

1679
B 35

WHICH IS THE
True Church?
The whole Christian World, as Headed only
BY
CHRIST,
(Of which the Reformed are the soundest part)
OR, THE
POPE of ROME
And his **SUBJECTS** as such ?

IN THREE PARTS.

- I. The *Papists* Confusion in explaining the terms of the Questions; not able to bear the light.
- II. A Defence of a Disputation concerning the continued Visibilty of the Church of which the Protestants are members.
- III. A Defence of the several Additional proofs of the said Visibilty.

By **RICHARD BAXTER..**

Written especially to instruct the younger unexperienced Scholars how to deal with these Deceivers, in these dangerous times.

LONDON; Printed, and are to be sold by *Richard Janeway*, in
Butcher-hall Lane. 1679.

21.5 x 16.2 cm.
(137) 168p.

3/2

211

The Preface to the Lovers of Truth.

Above eighteen years past I received a Paper (by the mediation of one Mr. Langhorne) from one that called himself *William Johnson*, to prove the Papal Church to be the Catholick, because no other had been visible in all Ages. I answered it, and received a Reply, and wrote a Rejoinder. But being not rich enough to pay either an *Ammanensis* or Transcriber, I never (to my remembrance) took a Copy of any Book which I wrote, except this Rejoinder to him, and one other; and I never (to my remembrance) lost any but those two. When I had sent this by the ordinary Carrier, he lost it, but took on him that he never knew how. Whereupon when I lookt for a Reply, I receiv'd an insulting Letter for not answering. But when I sent my Rejoinder the second time, I could never have any Reply thereto. Above a year after, coming up to London at the Kings Restoration, I enquired after the Disputer, and called yet for some Reply, but could get none: and I was there informed, that his name was *Terret*, and that he usually lived with the Earl of *Shrewsbury* (within seven miles of me, when I was told he lived near an hundred miles off): But that he was one of the greatest of their Disputers about London, where he spent much of his time, and had lately disputed with Mr. *Pet. Gunning*, and Mr. *Pierfon* (now both Bishops), and had printed the Dispute without their consent. And lest he should do so by any part of mine, I sent him word, That if he would not prosecute the Dispute, I would publish what was done. Whereupon he offered to do it rather by Conference than by Writing: Which I accepted, and he came to me, and we agreed to begin with the true explication of some terms which were likeliest to be most used in our Controversie. I offered to give him my sense of any terms of which he would desire it, and desired the like of him, which he granted. He desired none at all of me; but such terms as I offered to him, he wrote me immediately his explication of; which, because it rather encreased the darkness and uncertainty, I excepted against it, and desired fuller explication. By this time our hour was at an end, and I expected him to prosecute the Dispute,

THE PREFACE.

but could never see him more. Whereupon after urgency and expectation, I published what had passed between us.

The next year the Countess of Balcarres (now Countess of Argyll) a person to whom I had extraordinary obligations, sent for me, being in great affliction for her eldest Daughter turned Papist. Whereupon I offered a Conference with the person that had persuaded her, or any other whom she would chuse: which the Lady accepted, and undertook to bring one speedily to perform it. But at last she said the person was afraid of the danger of the Law, I urged her still, and then she told me, that when he knew who it was that he was to speak with, he professed that he feared no danger from me, and greatly honoured me, being one that knew me; but refused the Dispute. I provoked her to get some other, though it was the ablest that then attended on the Queen-mother (who then encourag'd her;) But she would have none, but him that did refuse it. Whereupon (her mother being in danger of death by grief) I was forced to speak more harshly to her, and ask her, Whether she dealt wisely to follow such as durst not let her hear what was to be said? I told her, that if she would spend but one hour in giving the reasons why she should turn Papist, and let me spend another hour in giving her my reasons to the contrary, I would leave the issue to her Conscience. After long denial, at last she told me, that the person did consent, on condition that there might be no *speaking*, but only *writing ex tempore*, and nothing done but by *syllogism*, according to the Laws of Disputation. I asked her, Whether that way was most suitable to her understanding and patience? And whether she would stay till we had done our writings, which might possibly be some years? And whether she might not as well read what is written already? But when nothing else would be consented to, I yielded to such writing, so be it she would but hear our several Reasons one hour or two first. And when that could not be obtained, I consented to meet him, and only to write. But just when the time came, the Lady was stoln away; and when they followed and overtook her, she told them that she was but going on some business, and would presently return (her mother professed that before her perversion she scarce ever found her in a Lye or disobedience, and after could scarce believe any thing that she said). But she went to a Nunnery in France, and her Mother saw her no more; but ere long received Letters of the Reasons of her Religion, which at her Mothers desire I answered, but you may suppose that they suffered her not to see the Answer.

When

THE PREFACE.

When she was gone, I understood that it was this same Mr. W. Johnson, alias Terret, who was the man that had seduced her, and refused the Dispute.

But not long after he Printed a Reply to the Book which I had published, and called it, *Novelty repress*: which when I perused, I saw that a Rejoinder would be of little use, because it must consist for the far greatest part, of the detection of his fallacious words, and of the vindication of a great deal of Church-History; and the former would rather tire than edifie the Reader, and the later would profit none but those that were already well acquainted with Church-History, or such as would fully search the Authors cited, till they understood by them *who* it is that citeth them aright: He that will not do this cannot judg of our case, and he that will do it needeth not my help. Wherefore having much better work, and no time to spare, expecting that my change was near, my Conscience forbad me such a frivolous expence of time as a Rejoinder to his Reply would prove. But having since written many Books against *Papery*, to none of which I can procure yet a word of answer, and hearing that they are obliged not to answer me till I am dead, (which they may shortly expect) by the persuasions of some I have attempted to make this Return to this *one Reply*, which is all that ever they published against me, that I know of.

And because true Order requireth first that we understand each others terms, I must begin with that, though it be the last thing in his Book; in which you will see what a sandy fabrick it is which is adorned by them with the great Epithetes of *Apostolical*, *Ancient*, *Universal*, *Infallible*, and how little they know, or can make others know what it is of which they do dispute, or what that Church is, to which so many hundred thousand Christians (called by them Heretics) have been sacrificed by sword and flames.

In the second Part I defend the Visibilty of the Church which the Protestants are members of, against his vain Objections. And in the third Part I defend those Additional arguments by which I proved it.

In all which I doubt not but the impartial understanding Reader may see, that their Terrestrial Universal Monarchy, and their condemnation of the greatest part of the Church of Christ, are contrary to *Sense*, *Reason*, *Tradition*, *Consent*, *Antiquity* and *Scripture*; and that their Kingdom standeth but on three Legs, IGNORANCE and deceit, worldly INTEREST, and the SWORD and violence. And when these (and especially the sword of Princes) do cease to uphold it,

T H E P R E F A C E.

it, it will presently die and come to nothing. For though *Melchior Canus* say, that the *Roman Priviledges* (as he calleth them) have stood, though the greater number of *Bishops and Churches*, and the *Arms of Emperours* have been against them, yet was it upheld against all these by no better means than those aforesaid. The greater number of *Churches and Bishops* (*viz.* of East and South) being against them, and all the other four *Patriarchates* renouncing them (as they do to this day) they laid the faster hold of the West, and by mastering *Italy*, flattering and advancing *France*, promising *Kingdoms and Empire* to their Adherents, threatening the deposition of others, dividing *Germany* and all *Europe*, that many might need the Pope, and few be able to resist him, and by keeping men ignorant that they might be capable of their Government, by these means they overcame the *Arms of Emperours*, and made them their Subjects, whose Subjects they had been.

If there were nothing else to satisfy the Reader against *Papery* but these following Particulars, it were a shame to humane nature to receive it. 1. The natural incapacity of one man to be a Church-Monarch, any more than to be a Civil Monarch of the whole Earth. 2. That *Bellarmino* confesseth that the Pope succeedeth not *Peter* as an Apostle (but as an Universal Pastor): But *Peter* never had any higher office than to be the first Apostle, *1 Cor.* 12. 28. *God hath set in the Church first Apostles*, (not first a Vice-Christ.) 3. That they affirm that it is not *de fide* that the Pope is *Peter's* Successor. 4. That none of the other Apostles had Successors as in superior seats; nor did any Patriarch (much less twelve) claim power as Successors of any Apostle, save *Antioch* and *Rome*, and *Antioch* as from the same *St. Peter*, but no Universal Sovereignty. 5. That whoever will turn Papist, must confess that he was an ungodly hypocrite before, and that all professed Christians are so, save the Papists, that know their doctrine. 6. That he must renounce the senses of all sound men, and believe them all deceived by Miracle.

The Contents of the first Part.

C H A P. I.

Sect. 1. **H** Is Explication of the terms CATHOLICK CHURCH.

1. He excludeth all from *Christs Universal Church*, and Christianity, that are no Members of Christian Congregations: Yet meaneth not only Churches, but Families, Ships or any civil Assemblies. Damning all solitary Christians, or that are alone among Infidels.
2. He maketh subjection to the Supreme Pastor necessary, and yet saith the Votum of it alone will serve.
- Sect. 2. He unchurcheth Parish-Churches. He maketh dependance on lawful Pastors in general necessary, but not on the Pope particularly.
- Sect. 3. What Faith must be in a Church-member. His implicite discourse of implicite faith, which indeed is no faith of any particular Article. Several senses of implicite faith opened. His general faith proved, No particular faith. In what sense we believe all that God hath revealed, Sect. 8. His instances explained, Sect. 9. When virtual repentance sufficeth, Sect. 10. His avoiding to answer, Sect. 11.
- The Papists Church invisible. Sect. 12.
- His strange Doctrine of generals. Sect. 13.
- What Christianity is, is no point of faith with them, Sect. 14.
- The invisibility of their Church further proved, Sect. 15.
- Their contradictions about receiving all faith on the Churches Authority. Sect. 16.
- 17.
- The true method of believing. Sect. 18.
- Humane faith is joyned with Divine. Sect. 20.
- What the Essentials of Christianity are. Sect. 21.
- Papists utterly disagreed what a Christian is, and confounded, and their Church invisible, Sect. 22. Notes of great moment hereupon. The baptizing of men that believe only that [there is a rewarding God] is a new false baptism.
- Sect. 23. Q 3. Who are the Pastors whose rejection unchurcheth men? Of Parish Priests.
- Q 4. How shall all the world be sure that Popes and Priests had a just Election or ordination. Sect. 24, 25, 26, 27, 28.

C H A P. 2. Their sense of the word HERESY.

Whether Heresie be in will or understanding. Sect. 1. Hereticks by their definition are unknown, Sect. 2. The power of judging of the [Sufficiency] of proposals, maketh the Clergie Masters of all men lives, Sect. 3.

The Contents.

He maketh none Hereticks that deny not Gods Veracity. Sect. 4. And all Hereticks to deny it; Yea all that receive not every truth sufficiently proposed. Yet unfaith all, and faith, that not culpable neglect of sufficient proof of all, but contradiction to the known proposal of lawful Superiours, makes a Heretick. Sect. 7.

Q. What sufficient proposal is. Sect. 8. 9.

He saith that the true Church-Governours may be known without Revelation. Sect. 10. Sufficiency further examined. Sect. 11. He hereticateth themselves or none. Sect. 12.

Whether every misunderstanding of an intelligible Text of Scripture be Herefie. Sect. 13. What Herefie is indeed. Sect. 14.

C H A P. 3. Their meaning of the word POPE.

Sect. 1. Popes judged Hereticks by many Councils.

Where Christs institution of the Papacy must be found. Sect. 2.

Who ad esse must elect the Pope. Sect. 3. W. J. cannot and dare not tell Consecration denied to be necessary to the Pope. Sect. 6.

Neither Papal nor Episcopal Jurisdiction, he saith, depends on Papal or Episcopal ordination. Sect. 7. So they may be Laymen. What such jurisdiction is.

Sect. 8. What notice or proof is necessary to the Subjects.

C H A P. 4. Their sense of the word BISHOP.

The Pope is not of Gods ordaining, in their way. Sect. 1. 2. Their Bishop of Calcedons testimony put off. Sect. 3. They make all men that will, or no men to be Bishops. His great confusion and contradictions. Saying, we want not Episcopal Consecration, but Election, Confirmation, Vocation, Missions, Jurisdiction. All these explained. Sect. 8. He makes the Chapters in Queen Elizabeth days to have had the power of choosing all the Parish Priests. Popes no Popes for want of common consent. Sect. 9. who must choose a Monark of all the earth. Sect. 10. Their succession interrupted. Sect. 11. 12. Is it essential to a Bishop to have many Congregations, parishes or presbyters. By affirming this he nullifieth all the first Bishops, who were Bishops before they made presbyters under them, and so denyeth all succession by denying the roor.

C H A P. 5. What they mean by TRADITION.

Sect. 1. He thinks the Tradition of all the world may be known by every Christian; as easily as the Tradition of the Canonical Scripture. Sect. 2.

Tradition against Popery. Sect. 4. The Protestants, Abasines, Armenians, Greeks, &c. are of one Church. Sect. 4. The contradictions of W. J. The unity of all other Christians, as such, greater than the unity of Papists as Papists, Sect. 5.

C H A P. 6. What they mean by a General COUNCIL.

His definition of a general Council is no definition. Sect. 2. Councils of old not called by

The Contents.

by the Pope, Sect. 3. His confusion and contradictions. Sect. 4. General Councils were but of the Empire, proved. Sect. 5. The impossibility and utter unlawfulness of a true universal Council of the whole Christian world, proved. Sect. 6. How many make an universal Council. Sect. 7. They make presbyters incapable of voting in councils, and yet the highest ancient part of the Papacy (viz. to preside in councils) is oft deputed to presbyters, Sect. 8. The council of Basil that had presbyters rejected by them for other reasons. Sect. 9.

CHAP. 7. What they mean by SCHISM.

Papists acquit all from schism who separate not from the Whole visible Church of Christ, Sect. 1. We separated not from the Greeks, Arminians, &c. Sect. 3. He absurdly requireth that we should have our Mission and Jurisdiction from them, if we have communion with them, Sect. 4. We have the same faith with them, Sect. 5. How far we separate from Rome, Sect. 6. They were not our lawful pastors, Sect. 7. Of hearing the pharises, Sect. 8. We infer not Rebellion against Authority by our rejecting traiterous Usurpers, Sect. 9. Whether the first Reformers knowingly and wilfully separated from the whole Church on earth, Sect. 10. He pretendeth that the Churches unity is perfect, and therefore that it is impossible there should be any schism in it, but only from it, when their own sect had a schisme by divers Popes for forty years. Whether all that followed the wrong Pope those forty years were out of the Church and damned, Sect. 11. His definition of schism agreeth best to the Papists, who separate from all the Church save their own sect, Sect. 12. An admonition to others, Sect. 13. My Reasons unanswered by which I proved. 1. That we interrupted not our Church succession when we broke off from Rome. 2. That the Roman Church is changed in Essentials.

PART. II.

The PREFACE.

ALL was not well said or done by every Bishop, or Council of old, Sect. 1, 2, 3. Of the considerableness of the extra-Imperial Churches of old. Sect. 4. 5. The plea of Peters supremacy, and their succession, overthrown: There never were twelve Patriarchal seats as the successors of the twelve Apostles. No one Patriarch claimed to be an Apostles successor but Rome and Antioch, and Antioch never claimed supremacy on that account, Sect. 6. The true state of the controversy about the Churches perpetual visibility, Sect. 7. Papists make Christians no Christians, for not obeying the Pope, and no Christians to be Christians if they will be his subjects, Sect. 8, 9. What I maintain, Sect. 10. A discourse republished proving that Christs Church hath no Universal Head but himself, (Pope nor Council)

CHAP. 1. The Confutation of W. J's Reply.

Twelve instances confuting the wild fundamental principle of W. J. that [whatever hath been ever in the Church by Christs institution, is essential to it] Sect. 4.

The Contents.

By this he unchurcheth Rome, Sect. 5. He saith that every such thing is essential to the Church, but not to every member of the Church, but to such as have sufficient proposal, confuted, Sect. 6. By this their Church cannot be known, or the faith of a few may make others Christians, Sect. 7. His assertion further confuted, Sect. 8. His Logical proof [shamed [that every accident is separable] and therefore all that Christ instituted to continue is no accident, Sect. 9. Whether the belief of every institution for continuance, be essential to the Church, Sect. 10. They unchurch themselves, Sect. 11. He acknowledgeth that all Christian Nations are not bound to believe the Popes supremacy expressly, but implicitly in subjecting themselves to them that Christ hath instituted to be their lawful pastors. Five notable consequents of this: The true method of believing, Sect. 12. The instance of the conversion of the Iberians and Indians vindicated. He supposeth that every revealed truth was taught them by lay-persons, Sect. 13. The instance of Peters not preaching his own supremacy, Act. 2. vindicated, Sect. 14. The Indians converted by the English and Dutch are taught the true faith, Sect. 15. And so are the Abassines, Sect. 16. His Doctrine against Christs visible reign, containeth many gross errors commonly called Heresies. And by making the Christian world a Monster if it have not one Papal Head, he maketh the humane world a Monster because it hath not one humane King. Sect. 17.

CHAP. 2. Our Churches visibility confessed.

Theirs to be by them proved. How far any Protestants grant the power of Patriarchs, and the Pope as Patriarch, Sect. 1. He biddeth me but prove that any Church which now denieth the Popes Sovereignty hath been always visible, and he is satisfied, whether that Church always denied it or not, Sect. 2. Notes hereon. Whether they should exclaim against Christ as an invisible Head, who make him as visible in the Eucharist to every receiver, as a King is in his clothes, Sect. 3. Whether a Ministry be essential to the universal Church, Sect. 4. His Argument against our Christianity re-examined, and confuted by divers instances of such fallacies, Sect. 5. He requirerh an instance of any Church-Unity, though without a humane head: which endeth the controversy, Sect. 6. More differences and greater amongst Papists than among all the other Churches, Sect. 7. He hath no evasion, but saying that these Churches are not Christians (because they depend not on the Pope) from which he before said that he abstracted, Sect. 8. He denieth us (with the Abassines, Greeks, Armenians, &c.) to have been of the Church, and of one Church, both fully proved, Sect. 9. The charge of Nestorianism and Eutichianism on many Churches, examined, Sect. 10. His shameful calling for the names of sects, and requiring proof of the Negative, that they are not such, Sect. 11.

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. 3. More of our Unity.

Of the speech of Celestines Legat at Ephesus, Sect. 1, 2. His saying and unsaying, Sect. 3. His instances of Goths, Danes, Swedes, examined, Sect. 4, 5. Whether extra Imperial Churches were under the Pope, Sect. 5. In what cases some were, and which. His pretence to the Indians, Armenians, and Persians, examined, Sect. 6. The Tradition of these Churches is against Popery, Sect. 7. His notorious fictions about the subjection of the Indians, Armenians, and Abassines, to Rome, Sect. 9. 10. Of Pisanus, Arabick, Nicene Canons, Sect. 11. He intended to write a Treatise to prove that extraneous Bishops were at the Councils: But that put-off goeth for an answer, Sect. 12. He confesseth that the very Gallicane and Spanish Liturgies mention not the Popes Sovereignty, no more than the Ethiopick, Sect. 13. When Constantine intreated the King of Persia for the Churches there, the Pope did not command there, Sect. 14. Whether before Gregory's Mission, the British Church was ever subject to the Pope, or heretical, Sect. 15. Reynerius words vindicated, viz. [The Churches of the Armenians, Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of Rome. Sect. 16. The 28 Can. of the Council of Calcedon vindicated, which declareth the Pope to be but the first Patriarch in the Empire, by humane right, for the sake of the Imperial City, Sect. 17, 18, 19, 20. His brave attempt to prove that extra-Imperial Bishops were summoned to the Councils, At Nice of John Persidis, Armenians, Gothia, At Ephes. 1. Thebamon Bishop of Coptus, Sect. 21, 22. His other citations confuted, Sect. 23. Of Eusebius his circular Letter, Sect. 24.

CHAP. 4. The Emperors and not the Pope called the old Councils, Sect. 1.

Myraus his Notitia Episcopat against him, Sect. 2. Of the authority over the barbarous given, Con. Calced. c. 28. Proof that the Papal power was held to be but jure humano, Sect. 5. He was over but one Empire, Sect. 6. No councils but of one Empire. Prosper's testimony examined, & caput mundi expounded, Sect. 7. Pope Leo's words examined, Sect. 8, 9. The Decretal Epistles shew the Popes ruled not the world, Sect. 10. More of Ethiopia and Pisanus's Canons, Sect. 11.

CHAP. 5. The Case repeated. The uselessness of his Testimonies therein.

CHAP.

The Contents.

CHAP. 6. The Vanity of his proofs that Councils were called General as to all the world, and not only to the Empire. From the words [*totius orbis*] from the end, the peace of the World: and the rest, Sect. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7.

His Question answered, what Hereticks are Christians, Sect. 8, 9, 10, 11. He saith that no Heretick believeth for the authority of God revealing; and so acquitteth all that do but believe that God is true, which is all that believe indeed that there is a God, Sect. 12.

Of sufficiency of proposal of truths. It is not equal. He absolveth Hereticks. And maketh Hereticks of the Papists, Sect. 13, 14, 15.

Whether the Papists and Protestants are one Church. Whether the Pope and Christ are two heads. Whether a King that saith God hath made me the Vice-god of all the earth, set not up a policy distinct from Gods, Sect. 16.

One called a Papist may be a Christian, and another not, Sect. 17, 18.

CHAP. 7. Whether we separate from the Church, as the old Hereticks did, Sect. 1.

Whether we separate from other Churches as we do from the Papal, Sect. 2. Arrians separate from the Church as Christian, Sect. 3. Why they call us Schismatics, Sect. 4. 5. Papists agree not whether Hereticks are in the Church, Sect. 6. What we hold herein, Sect. 6. His absurd answer, Sect. 7. Whether every man deny Christs veracity who receiveth not every truth sufficiently proposed, Sect. 8, 9.

He maketh it a grand novelty of mine, to say that there may be divisions in the Church, and not from the Church, because the Church is a most perfect unity. The shame of this charge, Sect. 10, 11.

His charge of Eutychianisme on the Abassines, &c. Sect. 12. Of self-conceited hereticating wits, Sect. 12.

Whether the Abassines confess themselves Eutichianes, Sect. 14.

Of the Greek Churches rejecting us, Sect. 16.

The Greek Church claimed not Sovereignty over all the world, but in the Empire Sect. 17, 18, 19.

Whether every child, subject, or neighbour, must judge Hereticks, and avoid them unsentenced, Sect. 20.

His false answer to the testimony of their own writers, that free the Greeks from heresy, Sect. 21.

The witnesses of the Council of Florence, That the Greeks meant Orthodoxy, Sect. 23. Nilus testimony vindicated, Sect. 24. Our unity with Greeks and others, Sect. 25.

A notable passage of Meletius Patriarch of Alexandria and Constantinople for the sole Headship of Christ, and the Popes usurpation, novelties, and forsaking tradition, which (with Cyrils testimony) W. J. passed over, Sect. 26.

The

The Answer to W. J's second part of his Reply.

Sect. 1. *Sufficient answers to all his citations pretermitted in terms.*

Sect. 2. *Because I cite a Patriarch and Councils excommunicating a Pope by the Emperor Theodosius countenance, he saith, I plead for Rebellion.*

Sect. 4. *His instances of the Popes extraneous power confuted.*

Sect. 5. *His particular proofs (before promised in a special Tract) examined. 1. His error of Theophilus Gothice, Sect. 6. 2. Of Domnus Bospori his gross error,*

Sect. 7. 3. Of Joh. Perfidis, Sect. 8. 4. Of Bishops of Scythia, Sect. 9. 5. Of Etherius Anchialensis (for Sebastianus), Sect. 10. 6. Of Phæbannon Copti.

Sect. 11. 7. Of Theodulus Eulæ (so falsely called), Sect. 12. 8. Of Theodorus Gadarorum, Sect. 13. 9. Of Antipater Bosporum, Sect. 14. 10. Of Olympius Scythopoleos, Sect. 15. 11. Of Eusebius Gentis Saracenorum,

Sect. 16. 12. Constantinus Bosporum, Sect. 17. 13. One pro Glaco Geratæ. All shew his gross ignorance of the Bishopricks of the Empire.

Sect. 19. *The Nestorians Epistle at the Council Ephes. to Callimores Rex, expounded. Sect. 20, 21. Remarks upon passages in the first Ephesine Council.*

Sect. 22. *Remarks of the Council of Calcedon.*

Sect. 23. *Of the Titles, Caput Mundi, Mater omnium Ecclesiarum, Primatus Apostolicus, &c. given to Antioch and Jerusalem.*

Sect. 24. *Binnius confession, that at Conc. Conf. 1. The Pope presided not, per se vel per Legatos.*

Sect. 25. *His assertion, that the Councils pretended to jurisdiction over the Church through all the World, examined.*

Sect. 26. *The vanity of his first proof. Sect. 27, 28. Of his second and third. More Notes of the Council. Calced. Sect. 29. His fourth instance confuted. Sect. 30.*

His fifth confuted. Sect. 31. His sixth confuted. Sect. 32. His last instance vain.

Sect. 33. *He could not disprove the Roman Church from being really two Churches (named one) as having two supreme Heads.*

Sect. 34. *I could not intreat him by any provocation, to prove the continued visibility of the Church as Papal.*

PART. III.

A Defence of my Arguments, for our continued visibility.

Sect. 1. *Whether all Believers are Christians.*

Sect. 2. *The vanity of his next Cavil against my definition.*

Sect. 3. *My definition of Protestants vindicated.*

Sect. 4. *One may have communion with faulty Churches.*

Sect. 5. *His shameful reformation of Syllogisms, and pretence of Logical form.*

Sect. 6. *He denieth Protestants to be of the Church of Christ. I prove it. His silly cavils at the form of the Argument.*

Sect.

The Contents.

