eoque legitime electus & ordinatus.* Zanch. in 4 præc.

“The word *To ordain*, Tit.1.5. [GREEK], even when it is used concerning Officers, signifies to *fixe, settle, establish one who was in office before*, as appears by *Psal.2.6*. where the Septuagint use the same word *Paul* doth to *Titus*, [??? Gk. phrase].”

Ans. In this paragraph you seem to imagine this argument. If Ordination be essentiall to the calling of a Minister, then, *Titus* 1.5. compared with *Act.14.23*. must prove it to be so, because in those places we read of some who were made Ministers by Ordination only, and have little else to guide us in things of this kind but examples. Hereupon you set your self by way of undermining to make a shew that no such proposition can be gathered out of those Texts, and instead of laying down your grounds directly for your own position, you give us in an oblique insinuation that the contrary cannot be proved. And though it might suffice to say that the places instanced in bear not the whole stresse of the affirmative against your thesis, and if the whole of your implied assumption was granted, yet the consequence remains unproved; yea, suppose all were true which is contained in your own expresse assertion, that the word *To ordain*, Tit.1.5. signifies to *fixe, settle, &c.* It follows not, therefore Ordination is not essentiall: because though it have such a signification in some places, in *Titus* it may have another. Yet I shall answer more particularly.

I. Here is no proof that [GREEK] in *Titus* 1.5. must have the same sense and signification with [GREEK] in *Psal.2.6*.

2. The *Hebrew* of the Psalm should rather be consulted with then the *Septuagint*, a corrupt translation; Especially because it renders that passively (contrary to all other Greek Translators) as spoken by David or Christ, which should be active as spoken by God. The word is [HEBREW] that is, *I have annointed or powred out, ordained, authorised**.¹⁸ The translation of the Seventy cannot be retained, but *force must be offered unto the Hebrew text in three places*, as *Rivet* and others upon the Psalm observe*.¹⁹ [GREEK] *Que verba reti[??]eri non possunt quin vi[??] [??]t Ebraico textus /7/ tribus in locis.* & [HEBREW] *masakti, legatur* [HEBREW] *nifakti, in Niphal.* & *pro* [HEBREW] *malki, regem meum* [HEBREW] *malko rex ejus.* & *pro* [HEBREW] *kodeshi sanctum meum.* [HEBREW] *kodsho. Rivetus Musculus*, besides the same observation with *Rivet* observes further against the Greek translator, *Et adjecit quod in textu non est [??]* i.e. *in co.—Chaldaus Paraphrastes Ebraicam veritatem retinnit.*

3. As for the Hebrew word, it may relate to Gods decree. *Yet have I set my King upon my holy hill of Sion*, that is, my eternall decree and purpose. Which is the more probable because of that which followes in the next verse. *I will declare the decree, &c.* In *Prov.8.23*. where we have the phrase used passively,*²⁰ *I was set up from everlasting, from the beginning or ever the earth Was*; it cannot be understood otherwise then of Christs *eternall generation*, or that decree of God whereby he was assigned to his Incarnation and Offices. In neither way it will agree to your sense of *of fixing, settling, or establishing one who was in office before*.

4. There is a vast difference between settling (*per* [GREEK]) *by way of might, and* ([GREEK]) *by way of authority*. God might set a King in Sion (especially as you understand it) by force; but *Titus* could set Elders from city to city no otherwise then by the peaceable exercise of spirituall power: And therefore there's the lesse likelihood that we should have recourse to the 2. *Psalm*, to understand that phrase in *Titus*. And if you will needs compare them, some *authoritative act* must needs be understood in both places; and all power of making Ministers did not belong unto those in *Crete* among themselves, but unto *Titus*, as one sent unto them to set

¹⁸ [??? Gk and Latin sentence???

¹⁹ *Ainsw.* on the place.

²⁰ [??? Hebrew, 2 words]

others over them. For in both places, not simply fixing, setting and establishing, but such a fixing, &c. as is by vertue of power and authority so to do, must needs be understood.

But you adde,

“Now if you understand the Psalm of David in the type, he was a King many years before he took in the hill and fort of Zion, 2 Sam.5.5,6. Or if you understand it of the Apostles preaching up Christ, as the Apostles do the Psalm, Act.4.25. &c. Christ received all power at his ascension, and did but /8/ settle his Kingdome by their Preaching, the Apostles Were but witnesses of Christs glory, and in being so did [GREEK].

Answ. I. Its well you put an [if] concerning the Psalm as to be understood of *David* in the type, because its noted *that almost all the Orthodox Fathers doe understand all things in this Psalme, simply and immediately of**²¹ Christ.

2. It may be questioned whether that act of *David*s taking in the Hill of Zion be here directly pointed at, because we reade of his anointing by *Samuel* at *Bethlehem*, and at *Hebron* twice,* but never of any anointing at the Hill or Fort of *Sion*, and therefore have no ground for the Hebrew phrase here used in the strict and proper acception of it.

3. How the Apostles understand the Psalme, and this passage of it appeares by those words Act. 4 27. *Against thy holy Child Jesus whom thou hast annointed**²² *both Herod and Pontius Pilate with the Gentiles and the people of Israel were gathered together.* Here [??] in the Greek answers to *Natakti* in the Hebrew, and both together imply *that God had made Christ Jesus whom the Jewes crucified, both Lord and Christ*, Acts 2.36.

4. As for the Apostles, tht they may be said [?? 3 Gk words], to settle his Kingdome by their preaching, we find no such phrase in Scripture, you doe but dreame in using of it; and though its true *they were Witnesses of Christs glory*, yet its also true they were more then witnesses; as you use the word In way of Diminution, but to [??] settle, and establish Christ upon his Throne either by preaching, witnessing or other way is no where ascribed unto them.

Thus you proceed.

“And however the word [??] may be taken sometimes, yet Titus 1.5. it cannot be taken for making him an Elder who was none before. For what is injoynd there is to be done by Titus onely, or by Titus joyning with other Ministers. For the text saith, I have left [thee] to ordaine. But neither did the Apostles, muchy lesse might other Ministers make a Minister by a sole act of their own.”

Answ. How the word may be taken sometimes is not /9/ much materiall; the ordinary acception is chiefly to be looked at. For that must take place in *Titus*, unlesse some reason from the text it self, or from the nature of the things there spoken of, can be given to the contrary. If all the places in the New Testament of htis kind, where it is used, be enquired into, it will be found to signifie either the making of him an officer who was none before, orto give him a greater power then he had at first. For instance, *Mat. 24. 45. Who is then a faithfull and wise servant, whom his Lord hath made ruler [(?? Gk ??)] over his houshold to give them meat in due season?* *Luk. 12. 14. Man, who made me [(?? Gk)] a Judge or divider over you?* *Act. 7. 10. Pharoah made him (speaking of Joseph) governour over Egypt and all his house, [?? Gk phrase].*

²¹ **Patres Orthodoxi[??] omnes de Christo simpliciter & immediate accipiunt, & interpretantur quecunquei[??] hoc Psalme d [??]. Rivetus in arg. & partitione Psal. [??] 1 Sam 16 13. 2 Sam. 2.4. c.5.1. & 3.8.*

²² [?? Gk ??]

For the Second sense, see *Mat.24.47. Verily I say to you he shall make him ruler [(???)]* over all his goods.*Mat.25.21. I will make thee ruler [(???)]* over many things. The like in *Luk.12.42.44.* When Deacons were first to be constituted in the Church of Jerusalem, the Apostle speaks thus unto the multitude, *Look you out among you seven men of honest report, full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom, [(???)]* whom we may appoint over this business. *²³To produce like places out of the Septuagint, is as needlesse as it would be endlesse; or out of the first and most ancient of the Greek*²⁴ Councils. One place out of *Clemens* his Epistle to the Corinthians (which is of great repute among the learned) may give some light unto the text in hand, speaking of the Apostles and of their preaching in countries and cities, he saith [GREEK] *they made the first fruits of them that believe Bishops and Deacons*, (not by popular election, but by vertue of the spirit of discerning, [GREEK]*. ²⁵ What they did themselves in this kind, they did also appoint to be done by Evangelists as they saw occasion.

“But you say [however the word may be taken sometime, yet Titus 1. 5. it cannot be taken for making him an elder who was none before. And your reason is, because what is enjoined there is to be done by Titus only, or by Titus joyning with other Ministers.” /10/

Ans. Be it granted that *Titus* only was to ordain, what need then that other Ministers should joyne with him? And if other Ministers were to joyne, yet that cannot be proved from the significaiton of the word ([GREEK]) there used. Something was peculiarly enjoined him, for wherefore else receives he a commission and commandment from Saint *Paul*? [GREEK] *as I have appointed thee*. That which followes [*that the Apostles, much lesse other Ministers, might not make a Minister by a sole act of their owne*] is a meere *petitio principii*.

Your [*as for example*] is no prooffe. Was *Titus* a Minister to *Crete* when he came thither, or was he not? if he was, shew us whose act concurred with Saint *Paul*'s, and whose authority he took in to settle him there as a Minister to them.

Thus you go on [*as for example, Acts 14.23. [GREEK], &c. the word translated they ordained in the plurall number, may be referred to the people as well as to Paul and Barnabas*.

Ans. The word [GREEK] in the one place doth no more referre to the people then the other word [GREEK]. When the people are spoken of it refers to them, but *Paul* and *Barnabas* only are here distinguished from the people.

To that which followes

[“For it is such a Word as properly belongs to the people as well as their Rulers, when they gave their votes, and never to the Rulers without the people.”]

Ans. The truth is it belongs properly either to Rulers or people together, or a part as there is occasion. Your [*never to the Rulers without the People*] is too confident an assertion, if so be (*de facto*) no instance could be given to the contrary: yet (*de jure*, no reason is produced why it might not. [GREEK] (as *Suidas* hath it) signifies both *Plebiscitum*, a Law made by the people; and [GREEK] which is the ordinary word used in *Demosthenes* and in the *Attick* laws for (*Senatm consultum*) a Law made by the Senate. As when the people make a Law, they are said [GREEK]: so may the Rulers /11/ in like manner in those Lawes which are made by themselves alone. What think you of this passage in *Julius Pollux*? [??? Greek sentence].*²⁶ The

²³ Act.6.3.

²⁴ Vid: Concil. Nicenum can 4 Ancyranum can.10 & 18. Antiochenum can. 23. Laodicense can.11. & 16. Sardicense can.4 & 6.

²⁵ Clemens in epist.as Corinth p.54 & 55.

²⁶ Julius Pollux l.8.c.9.§ 1.

Thesmotheta doe privately prescribe when judgement is to be given, and promulge publique accusations and suffrages to the people. Whose suffrages were these, if not the Rulers?

And of that in *Demosth. (Phil. I)* cited by *Hen. Steph.* whom you quote so often [??? Greek sentence]. and of making an Officer [??? Greek phrase].

“But you say [the custome was among the Gracians in their [GREEK] or lawfull meetings, that the people joyned Votes with the Rulers, and the Rulers with the people, before any act was accounted legall. Yea it may be rather referred to the people, than to them, for the people sometimes voted alone, but the Ruler did never.”

Ans. For this (I think) you cite *Bud[??]* and *Henry Stephen*, but at large; go and consult them once againe; you wrong those learned men while you would have us to beleieve that they were as ignorant of the Greek story as your selfe, or that this is to be found in them which is not. For what you here assert, were it true of some particular Common-wealth in Greece at some time, yet it is far from truth concerning al the Grecians generally. The Rulers in *Athens* often met apart and voted apart; nothing was, or might bee brought into their [GREEK] but what the Rulers had first consulted and concluded.*²⁷ A Law made by the Senate alone stood good for a yeere before the people were consulted with about it. And this was one of *Solons Lawes*, *fine Senatus prajudicio populus nulla de re rogatur. Let the people be consulted with in nothing which the Senate have not predetermined.**²⁸ There were a sort of Rulers among them who voted things amongst themselves [??? Greek phrase] *before the Senate and the Common Hall.**²⁹ See more to the clearing of this in *Henry Steph. Tom. 4.p. 429.G.* But imagine all was as you say of the custome among the Græcians /12/ in their ([GREEK]) lawfull civill meetings, what is that to binde Christians in their Churches? *Paul* saith *we have no such Custome nor the Churches of God.*³⁰ Tis not said, nor the Churches of Greece as meaning civill Assemblies. You must first prove that the government of the Church is Democraticall, and that every single Congregation among us is to have the same power which a Common-Hall had among them, and that our manner of proceeding is to be regulated by theirs; before you argue from the one to the other. But to go on:

“[And in this sense (say you) it is to be taken by the Reverend Divine of Scotland;³¹ his words are, [But it is objected that Luke saith not of the whole Church, but of Paul and Barnabas, that they made htem by voices Elders in every city. Ans. But how can we imagine that betwixt them two alone the matter went to suffrages? Election by most voices or the lifting up of the hand in token of a suffrage, had place only among a multitude assembled together. Wherefore we say with Junius, that [GREEK] is both a common and particular action, whereby a man chooseth by his own suffrage in particular, and likewise with others in common, one; so that in one and the same action we cannot divide those things which are so joyned together.]

Ans. The sense you mean, as I suppose, is this. *Paul* and *Barnabas* as Rulers, together with the People who had interest of authority in this busines, by joint suffrage or election made Elders, not *Paul* and *Barnabas* alone. This you call the sense of a reverend Divine of *Scotland*; in other passages you cite the same book as speaking the sense of that Church. 1. Though I reverence the Church and the Divine thereof, yet I cannot but remember *Amicus Plato*, &c. though [???] be here taken in, yet all will not help to prove that [GREEK] doth necessarily refer

²⁷ *Sam. Petitus in comment.ad leges Atticas, [???] de legibus titulos, p.116.*

²⁸ [??? there is no note to correspond with this asterisk, or the next note is supposed to be here]

²⁹ *idem p. 123.*

³⁰ I Cor, 11. 16.

³¹ *Engl.Pop.cer.p.166.*

in this place to any other than to *Paul* and *Barnabas*. It sufficeth against the Papists, that the people are not excluded by the Word; but how it shall be proved that they are included by vertue of it, I see not. The note of *Grotius* upon the place is worth observing. *Sol[??] [??? mix of Greek and Latin indecipherable]*. /13/

2. And be it granted that *Paul* and *Barnabas* made Elders with the consent of the people, as it is by *Grotius* himself and Protestants generally, (their consent is one thing, and by their authority another) that must be granted not from the meaning of [GREEK], but from analogy of the act of making Ministers with that of choosing *Matthias*, *Act.I.* or Deacons *Act.6.* or from some other ground.

3. Neither need it seem strange that a thing should go to suffrage between two, if we consider what we read of *Barnabas* and *Paul* in the case of *John Mark* *Act. 15.37, 38.* and what is the meaning of the word [GREEK], which refers to God alone, *Act.10.42.*

4. When *Junius* saith that [GREEK] is both a common and particular action, his meaning cannot be that there must be many of divers sorts, people as well as rulers, or else there is no [GREEK]. And granting, as he doth, that it may signifie a particular action, it cannot be from the word proved that more joyn in the action then are said to joyn. Besides, where two alone do joyn, there is *actus communis & particularis simul*. And as to the Text in hand, only *Paul* and *Barnabas* are here expressed to be those who gave suffrage. And when two are said [GREEK], its not necessary to understand twenty or two hundred. Two Consuls may be said truly [GREEK] both by a common and a particular act, when they joyn in any busines belonging to them as Consuls, though the whole *Senatus Populúsque Romanus* do not Vote with them. Those Divines among us Protestants (as *Calvin* and *Ames*^{*32}) who answer the Papists that *Paul* and *Barnabas* are said to ordain, because they gave direction and had precedence in this businesse, do thereby acknowledge that the action is here expresly ascribed to them alone.

To that which follows, “[*But if the Word [they ordained] be referred to Paul and Barnabas, and signifie to create or make an Officer who was none before; yet the power whereby this creation is wrought is not their own only; for [GREEK] is creare per suffragia, as H.Stephen renders it, which is as much as to say they did it not only virtually in the power of others, but they did it by others.* /14/

Ans. The word [GREEK] signifies sometimes simply to choose, with lifting up of hands or without, so as there be some outward expression of the inward consent of the mind it sufficeth; and sometimes by choosing to create. But how will you prove that it signifies mixtly to create *per suffragium proprium & alienum*, or *non per proprium sed per alienum*, as you here suppose, or that the plurall *suffragia* hath any weight to imply a multitude in the Latine tongue? They who gave their own suffrage, and by giving it created and made or cho[??] Ministers, they had the power. Thus did *Paul* and *Barnabas*, they made Presbyters *by suffrage*; that must be understood of their own suffrage: Not they *by the people*, but they, that is *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *for them*, that is for the people to their use and benefit. That the people did it *in Paul* and *Barnabas* by acquiescing in their vote, will not be denied; but that thye people did it *by them*, as if the power were the peoples, and not the Apostles unlesse by delegation from the people, is not yet, nor can be proved from the word as here used. In the close of this Paragraph, as your reasoning is weak, so your expressions are confused: if the answer fall short, thank your self.

³² **Calvin instit. l.4.c.3. §.15. Nempe sic Romani historici non rarò loquuntur consulem qui comitia ha, buerit creasse novos magistrat[??] non aliam ob sansam nisi quia suffragia receperit & pepulum moderatus sit in eligendo.**
Amesius Bellarm. enerv. [??]2.l.3. c.2.§.31. [GREEK] i[??] qui praest [GREEK] quo sensutribuitur presbyteria primarii[??] vel episc[??]pia aliqua.. do pud Euseb.

Your second argument to prove that Ordination is not essential to the calling of a Minister, begins thus:

“2. *The end and scope of Ordination is but to solemnize, inaugurate, or publish the Calling of a Minister. It is to a Minister as Coronation is to a King, it makes him not a King, but declares him and sets him forth with glory. These are the very expressions and similitudes of Protestant writers both Lutherans and Calvinists in this matter. Sicut non coronatio facit regem, sed electio.*] *Ægyd. Hun. ad artic. Arturi, contra assert.6.Ames, Bellarmini enerv.tom.2.p.76. idem. Cas.cons.l.4.c.25.sect.28. Boet.disp.causa papatus.l.2. c.[??]0.p.264. Majorem differentiam comminisci non potest inter duo illa (elect. & ordinat.) quam inter constitutionem & commissionem principis nudè spectatam, & inter candem commissionem erbitrariis quibusdams symbolis, sceptro, coronâ, &c. insignitam, id.p. 267. Your margin, Ægid.Hun.ad [??]rtic.Arturi contra assert.6. declara[??] solennis. Ames.cas. /15/ cons.l.[?].c.25.s.28. constitutionis testificatio. Croci Antisoci disp 24.s.3. missio solennis in possessionem honoris. Jun. testimonium vocati publicum. T[??]ob. de minist.l.I.c.25. Consecratio, & manifestatio, declaratio, promulgatio, significatio coram ecclesia, solennis testificatio. Voct.desp.causa Papat. l.2.f.2.c.20.*

Ans. I. If there were no other use of Ordination, then there is of Coronation to a King, it might suffice in some sense to prove it essential to the calling of a Minister. If coronation among Kings in our time be of like use to them as anointing was to Kings among the Jews, or as imposition of hands was unto the Elders and unto *Joshua* in succession unto *Moses*.³³

2. Coronation is not of the like nature in all times and places, nor in all mens judgements, who write of Politicks. And though for the most part it suppose some precedent act whereby a King receives title; yet such weight is laid on this solemnity even among those who inherit by succession, that he who is a King thinks himself not rightly settled till he hath been crowned, and from the time of crowning the time of reigning uses to be accounted in the empire.*³⁴

3. It is not simply right that makes a man to be a King, but the solemn declaration of that right in a forensick way (which uses to be done by proclamation) and some acknowledgement of the right demanded, and that's by coronation. All these in the substance of the things must concur and may be said to be essential, because though the outward sign be *juris positivi*, yet the thing signified is *juris naturalis*. Apply this to the calling of a Minister, and see what follows. The consent of those who have power to make him a Minister who otherwise is none, is substantially necessary. Among those who have that power, I hope the Ministers and Elders as such, shall be allowed their share. And that manner of declaring consent, which is approveable by the fundamentall laws of the kingdom of Christ is also necessary; the one antecedently, the other consequently. Let Ordination be in as much request among us for making Ministers, as Coronation is for our Kings, and it shall suffice: for then, as we have no /16/ EDITED THROUGH TO THIS POINT AS OF 9-24-2012 Kings but such as are crowned, so we shall have no Ministers but those who are ordained. Remember that you are now speaking of Ordination as it is an act of Ministers and Elders, wherein they are to consent for making of a Minister. And if their consent as such, *h. e.* as Ministers and Elders, be essential, though the manner of Declaring it were arbitrary, yet that will suffice to prove Ordination in some sense essential.

4. As for the Protestant writers, when they compare Ordination to Coronation; though it might suffice to say Comparisons prove nothing, (*Theologica symbolica non est argumentativa*)

³³ Josh.27.18

³⁴ *Althus;polit.c.19. num.95.*

yet I answer further, They thereby understand for the most part the rite of Ordination, or the act of Imposition of hands as distinguished from the foregoing consent of the Ministers and Elders; and in that sense it may be admitted that Ordination is *declaration solemnis, ant constitutionis testificatio, missio selemnis in possessionem honoris*, and such like. And this will be no advantage to you, or prejudice to us. You are now to speak of Ordination as distinguished from Imposition of hands, (for that follows afterward to be considered) but how the Protestant wirters understand it when they compare it to Coronation, is another thing. To the testimonies which are cited by you, I shall speak more particularly in the close.

Whereas you say that [*these expressions and similitudes are "agreeable to Scripture; for, Act. 13. Paul and Barnabas are said to be separated to the work by prayer and fasting and laying on of hands, but both of them were Ministers before, as appears Act.12.ult.*

Ans. This text Act.13. compared with Act.12. makes nothing for proving the former expression and similitudes, but it makes much against the scope of your argument; because if *Paul and Barnabas* were Ministers before by a call from God without election, and yet the Lord would have them to be ordained, it makes much for the necessity of Ordination where it may be had. The holy Ghost said *Separate me Barnabas and Saul for the work whereto I have called them.* [I have called them] why might not that suffice? but that /17/ the Lord would teach us by this extraordinary act and dispensation of his Spirit to make more account of Ordination than of Election, or at least more then you would have us.³⁵ He saith no more but [*Separate them for the Work*] they understand his meaning to be [Ordain them:] And therefore when they had fasted and prayed, *they* (that is the Prophets and Teachers of *Antioch*) laid their hands on them. No man therefore in an ordinary way, is to be accounted separate to the work of the Ministry, untill with fasting and prayer he hath hands laid on him. But of this more hereafter.

