

ordination as
office, fixed
presbiteriou
e or number
authorities
teriou is to
imitive Pa-
o which you
l of Presby-
teried con-
he says, in
s not lawfu
ate the holy
at his Pres-
e who bear
in virtue of
ent power,
at all times,
r both Bap-
I interpret
him as sa-
n his Com-
ain Elders,"
city," says
mitted to one
and his own
be easier to
e more care
an about to
e ruling of

It is a sin-
on this sub-
14. "Noli
t prophetia,
xpressly ad-
byters are,
gnifies the
office

office conferred and not the *body of ministers* who conferred it, was maintained by Calvin himself till he changed his views and adopted the other sense which you mention. It is too absurd to deserve serious refutation

I have nearly extended this letter to *four sheets*, and must now think of drawing to a close. Nothing material in the shape of *reasoning*, in your Remarks, has been wilfully overlooked. You contradict "the faith of history" when you deny *prelatical* acknowledgment of the validity of Presbyterian ordination. You put emphasis on the *many Bishops* who were consecrated without Episcopal ordination, but it is quite sufficient if there was *one* instance, as that *one* could not fail to corrupt the purity of *Episcopal succession*, by the illegitimate admixture of the blood of Presbyters. I have my doubts whether the succession to the throne of Great Britain is a matter of such grave interest to some high Churchmen as the legitimacy and purity of succession in the line of Bishops. The saying of Chillingworth which you introduce in triumph is unfortunately equally strong in favour of *Romish* episcopacy; the same *presumptive* argument was actually employed by Bellarmine against the protestants of his day, in support of prelacy and its attendant corruptions. It proceeds on *false data*, for it supposes that innovations were introduced *suddenly*, and at *once*, whereas Jerome expressly asserts that they came in (*paulatim*) by *little and little*, and Mosheim, Gibbon, Haweis, &c. who are all historians of veracity, (though they do not in *all things please* you and your friends) expressly inform us of the *different stages* which marked the progress of hierarchical usurpation and intolerance.

And now, Sir, I presume this is the longest Letter you ever received, but I hope you will find it both useful and edifying. I have confined your attention to the topics embraced in your Remarks, carefully avoiding the *argument* in favour of Presbytery, because I deprecate all such perverse disputations. I hope you will not be tempted to break your resolution by again *breaking silence*. I have no thirst for controversy, neither do I shrink from the contest; and if your Remarks are to be regarded as a test of the dimensions of your mind, or the extent of your information, I hesitate not, *single and alone*,