- SECT. 7. *Protestants profess all the Essentials of Christianity. Proved. His cavils shamed.*
- SECT. 8. *His oft repeated Reason confuted, of not receiving the Churches expositions.*
- SECT. 9. *The novelty and discord of Popery. The confusions in Councils.*
- SECT. 10. *My second Argument to prove, that we hold all essentials: The Popish faith explained.*
- SECT. 12. *My third Argument, Creed and Scriptures are with them too little; and yet, an insufficient proposal makes Christianity itself unnecessary.*
- SECT. 12. *He giveth up his Cause, confessing the sufficiency of our explicate belief.*
- SECT. 13. *My fourth Argument, His ridiculous denying, that to deny the minor, is to deny the antecedent.*
- SECT. 14. *The minor proved: All Protestants, as such, profess to love God: Ergo, sincere Protestants do love him. What miracles believing in the Pope doth.*
- SECT. 15. *He had no way to deny that Protestants profess true faith, but by his impudent denying, 1. That we profess to love God. 2. And that we feel that we do love him.*
- SECT. 20. *My second Argument, to prove the perpetual visibility of our Church; confoundeth him.*
- SECT. 21. *Scripture sufficiency.*
- SECT. 22. *My third Argument, and his shameful Answer.*
- SECT. 25. *My fourth Argument proveth the visibility of our Church, not only as Christian, but as without Popery. Ten sub-arguments for that, 1. From the twentieth Canon of Conc. Calced. 2. From the silence of the old Writers against Heretics.*
- SECT. 28. 3. *From Tradition proved. 4. From Churches never subject to Rome. His citations briefly confuted.*
- SECT. 30. 5. *From the non-subjection, even of the Imperial Churches.*
- SECT. 32. 6. *From Gregory the first's testimony.*
- SECT. 31. 7. *From their confessions, An. Silvius, Reynierius, Canus, Binnius, vindicated.*
- SECT. 38. 8. *Phocas giving the Primacy to Boniface. SECT. 39. 9. Their Liturgy new.*
- SECT. 40. *Twelve instances of new Articles of the Popish Faith, which he durst not Answer.*
- SECT. 42. *The tenth Argument, he yieldeth the cause in sense.*
- SECT. 43. *Notable testimonies unanswered.*
- SECT. 44. *Papists differ de fide.*
- SECT. 47. *What Hereticks are, or are not in the Church; fully opened: His shameful exclaiming against me for distinguishing.*
- SECT. 48. *Fifty six of Philastrius Hereticks, named, many being small matters, and many notorious certain truths.*
- SECT. 49. *The woful work of Hereticizing Councils.*
- SECT. 50. *Councils hereticated Popes and one another: Almost all the Christian world hereticate one another.*
- SECT. 55. *His reason answered for unchurching all Hereticks.*
- SECT. 60. *Their Doctrine of sufficient proposal fullier confuted, and their hereticizing and unchurching themselves, evinced.*

Mr.

[1]

Mr. Johnson's (alias Terret's) Explication of seven Terms of our Questions examined, and his confusion manifested.

C H A P. I.

Question 1.



WHAT mean you by the Catholick Church?

W. J. The Catholick Church is all those Visible Assemblies, Congregations or Communities of Christians, who live in unity of true faith, and external Communion with one another, and in dependance of their lawful Pastors.

R. B. Qu. 1. Whether you exclude not all those converted among Infidels, that never had external communion, nor were members of any particular visible Church, of which you make the Catholick to be constituted.

W. J. It is sufficient that such be subject to the supreme Pastors in voto, or quantum in se est, resolved to be of that particular Church actually, which shall or may be designed for them by that Pastor, to be included in my definition.

R. B. You see then that your definitions signifie nothing: No man knoweth your meaning by them.

W. J. You shall presently see that your Exceptions signifie less than nothing.

R. B. 1. You make the Catholick Church to consist only of visible Assemblies; and after you allow such to be members of the Church, that are no visible Assemblies.

W. J. I make those converted Infidels visible Assemblies, as my definition speaks, though not actual members of any particular visible Church. For though every particular visible Church be an assembly of Christians, yet every assembly of Christians is not a particular visible Church. I do not therefore allow such to be of the Church, who are no visible assemblies, as you mis-conceive.

R. B. 1. Would any man have understood that by [Visible Assemblies] the man had not meant only [Churches] but also Families, Schools, Cities, &c? 2. Doth he not here expressly deny all those persons to be of the Church, who are not members of some other visible assemblies? And if a man be a Pilgrim, a Hermite, or if one or many be cast upon an uninhabited coast, and if any are members of no visible assembly, as Merchants, Embassadors to Infidels, &c. when will he prove that this unchristianeth or unchurcheth them?

R. B. 2. You now mention subjection to the supreme Pastor, as sufficient, which in your description or definition you did not.

W. J. Am I obliged to mention all things in my definition, which I express after in answering your Exceptions.

Ans. All that belongs to a notifying definition.

B

R. B.

R. B. 3. If to be only in *Viso* resolved to be of a particular Church, will serve; then inexistence is not necessary: To be only in *Viso* of the Catholick Church, proveth no man a member of it, because it is *terminus diminuentis*, but the contrary. Seeing then by your own confession, inexistence in a particular Church, is not of necessity to inexistence in the Catholick Church, why do you not only mention it in your definition, but confine the Church to it?

W. J. I make them actually inexistent in some visible assembly, according to my definition, and in *Viso* only in a particular Church. Now every particular family or neighbourhood, may two or three gathered in prayer, is an actual assembly.

R. B. Strange Doctrine! so it is of necessity to our Christianity and Salvation, that we be members of a Christian City or Village, or Fair or Market, or some Meeting! And so all Christians that live solitarily in Wildernesses, or among *Turks* or Heathens, are all unchristened and damned.

W. J. St. Hierome saith, *Ecclesia est plebs unita Episcopo*.---In this consists your fallacy, that you esteem none to be actually members of the Universal Church, unless they be actual members of some particular Church, which I deny.

R. B. I thought verily it had been I that was denying it, all this while. This is disputing in the dark. Will you say that you meant in *Viso*? who can understand you then, when you say, They must be of visible assemblies, and mean that they need not be of any, but with they were, or purpose to be so.

W. J. It is sufficient if they be actually of some assembly or congregation of Christians, though it be no particular Church.

R. B. 1. Here is a new Exposition of Solomon's *Pe soli, wo* to him that is alone; for he is unchristened by it, or unchurch'd. O poor Anchorites, Hermits, that are alone, and shipwreck Christians, &c. 2. Here is a new-found priviledg of having company, if in a Tavern or Alehouse; and of being married and in a family; such may be Christians, when the solitary cannot. Who would have thought that the Papists had held this!

But you say nothing to the case of them that are converted to Christ by a solitary Preacher, that never tells him of a supreme Pastor, as the English and Dutch convert many Indians: Can they be subject to him that they hear not of?

W. J. Whether to be nam'd or no, the Church must be supposed to be sufficiently explicated to them, as having some prudent manner of Government; so that they must be instructed to render obedience to such Governments as Christ instituted in his Church, which is virtually to a chief Pastor.

R. B. 1. So they that take the Pope, for Antichrist, may virtually be Papists: Be content with that virtue. 2. But I think that even that general belief of Pastoral Government is necessary *ad bene esse*, rather than *ad esse* of a Christian.

R. B. 1. I note by the way to be hereafter remembered, his description of a particular Church as given by Hierome, that it is *Plebs unita Episcopo*; and Cyprian saith, *Ubi Episcopus ibi Ecclesia*. And Ignatius, To every Church there is one Altar, and one Bishop, with the Presbyters and Deacons. But by this Rule they make those that are now called *Presbytery-Churches*, to be no Churches, but only parts of a particular Church.

2. Note, that in his Definition he maketh living in external communion essential to those Congregations or Communities of Christians who make up the Catholick Church; but tells us not whether it must be a Civil or only a Religious Communion; or what Religious Communions besides unity of faith and dependance on Pastors it must be: If by those words, pag. 3. every particular family or neighbourhood, he expects that external communion, then if their Pastors never give them Gods Word, Sacraments, or Prayer, it may serve.

3. He saith, p. 4. In this consists your fallacy, that you esteem none to be actual members of the universal Church, unless they be actual members of some particular Church, which I deny. Which is his meer fiction, of which I was so far from giving him any occasion, that I was

Self. 2.

charging it as an error on himself; reasonably supposing that by *Visible Assemblies* he had meant Churches.

4. Note that he maketh it essential to the members of the Catholick Church, that they depend on their lawful Pastors, and yet that it is but a virtual subjection to the Pope (by subjecting themselves to Christs manner of Government) which is essential. 1. Are not all Protestants and other Christians that own not the Pope, true members of the Church then, while they subject themselves in general to Christs manner of Government? 2. He subjecteth himself to no Governor, who doth it not to some existent individual: For the universal, existeth not but in the individuals. And if it be not necessary that the Pope be this individual then subjection to some other is more essential than to the Pope. And who is that who must be preferred before him?

Q. 2. What is that Faith in unity whereof all members of the Catholick Church do live? Is it the belief of all that God hath revealed to be believed? or of part? and of what part?

W. J. Of all, either explicitly or implicitly.

R. B. He might easily have known that it is explicit belief which the question meant; for his implicit belief is the actual belief of nothing but the general, and not of any unknown particulars. Where there is no object in *esse cognito vel percepto*, there is no act of faith (for the object essentialteth the act in *specie*). And where only the general object is perceived, and no particular, (e.g. All that God saith in Scripture is true, when one word of Scripture is not known) there is no object for a particular belief: But it is the belief of this or that in particular that we enquire of (e.g. that Jesus is the Christ, &c.) Your implicit belief is actual belief of the general; or, but of particulars it is actually none at all, as common reason tells us.

His reply to this I shall answer by parts in order.

R. B. We have here a most implicit account of the implicit faith which is essential to a Church-member. The man would make the ignorant believe, that their Schools are agreed of the sense, when he might easily know the contrary. I mentioned different senses of implicit faith. 1. When Particulars are known and believed actually, but confessedly, and not distinctly, but in gross. So Dr. Holden in *Analys. fid.* seemeth to take it: so the parts are seen or known oft in the whole; so a purblind man seeth all the letters, men, trees, &c. before him. I see all the sand in the hour-glass, or much; but not distinctly the sand from another. This is a real knowledge of the very things; but an imperfect knowledge. 2. But besides this, there is a knowledge of things only in their general nature, which is a real knowledge, but partial and imperfect. As when I see something coming towards me afar off, and know not whether it be a man or a beast, I say it is an animal or a weight; but what, I know not. This is not to know the thing formally, but to know *aliquid rei*, somewhat of that thing.

3. There is also a knowledge which besides the general nature, extendeth to some inadequate conception of the form, but leaveth out other parts of the conception which are essential. As when one knoweth so much of a man as that he hath a rational soul, and not that he hath a body; or that his soul is a *virtus intellectualis*, but not that it is *volitiva*; or when one knoweth that fire is formally a *virtus illuminativa*, but not that it is *calcfativa* or *motiva*. This is a real knowledge, but partial, and not formal, being not of the whole essence. So when one knoweth Christ to be God, but not to be man, or man and not God, or to be a Teacher, but not a King or Priest; this is not properly to know Christ, but somewhat of Christ.

4. There is a knowledge of meer universal Propositions, (which is but *Organical* as to things;) And this is no knowledge of all the particular things spoken of, nor oft of many, nor sometimes of any of them; nor of the particular Propositions which should be further known; nor of the conclusion that should be infer'd from both. For instance, Men may say that *Omnia spiritalia sunt immaterialia*. And one may mean and know by it, but as the Sadducees, or Hobbs, or Gassendus, that a spirit is a chimera, & si daretur spiritus, immaterialis foret. And another may doubt and mean, si deus spiritus, immaterialis est. And another may hold that there is no spirit but God, and the *Anima Mundi*, and say that these are immaterial, and never the more believe

Self. 3.

believe that *Angels or Souls are spirits*; And no man can reasonably imagine, that *omnis spiritus est immaterialis*; doth include *omnis anima est spiritus*; or that *W. J's est spiritus immaterialis*.

So one may say, that all that are sanctified shall be glorified; and yet not believe that *Peter, Paul, yea, or Christ* were Holy: of this sort of knowledge I mentioned that which is a belief of no more but the formal object of Faith, that is, *Gods veracity*, that *God cannot lye*; and so, that all that *God faith is true*: when yet one that confesseth this, denieth all the Bible to be his Word, and believeth rather *Mahomet, Amida, or Confucius* to have been Gods Messengers, or the ancient Oracles at *Delpbos, &c.* to have been his word.

But the confused Head of *W. J.* confoundeth several of these different sorts; and because he thought that he might handfomly call a meer general knowledge, or faith, confused; therefore he confoundeth the true confused faith with the general, which are easily distinguished.

And first he calls for my proof, That a meer general belief, is no belief at all of the particulars; (though a confused faith may) I prove it.

1. Where there is no intellectual conception of the particulars, there is no actual belief of the particulars: But where there is only a conception of a general proposition, there is no intellectual conception of the particulars: *Ergo, &c.* the major is undeniable, and the minor no less.

2. Where the particular Object is not understood or believed, there is not the particular Act of knowing or believing that Object; for the Object is essential to the Act: But where there is only a knowledge and belief of the general Object, there the particular Object is not understood or believed. *Ergo, &c.*

3. That is not an actual belief of the particulars, which may consist with the actual belief of the contradictory: But a meer belief of the General Proposition may consist in the contradictory to the belief of particulars. *Ergo, &c.*

But he comes upon me with some instances for worded, as may deceive the ignorant.

1. Saith he, *Doth not this Proposition, Omne animal vivit, contain the substance of these truths, Equus vivit, Leo vivit, Aquila vivit, &c?*

Ans. No surely, unless by substance, you mean not the other Proposition, but something else, what you list; for it containeth not the very subject, that there is such a thing as *Equus, Leo, Aquila* in being, and that they are *animalia*. May not a man that never heard or believed that there was such a creature as an *Eagle, Lion, &c.* (no more than a *Unicorn* or *Phoenix*) yet know that *omne animal vivit*?

2. He saith, *Believing all that is in Scripture is the Word of God, and true expressly, I believe, in confuso, all that is in Genesis, &c.*

Ans. Yes, if (in confuso) be terminus diminuens to actual belief of the particulars: By meer believing the first, you do not actually believe a word of *Genesis* or *Exodus, &c.* for your Proposition saith not that there is any such Book in the Scripture: As I believe all the holy Scripture to be true, and yet believe not *Tobit, Judith, Bell and the Dragon* to be true, because I believe them not to be the Holy Scriptures; so may others by *Genesis, Exodus, &c.* as the Hereticks of old denied many Books: and as Infidels may believe all that is Gods Word to be true, and yet not believe that the Scripture is his Word.

3. Saith he, *Is not an express knowledge of the Genus, a confused knowledge of species under it: and so the species of the individua?*

Ans. Yes, if by confused knowledge, you mean no knowledge of them, it is no true knowledge of them at all.

4. But he saith that my words (not knowing whether you be Animal or Cadaver) is a contradictory Proposition.

Ans. Say you so? May not I see you asleep, and think that you are dead? Doth this Proposition, *Omne animal vivit*, include that there is such a *Wight* in being, as *W. J.* or

N. N.

N. N.? or that he is now alive? or that it is really a *Man* and not a *Horse* that is so called, any more than that *Bucephalus* was a *Man*? Yet doth he back these absurdities with advising me to a little more heed to what I write?

Note that page 9, he asserteth that, The object of implicate faith delivered in the Schools, is nothing save particular truths contained in substance under some general propositions; so that they be neither known nor believed distinctly and expressly; yet in confuso they are, by the knowledge or belief of their general proposition.

Ans. But there is a confused knowledge of particulars which is actual, of the being of them, though not distinct, not fit or ripe for words to utter it: This is different from the knowledge of meer Generals; which is indeed no knowledge of the particulars, that any such are contained in those generals at all.

He next comes to expound his words, That faith believeth all that God revealeth explicitly or implicitly; that is now some things explicitly, and some things implicitly; when as I asked him, *What was the faith in which we must unite?* who would have expected such an answer, That it is a general belief of all things revealed, and a particular belief of some things? That it is such a belief of all particulars, as is no real actual belief of some of them; and it is an actual belief of other some? But is any man ever the nearer the knowledge of their minds by this?

1. Here is no notice what the General is that must be believed: He professeth that it is not the formal object only, that is, *The veracity, or faithfulness of God the Revealer*: And what else it is whether that all that the Scripture revealeth is true, or that all that the Church declareth to be Gods word is true; and whom we must take for that Church, &c. he hath not told us; and so hath given an answer which is no answer.

2. Nor hath he told us what the Particulars are that must be believed: But we may know what faith it is that the Church must unite in, by hearing that it is something we know not what; or that it is somewhat in general, and somewhat in particular: Doth this account satisfy themselves? or do they look that it should satisfy us? Will this distinguish their Church from Hereticks or Mahometans? Do not these believe somewhat in general, and somewhat in particular? And do not Heathens do the same? If this be enough for Christianity or Concord, why do they call us Hereticks? Are we not all of that Faith which believeth somewhat in general (even that all Gods Word is true) and somewhat in Particular? But it's well that he saith, that the explicate belief of somewhat is necessary, though we may not know what.

And he tells us, That while they have an explicate belief of some Articles they can never be thought to be without faith.

Ans. Either he meaneth that faith which was in the question, which must unite us from Hereticks and from others without, and which the Church must unite in, or some other faith: If any other, doth he not wilfully juggle, and fly from answering when he pretends to answer? If he means the faith in question, then Mahometans and Heathens are of their Faith, and Members of their Church; yea, and all that they call Hereticks, and anathematize themselves; yea, and the Devils that believe and tremble.

But one would think, that, pag. 11, he described the necessary implicate Faith: when he saith, *Our ordinary sense is, so to believe that point, that we have no distinct or express knowledge of it, but only a confused understanding; because it is contained, in confuso, under this proposition, I believe all that God hath revealed: or I believe all that is delivered to be believed in the Holy Scripture.*

Ans. 1. But I must again repeat, that here the word, confused, is used but to confound: This is no actual belief of any particular under that proposition. When a thing is actually known in itself, but only by a General knowledge, or not distinct, this is truly an imperfect knowledge; it is to know somewhat of that thing, though not its form or individuation: If I see something, which I know not whether it be a *Man* or a *Tree*, a *Steeple* or a *Rock*; I verily know somewhat of that thing in itself, but not the form of it.

18

If I see a Book open at two-yards distance, I see the Letters distinctly, but not formally; for I know not what any one of them is. If I see a clod of Earth, or a River, I see much of the very substance of the earth and water; but I discern not the sands or the drops as distinct parts: Here something is known, though the special or numerical difference (much more some accidents) be unknown. But in knowing W, J's general proposition only, I know nothing at all of the particulars, as shall yet be further manifested.

Self. 7. 2. And mark what his general Proposition is, which, he saith, is the object of their Implicite faith, viz. I believe all that God hath revealed, or, all that is delivered to be believed in the Holy Scriptures. Either he really meaneth that this is the implicite faith by which Christians are notified, and which uniteeth the Members of the Church, and distinguisheth them from those without; or he doth not: If he do not, what doth he but deceive his Reader? If he do, then as I said, All Christians, Hereticks, most Mahometans and Heathens, believe the first proposition, viz. That all is true that God revealeth. And Protestants and Papists, and most other sorts of Christians agree in the second, The Scripture-truth. Here then is a justification of our Faith so far. But do you think that he meaneth as he seemeth to mean? Do they not hold it also necessary, that men must take their Church to be the declarer of this Scripture-truth? And also that Tradition not written in the Bible be believed? Must not both these make up their Implicite Faith? If our general Faith and theirs be the same, what maketh them accuse us herein as they do?

Self. 8. But now, pag. 11. he proceeds to assault me, with such reasoning as this: No man knoweth all that God hath revealed, to wit, with an actual understanding of every particular: Ergo say I, No man believes all that God hath revealed. Now I proceed, If no man believe all that God hath revealed, then you believe not all that God hath revealed. Then further, whoever believeth not all that God hath revealed, is no good Christian, nor in state of salvation: But you believe not all that God hath revealed. Ergo, you are no good Christian, nor in a state of salvation. See you not how fair a thread you have spun? Or will you say, that he that believeth not all that God hath revealed is a good Christian? If you will, you may; but no good Christian will believe you.

Ans. The man seemeth in good sadness in all this Childish Play; And must Rome be thus upheld? And must poor mens Faith and Consciences be thus laid upon a game at Cheating Words? No wonder that this Hector would have nothing said in dispute but syllogism, &c. Few Lads and Women would unmask his pitiful deceits; whether the great disputer saw their vanity himself I know not: But men at age, that can speak and try sense, will see, that all this Cant is but the sporting-equivocation of one syllable ALL: This ALL is either a term of a meer general proposition: e. g. All Gods word is true. Here I believe what is predicated of this general word ALL; and take this for a true proposition, ALL Gods word is true: Or it signifieth the very things, species, or parts, as in themselves known; and so if the very things, species, or parts generally expressed by the word ALL, be not themselves known as such things, species, or parts, it is no actual knowledge of them at all, to know that truth of the said general proposition. And doth not every novice in Logic know this? The same I say of Beliefs as of Knowledge; He is no good Christian, who believeth not that all Divine Revelations are true (which Hereticks and Heathens believe) But neither I, nor any Christian known to him or me, knoweth or believeth ALL the particular verities which God hath revealed: And he believeth not one of them (beside that proposition it self which is found among the rest) who believeth but that general.

Self. 9. But yet he will justify his vanity by more instances: pag. 12, he saith, When you profess in the Creed, that God is the Creator of all things visible and invisible, I demand, Do you believe as you profess? If you do, then you may believe with an actual belief, that he is the Creator of many things visible and invisible, whereof you have no actual understanding, or which are

vobolly

vobolly unknown particularly; or distinctly to you, or by any other knowledge, than as confessedly contained in the word ALL.

Ans. 1. What's all this, but to say, that I believe this proposition, All things, of which many are unknown to me, are created by God? This proposition I know and believe; but the things themselves as such, I no further believe than I know: if I know not that they are, I believe not that they are: if I know not what they are, I believe not what they are; that is, if I have not an intellectual conception That they are, and what they are: for believing is indeed but a knowing by the medium of a Testimony or Revelation, and the veracity of the Revealer.

I believe that God made all that is about the Center of the earth; and yet I neither know nor actually believe any one thing, species, or individual or part that is there. If the question be, whether there be there fire, water, air, earth, gold, silver, or men or devils, created by God? I neither know nor believe that there is, or is not.

A Sadducee or an Atheist may believe, That all that is in heaven is good: Is this an implicit actual belief, that God, Angels, and Spirits are good, when he believeth not that in heaven or any-where else, there is any God, or any Angel, or Spirit?

A Protestant believeth, that he can prove by the Bible, that the Pope is a Traytor against Christ by claiming his prerogative. Doth he also believe, that he is Christs Vicar-General, because he believeth that the Bible is true?

Protestants believe that all Tradition is true which really cometh down to us from Christ and his Apostles by credible evidence; Doth it follow that they believe the Papijs Traditions to be true, when they believe multitudes of them to be novelties or fictions contrary to Scripture, and to the Tradition of the greatest part of the Church?

The Papist woman mentioned by Dr. white, believed the Creed; but she knew and believed no more of Jesus Christ, but that it was some good thing (she knew not what) or else it would not have been in the Creed.

But he goeth on: You profess to believe that All men shall rise at the last coming of Christ; and yet you have no actual knowledge of many thousands.

Ans. And what then? If I know not that those thousands had a being, and were men, I cannot know or believe that they shall rise; notwithstanding I believe, that All shall rise; and if the question be, whether this, or that, or thousands that you may name, shall rise, I know not, because I know not whether you feign not men that never were. If any were so foolish as not to know that there ever were more men in the world than he hath seen, he cannot believe that any more shall rise; and yet may believe that All shall rise; not all in true reality, as signifying the whole that hath existed indeed; but all as the subject-term in the proposition. When I say all shall rise, I do not only say that I believe that proposition; but I know many individuals contained in the whole; and I know that there are more than I personally know, and that there have been more than I have heard of; and by the word All I mean all these particulars inclusively; and so the word being a General expressing A Totum, some of whose parts I have known by sight, and others by history, and I know that other parts have been, but some parts I know not at all that they have been, accordingly my belief is according to the object, partly singular, partly particular, partly indefinite, and partly universal.

He proceeds: All. 2. 4. 5. 14. Credeus omnibus quae in Lege & Prophetis scripta sunt: Yet Paul had not an actual understanding of every particular contained in them.

Ans. Then he had not an actual belief of those particulars. He believed in general, that all Gods word was true; and he believed all in particular which he knew to be part of that word: But when he thought that he ought to do many things against the Name of Jesus, and persecuted and blasphemed him; had he then an actual belief that This Jesus was the Messiah?

He addeth: A Christian that hath forgotten some sin, yet as death is sorrowful for all his sins; Hath he no actual sorrow for that forgotten sin?

Answer, No: if he have no actual understanding of it. There were some that Christ foretold they would think that they did God service by killing his servants: Do you think that if these repented of all sin in general, and took this for a duty, that this were an actual repentance?

ance

ance for this sin? Nay, is a *meer general repentance*, any *actual repentance* at all, if it extend to no particulars? If a man say, *I repent of all my sin*, but I think I have no sin, but my bearing, praying, being a *Christian*, &c. doth he *actually* repent of any? And as to your instance, if you do but *forget* a sin, it implieth that you did *once* remember it, and perhaps repented of it then; but if you *know* not or remember not that *ever* you committed any such thing, or that it is any sin, you have no *actual repentance* of that sin.

Señ. 10.

O but faith he, *What horrid Doctrine would this be?*

Ans. What a childish exclamation is this! It's ten to one but if you were well examined your self, you would confess that all this quarrel is but *de nomine*. You confess that here is no *particular repentance* or *faith* of the thing in question; nor are universals as containing the particulars known confusedly in themselves; but with the bare name of an *actual knowledge* of Particulars, you would cheat them that have only the knowledge of the universal Proposition. That you may see it is no horrid Doctrine, consider, that 1. If this *general repentance* have also joined a particular repentance of all such sin as must be to repented of, of necessity, to Salvation, then a *virtual repentance* of other forgotten particular sins, will prove sufficient to pardon and salvation. A *general repentance* which hath an actual hatred of sin as sin, and a habit inclining the person unfeignedly to repent of all sin when he knoweth it [joined with an actual repentance of all that he knoweth, and a faithful endeavour to know all] this is not an *actual repentance* of the *unknown particulars*; but it may be called a *virtual repentance* of them, because there is that cause, that virtue, that Grace which would produce an actual repentance if the impediment of forgetfulness were removed. But even *confused actual repentance*, hath not a total oblivion or ignorance of the particulars, but only a *confused knowledge* and memory of them, and is another thing than the knowledge of *Universals*.

He adds, *One that forgiveth all injuries, and hath forgotten some; doth he not forgive those forgotten?*

Ans. Yes, if the word *forgiveness* signifie the effect, or his act as sufficient to that effect: For it is in his power to discharge, acquit, or forgive another, by a *meer general remission* or discharge, though he remembered but one or no particular at all: But if by *forgiving* you mean an act of his will whose object is the crime as well as the punishment, and evil consequents remitted; he so *actually forgiveth* in his own mental act no more than he knoweth: But his *general forgiveness* sufficeth to all the ends without it; and such a *sufficient remission* goeth commonly by the name of *full forgiveness*: But instead of speaking to the point in hand, you play with ambiguous words of another sense and subject. *Forgiving another* is an act of the Will, whose effect is extrinsecal; and as a man may burn a house, or give away or sell a house, and all that is in it, though he *know* not what is in it; so a man may remit all debts or penalties to another, or the King may pardon all crimes by an Act of Oblivion, without *knowing* what they are: But if the question were about an *intellectual act*, whose object doth *specifie* it intrinsically in the mind; As whether the King *actually* know the particular crimes which he pardoneth? If you say that he knoweth the particulars *actually* in *confuso*, because he only knoweth in general that some crimes there are, this is but to talk against all the usual sense of mankind, and to call that, *An actual knowledge of particulars in confuso*, which other men call, *No actual knowledge of particulars*, but only of *generals*, which in some cases may be called a *virtual knowledge* of Particulars, (which is no actual knowledge of them) and in some not. But if he had heard some imperfect confused Narratives of the crimes themselves, this might be called, *An actual confused knowledge of them*.