5. Should I say no more, I think I fall not short of a sufficient answer to this Argument. Yet because herein you make the fairest shew, and seem to have the *Lutherans* and *Cavlinists* all on your side, and make many particular citations; therefore I shall the rather inlarge my self a little in matter of testimony, and de[??]e that these few things may be observed.³⁶

1. The generall opinion of the *Lutherans* about the regular and orderly Calling of a Minister, is, That the three *Orders, Classes, or Estates*, (all these words are used by them) that /18/ is, Magistrates, Ministers, and People, by a severall interest of Suffrage, are to concur, together, or apart, to the calling of a Minister. And herein they make an act of Ministers and Elders, as such, to be necessary, yea the most necessary, proper and essentiall thing. And this supposed as antedecedent, they use to say Ordination is the declaration of a Call, and compare it with Coronation, or the solemnization of Mariage. And though they hold Ordination to be but a declaration of the Calling, yet they hold it more or lesse necessary, and to be the peculiar act of Ministers and Elders.

Gerhard one of the most eminent among them, to justifie the Calling of Ministers (*in ecclesiis quas vocant evangelicis*) useth this argument against Bellarmine. *Vocatio mediata legitima juxta divinam institutionem & Apostolorum praxin furi debet à tota ecclesia & omnibus tribus illius ordinibus. Nostrorum vocatio vocatio fit à tota ecclesia & omnibus tribus illins*

³⁵ *Quod si hoc factum suit in co qui immediatesuit vocatus quanto magis id facere decet in vocationibus mediatis. aue sunt verba D. Chemnitii, par. 3. l.de ecclesia c. [??] apud Gesh.l.com.de.min. eccl.c.3s.2.

³⁶ Nos verdlegitimam vocationen nominanius eam [??] sit collectis suffragiis totius ecclesia nullo ordine excluso:ita tamenat certa persona[??? extended Latin portion illegible] &populo, à quo publicè audita communibus omnium ordin[??] suffragiis eligitur, vel justis allegatis rationibus rejicitur. Fred.Balquinius de arric. [???], dispur.17.thesi 16. Sequitur secundum Ministror

ordinibus. Ergo. “A Lawfull mediate Calling according to Divine institution and the Apostles practice, must be made by the whole Church and all the three Orders thereof. The call of our Ministers is made by the whole Church, and all the three Orders thereof. Therefore it is lawfull according to Divine institution, and Apostolicall practice. The *minor*, saith he, is manifest out of the custome used in our Churches*.³⁷ So as in their judgements an act of Ministers and Elders is of divine institution in the calling of a Minister.

Yet a little more cleerly and fully concerning the interest of Ministers about the calling of a Minister.*³⁸ The same *Gerhard* enquiring to whom the right and power of Calling doth belong, gives this answer. [Whereas in the Church there be three distinct states or orders, the Ecclesiasticall, Politicall, and Oeconomicall; or Presbyterie, Magistrate, and People, of all which as so many members the Church /19/ consisteth; Therefore no state of the Church is simply to be excluded, but their parts and offices must be left to every one of them in the mediate calling of Ministers. And I. (saith he) that Bishops and Presbyters (understand by both names one thing) must be used when the Ministry is to be commended to any one, is manifest (*ex mandato Apostolico*) by the Apostolike commandment and the approved examples of Scripture, Act. 14.23. 1 Tim.4.14. 1 Tim.5.22. 2 Tim.2.2. Tit.1.5. Comming afterwards to speak more particularly (*quid cuius statui propriè tribuendum sit*) what is properly to be given to every severall state; that no confusion may arise, and one state may not take to it self that which is peculiar to another; after other things premised, he makes this distribution of their parts:

Presbyterio competit exame[??], ordinatio & inauguratio: To the Presbyterie belongs examination, ordination, inauguration. *Magistratui Christiano nominatio, presentatio, confirmatio*: To the Christian Magistrate nomination, presentation, confirmation. *Populo consensus, suffragium, approbatio, vel etiam[??] pro ratione circumstantiarum postulatio*: To the People consent, suffrage, approving, or as circumstances may require, postulation. *Id. loco & cap.citatis sec.3.num.85. p.93.num.86.p.95.**³⁹ Now Sir I beseech you recollect your self, and tell whether in the judgement of the *Lutherans*, Ministers and Elders, as such, have not an interest in the calling of a Minister; or why the Peoples act should be essentiall, and not the Ministers, by vertue of any ground which they build upon; and where you find in them Ordination and Imposition of hands so distinguished as they are here by you.

2. The *Calvinists* do for the most part agree with the *Lutherans* touching the interest of Magistrates, Ministers and People about the calling of a Minister; though in manner of expression there be some difference, yet in the substance of the thing it self there is an harmony.⁴⁰ Some speak of Calling others of Election, both mean the same thing; and ascribe it

³⁷ **Ad exemplum enim ecclesiae Apostolica & primitive [??] [??] & necessariis*

³⁸ **v. Nic. Hun. in d[??] Min. Lutherani, p. 199. nultis excansis [??] sabem susfragiuns, sed primum ac prapip. suffragium meriti simconceditur. 1. Hoc postulat precepium Apostolicum, 2 Tim.2.2. Tit.1.5. 2. Apitudo eligendi. 3. ipsius officii ra[??]. 4 ration proanima. bus reddenda. 5. exemplū Apostoli, Act.I. Act. 6.2,3. 6. pia & orthodoxa antiquitatis esemplū.*

³⁹ **vid.ead.apud eand.Augustiana confessionis par.2.cap.1.*

⁴⁰ *Hanc (viz.ele[??]tionem seu designationem Ministri) dicimus non ad solum supremum Magistratum p[??]nere, us Grotius & [??] judicarunt, [??] etiam ad solam ecclesiam Excluso magistra tu ut alii volunt, imprimis Anabaptistia & Papistia: sed dicimus ad totam Ecclesiam hanc electionem certo respectu pertinere, ordine tamen debito observato ut praecant Ecclesiae praefecti adsentiantur populus, quisque suo ordine.Ant. Wallæus locis com.patte 2.de functionibus ecclesiasticis edit.priore in 4.p.907. Pertinet autem electio & designatio ipsa ad totam Ecclesiam in qui sit:sed diversaratione—Pessime quoque hallucinantur qui non distinguunt qua sunt Presbyterii, qua aut[??] Plebia in electionibus istis partes; sed quod est illius, istitribuunt, iudi[??] in ecclesiam Dei magn[??] omnia confusionem. Praebyterorumtst,persomam qua idonea ad mun[??]vatum videripotest,inquirare ex tocepopulo,camq; designarculis & de ea interstse qugere & confe[??]ire enim toti EcclesiaPresbyteri.__Cum autem hoc primum*

not to the People alone, as you do with the Libertines, Anabaptists, Brownists and the like, nor to the Magistrate alone /20/ as *Grotius* and the *Erastians*; but *principally and primarily* to the *Ministers and Elders*, and *respectively* to the whole Church.

3. None of those writers in particular which you cite either in the body or margin of that paragraph, *pag.7.* exclude Ministers and Elders from sharing in the power and act whereby a meet person is made a Minister; but every one of them hath *more or lesse*, *expresly*, for their interest. For the *Calvinists* (to give them the first place) I shall speak of them in order as you rank them. *Ames* against *Bellarmino*, tom.2.p.76. hath nothing at all one way or other, unlesse the Edition which I follow deceive me. In that of *Oxford*, 1624, p.96. I find this. *Populus in judicando dirigi potest ac ordinarie* [??] *et à judicio aliorum pastorum electionem vel pr[??]unte vel. /21/ comitante. The people may, and ordinarily must be directed in judgement by the judgement of other Pastors either foregoing or accompanying Election.* And in his book of Cases of Conscience, lib.4.cap.25.num.27. *Actus varii ad vocationem pertinentes possunt aliis committi, & ex ordine debent à præcipuis ecclesia membris vel presbyteris* [???]. *Cura etiam ut omnia rectè siant pertinet ad Magistratum.* [“Divers actions pertaining to the calling of a Minister may be committed to some, and according to order must be performed by the principall Members or Presbyers of the Church: the care also that all things be done rightly belongeth to the Magistrate.”] *Crocus* tells us, *the conspiracie of the people must not be taken for a lawfull call. Non conspiratio populi pro pefecte legitimâ vocatione haberi debet.*^{*41} Of the rite of Ordaining he says, *Hac est constituionis illius testificatio, qua exemplo Apostolorum docetur licita, neque extra casum necessitatis in Ministerio constituto temerè negligenda.*] This is a testification of that “Election, which is taught to be lawfull by the Apostles example and not to be rashly neglected in a settled Ministry, when there is no case of necessity.”] Out of his words I frame this argument. That which is not only lawfull, but so necessary about the calling of a Minister, that it may not be omitted but only in case of necessity, is more then a bare solemnization, inauguration, or publication and little lesse then essentiall: but so it is with Ordination in the judgement of *Crotius*: therefore *Crocus* makes against you, not for you.

For *Iunius*, he is so far from giving nothing but a bare rite about Ordination to the Presbyterie, that he gives all unto it. And though (in severall respects and a divers kind) he ascribes the power of Ordaining, both to *Christ* as the head and Spouse of his Church, and to the *Church* as the Body and Bride: yet (in a mediate Calling) both of them in his judgement make over the pwoer unto Minisiters and Elders. *Sic totum in solidum Ordinationis potestatem*

suffragito ad pras byterosperintat non ad universam ecclesiam & populi,quemodmedia tomen quidem sertius ut & consentiose disputant. Ratio est. 1. quòd presbyteri & pastores dicuntur [???] [???] [GREEK] *ecclesia* Heb.13.7. *unda sua vocesuóque consilio praire populo debent. 2. Quòd illiipsisu* [??] *ecclesia senatus ad quem prima rerum ecclesiasticarum deliberatio ac cura pertinet, atque etiam referenda est. 3. /exemplum ipsius primitiva ecclesia, Apostoli enim ipsi primi de diaconis eligendu deliberant. 4. Ex ipsa loquendi ratione quâ utitur ?Scriptura* Act.15 v.22. 16 v.4. 1 Cor.16.v.3. [GREEK] *ex qua phrasi luce clarim intelligatur à populu & universa ecclesiam probari iantum vel improbari que præsbyteri & ipsi prapositioni ecclesia* [???] *ecclesia esse judicant alque proposucrant. 5. Exempla posterioris ecclesie, qua ium* [???] *suis sanxit, tum* [???] *usu ipso & praxi d* [??] *à plebetantum essensuan requiri, ut* [???] *presbyterio gesta sunt justa aliqua ratione plebs vel ra* [??] *a baberet vel irrita saceret. /Sed fierit summus Magistratus fidelis in cuju territorio aliquis ad dignitatem ecclesiasticam est asciscendus, debet cert* [??] *specialis istius Magistratus consensus pratcreum qui à toto populo prastatur expectari & accedere.* Lamb.Danæus com. in I.ad Tim. ad cap.5.v.22.1.348,349,352,353,354. *Vide plura in* [??] *unc sensum apud Bucanum, loc.42. de Ministerio in respons.ad quest.39. & Marcsium in Endhiridio de Minist. potest. & discip. ecclesia, p.117.these 39. inter Canones ecclesiasticas Synodi Dordras.can 4. Zanch in 4.prac.loc.4.qu.2. to 4.p.780. & sequ.* Harmo.Synodorum Belgic. cap.1.[???].4.

⁴¹ *Anti-Socin. disp. 24.

Christus habet, quam cum ecclesia sua communicat; uterque verò pro suo jure, sponsus inquam, & sponsa, Presbyterio tradit Iure Divino. [So “as al the power of Ordination in ful belongs to Christ, which he communicates with his Church; and both of them, the /22/ Bridegroom and th: Bride, according to the right of each, gives it by Divine right unto the Presbyterie.*] ⁴² And where as in the Presbyterie, it it be compleat, there be two sorts of Elders; he distinguisheth after this manner, that it may be known what belongs to each. *Actu presbyterium totum (i.e. singuli in corprre presbyterii) potestatem ordinandi habet, ritu verò soli Presbyteri pascentes verbo, i.e. Ministri verbi habent ordinandi potestatem*.* ⁴³ The power of Ordaining, in the act of it, belongs to the whole Presbyterie, (consisting of Ministers and Elders as distinguished) but in the rite of it it belongs to the Preachers only.] What can this Act be as thus considered apart from the Rite, but something substantiall to the Calling? the rather because (in the same chapter*) ⁴⁴ he makes the act of the Ministers and Elders to be that whereby a fit person is made a Minister; and the act of the Church to be that, whereby he is made a Minister of this or that particular Church.

As for Voetius, though of all other he seem most to favour your cause, and to ascribe much to election, and little to Ordination; yet I desire that this may be seriously weighed out of him: That he professedly and at large maintains against *Iansenius*, that the first Reformers had an ordinary outward call, not only to the work of reforming, but also to the office of being Ministers. Which cannot possibly be maintained on any ohter principle but his; That as in some cases Election alone sufficeth (for he speaks but of Cases) as all that is esstially to a Callling; so in their case, Ordination alone made them Ministers, and that way of Calling contained all that was essentiall thereunto. See to this purpose. *De[?].causa Papatus, lib.2.sect.1.à cap.2.ad ult. & sec.2.cap.1. & seq.usque ad 12.*

And whereas he says, *Majorem differentians, &c. None can imagine a greater difference between these two, Election and Ordination, then between the Constitution an dCommission of a Prince considered nakedly, and the same commission adorned with some arbitrary symbols, as scepter, crown, &c.* It may be answered, besides all the premises, that Election is that act whereby one is chosen *in futurum Presbyterum*, to be made a /23/ Minister; and Ordination is that whereby he who is so chosen is actually made a Minister. And the reason is cleer, Because between Election and Ordination something may intervene to make the choise null in relation to the end and effect whereunto it is intended, to wit the making of such a peson to be a Minister. The designing of a person to be made a King, and the act of putting him into the Kingly office, as the choise of a meet person to be a wife, and that act of mariage whereby she is made a wife (*de prasenti*) do very much differ: the last is the most formall and constitutive. And so it is between Election and Ordination when they are rightly compared, and specially when Ordination (as in this debate) is taken for the substantiall act of Ministers and Elders distinct form the rite of Imposing hands.

Hitherto of those *Calvinists* which you cited. Now for the *Lutherans*, though your speak big, yet you name but two, and the one was cited to your hamd in the other, as *Hunnius* in *Turnovius*. For the judgement of *Turnovius*, ⁴⁵ he makes Election to be (*vocationis initium tantum*) only the beginning of a call, and that it differs from Calling it self; which he proves by *the instance* of those two Act. 1. 23. who were both chosen, and yet but one of them was called:

⁴² **Junius anim. in Bellar.con.5 l.I.c.3.a[?].16.*

⁴³ **Art. 21.*

⁴⁴ **Art.3. profecto id legitimis est ut quemadmodum in ministerio absolutè per episcopos; ita in mininserio [???] busus aut illus ecclesia per ipsam ecclesiam ordinetur communi ecclesia nomine.*

⁴⁵ **Paulus Turnovius de S. ministerio, l.I.c.6.*

and by experience, because many are chosen, and yet upon examination rejected. And relating to the judgement of *Danaus*, that the first suffrage belongs to the Presbyterie, though he grants in matter of fact it is sometime otherwise, yet he says it would be (*rectissimum & justissimus*) the most right and just way, that no Patron, Magistrate, Nobleman, or Ruler, should make any promise to any that they should be taken into this Order of the Ministry, before he Was (*satis exploratus*) sufficiently tryed both for doctrine, ability to teach, and conversation, by the Presbyterie, Consistory, or Superintendent and Company of Ministers. *Quòd quoties negligitur, & hic ordo legitimus non servatur, toties jus a ecclesia violantur, a[??]que utinam ips[??] in periculum nunquam præcipitaretur.* For *Humius*, I cannot yet meet with that Tract of his which you cite, but you have his judgement out of other writings.

4. The use of Ordination [take it how you will in the /24/ sense of Protestant writers) is more then to solemnize, inaugurate, or publish the calling of a Minister. And therefore your [*but to solemnize*] is a glosse of your own to corrupt the text of those Authors (and others of like kind) whom you have quoted.

Why was not that englished, *Missio solemnis in possessionem honoris*, The solemn mission into the possession of honour? Shew us some reason why a right in the thing should not be essentiall as well as a right unto it; or some other Scripture way whereby a Minister is actually made a Minister, and put into the possession of Ministeriall power, besides that of Ordination. *Tarnovius* in the book and chap. which you have cited, pag.267. assigns a threefold use of it. [“1. The person chosen is by this ceremony separated from the remaining company of Hearers, and consecrated unto God as a sacrifice. 2. He is hereby commended to the Church as the Governour thereof. 3. Blessed unto the Ministry, and to that end Prayer and Fasting use to be joyned.] From the first of these ariseth this argument. When a man is separated from the common company and conditin of hearers, and consecrated unto God to do him service in the holy function of the Ministry, then he is formally and essentially made a Minister. But every man is so separated and consecrated in and by his Ordination; therefore in and by Ordination he is formally and essentially made a Minister.

Chemnitius among other uses whereunto it serves, sets down this for one, *ut esset quasi publica & solemnis ecclesia coram deo protestatio in electione & vocatione servatam esse formam & regulam à spiritu sancto prascriptam.* [“That it might be as it were a publique and solemn protestation of the Church of God, that the forme and rule prescribed by the holy Gost hath been observed in election and calling.] But how can such a protestation be thereby made, unlesse Ministers be taken into the Election and Calling, *not onely to direct and guide the Church in choosing, but also to judge and determine of the validity of their choice*; seeing the forme and rule prescribed by the holy Ghost in Scripture examples gives no election or power of calling to the people, /25/ but under an oversight and pr[??]acie. (For as he well observes*⁴⁶ out of the Apostles practice Act.1. about *Mathias*, and Act.6. about Deacons) *Non prorsus se abdicant cura vocationis, & vulgi ast multitudinis [??] & consusæ libidini c[??] permittunt, sed sunt quasi gubernatores & moderatores electionis & vocationis. ‘Propon[??] enim doctrinam & regulam quales & quomodo eligere debe[??] & electi sistuntur coram Apostolis, ut illorum judicio electio probetur an rectè fiat; illi verò orantes impositione manuum electionem approbant.* The end of Ordination is therefore (with him) to approve and validate the Peoples choice, which might otherwise be accounted null or insufficient. And in this sense may all those particular expressions which you have cited be understood; that Ordination is a *solemne declaration, a testification of the Ministers constitution, A publique testimony of one called, A*

⁴⁶ *ad Can.6,7,8.

consecrecation, manifestation, declaration, signification, and solemn testification before the Church. All which declaration, testification, &c. is to be performed by Ministers and Elders; not only *as Witnesses*, but *as Judges* in the room and stead of God and Christ: and without this, the sufficiency of all that is done by the people may be suspected and questioned. And if it be well considered that the *mediate*, as well as *immediate* Calling of a Minister doth properly belong to God alone and to Christ as their act; it will plainly appeare, that where such a declaration is wanting (which should be performed by them who in their office act in the name of God and Christ) that there that which is most proper to an externall and mediate calling from God is wanting. And if it were granted that Ordination in this sense is but to solemnize &c. yet it would not follow that it is not essentiall to the calling of a Minister, but rather on the contrary that it is: because though it may be admitted that God calls by the Church in choosing; yet the Peoples proper part is to desire and accept, or to designe the person, but with submission to the Ministers and Elders, who are to judge, determine and declare, yea *to give*, and *set over*, with the Churches consent and approbation, in the room and stead of Christ: so as when one is to be Ordained, (*Committur illi /26/ nomine ac loco Dei ub Ordinatore cura gregis dominici*) The care of the Lords flock is, by him who Ordains, committed to him that is Ordained, in the name and place of God.*⁴⁷

Your third Reason:

“Then a man is a Minister when he hath a calling to the Work from God and man: But both these he may have without Ordination.”

Ans. That a man is a Minister when he hath a calling to the work from God and man, is granted; if you understand this Call not of a providentiall permission on God’s part, nor of any undue and irregular choise by the people alone; but of Gods calling with approbation, and mans orderly proceeding to make a Minister according to the rules of Scripture in that case provided. And that both these, God and man, may concur in a calling without Ordination in some extraordinary cases, will not be denied. That which you should prove, is, that Ordination is essentiall neither *in ecclesiâ consti[??]utâ* But let us see what you prove.

“A man is called by God, when he is approved to be of eminent gifts, and hath his heart stirred up by spirituall respects to use those gifts for publique good.”

Ans. It seems by this, that *Judas* had no call of God to be an Apostle, nor the sons of *Ely* to be Priests; and that an unregenerate person cannot be a Minister called of God; nor any regenerate person, though he have sufficiencie, unlesse he be of eminent gifts. But who must have the judging of the eminencie, and of the spirituall respects wherewith the heart is stirred up to use them for publique good? Is no other judgement to be made use of but a mans own? or have the People all power to be sole Judges in this case? First prove that Ministers and Elders are no competent Judges in this kind, and then you shall heare further. But of Mans calling it followes. /27/

“He is called by Man, when the People who are godly, consulting with the Word of God, and laying aside all carnall respects, choose him and give up themselves unto him.”

⁴⁷ **Nic. Hunnius quo supr.p.2§0.*

Ans. Suppose ungodly people choose a godly man approved to be of eminent parts; is the choice void, because the choosers are not godly? Who shall be Judge of the peoples godliness? if themselves alone, then who will be excluded from being of the number of the godly? Every Minister lawfully called is *a gift of Christ**:⁴⁸ therefore people should rather receive Ministers as from his hands, by the Ordination of other Ministers and Elders, then give Ministers unto Christ, and unto themselves. If Ministers be sent them and set over them in the Lord, they may *receive them* by acceptance, and *give up themselves unto the Lord, and unto them* as his Ministers, although they do not first and formally choose them themselves. Carnall respects may sometimes cause godly people to choose one rather than another, and (it may be) the more unworthy. True Apostles were often despised, when False teachers and the messengers of Satan were welcomed as Angels of light. And therefore the calling of a Minister should not be left entirely to peoples election upon pretence of godliness. You know who made this outcry,*⁴⁹ *All the Congregation is holy, yea every one of them*; to set up themselves in stead of those who were set over them by the Lord himself. And we cannot but remember *S. Pauls* prophesie, which is too much verified in the history of our times; *The time will come When they will not endure sound doctrine, but after their own lusts they shall heap to themselves Teachers, having itching eares.*

But where is the proof of your Assertion? what Scripture have you to shew that Peoples choice (their consent is of another nature) is either only essentiall, or otherwise essentiall unto the calling of a Minister in all cases, then Ordination is? or where are Ministers and Elders interdicted from acting in the call of others?

