

bishops who dissented likewise, and consequently it possessed the power of ordination.

Wherefore, permit me to ask, was there not a necessity for other bodies to dissent from the Episcopal Church of England?

What were the reasons of this dissension? Was it owing to pride? To any ambitious intention of *exalting themselves*? Or, to a temper of disobedience to religions in civil government?

Rather, was it not owing, in several instances, to their having enlightened consciences, which would not allow them to sacrifice their religious rights to human policy; and to connect with the doctrines of Scripture the commandments of men?

Without adducing any instances in support of this from the history of the various dissensions, I would ask whether, even within the memory of persons now living, a man could receive ordination from the Church of England without submitting to human assertions as to doctrines of Scripture?

When circumstances are such, it is the duty of a people either to submit their consciences to human rules, or to be destitute of the ordinances of the Gospel, or to have a ministry upon their own principles.

To neglect the ordinances of the Gospel cannot be a duty.

To resign our religious liberty to human policy *must* be a *sin*.

And therefore there has been, and is a necessity for persons to receive ordination from *others besides Episcopal bishops*, and consequently there are no successors to the Apostles.

When I say that the Apostles have no successors, I do not mean that their *characters* are in no respect represented. The powers which the true ministers of the Gospel possess were once enjoyed by them, and have been conveyed down by God as he hath pleased. In this sense, the character of Christ is, in some respects, represented. But my meaning is, that as there is one *Lord Jesus Christ*, so there are *twelve Apostles*, and *ONE APOSTLE* of the Gentiles; and that all succeeding officers in the Church are *inferior to them at least*