Señ. 11.

But mark Reader what edification is to be expected from these mens Disputations. He knew very well that he and I are agreed that all Christians must take Gods Veracity in his Revelations for the *formal object*, without which faith is no faith, and so must believe that God cannot lie, and that all is true which he asserteth. And that we Protestants hold that this is not enough, nor includeth the knowledge or belief of any thing which he hath revealed (beside this one general): He knoweth that our question is, *Whether it be not necessary to believe some parti-*

particulars as revealed by God? And whether this faith do not go to *essentiate* a Christian and a member of the Church? And if so, then what those particulars are which must be believed to constitute a true Christian and member of the Church. Now he durst not come into the light, and answer this question; but as if he were mocking women or children, saith, *All that God hath revealed must be believed explicitly or implicitly*. We understand you, Sir, that we must believe this Proposition, *All that God revealeth is true*. But is that enough? then Heathens, Idolaters, Sadducees, Infidels, Mahometans, are Christians and members of your Church. (But do they think to themselves?) If you can thus with a juggle make all the world Christians, the like art may make them subjects of the Pope. No, faith he, *there must some things also be believed explicitly*. But the question is, *what they are?* O there you must excuse him; he dare not, he cannot tell you what. But Sir, are these [some things] essential to Christianity and Church-membership, or not? If you say, *Not*, what! nothing essential to Christian faith in particular? Is it faith, and yet a belief of nothing in particular? Is there no material difference at all between a Christian and a Sadducee, Infidel, Mahometan, or Heathen? And yet cannot Protestants be saved for want of the right belief? O marvellous Religion! But if any particular belief be necessary, cannot it be known what it is? How then can a Christian be known by himself or others from all the unbelieving world? or your Church from other men? This was my question to you, Is not your Church then *invisible*, when no man can know what makes a member of it?

Señ. 12.

And yet the man talketh confidently in his darkness, as if this would serve instead of light: and faith, *I make my Church visible, though by comprehending in it all those who profess an explicit faith in several Articles, which they understand distinctly, and an implicit belief of the rest whereof they have not distinct understanding, by professing that they believe all that God hath revealed to be believed by them, whatsoever they be in particular: Now so long as they persevere in this belief, though they should happen through culpable negligence, not to arrive to the knowledge of many things which they ought to know necessitate precepti, yet they remain members (though corrupt and wicked) of the Church: Whereby you see how easily I avoid that difficulty which you thought I could not*.

Ans. Too easily against all reason. Reader, this Paragraph is worth the noting, 1. Several Articles must be believed explicitly: but not a word to tell you which, or what they are; or whether it be any whatever that will serve the turn, if it be but that *Cain* was the son of Adam.

2. The implicit belief of all the rest, is not here said to be any implicit belief of the Pope, Council or Church of Rome, but that they believe all that God hath revealed to be believed by them. And are we not yet to far right and reconciled? This is too kind to the Protestants, for it takes in all mankind with them who confess a God. For to give him the Lie, is to deny his Perfection, that is, his Godhead.

3. Mark, that even culpable ignorance of other things unchurcheth not.

4. And yet all this denoteth but a corrupt and wicked member of their holy Church, which (if such) cannot be saved.

5. And with this chat the man thinks he hath done his business. And doubtless there are some so ignorant as to believe him.

But all this wants but two things to make it just the true Christian faith: One is to name those Particulars essential to Christianity which must be believed: The other is to distinguish between a sound and serious practical belief, and a dead opinion or profession: And to conclude that the sincere practical belief constituteth invisible justified members, and the profession maketh only visible ones.

Next he hath another bout against *Omne animal vivit*, the question was whether to know this, be to know that *W. J. Bucephalus*, a Phoenix, or an Unicorn liveth? I say, No: because it may stand with the ignorance that ever there was or will be such an Animal as is called *W. J.* or any of the rest. But he makes all good on his side by talking of *Impossibilities* and such-like words, which are of the same use in respect to our arguments, that Drums in an Army are to drown the groans of dying men, and put courage into the Soldiers. He saith,

Señ. 13.

when

When Philosophers say, Omne animal vivit, they mean it of the essence or notion of Animal to be a living thing; and this is true of me and all particulars, whether we be in actual existence or not. Is not here excellent Philosophy! It's very true that this is a true Proposition, Omne animal vivit, whether *vv*. f. exist or not. But it's this true of *vv*. f. and all particulars, *vv*. neither they exist or not? That which existeth not is nothing, neither *vv*. f. nor any particular. The sum is then, Nothing is a living thing, or animal. There is a *vv*. f. and all particulars, which are all nothing, and yet are animals, or live. Who would not turn Papist, and run into a Nunery, that is but charmed with such Philosophy?

Self. 14. Next, pag. 15, he saith, That how much must be believed explicitly, is a dispute among Divines, not necessary to be determined here; yet I will say something to that presently.

Ans. I warrant you, nothing is necessary to you to do, which you cannot do without coming into the light. It's a dispute among the Papists Divines what a Christian is, or what Christianity is? And yet they have an infallible Judge of all the Scripture, and all Controversies. And yet they can tell that Protestants are Hereticks, And yet they can tell who are members of th^e Church, though it be a dispute among Divines. But mark, that this is not then with them *de fide*, any point of faith (what a Christian is, or what must be believed): For their Divines dispute not that which they take to be *de fide*.

Self. 15. I told him that a man may believe that the Bible is true, and Gods word, and yet not know a word that is in it, or that Christ is the Messiah, or that there was ever such a person.

He answereth that, This is morally impossible: For either such a person believes the Bible rashly and imprudently, and then (according to all Divines) his faith cannot be supernatural and divine, or sufficient to constitute him a Christian; or he believeth it prudently by prudential motives of credibility. Now that can be no other than the authority of the Catholick Church, which he cannot be ignorant to profess the faith of Christ, there being no other save that; though he know not by experience that Christ is mentioned in the Bible, he cannot but know that he is professed to be the Son of God, and Saviour of the world by those of the Catholick Church; who delivered the Bible to him as the word of God, and that such a faith is necessary to Salvation.

Ans. Here are many things worthy our consideration. 1. That a man is not a member of the Church, that is, a Christian, unless his faith be supernatural and divine, not only in the object, but his act: And surely no man knoweth what other mans act of faith is supernatural and divine: Therefore no man knoweth who is a Christian, and so their Church is still invisible.

2. No man that believeth the Bible rashly and imprudently is a Christian: And no man knoweth whether another believe it not rashly and imprudently, (yea whether he believe it at all.) Therefore no man knoweth who is a Christian, or member of the Church of Rome.

3. No other motive than the authority of the Catholick Church, can serve to free a man from this rashness, imprudence and nullity of his Christianity. 1. But why then had we not this General, The Church Catholick is to be believed, and the Scripture to be received only by its authority, before in the description of implicit or explicit faith? 2. Was that man no Christian in the Primitive times who was converted by a single Apostle, and took not the faith on the authority of the Catholick Church? Did the Eunuch converted by Philip, Act. 8. or the Taylor and Lydia converted by Paul, Act. 16. or the 3000 converted by Peter, Act. 2. receive faith on the authority of the Catholick Church? Or the Indian when converted by Frumentius and Edeius? or the Abyssinian Empire that till lately knew nothing of the Pope, and his pretensions? Or do we convert the Apostles did use that argument, The authority of the Catholick Church, to convert their hearers? or that they always first told them of the authority of such a Church? If by the Church you mean any single Apostle or Teacher, hold to that, and we shall do well enough with you. 3. But Authority is an ambiguous word, and may deceive. We maintain that a preserving and teaching ministerial authority, is usually needful to mens conversion to the faith, though not absolutely necessary to be first believed by the hearer. But a judging authority, (yea, Whether there be a God, a Christ, a Scripture, a Heaven, &c. or not, which determined by a sentence, rather than rendered by opening that evidence which caused belief

belief in the Teacher himself) this is not necessary to mans faith: 4. And what if a man should hear a Preacher open the other reasons of Christianity without talking of the Catholick Church, and its authority, and should hereupon believe? or should believe by the bare reading of a Bible? how prove you that this man is no Christian, nor shall be saved? when Christ saith, *He that believeth shall be saved, and shall not perish*; and faith not, *He that believeth on any other motive than the authority of the Catholick Church* (and that must be the Romans) believeth rashly and imprudently and shall perish?

4. But it's well worth the enquiry, could we possibly find it out, what he meant by knowing the Church, and its profession, and its authority, and whether this be an act of necessary faith, before anything else can be believed? Or what other points of faith are contained in our belief of the Church and its authority? And what is the foundation of this faith?

It seemeth that he supposed that the Church must be known before that the Christian faith be believed: And that in knowing the Church we must know the faith of the Church. It is one thing to know that they are a company of men called the Christian Church; and another thing to know what a Christian Church is; and another thing to know that this company of men is that Church: Must all these be known before we can believe? or but one, or two? and which?

1. If the same were enough, a man may know that a company of men are called Christians, (or Mahometanes) who knoweth not at all what Christianity (or Mahometanism) is. You say, that it must be known that they profess to trust in Christ: this they may do and not know who Christ is, whether God or man, or what he hath done, or will do for us. If you say, that they must know that they profess that Christ is the Saviour, so they may do, and yet not know what the word Saviour signifieth, or what Christ ever did or will do for our Salvation.

2. But if he mean here that every one that will believe Gods Word, must first know the Church as defined, or know it in all its essence; then 1. How few will be able to prove to be Christians? And how will he know who they are? 2. And still the question recurrith, what is it that must be particularly believed to essentiate the Church? For if he know not that, he cannot know that he knoweth what the Church is.

3. And when that is done, it seems he must know which is that Church considered in existence, as differing from all Heresies, and other Societies.

But by this method our difficulties are multiplied. 1. How shall I be sure that this Church doth not deceive me, in saying that this and not that is Gods Word? Is this by an act of knowledge, or of divine faith? If of knowledge, what evidences prove it? If of faith, then I must believe God before I can believe him? that is, I must believe that this is his Revelation and Revelation, before I can know or believe any of his Revelation. If they mean that this act of faith must go first, before I can have any other, why may I not know and believe other articles of faith without the divine belief of the Churches authority or infallibility, as I may believe this one, God hath revealed that the Church is infallible or true in telling me what I must believe. If one Article may be believed without that motive (and sure it is not believed before it be believed) why not others as well as that? 2. And which way, or by what Revelation did God confer this Infallibility on the Church? If by Scripture, it is supposed that yet you know not what is in the Scripture, or believe it not to be true, till you have first believed the Churches Veracity. Therefore it cannot be that way: If by verbal tradition, it is equally supposed that you know not that Tradition to be Gods word and true, before you know the Churches Veracity that tells you so. So that the Question, How I must believe the Churches Veracity herein? by what divine revelation (before I can believe any other revelation)? is still unanswered, and answerable only by palpable contradiction.

But (were it not for interpreting him contrary to his company) I should by his words here judge that it is no Divine faith of the Churches Veracity, which he maketh pre-requisite to all other acts of faith; but is a prudential motives of credibility, which must draw him to afford credit to that authority as derived from God, which commends to him the Bible as the word of God: no more than can be no other than the Authority of the Catholick Church.

Self. 16.

Self. 17.

Ans.

Ans. Mark Reader. It can be no other than the Authority of the Church, which must be the prudent-
 ist motive to credit the authority of the Church as derived from God. So the Churches Authority
 must be first credited, that he may credit it; or else the Authority not credited must move
 him to credit it; which is all contradiction, unless he mean that the Churches Authority cred-
 ited by a humane faith, or by some notifying or conjunct evidences, besides divine revelati-
 on, must move him to believe that it is authorized by God. When they have told us, whether
 that first credit given to the Church, have any certainty for its object, and also what and
 whence that certainty is, we shall know what to say to them. *Know* against *Chillingworth* is
 said to say, That it is the Churches own *Attestation*, by which it is known to have divine authority,
before we can believe any word of God. And so no man can be sure that Gods word is his word,
 and true, till he be first sure that the Church of Rome hath wrought such miracles as prove
 its veracity as from God; which will require in the Catechumens so much acquaintance
 with Historical Legends (which the more he reads them, the less he will believe them) as will
 make it a far longer and more uncertain way to become a Christian, than better Teachers have
 of old made use of.

And 2. it seems, when all is done, that he taketh this Authority of the Church but for a
 prudent-ist motive, But is it certain or uncertain? If uncertain, so will all be that's built upon
 it. If certain, again tell us by what ascertaining evidence?

Sect. 18. Reader, it is the crooked ways into which by assid-
 ing-interest hath tempted these men to lead
 poor souls, which are thus perplexing and confounding.

How plain and sure a way God hath prescribed us, I have told you in a small Tractate cal-
 led *The Certainty of Christianity without Popery*. In short, it is possible if a man never hear
 but one Sermon (which mentioneth not the authority of the Church) or find a Bible on the
 high-way and read it, that he may see that evidence in it that may persuade him faithfully to
 believe (through grace) that it truly affirmeth it self to be the word of God. But the ordina-
 ry method for most rational certainty is, to have first Historical ascertaining evidence of the mat-
 ter of fact, viz. that *This Book* was indeed written, and these miracles and other things done as it
 affirmeth. Or first perhaps, that this Baptismal Covenant, Lords Prayer, Creed, and Decalogue, have
 been delivered down from the first witnesses of Christ, and Miracles wrought to confirm the
 Gospel, which is also written at large in that Book. This we have far greater Historical
 Certainty of, than the pretended authority of a judging-Church of Rome; even the infallible
 testimony of all the Churches in the world; and as to the essentials (Baptism, the Creed, &c.)
 of Heretics, Infidels, and Heathens, which I have opened at large in a Book called, *The*
Reasons of Christian Religion, and another called *The Unreasonableness of Infidelity*, and in other
 writings. And the matter of fact with the Book being thus certainly brought down to us (as
 the Statutes of the Land are) we then know the Gospel and that Book to be of God, by all
 those evidences which in the foresaid Treatises I have opened at large (and more briefly in a
 Treatise called *The Life of Faith*) the sum of which is the Holy Spirit as Christs Agent, Ad-
 vocate, and Witness, in his Works of Divine Power, Wisdom, and Goodness, or Love, printed
 first on Christ himself, his Life and Doctrine, and then on the Apostles their Works and Doctrine;
 and then on all sanctified believers in all ages, and especially on our selves (besides his ante-
 cedent prophecies).

Sect. 19. *Page 16.* He again pretendeth that he need not name the necessary Articles of Faith, because
 my self say, They must be the Essentials; and it is supposed I understand my own terms.

Ans. A candid Disputant! The light followeth him while he flyeth from it. Doth it follow
 that if I know my own meaning, I therefore know yours? and if I know which are the essen-
 tials, that therefore you know them, and are of the same mind.

Sect. 20. *Page 17.* The man would make me believe, that I speak not true divinity, when I say that
 Divine and humane Faith may be conjunct, when the testimonies are so conjunct, as that we are sure
 that it is God that speaketh by man, who is therefore credible, because God infallibly guideth and inspi-
 reth him. He would make you believe that I am singular and erroneous here.

Ans.

Ans. And why? He saith, that would make Christian faith partly humane. But 1. when I talk
 but of two faiths conjunct, what if I called the former divine faith, only the Christian faith
 may not be humane yet be conjunct with the Christian?

2. But words must be examined. If Christian faith be so called from the Object, then Christ
 and not his Apostles, are the reason of the name materially; we are called Christians for be-
 lieving in Christ, and not for believing in them. 3. If Christian faith be taken subjectively
 it is humane faith, for men are the subjects of it. 4. If Christian faith be denominated from
 the prime or second efficient of the revelation, it is the belief of God, and of Christ as Media-
 tor, and not of the Apostles; and so Gods own *Peracry*, and not mans, is the *objectum formale*,
fidei divine. 5. But why may I subordinate humane faith be conjoined with this, and so
 we believe Christ to be the Messiah at once? 1. By the testimony of God. 2. Of Christ as man
 3. And of the Prophets and Apostles.

1. Did not the union of the Divine nature with the humane, make Christ as man to be cre-
 dible? If so, why should we not believe him?

2. Did not the sanctifying work of the Holy Ghost, and divine inspiration joined to it,
 make the Apostles and Prophets credible persons? If so, why should we not believe them?

3. Did not the Miracles which they wrought, render the persons and their testimonies cre-
 dible, together with the circumstances of their being eye-witnesses, and such-like?

4. Is not every honest man credible according to the measure of his skill and honesty?

5. Doth not every man know that there may be many efficient causes conjoined in produ-
 cing one effect? May not faith now be wrought by the Preachers word and Spirit? Why else
 doth Christ say to Paul, Acts 26. 17, 18, *I send thee to open their eyes; and turn them, &c.* And
Paul directeth Timothy to save himself, and those that hear him. Why may not believing God, be-
lieving Christ as man, and believing Peter and John, &c. that saw him risen, be conjunct cau-
 ses of our faith in Christs Resurrection? If they might not produce one faith, at least they
 might produce three faiths united by conjunction.

But would one ever have expected this from a Jesuit or Roman Priest? Remember, Reader,
 that Divine belief, and a belief of the Church, Council, Pope, or Priest, are not to be taken for
 conjunct causes of our believing the Gospel, or Christian faith, in this mans opinion.

But he saith, Though the Prophet be a humane person, yet he speaks when he is inspired by God, not
 by humane, but divine authority, God speaking by his mouth.

Ans. It is *Peracry* that is the thing that we now speak of, and is the authority in question.
 And doth not Gods *Peracry* give *Peracry* to the Speaker, and use it? Doth God speak by
 Prophets and Christs Humanity, as through an inanimate Pipe or Whistle, or as by *Balaams*
 ass? Doth he make no use of the reason and honesty of the Speaker? nor make them more
 knowing, and more honest, true and careful, that they may be the fitter to be believed? Is this
 Roman Divinity? Why then do the Apostles so oft protest that they speak the truth and lye
 not, even of that which they had seen and heard? Would the Gospel have been equally cre-
 dible to us, if all the witnesses had in other matters been knaves and liars?

2. Reader, judg whether those that accuse the Roman Clergy of *Fanaticism* and *Enthusiasm*,
 do them any wrong, while they think that God maketh them infallible by such inspiration, as
 maketh no use of their Reason, Learning, or Honesty. And read but what their own Histori-
 ans say of Fifty Popes together, besides all the rest, and of the Ninth and Tenth Centuries of
 the Church, and of the Popes that were laids, and could not read Mass, but were illiterate.
 Read what their Councils have laid of some whom they deposed as inhuman Monsters, and
 judg whether it be easie to believe that any inspiration used those men as infallible deliverers
 of that Christian faith; and see here why it is that they think *me* and *honesty* no more neces-
 sary in Pope or Councils, if God use them but as an organ-pipe or trumpet.

Page 18. When he is urged to tell me, what it is that is the necessary belief of their Church,
 which must make a man a member of it: he again bids me tell him what points I make essential to
 a Christian, and I shall save him the labour.

Ans. And are we indeed agreed? And yet do they write so many Volumes to the contrary?
 Reader,

Sect. 21.

Reader, I take him at his word: I have said that it is *The belief, and consent to the Baptismal Covenant, that is the constitutive essence of a Christian*. Remember this when they jest at Fundamentals, and tell us of damnation if we believe not their Councils, and the Country-Priests that are the reporters of them. Remember now the extent of the Christian Church, that it reacheth to all that believe and consent to the Baptismal Covenant. But will these wavering men long stand to this, and confess their *Self* to be but a fourth, or third part of the Church?

But perhaps they will say, *That words mean, understood are no true faith, we are yet to seek what believing in God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost do mean and comprehend.*

Ans. These ignorances or artifices have too long abused unskilled men. It is not now the unsearchable truth of mens subjective faith or internal acts which we dispute of; But is of necessary objective faith, or what *ex parte objecti* is essentially necessary to true subjective faith in case it be truly believed (which God only can tell.) And I say, 1. It is no mere words spoken more or less, which can prove to another the sincerity of the speakers belief of them: 2. But the words of the Baptismal Profession and Covenant, if sincerely believed, contain all essential to the Christian faith. 3. And for more or fewer words, I say, that the more understanding any man hath, the more fully and easily he may understand the sense of those words, though general and few; but to an ignorant person there must be many words and oft repeated to make him understand the same thing which the other doth by the few. And must we therefore have as many symbols of Christianity as there are various degrees of Understandings? 4. And the Church hath in its last times taken up with the Creed as the Exposition of the Baptismal faith: and if it now contain any words more than essential, that *Cræstel* not its use, which was to be a just and satisfactory Explication of that Baptismal faith, which had nothing but the Essentials. And accordingly till faith and piety degenerated into opinion and *hypocrisy*, Baptized persons were accounted Christians and members of the Catholick Church, and as obliged to live as Christs Disciples in love to one another; it being none but Christ himself who instituted Baptism as our Christening, to be the symbol and badge of his Disciples.

Self. 22. Pag. 19. When Thad prest him to a particular answer, and told him what would follow upon the Answers which I supposed he might make, he tells me that Divines have a hundred times told us that some things must be believed necessitate præcepti, and some things necessitate mediæ.

Ans. We have heard some things, some things to of, that we would fain know what things at last are necessary in media. Reader, if these Writers must not be ashamed of their tergiversation, what sort of Disputants should blush? would you think after all this, what his answer is? You shall have it in his own words: *And know you not that Divines are divided what are the points necessary to be believed explicitly necessitate mediæ? Some, and those the more ancient, hold that the explicate belief of God, of the whole Trinity, of Christ, his Passion, Resurrection, &c. are necessary necessitate mediæ. Others among the Recentors, that no more than the belief of the Deity, and that he is a rewarder of our works, is absolutely necessary with that necessity to be explicitly believed. Now to answer your Question, what it is whereby our Church members are known: I answer, that it is, All those who are baptized and believe all the point of our faith explicitly, (if any such are to be found) are undoubtedly members of our Church. 2. All those who believe explicitly all the Articles whatever belongs to them in particular, by reason of their respective offices in the Church. 3. Those who believe all things necessary, necessitate mediæ, or necessitate præcepti extended to all adults. 4. All those who believe in that manner all things held necessary necessitate mediæ according to the first opinion of the more ancient Doctors. 5. It is probable, though not altogether so certain as the former, that such who believe explicitly the Deity, and that he is a rewarder of our works, and the next implicitly contained in confessions, are parts of the Catholick Church (Baptism supposed). 6. I don't seeing all those in my four first Numbers (which comprehend almost all Christians) are certainly parts of the Catholick Church, we have a sufficient certainty of a determinate Church, consisting at least of these, by reason whereof our Church has*

has a visible consistency, those of the fifth rank, though not so certain, not taking away the certainty of the former. See you not by this Discourse that we answer sufficiently to your question by selling which are undoubted members.

Ans. Reader, how sad is the case of mankind, when such a talker as this shall go for a Champion, and prevail with silly souls in the matters of Salvation, against common reason, and the notices of Christianity? Mark here, 1. He asketh me, *Know you not that Divines are divided?* Yes, and I know how lamentably you have divided the Christian world. See, Reader, what is the unity and concord of the Church of Rome: Not only the Laity but their Divines are divided about the very essence of a Christian, and their Church. These are the men that cry up Unity as a mark of their Church, and cry out of us as Schismatics, as if we were all crumbled into dust by Sects, because we differ about some small circumstances of Worship, or Exposition of some imposed words of men, or of some difficult point of no consequence.

2. Note here also the Infallibility of their Church, and what a privileged they have in having a *Judge of Controversies*; While their Doctors are divided on the question, *what a Christian is?* And Pope and Council dare not, or cannot, do will not determinate what maketh a Christian, or member of their Church. O happy, infallible Judge of Controversies!

3. Note also the extent of the Roman faith: it is so big as that it and its circumstances fill large Volumes, called the Councils; and yet it is no article of their faith, *what Christianity is*, or what must constitute a member of their Church, but this is left at liberty to dispute.

4. Note also the great partiality of the Papists. The Doctors may be divided about the essence of Christianity, and may deny faith in Christ to be particularly necessary to a Christian. But if a man believes not that Rome is the Mistress of all Churches, and the Pope the Universal Governour, and that there is no bond and wine in the Lords Supper, when the Priest hath consecrated, he is to be exterminated, or burnt as a Heretic; and Princes deposed that will not execute it.

5. Note here, that here is not a word in all this of believing the Pope to be the Governour of all the Churches in the world. Either they take this to be essential to a member of their Church, or not. If they do, they are jugglers and ashamed of their faith, when they rhyme it in. If not, what is become of their *Sectarian Church*, and all their accusations and condemnations of most of the Christian World, who believe such office of the Pope? And what a Society is that where the reception of the *Papal Imperium* is unnecessary to every subject?

6. Note here whether the Roman Religion be mutable or not; and whether consistency be a note of their verity? When he professeth that the ancient Doctors, and the Recentors (or Novelties) do dispute about the very essence of Christianity. Have these Recentors iniquity to boast off?

7. Note also from hence the validity of their common argument from Tradition: As if all their Church were now, and always of one mind: when at present they are divided about the essence of Christianity; and the Recentors forsake the Tradition for their opinion, or not? If they had, how come the Recentors to forsake it? If not, what an insufficient thing is your Tradition, that hath not told you what a Christian or Church member is? And yet we must take this Tradition as sufficient to tell us what orders and ceremonies Peter sealed as Rome.

8. I pray you note, that even their ancient Doctors opinion (which is all that must keep his cause from utter shame) he durst not describe in answer to my question; but having named five words, God, the whole Trinity, Christ, his Passion, and Resurrection, he crassly shoves it up with an *Ecce tena*; so that if you suppose him to say that these five things are all that they require, he may deny it, because he added an *Ecce*. If you ask, what beside, *Ecce* tena; are here we begun, and *Ecce* is all the answer.

9. Well, let us pursue this intricate particular sort of members dividedly, which make up their Church, and add now whether they be visible or not; or whether the Reader will not wonder that such trained disputers have no more to say, nor a more plausible sort of fraud to use.

1. His first sort of visible members are, *All those that are baptized, and believe explicitly all the points of our faith (if any such are to be found.)*

Ans. Is not this a modest Parenthesis? whether any such are to be found, he seemeth uncertain; and yet faith, *These are the undoubted members of our Church.* The undoubted members! when he doubteth himself whether any such are to be found? And can we find the Church by them then? And no wonder that they are not to be found; for note, Reader, that he never tells you here yet at all, what the faith of their Church is, but only that if any have it all, they are Christians. Is this a satisfactory answering? And yet if you will know the truth from their common writings, the faith of their Church containeth these great bodies: 1. *All that is in the holy Scripture and the Apocrypha.* 2. *All the Decrees of their General Councils (if not also the Provincials and Popes Decretals) that are de fide.* 3. *All their unwritten Traditions de fide, which they have yet to bring forth as need requireth.* And do you not approve his modesty that faith, *If any such be found that believe all this.*

2. The second sort of their Church-members are, *All who believe explicitly all Articles, and whatever belongs to them in particular, by reason of their respective offices.*

Ans. But he tells you not a word what Articles these be, nor what belongs to their Offices; whether in be all the Articles of all the Creeds, or all of their Councils, Decrees, or when it shall be known what is necessary to be believed about their office. And is here any notice how to know a member of their Church any more than in the former? He that believeth all that he should believe is a Christian; But is there any such? and what is that all? and how shall we know them?