Your *Minor*, That a Minister may have a call both from God and man, without Ordination, may be thus inverted. A Minister may have a call from God and man without the /28/ Peoples election: for so had the Evangelists, and so may they who are sent to preach among the Heathens; and they who are first Ordained, and after sent unto a people and accepted of by them as their Ministers. And therefore popular election is not essentiall to the calling of a Minister.

Yet though the Scripture faile, it may be the *Protestants* against the *Socinians* will help you out. Of all others, I fear, those who write against *Socinians* (whose cause you patronize in this) will hardly stand by you to the last; And the *Socinians* themselves do speak more favourably of Ordination then you have done. *Smalcus* against *Frantzius* speaking in the name of all the rest, sayes thus: *Non negamus ex ista consuetudine primitive ecclesiæ Apostolica consequi, illudetiam jure fieri posse hodie quod olim fiebat; & si ecclesia semper incorrupta mansisset, non dubitamus quin valde justum fuisset [??] modus iste ordinandi Ministros observaretur, quemadmodum etiam nunc ubi constituta est respub. Christiana valdè decorum esse arbitramur ut id observetur. Sed non hoc potissimam queritur. Hoc enim in quæstione est, an hujusmodi constitutio sit prorsus necessaria ad constituendum verbi Dei minister**.⁵⁰ You engage your self upon the same point of contest with them, but no where grant so much as they. to that of *Crocus* against the *Socinians*, where he makes Calling necessary, and not Ordination, this might suffice: He speaks not of Ordination as distinguished from Imposition of hands, as you here do, but as convertible therewith; and in Calling does not exclude the Ministers and Elders from acting, as such. Yet because all that you have here, is a transcript out of him, (yet but a part) I have the more diligently perused that Author, & find you very injurious in quoting

⁴⁸ *Eph.4. 8.11.

⁴⁹ *Numb.16.3.

⁵⁰ * *Smalcus in refutatione Thesium* [??] *Frantzii* disp 4 pag.377. Vide plura apud eund. Hom.4 in I Joh.p.40.

of him by leaveing out these two materiall passages. One concerning Election: *Non enim conspiratio populi pro perfectè legitimâ vocatione haberi debet, ubi non observatur Dei voluntas, sed temerarius plebis & stultus assensus, quem rudiores & indigni præproperis pransationibus ferè captant.* Wherein he intimates what great abuse is incident to the choice of the people: for the preventing whereof I conceive no better remedy then Ordination. The other is concerning Ordination, which though /29/ he makes to be but *Constitutiois testificatio*, (speaking of the rite) yet he sayes it is not [??] *necessitatis in Ministerio constituto temerè negligenda.* In another of his Works he speaks more fully to the same point. *Ordinatio ministrorum per manuum impositionem, non quidem absolutè necessaria* (that's against the Papists) *non tamen quia apprimè utilis, extra necessitatis casum temere omittenda est.* (this late part makes against the Socinians and your self.).*⁵¹

Jos. Stegman speaking to the same point, expresseth himself more exactly.⁵² [We distinguish between the necessity of Vocation and Ordination: *Vocationis necessitatem majorem, Ordinationis minorem dicimus.*] Both are necessary according to his judgement, though not alike necessary [??] And a little after: *Vel ipso respectu manet necessaria quod extra casum necessitatis in Ministerio constituto negligi non potest.* All this he saith (*de ritu Ordinationis*) of the ceremony used in Ordaining. What he judgeth of the substantiall act of Ministers and Elders, may be easily understood thereby.

It remains yet on your part to prove, that Ordination is never necessary to a Calling: your own Witnesses have asserted the contrary; and besides them the *Professors at Leyden*, who are as antient as *Ames*, *Crocus*, or *Voetius*, and as well worthy to be reckned among *Protestant Divines*. They propounding the question, *⁵³*Whether Ordination be alwayes required?* answer affirmatively against the Socinians, *That in a constituted Church it is alwayes required.*

Your fourth Reason:

“*Whatsoever substantiall act belongs to the making of a Minister, or is solemnized in Ordination, the same is done in Election.* /30/

Ans. What you mean by Election here is uncertain, whether an act of choice by the people alone, (as most of your expressions imply) or an act of the whole Church consisting of Ministers and Elders as one part, and of the People as of another: for so it is to be understood in *Hunnius*, whom here you cite in the margin; what think you of this in stead of it? Ministers and Elders alone without People do every substantiall act which is done in election. They examine and approve his abilities, set him apart to the Ministry. The people receive him as from God by their hands, and he accepts of the Charge whereunto he is assigned by them; therefore Election is not essentiall unto the calling of a Minister. But perhaps the strength of your Proofs may carry it,

⁵¹ * *Lud. Crocius syntag. Theol. l.4.c.15.reg.6.*

⁵² * Jos. Stegman *Photinianismo desp. 52. qu. 5. An ritus ordinationis futuro Ecclesiæ ministro sit necessarius?*

⁵³ * *In Synop. pur. Thcol. inter Coroll. ad disput. 42. An Ministri futuri Ordinatione in ecclesia [??] requiratur? R. Sicut ejus vocationem, sic ejusdem Ordinationem in ecclesia [??] constitutasemper requiri, adversus Sociniano affirmamus.* For Rivetus (who is one of them) these are his words by himself, in the name of Protestants. *Cum Cypriano agnoscimus, [??] tenere ecclesiam nullo modo posse, qui ordinatus in ecclesia non est. Nec nos alio agnoscimus Pastores p[er] eos qui juxta Apostolorum canones in Acts & Epistolis, legitime sunt Ordinati. Si qui sunt qui illud munus usurpant sine vocatione Ecclesia, eos inter vagabundos & circum[?] rejicimus.* Apol, pro ver 2 pace Eccl. §.96.p.180.

though your naked Argument would blush to see it self. Therefore if this might suffice to the whole, yet I shall say something to the particulars of amplification.

“To Election there goes the tryall and approbation of a mans abilities.”

Ans. So there does to Ordination; and whether Ministers and Elders be not as able at least for this, as the People, let the people judge. In this respect therefore Ordination may be as essentiall as Election.*⁵⁴ As for your quotations here to the beginning of this 4. reason, they are the same which you gave us before, p.7. for the 8. Reason and serve only in this place to swell the margin for a shew; and therefore I passe them over and refer the Reader to the answer of them in that place where they were first alleadged.

*“In Election the Church giveth up it self to God to take whom he shall direct their hearts unto. and in choosing one well qualified they choose him whom God would have chosen.”*⁵⁵

Ans. In Ordination Ministers and Elders give up themselves to God to ordain him whom he shall direct their hearts unto; and in ordaining one well qualified, they ordain him whom God would have ordained. Where is the substantiall /31/ difference that Ordination may not be essentiall? Yet I pray you remember that which we read Act.1.24. speaks of Gods choosing, not of the peoples. And where all the eleven Apostles were choosers, Ministers and Elders are virtually a part. There were two nominated at that time, both well qualified, and both referred unto God, and he chose one. If the people had all power in making Ministers, why did not they apart from the Apostles choose one alone, when there was but one to be chosen? but to teach us that to the regular Call of a Minister something is necessary besides a meer election by the people.

In their choice they (h.e. the People) co ipso separate and set him apart to the Ministry.”

Ans. Those two whom the hundred & twenty presented Act. 1.23. [GREEK], were neither of them *co ipso* set apart to the Ministry, but afr the lot fell upon *Mathias*, *co ipso* he became an Apostle, and was numbred with the eleven. When the holy Ghost said, *Separate me Paul and Barnabas* with fasting and prayer, by Imposition of hands they were separated, Act.13.1,2,3. So in Ordination, when a person well qualified hath hands laid on him with fasting and pryer, *co ipso* he is separate and set apart to the Ministry*.⁵⁶ But where is either precept, example, or ground of reason for people to set any man apart by a sole act of their own, and thereby to make him a Minister, when they may have Ministers and Elders to joyn with them in choosing, and after to Ordain?

“Him (h.e. the Minister) they take as from Gods appointment and hand, they offer themselves to God by him.”

⁵⁴ * Note.

⁵⁵ Act. 1. 24.

⁵⁶ * See the testimonies formerly cited, pag. 17.

Ans. This is true, when one is Ordained for them, whom they accept of as made their Minister by Ordination, and who accepts of them as his cure and charge. But when people choose one to be a Minister, who neither is Ordained, nor intends to be, they give him to God so as they are the Priests, and the Minister the Sacrifice, and God must receive /32/ him as a Minister to him from their appointment and hand. The truth is, a Minister should be called in such a manner as he may come to the Church from God, and as a gift of Christ, yet so as it may appear that the Church receives him as such; and therefore as some testimony of the Churches consent is necessary, so much more an Ordination by Ministers and Elders: for otherwise well may Ministers be looked upon as given by the Church unto God, but it cannot be held out that they are given from God to the Church.

*“In accepting the choice, the Party chosen undertaketh to be in Gods stead to them, and in their stead and behalf to God, (for what else is it to be a Minister?) And all this is done with prayer and mutuall agreement.”*⁵⁷

Ans. All this is but a consequent of Election and Ordination both; no substantiall act of either, but an effect; The duty of a Minister when he hath a call, towards God and the people to whom he is assigned, not the formall thing whereby he is made a Minister. That a Minister is *an ambassadour for Christ, God beseeches by him, and he is Christs stead*, we learn indeed from 2 Cor.5.20. But this makes nothing at all for a call by popular election, because many were true Ministers (as Prophets and Apostles) in all these respects, who were never chosen by the Church to that end, but by God alone. And what is more improper then for a People to choose an Ambassador, and one to be in Gods stead unto them? As he is to act for them, there is some pretence for choice, but no necessity; for *every High-Priest* (yea every Priest) *was taken from among men, and Ordained for men in things pertaining to God:* and yet none of them was properly chosen by men, but all by God.⁵⁸ And as he is to act for God, so its necessary there should be some act whereby Gods sending of him in his stead may appeare. The choice or calling of Ambassadors belongs not to them to whom they come as Ambassadors, but unto him from whom and in whose name they are to act. And because God doth not now adayes make any extraordinary designations, either by voyce from /33/ heaven, as at Christs⁵⁹ baptisme and transfiguration,⁶⁰ or by prophecie, as in the case of *Timothy*;⁶¹ or by some extraordinary and expresse signation of his Spirit, as in the case of *Paul* and *Barnabas*;⁶² or by vision, as in the case of *Paul* at first unto *Ananias*;⁶³ or by lot, as in the case of *Matthias*;⁶⁴ there remains the only way of Ordination, whereby we come to know who are sent of God, and who are not.

“Now as where the Church agrees in an act, God will be present to confirme that act, Mat. 18. 18,19. so Prayer is also a separation of one to the Ministry, Act,13.2,3.”

⁵⁷ 2 Cor.5.20.

⁵⁸ Heb. 5.1.

⁵⁹ *a* Mat.3.17.

⁶⁰ *b* ch.17.5.

⁶¹ *c* 1 Tim.4.14.

⁶² *d* Act.13.2.

⁶³ *e* ch.9.15.

⁶⁴ *f* ch.1.26.

Ans. The word Church is not used in either of those verses which you cite in *Matthew*; and in the 17. verse where we find it, it signifies a company endowed with power of *binding and loosing*, and consequently the Presbyterie, Ministers and Elders. If they agree to *Ordain a Minister*, their act is valid by vertue of this text: And if they ask of God the confirmation of blessing of their act, it shall be granted them. Agreement must here be understood not only with reference to the persons among themselves, but with respect unto the right rule of acting. That people have a power to choose themselves a Minister, and by that act of theirs to make him one without Ordination, who otherwise is none, even when there is a way open for his Ordination, (for that must here be supposed) remains yet for you to prove. That Prayer alone is a separation of one to the Ministry, is but your bare assertion: and to cite *Act.13.2,3.* for the proof of this, is bold presumption, and abuse of Scripture. That Deacons were separated with prayer and imposition of hands without fasting, (for there is no mention of that) we read in *Act.6.6.* And that *Paul and Barnabas* were separated by prayer, fasting, and imposition of hands, we read also *Act. 13.2,3.* But what's this to prove separation by Prayer only; and that also by the people alone, without Ministers and Elders?

“Adde further. Our translators of the Bible take and render [GREEK] to ordain, which signifies properly to choose: And /34/ where the Scripture speaks expresly of choosing, they supply the text ith the word Ordain.”

Ans. Our translators use the word *Ordain* for the English of severall words in the Greek: as in the Old Testament for that one English word *Idols*, there may be many and divers words in the Hebrew.⁶⁵ This liberty is necessary and almost unavoidable in many places; and the more warrantable, because the *Holy Ghost* speaking in divers places of the same thing, does often vary in the manner of expressing. And this is to be found not only by comparing those places which are cited out of the Hebrew in the Greek of the New Testament, but also one place of the Hebrew with another, as *Ainsworth* often observes in his Annotations. That [GREEK] often signifies properly *to choose*, in some places, is granted; provided that you acknowledge it may signifie sometimes as properly *to ordain*: for it may indifferently be applied as well to Magistrates, when by vote or suffrage they constitute, which is by way of authority *to ordain*; as to People, when they elect or choose by way of privilege or of power. Whereas you say the Scripture speaks expresly of *choosing*, in *Act.1.22.* and yet the Translators supply the text with the word *ordain*; it is a great injury not only to the Translators, but to the Scripture it self, and to the *Holy Ghost* who is the author of them. The 21. and 22. Verses being taken in together to make up one entire sentence, tell us, [??? Greek phrase] *One must be made witnesse with us of Christs resurrection.* Here the Scripture speaks expresly of *making*, not of *choosing*; and of one to be made not by the people, but by God. Among those who were present, there were not people only, but those who were greater then Ministers and Elders: and they appointed ([???) or presented and nominated two, that God might choose one*.⁶⁶ *Shew whether of these two thou hast chosen*, ([???) Here indeed the Scripture speaks of Gods *choosing* one, and such a kind of choosing may well be called *ordaining*, because it is a constitutive and consummating act whereby the people are bound to receive one as set over them by God. But in the making of *Matthias* an Apostle, the people had no such power (as in this sense) to /35/ choose him: if they had, why were lots used? for then they might have pitched on one without using such a means of decision.

⁶⁵ [???) *Gillu*. [???) *Teraphim*. *Baalam*. *Ts[??]m*. &c.

⁶⁶ * *Non audent unum aliquem certo nomina re, sed duos [???) medium prodi[??] & Dominus forte declaret utrum ex iis velit succedere.* Calv. inst. 1.4.c.3.[??].13.

“Hen. Stephan *calls the act of choice* ([GREEK]) *creare magistratum, the making of an Officer; for it is (as he syes) a new-found sense of the word to signifie laying on of hands. And if the Apostle Luke should use it for laying on of hands, it was never used so before his time by any Writer holy or prophane: And unlesse his purpose was to write that which none should read, it must needs be that as he wrote, so he meant, Election by voyces, (sayes Cartwright.)*

Ans. Henry Stephan sayes that [GREEK] signifies (a-among other things) *creare magistratum* the making of a Magistrate; *at cum accusativo persona, creare. Sic etiam Act.14.* citing the words of the Text; and adds, *At vetus interpres, Quum constituissem.* But then he tells you, *Sunt [??] qui ad ritum [??] Greek phrase*, i.e. *impositionis manuum, id reserripu[?], quum aliequi novum usum huic verbo hic tribuere minimo necesse vidcatur.* Here you discover either negligence or fraud. The sense of the word which he approves in that Text Act. 14 is creating, or constituting; others he sayes understand by it *imposition of hands*; this he calls a new use of the word, and sayes it may seem not necessary, yet he does not deny but the word may beare that sense: because he knew well what he had said before, that [GREEK] *manum portendo & attollo, manum porrigo*; and that in Imposition of hands there is a lifting up and stretching out of the hands; for what is [GREEK] but [??] Greek phrase] as he also expresses it? The Text speaks of *constituting*; and because in constituting Church officers, imposition of hands was the rite used in the Apostles times, therefore it should not seem so strange a thing to hold, that as the act of *Paul and Barnabas* in choosing Presbyters, so also the consequent act of *imposing hands* should be comprehended under that one word [GREEK], seeing the etymologie of the word agrees to the latter, if the use do not. Certain it is that the Greek Fathers and Councils do use the word for *imposition of hands* most frequently, as *Bil[?]* instances at large*;⁶⁷ which /36/ they would never have done if the nature of the word would not have borne such a use.⁶⁸ And it is as certain that many Greek words are used in the New Testament in such a sense as they are no where else to be found: those common words of [GREEK] and [GREEK] are enough to prove it. And if you will needs have [GREEK] to signifie nothing but an act of choice or election by voices (as you call it) yet *Paul and Barnabas* were the choosers, and this makes nothing for popular election, which you would haue to be the *unum* and *unicum necessarium* in the Calling of a Minister; and yet you cannot prove by this word (as there used) that the people chose at all and much lesse that they only were the choosers. Produce if you can but one instance out of any Author, wherein the word is used in such a sense as you contend for, viz. for some to choose by other mens voices? Our old English translation, *When they had ordained them Elders by election*, doth plainly hold out that two distinct acts, *ordaining* and *electing*, yet not two distinct agents, are included under that one word. *Beza* upon the place, though he sayes enought to shew that Ordination from Popish Bishops is not necessary, yet endeavours not to prove that *Imposition of hands* is not included under the Greek word. To say that Imposition of hands is there meant (*vi vocis*) by the proper signification of the word, is indeed absurd; but to hold it is included (*ex natura rei*) from the nature of the thing, *the making of Church-officers*, and the example of the Apostles elsewhere upon like occasion, is no absurdity. As for *Cartwright*, though he is a little warmer in many expressions then needed, yet in the close he is exceeding wary, and sayes, *They speak untruly which accuse us (Protestants) as if we so commended the Churches election, as we shut out the Bishops ordination, which we do not only*

⁶⁷ * Of Perp. Government.

⁶⁸ Dr. Fulk in locum sayes, both election by the Church, and Ordinatin by imposition of hands of the Apostles, are comprehended under that one word.

give unto them, but make them also the chief and directors in the Election; understanding by Bishops only such as are mentioned in Scripture, and not humane creatures.

All that followes might be spared, but that you have a great mind to let the world know you sometimes look into a Greek Dictionary: and lest some Readers be beguiled /37/ by your shew of Learning; I shall therefore omit nothing, especially because you earnestly call for observation.

“Yea let it further be observed that in Election and Ordination the same word is used. In Election, Act.1.23.Act.6.6. [GREEK]. In Ordination it is [GREEK], the same word with the addition of a Preposition ([GREEK]) only.”

Ans. That Act. 1. 23. speaks not properly of Election, in your sense, is already proved. Neither is Election to be understood by the word [GREEK] in Act.6.6. In the 5. verse it is said of the whole multitude, they chose *Steven &c.* [GREEK]. The sixth verse sayes they set them, viz. those whom they had chosen, *before the Apostles, not over themselves by way of authority*, but before them that they might Ordain them. I wonder at your boldnesse with the Scripture, and especially at your abuse of words in the Originall language. The truth is, though the Apostles referred the choice of fit persons to the people, yet as they took unto themselves to prescribe the qualification, and the number of the persons, wherein they make themselves Judges of the election, so they reserved unto themselves the constitution and ordination of them, and thereby plainly declare that Election without an Ordination suffices not, no not in the case of *Deacons*, and much lesse of *Ministers of the Word*. And in this they seem plainly to have an eye (as in all things that belong to the politie of the Church) to the *common-wealth of Israel*, and to *Moses* his manner of maing officers among the Jews, whereof we read in *Deuteronomy*. *Take (or give) ye wise men and understanding among yur tribes, and I will make them*⁶⁹ *rulers over you,* (ch.1.13.) *And ye answered me and said, The thing which thou hast spoken is good for us to do* (v.14.) *so I took the chief of your tribes wise men and known, and made them*⁷⁰ *heads over you.* (v.15.) This gives great light to that in the Acts, if the phrases be compared. But all this while we have nothing for Election alone, without Ordination. But something we have for Ordination by your own grant, for [GREEK] refers to Ordination. You must needs intend this of the phrase in /38/ Act.6.3. and if there it be so understood, it is the more likely to have the same sense in Tit. 1.5. which you denyed before. Yet you seem loth to grant that truth which you dare not deny: and therefore having said that [GREEK] in Act.1.23. and Act.6.6. is to be understood of Election, and [GREEK] (fot that you mean out of Act.6.3.) of Ordination; yet you go about to prove that the simple and compound word have the same sense and signification, that by this *grammaticisme* you may seem to gain something. Thus men who are ready to sink, use to catch at any thing, or the shadow of a thing. Hitherto we have not found an Election in any sense without an Ordination, as Act.6. or something more, as an extraordinary decision by lots, but it may be we shall anon.

“And as the translators of the Bible render both words Appoint; [GREEK] They appointed, Act.1.23. [GREEK] We will appoint, Act.6.6. So the preposition [GREEK] doth not alter the sense specifically from the word when it is without it, no not in the matter of making an Officer; for it is all one, [GREEK] and [GREEK], as H. Stephen observes. In the New

⁶⁹ *[GREEK] *apud Sept.*

⁷⁰ * [GREEK].

Testament [GREEK] signifies to place one, and to place one with honor: when the phrase is, [GREEK], He shall set the sheep on his right hand, Mat.25.33. it is an authoritative word, as Rom.3.31. [GREEK], We establish the Law. And the Septuagint whom Luke is observed to follow most, use [GREEK] for as much as [GREEK], 1 Chron. 9. 22. [GREEK]. These did David and Solomon appoint in their set office.

