

which is more
 untes) that is,
 hop is drawn.
 o thee? Let
 nder, whom
 doctrine from
 lect Lady and
 t that one was
 rest, was done
 ing the church
 ces. For at
 Heracles and
 always named
 a higher de-
 emperor; or
 es whom they
 con." And a
 " Presbyter
 er of *dignity*.
 ere is mention
 n, but not of
the Bishop."

icious than fo-
 at all. You
 of England
 ce of God in
 e order. Yet,
 above a Dea-
 sbyter and a
 ial as to offi-
 heir degrees.
 ers, but differ
 e the plan of
 ion to which
 ? It proves a
 es " the plan
 Presbyterian
 parity"

parity *one and the same.* Pastors, Elders and Deacons have their appropriate offices in the Church, but an Elder is a *degree* above a *Deacon*, and a Pastor is a degree above both an Elder and a Deacon, therefore we have either episcopal parity or presbyterian *imparity.* You try to make the inequalities as few and as small as possible, but the official powers of a Bishop in the English Church collocatus in *excelliori gradu* are too peculiar to be so easily reduced. Every thing depends on the *height* of the *degree*, and if you can shew from Scripture or the Fathers that a Presbyter required to be *re-ordained* when he was placed in *excelliori gradu*, then will I acknowledge that you have something *like* argument to oppose to the Presbyterian scheme and still more if you shew that any Bishop had a number of congregations and pastors under him who were subjected to his spiritual jurisdiction. Every Bishop is a Presbyter but every Presbyter is not a Bishop; for no man can receive the latter title unless he has the charge of a particular congregation. Of course your statement regarding the consecration of Spottiswood, Lamb, and Hamilton as Bishops, in the chapel of London-House, without previous ordination as Presbyters, is nothing to the purpose. Had they been Presbyters and ordained anew, the case would have been widely different.

You quote Clement's allusion to the orders of Priesthood in the Jewish Church, from which you presume that he argues for a similar order in the Christian Ministry. You ought to have extracted the whole passage, and you would have found that his object was to enforce on the Corinthian Church the duty of submission to their pastors, and to impress them with a sense of the importance of ecclesiastical order; that with this view he refers to the subordination necessary in *military affairs*, remarking that some are only common soldiers, some prefects, some captains of fifties, some of hundreds, and some of thousands, every one of whom is bound to keep his own station; and that if any thing is to be deduced from his allusion to the *Jewish Priesthood*, in reference to the order of the Christian ministry, it must also be drawn from his allusion to the army, and of course there must be *four orders* of ministers corresponding