3. His third sort of members are, *Those who so believe all things necessary necesseitate medii vel precepti, extended to all the adults.*

Ans. And what's this but the same again? we know none but the adults that are to believe. And so here we are told; *That all men who believe all things commanded are Christians.* We were told this before: But it was with; *If any such are to be found.* And who knows by this what your *All* is? When we find men that do not command and sin not, we will hope to find men that know all revealed, and have no ignorance; yet here is no visible Church.

4. His fourth sort are, *All those who believe in like manner all things necessary necesseitate medii, according to the first opinion of the more ancient Doctors.* But what those things are, we are not yet told, but five words set down without *&c.* And is here yet a word to satisfy any man of reason what their faith is, or what Christianity is, or what maketh a member of their Church, or is the bond of Union?

But Reader, hath God left us so much in the dark? Is Christianity any thing or nothing? If something, hath it not an essence which may be defined? Is this all our notice of it, That men that know all that God hath revealed, and believe it, are Christians? or such as believe five Articles, *&c.* Judge now whether their Church be not invisible. And if any little part of it were visible, what's that to the rest? or to that visibility of particular members? He tells us these are almost all Christians. And yet questioned whether any of the first be found; and the rest are no more to be found than they.

5. And his fifth sort he confesseth himself to be uncertain, which yet its doubted are no small part that go for Papists.

And note, I pray you, that it is the present Church which they use to approach to for necessary resolution; and the Recentors are more the present Church than the Ancients. And according to these: 1. Their Church is confessedly doubtful or unknown as to most or multitudes of members. 2. And note; that their Articles being but two, *That God is, and that he rewardeth works*, all the common Heathens of the world, and all the Mahometans, are of the Papists Faith and Church, according to this opinion. 3. But mark, Reader, another desperate corruption, That *Baptism* must concur with these two articles. O horrid corruption of Christianity itself! Is this antiquity and tradition? Did the Christian Church use to baptize men that believed neither in Jesus Christ nor the Holy Ghost? if they did but believe a God and a Rewarder? Do you baptize such in your Church? I suppose even Pope Stephen himself would have been for the re-baptizing of such. Reader,

Reader, if one of us had charged such doctrine on the Papists as this their Champion doth, should we not have been thought to slander them? viz. *That their later Doctors hold that all that believe explicitly but a God and a Rewarder, and are baptized, are members of the Church of Rome;* and consequently, that all that believe but this much, *should be baptized;* that is all the Mahometans, and almost all the Heathens in the world: And is *Baptism* and the *Creed* come to this? But I confess if the world were perwaded of this, the Pope could make his use of it: For when he is once taken for Governour of all the Church on earth, if he can but prove all the world to be the Church, it followeth that he is Governour of all the world. And what need they now their feigned embassies and submissions to prove the *Abissines, Armenians, and Greeks* to be of their Church, when Heathens and Mahometans are proved of it? and yet are Protestants no part.

He tells us, *That a living body may be defined by head, shoulders, arms, though there be a doubt among Philosophers, whether hair, humours, &c. be animated or parts.*

Ans. But 1. it is known then that there is visibly head and shoulders, &c. But you tell us not how to know any individual persons to be visible members of your Church. To tell us that there are some men that hold all that they are bound to hold, maketh none visible, while we are not told either what they are bound to believe, or by what profession or proof it must be known that they do so. When we tell you that *sincere justifying faith and love* do prove true Christians, and that *such there are*, it's agreed that this proveth but a Church as invisible or unknown to us, because we know not who have this sincerity. So is it when you tell us that there are men that believe all that's necessary; for till it be known what that is, no profession can thereby prove them Christians.

2. But what if you had told us how to know those men that are certain or eminent members of your Church? Is it nothing to you to leave all the world besides, almost, uncertain whether they be in the Church or not? How know you whom to admit to your Sacramental Communion, or to use as a Christian? When a Congregation of many thousand persons called Papists meet, you cannot tell how many of these are of your Church, and yet you give them the Eucharist? And it seemeth by you that they must be Baptized, though you know not after whether they be members of the Church.

Remember, Reader, that our question is not what mercy God sheweth to the rest of the world, nor whether any out of the Christian Church be saved? But it is, what is the faith which is essential to a member of the Christian Church? and whether Papists make it not uncertain? and whether he that believeth only that there is a God that rewardeth, and believeth not in Christ, or the Holy Ghost, be a member of the Christian Church, or should be baptized.

My third Question about his definition of the Church was, *Is it [any] lawful Pastors, or [all] that must necessarily be depended on by every member? who are those Pastors?*

To this he said, *Of all respectively to each subject; that is, that the authority of none of them, mediate or immediate, be rejected or contemned.*

I shewed him how he contradicted himself; for *dependance* is more than *non-rejection*; and Millions of Heathens neither depend on the Pope or reject him, that never heard of him.

To this he rejoined, *that he spake of subjects only, and not of others.*

Ans. 1. But we are never the nearer knowing their Church by this, while we are not told who the subjects are, and what maketh a visible subject? 2. Do not they take all Infidels and Heathens, and the Christian *Abissines, Armenians, Greeks, Protestants, &c.* to be subjects of the Pope, as to obligation and right, though not consent? yet the *Abissines* neither obeyed the Pope, nor rejected him till *Oviedo* was sent to them. 3. For about forty or fifty years one part of Europe took one man for Pope, and the rest took another man for Pope, and men were uncertain which was the right, or whether either of them, and so of the Clergy authorized by them. Which was the Church then, and who were the members, when Millions received one, and Millions rejected him? and many neither received nor rejected, but remained in suspense? 4. And if all the Priests should desert a Country (as Ireland, Mexico, or our Wales, or Highlands) are all the people thereby unchristened or unchurched,

churched, while they have no Priest either to receive or reject, and perhaps hear not of a Pope.

But I specially answered him, *That this maketh every Priest so essential to that Church, that a man is unchurched that rejecteth or condemneth any one of them, though he should honour the Pope, Councils, and thousands others: If a man take a Priest in such a crime, as Wayson, Momalrus and others tell us of, is condemning him an unchristening of us? Yea, if it be done causelessly upon a quarrel? This is a notable advancement of the Clergy. If contempt of one Priest be damnation or unchristening us, he that can make Priests for all the world, may well be Lord of all the world, even of Princes as well as other men.*

To this he rejoined, that by the word *respectively* he did not mean all Priests, but all *that are Pastors to that man; for there are some Priests that have no care or cure of souls committed to them; but a private Christian rejecting the authority of his Parish-Priest, Bishop, Archbishop, Metropolitan, Primate, Patriarch, or supreme Bishop, becomes a Schismatick, and casts himself out of the Church.*

Ans. 1. He is a strange Priest that hath no Cure of Souls, what then is his office? If he be not affixed to a particular charge, sure he hath an indefinite cure of Souls in the Church Universal. 2. Then one of the next Parish may take our Parish-Priest and all the Parish-Priests in the Country *save his own*, for Hereticks, Fornicators, Traytors, and such as must be rejected, and yet be no Schismatick but a Church-member: But if I reverence all other Priests, and take our own Parish-Priest for an ignorant sot, or a knave, or a wicked man, and condemn him. I am cut off from the Church. This tells us more reason than I knew of before, for our Canon against going from our own Parish-Churches when we have no Preacher there And this tells me how great the power of Patrons is, who can make an ignorant wicked man so absolute a Lord of all his Parishioners, though they be the greatest Lords, that to condemn him shall cost them their damnation.

And this tells me more than I knew before, that the *Roman* Clergy do not plead for the Pope for his sake only, but for their own; if all men be in as much danger of damnation or unchurched for rejecting any Parish-Priest, as for rejecting the Pope.

And this tells me more than I knew before of the great Pre-eminence of the *Secular* Clergy: (as they call them) above the Regulars, and how low comparatively the Jesuits and Friars are, when it will cut a man off from the Church to condemn one foolish drunken Curate, or Parish-Priest that can but read Mass, and to condemn ten thousand Friars and Jesuits will not do so?

And this tells us of how great concernment Parish-bounds are, and what a privilege it is to remove ones dwelling: For if I will but remove my dwelling one yard out of the Parish, I may then condemn the Parish-Priest without being unchurched, which on the other side the way I could not do.

And this tells us why the Clergy are exempt so much from Princes and Magistrates judgment. It may cut off a Prince from the Church to condemn his Priest, (whether to hang him if he prove a Traytor, be contempt I know not.) Many such lessons may be hence learnt.

3. But how came *Cyprian* then so much mistaken, that said, *Plebs maximam habet potestatem: sacerdotes indignos recusandi*? And how came all the ancient Churches to use that freedom in consenting or dissenting, electing or rejecting their Bishops and Priests, which *Blondel* hath copiously proved, *pro senent. Hieron. de jure plebis in regim. Eccles.*

4. And what a privilege hath the Pope or a Patriarch above an inferior Christian? when he may reject a thousand Priests, or interdict whole Kingdoms, or reject most Christian Churches and Pastors in the world; as being none of Christs, and yet not be himself cut off for so doing; whereas one that falls out with his Parish-priest and rejecteth him alone, is presently no member of the Universal Church?

It seems that God punisheth not men according to the greatness of their sin; for sure it is a greater sin unjustly to reject ten thousand Priests, than one. Or to condemn all other Priests in the Country, mistaking them all for Hereticks, Usurpers, or intollerable: than so to do by one Parish-priest only.

5. How

5. How many Millions then that seem to be of the Church of *Rome* are not so; because they condemn the authority of their Parish-priest?

6. But what is the proof of this assertion? None at all. In other Societies no Union is essential to a member but that which is with the *Pars Imperans*, or supreme power, and with the body. A man that rejecteth a Justice, or the Mayor of a City, or the Master of a College or School, &c. may be yet a subject, and a member of the Kingdom while he rejecteth not the King, though he be faulty, and be cut off from the City, College or School. And I think that to reject a Parish-priest that ought to be so rejected, is well done: and if he ought not, it's ill done. And that he that separateth from that Parish-Church, may yet be a member of the Church Universal, while he separateth not from it. But I see that *Guiliel. de Sando Amore*, and such others, had greater reason to condemn the Friars; and *Wayson*, and such others, the Jesuits, than we knew of.

I noted also the difficulty. *How we shall know the Authority of every Parish-Priest, Bishop, Archbishop, Patriarch, and Pope.* And 1. in a Country where Orders have ordinarily been forged.

To this he answered, *As much as you can be assured of any being Pastor of such a Church, or Bishop, or Justice, &c.*

Ans. 1. If you prove it a duty to believe and obey every such deceiver that hath no authority, we will not believe till you prove it, that to do otherwise doth unchurch us. 2. And if two or three claim authority over us at once (as they did in the Papacy about forty years together) are we cut off from Christ if we receive not both? or how shall we know which? If either will serve, then they that took *John of Constantinople* for Universal Bishop, were as much in the Church, as they that received Pope *Boniface* as such. And they that followed *Dioscorus at Alexandria* (being Orthodox), as they that adhered to *Proterius* at *Ce.* Is it no matter who it be, so we think him to be the right? Why then do you deny our English Clergy, when we judge them to have the true authority?

2. I asked, *What if we be ignorant whether the ordainer had intentionem ordinandi, how shall we be sure of the authority of the Ordained?*

He answered, *As sure as you can be that you were the lawful child of your parents who could not be truly married without intention.*

Ans. This is new Doctrine; they that speak the words and do the actions which properly signify a true intention, and do profess it, do thereby mutually oblige themselves in the relation of husband and wife to each other; and they that truly so oblige themselves, are truly (though sinfully) married: For what is Marriage, but such a mutual obliging contract; they are truly my parents, and I owe them obedience whatever their intention was. But you had a man to be no Priest that was not ordained *ex intentione ordinandi*, and our Salvation to lie on our obeying him as a Priest who is none.

My fourth Question was, *How the people that dwell in other Countrys can know whether the Priest, Prelate, or Pope, had necessary Election and Ordination.*

To which he saith, *When it is publicly allowed in the Church, witnessed to be performed according to Canonical prescription, by those that were present, and derived to the people without contradiction by publick fame.*

Ans. 1. This alloweth the Ministry in *Ethiopia, Armenia, Moscovie, Greece*, as much as the *Roman*: For it is publicly allowed and attested, and brought to the people by uncontradicted fame. And so is the Ministry of the Reformed Churches to all that hear not your contradiction. 2. But with *Rome* the case is otherwise, one part of the Church hath publicly allowed one Pope and all his Clergy, and another part rejected him, and allowed another and his Clergy; and publick fame hath contradicted one party. 3. And what can fame say to us in *England* of the Election or Ordination made at *Rome*, of a Pope, Prelate, or Parish-priest, when we hear not any witness of it? 4. And how can we expect contradiction of an action done a thousand miles off, which none near knew of? 5. And yet how few Priests or Prelates are they whose authority fame publisheth without contradiction? Do not Protestants contradict

the authority of your Priests, and most of the Christian World the authority of your Pope? My fifth Question was, if you tell me your own opinion of the sufficient means to know the Popes or Priests authority, how shall I know that you are not deceived, unless a Council had defined it sufficient?

To this he saith, That the orders prescribed in the Canon Law, and universally received, are sufficient for this, without Decrees of General Councils: for they are no points of faith but of order and discipline, whereof a moral certainty and Ecclesiastical authority are sufficient.

Ans. 1. Is this moral certainty, true, certainty, or uncertainty? If true, certainty, it hath its moral ascertaining evidences. And what are those?

a. Who is the maker of this Canon Law? If not General Councils, how shall we know their authority? If the Pope and Cardinals, how shall we know whether those of e.g. Stephen, Sergius, or Formosus, be the authentick ones? and so of many other contradictory ones? If a General Council damn and depose, e.g. Eugenius the fourth as a Heretick, &c. and he make Canons after, how shall we know that they are authoritative?

3. But are your matters of order and discipline no matters of faith? Then God hath not bound us to believe that the Pope is the Universal Bishop, or Pastor, or that Rome hath any authority over the world, or other Christian Churches; or that your Priests are the true Ministers of Christ, and have any authority over us; or that the Mass is to be celebrated, &c. But either these are matters of Divine or Humane Law. If man only command them, how cometh our Christianity, and Salvation to be laid on them? What man commands, man may abrogate, unless extrinck accidents hinder. If God command them, doth God command any thing which he binds us not to believe to be our duty? Many things may be de fide, revealed, which are not de moribus, not to be done; but nothing is by God commanded to be done, which is not first to be known or believed to be duty.

4. If it be no matter of faith, how to know that your Elections and Ordinations are true; then it is no matter of faith that you are true Pastors, or have any authority (because without true Election and Ordination, it is not so); and if so, then it's no heresie to believe that you are all deceivers.

5. Your Authority (or Decrees) below that of Pope and General Councils, pretend to no Infallible certainty: upon this it seems your Church is built, and into uncertainty its authority resolved; and yet from this we must fetch our certainty of the Gospel in your way. And is not the Gospel then made uncertain by you, which must be believed on the authority of an uncertain Ministry? yea, and are not Councils uncertain which consist of such a Ministry?

6. It's a vanity to pretend that your Canon Law is universally received; most of the Christian World receive but part of it, and much no part at all, unless you call the Scripture the Canon Law.

7. If your Canon Law be so universally received and sufficient, then when that Law is received into England, England must be burnt as a land of Hereticks; for that's part of your Law; and so your Ministry and our burning as Hereticks, have the same authority.

My next Question was, If I culpably were ignorant but of some few Priests authority among thousands, am I cut off from all the rest, and the Church?

His answer is, It is not all Priests, but all Pastors in relation to their flocks.

Ans. 1. But if my Parish-priest be but one of twenty or an hundred thousand, doth my culpable ignorance of his authority cut me off from all the Church? It may be I believe Pope Nicolas Decrees, that a man must not hear Mass of a Priest that hath a Concubine? Or that a Simonical Pope or Bishop is no true Pope or Bishop. 2. And remember, that my Parish-Priest, and my Bishop, Metropolitan, Patriarch and Pope, can never make a General Council: Either I may be safely ignorant of the Priesthood of all the rest in such a Council, or not: If not, then I must know the certain Priesthood of all others as well as of my own Pastors, contrary to what you say; If yea, then I have no certainty of the Priestly authority of Councils.

I next

I next argued, That it is not the rejecting of a Constables authority which maketh him no subject that owns the Sovereign. Self. 27.

To this he rejoineeth, That yet if I reject the Constable, and wish him all superior Magistrates, and at last the Sovereign, I am a rebell. And so if I reject the authority first of a Parish-priest, and then the Bishop of the Diocese, and after of all his Superiors to the highest, I am a rebel to the visible Church, and cast out, and reject Christs authority.

Ans. 1. Do you see what all our dispute is come to at last? All this while it was the rejecting of any one Pastor that cut us off; and now it is the rejecting of him and all above him to the highest, lest not lost labour to dispute with these men?

2. When you have proved that Christ hath such a thing as you call the visible Church, that is, all the world obliged to obey any one man or Governour besides Christ, (when he is naturally as incapable of it, as of being the Universal Physician) even at the Antipodes, and where he can never send, then we will take it for rebellion to reject that Head: Till then, we shall take it to be Treason against Christ to claim and own that which is his prerogative.

How cometh it to pass that no one yet learned to call himself the Universal King of the Earth? or the Universal Judge, Physician, School-master, &c. as well as the Universal Priest and Teacher of Religion?

Next I craved his answer to much which I had written on this subject before in my Safe Relig. which he refuseth, and tells me, That I make a visible body with an invisible head to the Church, which Government is internal and invisible, abstracting from visible supreme authority.

Ans. 1. Christ was seen on Earth. 2. He is seen in the Court of Heaven. 3. He hath left a visible Universal Law, by which he governeth. 4. He hath appointed visible Officers over the world (though no Head) which is the way that the Pope pretendeth to govern, (even per alios, when he never sent to a quarter of the world). 5. His subjects are men visible, known by audible profession and visible worship. 6. He will visibly judge the world in Glory, and be seen by all his Church for ever. And when you prove that he hath a Church that is otherwise visible, we will hear you.

They that assert an Anima Mundi, and they that think one Intelligence or Angel ruleth all the Earth, say that which is possible, though they can never prove it: But to talk of a Governour of all the World, that never heard who dwelleth on a third part of it, and that can get no Ships to sail about the Earth in many ages; and when they do, come not near the hundredth part of the world, this is a prodigious claim for a waking man.

My fourth Question about his definition of the Church was, why exclude you the chief Pastors that depend on none? Self. 28.

He answereth, I include them, Ecclesia est plebs Episcopo unita.

Ans. 1. But he had defined the Church as those that depend on the Pastors: which seemed to exclude the Popes that depend on none. 2. Hierome defineth a particular Church, and not the universal. 3. They oft call the Clergy the Church.

He rejoineeth, That Terms have different acceptations.

Ans. But by all this ado I can have no reasonable satisfaction from you, what you mean by the Church, or what that Church is which you call us to unite with, and which you accuse us as separating from. We are like to dispute well with men that cannot or will not explain the terms of the question.

CHAP. II.

Of their sense of the Word HERESIE.

W. J. HERESIE is an obstinate intellectual opposition against Divine Authority revealed, when it is sufficiently propounded.

R. B. Q. 1. Is the obstinacy that maketh Heresie, in the Intellect or the Will?

W. J. In the Will, by an imperative act restraining the understanding to that.

R. B. Still your descriptions signify just nothing; you describe it to be an Intellectual opposition, and now say that it is in the Will.

He replieth, that the error is in the Understanding, but the obstinacy in the Will.

Ans. Indeed the obstinacy is in both, but radically in the Will; but did Intellectual opposition denote this?

R. B. And you contradict your self by saying that it is an imperative act. For no imperative act is in the Will, but out of or from the Will. The imperative act is in the Will; but the imperative (as Intellegere) in the commanded faculty.

To this he replieth, That 1. he meant not the act was in the Will, though he said it was an act of the Will. 2. That all Philosophers are against me, and say that the Will may command Charity and other acts in it self.

Ans. 1. Who could conjecture that by an act of the Will, you meant not an act in the Will, but from it? 2. It's true that *Polo velle* is a proper speech, and one act of the Will may be the object of another; and a good man will wish nothing more here than to will better; and if you will call this commanding, I will not contend about the word: But certainly all these Possessions are such acts as they call elicit, which they usually distinguish from imperative; and thus you confound them. Otherwise every act of the Will which is willed by a former act should be called imperative, and so none but the first should be elicit? And who knoweth when that first act was in being, seeing the Will doth still will its own future action?

Self. 2.

R. B. 2. Hence noted, that if wilful obstinacy be essential to Heresie, their Church cannot know a Heretick (while they burn them): For they know not the heart; and many that they burn, would take their oaths that they are not willing to err: He answereth,

W. J. We enter not into mens hearts, that we leave to God: only the Church presumes such to be Heretics as have Catholic truths sufficiently propounded to them, and yet contradict and oppose them; let such be ready to swear what they will.

R. B. 1. Note here that they burn men for Heretics, and yet profess that Heresie is an obstinacy of the Will, which they know not, but leave to God; and only presume that men are Heretics though they know it not. And so a presuming Clergy are masters of the Crowns of Kings, and the lives of all men. How excellently would this power have fitted the turn of Ahab and Jezebel, and the murderers of Christ? they need not have got false witnesses to condemn them as Blasphemers: A presuming Clergy might have served: For the very act which the Papists judge men for, is internal in the intellect and Will, as Blasphemy is external. To condemn men for Blasphemy hath some reason of justice, because it may be proved; but Intellectual obstinate opposition cannot.

2. He tells us now that Heresie is a contradicting Catholic Truths, but never tells what those Catholic Truths are: Whether any one, or only some of the greater sort: and how we may know them. But it is sufficient that the presumers know. It is a Catholic Truth with them for which *Belzharine* citeth many Councils, * That the Pope may excommunicate and depose Kings and Rulers: To oppose this now is Heresie: A Heretick must be burnt! O happy Kings that have such a King over them, and such a presuming Clergy!

3. But this Catholic Truth must be sufficiently proposed: That sufficiently is a doubtful dangerous word: who would think how much lieth on Grammatical learning! The Pope and his

his Clergy are Masters of Kingdoms, and all mens estates and lives, by being the only judges of the meaning of this one word, SUFFICIENTLY; either it is called sufficiently proposed, with respect to the proposer, (as a Law is sufficiently promulgated) when he hath done as much as he was bound to do: And then a lazie or a proud Priest will think that two words is one that hath a Parish ten times greater than he can speak to, will think that he hath done General Council Printed goeth for sufficient proposal to millions that cannot read, nor ever deriding of the hearers, sufficient to convince him; and it is supposed that it is not effectual: and what mortal man is able to judge of the sufficiency of proposal, respectively to all mens understandings? some men have great natural dullness and slowness of conception, next to Ideots; some by long disuse of such cogitations, hear all spiritual Doctrine as if it were spoken in an unknown tongue; some cannot easily see the connexion of verities: And some of weak heads or memories cannot endure to think long enough of such matters, as to overcome the difficulties: And some think that they perceive such clear evidence for the contrary opinion, that it is not in their power to take it to be false. There is as great variety of receptive capacities, as there is of persons in the world. And the Priest knoweth not the internal case of their thoughts: They are like a man that had a writing in a Table-book to obliterate, and another to write in it in the dark, and would so judge that it was sufficiently done.

And what is Sufficiency? they will say, that which maketh conviction possible; and so poor men that might but possibly have been convinced, must be burnt because it is not done.

Is not this a notable way to save Parish-priests much labour? If they have told thousands the truth once or so oft as might possibly have convinced them: burn them then to save him the labour of any longer preaching to them; but who then shall pay him his Tythes? There is remedy in that case, most, rather than be burned, will say what the Priest bids them, whether they understand him, or believe him or not, and then they are safe.

But they will say perhaps, That that proposal is sufficient to convince men which were sufficient if they were not possessed with a blind zeal for their opinions, (for that's it that W. J. here lays it on,

Ans. But is there any man that hath no error? and must a man have no zeal for that which he judgeth truth: The sense of this is, that Proposal is sufficient to cure a man, which but a pure receptivity of any revealed truth, as Christ in his childhood, and Adam in innocence, then this proposal is sufficient; But if he be not as white paper that hath nothing to be obliterated, but have any sinful opinion to resist the truth, than burn him for an Heretick: And are not the Papists merciful men that will burn none but sinners?

4. But, Reader, if this definition of Heresie be not recanted, the number of Heretics is very great. For by this all the Heathens and Infidels, Jews and Mahometans in the world are Heretics, that believe not when the Gospel is sufficiently proposed to them. For here is obstinate intellectual opposition to it is Heresie: But the old Doctors never said so, nor do the Papists ordinarily say so: nor do they burn all Infidels that will not turn Christians: whereas it be because such are unwilling to be burned, and ten men can scarce burn ten thousand against their wills, I know not.

But I suppose W. J. forgot here to put Baptized persons into his definition. And if he had, if all the Janizaries be but baptized before the Turks take them from their parents, then they are Heretics, that be but baptized; seems, or else not.

But perhaps Apostates also should have been excepted. But there is no end of conjecturing at unexpressed meanings, or of amending other mens words.

R. B. Q. 2. Must it needs be the formal object of faith? Is he no Heretick that denieth the matter revealed, without opposing obstinately the authority revealing? (For he defined it to be an opposition to Divine authority,

Self. 4.

W. J.

W. J. Yes: nor is he a formal, but only a material heretick, who opposeth a revealed truth, which is not sufficiently propounded to him to be a Divine revelation.

R. B. To this I answer, 1. His definition and his answer here are contradictory, 2. His addition solveth it not; sufficient propounding it to be a Divine revelation doth not infer that he taketh God for a liar, but only that he culpably denieth this to be the Word of God.

I answered therefore, That all men that believe a God, believe him to be true, and no liar; and to W. J. maketh none but Atheists to be Hereticks. To this he answereth:

W. J. There is a twofold denying of God, one formal and direct, the other virtual and indirect: Atheists are guilty of the first, Hereticks of the second. This I oblige myself to prove, whosoever obstinately contradicts any truth revealed from God, is all Hereticks do some or other of them, they justly and justly affirm that what God hath revealed is not true, and consequently that God is a liar, and by that destroy as much as in them lieth the very essence of God.