Ans. This great shew of something comes to nothing. For, granting that the simple and compound word have sometimes (for alwayes they have not) the same signification, yet it will not follow that they have the same sense in the Texts alleadged, as appears by that which hath been said already. The action of the hundred and twenty in appointing two out of which God was to choose one, was not of the same nature with Gods appointing one, because neither of the two were made Apostles by the former act, but one /39/ alone by the latter. And that of the Multitude in setting seven men before the Twelve, was not of like nature with the Apostles in Ordaining them. Whereas you say in the margin, [GREEK] *pro* [GREEK] *apud Enstath.* you abuse your self and the Reader: Because neither the simple nor the compound in his sense are to be understood as you understand them here. And *H. Stephan* (of whose words you pretend not to be ignorant, and are therefore the more inexcusable) hath it thus: *At eustathius* [???][GREEK] *esse pro simplici* [GREEK], *intelligens ut opinor* [GREEK] *pro siste: sed ita sumpto, ut quum dicitur sistere c[??].* *Possit tamen aliquis magis etiam proprio verbo utens, illud* [GREEK] *Eustathii reddere Appelle**.⁷¹ In the latter of those pages which you cite out of him, viz. p. 1767. he sayes that *Cicero's* phrase, *constituere regem*, is (in Greek) [GREEK]: And in the former of them (viz.p.1732.) [GREEK], *id est quod Cicero constituere regem dicit.* But what of this, till we know what *Cicero* means by his *constituero*? Is there therefore no difference between the peoples appointing two, and Gods choosing one? or did the Multitude and the Apostles, both or either, constitute (as Kings use to be constituted) in the same sense? Then why should the foregoing act of the people be counted essentiall in the Calling of *Matthias* and the Deacons, rather then the latter act of God alone, or the Twelve? It might suffice you to say, the act of the multitude in setting seven men before the Apostles was essentiall, though the act of the Apostles in setting the same seven over the multitude was not. But must you needs make the act of God in choosing one of two, to be a meer accident? Take heed. To make the præposition [GREEK] a Diminutive, is against all use and reason. That [GREEK] signifies to place one, and to place one with honour, and is an authoritative word, and as much as [GREEK], may be granted in some texts, though not in these; but that will not content you, unlesse the compound signifie lesse then the simple. In good earnest let us know some reason why [GREEK] may not signifie *prasicire* (as *H. Stephan* saith it doth in those texts of *Matthew* and *Luke* heretofore insisted on) and consequently to place one in honour, by way of authority, /40/ and as much as [GREEK]? Why is the act of the people *under authority* a substance, and the act of those who are *over them* in the Lord a shadow? I feare it is not so much for the Truths sake, or for the Peoples good, as for some advantage, that you make so light account of the Apostles and God himself. I would willingly allow the people all right, but I dare not say that alone which they do is essential, authoritative word in that phrase, *We establish the law*, where the Apostle speaks but of a doctrinall establishment; let us know why, when he speaks of politicall acts, and applies the compound to them, that should not also be as authoritative, or at least authorittative?

When you say, [“the Septuagint whom Luke is observed to follow, use [GREEK] for as much as [GREEK], as 1 Chron.9.22. [GREEK], *These did David and Solomon appoint in their*

⁷¹ [There is no note corresponding to this asterisk.]

set office.”] I hope by this time you see the mistake. The words are, *whom David and Samuel the Seer did appoint in their set office*. And if you mean that the peoples act in Act.1.23. and Act.6.6. was like unto that of *David and Samuel* about the potters, you are mistaken. *David and Samuel* might be said to *set, appoint, or ordain*, either as the one was a King, and the other a Judge, or as they were both Prophets, but neither of these acceptions belong unto the people. Yet there is something in the close wherein perhaps you may speed better then you have done hitherto.

“*But especially consider that electing one is taking up an office for him, Act. 1. 20.22. and he that is elected is said to be numbred amongst its officers, Act.1.26. The lot fell upon Matthias, and he was numbred amongst the Apostles. Numbred [GREEK] communibus suffragiis seu calculis ad scriptus est, by common consent or votes he was put into the number or inrolled amongst the Apostles.*

Ans. That electing one, is taking up an office for him, I understand not. But that by Gods election *Matthias* was made an Apostle, as all the rest by Christ, is certain. That /41/ there were two presented by the people at first, and afterward one accepted of by common consent in way of obedience to Gods determination, I verily believe.⁷² There was no other sufrage nor second lot, though the word [GREEK] found that way: (for to refer the choice by lot to God, and after to vote whether Gods decision should stand, were to tempt God.) but an acquiescence on all parts in his as the last resolve. *Calvin* speaking to this point, *A quibus eligendi sunt Ministri*, sayes, *Hujus rei certa regula ex Apostolorum institutione peti non potest, qua [??] habuit à communi reliquorum vocatione dissimile**.⁷³ And that the 120. acted here as a generall Church visible, not as a single Congregation, is the rather to be believed, because he that was chosen was to be an Apostle: and this will make little for the right of Congregations to have all power in electing of their Officers. Yet this example may be of this use, to teach us, 1. That the Churches consent of assent is in some cases requisite unto the call of a Minister. 2. That a Ministers call is not to be left wholly to the Peoples election; for then what need either of a Lot, as here; or of Ordination, as in the case of Deacons? And for all that yet appeares in the discussion of this argument, Ordination may be essentiall to the calling of a Minister.

Your fifth Argument: pag. 11.

“5. *Upon whomsoever Election falleth, Ordination doth necessarily, and therefore the Call to the Ministry lies principally in Election; as he that is chosen to be a King, must be crowned, therefore his Election gives hm the right to rule. That Ordination necessarily follows Election, appears Act.6.3. where the Apostle bids them look out (i.e. chuse, as is explained ver.5.) and he would appoint.*”

Ans. This Arguments falls short in the Conclusien, That therefore Ordination is not essentiall. And if *Ordination do necessarily fall upon whomsoever Election falleth*, then is Ordination at least necessary after Election. If it be necessary, it may not be omitted when it may be had; all that neglect or despise it are without excuse, especially when the Magistrate /42/ injoyns it agreeably unto the Word. And if it should alwayes follow upon Election, yet you cannot thence conclude that the Call to the Ministry lies principally in Election. Marriage is

⁷² *Apostolos solus Deus eligic, [??]clesia accipit: Apostoli [??] Christo sola Ecclesiae copito, ac non ab homnibus, (ut Paulus ad Galat. [??].) eliquatur. Jun. ecclesiast. lib 3. cap. [??].*

⁷³ * *Calv. inst. l.4.c.3.§.13.*

begun by the motion of the man to the woman that he may have her for his wife; and yet marriage it selfe lies not principally in that, nor in their mutuall consent, but in their solemn taking one another, and in the ratification thereof by suth as are in authority to allow or disallow of such desires and purposes. In generation *nature* begins with the preparation of the matter, and after that the *forme* is educed or introduced, and yet the *essence* or being arises from the union of the forme with the matter. That he who is chosen to be a King, *must* be crowned, makes still more for the necessity of Ordination; and if his Election gives him the right to rule, yet his Coronation only doth solemnly declare to the binding of all his Subjects unto obedience, that his right is acknowledged, and he is actually put into the exercise of it. Grant that a Minister may not (have *jus in re*) *act as a Minister* in things of *Order* and *Jurisdiction*, till he be Ordained, and our strife will cease. Where you say, *that Ordination necessarily follows Election, appears* Act.6.3. I fear you mean it backwards, that Election must necessarily go before Ordination: but then Act.6.3. will not prove it, because neither *that one example* nor any other hold out a *full enumeration for all cases* which belong unto the calling of a Minister*. ⁷⁴ And if the Apostle reserves (as you grant) [*appointing*] to himself, it thereby appears that some act of another nature distinct from Election belongs to the caling of a Deacon, which is not in the peoples power: for why should the Apostles reserve that unto themselves which did belong unto the people.

As to your Margin about this Argument, if I should take no notice of it, either you might think yourself neglected, or some Reader be so weak as to imagine there was strength in the *Latine*, though the *English* prove weak; and therefore I shall take that also into consideration. Out of Ames you tell us, ⁷⁵ *All those acts which pertain to Calling, either tend to Election, as Nomination, Presentation, Examination, /43/ or depend upon Election, as Ordination, Institution, or Immission.*

Ans. Nomination, Presentation, and Examination, tend equally to Ordination as to Election, and some kind both of examination and election belongs properly to the Ordainers, and not unto the People. If Election be taken for the peoples act, Ordination does not depend upon it absolutely in all cases, as hath been proved already: but suppose it did, what hinders but that those things which depend upon Election may be as essentiall unto Calling as Election it self? What think you of the act of a Minister in accepting of the work and charge unto which he hath been chosen? If that be not essentiall, a Minister may be compelled and made a Minister whether he will or no: If you say it is essentiall, you grant that something which depends upon Election is esentiall; for he cannot properly accept untill he have been chosen first. Sometimes there is Mission, Institution, Ordination, or something of like nature thereunto, without any Election on their part to whom Ministers are sent; as in the case of particular Ordination, as *Junius* distinguishes of it into *universall* and *particular*. When *Peter* and *John* were sent unto *Samaria*, they might preach, baptize, perform any act of *Ministeriall order* among the *Samaritans* respectively to their state and condition: and if they had any Election from the Believers there, it must follow after their lawfull calling to the Ministeriall work in that place, which they brought with them from *Jerusalem*, and received not in *Samaria*, and so was not *essentiall* to constitute, but *accumulative* to corroborate their call. When a Ministry is first set

⁷⁴ * *In hist. N. Test amentisexempla habemus constitutionis [???] [???], & ejusde[??] etiam conservationis, sed n6 [???] rationis ejus aut Reformationis post generale[??] apostat[??]. On nia igitur quae pertinent ad ple[??] fidelem intali casu, [???] repiesentantur ibi [???] ex[??]mplis. Ames. Bell. Ene[??]. [???, etc.]*

⁷⁵ * *Omnes illi a[??]us [???] pertinent ad Electi. onem, ut nominatio, præsenta[??] examinatio, vel ab Electione pendent, ut O dinatio, in[??] immissio. Ames. cas. consc. q.10 supra.*

up in any place to convert those who are yet uncalled, it comes in after this manner mediately or immediately.

To that of Voetius, though it be more full in his own words then as you contract it, *⁷⁶
That relations are said to exist in their subject upon the position of their foundation and terme, and that the lawfull election and vote ([GREEK]) of the Church is the foundation of the Ministry, and this or that particular Church the term, as also, that Consecration is but the adjunct of Ministry, and the adjunct is after his subject. /44/ Yet you shall do well to prefer reason before testimony, and to consider that the foundation of Calling, is power and authority to set one over others in the Lord for the Ministry: and the terme may be indefinite or particular, or both, as the good and state of the Church doth require. Election of the people can be nothing else but a desire thast such a one may be made a Minister, and their Minister in particular; and may either go before, or follow Ordination, according to the state of the person who is desired. This desire of theirs is to be subject, as in some respect to the person himself, so more especially unto them who are to discern, judge and determine in the room of Christ. The sentence of such competent Judges is the true foundation of Calling; and the assignation of a particular Company to be ministered unto (which when they are Saints is to be done with their consent) is the terme. All this is done in Ordination; and in that regard Ordination rightly stated is not an adjunct of Calling (it might be an adjunct, and yet inseparable) but the forme it self.

That which follows concerns those of Scotland.

*“And to this agree our Brethren of the Church of Scotland, speaking of Ordination in generall, (though they instance it as to a particular stock) Neither the Patrons presentation, nor the Clergies nomination, examination, and recommendation, or the Bishops laying on of hands and giving of institution, nor all these put together, can make up to a man his Calling to be a Pastor, without the free election of the flock.”*⁷⁷ [Here it might be added, Nor the free election of the People without Ordination.] *Again. “A man hath from his Election power to be a Pastor, so far as concerns jus ad rem; and Ordination only applyeth him to the actuall exercising of his Pastorall office, which Ordination ought to be given to him onely who is elected, and that because he is elected.”*

Ans. Upon what ground you intitle that book so often cited, *to the Brethren*, and sometime to the *Church of Scotland* generally, I know not, unlesse it be to delude the Reader, /45/ or upbraid the Brethren and the Church. Some of them have been long in *England* as Commissioners from that Church; and have not been silent where they had occasion to debate. Besides, their Works speak for them; as the great paines of Reverend Mr. *Rutherford* at large to the point in hand*.⁷⁸ Before their arrivall here, there was a learned Tract of *Patrick Forbes* of *Corse*, to cleare the Call of Ministers in the Reformed Churches, and particularly in *Scotland*, against Objections of the Papists. As to these particular passages hete cited, you wrong both *the Author, the Reader, and the Truth it self*, by leaving out all those expressions whereby Ministers and Elders are interested in Election as distinguished from Ordination; and by misapplying those words which you have expressed. *But whiles* (saith he) *we plead for the Election of People, we adde, 1. Let the Clergy of the adjacent bounds in their Presbyteriall assembly try and judge who*

⁷⁶ * *Relationes [??] subjecto d[??] existere [??] fundamento & termino. Sed legitima electio est fundamentum Ministerii, & particularis Ecclesia ista vel illa terminus. Voci. ubi sup. p.265. Consecratio est adjunctum Ministeris, atque adjunctum est po[??]us suo subjecto.Id.[??].*

⁷⁷ Eng.pop. cer. pt.3.5.8.p.167.

⁷⁸ * *Due right of Presb. from p.178. to 241.*

are fit for the Ministry. 2. Even when it comes to Election, yet (*Populus non folus judicat, sed præcunte & moderante actionem Presbyterio: the words of Junius*) *Let the Elders of the Congregation, together with some of the Clergy concurring with them, moderate the action, and go before the body of the People.* Would to God that these things were observed by all. I adde Amen for then an act of Ministers and Elders in judging of the Calling of a particular person, would alwayes be found *in praxi*, and without it all choice by People alone would be counted null and invalid. Whereas you say he speaks of *Ordination in generall*, and yet instances it is to a particular Flock, the truth is, he speaks there only of Ordination to a particular flock, and not of Ordination in generall untill he come to the next page.⁷⁹ It followeth (saith he) to speak of Ordination; wherein with Calvin, Junius, Gersom, Bucer, and other learned men, we distinguish between the act of it, and ther rite of it. The act of Ordination standeth in the mission or deputation of a man to an Ecclesiasticall function, with power and authority to perform the same. Now the Ordination, as thus described, is essentiall to a Calling, he himself implies by these words, *For how shall they preach except they be sent?* speaking of such a sending as he had before stated. That Ministers should not /46/ be obtruded *invito populo*, against the peoples will, is the sum of all which he pleads for, and will not be gainsaid where the people are Saints and Orthodox: but it will not thence follow that People have a power to make one a Minister, *excluso* or *invito Presbyterio*, without or against, or otherwise then by a Presbyterie. Suppose a man had by Election *jus ad rem*, power to be a Pastor, yet he is not therefore or thereby a Pastor actually; and if Ordination be that which gives *jus in re*, no man is to act as a Pastor till he be ordained. And if Election do only design a man to be made a Minister, and Ordination be that act whereby he is so made; I hope it will be plain, that as the introducing of the form is essentiall in creating, rather then preparing the matter or masse which is to receive it; so Ordination will be found to be essentiall rather then Election, though Election may precede in time, and Ordination follow after.

6. “A Minister may want and be without Ordination in some cases; therefore it is not essentiall to his Calling. Thus Gregor. Thaumaturgus was, and others may be in times of persecution.”⁸⁰

Ans. Here you fight against your self, if one word be changed. A Minister may want and be without Election in some cases, therefore it is not essentiall to his Calling. This is commonly judged to be the case of our first Reformers, and may be the case of others in times of extreme persecution. You care not to wound your self, so as you may strike others. There must be a voice from heaven, i.e. a true Ministry to bring men out of Babylon*⁸¹ (Rev.18.4) but who shall either ordain or elect, when Clergy and Laity (I use the words only for distinction sake) are equally corrupted. At such a time, where-ever God providentially sets up a standard, his people

⁷⁹ pag. 168.

⁸⁰ The sixth Argument.

⁸¹ * Non pot[?] Ecclesia resti[?], [??] restituto Ministerio, (de formâ ecclesi[?] [??] loquo[?]) quia non alia ratione qu[?] prædicatione Evangelii vel instaurari ecclesia, vel instaurata po[?] conservari[?] Sadeel de [??] git. vocatione Min.p.7. rerum [??] summo [??] attendi debet, qu[?]d vocationis Ministrorum verbi divini ne[?], [??] ad[?], non ad [??] to the end of this page illegible] ecclesiæ, atque turbatæ falsa doctrina atque immani persecutione. Nam ubi ecclesia, aut salsa doctrinâ turbata, aut persecutione dissipataest, it[?] desiant qui sinceros verbi divini Ministros [GREEK] vocate possint & [??]line: hac certè rerum necessitate extrema conced[?] Deus, ut quivis qui volun[?]tis divin[?] gnari sunt, verbum Dei prædicont, Sacramenta administrent, collapsam veritatem restaurent, & [??] munia sacra citra ordina[?]m vocationem obeant. [GREEK] . p.222.

may flock unto it; and it they fine *a burning and a shining light*, it sufficeth that they know it is *not of men, but from heaven*, and that they ought to walk in the light of it. /47/

But you adde:

“This argument Voetius presseth larger, and sheweth (even by confession of Papists) that one Elected or chosen may without Ordination do all the Offices of a Minister, as Excommunicate, Absolve: and concludes it is no more to the essence of a Minister, then bowing of the knee externally is essentiall to prayer to God, or the leading of the Bride and pomp of a wedding day is to Mariage. Desper.causa Papat. 266,267.

Ans. 1. Voetius speaks not of Ordination there as an act of Ministers and Elders distinct from the rite of laying on hands. 2. The Papists distinguish between the power of *Order* and *Jurisdiction*; though they grant Election gives jurisdiction, yet it is but in some cases; and those things which belong to *Order* can be done by none but by Ordained persons, according to their principles. Neither 3. doth Voetius produce any such confession of the Papists as you here assert he doth, *that one elected or chosen may without Ordination do all the offices of a Minister*. And the instances which you give of Excommunication and Absolution (both of which belong to Jurisdiction) shew plainly of what kind of actions the Papists are to be understood; and such are all those cases which you find cited in him, and many more of like nature which are more fully insisted on by a *Parisian Lawyer* to the same purpose*.⁸² 4. But this is especially to be noted, That Voetius thinks Ordination, or (as he there expresses himself) Coronation or Investiture may be wanting only (*alique in casu*) in some case, and instances in the time of persecution, (*cum neo plebs nec presbyteri in summa convenire possunt*) *When neither the People nor Elders can meet together*. Wherein he seems to suppose it is necessary at other times. The reasons which he gives why it should not be necessary in the case, /48/ concludes as much against the one, as against the other. *In time of persecution Ministers cannot assemble to Ordain, nor People* (saith he) [*I adde, to Elect*] and therefore that case which voyds the one, voyds the other also, and more strongly: A few Ministers may more safely meet privately to Ordain, then many people to Elect. The case of *Greg. Thaumaturgus*, if truly stated out of Voetius (whence you had it, as all the rest of this Paragraph) doth much confirm thi ; For as he was not Ordained so neither was he Elected in your sense *h.e.* chosen by the people; nor so much as present, neither did he consent, but was compelled: there went nothing to his Call but an act of the Bishop (*Deo consecrans [???] qui corpore non aderat*) *Consecrating him who was not present bodily, unto God*. And if this be all that is essentiall to a Call, a company of Ministers and Elders may perform it, as well as one Bishop alone. The same *Gregory* (as you may read elsewhere) being called to *Cumas* to Ordain a Pastor for that Church, the People being divided in their Election, he alone chose *Alexander Carbonarius, & dedit civitati Sacerdotem, nihil [???] atus consensum aut electionem Populi*.⁸³

The seventh Argument:

7. *“The invonveniences will be very great which follow upon this, That Ordination is essentiall to the calling of a Minister: For of necessity, for the maintenance of it, it must be asserted that the Romish Priests, by whom Ordination comes to us, (And therefore to Beza it was all one to be Ordained by the Ordinary, and to be Consecrated in Romana Ecclesia, in*

⁸² * *Johan Darius de Hierarch. Ecclesia [??].p.10.*

⁸³ *Histor. Pontif. Jurisd. Paris 1624. l 2.c.1.*

Ac.14.23.) are the Ministers of Jesus Christ; and the Church of Rome wherein they are, the true Church & Spouse of Christ: yea, that there is a personall succession of Ministers (uninterrupted by Heresie, or whatsoever else may nullifie a Ministers Calling) from the Apostles times to this present and if there be but one, who when he Ordained was no Minister [???] not Ordained, all that were Ordained by him are no Ministers, if Ordination be essentiall. /49/

Ans. Is this the best, or the worst of your Wine, that you have kept it for the last? Whatever you intended, your Arguings (like violent motions) grow weaker and weaker neerer the end. If you think *there's none like this*, as David said of Goliaths sword, I think your cause will utterly perish, as that Giant did by his own weapon. And though you make a flourish with many words, yet this in short is the substance of your argument. [*If Ordination be essentiall to the calling of a Minister, then the Church and Ministry of Rome are true, and Personall succession uninterrupted is necessary.*] 1. I deny the consequence, and shall expect your proof hereafter, for at present you do not so much as offer any. And why have we nothing of Voetius here? do you not know that he maintains the lawfulness of that Call which Luther and other of the first Reformers had in the Church of Rome (for the substance of the thing) and yet denies that it follows thence that the Church of Rome is a true Church*.⁸⁴ To cleare the ground of this denyall, I distinguish between the Church and her *externall Politie*: That which is essentiall to the Churches *Being* neer ceases, but that which is essentiall to her *outward Politie* may, because Politie it self is not essentiall. The Church, for *Being*, like Christ as God, never dies; but in her *externall Order*, like Christ as man, *she dies and rises again*. If this be no good argument: [*Election* is essential, therefore it hath been from the beginning of the world, and shall continue to the end, as the Church and Calling have done and shall do]—as you know it is not; then must you needs acknowledge your own inconsequence in the former. For every one of your aggravated inconveniences will fall as heavy on the head of Election, as you think they do on Ordination, and besides them many more. As 1. That there must be a true Church before there can be a true Ministry. *i.e.* the effect before the cause, and the end attained before the means of attaining are provided. 2. That the government of the Church is purely and strictly Democraticall or popular; for if the People without Ministers and Elders are sole Judges of their own Saintship, and of fitnessse for the Ministry, and consequently of soundnesse of Doctrine and /50/ the right way of Worship, what can be denied them? 3. That a Ministers calling, as a Minister, extends not beyond the bounds of a single Congregation; or that one Congregation may make a Minister to serve themselves or any other. 4. That the providence of God hath failed concerning the essentials of Ministers calling, for many generations every where, because the right of electing Ministers hath been denied to Christian people.