R. B. Here is little but novelty and deceit, 1. It is deceit to call that a denying of God, in a controversy of such moment (whatever you might do rhetorically in an Oration) which you confess your self is not a denying him: For you say that it is not a formal but a virtual denying him; and that is truly no actual denying him; for *forma dat nomen & esse*, Boys will deride you if you deny this.

If you object Paul's words, Tit. 1. They confess him in words, but in their works they deny him, I answer, that they denied him formally by their works. For those works signified that their minds did not formally believe God to be God indeed, according to his Essentialities.

2. It is novelty and deceit to affirm (and stoutly undertake to prove) that the denying of one of the Propositions from which the Conclusion must arise, is virtually a denying of both. e. g. whatever is Gods word is true; but the story of Bell and the Dragon, and of the Angel in Tobit, saying he was the Son of Ananias of the Tribe of Naphthali; and that the intrals of a filth would drive away all Devils, that they should never return, &c. are the word of God. May not a man firmly believe the Major, that taketh the Minor for a lie? And suppose that the Roman Church say that I am obstinate: my reasons are, 1. Angels be not born of man. 2. Christ saith, This kind goeth not out but by fasting and prayer, &c. so that I must take Christ for a liar, if I take not Tobit to be false: I may not be obstinate in this, and yet not deny that all the Word of God is true. If the Manichees tell me that the Gospel of Nicodemus, and of Saint Thomas is the word of God, and the Papists, that the Apostolical Canons and Constitutions, and the Itinerary of Peter, were written by Clement, is obstinate unbelief of this, a denying that God is true. Your sufficient proposal is that of your Church. A General Council is your highest proposer (with the Pope). I find that the Council at Constance, and Basil, and Pisa, say one thing, and that at Lateran and Florence, say the contrary; and obstinately refuse to believe them both, may I not yet firmly believe that God is true? you are not God; And verily I have more reason to suspect you than God. The Country-man that never read Councils, nor travelled to Rome, knoweth nothing of your matters, but by his Parish-priest. If he know this Priest to be a common whoremonger and liar, may he not suspect him without denying God?

But if you can prove what you undertake, 'tis the sadder with you, that can triumph in sentencing your selves as Hereticks to Hell, e. g. whatever is Gods word is true, but it is Gods word that the Lords Supper should be administered in both kinds (bread and wine) (This do in remembrance of me), and that it is bread after the consecration, 1 Cor. 11. and that it is better to pray in a known tongue than in an unknown, 1 Cor. 14. and that they know not what manner of spirit they are of, who would have the resistors of Christs Apostles, and of Christ himself consumed with fire; and that the Clergy must not Lord it over Gods heritage, but as servants to all, rule them willingly and not by constraints, &c. Ergo, this is all true.

And whoever denieth this truth of God, indirectly denieth Gods essence, and maketh him a liar: But the Church of Rome denieth all these: Doth it follow that the Church of Rome are Hereticks, blasphemers and liars? And all this is sufficiently revealed, for it is plainly written in the Word of God.

3. Note

3. Note Reader, that such a contradiction of any truth revealed by God, doth make a man an Heretick; O then what abundance of Hereticks be in the world! What one man can say, that he doth not contradict some truth revealed by God, by nature or Scripture, or both? Every mans mind and will is depraved, and being so, hath some degree of obstinacy in resisting some truth of God; and so all men in the world (as well as the obstinately erroneous Papists) are Hereticks. Not only Papists that will believe neither the Scripture, Tradition, Reason, nor all mens senses, that there is bread after or any point of Genealogy, or of Chronology, or differing Numbers in Kings and Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah, Mat. 1. and Luk. 3, &c. Or that doth not believe that every word in Judith, Tobit, &c. are Gods word, are all Hereticks and deniers of Gods Essence.

Nor doth he except any age of persons; so that if a School-boy should but obstinately deny to believe his Master about a tradition, or a Scripture-name or number, he were a Heretick.

The Council of Basil revealeth the sinless conception of the Virgin Mary, and yet the Papists that deny it are not accounted Hereticks: And what shew is there of this consequence, the Council of Ephesus 2. of Ariminum, of Lateran, of Nice 2. of Florence, of Constance, Basil, Trent, may lie: Ergo, God is a liar. Hereticks should be softer in defining Heresie.

I next instance, what if a man deny that there is a Heaven, Hell, Resurrection, and also the revelation of these, and yet deny not the veracity of God (no nor of the Church) is this no Heretick?

Self. 5.

He answereth, No, if not sufficiently propounded to him as revealed from God. But that Proposition must be made by the Church; and as long as he believeth the infallible veracity of the Church propounding, he cannot disbelieve what it propoundeth sufficiently, &c.

R. B. 1. But a man that doth not believe the infallibility of the Church, may believe Gods Veracity, and yet be an Heretick.

2. A Papist that holdeth your Church infallible, may disbelieve what General Councils deliver as *de fide*, for so you do. So that this word sufficient is as unintelligible among your selves, as meer non-sense: For even General Councils proposals are not accounted sufficient when you are against them, and yet every Priest is, when your turn requireth it.

3. And many a man may take the Churches proposal to be certain, and yet think that the Roman Church is but an erroneous faction, and scarce a (corrupt) third part of the Church.

I next told him that the Jesuit Turnbull against Rob. Baronius, maintaineth that Revelation is no part of the formal object of faith, and therefore to deny it, is not to deny the formal object. 2. And that *forma dat nomen*, and *he is no Heretick that is none formally*.

Self. 6.

To the latter he giveth no answer; and to the first as bad as none, viz. that the Heretick denieth also the material object (and what's that to the case in hand?) and that which he is obliged by sufficient reason to believe to be revealed of God; and therefore virtually denieth God to be true.

Ans. But I again reply, 1. Virtual is not actual. 2. It is no virtual denial that God is true, but only that the proposer is true. To be obliged to believe a thing to be Gods word, only proveth that I break that obligation if I believe it not to be his word; but not at all that I believe God to be a liar, whose word I believe it not to be. Again, this maketh all Christians to be Hereticks, past dispute: For all Christians receive not something or other (small or great) which they were obliged to believe to be Gods word. Do you err in any thing that is revealed by Scripture or Tradition, or not? If you say no, and so that your understanding hath no sin, you deceive your self, and the truth is not in you: If yea, then were you not obliged to believe the contrary to be Gods word; if not obliged, then your error

E

is

is no sin: so that you make every sinful error to be Heresie, and proudly deny that you have any sinful error, lest you should be a Heretick.

Self. 7.

I added, that *their Church is constituted of men that sinfully neglect some points of truth or other sufficiently proposed: Ergo with constituted of Hereticks.*

So all that they believe explicitly what is necessary to be so believed necessitate mediis, and implicitly the rest, they can be no Hereticks: for it is not the ignorance though culpable, but contradiction to what is known to them to be propounded by those that have power to oblige them as being their lawful superiors, which makes an heretick.

R. B. 1. But still you agree not, nor tell us what is explicitly to be believed necessarily. 2. By this we are all absolved from heresie: for we believe all explicitly that is necessary *necessitate mediis*, and all the rest implicitly by a double implicate faith: 1. In God and our Redeemer. 2. In the inspired Apostles and Prophets: we believe all to be true which God hath revealed, and which his Apostles have delivered as Gods word. 3. Yea, and all that we know to be propounded by any obliging superiors; for we know not the Pope, nor your contradictory Councils to be such.

Self. 8.

My next Qu. was, *What mean you by sufficient proposal?*

W. J. Such as is sufficient among men in humanis, to oblige one to take notice, that a King hath enacted such and such Laws, &c. that is, a publick testimony that such things are revealed by the infallible authority of those who are the highest tribunal of Gods Church, or by notorious and universal tradition.

R. B. 1. Here the Reader may see, that he taketh sufficiency respectively to the Promulgator, viz. as much as he was obliged to do: for a King is not bound to publish his Laws in every parish, or county, but only to make such a publication of them in the chief places of his kingdom, as that men may take notice of them. Kings send not Schoolmasters to teach every man how to prove that his Laws are not counterfeit, and what they are, and what is the meaning of them. For the enacting of them being a late matter of fact, and easily notified, as near unto them, and no other knowledge or belief of them being required but such as is necessary to that part of the obedience of them which belongeth to every man in his place, this is not necessary. And if such a publication of Gods Laws be sufficient, millions that never heard a word of the Bible, or what Christ is, have such a sufficient publication: for the Gospel is published in many parts of the world, and perhaps in many places of the Kingdoms where they dwell, though they never heard it.

2. But when men have the publick testimony that such statutes are made, and such a Book sent from God, this doth not acquaint men what those Statutes or that Book contains: so that by this rule it should be sufficient to know that God made the Bible, without knowing what is in it; or else he that is but told that there is such a book, is bound by that much to know all that is in it.

3. But note the Popish difficulty of faith; *W. J.* tells us (after the rest) that we must know these things revealed by the infallible authority of those who are the highest tribunal of Gods Church, &c. And is it possible for one that knoweth nothing of Christ or the Scripture, or that Christ hath a Church, to know yet? 1. That he hath a Church. 2. And that he hath authorized some men to be the highest Tribunal to judge that Church through all the world. And 3. That he hath particularly authorized them to judge which is and is not his revelation. 4. And to know who be the men that are this highest Tribunal to all the world, viz. for those of *Abassia*, that had not so much History as to tell them that there was such a City as *Rome*, or such a man as the Pope in the world, till *Ovidio* was sent (who told it but to few), could yet know that this Pope and his Council are their Judges, and from them they must receive the Gospel. 5. And to know that this *Universal Tribunal* is infallible, before they believe in Christ himself, who is supposed to give them their Infallibility? Alas! must every poor Infidel know all this, before he can believe in Christ? When we that live among them, and read their laws and doctrines, cannot easily believe the Infallibility of those popes, who by General Councils are

are charged not only with Murder, Adultery, Simony, Perjury, &c. but with Heresie also, or Infidelity? Nor the Infallibility of those General Councils, who are accused by Popes and by other Councils of Error, Heresie or Schism?

4. But he addeth another way, *Or by notorious and universal Tradition.* And 1. If this will serve, then I hope we may have true faith that believe no humane infallible Tribunal over all the world, much less that the Pope and his Council are such a Tribunal: for we have *notorious Universal Tradition*, delivering us all our Religion.

2. But yet these are hard terms for every poor Heathen to come to Christ by: Alas, how shall the millions of people through the world, who know nothing that is many days journey from their houses, know what is the *notorious Tradition of all the Christian world*? I that search after it in all the books that I can get, can scarce give a good account of the Tradition of much of the greater part of Christians. Nay no *Universal Tradition* at all is *notorious* to most Christians, much less to all the Heathens and Infidels on earth. It is not *notorious* to most in England, what is the Tradition of the *Abassians*, *Syrians*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, no nor of the *Italians*, *French*, *Spaniards*, *Germans*, &c. That is notorious to Scholars, which is not so to the unlearned; and to Antiquaries, which is not so to other Scholars.

Here *W. J.* answereth two things. 1. That to know some Laws of the Commonwealth, is of importance to salvation. 2. That God should have made a visible Government imprudently, whose governors could not be known but by revelation.

Self. 10.

R. B. 1. And how comes importing to be put instead of necessity to salvation? This is but fraud.

2. It were worth our diligent enquiry, could we prevail with these men to open to us this mystery: How is it that the Pope and his Council may be known to be the supreme Governors of the world, without revelation? I will abate my Antagonists the answering of all the rest, if they will but be intreated to answer me this one question. It seems that it is by no promise of Christ, no word of God, no nor by any revelation of the Spirit, or Miracles, that we must know them to be our Governors. I confess I can know without revelation, that they claim such authority as any Tyrant or Usurper may do; but that they have such authority, it is past my reach to conjecture which way it is to be proved without revelation.

But I intreat the Reader to remember this, in all our further disputes with them, That they confess that it is not by revelation (by Scripture, Spirit, Miracles, or Tradition, made known) that the Pope and his Council are the supreme Governors of the Universal Church.

And yet we must know this before we can believe in Christ, or believe the Scripture to be true: And we must know it of necessity to salvation.

And another difficulty here seemeth insuperable, viz. Seeing this is not a matter of Revelation, it can be no matter of Divine faith; and if so, how is all other faith resolved into it?

And how is the belief of this (which is no belief) called our implicit belief of all the word of God? can no man be saved that cannot unriddle all these contradictions?

Next I further noted: *R. B.* That if he lay the sufficiency on the respect to all mens various capacities of receiving the notice, then they can never know who are Hereticks; but if they lay it on a general publication, then all or almost all men are Hereticks; being unavoidably ignorant of many things so published.

Self. 11.

To this he saith, That he judgeth of no mans conscience. *Ans.* But do not they judge of them, that burn them, and depose Princes for not exterminating them?

He saith, It is sufficient, 1. that such as acknowledge themselves they know such points of faith to be propounded by the Roman Church (which I infallibly believe to be the true Church) and that notwithstanding they are in error; give me grounds to presume them to be Hereticks.

Ans. I expect that it is not the Pope only that is infallible, but you also are infallible in believing his Church. But alas! how many are deceived and deceivers, that call themselves infallible!

a. But if your belief in the Pope were infallible, mult all others be hereticks, and be burnt, that have not attained to your degree of knowledge (or self-conceitedness)?

3. Just now you said the Governours of the Church need no revelation to make them known; and now it is an article of your belief, *That the Roman Church is the true Church*: so slippery is your foundation!

4. But what meaneth that hard word *The true Church*? Is it not enough if it were proved *a true Church*? Either you mean the *universal Church*, or a *particular Church*; if the former, why speak you so sneakingly, and did not speak out, that the *Roman Church is all the whole Church* that Christ hath on earth? Which assertion we abhor, and despair of any thing like a proof of it. If the latter, what is it to us whether *Rome* be a true Church, any more than whether *Ephesus*, *Theſſalonica*, or such other be so?

5. But (to leave your parenthesis) what's all this to the most of the Christian-world that do not acknowledge themselves that they know such points of faith to be propounded by the Church of *Rome*? There is not one of five hundred among us that ever read your Councils, nor knoweth one of many things propounded by you to be such: And are all these now absolved from heresie? How long will that be their security, if the burning and exterminating Religion should prevail? And is it my hard fate to become a Heretic more than all the rest of my neighbours, because I have read your Councils when they have not? Then I would counsel all that love not to be burned, to take heed of meddling with such Councils. I have oft read how dangerous a thing you judge it for unlicensed men to read Gods word, and of many that have been burned for it, and its consequents, and how you account it the way to Heresie: But I have not oft before read how dangerous it is to read your *Decrees*, or to know all that the Church of *Rome* propoundeth; for he that knoweth them all, must have a very ready commandable faith, such as can believe in despite of Sense, Reason, Scripture, and Tradition, to escape the guilt of Heresie. But I pray you, (were you not inexorable executioners) when it cometh next to the burning of Dissenters, that you will spare all that confess not that they know what is propounded by your Church, yea though they take not their parish-priest that tells it them, to be infallible, especially if they know him to be a common liar, or one that holds that lying for mens good, is a venial sin, or none.

Sect. 12.

W. J. 2. Such as oppose what all visible Churches have most notoriously professed and believed as Divine truths, while they were so universally taught and professed, I may safely presume to be Hereticks.

R. B. 1. No Oedipus can tell whether (*while*) here, refer to (*believed*) or to (*oppose*): For to the latter, then neither *Abassines*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, or *Protestants*, are Hereticks; for they oppose not such points *while they were so universally taught and professed* (whatever their forefathers did); for they have themselves for many partners, as derogates from the pretended *Universality* of the Adversaries. But if, by *all the visible Church*, you mean *all except themselves*; or if the word (*while*) relate to (*believe*), then the Church of *Rome* are characterized by you for certain Hereticks: for I despise impudence itself, in challenging it to deny, that the *Universal Church* did notoriously believe and practice the administration of the Lords Supper in both kinds (the Cup as well as the Bread) and the celebration of public worship in a known tongue, and the reading and hearing of the Scripture in a known tongue by the people, and others such like.

But yet I will not take you at your word, nor call you Hereticks meely on the account asserted by you; for I know that your rule is false. And if a man had known that the *Universal Church* had held some opinion of Chronology, or Genealogy, or Cosmography, (as about *Cainan*, or the age of *Sem*, or that there were no *Antipodes*) especially in the dismal Ninth Century; and if he had thought that they took this point for a Divine Revelation, believing the Septuagint or some other mis-translation. (which was commonly received before *Heromes* time) this man so thinking that the whole Church then erred in so small a point, was no Heretic for so thinking; for I would know of your self, whether the Popes and all their followers be not Hereticks? For the Septuagint was long taken by the *Universal Church*

Church for the Word of God, and so was the *Vulgar Latin* long after by your *Universal Roman Church*: and consequently that those Texts were Gods Word which yet afterward you altered: Many hundred or thousand alterations in the one were made by *Sixtus 5*, and *Clement 8*, all which were so many judgments that the Church had erred that before took the other readings for the Word of God (unless you can make one thing Gods word to day, and the contrary to morrow.)

5. But by this rule also we are acquit from Heresie, if it was not notorious to us that the *Universal Church* believed and practised contrary to us, which sure is notorious to very few at most. And indeed we differ from the *Roman Church* the more, because we dare not with them differ from the belief and practice of the far greatest part of the Church of Christ in this and in former ages.

R. B. Is not the Bible a publick testimony, and record, and being universally received is an universal tradition? and yet abundance of truths in it, are not actually known or believed by most of your own Church.

W. J. It is only a Tradition, that whatever is there delivered is the word of God; but it is no tradition that such a determinate sense and no other is the word of God in every sentence contained in it, when according to the analogy of faith the words are capable of many senses.

Sect. 13.

R. B. Worse and worse still! 1. Tradition tells us that this Bible is Gods Word: This Word of Gods is significant and intelligible, or else it is worse and more defective than the common words of men: This intelligible Bible or Word therefore delivereth to us its own sense: If not, then Councils do not deliver us the sense of Gods Word, or their own: For God could speak as well as they, and their words are no more plain than his. Yet a multitude of plain intelligible Texts are not understood by many of your Church, whom you call not Hereticks; yea your learned Commentators differ and fight about their sense.

2. Therefore when you talk of every sentence, you do but fly and hide your fraud: If your meaning be, that no sentences of Scripture are Divine revelations as they are in Gods own words, but as expounded by your Church, all Christian ears should abhor your blasphemy: If you mean only that there are some Texts so difficult as that most Christians cannot understand them, or that are capable of various senses, we grant it: But what are those to all the rest? Is every man a Heretic that erreth about the sense of any one plain Text of Scripture, or not?

And it is perverse that you say, of divers senses according to the analogy of faith: For a Text may be expounded contrary to the plain words and context, which yet is not expounded contrary to the analogy of faith, if by that word you mean as is usual, contrary to the harmony of Christian necessary Truths, yea or contrary to any other truth whatever, save that Text it self.

And now, Reader, I leave it to thy reason whether this man have given us any remarkable notice at all, what is Heresie? or what they mean by it, or have not trifled and said nothing.

But what Heresie is, I will briefly tell you: The word signifying *Electio*, was used to the beginning sometime for any *Self* or *Party* divided from the common body of the Church: And Christians were called a *Her-se* by the *Jews*. By the Christians the name signified any party of men that professing to differ in some necessary thing from the common body of Christians, and the Doctrine of the Apostles, did separate from them as unmeet for their Communion, and gather themselves into divided Societies: So that differing from the Apostolical Doctrine and Churches, and making different Sects or Societies therefore which separated from and opposed the Churches, was called Heresie by the Apostles; and it was the same thing with the grossest sort of Schism. And the commonest sense of the word *Schism*, then was lower, signifying either the contentions making of divisions within a Church without separating from it, or else the breaking

Sect. 14.

king:

king of one Church into many, without separating from other Churches, or the generality of Christians. And so long after the word *Heretic* was sometimes used for such *Schism* only & hence *Lucifer Calatinus*, and the *Novatians*, and many others were called Hereticks). And sometimes used more cautiously in a narrower sense, for those only that denied some essential article of faith or practice. And sometimes in a yet narrower sense, for those only that upon such a denial of some essential point, did gather into a separated Society to maintain their error, and oppugn the truth.

And according to these various senses of the word *Heretic*, and *Heretick*, we must conclude that a Heretick may or may not be saved, and is, or is not within the Universal Church; which *W. J.* doth deceitfully confound.

Of which I have said more in the End, and shewed you by an instance of *Platinius*, how mischievous it is to abuse the name of *Heretic* against every different opinion of true Christians, and so to make Hereticks of all Believers in the world.

CHAP. III.

What mean you by the Word POPE?

Self. 1. **W. J.** By POPE I mean St. Peter, or any of his lawful successors in the See of Rome, having authority by the institution of Christ, to govern all particular Churches next under Christ.

R. B. I am never the nearer knowing the Pope by this, till I know how St. Peter's Successors may be known to me.

Q. 1. What personal qualification is necessary ad esse?

W. J. Such as are necessary ad esse of other Bishops, which I suppose you know.

R. B. If so, then all those were no Popes that were Hereticks, or denied essential points of faith.

W. J. 'Tis true, they were no Popes while formal Hereticks, if any such were.

R. B. As John 22, 23, *Eugenius* 4th, &c.

W. J. Prove that.

R. B. The Articles brought against them, and the judgments thereupon, are a proof, if any thing may be called a proof; viz. in the Council at Rome against *John*, in the Councils of *Constance* against divers, at *Basil* against *Eugenius*, and others much elder against *Honorius*, &c. Is a General Council no proof?

I added that so they were no Christians: and he answers, Prove that. To which I say, General Councils are your Catholic Church representative, and those charge these Popes with Heresy and Infidelity: If you are so frontless as to deny it, I will not therefore tire the Reader with transcribing Councils as oft as you can say, Prove it.

I added, And all those that wanted the necessary abilities to the essentials of their office, He saith, Prove that there were such Popes? I answer, That you have had children Popes, and some that were illiterate and ignorant, I have oft proved by the express testimonies of your own Historians. How oft must I repeat them?

I added, That therefore their Church hath oft been headless, and the Succession interrupted; Councils having thus censured many Popes.

W. J. When you have proved the precedents, prove that.

R. B. Reader, is not the cause of the Papacy in a desperate case; if Arms upheld it not, when their Champion hath no more to say for the very successive being of the Popes, but to bid me prove that which all men that read them know is commonly, and copiously asserted by their Councils and Historians? How oft have I cited their

Platina,

Platina, *Werverus*, yea *Baronius*, *Binnius*, *Genebrard* their greatest flatterers, telling us that some were Children, and some illiterate, and fifty together were not Apostolical, but Apostolical, &c.

W. J. Prove that they were lawful Councils which so censured any Popes, which we admit as true and lawful.

R. B. Alas, poor men! are you driven to that? 1. If you have the face to deny those to be lawful Councils that censured *Aonorius*, the two *Johns*, *Eugenius*, &c. we may as well and a little better use the same liberty, and question whether that of *Trent*, *Florence*, *Lateran*, &c. were lawful?

2. May not the world see now what is the foundation of your faith, and the validity of your Authority and Tradition? even your own wills? General Councils tell you the sense of the Church, and the Tradition of your forefathers, if you like them. But if the Pope dislike them, they are no lawful Councils, and their testimony null. The sum is, whatever Councils say, the Pope shall never be proved a Heretick or Infidel till he will say that he is one himself, and will subscribe as *Attreclinus* did to his own condemnation, or with *Liberius* confess his fault.

3. And have not these men a notable advantage to proselyte Ladies and illiterate persons, when if General Councils damn their Popes, it is but bidding them, Prove those to have been lawful Councils. And though I can prove to them that even their own Popes have affirmed them lawful, yet few women are so far skilled in History, and so they must yield to every impudent deceiver: And when I have proved all, it is but as *Belarmine's* fetching a denial out of the word *Conciliariter*, against the approbation of *Martin* 5.

4. But is this enough for you? what if none were lawful Councils that displease I said that the Pope? Are they therefore no competent witnesses of a matter of fact? In the charge of so many hundred Bishops and other Clerks as were at the Councils of *Basil*, *Constance*, many of them *Pisa*, &c. competent Witnesses, that the Pope was a Heretick, Simonest, Murderer, &c. incapable, &c. had the Pope but consented these Councils had been the Catholic Church and infallible, which he gave? And may they not be credible Witnesses against him till he consent? How shall we believe them, when they tell us what was held and done in all the Christian World a thousand or fourteen hundred years ago, if after examination of Witnesses we may not believe them concerning one man, one public sinner, in their own time, and know assert it, and Historians signify, if the testimony of many hundred Bishops congregate and deliberately examining, consulting and sentencing, be false?

R. B. I next asked, Q. 2. Where and how must this Institution of Christ (of the Papacy) be found?

W. J. In the revealed Word of God, written or unwritten.

R. B. 1. Remember, Reader, that even now he told us that the Church-Governours are known without Revelation, else God had made an imprudent Government. He could not mean that they are known to be men, but Governours, distinct from Usurpers, or else he had spoke non-sense or impertinently. And yet now it is in the revealed word of God.

2. I answered, That they never gave the world assurance how to know the measure of their unwritten word, nor where to find it, so as to know what it is.

W. J. We say we have.

R. B. Just as now you do to me: If that Word of God be still unwritten, and neither to be found in your Councils, nor any of your Books, I challenge all the reason in the world, to tell us where we may certainly come to know what it is, and when we have all; especially when so great Councils as *Ariminum*, *Ephes*, 2, *Constance* & *Basil* may be deceived in your very Fundamentals of Authority, in matter of fact so near at hand.

R. B. Tib 4.

R. B. Till you prove Christ's institution, which you have never done, you free us from believing in the Pope.

W. J. All are free from believing in the Pope; we believe in God, but not in the Pope: who of us ever charged you to do so?

R. B. Even they that charge us to trust our very Salvation upon his Infallibility, Veracity or Authority, as from which only with his Council we must know what is God's Word, and what the meaning of it, what is it to believe in, but to believe his Authority and Veracity, and trust upon it? But we thank you for discharging us from believing in the Pope: But I doubt when we are in your power, you will call us to an after-reckoning, and burn us for not believing on him, when you acquit us from believing in him; so much of your faith doth lie on a Letter.

R. B. *Quest. 3. Will any, ones Election prove him to be Pope? or who must elect him, ad esse?*

W. J. Such as by approved custom are esteemed by those to whom it belongs, fit for that charge, and with whose election the Church is satisfied.

R. B. Now we come to their desperation! never were men put to more open confusion in the very essence of their cause. Something must be said, but they know not what. I noted here, that if no Election, or any ones Election will serve turn, the Scholars may elect a Schoolmaster Pope, and any man may be Pope, or an hundred may be Popes: But if not, then it must be known who it is that hath the power of Election, and that it was done by them. The people of *Barnet* or *Brainford* have no authority to elect a Lord Mayor of *London*; nor would one of their choice be any better than a Play-house Lord. Our Question is, who must choose the Governor of all the world? To reason all the world should meet by themselves, or their just Delegates to choose him. But the man that claimeth this Divine Sovereignty hath been sometime chosen at *Rome* by a meeting of Lay-citizens; and sometimes by neighbour-Bishops, and sometimes (at the best) by Citizens and Presbyters together, Bishops approving it, and sometimes by the Emperors of *Rome*, of *Constantinople*, or of *Germany*, and sometime by a sort of things called Cardinals. Now if none of these have more right to choose him than the rest, then either any body hath right that can carry it out, and get possession, or else no body hath right, or none can tell who hath it. Accordingly for above forty years together, the Emperour and his party chose one Pope, and the King of *France* and his party chose another; one reigned at *Rome*, and another at *Avignon* in *France*. Part of Europe chose or owned one, and part another; and at once, saith *Wernerus*, there were six alive that were then Popes, or had been Popes (of whom one honeste than the rest, because he could not read himself, chose another Pope to be his partner to read the Mass, which he could not do, and to help him in the rest).

Here in the answer of W. J. 1. He durst not tell us who have the power of Election. 2. But he saith it must be those that are fit for the charge. If I should ask who must choose the Lord Mayor of *London*, and you should so answer me, Those that are fit for the charge, would not any sensible Reader judge by your answer that you were unfit for an honest disputation.

3. He saith, that the Electors must be so esteemed (fit for the charge) by those to whom it doth belong. To whom what doth belong? why, to esteem the Electors fit. But how should a man know to whom it doth belong to judge who is fit to be an Elector? Doth it belong to the world or to *Rome*? To the people, Presbyters, Bishops, Emperours or Cardinals? Here we have more difficulties than we thought of; we must know who is fit to be Pope, and who is fit to elect him, and to whom it belongs to judge who are fit to be Electors; that is, to elect Electors; and when shall we come to know all this? If he say that it is the people that must choose the Choosers, what people be they? they of *Rome*? or they of all *Italy*? or they of *Germany*? or of *France*? or of all *Europe*? or of all the world?

3. He

3. He saith that the choosers must be such as by custom are esteemed fit by those: But what custom doth the man mean? when there have been four or five ways or sorts of Election, had not every one of them a beginning? and at their beginning could they plead custom? O that your sword were no stronger than your reasons!

4. Yea, he saith, it must be approved customs. But not a word who must be the approvers of all these new customs.

5. And when all is done, no more is needful, but that the unknown persons to whom it belongs do esteem the Electors fit, and so be they fit or unfit their estimation carrieth it.

6. But yet the hardest part remaineth, The Church must be satisfied with the Election. But, 1. Either the Election is valid or invalid before: If valid, will the Churches dissatisfaction invalidate it? If invalid, will the Churches satisfaction make it valid, or make him Pope that was none before? Who would have thought that a Pope had been a wight so utterly unintelligible?

2. And what way must the Churches satisfaction be notified to me? Is it by some note of approbation, or by silence? It's in vain for men to contradict that have no power. But what if I believed in my conscience that most of the Church is unsatisfied in the Election? Must I take that man to be no Pope? Then I am necessitated to believe that when Whores and Murderers, and such like, brought in the fifty that *Baronius* and *Genebrard* called Apostatical, &c. there was an interruption of the Succession by the dissatisfaction of the Church. Good Sir, was the Church satisfied with such men? Was it satisfied with those that the forefaid Council condemned as Heretical, wicked, and one of them a Devil incarnate? Did those Councils signify no dissatisfaction of the Church?

3. And must I suspend my reception of the Pope till the *Abyssines*, *Armenians*, *Graeks*, yea or *Mexicans*, and the *Antipodes* signify their satisfaction?

4. But what is the Church that must be satisfied? when half *Europe* was for one, and the rest for another for forty years and more, with which of them was the Church satisfied? Was *France* or *Germany* the Church?

5. Lastly, by this we are acquit from acknowledging your Pope at all, while we know that three fourth parts, or at least two third parts of Christs Church on Earth is unsatisfied with your Pope and Papacy it self. To all this he answers:

W. J. 1. Four exceptions are fallacies, a sensu conjuncto ad sensum disjunctum.

R. B. See, Reader, what the Papacy is come to, if it had not the sword, or ignorance to uphold it, when he puts together so many things as necessary ad esse to the Election of a Pope, (and yet makes nothing but a meer name to deceive the ignorant of any one of them) is it fallacious of me to expect that all those things be found in the Election? Or is it not fallacious in him that can shew us never a one of them?

Next W. J. saith, If the Church did really acquiesce in such an elected person as Pope, it was satisfied according to the substance of the Election, though not in the circumstances.

R. B. 1. Reader, is this any answer to any of the forefaid Objections? what satisfaction? what Church? when part of the Church was divided, and the greater part abhorred them all? And was he Pope or no before this acquiescing? If so, what made him so? And, 2. What doth he but cheat us by his distinction of the substance and circumstances of Election? Doth he not obstinately (but necessarily) refuse to tell what is the substance of Election? Have those that were brought in by Whores, Poison and Murderers, the substance? Had those that were chosen by people, Presbyters, Bishops, Emperours, and Cardinals, all the substance? If so, why may not twenty have the substance at once, or four or five at least? what is it that is the substance? Alas, we ask in vain that which cannot be told us!

Next he saith, If the Church never accepted them as Popes, they are not to be accounted Legal Popes.

Self. 4. *Ans.* Farewel the Papacy then; and yet must we be burnt for, not being their Subjects. 1. Then it seems that Election and Consecration made them, not Popes at all before the Churches acceptance: And sure that never made them such afterward. 2. Then we have no Popes, now most of the Church (*Abassines, Copties, Armenians, Syrians, Greeks, Moscovites, Protestants, &c.* there are two to one) are against the Papacy. 3. And then *Eugenius* the 4th, and others disowned and damned by General Councils (your own Churches Representatives) were, no Popes.

Self. 5. Next he saith, *That the abuses of Election came from mingling Lay-authority with Church-Government, which is out of their Sphere.* Now this abuse is much consonant with the Doctrine of Protestants; so that those for the most part who conform their practice according to the Protestant Principles, introduced this abuse into the Popes Election.

Ans. Reader, what doth this man deserve for thus murdering the Papal cause? 1. Our question was not who it was long of that they had no true lawful Popes for a long time, but whether it be not true, and their succession interrupted?

2. And is he worthy to be accounted a man that ever read Church-History that knoweth not, that before there were any Christian Emperours, the Laity with the Presbyters chose the Bishop of Rome, and all other Bishops? To then, if this was the abuse, the first and ancient way was the abuse, which their innovation rectified; and who knoweth not what power the Emperours used from 320 till 1000 years, in disposing of all the Patriarchal seats? And seeing Cardinals are the newest way of Election, is not the newest likeliest to be the abuse?

3. But I desire the Reader specially to note, that this man confesseth that Popes were formerly chosen according to Protestant principles; and that their present way is a Reformation of the Protestant way as abusive; and who then are the Innovators, and the culpable Reformers? even *Zilibrander Greg. 7.* after bloody Wars against the Emperours, and the perjury that he had involved a great part of the Clergy in. And yet they would persuade men that it is our Principles and Reformation that are new, and theirs is the old way.

4. We are not ashamed to own that the Protestant principles do assert the power of Christian Princes in matters of Religion so far as the sword is therein to interpose (which Bishop *Bilson* of *Christ* Subjection hath well opened) and the power of the people in consenting to their Pastors; and that we abhor their forcing Princes to be their executioners.

Self. 6. *R. B.* Is consecration necessary, and by whom ad esse?

W. J. It is not absolutely necessary ad esse.

R. B. If consecration be not necessary to Papacy, then it is not necessary that this or that man consecrate him more than another; and then it is not necessary to a Bishop, and then the want of it makes no interruption in any Church, any more than in yours.

Self. 7. *W. J.* Neither Papal nor Episcopal Jurisdiction (as all the Learned know) depends of Episcopal or Papal ordination, nor was there ever interruption in successions in Episcopal Jurisdiction in any See for want of that alone, that is necessary for consecrating others validly, and not for jurisdiction over them.

R. B. What multiplied self-destroying answers are you driven to? 1. See here, Reader, how short a solution you have from yourselves, of all their old objections about the Bishops Ordination at the *Nags-head-Tavern* in *Cheapside*, and the interruption of our Succession, and nullity of our Priesthood; now you see that jurisdiction depends not on Ordination, but may be without it. Their Pope and Bishops may have all their Ecclesiastical Government, though they be Lay-men. And may not Parish-priests have so also over the people? These *Papists* are more kind to the Protestant-Churches that have not Episcopal Ordination, than some called Protestants in this age are; want of Ordination nulleth not their Government. But for my part I would the Church had never known any such jurisdiction, as is neither the Magistracy by the sword, nor given by Ordination to the Pastors, called the power of the Keys: At least I thought that it had been necessary to Popes and Prelates that they be Priests. If some as Juniors among Presbyters, may be the Governors of the rest, (as an Abbot among Monks) yet sure he must be a Presbyter (or Monk) himself. I take the Priestly Office or Ministry.

by to be effcientiated by a Subordination to Christ in the participation of the three parts of his Office ministerially, viz. to be Sub-teachers, Sub-rectors, and Sub-priests to guide the people in Gods worship.

If Ordination be not necessary to Jurisdiction (A presumptuous word for Clergy-men) then either such unordained Bishops may ordain or not. If not, then they are no Bishops. What is their Jurisdiction? If yes, then they may give that which they never had, and Lay-men may ordain. And may not ordained Presbyters ordain much more? One would think that the reading of *Forus* against *Gausseus*, *De desperata causa Papatus* had driven this man to these desperate answers: But he was aware that some Popes having been unordained men, he had no other shift.

Join to this what Dr. *Stillingfleet* after others hath fully proved, that the Orders given by Schismatics and Heretics are valid in the opinion of their Doctors, and you will see that their talk against the English Ministry is such, as the men do not believe themselves.

R. B. Q. 3. What notice or proof is necessary to the Subjects?

W. J. So much as is necessary to oblige subjects to accept of other elected Princes to be their Sovereigns.

R. B. 1. But what that is, you would not tell us.

2. But if this be so, it must be so much as sufficeth to the subjects to distinguish him from Usurpers; or else Kings and Usurpers must be equally obeyed; and if so, then 1. The greatest part of the Christian world (*Abassines* and the rest before named) have no such notice of your Pope; it was many ages before the *Abassines* heard of him. 2. And *Greeks* and *Protestants* have no such notice; nay you tell no man which way he should have it, when neither any way of election, nor any Consecration is necessary to the Office. 3. And then what notice had men in the long Schisms, which was the true Pope?

But note, Reader, that a Kingdom is so narrow a space, that notice may be given to all the subjects who is their true King. But the Earth is so great, and so much of it unknown, and so few ever sailed about it since the Creation, and those few saw so few of the inhabitants, that verily it is a hard matter to satisfy all the world who is the true Pope, and that he is truly elected, and is no Usurper. And on these terms it is but little of the world that is obliged to be subject to the Pope.

And now, Reader, if this man hath taught thee to understand what a Pope is, and what makes him so, and who is he, thou art far more teachable than I am; for he leaveth me more at a loss than he found me.

CHAP. IV.

What mean you by the word Bishop?

W. J. I mean by Bishop such a Christian Pastor as hath power and jurisdiction to govern the inferior Pastors, Clergy and people within his Diocese, and so confirm and give holy Orders to such as are subject to him.

R. B. Here I desired to know of him, whether he meant a power given by God, or by men? and if by God, whether mediately or immediately? But this he was not willing to answer. Saying:

W. J. The definition abstracts from particulars, and subsists without determining that question.

R. B. But sure equivocal make no good definitions, and power or Episcopacy given by God, and given by men, cannot be *ejusdem* species, and therefore the word as to them is equivocal. Here therefore I asked:

Q. 1. Whether, seeing they seem to make the Pope himself but a humane creature (or jure humano) they yet not the Bishop above him, if the Bishop be jure divino. And if not, whether they make not all their Churches humane things; (or however the Roman Church to be humane, and so its form not necessary to Salvation, if the Pope be humane.)

W. J. Where said I that Election was jure humano? that there be an election of him, is jure divino, (by competent Electors): the determination who hic & nunc are competent, is jure Ecclesiasticum. Know you not that neither the Electors nor Consecrators of him, give him Papal jurisdiction, but Christ.

R. B. 1. You say that there is no need of Revelation to know the Church-Governours: therefore they are not of Gods making, unless it be jure naturali; which none pretend. For God no way giveth right but by natural evidence of his will; or by Revelation, (either natural in the constitution of the Creatures, or natural by Providential alterations, or by Supernatural notice.) 2. If God have not annexed the power to any one sort of Electors choice, or have given no power to any determinate persons to choose a Pope, nor to any to choose the Choosers, then either God giveth no power to the Pope, or else he giveth Papal power to every one that shall be chosen by whomsoever: The latter you abhor, for then any man might be Pope at his pleasure, and there might be a thousand at once. The former consequence is plain, because if God make not every man a Pope; but one man in the world; the Donation of God must by God be some way applied to that person rather than to others: Now if God hath neither imposed any determinate (or specified) persons to elect him rather than others, nor any to elect Electors, nor yet made the Consecrators the determining applicers, there is no way by which God applyeth it more to that man than to others: You neither donor can name any other way. Now you confess that God hath not given the power of Election to any determinate persons; but that the Electors may be sometimes people, sometime Presbyters, or both; sometime Princes, sometime Bishops, sometime Cardinals. All that God saith you hold, is that they be competent. But this determineth of none. And you neither do, nor can tell us to whom God hath given the power to judge antecedently of the Election competency, and to choose the choosing persons, without which it will never be any mans work, unless all that think themselves competent might choose Popes. You dare not undertake to tell us, whether it be all the Christian world, or only the City of Rome, Princes, Prelates, Presbyters, people, or who that God hath made choosers of the choosers. So that you cannot say that God giveth the Pope his power by your way.

3. But on the by I desire those that say that their Electors or Ordainers give Ministers their power, to learn here this truth from you, that God giveth the power by his Donative word, and mends our determine of the person that shall from God receive it. But yet a determination there must be, and that of Gods appointment.

R. B. I told him that R. Smith, called Bishop of Caledon, Governour of the English Papists, ubi supra, confesseth it to be no part of their faith that the Pope is St. Peters successor jure divino. He answereth:

W. J. You should have done well to cite the place; for I have no time to seek whole books over.

R. B. Note what must be due to this sort of men. I had to him in the same book cited the words in pag. 299. of my book, and R. Catechism book, pag. 9. the words are: To us it appeareth that the Bishop of Rome is St. Peter's successor, and should be the Father, Head, and all the Catholic Church believe with him whether it be jure divino, or humanum, is no point of faith. Now when he came to the words where I cited them; he wisely takes no notice of them. And now when I refer him to the citation which was a few leaves before, the weary way man instead of an answer, saith, I should have done well to cite the place, for he hath not time to seek whole books. But what good will well-doing do to such a one as you, where the better it is, the worse you like it. To not this, is a sad imagination that you did not understand.

R. B. Q. 2. I asked, how should the Pope have the Episcopal power? what election or consecration is necessary to it? If I know not who hath it, I am never the better. He answereth:

W. J.

W. J. As you know who hath temporal power, by an universal or most common consent of the people: The Election is differently according to different times, places, and other circumstances; Episcopal Consecration is not absolutely necessary to true Episcopal Jurisdiction.

R. B. More hard things still! 1. I know who is king in temporal power in our hereditary Kingdom, by the constitution of the Monarchy consent by all men to be hereditary, and so attested by Law and History; and by most credible testimony, and uncontrolled fame, that CHARLES the Second is the true Heir: And in Elective Kingdoms, as Poland, it is known by publick undenied testimony. But do Bishops become such by their birthright and hereditary Title? who hath asserted that? If it be by Election, the Electors must have just power to elect?

2. But what mean you by common consent of the people? No man can tell whether you join those words to know, or to hath. If you mean that I must know it by the peoples consent, as notifying it to me, it's nothing to our question now; nor is it always true: The greater part of the people may mistake the Prince's right, and suppose it to be in a Usurper, and yet the Prince doth not lose his right by that, nor must I believe them. And I think in your Schisms, no man could say that the common consent of the people, was always for him that carried it at last as right. But if you mean, as you seem, that the universal or common consent of the people, is the determining cause that must qualifie the person for the power, Then either you mean an antecedent or a consequent consent. If antecedent, that is election, which you say may vary. If consequent, it could not cause that which was caused before. And it is not true that the consequent consent of the most of the people, depriveth the King of his Power, or proveth it to be in a Usurper.

3. But seeing you here also say, that Consecration is not absolutely necessary, nor Election by any one sort or way, but may be varied as times vary, you have made either, any man a Bishop, that any men will chuse; or you have made no man a Bishop, for want of a determining application; or no man can know himself, or be known to be a Bishop. If the question were, who is the true Husband of such a woman? and you should say, That her own antecedent consent or election is not necessary, but without it sometimes the Kings election, sometimes the Ministers, sometimes the Parents may serve; and Matrimonial celebration is not necessary; it would follow that the woman may have a Husband against her will; and before she consent; and the man may have many, or can never know which is he; for the King may chuse her one, and the Priest another, and the Parents a third. So here.

4. And if his Consecration be not necessary to Episcopacy, how will you prove Ordination necessary to the Priesthood? Here I noted,

R. B. that he resolveth the mysteries of their succession and mission, into popular consent.

To this W. J. saith, that he meaneth it only as the means of knowing it.

Ans. But I enquired of the causes or evidences by which a Bishop may be known from a Usurper; what it is that maketh him a Bishop? as I would know a man from a brute; a Judge, a Physician, a Merchant, from other men. But he durst not come to this, because guilt makes them conscious of their own defect.

But W. J. saith, p. 50. It is sufficient that some generalities of Election be determined jure divino. Ans. Let them be such that I may know a Bishop from a Usurper by, and it is enough.

W. J. As that it be done by Christians; by such as are capable to know who is a fit person for the Office, choosing freely according to the Laws of God; the further determinations are left to the Church, &c.

R. B. Worse still! 1. If the men of sort chuse a Bishop of London, or several parties chuse ten Bishops here, they are all chosen by Christians. But that is not enough. What if ten parties chuse ten Popes, ten Kings, ten Bishops; the Christianity of the chusers will not prove them all authorized.

2. Nor will the choosers capacity of knowing the capable prove it. Three or four very wise men may best know who is capable to be a Judge, a Bishop, a Husband, a Tutor, a Physician,

an,

an' &c. and yet if they should choose all the Judges, Bishops, Husbands, &c. in the land, the persons chosen by them would be never the more such, than the unchosen.

Scct. 7.

3. But being conscious that you had said nothing, you put in these words, according to the Laws of God. But the question is, *How shall I know what makes a true Bishop according to the Laws of God?* and you skillfully tell me, he must be chosen by knowing Christians according to the Laws of God. He that is not satisfied by you with such talk, let him be unsatisfied.

R. B. I here noted again that by his way none of our Churches are disabled from the plea of a continued succession for want of Episcopal Consecration (Ordination) or due Elections. 2. But that we cannot know if our Bishops to be true Bishops, because we cannot know that they have common consent. He answereth:

Scct. 8.

¶ W. J. I No man argues you of the want of succession in your respective Sees because you want Episcopal Consecrations; but because you want Episcopal Election, Confirmation, Pocation, Mission, Jurisdiction. For your first Bishops in Queen Elizabeths time (and the same is of your Ministers of Parishes) were intruded by secular power, — the Capisula had the present power of electing the Bishops. — vid. eat.

R. B. 1. It's well we are now quite rid of the old cavil of the Nag's-head Consecration: Why was not this contest sooner? Did you well to abuse the people so long?

2. I thought we had nothing to have proved but due Qualifications, due election (or consent) and due Ordination (or Consecration). But here now comes in I know not what and how much more, Confirmation, Pocation, Mission, Jurisdiction. All hard words: Had I put him but to have told us the meaning of these also what work should I have made him?

1. What is Confirmation without which Qualifications, Election and Ordination make not a true Minister or Bishop? O that we knew it. 2. What is Pocation besides the three aforesaid, and which is necessary ad esse? 3. And what is Mission besides those three, which is also so necessary? 4. And what meaneth he by Jurisdiction that was wanting? was it the Jurisdiction of the Collator, or of the Receiver; not the former, for we never knew that God gave any Jurisdiction to the Clergy, but the Pastoral power of guiding the Churches by the Word and Keys; which is the work of their own office; and the office of the Ordainer is to ordain; and if he have power to Ordain (or Consecrate) he hath that Jurisdiction which consisteth of that power. If it be the Receiver's Jurisdiction that he meaneth, that is the same contradiction. For to ordain one to the Pastoral office, is to give him all the jurisdiction which is part of that office. And for any other jurisdiction we with Princes would keep it both from the ordainers and the ordained.

But he saith that our Bishops wanted Episcopal Election. Is it come to that, and yet the way of Election all this while made so indifferent? What is Episcopal Election? not an Election by Bishops, that you affirm not: Not an election to be Bishops; that you deny them not. It is therefore such an Election as is necessary to the being of a Bishop. And what is that? why all that we have been able to extort from you is, *That it be done by Christians capable to know fit persons, choosing freely according to the word of God.* But what it is that is according to the Word of God, and what measure of consonancy to the Word, and in what points is necessary ad esse, you durst never tell us: And we say that our Bishops were chosen by Christians capable of knowing fit persons. I confess that it is my own judgment that they should have the choice or consent of the people whom they are to oversee (and of the Presbyters where there are any under them) and so thought your own Bishops for above 600 years, even when Gregory 1st wrote his Epistles: But if you had asserted that, it would do more to unpope and unbishop your Church, than to disprove ours.

But he saith that the Capisula had the power of electing Bishops, and of constituting Parishes: Priests in such places as wanted them.

Ans. 1. Suppose they had: you say no particular Elections are necessary ad esse; and why theirs? 2. But quo jure, by what right could one Dean and Chapter of a City elect an Overseer of many hundred Parish-priests, and many score or hundred thousand souls, without their consent? You dare not say that God gave them that power; and if man did it, what

men

men were they? If you say that they were men that had more power in England than the King, Parliament, and the consenting people, you must prove it. If you lay it on any foreign power, Pope and Council, we will deny their power here and herein. What man doth, man may undo. 3. But indeed your meer Capisular Election is null and contrary to Gods Word, and the ancient custom of the Churches. By Gods Word, the consent of the Flock, and of the ordainers and of the ordained, made a Pastor, Bishop or Presbyter. By the customs of the Churches in the Empire, sometime the greatest neighbour-Bishops assumed the power, and sometimes Councils overtopped them all, and undid what they did, and sometimes the Emperours put in and out as pleased them (as Solomon put out Abiathar.) But always the peoples election or acceptance was necessary. For instance; when Gregory Nazianzenese had consuted the Macedonians and Arrians, and encreased the Church at Constantinople, though the Arrian Bishop since Valens time kept the great Church, Gregory had a little one, and was chosen their Bishop by the Orthodox people alone. This was his first title. After that, Peter Bishop of Alexandria made him Bishop quantum in se, or confirmed him; this was his additional title. After this the same Peter bribed by money, without recalling his former grant, made Maximus (a right seeker of a Bishoprick, as the world hath since gone) bishop in his stead: the people refused the change, and retained Gregory. Afterward Maximus got both Peter and the Egyptian bishops to make him bishop of Constantinople (where was the Pope all this while) the people still kept close to Gregory. Afterward Theodosius the Emperor (removing from the West) puts Gregory in possession of the great Church, and turneth out the Arrians, and confirmeth him bishop. After this Asclepius of Antioch, and a Council at Constantinople, make Gregory bishop. After this more bishops coming in to the Council, got the major vote, and he discerning that they were resolved to depose him, departed, requesting the Emperours leave, as seeing the doleful divisions and contentions of the bishops, not otherwise to be quieted; entreating the Emperor to keep them in some unity and peace, lest it should disgrace and ruin the newly reformed Church. And the Council made Nectarius bishop (the Pope in all this * Or rather never minded?). By this one instance you may see how bishops were then made in the greater places; though in lesser, the election of the people and Presbyters, and the ordination of three for some bishops, neighbour-bishops did suffice, according to the ancient rule and custom.

But he saith, *That the old bishops were living, and not legally deposed.* Ans. 1. Sub judice est; we say they were. 2. Some deserted. 3. An illegal removal of the former, doth not ever nullifie the title of the latter, viz. when the flock consenteth to the change. &c. else what fear is there that hath not had their succession interrupted and corrupted? but none more than Rome, and Constantinople, and Alexandria. What poisonings, unjust depositions and schisms, have made way for successions? Is your Papacy therefore null?

But methinks it is a strange novelty that he makes the Capisula to have had the right of choosing (not only the bishops, but) all the Parish-priests: to say nothing of the Patrons or the Princes power (which I think is as good as the Chapters) who knoweth not that the bishops and the people did always chuse the Presbyters, and not the Chapters?

But he saith that they were intruded by Secular Power. Ans. And were not your Popes so ordinarily, till Hildebrand got the better of the Emperors? But we had more than this.

R. B. Your Popes have not the consent of the most of the Christians in the world; nor (for ought you or any man knows) of most in Europe.

W. J. Of what Christians? such as you and your associates are? We regard that no more than did the ancient holy Popes, not to have had the consent of the Nestorians, Eutychians, Pelagians, Donatists, Arrians, &c.

R. B. Contempt of most of the body of Christ, is one of the great proofs that you are all the Church: And did not the Donatists say the same before you? And what but the sword doth make your cause to be better than theirs? How easie is it for any Sect to say, We are the only Church of Christ, and though most of the Christian world be against us, we regard them not?

Reader,

Scct. 9.

Scct. 10.

Reader, mark the truth and candor of these men! When we tell them that the *Greeks, Armenians, Syrians, Jacobites, Georgians, Copts, Abyssinians*, are of the same Church with us (because they have the same *Heads*, and the same essential faith), the Papists (in their talk and writings) tell us, that they are more of their mind than of ours; and that indeed they are not Heretics, but well-meaning-men. But when we tell them then how two or three parts of the Church is against their Popes, pretended universal power, they number all these then with Heretics, as not to be regarded.

But abundance of their own Writers, yea such as have lived among them at *Jerusalem* and other parts, do vindicate the generality of these foreign Christians from the charge of Herefie.

2. But doth not the world know, that a man is supposed to be rightful Pope as soon as the Cardinals (an upstart sort of things) have chosen him, before ever any of the people of *Europe*, even *Papists*, do consent? But perhaps he'll say, that the people consent that these shall be the chusers; sure they did not so till *Etienne* days; nor since any otherwise than by silence or non-resistance, where they have no places to speak, nor power to resist, even as the Country-men consent to the conquering Armies that oppress them.

Self. 11. R. B. It's few of your own people that know who is Pope (much less are called to consent) till after he is seated in possession.

W. J. What then? Is not the same in all elective Princes, where the extent of their Dominions is exceeding large?

R. B. 1. I confess when we have an Elective King of all the world, I had rather Cardinals chuse him at *Rome*, than all the world should meet to chuse him. And if Christ had made us a King or Bishop of all the world, he would have told us who must chuse him, to save the men at the *Antioch* their journey.