As to the Inconveniences themselves, let them be considered distinctly, and have the patience to heare what the Reformed Churches and Protestant Divines do think of them. The first inconvenience is:

“1. *That the Romish Priests by whom Ordination comes to us are the Ministers of Jesus Christ.* To make this the more od[??] us; you swell it out with a windy parenthesis, *That to Beza it was all [???] be Ordained by the Ordinary, and to be Consecrated in Roman Ecclesia. in Ac.14.23.*] Herein you wrong him, and abuse the Reader; for he speaks not of Ordination in your sense, as distinguished from Imposition of hands, neither doth he account it all one to be Ordained by the Ordinary, and to be Consecrated in the Roman Church; as if every one that is Ordained by a Bishop in any of the Reformed Churches, were in that respect to be looked upon as Consecrated in the Romaine Church: (To say nothing of those who are Ordained by

⁸⁴ * Lib. 2. sec. 1. cap.6. pag.97.

Ordinaries in the Greek Church) And this is plain by his own words, speaking of the word [GREEK]. *Quidam* (saith he) *hoc referre m[??]unt ad ma[??] impositionem, qua & ipsa sit prorsus necessaria, ut hoc prætexim accepto vocationem nostram irritam esse dicans, quoni[??] Ordinarii quos vocans nob[??] manus non impos[??]runt, sive quòd non sumus in Romana ecclesia constituti.* And though after he shew the invalidity of their Call, *ex ipsis Canonibus quos ja[??]*, out of those Canons which they boast of; yet he brings not one reason to prove that *Imposition of hands* is not to be included in the Originall word so much insisted on. And if the word [*Elders*] used in that Text, [??] be taken synecdochically for Pastors, Deacons, and Ruling Elders, as he there expounds it; why may it not as well be said that /51/ [GREEK] though it signifie choosing, does also include Ordaining? because it appears by Act.6. that with *choosing*, Ordination by Imposition of hands was also used.] This by the way to your Parenthesis. To the Inconvenience it self I answer:

1. The Ordination of Romish Priests as Priests is a meer nullity, because the Priesthood itself is so: but their Ordination *adonum Presbyterii, to Preach and administer the Sacraments*, is of another nature, and therefore these must not be confounded together; the rather, because in their manner of Ordaining they are real[??] distinguished*. ⁸⁵

2. Though some of our Divines deny a lawfull Ministry, and Calling thereunto, to be in the Roman Hierarchy, as *⁸⁶ *Beza* and *S[??]*; (not as making of it to be simply invalid and null, but extreme sinfull) yet they must not be interpreted too rigorously, unlesse we mean to set *Protestants* at variance among themselves to our own prejudice. And that 1. Because the *Lutherans* do maintain the ordinary Call which *Luther* had in the Church of *Rome*, as sufficient. And, 2. not they only, but divers also of the *Calvinists*, as *Voetius*, *Forbes*, *Festus*, *Homius*, &c. 3. They who say there ws something extraordinary in *Luthers* Calling, do place that extraordinarinesse rather in his spirit, gifts, successe, and manner of ministry, than in the Call it self, and therefore make his Calling mixt.

3. The most judicious and best approved amongst us do hold, That as *Baptisme*, so *Ordination* even in *Rome* is so far forth valid, that upon separation from them, and joyning with us, there needs neither new *Baptisme* nor a new *Ordination*.

4. We all agree that a Call from *Rome* is not necessary at all, against the *Papists*, who make the Pope to be the fountain of *Order* and *Jurisdiction*.

5. This inconvenience follows not at all upon the opinion that Ordination is essttiall; but upon that mistake only that the lawfull way of Calling is *one onely in all cases and conditions of the Church*: wherein whosoever engages either for Election or Ordination, apart, and much more for /52/ both together, will be sure to plunge himself into inextricable labyrinths. *I approve our men* (saith Reverend *Forbes*) *who sustain our ordinary Vocation in common, but who plead so for it as a point absolutely requisite for approving our cause, and in such a case of the Church do place all defence therein: in my judgement they do wrongly limit the Holy One of Israel, against both the priviledge of his power and his usuall manner of dealing in such cases.* Forbes Defence of the lawfull Calling, sec.28.pag.60.

To your second inconvenience:

“*That (then) the Church of Rome is a true Church and Spouse of Christ.*”

I answer, 1. It followes not; because in a false Church there my be something true. 2. Many *Protestant Divines* are not afraid to grant that in some sense it is a true Church, [*So as the whole Church was not extinct in Rome, neither did the Ministry altogether perish there.*]

⁸⁵ * *Vide Pontificale Reminum.*

⁸⁶ [there is no marginal note for this asterisk]

3. This objection is so fully answered by all *our Writers* of this subject against the *Papists*, that it is not worth the while to transcribe them. *Vide Voetium quo supra.*⁸⁷

4. Those who are commonly called *Brownists* are sufficiently zealous against *Rome*; and yet even among them the more moderate part, as *Johnson* and his followers, do not only grant that the Society commonly called the *Church of Rome* is a true Church, without all fear of inconvenience, but labour at large to prove it*.⁸⁸ The more rigid of them, who deny that which he grants, as *Robinson* and *Ainsworth*, yet acknowledge that in *Rome* there are some true Ordinances, as Baptisme with those of *Rome* to be valid, and yet denying the Church to be true, they must needs reject your consequence.

“As the Lord hath his people in *Babylon* (saith *Robinson*) his I mean both in respect of Election and of personall Sanctification: so hath he for their sakes there preserved (not withstanding all the apostasie and confusion which is found in it) sundry his holy Truths and Ordinances, amongst which Baptisme is one. *Robins. justificat. of Separas.* [???] ult. p.232. /53/

If the question be whether Ordination or *Imposition of hands* be not another Ordinance retained in *Rome* from the beginning; the Reader shall do well to weigh what follows here out of *Mr. Johnson*, one of no mean account among the Brethren of the Separation.

Whereas one that was Minister in the Church of England, was after chose Teacher to a Separate Congregation without any new Imposition of hands, he labours for to justify it after this manner, (in his *Ans. to the Letter of H.A. touching the division among themselves*, p.50.&seq.)

“The Anabaptists holding (saith he) that Antichrist hath utterly destroyed all Gods ordinances, so as thee was not so much as true Baptisme retained and had among them (h.e. in *Rome* or *England*) thereupon they began to baptize themselves again. Whose errors while we confuted, and while some of them objected that We should no more retain the Baptisme then the Ministry there received: we had just occasion thereupon to consider thereof; and so weighing with our selves that one main and speciall reason against Rebaptization is, because Baptisme is an ordinance of God which was had in the Church of *Rome* before she fell into apostasie, and hath been there continued ever since the Apostles times (however it be comingled among them with many corruptions and inventions of their own) we began to consider Whether the like might not be observed and said concerning Imposition of hands; that it was had from the Apostles in the Church of *Rome* before her apostasie, and is there continue to this day, though mixed with many pollutions and devises of their own.

And entring into a consideration thereof, we observed—1. That Imposition of hands is of God, and not an invention of man; not a post or threshold first brought by Antichrist into the temple of God, but had therein afore Antichrist sate there. 2. That Baptisme and Imposition of hands are joyned together among the principles of the foundation spoken of *Heb.6.2*. Which we thought therefore should in this behalf be well regarded. 3. That Imposition of hands is in the Church of *Rome* still given to the Office of Ministry, and in the name of the Lord; as they do also still administer Baptisme. 4. That we found /54/ not either precept, example, or ground in the Scripture binding us to the repetition thereof. 5. That the Priests and Levites in *Israel* becomming unclean, when afterward they were cleansed retained still their places of being Priests and Levites: And that the children of the Priests and Levites succeeding after them, did minister without a new Anointing, or new Imposition of hands: yea that in the case of Idolatry,

⁸⁷ *--Ita ut sicut non penitus ex[??] ibi suit Ecclesia, sic neque penitus interi[??] Mi[??] Zanch. [??] 4 [??].

⁸⁸ * *Christian Plea* by *Fran. Johnson*. Printed Anno 1617 [??] pag. 119. [??] 215.

the Levites repenting kept their first function, and the Priests also, being only debarred from the Altar, but still remaining Priests, both doing such duties, and enjoying such benefits thereof as the other Israelites might not, no nor the Levites but in cases of necessity. Lev. 22.1,9. and Ezech. 44. 10,14. 2 King.23.9. with Lev.21. and 24,9. Mat. 12.4, &c.

Other reasons we considered also on the other hand, which I need not here mention. But seeing we found that it was even from the Apostles times in the Church of Rome long before she became apostate, as Baptisme was; and that the repeating of it among us, and not regarding the having of it there, is a means to strengthen the Anabaptists in their errors,--We stayed our selves, and rested in this that the Church did chuse.

5. Let it be supposed that some others are of the same opinion, as you know there are, whose testimonies are elsewhere produced by *Dr. Hall*: What is the inconvenience which you so much feare by this concession? That then Separation from the Church of *Rome* is unlawfull? So *Robinson* and *John Can* imagine. But (if I mistake you not)*⁸⁹ you your self and many others in these times can tell how to avoyd that, who pretend to acknowledge the Church of *England* and her Assemblies to be true Churches, and yet separate your selves from them: and *Johnson* in his *Plea*, p.118. will help you out, so as the inconvenience is not so great as you would have us to conceit it.

But you tell us of a third—

That there is a personall succession of Ministers (uninterrupted by Heresie, or whatsoever else may nullifie a Ministers Calling) from the Apostles time to this present. For if there /55/ be but One who when he was Ordained was no Minister, or not Ordained, all that are Ordained by him are no Ministers, if Ordination be essentiall.

To this I answer, 1. It cannot be inferred upon the supposition, unlesse Ordination were the only essentiall way of calling Ministers at all times, and in all cases, which needs not be much insisted on. 2. Though *in fact* a personall succession could not be proved, yet *of right* and according to precept it might be necessary; as in the case of Circumcision among the Jews from *Abraham* downward among his posterity, during the force of that Law. 3. That which you suppose, that *heresie and something else* (you say not what) *may nullifie a Ministers calling*; as you do not prove it, so it is not grnted neither by all the Papists*⁹⁰ nor by our Protestant Writers. Suppose the people who choose a Minister be indeed Hereticall, if you say their Calling of him by Election alone is a nullity, as therein you shall gratifie the Papists who in this respect especially except against our Calling in *England*, because our fist Reformers, though Ordained persons, were (as they reproach them) Hereticks: so also will you wound your best friends in the point in hand, the *Socinians*, 4. More may be said for personall succession in way of Ordination, to prove it hath been, then you take notice of. See *Voetius* to that purpose*. ⁹¹ And as it was of some use to the *Fathers* in the primitive times, so it is no small comfort to the Churches now. We are sorry for the death of Christian friends, though we believe their resurrection; and should count it no small part of our misery, that Succession though now revived in Reformed Churches, yet was sometime at that passe as to need a raising up again. 5. Succession of Ministers is the more to be enquired into, because of that promise *Mat.28.20. I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world.* As also because either *Apostles, Prophets, and Evangelists, or Pastors and Teachers* are alwayes necessary *for the perfecting of the Saints, for the work of the Ministry, for*

⁸⁹ [no note corresponds with the asterisk]

⁹⁰ * *Nulla l[??]portio a[??] [??] qui [??] heretick jam damnatis orainatur. Decret. par. 1. d[??]. 20 cap. 8.*

⁹¹ * *Desp. Cansa Pap. l. 2. sect. 1. cap. 2 pag. 65.*

the edifying of the Body of Christ. Eph. 4.11,22. 6. This also is worth observing, that the chief Instruments of Reformation have been rai ed out of the number of Ordained persons /56/ in all places. yet, 7. there is not a like necessity of the way of Calling, as of the Calling it self; because the Scripture examples afford, and the state of the Church requires a greater liberty for the manner of Calling, then for the want of Ministers. And God *in thrusting fort labourers into his harvest* by ways of providence, with a blessing, shews plainly that he is free to give as he please*.⁹²

8. For matter of succession in the way of Ordination, I see no need of contending for more then is granted by some of *the Separation*.

“[I deny not but confesse (saith Robinson*⁹³) that the Church of God, and more particularly the Churches of the New Testament continuing and abiding in that State, saith, and order, wherein they were set, and established by the Lord in the hands of his Se vants the Apostles and Evangelists, were to receive their Ministers constantly by succession after a sort, namely so farre as that all succeeding Ministers were to be Ordained by Ministers, and not otherwise]

Provided that this be added, when *Faith* and *Order* are revived, the same way of succession ought also to be revived: because *this Order* is necessary to preserve *that faith which was once delivered to the Saints*.

To conclude.

Whatsoever may be said of the calling of our first Reformers, in the case of immediate separation from *Rome*, or of others in times of tyranny and persecution, when there is no place either for an orderly Election, or Ordination, yet you have not brought so much as one shadow of reason, why Ordination should not be necessary with us in *England*, in the way now appointed by Ordinance of Parliament, should all be granted whereby you pretend to prove, *That Ordination* (as commonly taken) *is not essentiall to the calling of a Minister*.

But as to the regular and ordinary lawfull Calling of a /57/ Minister: if precept and examples out of *Scripture*; the generall practise of the Church in all ages from the Primitive downward, with that of the Reformed Churches, ever since the foundations of the *Second-Temple-mysticall* have been laid among them; or arguments drawn out of *Scripture* and from the judgement of Protestant Divines conforme thereunto, will determine any Question: I shall presume (notwithstanding all you have insisted on unto the contrary) That

Ordination, h.c. an act of Ministers and Elders as such, whereby they IN THE NAME OF CHRIST separate and set apart a meet person to the Work and office of a Minister, is necessary, and more or lesse essentiall to his Calling.

For *Imposition of hands*, though many things unavoydably, as either *You*, those *authors* which you have cited, or the *nature of the thing* gave occasion, have been touched upon about it; yet it followes now *more particularly* to be considered.

Yet stay a while.

Upon perusall of the papers, after the Presse had made some progresse, I take notice of a double over sight, one in *my self*, another in *you*, besides some *errata* 's of the *Printer*. In the transcribing of *your part*, a few things are unwittingly omitted, which should be in the margin: yet for the things themselves you shall find an answer. Only one passage which is with you, *pag.*

⁹² * C[??] dei judicis ita lab[??]a [???} Ecclesia, [???] jamjam ruitura [???], cerruptis jam [??? through the end of the note.]

⁹³ * Justif. of separation pag. 322. [???] page 327.ed.ult.

8. in the body of the Tract, I forgot to set down at length; and therefore (though out of place) supply it here, which should have been inserted *pag.* 29 before the fourth reason.

“*This (meaning the third) is the reason of Crocius in defence of the Protestants against the Socinians.*⁹⁴ *Distingui[??] inter necessitatem Vocationis & Ordinationis, (sayes he) We distinguish between the necessity of having a Call, and of being Ordained*.*⁹⁵ *A Calling is necessary be reason of Gods command; Ordination is necessary in respect of order and Ecclesiasticall constitution. The Calling is the Constitution of one in Office; which (if it be Lawfull) hath two things /50/ in it. 1. That one be chosen of God. 2 That he be chosen by the antecedent consent of the people. One chosen of God when he is adorned with gifts, &c.*

To this, besides what I have already said (*pag.28.lin.22. &seq.*) I shall now adde further.

1. That the Socinians insisting only upon this question, [*Whether a Constitution by way of Ordination be altogether necessary to the making of a Minister?*] are not (as you think) to be opposed; neither are the Reformed Churches nor Protestant Divines of any other judgement then *they*: and therefore what needs Crocius to defend the Protestants against them in this point, or professe himself *Anti-Socinian*? unlesse he will say more for Ordination then they have done; which cannot well be, but by holding it to be essentiall.

2. It's granted, that there is lesse necessity of *Ordination* then of *Calling*; yea, that Ordination is not alwayes alike necessary, but according to the state of the Church. And it might be proved, that there is a case wherein it is so far from being necessary, that is is not lawfull: But it will not thence follow, that in no case it is essentiall.

3. Those Scriptures which prove the lawfulness of it, wil prove more: For we cannot argue from the bare example of the Apostles—*Thus they did; therefore we may do the same.* Because it follows not in al things. Therefore Crocius (in a later Work) flies to 1 Tim.5.22. for his ground and proof: and there we have a *precept*.

4. That *Order* and *Ecclesiasticall constitution* which he speaks of, can be understood of one other then *Apostolicall*; and those things which the Apostles wrote about *Order*, were *commandments*, 1 Cor.14.37.

5. Whereas he sayes, *A Calling is necessary by Gods command*; and after seems to shew what he means by *Calling*; namely, that the person constituted *be chosen by the antecedent consent of the People*. You know full well, no command of God can be found for this way of Calling, but as it is gathered out of examples by consequence from Act. 1. /51/ and the 6 chap. And if *those examples* imply a command for the Peoples *Election* one way, I would hear some solid reasons why *the like command* is not to be concluded out of examples for *Ordination*.

6. Whether *the antecedent consent of the People* be alwayes necessary, is not the pont at present under debate. But this is his sense: That the power of choosing is the right of the *whole Church*, and belongeth not to the *People* alone, as we commonly understand the word: And the antecedent consent of Ministers and Elders, is (I'le be bold to say it) necessary unto a Call. And that granted, sutfices to the matter of Ordination, as it is here considered.

7. To that *That one is chosen of God, when he is adorned with gifts*. I think you yourself make some scruple of it. When the Ministers of *England* have pleaded (among other things) to prove their *Calling*, *the gifts which God had given them*: Those of the *Separati[??]*, in their

⁹⁴ * Anti Soc.disp. 24. sec 2.

⁹⁵ *Illa est necesseria ratione mandati, hac ratione ordinis & constitutionis Ecclesiasticæ. Illa ext constitutio in officio, que s[??] leguima est duo babes.[??] Vt à Deo quis eligatur. 2. Vt per an[??]atem po[??] consensum eligatu[??]. A Deo [??]gitur cum ipse donis ex[??], &c.*

Writings, are wont to tell them, *Qualification is no Calling*. Neither dare I say, Every one that is fit to be a Minister, is called to be one. And in a mediate Calling, the testimony of competent Judges concerning *Abilities*, and the *right* to exercise them, is most necessary; and that useth to be, in the orderly way of Gods prescribing in the Word, *by Ordination*.

Now (Sir) give me leave to minde you of an oversight in your self. You told us in your Title-page, of the *Judgement of the Reformed Churches*, as a distinct part from that of *Protestant Divines*. Why are none of their *Confessions* cited, or *Books of Discipline*? Make they for you, or against you? If they be on your side, would you spare to tell us? Suppose they were against you, yet you might not conceale it, while you pretend to hold it our. As for particular men, their Judgement is not *tanti*, if it agree not with the Church in generall. He that made the *Observations on the Harmony of Confessions in English*, will help you out a little: but the *Confessions* themselves are not (as it seems) for your turn. As for the *Divines* which you have cited; of the *Lutherans* there are but two, *Hunnius* and *Tarnovius*; and of the /60/ *Calvinists* but three, *Ames*, *Voetius*, and *Crotius*. Though each of them be Reverend, yet they are but of *yesterday*, either living, or lately dead; too few to make up a *full verdict* touching the Historicall part of the point in question. Indeed you have not so much as *one* witnesse to your *Thesis of Ordination* as it was stated in the beginning. As for the *English Popish Ceremonies*, whether *one alone* composed that *Tract*, or many concurred together by their joint endeavours, I know not? I take it for no more then a *single*, and in many things for a *singular* and *solitary* Testimony.

What think you of *Protestant Estates*? Is not their Judgement considerable? If they do not hold Ordination to be essentiall, why have they ever been so strict in urging it? You know our Worthies assembled in *Parliament* are under a *Solemn Vow and Covenant* to reform *according to the Word of God*, and the *Example of the best Reformed Churches*; and in pursuance thereof they have declared it, as a thing *manifest by the Word of GOD*, *⁹⁶

“*That no man ought to take upon him the office of a Minister, untill he be lawfully Called, and Ordained thereunto. And that the work of Ordination, that is to say, An outward solemnsetting apart of persons for the Office of the Ministry in the Church by Preaching Presbyters, is an Ordinance of Christ.*”

This they have since attested unto in the same words in other *Ordinances* of Theirs, giving power to Ordain unto *Classicall Presbyteries*. And that this sense of Theirs might be better taken notice of, they have further *Ordered* as here followeth.

Die

⁹⁶ Ordinance of Parliament for Ordination p[??].

[woodcut]

Die Sabbathi, 26 April. 1645.

It is this day Ordered and Declared by the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, that no [??] be permitted to Preach, who is not Ordained [??] either in this, or some other Reformed Church; except such as ([??] the Ministry) shall be allowed for the tryall of their Gift, by those who shall be appointed thereunto by both housed of Parliament.

It is this day Ordered by the Lords and Commons in Parliament assembled, that this Ordinance be forthwith printed and published; And that it be forthwith sent to Sir THOMAS FAIRFAX, with an earnest desire and recommendation from both Houses, That he take care that this Ordinance may be duly observed in the Army; and that if any shall transgresse this Ordinance, that he make speedy representation thereof to both Houses, that the Offenders may receive condigne punishment for their contempts. It is further Ordered by the Lords and Commons, That this Ordinance be forthwith sent to the Lord Mayor and Committee of the Militia in London; to the Governours, Commanders, and Magistrates of all Garrisons, Forces, Places of strength, Cities, Towns, Forts and Ports: And to the severall and respective Committees of the severall and respective Counties, with the like injunction unto them respectively; and that they take care that this Ordinance be duly observed in the places aforesaid respectively, and that they make speedy representation to both Houses of such as shall offend herein, that they may receive condigne punishment.

Die

Die Jovis, 31. Decemb. 1646.

A Declaration of the Commons assembled
in Parliament, Against all such Persons
as shall take upon them to Preach
or Expound the Scriptures in any Church
or Chappel, or any other publique
place, except they be Ordained either
here or in some other
Reformed Church.

THE Commons assembled in Parliament do Declare, That they do dislike, and will proceed against all such persons as shall take upon them to Preach, or Expound the Scriptures in any Church or Chappel, or any other publique place (except they be Ordained either here or in some other Reformed Church, as it is already prohibited in an Order of both Houses of 26. *April*, 1645.) And likewise against all such Ministers or others, as shall publish or maintain by Preaching, Writing, Printing, or any other way, any thing against or in derogation of the Church-government which is now estblished by the authority of both Houses of /55/ Parliament. And also against all and every person or persons, who shall willingly and purposely interrupt or disturb a Preacher who is in the publique Exercise of his Function: And all Justices of Peace, Sheriffs, Mayors, Bailiffs, and other Head-Officers of Corporations; And all Officers of the Army are to take notice of this Declaration, and by all lawfull wayes and means to prevent offences of this kind, and to apprehend the offenders, and give notice hereof unto this House, that thereupon course may bee speedily taken for a due punishment to be inflicted on them.

For the Example of the *best Reformed Churches*, if thereby you understand (as some do) those of *New-England*, how ever their *Elders* speak in part as you have done, yet by their *Practise* they make it essentiall (for why else is it that they put the power and all of *Ordaining* into the peoples hand, or some of their dep[??]ing when they have no *Officers*?) and in their *Doctrine* they hold it *Necessary by Divine Institution**.⁹⁷

For those of the *separation*, these are the words of *their Confession*, Art. 23. *that every Christian Congregation hath power and Commandment to elect and ordaine their own Ministerie according to the rules in Gods word prescribed.*—And if there be a commandment for *Ordination*, as well as /64/ for *election*, why should not the former be essential, as well as (in their account) the latter is. Whether every congregation have the power is not part of the present question and therefor as they affirme it. I deny it and passe it by.

Those who are wont to be called *Non-conformists*, in that book of *Common prayer* which they advised*⁹⁸ they speak of the *Election* and *Ordination* of Ministers to the Election they call in neighbour-Ministers. *After that* (say they) *he is to be ordained by the laying on of the hands of the Eldership, with these Words pronounced by the Minister thereunto appointed* [According to this lawfull calling, agreeable to the word of God, whereby thou are chosen pastor *IN THE NAME OF GOD*, stand thou charged with the pastorall charge of this people over which the *Holy*

⁹⁷ * Church Government and Church Covenant discusses. pag. 67.

⁹⁸ * Printed at [???, etc.]

Ghost hath made thee *Overseer*, to governe this flock of God which he hath purchased with his bloud.] Among *them* there are two of great eminency, whose expressions I shall here adde. One, the Reverend Mr. *Arthur Hildersam*, who (in that letter which *Johnson* in his *Treatise of the Ministry**⁹⁹ pretends to answer) makes *a right Ordination into the office a substantiall part of a true Caling to the Ministerie*. The other Mr. *H. Jacob* (whose *old books* have furnished those who are known among us by the name of *Independents*, with their *new light* and all subtilties whereby they would be thought to distinguish themselves from *Brownists*) *There are two essentiall parts of Calling to the Ministry* (these are his words*)¹⁰⁰ *Election and Ordination*. And though he make *Imposition of hands* but a ceremony, yet he adds *Howbeit I suppose Christs Church offendeth in omitting of it, for though it be but a ceremony, yet it is Apostolick*. And howsoever in this place he reputes it but a Ceremony, yet elsewhere*¹⁰¹ he makes it to be *of the foundation necessary to salvation ordinarily, and unchangeable by men*.

Whether these latter witnesses be to be reckoned among *Protestant Divines*, especially in your account, I shall leave it to you to judge.

But let this suffice at present to the question of Ordination.

/65/

⁹⁹ * Page 117.

¹⁰⁰ * Attestation ch 8.pag. 299.

¹⁰¹ * Declaration pag. 39. The Divin beginning and institution of Christs true visible or Mnisteriall Church. *Argum.* 7.

[woodcut]

Concerning
IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

This is your Position—pag.13.

“Imposition or laying on of Hands is neither essentiall to a Ministers Call, nor to his Ordination.”

Ans. Before I speak to the particulars wherein you *pretend* to the proof of this, it seems necessary to preface a little concerning the Subject in generall, that the Terms belonging to the Question may be the better understood.

When shall we know what you mean by a Call? and how it shall be discerned what is essentiall to it? Or to whom the power of Calling does belong? Whether *one* way of Calling be precisely determined? Or what manner of Ordaining is to be found in Scripture, besides that of Laying on of hands? At your leisure resolve these Enquiries distinctly, that the Reader may be fully informed.

Till I am convinced of the contrary by your self or some other, I shall presume that a Call is alwayes necessary, yea a Call from God, *mediate* or *immediate*. That way of Calling *mediately* is to be followed in succeeding times, which is warranted by precepts or example; in the *New Testament*. In the nature of the thing it self, *Calling* for the substance of the act is more necessary, than this or that manner, or rite of Calling. *Elecion* may possibly be either *by silence*, as in the discipline of the French Churches it is prescribed, of *by lively* /66/ *voyce*, or *by holding up the hand* or *by writing*. The Church at *Frankford* in *Queen Marjes* dayes had a peculiar way of choosing Ministers, in part blindfold, *by a kind of Ballattingbox**.¹⁰² For *Ordination*, the Papists have devised many Rites, not only be perverse applying of the examples of *Christ* and his *Apostles*, but also by their own *presumptuous inventions*. The *Reformed Churches* suffice themselves with Prayer, Fasting, and Laying on of hands. Some few have used *manus porrectione*, the *giving of the right hand of fellowship* in stead of Laying on of hands: but though there be an instance of the use of that Ceremony in token there be an instance of the use of that Ceremony in token of approbation between *Paul* and *Barnabas* on the one side, and some of the *Apostles* at *Jerusalem* on the other part, (*Gal.2.9*) yet that will conclude nothing to the question of Ordination.

In such things as are *indeed* (not pretendedly) left unto the Churches liberty, she may use it as makes most for edifying; and about many *Circumstances* belonging to a Ministers Call, there is a liberty supposed, granted, and taken; and in some things necessary to be determined, no so much *by rule or Canon*, as (*per prudentiam practice practicam*) *by the discretion* of those who are (*pro hi*[??] & *nunc*) imployed in Calling. To this purpose some speak largely enough*,¹⁰³ and more then I dare assent unto without due caution.

¹⁰² * *L*[??]*ia in Ecclesia Peregri*[??] *F*[??] [??]. p.51.

¹⁰³ * *Quibus vitibus Doctores ecclesiae fent vocarai, quâ ratione publicum hoc docendi* [??] [??] *s*[??]*t delegrandum ac imporendum, non est e*[??]*presse traditum, sed liberrari Ecclesia relictum.* Magdeburgenses, cent. 1. cap.4 pag.118.lin.33. *Modus electi nic* [??] *certus ext prascriptus in sacris literis.* Aretius, probl. parte 3. d[??] *Min*[??]*t. Voca*[??]*tahabenda, dum vocatio Dei manet conjuncta foris a*[??]*d restifica*[??] *ipstus, quæ qui*[??]*aria ext, desinire non possum es.* Armin.

Yet this must be remembred, *that God is not sought after the due Order*, (1 Chron, 15.13.) when any rite or manner of doing is omitted which is of his appointing: And it's safer to cleave unto warrantable examples even about circumstances, then to presume too much of our freedom in devising any thing which may be called *new*, or transferring the rite of one thing to another. And many things which were *in themselves*, and *to the Apostles*, *free and indifferent*, become by their example more or lesse *necessary to us*, especially when /67/ their example is backed by the aptnesse or equity of the thing it self, and either directly commended to us, or enlivened with some insinuation, that in doing as they did we shall do well. The certainty of *lawfulnesse* is alwayes a sure point for us to enter in.

As to the use of *Laying on of hands* (to say nothing of that which was common to all Christians to be applied unto them upon severall occasions, but of that which was used by those who were already in office, in puttin gothers into office also) The *Papists* urging of it *as a Sacrament, as a meanes of conveyeing the Holy Ghost, as alwayes absolutely necessary and essentiall*: And those hands to be *a Bishops*, as an *Order or Degree* superior to *a Presbyter*, gave occasion to *some* of the *first Reformers* in some parts to suspect it, to judge it indifferent; and to argue from the Apostles liberty in taking of it up, and translating of it from a Jewish use unto a Christian, to their liberty of using or disusing it as they found expedient, and the state of the Church in their times and those places where their lot fell, made way.

For my part, when I consider how uniform and accurate the Apostles were in obseving it, and of this rite alone in the matter of Ordination, and that we have no instance or example of their Ordaining otherwise; How unsafe it is to vary from their lawfull and imitable practise; What advantage the *Papists* have to bring in other rites upon pretence of liberty, and what danger might be by substituting another way of Ordaining then we have sure warrant for; Of what consequence it is that Ministers should keep up a peculiar interest of acting *in the name and stead of Christ*, by something peculiar to themselves; and that *this alone* doth most cleerly hold it out, beside the manifold uses of it which are expressed by *Protestant Divines*: Though it be commonly called *a rite*, and in that respect is but *an adjunct*, so as it must needs seem harsh to call it *essentiall*; yet I judge it sinfull for any who desire the office of a Minister to refuse it, and scandalous in any Church wilfully to throw it aside. That its more or lesse necessary in the judgement of *Reformed Churches* and *their Divines*, cannot but be known to those who are acquainted /68/ with their writings. The peace of the Church may be preserved among those who hold it *lawfull*; and the dispute *whether it be Essentiall*, might be spared.

Yet because though it were not essentiall, your Proofs may fall short of tht Conclusion, I shall consider of them.

Your first Reason is:

"Some have been made Ministers without it, as the Apostles and Matthias, Act. 1.

To which I answer. 1. If your Argument had truth and weight in it, it would prove, That nothing is essentiall which is to be performed either by the Church or her Officers, because the *Apostles* were made Ministers by the *Head* alone without the *Body*. *Paul* calls himself *an Apostle neither of man nor by man*, Gal. 1.1. and yet he was *a Minister*, 1 Cor.4.1. The like may be said of the *Twelve*. And whereas you distinguish between the *Apostles* and *Matthias*, as if he were none; *Acts 1*. the Text here cited proves the contrary.

2. Its not enough to say, *That some were made Ministers without it*; unlesse you shew further, that in being made Ministers they were Ordained, and that without *Laying on of hands*.

3. How *some have been made Ministers* in particular cases, as *Matthias* alone by lot, is not to be insisted on; but what's the generall rule for all in an ordinary way.

4. Were it proved that the Apostles have been made Ministers, and Ordained without the Rite in question; it would be little to the purpose because there is neither the same rule nor reason for *Them* and *ordinary Officers*.

The second Reason:

"When the Apostle bids Titus to Ordain, Tit. 1.5. he sayes not a word of Imposition of hands.

Ans. You should say, *Not of Election by the People, and therefore Election is not essentiall.* But if *Tit.1.5* be compared with *Act.6.3.5* it will appeare he means *appointing or constituting by Imposition of hands.* There were among the *Cretians many [???] and vain talkers, specially they of the Circumcision /69/ whose mouths (saith Paul) must be stopped, who subvert whole houses, teaching things which they ought not, for filthy lucre's sake.* These might well be the fruits of the liberty of Preaching without a Call, and the Peoples making to themselves Ministers by their own choice without Ordination or Imposition of hands, which you contend for; and *Titus*, it seems, was left at *Crete* to Ordain others in stead of these.

The third:

"When the Apostle used it to Timothy, 1 Tim.1.6. it was so used as it was in giving the Holy Ghost; as appears by comparing that place with Act.19.6. And therefore was no more essentiall to Timothies being a Minister, then it was to their Baptisme, Act.19.6.

And. 1. Suppose the *Holy Ghost* was given by Imposition of hands, both after Baptisme, and in Ordination; as this makes nothing to prove it to be essentiall unto either, so it makes nothing against it: but in that *such a blessing* did then accompany it, we may be assured that the use of it was *of God*, and not *from men*.

2. There's no mention of the *Holy Ghost*, in *2 Tim. 1.6.* but *of the gift of God which was in him* (or which he had) *by the laying on of Pauls hands*, that may be meant of the *power and authority* conferred on him, or of the *Office it self*; for Offices are called [GREEK] *gifts*, *Eph.4.8.* And *Power and Authority* is by many thought to be called [GREEK] *grace*, *Rom.12.3.* If *Laying on of hands* be the instrumentall rite of conveying the *gift* or *grace* in this sense, it is the more necessary.

3. Because the *Holy Ghost* was given by Laying on of hands after Baptisme in Ordination, and upon other occasions also; therefore you will not easily prove that Ordination must needs be understood in that place, as you use to argue.

Neither, 4. doth *Act.19.6.* or any other place speak of Laying on of hands in Baptisme: and in *Heb. 6.2.* *Baptisme* and *Laying on of hands* are distinguished as things of a diverse kind. In all this you seem rather to answer, than to frame /70/ an Argument. To say the *Holy Ghost* was given by Imposition of hands *then*, but not *now*, and therefore it is not essentiall, is no prooffe (as shall further appear hereafter.)

5. Under the *Old Testament* Imposition of hands was used in divers cases. As first in *Blessing*, *Gen.48.14.20.* Secondly, in *Consecrating*, or setting apart of a sacrifice unto God, *Numb.8.12.* Thirdly, in *Ordaining*, or appointing unto an Office; as when *Joshua* was appointed to succeed *Moses*, *Moses laid his hands upon him and gave him a charge Num.27.23.* *Joshua* also is said to be *full of the Spirit of Wisdome, for Moses had laid his hands on him, Deut.34.9.* He was *full of the Spirit of wisdome*, and therefore had hands laid on him, [??] appears

Num.27.18. *Take thee Joshua the son of Nun, a man in whom is the Spirit, and lay thy hands upon him.* As in the New Testament, the Deacons were first *full of the Holy Ghost and wisdom*, Act.6.3. and therefore they had hands laid on them, v.6.¹⁰⁴ This *laying on of hands* was (as Ainsworth calls it) *a signe of his Calling and Ordination*. And though a greater measure of the Spirit might be given with the signe, yet that was not the only ground of using it. We read not of any Law requiring the use of it constantly, save in the case of *consecrating*: and yet you shew no reason to the contrary, why it may not be necessary *under the Gospel* in the *setting apart* of a meet person *to an holy function*, though every other kind of using it be not necessary, whereof we have example in the New Testament. All Ends of using it do meet together in *Ordination*; as *Blessing, Consecrating, and Setting apart unto an Office*. And therefore we have the greater reason to continue it still.

To that of the Divines of Scotland:

*“The Apostles indeed by the Laying on of hands did signifie their giving of the Holy Ghost: but now as the miracle, so the mysterie hath ceased.”*¹⁰⁵

Ans. 1. It no where appeares by any expresse Scripture, that Laying on of hands in Ordination was used by the Apostles as *a signe*, with relation to the *Holy Ghost as the thing signified and given thereby*: It’s too much advantage to the /71/ Papists, in making [ink splotch obliterates some text] Sacrament, to grant so much. 2. Suppose that the [ink splotch obliterates some text] Ghost was given *by, with, or after* Imposition of hands in Ordination, and that such miraculous giving do now cease yet as *Baptisme of Water* continues, though there be no *miraculous Baptisme of the Holy Ghost*, and is not in that respect to crase, as the Socinians pretend; so may *Imposition of hands* continue still in Ordination as *a rite of designing a fit person to an office in the Church*, because no reason can be supposed for he use of it in that kinde *then*, which holds not *in other ages* of the Church, in the regular and ordinary state thereof.

“[Solemnly to designe and point out the person Ordained as a morall signe, was one of the ends and uses whereunto this rite of Laying on of hands was appointed by themselves, as Chemnitius sheweth.]

These last are the words of your own Testimony in the same page.

That which follows of your own, is—

“Something extraordinary its likely was in the Apostles Laying on of hands. For he says the gift was given [GREEK], by the laying on of my hands, as it was [GREEK] by prophecie, which was peculiar to extraordinary Officers; but it was but [with] [GREEK], 1 Tim.4.14. They (it seems) had but a bare concurrence, but the efficiencie was in Paul, as our Brethren of Scotland expresse it.

To which I answer, 1. All this is but, *its likely*, and *it seems*, by which its likely to prove nothing, and it seems you your self saw as much aforehand.

2. To say there was *something extraordinary* in the Apostles laying on of hands, is ambiguous, because it may relate either to the ground, or manner of doing, or to the effect or accidentall consequent thereof. There might be something extraordinary, but that can be no

¹⁰⁴ Ainsworth on Numb.18. 18.

¹⁰⁵ Engl.pop.cer. p.169. [The highlighted section of text was filled in from the second set of pages 70 & 71, which follows the first set that contains the note regarding the irregular pagination.]

prejudice to the ordinary use of this rite, unlesse they had only some *extraordinary gound* for thier using of it. /72/

3. In comparing 2 *Tim.* 1.6. [ink blot obscures some text] 4.14. there is indeed a difference between ([GREEK][???) *with*; and from thence the *Papists* and *Prelates* [ink blot obscures some text], That the *efficiency* of Timothy's *Presbyteratus* was in *Paul* as in a *Bishop*, and in the *Presbyterie* by a *bare concurrence*, and thence infer the necessity of a *Bishop* unto *Ordination*. But this is usually vain, as in *them* to one end, so in *you* to another. For that in 2 *Tim.* 1.6. you may remember what was said in the beginning of this answer to your Third. And as you tell us *pag.* 17. touching laying on of hands in 1 *Tim.* 5.22. that *its not necessary to be understood of Ordination, because it was used in other cases*. So might it be put off here. But be it granted that *Ordination* is intended in 2 *Tim.* 1. yet it will not follow that *Paul* ascribes any thing to himself, as excluding the *Presbyterie*. *Junius* speaking to this Text, sayes: "[In a common thing, the arguing from position of one, to the removing or denying of another, is inconsequent. As after this manner: Paul laid hands on Timothy, therefore the *Presbyterie* did not.]"¹⁰⁶ Those words [GREEK] *by prophecie*, do shew the *moving cause*, and what encouraged *Paul* with the *Presbyterie* to lay hands on him, viz. *It was prophecied that Timothy should be an excellent Minister*, as *Cartwright* (upon the place) interprets it.

That phrase, [GREEK] and the other, [GREEK] do both of them equally imply an *instrumentall efficiencie* in *Paul*, and in the rest of the *Presbyterie*. That the *Preposition* [GREEK] *by*, with a *genitive case*, doth usually signifie an *instrumentall working*, yet not in [GREEK], is amongst *Cartwrights* Annotations. [GREEK] *with*, is sometimes put for {GREEK} *by*. as *Act.* 13. 17. chap. 14. 27. & 15. 4. In the 12. v. of that chap. *Then all the multitude kept silence and gave audience to Barnabas and Paul, declaring what miracles and wonders God had wrought among the Gentiles* by them. In the *Greek*'tis [GREEK], in this latter place; but in all the rest [GREEK], and yet the like thing, viz. what God did by *them* as by instruments, is intended in them all. The reason why the *Apostle* useth [GREEK] and not [Greek] in 1 *Tim.* 4.14 may be because [GREEK] goes immediately before in the /73/ same verse in that phrase, [GREEK], where it hath another sense than the next words will beare, if it had been used there also. How fit it would have been for the words to have run thus: [Greek phrase]&c. *by prophecy, by laying on of hands*, let the learned judge.

5. If the *efficiencie* was in *Paul* singularly, and in the *Presbyterie* by a *bare concurrence*, as you say *it seems*; there using of it *then*, makes nothing at all for our using of it *now*, unlesse we had *such concurrence*: and then Laying on of hands in these times is not only *non-essentiall*, but *unlawfull*. We must wait with the *Seekers* for some *New Apostles* to revive this way of *Ordaining*: and the practice of those, who being themselves *out of Office* are *deputed to lay on hands*, is most presumptuous; because there is no instance so much as of their *concurrence*, and much lesse of their acting *alone* in this kinde.

6. Those words [*as our Brethren of Scotland expresse it*] seem to relate unto the former passages; and then they are injurious, because you go about to put a sense upon them which I think you know they will not owne: That the *Presbyterie* Ordained only by a *bare concurrence*, and not as (*Causa socia*) a *joint cause*, in way of *efficiencie*.

I shall now consider their words as you alledge them. "*Paul's hands were the mean; the laying on of their hands the rite and signe of his Ordination*. And therefore they adde (as you say) *Its not to be used with opinion of necessity; Ordination may be done by word alone, without ceremony*. And again. *If the use of Imposition of hands in Ordination be accounted and used as*

¹⁰⁶ * *Junius in Bel. Cont.* 5. hb. 1. cap 3 ar.5. 1 *Tim.* 1.18. *Ac.* 16.1 [??].

a sacred Rite, and is having a sacred signification, (the use of it not being necessary) it becomes unlawfull by reason of the by gone and present superstitious use of the same in Popery.

Ans 1. All this you heap together by substraction as you please: And though it's true, the last words [*Pauls hands were the means*—] are to be found in the place intended, yet your conscience will tell you that the Author used them *to one end*, and you *unto the contrary*. Take them fully, and let a third be Judge between us. Thus he: /74/

“[*Because Imposition of hands was used in Ordination, not only by the Apostles who had power to give extraordinarily the gifts of the Holy Ghost, but likewise by the Presbyterie or Company of Elders; and Timothy did not only receive that gift which was in him, by the laying on of Pauls hands as the mean, but with the laying on of the hands of the Presbyterie as the rite and signe of his Ordination: therfore the Church in after-ages hath still kept and used the same rite in Ordination; which rite shall without leave be yet retained in the Church.*]¹⁰⁷

2. For my part, I see no ground at all either in the nature of the thing, or in the Texts, for that distinction of *mean* and *signe*. The *Professors of Leyden* are not afraid to call Ordination *a mean*. *Ad legitinsam Pastoram ordinariorum vo[?]onem duo posissim[?] media sunt adhibends; vo[?]dorum Electio, & electorum Ordinatie.*¹⁰⁸ [Two *meanes* are especially to be used for the lawfull Calling of ordinary Pastors: *Election of those who are to be called, and Ordination of those who are elected.*] But this is cleer out of the former Testimony; that notwithstanding the difference of the phrases, *by the laying on of Pauls hands*, and *with the laying on of the hands of the Presbyterie* (in his judgement) *a bare concurrence*, because then it could not be a ground of using the rite either at the Present or in former ages.