2. But why pretend you then the peoples consent, when you plead it unnecessary? In *Polland*, that their *Diets* chuse their Kings, is from a known reason; it is the Constitution of their Kingdom, which the people agreed to, and chuse many of the chusers. But when did the Universal Church constitute your Cardinals to be the Electors? Or which of the Cardinals are chosen by the Universal Church, or any other than the Pope himself? God made Bishops like Corporations, where all may chuse the Mayor: Who made them like great Kingdoms, or set one over all the world (where the people cannot chuse, nor God made any chusers), is the question?

Self. 12. R. B. 4. According to this rule your successions have been frequently interrupted, when against the will of General Councils, and of the far greatest part of Christians, your Popes have kept the seats by force.

W. J. These are generalities: What Popes? What Councils in particular? Name and prove, if you will be answered.

R. B. What disgraceful ignorance are you forced to pretend? What need I go over your Schisms? What need I name any more than *Eugenius* the 4th. deposed by a great General Council, and two or three parts of the Church disowning your Pope at this day?

Self. 13. R. B. I told him how his instance even about Civil Power failed, seeing the consent of a people pre-engaged to their Prince, gives him right to a Usurper.

W. J. The people cannot be supposed to consent freely and lawfully to an usurper, &c.

R. B. Lawfully indeed they cannot, and that's the same thing that I affirmed: you confute me by granting what I say. When the Bishop of *Rome* hath a lawful election to be Bishop of all the world, we will obey him; and so we will any Prelate or Priest that hath a known lawful election.

Self. 14. R. B. Will any Diocese suffice ad esse? what if it be but in particular Assemblies?
W. J. It must be more than a Parish, or than one single Congregation, which hath no different inferior Pastors, and one who is their Superior, &c.

R. B. 1. How ambiguously and fraudulently do you answer? No man can tell by this whether you unbishop all that had but one Parish or Congregation; or only all that had not Presbyters

byters under them? Which ever you mean, it is notoriously false, and a nullifying of the ancient Episcopacy. Ignatius tells you, that in his days one Church was known by one *Aliter*; and one Bishop, with the Presbyters and Deacons. And though I think not as *Dr. Hammond*, that all the first Bishops in Scripture times were seeld as the sole Pastors of single Congregations, without any Presbyter under them; yet when you consider with whom he agreeth in this, viz. *Dionysius Petavius*, and what *St. Clara* saith for it, fathering it on *Scotus*, we think you should not so far differ from your own Doctors, as to deny all those to be true Bishops of the Scripture-times, who they think were the only Bishops. You have a custom of calling the Apostles Bishops, even *Peter* Bishop of *Antioch* and *Rome*; Did not those first Bishops then make all the Presbyters that were under them? *Quo*. Whether they were no Bishops till they had made those Presbyters? If no, then those first Presbyters had not Episcopical ordination: If yea, then *habetur questum*.

The truth is, all the ancientest Bishops were the Pastors of single Churches, not near so big as many of our Parishes: I have elsewhere proved this at large. I instance to him only in *Gregory, Neocesariensis*, who was Bishop only of Seventeen souls, when he came thither first. He answereth:

W. J. How know you that there were no more in the Country adjacent? 2. Know you not that he was sent to multiply Christians, and make himself a competent Diocese?

R. B. I know the first by the consent of History; that telleth us of the Seventeen in the City over whom he was set, and speaketh of no more in such circumstances as would have occasioned it. 2. And I believe your second; but do not you see that you desert your Cause? and contradict your self? 1. Speak out: Was he the bishop of the *infidels*? Were they his Church? Or was he only to convert and gather them to the Church? 2. Was he not a Bishop there (before he had converted any one) to those seventeen alone? You dare deny none of this. Therefore he was a Bishop before he had more Congregations than one, and before he had any Presbyters to govern.

And here you may see how the changes that Popes and their Prelates have made in the Church, constraineth them to defend them by subverting their own foundation. For if those were no Bishops who had but one Congregation, yea and those that had no subject Presbyters, then the first ages (if not also the second, except in *Rome* and *Alexandria*) had no true Bishops, or at least the founders were not such; and their Episcopacy, as they describe it, hath no succession from the Apostles. Truth and Error will never make a close coalition.

CHAP. V.

Q. What mean you by TRADITION?

Self. 15. W. J. Understand by Tradition the visible delivery from hand to hand in all cases, of the revealed will of God either written or unwritten.

R. B. I suppose by visible from hand to hand, you mean principally of the unwritten (audible from ear to ear by speech). But all the doubts, by whom it must be delivered, by the Pastors or people, or both? by the Pope, or Councils, or Bishops dissent? by the major part of the Church, Bishops or Presbyters? or by how many?

W. J. By such and so many proportionably as suffice in a Kingdom to certify the people which are the ancient universal received customs in that Kingdom, which so to be morally considered.

R. B. O wary Disputant! that taketh heed lest you should answer while you seem to answer! Reader, a Kingdom is not so big as all the world! The Customs of a Kingdom may be known by the constant consent of the people of that Kingdom; and if they differ about it, Records

cards and law-books, books of expostition; and judges by the decision of particular men cases by high rates! But our customs be known as well over all the world? Yea, and can matters of faith and doctrine be as easily known as *practical customs*? Can we know as easily what are the Traditions of *Abahs, Armenians, Syrians, Egyptians, &c.* as of *England*? Can they of *Abahs* tell what are the true Traditions of all the Christian world, that have Traditions in their own Country so different from ours? They have many books as sacred among them by tradition, which we receive not. They have annual Baptism, and other ceremonies by Tradition, which we account to be unlawful. *They have annual Baptism, and other ceremonies by Tradition,*

Here I told Mr. J. 1. How certainly Tradition is against them, when most of the Christian world deny the Popes Sovereignty, and that as by tradition. And how lame their tradition is which is carried but by their private affirmations, and is but the unproved saying of a Set.

To this he saith

W. J. Tharthis belongs to our Controversie, and not to the explication of our terms. And so I must close by.

R. B. Q: 2. What proof or notice must satisfy us in particular? What is true tradition?

W. J. Such as with proportion is a sufficient proof, or notice of the Laws and Customs of tempo-

R. B. But you durst not tell us what that is that is proportionable. This was answered before. I added, *If it be necessary for every Christian to be able to weigh the credit of contradicting parties*; When one half of the world say one thing, and the other another thing, what opportunity have ordinary Christians to compare them, and discern the moral advantages on each side? As in the case of the Popes Sovereignty, when two or three parts are against it, and the rest for it. Both salvation live on this.

W. J. As much as they have to know which books are, and which are not Canonical Scripture among those that are in controversy.

R. 2. That these books were sent to the Churches from the Apostles, 1. Is a matter of fact. 2. And an assertion easily remembered. 3. And all the Churches are agreed of all that we take as Canonical. 4. And yet men that practically believe the Creed and Summaries of Religion, shall certainly be saved, though they erroneously doubted of some of the uncontroverted books (as Chronicles, Esther, Canticles, &c.) much more that receive not the controverted Apocrypha.

But 2. Your Traditions in question are many particulars, hard for to be remembered. 2. And that of matter of faith and fact, where a word forgotten or altered, changeth the thing. 3. And most Chriſtians in the world are againſt it. 4. And you would lay the peoples ſalvation on it: yea, and make it one of your cheating quibbles, to prove your religion fafer than ours, becauſe ſome Proteſtants ſay a Papiſt may be ſaved, but you ſay that Proteſtants cannot be ſaved (that is, becauſe you have leſſ ſincerity and charity). Is not here difference enough?

If you hold that all they are damned that believed not that all the Apocryphal books were Canonical, peruse Bishop *Confins* Catalogue of Councils and Fathers that received them not and see whether you damn not almost all the Church. But if you confess that there is no more necessity so salvation for men to be the subjects of your Pope, than there is that they try all the Apocrypha whether it be Canonical, and know it; why then do you found your belief that Christ is the Son of God, upon your forebelieving that the Pope is his Vicar, or your Church his Church? And why do you make such a stir in the world to affright poor people to believe and be subject to your Pope?

T here asked him, *Must all the people heretate the words of their prefont Teacher? And he*
durst not answer any way, but as much as they do for the determination of Canonical Scriptures
Ans. If it be no more, it giveth them no certainty; but by the belief of one man as a Teacher
no they are brought to distrust themselves their own feeling evidences by which the Teacher
himself knoweth his Books are Canonical. And if they attain no higher than to believe that
because the most holy Doctores, the undoubted forerunners of some texts or Books, will no
concern them; And so have the Scriptures the empire of Divine authority, which to
prepare the way to you will present to do as they think that they are of God, though no
repute him of every particular Text and Book.

I R.R. Then most of the world must believe against you, because most of the Teachers are against you. Tradition will overthrow Paper.

W. J. There are some Congregations of Christians united in the same profession of faith, *essentially* in communion and dependence of "Fathers," which is congruity in belief, *namely* any multiplicity of sacrifice, with *extreme* and multiple. Prove there is, and name it. All our adversaries, together, are a single body of a thousand different professions, and as much adversaries; one to another as they draw us. The one sufficient *ing* us in that, whereas the other condemns us; so that no need is to be taken to their testimonies, *namely* *hunc* *convenientia*.

1. *A. T.* They agree not with your interest. But if the Testimonies and Tradition of two or three parts of the Christian world, be not to be needed, I doubt the testimony of your Church or fourth part will prove much less regardable. Let us try the case. For these you are utterly confounded, 1. Indeed none that our ordinary language calleth a Congregation, that is, men that meet locally together, are so big as all your party. But a Church far better united than you are, is far greater than yours. Those that have all the Elements of the true Church of Christ are the Church of Christ; but the Reformed Churches, the Greek, Armenian, Antioch, Syrian, Jacobites, Georgians, Coptics, &c. have all the Elements of the true Church of Christ. Therefore they say, that one Church of Christ, is the Church of Christ. The Minor is thus proved. They that hold the same Head of the Church, believing in the same God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, and are devoted to him in the same Adoration, Governance, and believe all the Articles of faith, desire and practice essential to Christianity, in the Creed, Lord's prayer and Decalogue, and acknowledge the same as Gods word, which is now here received as Canonical, these have all the Elements of the true Church of Christ (and much more) Antioch are all the Antiochian Christians. Ergo, &c.

The Head and the Body are the constitutive parts of the Church; The Head is Christ, the Body are Christians. 1. They are united in the same profession of faith, viz. the same Baptism, Creed and Scriptures. 2. They are united in the same external communion, if you mean overlooking of faults in those Essentials, and much more. They have the same Scriptures read and taught; they preach the same Gospel; they eat the same Sacraments of the Covenant of Grace, viz. Baptism and the Lords Supper; yea, they are equivoqual for some Condemnation Ordination, or exclusion of penitents and abolition of Ministers. Moreover, though they agree not whether the name of Sacraments befit them all, much less sacraments of the Covenant of Grace; they observe the same Lords day for public worship; they pray, sing, sing, give thanks and praises to God; and hold the communion of Saints, and communication to each other in water. This is their external communion. 3. They have the same dependence of one people on the other, as the Ministers of Christ, authorized in seal and keys the Churches, and to go before them in the public worshipping of God. But ye say, what if they have not the same essential communion of Saints, in dependence on, or by the Instrumental Government of all the rest? indeed there is none such but you. For it is in that that they differ from you.

Reader is nowhere answered. I must have been some 20 years ago, when I was a young man, that I read in the Christian world was against the Principle, the point of an Universal Head or Government of all Churches. He said that no party which is for an Universal Government, and not against an Universal Governor, is so big as their party. I grant it. Had they all dependence on one, as an Universal Governor, they were not against an Universal Government. The Presbyters have one Abba, but he claims no Universal Government. The Americans have their Christlike Bishop, but he claims no Universal power. The Greeks have their Archbishop at Constantinople, but he pretends not to govern all the World. We are all against any Head of the whole Christian Church on Earth, but Christ, and therefore are united under no other.

[illegible]

Christians, and oft turn'd into two or three Heads, one saying I am the Head, and another I am the Head, and setting the world in blood and contention to try it out which of them shall get the better, as your forty years Schisms shew'd. 2. Therefore this Church which you reproach as patch'd, is but one: But yours is really many and none, specifically, as well as oft numerically; when there were two or three Popes, you had two or three Churches. For it is the *pars imperans* that individuateth the Society. And *de specie*, you are still three Churches, as holding three several heads: one holdeth the Pope to be the Head, another a Council, and a third the Pope and Council agreeing: And these Heads have oft condemn'd and deposed one another: Councils flamed Popes as Heretics, Infidels, Simoniacks, Murderers, Adulterers; and Popes accus'd Councils of Schism and rebellion at least. And to this day there is no certainty which were true Popes, nor which were true Councils, some being called by you *apostate*, because they pleased not the Popes, and some *apostolic*. But our Head of the Church is not thus divided, nor schismatical. 3. Our common faith is still the same, and its rule the same; but yours is mutable by new additions, as long Councils will make new Decrees, and no man can tell when you have call, and your faith is come to its full stature: Nay, and your Decrees which are your rule of faith are so many and obscure, that you are not agreed your selves in the number or the meaning of them. 4. It is a notorious truth, that all these Churches which you say have a thousand professions (as they all agree in one Christian profession, so) do less differ among themselves, than your seemingly-united Church doth with itself, whether you respect the number or the weight of differences.

1. For the Number, *sem libri iudicant*; all the Christian World besides hath not so many (nor I think half so many) Volumes of Controversies, as your Writers have written against one another, (as far as is come to the notice of this part of the World.)

2. And for the Weight, I have shew'd that you are divided in your very Fundamentals, the Supremacy; you confess here that your Church is not at all agreed what the Christian faith is, or who is a Christian: Some say, he that believeth the Church; and that God is a rewarder; others say, a Christian must believe in Christ. *Sec. 1.* Your Commentators differ about the sense of hundreds or thousands of Texts of God's own word. *Sec. 2.* Your Disputers about Grace and free-will, accuse one the other of making God the cause of Sin, and of denying the Grace of God. *Sec. 3.* Your Moralists differ about many Instances of Excommunicating Kings, and then killing them, and of the Popes power to depose them; and of perjury, lying, murder, adultery, fornication, false witness, yea about loving God himself, whether it be necessary to love him once a year, or whether attrition, that is repentance from bare fear, with penitence, may not serve turn to Salvation. With abundance such. And we confess that other Christians have their differences! And what wonder while they are so imperfect in knowledge, and all grace? And now if *Councils of discord* must tell us whose Tradition or Judgment is most reliable, let the impartial Judge, whether the more regardable Tradition of the far greatest part of the Church be not against you? and whether your reproaching them for discord, condemn not your selves much more than them. If a subject should stile himself the Kings Viceregent, and claim much of his Prerogative without his Commission, and a third part of the Kingdom should unite in receiving and obeying him, and have otherwise a thousand contentions among them; *Ques.* Whether these or the rest of the Kingdom were the more and better united?

Self. 6. When I next questioned, Whether the vulgar that know not Councils, resolve not their faith into the belief of the Parish-priest? he saith no: And saith, That the Priest is but the means by whom we come to believe; and tells us that else we know not whether there were any Christians 500 years ago. *Sec.*

Ans. But if they will be content with an impartial reading, and Historical proof of things past, we would not differ from them; we do not only assert these as well as they, but we say that as we have sounder teaching, so we have far better Historical Tradition of our faith, than that which dependeth on a pretended Sanctus Infallibility, or authority of their Pope and Sect; even the Historical Tradition of the whole Christian World, and of many of the enemies themselves.

What mean you by a GENERAL COUNCIL?

Self. 1. A General Council I take to be an Assembly of Bishops, and other chief Prelates, called, convened, confirmed, by those who have sufficient spiritual authority to call, convene and confirm it.

R. B. Here is nothing still but flying and hiding: his cause is such that he dare not answer. Note that, 1. Here is no mention of what extent it must be at all, whether these Prelates must be sent from all the Christian world? or whence? The least Provincial Council that ever was called, may be a General Council by this description.

2. He tells us of other chief Prelates, and yet never tells what sort of things he meaneth by chief Prelates, that are, no Bishops. And when he hath told us, doubtless he will never prove (nor I hope affirm) that any such Prelates are of Christs institution. And if the master of General Councils be not of Divine right, whether such Councils can be of Divine right, I leave to censure. A Council of humane Officers, is but a humane Council; and yet he leaveth out, yea excludeth Presbyters who are of Gods institution.

3. He tells us not who it is that must call, convene and confirm them. And he had reason for it: lest he approbate all those that were otherwise called. Here therefore I first ask:

Ques. 1. Who is it (as else) that must call, convene and confirm it? Till I know that, I am never the wiser knowing what a Council is, and which is one indeed.

W. J. Definitions abstract from inferior Subdivisions: For your satisfaction I affirm, it belongs to the Bishop of Rome.

R. B. This you must needs say for your cause sake: But he justifieth his definition as having a sufficient Genus [An Assembly] and Differentia [Bishops and chief Prelates convened, &c.]

Ans. You do ill to refuse all disputes but what are exactly Logical, (which is your custom for advantage to amaze the women) if your Logick be no better, should not a Relative Assembly be defined by its subject, fundamentum & terminus? 1. Your Genus is too general; it should have been a nearer Genus. 2. Your subject is partly false (as taking in besides Bishops, other chief Prelates, and excluding Presbyters), and partly ambiguous, what [other chief Prelates] you mean? and specially too narrow, not at all differing this Council from any inferior Synod. 3. Here is no end or terminus expressed, and so no difference put between a Council, and an Assembly of Prelates called for any common civil use, as if it were but to choose or elect a Prince. 4. Here is no just notice of the fundamentum, or the ratio fundandi; the true fundamentum is totally omitted, which is the mutual consent, 1. of the Churches abusing and sending their Bishops or Delegates; 2. of the Bishops to go in that Relation; 3. of all the Bishops to convene and agitate conciliar business for the proper ends. And a fundamentum is mentioned, which is, 1. insufficient and as nothing being but a Genus [called by those that have sufficient authority]. Instead of a species in your own opinion, who think that the Authority is only in the Pope. 2. And when you to explain your self, it is false, as shall be shew'd. 3. Yea the very formal Relation is not mentioned; which is the relation which the assembled members have to the Churches which they represent, and to each other, and to the intended end and work. So that here is a definition that is no definition, nor hath any thing like a definition, yet defended by this great disputer: Nor can any man tell what a General Council is by it. And how can we dispute intelligibly, when you can no better explain your terms?

Here I urged from his making the Popes call, convening and confirmation, necessary ad esse, that this nullifieth the chief Councils called General; this he denieth to be true. To which instead of transcribing long Histories, I only say, that whoever readeth the true Histories of the calling and convening of the Councils at Nice, Constantinople, (divers) at Ephesus, the first and second, yea that at Calcedon, though Leo desired it of the Emperour, and many others in those

ages, and yet will not confess that most of them were called by the Emperours special command, sometime requiring the Bishop of *Alexandria* to call them, sometime the Bishop of *Constantinople*, and sometime writing or sending to all the Patriarchs, or most, to come and send their Bishops, and usually also to his Civil and Military Officers to concur, and to be Judges; I shall not think that man fit to be disputed with about such matters, who hath the face to contradict such content of History and Records.

R. B. Q. 2. *Must it not represent all the Catholic Church? Doth not your definition agree to a Provincial, or the smallest Council?*

Self. A. W. J. My definition speaks specifically of Bishops and those Prelates, as contradicted from the inferior Priests and Clergy, and thereby comprised all the Priesthood in little species, and consequently makes distinction from the National or particular Councils, where some Bishops are only convened, namely, that being only some parts, and not the whole species, or specific notion applied to Bishops of every age, and yet I said not all Bishops, but Bishops and chief Prelates; because though all are so called, yet it is necessary that all should come.

R. B. Q. 3. *What a disadvantage is this Council! The man is so confounded, that the further he goes, the worse he makes it.*

Self. A. Holmsted needs intimate that it is all the Church that must be represented, and yet he durst not speak that due.

2. He intimates, that his speaking specifically of Bishops and Prelates, is equivalent to all Bishops and Prelates.

3. He intimates, that naming Bishops as contradicted from inferior Priests and Clergy, was necessary to difference a General Council from a National or other; as if a National or Provincial one might not consist of Bishops only, or as if the inferior Clergy might not be of a General one, as they oft have been.

4. He makes the difference here to be, that some Bishops are convened, not all; when yet he asserts, that all come not to General Councils.

5. Our question being, *What constitutes a General Council?* He saith, *It is all the Bishops, and one, all are necessary, though odd, that none be wanting any part of the Council.*

Self. 5. He saith, *He is so confounded, that yet he well sets out the word all, though it makes all that are called, because they do not come.*

6. To this I further answered him, *That then you have bid no General Councils, much less can you have any more, if you have none to represent the greatest part of the Church, unless by a mock representation.*

7. If all must be called, your Councils were not General, a great part of the Church being not called, by your own Council.

8. If all are not his representing terms, then all were called, is, *He is so confounded, that yet he well sets out the word all, though it makes all that are called, because they do not come.*

9. If then you were immediately forbid, you do deny any dissent have elsewhere provided against Maliciousness, that they are Councils in general, but as to the Roman Empire, and seldom, if ever, as much as that, as the Emperours (who certainly called them) any power to call any of other Princes Dominions.

10. Doth any History mention that over the Emperours did so?

11. Did the Pope of Rome call to the Councils at *Nice*, *Constantinople*, *Ephesus*, *Calcedon*, &c. all the Bishops of all the Christian Churches?

12. Were the business there agitated, any of theirs?

13. Were any Councils Decrees executed on them? Any civil Imperial Bishops put in or out of suspended by them?

14. Were all the Bishops of the *Greek Churches*, of the *Armenians*, and all other Southern and Eastern Nations, called to the Councils at *Trent*, *Litania*, &c.?

15. What is it that some will not pretend?

Self. 6. 7. Were it not an impudent thing for any man to call together all the Bishops in the world? If it be not desired that they come, why are they called? Ludicrous hypocrites beset me matters of this moment. If it be desired only, that they chief some few among the rest, it is the chusing of those few only that should be required. But if it be intended, the Devil could scarce make a more malignant motion. What for all the Bishops on Earth, 1. To forsake their charges, most of them for many years. 2. To lose to many years time in Travel and Session. 3. To lose the lives of so many as are never like to endure Voyages and Journeys by Sea

Sea

Sea and Land so long, with strange air and other difficulties, &c. But why should I stay to shame such madnels? when though *W. J.* be fain to vent it, their Sect never intended nor attempted any such thing. But suppose it were but some delegate Bishops that he pleaded for to make an Universal Council, I have shewed in the 24 part of my Book called, *A Key for Catholics*, how impossible and wicked the design of a true Universal Council is. For, 1. They must be so many from all parts of the world as may make it an equal Representative, and not two or three from the remotest part, and 200 from Italy and other nearer parts, or else it is a putid mockery. 2. Some Churches have a 100 Bishops over so many Christians, as in other Countries are under one only. Most report that in all *Abassia* there is but one *Aluma*; which though it be not now so big as it hath been, or as *Alvarez* saith, yet is like to be as big as *Trierwood* concluded, viz. as *France*, *Spain*, *Italy* and *Germany*. And should that one *Aluma* leave his Country to have no more vote than *Pate* or *Olama* *Magna* had at *Trent*.

3. Most of the Christian world have not half so many able Teachers as they need, especially the remotest parts; and it would be cruelty to the peoples souls to call away from them proportionable representatives. 4. None are fit for the great business of Councils, as the ablest, boldest, experienced Bishops; and these are most of them aged, sickly and weak, and unfit for so long travels.

5. *Abassia* is not Sea-ports and the *Armenians* and other Nations are out of the reach of such necessary converse, as must duly warn all of the time and place. 6. The Bishops are under Princes of such various Religions, minds and interests, as they could never agree to a true Council. Would the Turk that is an enemy to Christianity, give leave to the *Greek* Bishops proportionably to come? Would the Countries that are in War with those that send them, give them a free passage?

7. The time would be so long in passing from *Abassia*, *Armenia*, *St. Thomas*, *Mexico*, the *Andpodes*, and staying at the Council and returning, that few were like to come home alive; and so the Bishops are murdered, and the Countries receive not any just account of their transactions. 8. When they come together, the number would be so great, as that they could not hear what was said by one another. 9. And many would understand and speak no one common language with the rest, and so be incapable of that right understanding and communication as is necessary to the end. 10. And their judgments and interests would be so cross, as would render the Council too like a pitch field; and when they had wearied themselves to go home to the further parts of the world with no better an account, but that they were overruled by a greater number of Europeans, who living near and under the Pope were awed by his power, or byassed by interest, what good would this do the Countries that sent them. And all this wicked and impossible design ariseth from the idle brains of men, without any true usefulness or need, or any ground of Gods word or reason; only because in one Empire there were oft such things as General Councils, which yet were like to fields of War, and had torn the Imperial Churches all to pieces, had not some Emperours done much to keep the peace: so that *Right* faith, That General Councils themselves were but a new device of *Constantine*, and not of Gods institution, nor of necessity.

R. B. I next asked of him, *If all must be called, and but some come, whether it is that never comethere (through distance, age, prohibition of Princes, poverty, &c.) be any parts of the Council? and so whether it be General, because those should come that do not? If that will serve, what if some come when all are called?* He answereth:

W. J. *As it is a true Parliament if a competent number come, when all are called, so here.*

R. B. 1. The validity of a few mens acts, cometh from the fundamental Constitution, which is as the Law to them. But who made such a Law for all the world? If God did, then it counts if man, who? and by what power? Whether all be right and valid that is done in a Parliament, or not, when few are there, yet it is certain there are absent. Parliaments meet and act under Laws; but Councils meet as Equals upon meer and voluntary consent. The Law may oblige all the Land by that which a few men do: but if there be a meeting, e.g. as now at *Nuremberg*, of the Agents of free Princes, who can oblige ten by the acts of two without their consent? How ever, if only Europeans be at the Council, it is certain that *Africans*, *Asians*, and *Americans* are absent; and if absent, their judgment and consent is not there signified: and therefore if your question

Self. 7.

question be only *de nomine*, whether forty bishops may be called a General Council, while the rest are far off? Or if it be whether the Laws or Canons of a small or Provincial Council, may oblige some men, though it were not general? These are nothing to our present business.

2. Moreover, were all the world under the Popes or any other mens Laws, yet they could not be bound to wickedness, self-murder, neglect of their flocks, and to impossibilities: Therefore if (R. 8) there were forty bishops, or forty two at Trent in the beginning, and 200 after, and perhaps 2000 absent that were never obliged to be there, the question is both whether this was an universal meeting, and whether the 2000 were obliged by the Acts of the 40 or 200. And if they were obliged, what's that to notify the Tradition of all the absent Churches? Can you know their minds and customs, by saying that they were obliged by the Decrees?

R. B. Q. 4. May none but Bishops and chief Prelates be members (as you say)?
W. J. No other, unless such Inferiors as are sent to supply their places, and as Deputies of those Bishops or Prelates, &c.