3. For those expressions—*Its not to be used with opinion of necessity*, and the rest; they are indeed Proviso's, or rather some *excerpta*, extracts of those things which the *Author* brings by way of *providing*: the summe whereof is—1. Laying on of hands is to continue, if it be not used with opinion of necessity; Nor 2. as a sacred significant Ceremony. But naked testimony avails little, especially when it [??] is *single* or *singular*. Therefore I answer, 1. Necessity must be distinguished. *Simple necessity* with relation to all times and cases, is asserted by none but Papists. *Necessity* (secundum quid) *in some respect*, either for *Orders* [??], or to *avoyd scandall*, is acknowledged by those Protestants who make [??] account of Laying on of hands. As must be granted /75/ that *all examples* either of Christ or his Apostles have not the nature of a Law; so must it also be maintained that *some* have: and I think as much may be said for this in particular, I mean the Apostles practise in Ordination, as for any other; or as much as for the gesture of sitting in receiving the Sacrament. At present here's nothing but bare Assertion, and therefore the lesse need to dwell upon the particular. 2. If Imposition of hands be a *signe*, and (as your Author calls it) a *morall signe*, it must in some sense be sacred, because the subject of it, and manner of using, belong unto the *first Table*; and as a *signe*, it is essentiall to it to be significant. *That grace is given by and with the Ordination of the Ministers, when it is duly given and received, we willingly yield, because the words of the Scripture beare it.* Thus much Cartwright grants unto the *Rhemists*, in the name of *Protestants*.

To your fourth Reason, pag.14.

“*If laying on of hands be essentiall to a Ministers Call, then are the Ministers of the Reformed Churches no Ministers: For though they use Laying on of hands, now, as a thing indifferent; yet they who used it first, had it not themselves.*

¹⁰⁷ 2 Tim. 1.6. 1 Tim 4 14.

¹⁰⁸ Synop.pur.I hed.[?].42.n.31.

I answer. The Consequence is denied. 1. Because *Laying on on hands* (contrary to what you say) hath continued in most of the *Reformed Churches* successively to this day; as in *England, Denmark, and many parts of Germany*. For *England*, in this respect the spight and envy of the Papists hath been especially set against the Ministry of it. And though*¹⁰⁹ *Champney* labours to invalid all which *Masou* alledges, (*de Ministerio Anglicano*) to prove succession; yet in his Epistle to *George Abbot* then Archbishop of *Canterbury*, he confesseth he heard that the said Archbishop caused some *Popish Priests* to be brought before himself and some others in Commission with him, that they might testifie they had seen those *Publike Acts* which *Masou* urged for his proof. For *Denmark*, and als for divers parts of *Germany*, I refer you to *Melchior Adamus* in the life of *Bugenhagius*, p.315.

2. Because there are times wherein neither *Election* nor /76/ *Ordination* [as Church-acts] are esentiall unto a Ministers Calling; as in part hath been cleered already, and will further appear in that which follows.

To your large Quotation out of *Beza* on Act. 14. 23. in these words”

“Some (said he) chuse to refer this to *Laying on of hands*, as if it also were altogether necessary; and under this pretence say Our Calling is null, because the Ordinaries (as they call them) have not laid hands on us, or because we are not Consecrated in the Church of Rome. I answer by those Canons which they boast of, the Consecration is null, where there was not first a lawfull choice, or which was done by one who is excommunicated. Let them shew but one in all their Hierarchy who is lawfully chosen, yea who is not by the very Law a hundred times Excommunicate, if they will stand to their own Synods. Why should we therefore desire hands to be laid on us by them? or by what Law can they do it? But we have by the blessing of God certain marks of our Calling, being (through the grace of God) adorned with the lawfull Testimony of our life and Doctrine, from our Churches; and after that, by calling upon the name of God, confirmed in our Ministry; which God, I hope, will blesse, and cast out both the Theeves and Hirelings.¹¹⁰

Ans. These few and briefe Notes may suffice for answer. 1. *Beza* gives no reason at all to prove why [GREEK] the word here spoken of, should not be referred to *laying on of hands*, or why it should imply some joint act of the Apostles and of the Churches. But of this enough before. 2. The whole passage is rther an apologie for want of Imposition of hands *in some*, than to shew that it is needlesse *in all*. 3. Its granted, that *in such a case* as he speaks of, *the first* /77/ *coming out to Babylon*, it was not necessary to return back again to Popish Bishops for Ordination: and to this his reasons are strong; but what is that to the regular and ordinary way of Calling? 4. It’s worth observing how he begins: [*Some chuse to refer this to Laying on of hands.*] For indeed they were not only Papists, who urged the necessity of having hands laid on, (and it seems from this place) but Protestants also were offended with the *first Reformers in France*, for want of succession in the way of Ordination. Which gave occasion to *Sadeel* to write a speciall Treatise (*De legitima vocatione Pastorum Ecclesia Reformatæ*) against those who professed to differ from the rest (*in hoc tantum capite*) *in this point only*, That Ministers wanted a lawfull Calling, for want of succession from the Apostles to the present times. And therefore you must not wonder if you cannot perswade all men to be of your mind, especially when your reasons are far from cogencie: And *Beza*, from whom you might expect something, and make a shew of much, waves the determining of that on the place, which was most proper to

¹⁰⁹ * *Tractatu de vocati*[??] [??].

¹¹⁰ *Quid in hoc ufere* [?? several words illegible] *accepto vocationem nostra*[?] *irritam esse dicunt: quinians Ord:*[??...??].

it. 5. If it be said, he gives *certain marks* of Calling, and yet reckons not Imposition of hands for one. As 1. the Testimony; 2. the Election of the Church, (for that's in the *Latine*, though you leave it out in the *translation*) and 3. Confirmation by prayer. I answer, these suffice when the condition of the Church will not possibly afford more, yea lesse then these: The edification of the Church is so necessary, that it must be endeavoured as Providence makes way; but when there may be *Order* and *beauty* observed, its sinfull to neglect the rules and means of procuring and upholding it. That which is lawfull by vertue of necessity, is only so far lawfull, as the necessity is reall, and not pretended.

That which followes is in part confused.

“And in the same case are the Lutherans, who hold *Laying on of hands* to be essentiall to their Calling, yea, that it's *Popery* to hold is so. Bellarmine (sayes Tarnovius) would have *laying on of hands* to be absolutely necessary, as the substantiall part of Ordination. /78/

Yet I answer, 1. In the connexion of these words either to those immediately foregoing, or to the beginning of the Paragraph, you make the *Lutherans* Theeves and Hirelings, or exclude them out of the number of the Reformed Churches, which is extreme uncharitable. 2. Though the *Lutherans* do not hold *Laying on of hands* to be essentiall, yet they need not fear a nullity in their Calling, having Imposition by succession, and using it still. The act it self is of force, though they should erre in the grounds of using it. 3. To hold *Laying on of hands* to be *absolutely necessary in all cases*, may well be counted *Popery*; if we think those hands must be a *Bishops*, and that Bishop consecrated by a power derived from the *Sea of Rome*, as Papists do: But to hold *Laying on of hands* such a rite as *ought not to be omitted* by those who have authority from the Word to use it, in designing a meet person to the Ministry, and in the visible declaration of that designation, is no *Popery*. 4. In this passage you deal fraudulently with your credulous Readers, while you pretend to tell them *the Judgement of Protestant Divines*, and do purposely conceale it. *Tarnovius* in that very place which you point at in your margin, propounding the question (*De impositionis manuum necessitate*) *Concerning the necessity of Laying on of hands*, supposeth a necessity more or lesse to be granted on both sides between *Papists* and *Lutherans*; and having set down *Bellarmines* opinion, afterward gives this for his own and others of that part. *Nos e?* (speaking of this rite) *necessarium existimamus secundum quid, nimi?m quia citra scandalum omitti hodie non potest, qui tot annos in Ecclesia usitatus suit, & habet suos usus*. What need you cite *Tarnovius* only to let us know what *Bellarmino* sayes and will not let us know the judgement of *Tarnovius* himself; if it were not upon designe to rake up all that may be said against that Rite, and to bury (as much as in you lies) all that makes for it. 5. As for the opinion of the *Papists* in generall, and particularly of *Bellarmino*, they are divided in this point. And though he labours to prove *Manus impositionem ad essentiam Sacramenti ordinis pertinere*; yet he sayes, *Alii existima? ? impositionem esse accident?*.¹¹¹—*ita Dominicus à /79/ Soto, & alii quidam*. Whether there be not some difference between (*pertinere ad essentia?*) *to belong unto the essence*, which is *Bellarmines* expression; and, *esse substantiale*, as *Tarnovius* hath it: or, *to be a substantiall part*, as yo phrase it, is considerable: because that *belongs unto the essence*, without which it cannot be compleat or entire; and that only is a *substantiall part*, without which it cannot be at all.¹¹² Among the *Decretals* of Gregory, this Case is put: *An permitt? debeat ministrare quisine impositione manuum fuerit and Ordinem Subdiaconatus assumptus*. Whether one taken into the

¹¹¹ *De Sac. Ord. lib.1.? ?*.

¹¹² *Decret. Greg. bb.1.tit.16.4.1.*

Order of a Subdeacon, without Imposition of hands, should be permitted to minister. By this it appears, 1. That laying on of hands was sometime omitted in some Ordinations. 2. That such Ordination was not presently thought to be *invalid*, and [eo ipso] *null*. Which is further manifest by the Popes answer to the Case, which is made a Canon in their Law. *In talibus non est aliquid iterandum, sed cantè supplendum, quod incantè fuerat prætermisum.* In such cases nothing is to be reiterated, but that must be warily supplied, which was unwarily pretermitted.¹¹³ This is of great use against the Papists themselves, who can find a salvo for want of Imposition of hands among themselves, and yet allow none to the Protestants. And serves also to shew the vanity of your argument, who from the defect of this one thing, without any distinction of time or state in the Church, would infer a meer nullity in the whole. Thus far by occasion of that in Tarnovius.

Touching Chemnitius it follows.

“Chemnitius puts the case, Whether his Ministry be Null who hath not hands laid on him? And having repeated their opinion who say its not necessary, so the Call be lawfull; he lays the necessity of it to be in regard of others who run and are not sent, not in regard of the Calling it self, but that the Calling may be witnessed which the Minister hath; and says, *Oratio non facit vocationem, Ordination makes not [??] Calling, but declares it.* And further, *Præcipuè servatur iste ritus, ut tota Ecclesia communibus & ardentibus precibus, &c. That Imposition of hands is retained chiefly for the Prayers saide which the whole Church makes, &c. Yea, [??] /80/ tendum sane nullum extare in Scripturis mandatum Dei quod he ritos Ordinationis sit adhibendus.* There is no command of God in Scripture to Ordain by Laying of hands. Loc.com.tom.3.137.¹¹⁴

The answer. 1. Why did you conceale from the Reader what you found in Chemnitius in favour of Ordination, as an act of Ministers and Elders, when you were upon that Head? Are not those his words, which you have here in the margin?¹¹⁵

2. Touching the matter it self which you here refer unto, you mis-relate him. He speaks not of laying on of hands in the ordinary and regular Call of a Minister, for therein he supposes Imposition of hands should be used; but of a certain case. *Nam interdum hujusmodi casus incidunt, ut quis habeat vocationem, & impediatur quo minus se conferat ad Nobiliorem Ecclesiam, in qua accipiat ritum Ordinationis.* Questio ergo est, *An illius ministerium sit evacuatum?* His answer is, *Aliqui id affirmans, aliqui negant:* Some grant it, some deny it.

3. It suffices me that he grants Imposition of hands to be necessary in any respect agreeable to the Word. For they who agree in that, will agree in a warrantable use of this rite; neither the peace nor the communion of the Church will be disturbed, though it be not held to be essentiall. 4. Take his own words fully, (*Sed tamen propter eos qui currunt, & non missi sunt, vocatio debet habere publicum Ecclesia testimonium. Et ritus Ordinationis nihil aliud est quam talis publica testificatio, quæ vocatio illa in conspectu Dei, & ipsius nomine declaratur esse legitima & divina.*) and consider whether this follow not:--A Ministers call is then declared lawfull and divine, and so to be reputed, when he is Ordained by laying on of hands. And if there be no other way of such Declaration to be found in Scripture, This of Imposition of hands will be

¹¹³ * *Impositio manuum non requiritur in omnibus Ordinibus ecclesiasticis [??] velut in cocol [??] & subdiacono ordinandis. Can. subdiacon. & can. seq. di [??]. 24.*

¹¹⁴ [??]. 5. 22.

¹¹⁵ *Certio & manifeste constat, cum ex Scriptura mandatis, tum ex. m [??]. Tit. 1. 5. 1 Tim. 4. 14. 2 Tim. 2. 2. Act. 14. 23. Eos qui jam sunt in Ministerio, & prof [??] tentur sacramentum [??], adhibendos esse quando per medium auctoritatem al cui comm [??] dandum est ministerium. Turbulenti & sedati si Anab. [??] minim: recte faciunt qui vocabulo Ecclesia intelligunt tantum promiscuam multiordinem, excluso Ministerio & pio Magistratu. Chemnit. par. 8. L.C. de Ecclesia. pag 134.*

/81/ essentiall to it. 5. Whereas you single out those words only, *Ordinatio non facit vocationem*, Ordination makes not his Calling, but declares it: —The entire sentence is this: *Licet ergo Ordinatio non facit vocationem, si tamen quis legitime est vocatus, ille ritus est declaratio & confirmatio vocationem illans quæ præcessit esse legitim[us]m*. Here are two things which you leave out. 1. That Ordination is a *confirmation* of that Call, as well as a *declaration*. 2. It is not barely a declaration of the Call, but of the Lawfulness; so as the lawfulness of the Call may justly be questioned, which hath not been declared by Ordination. 6. This rite is not retained chiefly for the Prayers sake (as you translate his words) but rather for the benefit of such prayers as use to be made at Ordination. [*Et illas preces tali ritu peractas, non esse inanes testatur Moses, Deut.34.9. 1 Tim.4.14. 2 Tim,1.6.*] 7. As I grant those are his words, *Faterdum [us]* &c. so you cannot deny that these which foliow are his also. *Habet tamen ille sua fundamenta in verbo Dei. This rite hath its foundations in the Word of God.* 8. It's much that you have alledged out of *Chemnitius*; but is there *nothing else* which is of concernment for the Reader to know *touching this Rite*? You know there is more (*pag.138.*) where he gives an account to what end and use Imposition of hands is retained in the *Reformed Churches*. As, 1. *Illo publico ri[us] testamur, hoc opus licet sit mediatum, esse tamen verè divinum.* [By this publike rite we testifie that *this work* although it be *mediate*, yet is *truly Divine*: for it is not *ours*, but *Gods work* which we performe, who calls and Ordains that person *by us*.] 2. *Hac impositione manuum sititur Ecclesia, ut [us] quoque admoneatur Deum per hanc personam & ejus uniuersum velle ipsos docere, exhortari, consolari, Sacramenta administrare, peccata vel absolvere vel ligare.* [By this imposition of hands the Minister is presented to the Church, that they also may be admonished that God by him and his ministry will teach, exhort, and comfort them, administer the Sacraments unto them, and loose or bind their sins.] But the people must hear nothing of this kind from Protestant Divines, lest they soon perceive that those Ministers who make them believe that power of /82/ Ordination belongs unto the people, do deceive; and that there is something belonging to the Call of a Minister, which *from the nature of the thing it self* cannot belong to the People, or to any of their deputing to this act, but to such as are already Ministers, by them to be performed towards the people *in the name of God and Christ alone. Authoritas coram Ecclesia tribuitur ei, cui manus sunt imposita.* [Authority is conferred on him publicly before the Church, on whom hands are laid. Thus *Chemnitius*. But his was not for your turne; neither doth it serve *ad captandum populum*, to heare of authority conferred on Ministers, especially by Imposition of hands. Thus far of *Chemnitius*.

To that of *Danaus* in 1 Tim.5.22

“*Laying on of hands is not necessary, so there be but Prayer made to confirme the Party elected, and the whole Church joyn in prayer with him, that the Spirit of God would strengthen him. And he gives amongst other reasons, as that Prayer is all, this for one.* Qui hanc ceremoniam præcisè urgent, incidunt in vanas quæstiones & ineptas. *The urging of it breeds vain and foolish questions about Ministers Callings.*

I answer, 1. I question whether ever you consulted with the *Author himself*, and did not rather transcribe a little out of that which you found cited in *Tarnovius*. If you did, it further appeares how partiall and unfaithfull you are in setting down the Judgement of *Protestant Divines*; For he makes *an act of the Presbyters* not only to be necessary, but necessary *in the first place* before he assent of the people be asked, in calling of a Minister; and gives *five strong reasons* for it, to which I refer the studious Reader in the Book it self, *pag.352,253,254.*] 2. Whereas you say, *Laying on of hands is not necessary*, *Danaus* his own words (*pag.360*) are, *Non usque adeo certè necessaria est.* And so they are also in *Tarnovium*, so as you cannot

pretend that he deceived you in this. By that manner of expression he grants *some* necessity though not absolute; and does not *simply* say [???] *Laying on of hand* is not necessary. 3. That reason, [???] *Prayer is all*, is obtruded on him (if I mistake not) and not to be found in any of his expressions. 4. What he sayes [???] /83/ the *precise urging* of the Ceremony, is to be understood of the urging of it *upon Popish grounds*. The *foolish questions* which he means, are those in a Popish Canon *de triplici manuum impositione, una Ordinatoria, altera Confirmatoria, tertia Curatoria*, and such like. 5. It's granted that he sayes *expresly*, that Laying on of hands is not *essentialis pars & ritus letitime vocationis*; and that it is *in rerum indifferentium numero, & retineri & omitti po[??]t pro more regionis in qua electus ordinatur*. This last is more then you have yet acknowledged: And if it be to be retained *pro more regionis* according to the custome of the Country, it must continue in use among us, for ought that you have said or can say to prove it Non-essentiall.

Now thus it follows—

“*And with them agrees the Church of Scotland.*¹¹⁶ *The Church hath full liberty touse any other decent rite, or to use no rite at all beside a publike declaration; the Church is not not tyed to use any rite at all by the Word of God, in the giving of Ordination.*

Ans. What's the matter tht you cite this book so often? Are you in love with *English Popish Ceremonies*? or do you take the Book for an *Oracle*? Or do you think the Church of Scotland will abide by *every expression* to be found therein? Or is there *no other way* to know the sense of the Church of Scotland, but by *that Book*? Are you of the *same judgement* with *that Church*, or any of those *Protestant Divines* whom you have cited, so much as in this one head of Ordination, and the rite of it? I feare nothing lesse. The Church of Scotland is at an agreement within it self, and with such eminent *Divines* abroad as *Chemnitius* and *Danaus*; but you and they differ (if I be not mis-informed) more then a little. But, 2. to the thing itself. Liberty of devising new rites in Ordination is neither [???] to be granted by way of doctrine, nor to be used in practice, especially in those Churches which have suffered much under pretence and by the abuse of such liberty, and who *in other things* are strict urgers of examples as binding, and that *in matter of Rite*. 3. Those Scriptures which tye the Church to Ordination, tye her also /84/ to the Rite which we are speaking of: Or tell us where you find a Scripture for the one, and not for the other?

That which follows, whether intended as a fifth reason, or as an *excursion* only, I know not; though it be confused, yet it sufficiently discovers what you aim at, viz. *To make those who were Ordained by Bishops no Ministers, under pretence that they were Ordained by them as a Superiour Order unto Presbyters*, and so you slide into another Question: *Whether the person ordaining or imposing hands be of the essence of the Call.*] I shall lay down all your own words entire, and then answer. Thus you, pag. 16.

“*Yea, suppose it essentiall; and then, whereas it hath been held against the Brownists, that the Ministry in the Church of England is not null, though the Bishops laid on their hands, who should not have had a finger in it, (because an extrinsecall Circumstance failing, or being corrupted, a thing ceases not bo be) yet if t be made Essentiall, what shall be said? Seeing both in the Bishops intention in ordaining, and in the profession of the Party ordained, hands were laid on him, not as a Presbyter formally, but s one of a superior Order to Elders; and for such an Order there is no Divine institution. As therefore that Baptisme must be repeated, which was administred by a person not lawfully called to the ministration of it, if the Person ministering be essentiall to Baptisme; so must that person be Ordained again, who had hands laid on by a*

¹¹⁶ Engl.pop.cer.pag. 168,169.

Bishop, as a Bishop, if Laying on of hands be essentiall to the Ministry. Whatsoever wants its Essentials, is not, though it seems to be.

Ans. Let the Questions be propounded distinctly, which are here involv'd, and then it will be easier for any one to judge.

1. What will follow concerning the Ministry in the Church of *England*, if *Laying on of hands* be essentiall?

I answer. That the Ministers of *England* who have Hands laid on them, have that which is essentiall to their Calling. Who can imagine otherwise upon the supposition?

2. But seeing Ministers in *England* were Ordained by Bishops as a superiour Order to Elders, and no such Order is /85/ of Gods appointing, nor ought to be; is not their Calling null in that respect?

Ans. No, it is not. 1. Because neither *Church* nor *State* did ever declare *Bishops* to be a *superiour Order*, though some of them (for they were but some) made such a claim. The *State* hath often declared against it, not only by books approved by them, as in the dayes of *Henry* the 8. but by severall acts of Parliament in King *Edwards* time, and since.

2. Because Bishops *only and alone* were never authorised to lay on hands, excluding other Presbyters, but together with them.

3. Bishops were *Elders* first, before they came to be Bishops; and of Elders were made Bishops in way of *accumulation*, not in way of *privation*. Their error, that they thought themselves a *superiour Order* above Presbyters, could not make them no Presbyters.

4. All Ordinations are counted valid which are performed in a *settled Church*, with the consent of Magistrate, Ministers and People; whethr the Ordainers be *Bishop*, *Superintendent*, or a *Presbyterie*. This *princile* is maintained both by the *Lutherans* and *Calvinists*, as you use to distinguish. For the *Lutherans*, I refer you to *Hen. Ekhardus* [in opusculo de Ordine Ecclesiastico, pag. 5[?]]. and to *Nicolaus Hummius* [*Demonst. Min. Lutherani*, pag. [??]94.] For others, *Zanchy* sayes, (quo supra.) *Nihil refert sive ab omnibus præsentibus Ministris, sive ab uno omnium nomine imponantur manus*. It matters not whether hands be laid on by all the Ministers who are presnt, or by one in the name of the rest. So he. And I think it might be added, nor how many be present; the *Quorum* is but of prudentiall determination. *Pareus* speaks more largely. *¹¹⁷ *The lawfull Calling of the Church is that, which is instituted in every Church by publike authority, for Orders sake unto edification. Neque enim uniformis est omnium ubique quoad circumstantias externas, sed libertati Ecclesiæ relicta.*

5. To speak my own judgement. When sin cleaves to the manner of Calling, through the generall error or corruption of all sorts who are concerned in it, though such a /86/ Calling cannot be said to be *legitima*, or *legi proxima*, but is displeasing to God, and *null* in some sense, (as *unworthy receiving* of the Sacrament is counted *no receiving*, 1 Cor. 11.20.) and *sinfull fasting*, *no fasting*, Zach.7.5.) yet it is not otherwise to be invalidated *here below*, than by *doctrinall censure* and *repentance*, and not (as we use to phrase it) by *reiteration*.

2. As to your third question, *What shall be said to the Brownists*? By the way, let us know what you are; whether to satisfie *you* and *them* be not one thing? And let them first agree amongst, and answer for themselves. *Ainsworth*, the more rigid, thinks the People have poqer to Ordain. *Johnson* denies it, and maintains the validity of Baptisme and Ordination not in *England* only, but in *Rome*. Whether all, I know not, but sure I am many of those in *New-England* fall in with *Ainsworth* in this *fundamentall* of the Brownists. Those amongst us here at home, who say they are not *Brownists*, and like not t be called *Independents*, are not all one mans children in this

¹¹⁷ * *Comment. ad Rom. 19.15.*

point. What a case are they in with the *Anabaptists*, who will not call in or repair unto the Elders of other Churches to Ordain for them, and can have no Eldership within themselves but by popular Election; if Ordination be essentiall, and the persons Ordaining in Scripture be found to be only Elders, or more then Elders, and there be nothing almost or in comparison but examples in things of this kind?

3. For your close: *Whatsoever wants its essentials, is not, though it seems to be.* I answer, There's difference between *essentia partis*, and *compositi*; and in a *totum integrale*, a member may be wanting, and yet all *being* not be destroyed. He that loses an arm or a legge, doth not thereby lose his life, unlesse it be by accident. As *Election* relates to the *People*, and *Ordination* to the *Elders*, they subsist apart: Each of them have their fair claims for priority. In severall cases both may carry it, and the presence of the one supply the absence of the other. That Ordination which is pretended by the body of the *People*, or such Members out of office as they depute, seems to be, and is not: But that which is performed /87/ by Preaching Presbyters, is an Ordinance of God, and you have yet proved nothing to the contrary.

Next you make shew of answering an Objection.

“1 Tim. 5.22. *Laying on of hands is put for the whole matter of appointing Ministers, Ergo it is essentiall.*¹¹⁸

Ans. Before I consider of your answer, I have something to say in generall, and particularly to this for the generall. 1. If you have a mind in good earnest to answer such things as may be produced for the affirmative of that *Thesis* which you deny, why say you nothing to that of *Calvin*, whereof I suppose you are not ignorant? *Although* (saith he) *there is no certain precept extant concerning Imposition of hands, yet because we see it was in perpetuall use by the Apostles, that their so accurate an observation must be in stead of a precept to us.*

2. Imposition of hands ws of such account with *him*, and many other *the most eminent* among Protestant Divines, that I believe you think they said too much in favour of it, and cannot but conceive they [??] some reason for so saying, and therefore it would not be below you to vouchsafe them an answer. *Non invitatus patior vocari Sacramentum.* So *Calvin**.¹¹⁹ In another place: *Super [??] impositio manuum, quam ut in veris legitimisque ordinationibus Sacramentum esse concedo, ita nego locum habere in hac fabula.* *Martin Bucer* enquiring after that Ordination which the *Holy Ghost* in his Scriptures teacheth to be lawfull, sayes. *Ea vero est.—impositionem, institutio, atque imitatio**.¹²⁰ In his judgement therefore, *where there is no laying on of hands, there is no lawfull Ordination; and this way of Ordaining is the Scripture way, and the way which the Holy Ghost teacheth.*

Now *particularly* to that place in 1 Tim.5.22. *Lay hands suddenly on no man.* This argument may be drawn from them /88/ Laying on of hands is established for continuance, because only the sudden laying on is forbidden, and whatsoever is commanded about Ordination is essentiall to it. But this you take no notice of; only you devise a Reason which I know not who will owne, and think perhaps to be applauded for your answer.

¹¹⁸ * *Licet nullum extet ecrium praceptum de manuum impositione, quia tamen suissa inperpetuousua apostolis videmus illa ta[??] accurata corum observatio pæcepti vice nobis esse debet.* *Calv.inst.lib.4. chp.3. sec. 16.*

¹¹⁹ * *Calv. lib. 4. cap.14.sec.20.cap.19. sec.39.*

¹²⁰ * *Videndum igitur quam Sp. Sanctus in script[??] suis doceat legitimam esse Ministrum [??] ordinationem. Ha verò est corum qui agnoscere [??] & debant ad Ecclesiæ ministeria esse vita [??] atque probati, ad [??] ministeria [??] legitimo Ordinatore sul[??] per [Too obliterated to continue.]*

“Take it for granted (say you) that [*Laying on of hands is put for the whole matter of appointing Ministers*] for this must be supplied hither out of the Objection) though it will not easily be proved, because the Scripture shews it hath been used in other cases then in appointing Officers; yet it follows not that it is the principall or essentiall thing in Ordination. As for example, Prayer is put for the whole worship of God, yet it is not the principall part of Worship; for some times keeping the Sabbath is put for all the Worship; as Isa.56.4. Again, as when the Scripture by the same figure puts lifting up of hands for Election (as it doth Act.14.23) it binds not to that in all Elections, nor placeth it the essence of a choice in that: so neither doth the Scripture place the chief part or essence of Ordination in laying on of hands, though it put it for that Work.

Ans. 1. Though laying on of hands was used at other times, as well as at Ordination; yet there is no reason why we should imagine that in this Text it refers to any other thing, because the Chapter speaks for the most part of things belonging to Elders. 2. Be it granted that laying on of hands was used in other cases besides that of appointing Officers: yet the use of it in ordaining Elders is *one thing*, if it be not the *only thing* here intended. 3. This argument will surely hold. *Laying on of hands is put for appointing Ministers, therefore in appointing Ministers its lawfull to lay on hands.* As this: *Prayer and keeping the Sabbath are put for Worship, therefore they belong to Worship.* And if because they be put for Worship, they are therefore parts of Worship; then Imposition of hands is part of Ordination, because its put for Ordination. If a part, then either essentiall or integrall; so as at least no Ordination is complete and entire without it. 3. Lifting up of hands is not put for Election in Act.14.23. /89/ as you understand Election; and if you will needs have Election understood there, it will follow that *Paul and Barnabas did both elect and ordain*; and while you grasp in all for the People, you will leave them nothing. 4. If *lifting up of hands* by the people, were as directly intended and as often expressed as *laying on of hands* by Apostles & elders is, you zeale for the People would make you think it necessary. To what purpose should laying of hands be so often mentioned, if the *Holy Ghost* intended it should be merely arbitrary, whether it be used or no? 5. Consider what *Antonius Walæus* hath said, propounding the question, *Whether Imposition of hands be necessary.**¹²¹ [I perceive (saith he) that it is required in all the Confessions of our Churches except one or two. And surely, seeing the Apostles alwayes used it, yea the Apostle gives Timothy a commandment, 1 Tim. 5. 22. *Lay hands suddenly on no man*: we judge it is not to be omitted; because in that negative commandment an affirmative is also contained: where being taken by a Synecdoche for the whole Election of a Pastor, it must be taken either for a rite, or for an essentiall part; (otherwise it could not be but for the whole) or at least for a proper adjunct, and that which is common to all *Callings*.]

Now you begin to draw towards a conclusion, and propound this question:

“If therefore laying on of hands be not essentiall, why should those be kept altogether from labouring in the Lords harvest, who cannot or have not received it, and in a way too that is as questionable as the thing it self? If the Calling may be true without it, why is it equally pressed with it? Is there more need of an adjunct, an accessory, a solemnity, then of Ministers,

¹²¹ * *Video in omnibus Confessionibus Nostrarum Ecclesiarum [??] [??] alte am, eam requiri & Sane cum Apostoli semper eam usurparint, [??] Apostolus pr[?]ceptum dat Timotheus. 1. Tim. 5 22 Necito cuiquam manus Imponito, nos [??] non judicanus: quia in ne[?] illo mandato, etiam affirmativis co[?]inetur: ubi[?] pro tot[?] clectione Pastoris s[?]ature per Synecdochen, certe pro ritu aut parte e[?] habenda est, [?]lioquin pro roto sumi non posit, aut falem proprio & omnibus vocationibus communi. Ant. Wal. l. de Funit. Eccl.*

peace, salvation to peoples soules by Preaching? Assoon as they had but an Altar, they offered on it when they came out of Babylon, and stayed not till all the Temple in all its furniture and utensils was ready, Ezra 3. Before they were wholly carried away into Babylon, they worshipped and served God with those vessels which were left in the Sanctuary, though they had not all, 2 Chron.36.7.10.18. What higher /90/ point of Separation is there, than to make voyd or deny a whole Ordinance for want of a Circumstance?

Ans. 1. Here are many rash insinuations: As,

1. That some are kept *altogether* from labouring in the Lords harvest, who cannot, or have not received Imposition of hands.

2. That the way to receive Imposition of hands, (speaking of the present) is as questionable as the thing it selfe.

3. That Calling, and Imposition of hands are equally pressed.

4. That nothing should be prest about the Calling of a Minister, but that which is essentiall.

I shall speak a little to these, and then answer your main question.

For the first. The fault of our times is, and long hath been a boundlesse liberty usurped by some, and connived at by others. Perhaps some may be denied approbation for, and admittance unto the publike Ministry by way of charge, not because they had not; but because they would not (though tendered to them) receive Imposition of hands. But who are kept back altogether? Many, both men and women, are said to have laboured *much in the Lord*, by their private endeavours; who did not yet stretch themselves beyond their line to preach publicly unordained.¹²² This liberty in a morall way is denied none.

For the second, I suppose your Margin is intended, where you tell us—

*“We have the word [Presbyterie] but once spoken of in all the Scripture, as belonging to the Churches of the New Testament. Calvin understands by it the office of a Presbyter, not a company of them. Those hwo take if for a company, differ among themselves. Some say a company of Preachers, as the Leyden-Professors. Synops. purior. Theol.disp.43.n.37. Some take it for a company of extraordinary Ministers, as Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets. Scoti [GREEK] Paracles. p.228. Others for a company of Ruling Elders as well as others, Eng.pop.cer. p.171. Some understand it of a Congregationall /91/ Presbyterie. (as the Non-conformists against Downham, and the Scots against Tilenus.)”*¹²³ *Some of a Classicall Provinciall Presbyterie, as the LONDON Ministers.*

Ans. 1. You should do well to let us know your own judgment, whether we shall repute you *Prelaticall, Brownist, Anabaptist, Independent, Erastian, Seeker, Sceptick?* Or whether you understand it of a *Conclave of Cardinals*. Would you have it a *cypher* to signifie nothing, or *ad placitum*? What means this pretending of ambiguity, where there is none? You cannot but perceive that most of these opinions fall into one, against those that place the power of Ordination *in the People*. There might be a company of Ordination *in the People*. There might be a company of Preachers, and of extraordinary Ministers, and some Ruling Elders, and yet all in one Presbyterie. *No man yet ever dreamed that it signified a company of Believers without Officers.* 2. What of that that it is but once spoken of in all the Scriptures? You cannot find the word *Excommunication* so much as once, not *Trinity*; will you therefore be *Erastian* or *Arrian*? Shew us one place for Ordination by the people, or calling to the office of a Minister without it? Wheresoever there were divers *Apostles, Evangelists, Prophets, or Bishops and Elders* orderly

¹²² Phil.4. 3. Rom. 16.12.

¹²³ See the answ to Bp. Downham. serm. p. 93.

assembled for acts of power, there was the substance of a Presbyterie, (we have neither fitten nor other name in Scripture to call such an Assembly by.) Such there were both at Jerusalem, Act. 15. and at Antioch, Act.13.1. and at Philippi, Phil.1.[?]. And therefore though we read of the *name* but once, we have the *thing* often. 3. For Calvin, these are his own words upon that Text (1 Tim. 4. 14.). *Presbyteriums qui h c collectiunm nomen esse pu[?] pro Collegio Presbyterorum positu[?], r ct  sentiunt mea judicio.* [They who think *Presbytorie* in this place to be a Noun collective put for a Colledge of Presbyters, do think rightly in my judgement.] Therefore though he think another sense (*non mal  quadrare*) may agree with the words; yet you have no reason to set him at a distance from others, and from himself. 4. As touching the *Leyden-Professors*, whereas your printed books [??] [??]. I suppose your Copy had /92/ *disp.*42. for there only is shew of something for your purpose, but nothing indeed. *Though the power of Ordaining or Confirming Pastors (say they) belong to the whole Presbytery; yet of old the Presbytery did execute that in the rite of laying on of hands, not so much by Ruling Elcers as by Pastors, who did especially attend on prophecy or explication of the Scripture, and application of it to the use of the faithfull.* [??] *Prophetia cum Manuum impositione per quam olim siebat Ordinatio Pastorum, ab Apostolo conjungitur.* 1 Tim.4. 14. By this it appears they have a singular opinion of the word *Prophecy*, not of the word *Presbytery*; for they plainly suppose the Presbyterie consisted of two sorts of Elders, and yet that preaching Elders only laid on hands. And well they might suppose that, (as doth your Author so often cited *pag.*171) because much of Prayer and Teaching is to accompany the act of Imposition, before and after. 5. That which you cite out of the answer to *Tilenus*, under the title of *Scoti* [GREEK] *Paraclesis*, is not to be found in it as applied to the word: but this he sayes in generall. There were many *Presbyteries* in the Apostles times, in which no Bishop (properly so called) could preside. *Quia pars magna ex Apostolis, Evangelistu, & ejusmodi viris constabat, qui Episcopis long  erant superiores.* [Because a great part (*not the whole*) did consist of Apostles, Evangelists, and such like men, which were far superior unto Bishops.] 6. None affirms that the word *Presbytery* as it is used in 1 Tim.4.14. does necessarily imply a company of Ruling Elders as well as others. But upon the supposition that there are two sorts of Elders, proved by other places, they may be included under that one word, because its comprehensive of them both. The Presbyterie may be in the essentiall consideration, but cannot be *whole* in the integrall without them. He that says, *The number of preaching Elders in one city, together with those Elders which in the same city laboured for Discipline only, made up that company which the Apostle (1 Tim.4.14) calleth a Presbyterie;* must be understood to speak of *that company* in the generall notion of it rather than in the peculiar or individuall.¹²⁴ And this is plain by those words of *his* which follow a little /93/ after. *The Doctor himslf* (speaking of *Forbes* in his *Irenicum*) *by the Presbyterie whereof the Apostle speaks, understandeth us we do,* Confessus Presbyterorum. 7. That some understand it of a *Congregationall Presbytery*, is granted; and some exclusively, as if there were no other, as you your self perhaps. But whatever the *Nonconformists* against *Downham* do, surely the *Scots* in generall do not, nor those in particular who wrote against *Tilenus*. And howsoever they use the word, *Parish* or *Congregation*, as distinct from *Diocesse*, yet they use it in so large a sense, as serves to take in *the greatest City of England* to make but one Congregtaion. The words of him that wrote against *Tilenus* (*lib.citat. cap.*28. *pag.*218) are these. *Divers  sunt Londini par[?] distincta, quarum tantus est numerus, & tam exiguus locus, ut impossibile sit omnes simal & semel convocari, & tamen pro una tantum habentur congregatione [??] paraci .*¹²⁵ 8.

¹²⁴ Eng.pop.cer.

¹²⁵ Note.

For the *London Ministers*, it appears plainly *pag.*191. that they bring the word *Presbytery* as used in 1 Tim. 4.14. only for the proof of this Position, *That there is no pattern of a Presbytery in the Word of Christ*. And that not only because they find the *thing* as in other places, but the *name* as here. And if we find the nature of a Presbytery, we shall more easily discern what use is to be made of it. 9. All this while I heare nothing but a windy noise, that the way to receive Imposition of hands is as questionable as the thing it self. *Sir.* to be plain with you before our parting, If you can say no more against the way of receiving, then you have said against the lawfulness and expedience of Laying on of hands, (which is worth the while in reference to practise) than you have said yet, You may begin when you please, and bring both ends to nothing.

To your third insinuation, *that Calling and Imposition of hands are equally prest.* I answer, 1. Were it so, you need not wonder; because there are few who zealously oppose the one, but they oppose the other also: if you mean it of a Church-Call, the thing it self is struck at. Most of those who care not for having Hands laid on them, do as little value the Peoples choice; were it not that the people are /94/ purs-bearers, & the *beneficium* is sure to come from them, whosoever conveys the *officium*. Gifted men would plead only the right of their own gifts, but that the Peoples gifts byas them towards the peoples Call. 2. He that scruples to have Hands laid on him, may well be suspected to question something else; the rather, because they make a new Sect beyond all in ordinary enumeration, who pretend the unlawfulness of this Rite: and therefore Church and State have need to watch against the creeping in of such.

To the last, *That nothing should be prest about the Calling of a Minister, but what is essentiall.* I answer; Consider of qualifications whether every one of them be essentiall or no: if they be not; yet whether they may not be prest? Is there any Church in the world that urgeth only essentials? Many things may be said for Imposition of hands, that cannot be said for every rite, if it be but a rite. This is to me in stead of all: That liberty, whereby we pretend to lay aside *this*, will imbolden us to devise *some other* in stead of it; and that's (at least) dangerous. Be it but an adjunct, in one sense it will prove an inseparable one; Ordination is likely to fall with it, and this monster like to arise in the room of it: the Church will be all body, in visible administrations to it self, to act her own part and Christs, confusedly.

But it remains to answer your Questions a little more particularly.

"If the Calling may be true without it, why is it equally pressed with us? Ans. It is as well pressed, but not *equally*; and therefore pressed though it were not essentiall, because so to do is conforme to the Apostles practise, not only in the particular thing, but in othercases, as Act. 15. Order, in the particulars of it is not essentiall; and yet particulars may be pressed for Orders sake, and that by way of *commandement*, 1 Cor.14.37.

"Is there more need of an adjunct, an accessory, a solemnity, than of Ministers, peace, and salvation to peoples soules by Preaching?

Ans. The necessity of Ministers, peace and salvation, are strong obligations to binde those who desire the office of /95/ Minister, not to refuse a lawfull adjunct, accessory, and solemnity. Woe unto him that had rather not preach, then submit himself to have hands laid on him; especially when the use of that rite is carefully purged from superstition and abuse.

"As soon as they had but an Altar, they offered on it when they came out of Bablylon, and stayed not till all the Temple in all its furniture and utensils was ready. Ezra 3.

Ans. Yet they did not sacrifice before they had an Altar, under pretence of necessity: And why should any do the work of the Office, and take the profit of it, who refuses in an orderly way to be admitted to the Office it self? Our Temple yet hath not all his furniture &

utensils, but we have a way of Ordination: let such as it concerns make use of it, & take heed that by their example in neglecting and opposing this particular, they provoke not God to make the work of Reformation cease, to the joy of our adversaries, and the grief not only of our own hearts, but of Gods spirit. Can any thing be more displeasing to God, and delightfull to the *Popish* and *Prelaticall*, than to make the labour of reformers a *Indibrium* and *opprobrium*? Is this to cry *grace! grace!* unto the work?

“Before they were wholly carried away into Babylon, they worshipped and served God with those vessels which were left in the Sanctuary, though they had not all. 2 Chro.36.7. 10.18.

Ans. Therefore though we have not the power of all Censures, nor a pure administration of every Ordinance; yet Ordination being purged, let’s make use of that as a pledge of the rest. To set and observe the right way of entring into the Ministry, whereunto Ordination serves, is not only to lay the foundation, but as the rearing of gates and bars belonging to the ngresse of the House of God. Let none be *as a thiefe* to break thorough and steale, but enter in by this doore.

Yet you have one questio to be resolved.

“What higher point of Separation is there, than to make void or deny a whole Ordinance for want of a Circumstance?”

Ans. 1. You shall do well to beware of *points of Separation*.^{*126} /96/ In these times many Teachers and Christians are all for *Chymicall extracts of Society*; [quorum separationem novus quidam Monachismus irrepit] *by whose separation a new kind of Monckery is crept in: And this plague is the more hurtfull* [quo est hypocrisi picturatio] *by being coloured over with a shew of greater holinesse.* These are the expressions of *Bullinger*^{*127} (no contemptible one among Protestant Divines) speaking of the *Catabaptists*.

2. To make void or deny a whole Ordinance by refusing to use a lawfull Circumstance, is, whether a high point of Separation I know not, (the phrase is improper) a great sinne questionlesse. But who are guilty of it, if not they, who rather than they will suffer Hands to be laid on them in such a way as is now established agreeable to the Word, will either not be Ministers at all, or be made Ministers (as they suppose) by such a company of Peoples as are not in a capacity for their parts to Elect, either by the laws of the Land, or any warrant in the Word of God; an dmuch lesse to Ordaine?

3. Multitudes have been allowed to preach and that publikely to their great profit, in this time of generall disturbanec in *Church* and *State*. But that liberty might be given and taken then, and whiles Reformation was under debate, which now can neither be asked with modesty, nor granted with wisdome and justice. If you please to take like paines for proving the Lawfulnesse of *Imposing hands in Ordination*, as now established, as you have done to argue against the Essentiality; I hope there will be little need to complain either of pressing to, or withdrawing or exclusion from the *Ministry*.

As touching your *Paradox* (for so I call it) *A man may lawfully Preach the Word, who is not Called to be a Minister*, That also shall be examined, *God Willing*, by it selfe apart.

FINIS.

¹²⁶ * *Nam confilia Separationis & inaniasunt, & pernicioſa, & ſacrilega; quia & ſuperba ſiunt, & pl[??] [???*
in[??] bon[??], quòus corigunt animoſos malos. Aig.[??]. Parm.l 3 c.2.to.7.

¹²⁷ * *Lib.de funct. Prophetica. p.18.col.2.*