R. B. Note here, 1. He determineth no others, but never tells us *quid lege*, and who it is that made that Law to all the world. And it's known that the Apostles, Elders and Brethren were *Conciliabularies* at Jerusalem, Act 15.

2. Inferiors may come as Deputies of the Bishops, for he knew that the Bishop of Rome had oft sent such to Councils so far off as his gravity would not suffer him to go to. But are these Priests capable persons or not? If not, how can a Bishops deputation make them capable? what if a Priest deputy a Lay-man to consecrate the Eucharist? or a Bishop deputy a Priest or Deacon only to ordain? will the deputation make them capable? but if they are capable, why may they not be there by their own right? If the business of Councils be as much as our modern Papists tell us, to transmit the Traditions which the several Countries have received from their Ancestors, why may not ten learned grave Priests as truly and credibly tell what are the Traditions of their Country, as one unlearned (or learned) Bishop.

3. Note here how the highest acts of a Pope or Prelate with them may be done *per alios*, by Deputies that are no Bishops. To preside in General Councils was of old in the Empire the top of the Popes prerogative, and yet he may do that by a Presbyter; and a Bishop may vote and do all his part in a General Council by a Presbyter. And is that an office properly Ecclesiastical and Sacred, which may be exercised by others not of that office? why then may not a Lay-man be deputed to preach, baptize, pray, consecrate and administer the Eucharist, excommunicate, absolve, &c. if deputed? And if so, what is proper to the office?

Told him of the Council of Basil, where were a multitude of Priests: And he answereth:
W. J. Basil in many things is not allowed of by us; name those others received as General Councils by us that had simple Priests with power of giving Votes as such.

R. B. See Reader, when they have talk of Councils and Traditions of all the Church, &c. all signifyeth but what please the Pope, and his dislike can make Councils and their judgments null at a word. Basil was one of the greatest Councils that ever was; but they condemned and deposed the Pope, and no wonder then if the Pope dislike them; and now that's an answer to all such authority, Basil is not allowed of by us. Nor is any thing allowed by you that is against you.

But if any of them would see where Priests have had Votes in Councils, let them read Blondel in the end of his *Def. Sent. Hieron* and he shall have proof enough. For I will not tire the Reader with vain citations, done by many long ago. Only note, 1. If Abbots that are no Bishops have Votes in Councils, why not Priests? having the Popes will, what makes the difference? (2d) If Presbyters may have Votes in National and Provincial Councils, why not in General ones? the will of the Pope makes and unmakes all. Thus we have no satisfaction what a General Council is.

CHAP. VII.

what mean you by [SCHISME.]

W. J. I understand by Schism, a wilful separation, or division of ones self from the whole visible Church of Christ. Sect. 1.

R. B. If this only be Schism it's comfortable news to many a thousand and million that some call Schismatics. I hope then there are no Schismatics in England, of those that are called Presbyterians, Erasmians, Independents, Separatists, or Anabaptists: For I know not one of these that separateth from the whole visible Church of Christ. But I doubt not these Judges the Church of Rome goes for the whole visible Church of Christ. I asked here.

Q. 1. Is it no Schism to separate from a particular Church, unless from the whole?
W. J. No; it is no Schism, as Schism is taken in the Holy Fathers, for that great and Capital Crime, so severely censured by them, in which sense only I take it here.

R. B. 1. He first defineth without distinguishing, and then tells us that he means only one sort of Schism.

2. Let the Reader but peruse all the Texts of Scriptures which mention Schism, and see whether he will not find, that every Text, or almost every one, do use the Word only of Divisions made in the Church, rather than of dividing, or separating from the Church; and whether such separating from the whole Church, be not there called *Heresie* rather than Schism.

But seeing it is only this Capital Schism that he calleth by that name, I have no mind to draw him now to more censoriousness, and therefore I noted how by this he absolveth the Protestants from the guilt of Schism.

W. J. Did not your first Protestants in Germany separate as much from the Armenians, Ethiopians, Greeks, as they did from the Romans? If they did not, shew the Communion they had with them. Sect. 2.

R. B. Very willingly, Sir: They had the same God, the same Saviour, the same Spirit, the same Faith, Baptism and Hope, and so were of the same Body of Christ, which is all the Union predicated by St. Paul, Eph. 4. 3, 4, 5, 6. They had also the same Scriptures, the same Rule of Prayer and Prædication, (the Lord's Prayer, and the Decalogue and Precepts of Christ, as well as the same Creed) the same Love, the same Sacrament of the Eucharist, Prayers of God, the Lords day for Holy Communion, Pastors of the same Order, and had no other Diversities in such things than St. Paul tells us are in the Body of Christ, 1 Cor. 12. Is this no Communion?

W. J. Did your Ministers first take either Mission or Jurisdiction to preach, from any of their Bishops or Patriarchs? Did they take the prescription of their Liturgies, Discipline or Hierarchy from them? Did they upon occasion join in Prayer, Sacraments or Sacrifice with them? Sect. 3.

R. B. 1. Do we hold Communion with none that we take not Mission and Jurisdiction from? What Absurdities do you thrust upon us? Did the Churches of Ephesus, Corinth, Galatia, Philippi, Colosse, &c. hold no Communion in Scripture-times, unless they had Mission and Jurisdiction from each other? Must the Greeks and Armenians have Mission, &c. from us? If not, why must we have it from them? Your Church receiveth no Mission or Jurisdiction from others. Have you therefore no Communion with them? Your Language favourereth of so much Tyranny and Pride, as would tempt Men indeed to take you for Antichristian: As if Subjection to you, and Communion with you, were all one; or you would have Communion with no Christians in the World, but in the relation of Servants or Subjects to you.

2. When we have Qualification, Election, and (where it may be had) due Ordination, we know of no other Mission necessary, besides Gods own Word which chargeth Christ's Ministers to preach the Gospel, in season and out of season, &c. God's charging all Ministers to

to preach, is their Mission when they are Ministers: Princes leave, and Peoples consent, do give them their opportunity; and for Jurisdiction, we need and desire none but a Ministerial Power of guiding Souls towards Heaven by God's Word, preached and applied: And he that ordains a Minister, thereby giveth him all the Jurisdiction which is necessary to his Office. If a Man be licensed a Physician, must he have also Mission and Jurisdiction given him after, before he may practice?

3. How could we take Ordination, Mission and Jurisdiction, from Men on the other side of the World? What need we go so far for it when the Gospel is near us, which telleth us how God would have Ministers more easily called than so?

4. And as for the prescript of our Liturgy, Discipline and Hierarchy, that is one of the differences between us and you: Must you needs have a Liturgy, Discipline and Hierarchy of Man's forming? so you have: But we can live in Christian Communion with so much as Christ and his Apostles by his Spirit have prescribed us. Is there no Communion to be had with any Church, but that which hath arrived at that height of Pride as to make Liturgies, Discipline, and Hierarchy for all the Christian World; and to suffer none to speak publicly to God, in any words but those which they write down for them to read to God? We make no such Laws to any other Church in the World, nor do we receive any such Laws from any; and yet we have Communion with them, fraternal and not *submissive* Communion. There is one Law-giver who is able to save and to destroy; who are you that make Laws for another's Servants and judge them? Had the Churches no Communion for the first 400 years when no Liturgies were imposed? or when the first Law made hereabout was, but that no one should use a Form of Prayer till he had shewed it to the Synod? No nor when Gregory's and Ambrose's Liturgies were striving for pre-eminence? Had the Church at Antiochia no Communion with that at Caesarea, because they had so different Liturgies, as their quarrel against Basil intimateth? And when every Bishop used what Liturgy he pleased in his own Congregation, Was there then no Communion between the Churches? We refuse not any meet Liturgy that is found needful to our Concord: But truly for Hierarchy and Species or Forms of Churches, and the *substantial* of Discipline, we earnestly wish that no Church had any but what God hath himself prescribed to them.

5. But how should we join with Men many hundred or thousand miles off us in Word and Sacraments, otherwise than by using those of the same species? We do not locally hold such Communion with the next Parishes to us, nor with many in the World; for we cannot be in many places at once, much less can we be every Lords day in every Assembly in *Babylonia* and *Armenia*.

As for [Sacifice] we know of none acceptable but the Commemoration of Christ's Sacrifice, once offered for Sin, and the offering of our selves and our Thanksgivings, praise, and other duties to God: And why you distinguish the first from Sacraments I know not.

Secl. 5. W. J. And did they profess the same Faith in all points of Faith, and those the very same wherein they differed from the Church of Rome?

R. B. 1. Ad hominem, it might suffice to say to you, that explicitly or implicitly they did. 2. But I better answer you, We profess the same Faith in all points essential to Christianity, and in abundance more: I have told you before that we agree in all the Old Creeds, and in the truth of the Canonical Scriptures. 3. But do you Papists agree in all points of Faith? no not by a thousand: For all is of Faith which God hath intelligibly revealed in the Holy Scriptures to be believed: But there is above a thousand intelligible Texts of Scripture about the sense of which your Commentators differ. If all Christians agree in all that is *de fide*, then all Christians fully understand every intelligible Word in the Scripture: And then every Woman and Ruffian is as wise in Divinity as the greatest Doctors; (yea far are the Doctors from such Wisdom.)

Secl. 6. W. J. If so, they may as well be said not to have separated from the external Communion of the Roman Church.

R. B. Some will tell you that we did not separate from you, but you from us; and I must say, that the Roman Church is considered either materially as Christians, and a part of the Church of Christ, and so we neither did nor do separate from you; or else formally as Papi; and so we renounce you, and all Communion with you, as being no Church of Christ,

Christ, but a Sect that treasonably usurpeth his Prerogative: The *pax imperans* specifeth or informeth the Society: Christ only is the Universal Head of all Christians as such; and of all the Churches with which we profess Concord and Communion: In this Head *Greeks, Armenians, Ethiopians, and Protestants* unite. But the Pope, falsely pretending to be Christ's Vicar-General, is taken for the Universal Head by the Papists: and, in renouncing this Head, we renounce no other Church but yours.

R. B. Not from you as Christians, but scandalous Offenders, whom we are commanded to avoid: we separate not from any but as they separate from Christ.

W. J. 1. No, sure, for if you did you must be Jews, Turks, or Infidels. 2. Was there no more in it? Did not the Primitive Persons, who began your breach and party, owe subjection to their respective Ecclesiastical Superiors, Bishops and Pastors? Secl. 7.

R. B. No, none at all as they were Papal, that is, the subordinate Ministers of the usurping Universal Bishop.

W. J. And is it lawful for a Subject to subvert himself from the obedience of a lawful Pastor because he is a scandalous Offender?

R. B. Yes, if his Offence be a ceasing to be a lawful Pastor, and taking on him a false Office by usurpation: Or if he remained lawful, *quoad hoc*, as Christian, and added a treasonable addition, we must have no Communion with him, at least in that unlawful part.

W. J. If you say he remaineth not in his former Power you contradict our Saviour, commanding obedience to the scandalous Pharisees, &c. Secl. 8.

R. B. 1. The Pharisees set not up a new usurped Office of Head-ship constituting (pretendedly) to the Universal Visible Church; but only abused a lawful Office that God had made. 2. Yet Christ requireth obedience to them no farther than as they sat in Moses's Chair and delivered the Law; but warned men to renounce them as Corrupters, and to take heed of their Doctrine. 3. And this much was but till they shewed themselves incurable, and he set up new Officers over his Church, and then all men were to forsake the Pharisees Government.

W. J. You destroy all Ecclesiastical Government, and open a way to tread under foot all temporal Authority: If you hold these Offences deprive him of all Ecclesiastical Power, why not so of Kings, and Magistrates, and Parents, and then you have spun a fair Thread, &c. Secl. 9.

R. B. Confusion may help to deceive the ignorant. 1. Your Popes, as Universal Bishops, had never true Power over us. 2. Nor any Bishops as their Ministers as such. 3. For this treasonable Usurpation we were bound to avoid them as scandalous Invaders of Christ's Prerogative, which some call Antichristian. 4. Our English Bishops, and other Pastors, when they came to see that such an Usurper had no right to govern them, forsook him, but forsook no Government. 5. Those Bishops that adhered to him the People justly forsook as *Usurpers* under him. 6. Those that forsook him they obeyed as their true Pastors. And now will it follow, if I be obliged to renounce a Usurping Vice-King and Traytor, as having no power over me as such, and that I partake not of his Treason, that I must therefore forsake the King for his personal faults? If the Deputy of Ireland should say, I am Vice-King of all the Kings Dominions, and I challenge Obedience from all the Subjects, and the King forbid us to obey him as such, I may obey him in Ireland till the King depose him, and I must renounce him in England, and yet I must not tell the King; Sir, why must we not then for your faults also renounce you? The scandal of Treasonable Usurpation differeth from a meer immorality or miscarriage.

R. B. Qu. 2. Is it no Schism to forsake us?

W. J. No.

R. B. Again, you further justify us from Schism: If it be wilful it must be against knowledge; But we are so far from separating wilfully from the whole Church, that we abhor the thought of it, as impious and damnable.

W. J. Abhor it as much as you please, (for your own particular (I know not what may be pleaded for you) I am certain that your first beginners did it, and that knowingly and wilfully; and you, still maintaining what they began, must by all considering Christians, be judged guilty of the same Crimes: for still you remain separate from all those Christians from which they departed, that is, from all the visible Churches existent immediately before they sprung up and in their time, and still continue through the whole World. R. B.

Secl. 7.

Secl. 8.

Secl. 9.

Secl. 10.

R. B. A naked, bold, and shameless assertion without one word of proof. Our Reformers knew no Head of the Church but [Christ] and they neither renounced him nor any one Member of his Church as such, but only a Traitorous Ulfurper and his Sect; indeed while he claimed but as *Patriarch* some Government of them *jure humano* by the Will of Princes, they gave him answerable obedience, and in their ignorance most gave him too much, and many perceived not his Ulfurpation: But when the Empire was down that fet him up, or had no power here, and their own Princes no longer obliged them hereto, he had not so much as such a *humane* Authority. And when they that renounced him as a Traitor to Christ, protested to hold Communion with all Christs Church on Earth according to their distant Capacities; and to abhor all separation from them; would not a man have expected that this Dispute should have given us some proof, that to forsake this false Head was to separate from all the visible Churches on Earth? I proved our Union with them before: Yea he presumes to say, *That he is certain that they did it knowingly and willfully*: As if he knew all the hearts of thousands whose Faces he never saw; when they that should know them better thought that they were certain that they separated from no Christians, but an Ulfurper and his Adherents, as such. And this we have great reason to continue, as much as Subjects have to separate from Rebels.

R. B. Q^y. 3. Is it no Schism if men make a division in the Church, and not from the Church?

W. J. Not as we are here to understand it, and as the *Easters* treat it: For the Church of Christ, being perfectly one, cannot admit of any proper Schism within it self; for that would divide it into two, which cannot be.

Sec. 11.

R. B. 1. If there be other Schisms besides separating from the whole Church, why should you not here understand it? unless understanding things as they are will hurt your Cause?

a. What a stranger doth this Disputer make himself to the Fathers, if he know not that they frequently use the word *Schism* in another sense than his? I will not be so vain as to trouble my self or the Reader with Citations: The Indexes of the Fathers and Councils will satisfy those that will but search them: Was it a separation from the whole Church which *Clement Romanus*, the eldest of them all, doth write his Epistle to the *Corinthians* against; or rather a particular Schism between the people and some few eminent men? Read it, and see what credit these men deserve when they talk of the *Easters* Judgments.

3. But his reason is most unreasonable: That [the Church of Christ is so perfectly one, that it cannot admit of any proper Schism within it self.] Can the Unity be perfect while all our uniting Graces are imperfect? When every Member is imperfect in Knowledge, Faith, Love, (Holiness) Obedience, Justice, Patience, &c. how can the Union be perfect?

4. Reader, do but read their Councils, Church-Histories, (*Baronius, Guesbard, Platina, Wernerus*, to whom I may add above one hundred,) and if thou dost not find them, (and also their polemical and practical Divines) commonly mentioning [Schisms in the Church of Rome it self,] then believe these deceivers and call me the deceiver. Do they not lament their Schisms? Were not the Councils of *Constance, Basle, Pisa*, &c. called to heal them? Do they not number the Schisms that fell out in 40 or 50 years time and continued? Dare any man deny it?

Were these then *Proper Schisms* or not? No, it's like this man would say that none of these Writers speak properly when they call it Schism. I would he would tell in the next what proper word to use.

But either these Schisms were within the Church or without it. (Reader, see whether falsehood will run at last) If they were within the Church, then W. J. doth but abuse you by his falsehoods. If without the Church then one half the Roman Church was Unchurched for 40 or 50 years when they followed one Pope, while the other half followed another. And who knoweth which of these parts was the Church? It seems whoever adhered to the wrong Pope was none of the Church. But, faith *Wernerus* and other Historians, sometimes the worst were at their Wits end, and knew not which was the true Pope, nor it is known to this day. Nay the matter is yet worse: A great General Council deposed *Eugenius* the Fourth as no Pope, but an incapable wicked Heretick, and yet he kept in, and became the only Head of their Church, whom the rest succeed. And so all that Church by this rule was unchurched. Sure necessity must make you recant, and say, that yet both Parties in your long

long and odious Schisms were within the Church; or else what a Wound will ye inflict on it? But an ill Cause will admit of no defence: If you come to this, mark what will follow: Even that millions are in the Church that are no Subjects of the Pope, but do reject him. If there were two real Popes, there were two real Churches, and therefore neither of them was Universal; and consequently neither of the two were Popes, because not Universal Bishops, so ill do such Forgeries cohere: But if only one of them was a true Pope, then, all that followed the other, rejected the Pope. Either these were fayed or damned, if fayed, then men that reject the Pope may be fayed: And then why ask you us where was a Church that rejected the Pope before *Luther*? when you tell us where, at home, if damned, what a happiness befell one Kingdom, and what a misery the other, by the Title or No Title of the Popes? Was it not France and that Party, or Germany and that Party, that were damned all those times? Hell had a great Harvest by it, whichsoever it was: and it's pity that one Man should be able to damn to many Nations by pretending that he was the true Pope: And methinks such a division as this should be called a proper Schism; unless he will be so jocular as to say, that it was a proper division and vent, but no proper Schism.

I add this note, Reader; if there be any Sect in the world that are true Schismatics according to W. J.'s own definition, judge whether it be not the Papal Sect? For it is they that condemn all the World, save themselves, and say that none else are Churches of Christ, and consequently separate from the whole Church of Christ, except themselves (who are but a third or fourth part of the whole): I never knew any of all our Sectaries do so: nor the Quakers themselves who come nearest it, (unless perhaps the Seekers, that say the Church is lost) but the Papists do so: Indeed they separate not always from themselves, though they do from all others; no more do any other Sect.

Sec. 12.

R. B. Though I am sure St. Paul calls it Schism when men make divisions in the Church, though not from it, nor making two Churches, but dislocating some Members, and abating Charity, and causing Contentions where there should be Peace; yet I accept your continued justification of us, who, if we should be tempted to be dividers in the Church, should yet hate to be dividers from it; as believing that he that is separated from the whole Body is also separate from the Head.

W. J. I am glad you accept of something at the last step-stone: If it be for your advantage God give you good use. I speak not of Schism taken in a large sense, but of that only which is created by the Fathers, and reckoned up among the most horrid Sins which a Christian can commit, and that separate from the whole Church: See Dr. Ham. of Schisms c. 1. 2. 3.

R. B. This is already answered. I again intreat you then to consider what a horrid sin it is in the Papal Sect to separate from all the Churches in the World, and then to divert their Consciences by crying out of Schism against all that will not join with them in so dangerous a Schism.

2. And I humbly admonish those Protestants that cry out Schism, Schism, against all that will not do as they do; even in a thing which they call indifferent, and others account a *heavenly sin*, to remember, that even these Papists are so moderate, as not to condemn other men as Schismatics, unless they separate from the whole Church of Christ. And I hope to refuse the *Tridentine* Symbolical Oath, or any other false or sinful Covenant or Profession, is not to separate from the whole Church of Christ; for false Oaths, Covenants, or other Sins, are not essential to Christ's Church.

Sec. 13.

R. B. Sir, urgent and unavoidable business constrained me to delay my return to your solicitous or Explanations of your definitions till this June 29. 1660. When you desire me to answer any such questions or explain any doubtful passages of mine, I shall willingly do it: In the mean time you may see while your Terms are unexplained, and your explanations or definitions so insignificant, how fit we are to proceed any further, till we better understand each other as to our Terms and Subject; which when you have done your parts to, I shall gladly, if God enable me, go on with you till we come (if it may be) to our desired issue: But still crave the performance of the double task you are engaged in. Richard Baxter.

Sec. 14.

W. J. Sir, I have thus far endeavoured to justify your Expectation; and to acquit my self of all obligations: wherein I have sought, as I strongly hope, first Gods eternal Glory, and in the next place, your Eternal good, with his for whom I undertake this labour, and of all those who as seriously and impartially press this Treatise. William Johnston.

R. B.

W. F. Your Intentions I leave to your self, of your performance and my answer I desire such judges as you describe, even attentive and impartial readers: But O how rare is impartiality, even in them that think they have it.

In the end I added an Appendix in answer to this objection of theirs, that [we can have no true Church without Errors; no Errors without Ordinations and no Ordination but from the Church of Rome: Therefore when we broke off from the Church of Rome, we interrupted our succession which cannot be repaired but by a return to them.] To this I gave a full answer, of which *W. F.* taketh no notice.

Lastly, I concluded with an address to himself, in which I gave him the reasons why I published our Writings, and also proved that the Church of Rome hath not successively been the same from the Apostles (much less received no corruptions) which I proved, first, because it hath since received a new essential part, even a pretended Vice-Christ or head of the Universal Church.

2. Because it hath had frequent and long intercessions in that essential head.
 3. Because it hath had new essential Articles of Faith and Religion.
- To all this he giveth no answer.

PART II.

Richard Baxter's Vindication of the CONTINUED VISIBILITY of the CHURCH, of which the Protestants are Members: In answer to William Johnson, alias Terret's Reply, called by him, Novelty represent.

THE PREFACE.

SECT. 1. I Have great reason to suppose, that if I should make this Book as long as it must be, if I repeated and answered all the words of *W. F.* it would frustrate my writing it, by discouraging most Readers, whose Leisure and Patience are as short as mine: Therefore I purpose to cull out all which I take to seem his real Strength, and of any importance to the understanding Reader, and to omit the Vagaries: And particularly where he and I differ about the words or sense of any Fathers, or Councils: what need I more than to leave that Matter to the perusal of the Reader, who cannot rationally rest in my *Tra.* or *W. F.*'s *Nay*: For how will either of those tell him what any Book in question doth contain? It is the perusal of the Book it self that must satisfy him. But about the *Wrights*, or Consequences of any such Citations, we may help his satisfaction.

SECT. 2. The Churches also have not been so innocent since *Lording* was its way of Government, as that all that we can find written or done by any great Patriarchs (Prelates) yea or Councils, should pass with us for proof that it was *well said or done*: nor can we take one Prelate for all Christ Church, nor a synod of the Clergie in the Roman Empire. Nor can we be so void of understanding as to read over the ancient Writers and the Councils, and not to know how much the Major Vote of the Clergie still followed the Emperours Wills, and the Byas of Interest. We cannot lye, or believe evident Lyes, on pretence of honouring them. He that readeth the Stories, and doth not find how much the Will of *Constantine* prevailed in one Council, and the contrary Will of *Constantine* in many: What the Will of *Valerian* did with most in the East, and the Will of *Jovian*, *Valentinian*, and other good Princes did against it: How far the Will of *Theodosius* went while he Reigned, against the *Arri-*

ans,

ans, to heal what *Valens* had done: And how much the Will of *Theodosius* junior did for the *Eutychians*, (and yet against the *Nestorians*;) And how far the Will of *Adrian* prevailed against the said *Eutychians* when he was dead: How much even the *Ursper Basilian* in a year or two could do to strengthen the *Arrians* and *Eutychians*: And how quickly *Zeno's* Prevalency turned the Scales: I say, he that doth read on such Histories to the end, and yet will think that the Clergie have been still one unanimous Body, of the same Mind and Opinion in all things, and not turned up and down by Princes Power, and their own Interest and fears: I leave such a Reader as desperate, and as one that will be deceived in despite of the clearest Evidence of Truth.

He that doth read these Stories, and doth not perceive the great Corruption of the Clergie, when once their places had a Bait of Wealth and Honour and Dominion, suitable to a proud, worldly, carnal mind; and what a continual War there was among the Clergie, between a holy spiritual, and a worldly proud domineering unconscionable Party; and how ordinarily, or oft, the carnal worldly Clergie had the major Vote: how the same (e.g.) Bishops at the Council of *Ephes.* 2. could yield to *Theodosius* and *Dioscorus*, and condemn the just; and at *Calcedon* go the contrary way, and cry out *omnes peccatores*, and we did it for fear! How the same Council at *Constantine*, that confirmed *Greg. Naz.* when some more were added, and got the major Vote, resolved to depose him, and caused him to depart: How the same *Peter of Alexandria*, (*Aphanasius*'s Successour) that first made him Bishop of *Constantinople*, for a sum of Money put in *Maximus* in his place, without once hearing him, or giving any Reason, or re-calling his first Letters; and how the bribed Egyptian Bishops did concur. How *Theophilus* carried it with the Egyptian Monks, and against *Origen*, and *Chrysostome*, and between *Theodosius* and *Eugenius* the *Ursper*; and how the Synod carried it against *Chrysostome*; and how *Cyri*l first made himself a Magistrate to use the Sword at *Alexandria*; and what past between *Theodore*, *Johan*, *Antioch*, and him; and how the Bishops and their Synods in *Ibaci*us time carried it against *St. Martin*, and against the *Pri*scillanists; and how all this while *Rome* and *Constantinople* set and kept the Empire in a Flame, by striving which should be the greatest; and how the Pope on such puid accounts did molest the African Churches, in the days of *Augustine* himself; and their Writers charge them with Schism to this day: I say, he that can read abundance of such stuff as this, and yet think that any one Citation of the words of a Prelate, Pope, or Council, is as valid as it were the word of God, let him go his own way, for he is not for my Company.

Nay if they could prove as much of the Popes Universal Episcopacy within the Empire under the Christian Emperours, as *Salmasius* (I think too liberally) granteth them, (*de Eccl. Jurisdictione, circa finem*) it is no more with me than to prove the Power of the Bishop of *Alexandria* or of *Antioch* in their assigned Patriarchates, which altered at the Pleasure of the Emperours and Synods, (as the division made after between the Bishops of *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, and *Cesarea* sheweth, and that which was given to *Constantinople* from *Heracleus*, *Romus*, and *Asia*.)

Christianity was not unknown till Councils, or altered as often as they made new decrees: And it is a great mistake of them that think that there was little of Christianity, save in the Roman Empire: The Apostles preached else-where, and they preached not in vain. There were Churches in *Ethiopia*, the *Indies*, *Persia*, *Parthia*, the outer *Armenia*, *Scythia*, *Britania*, and other parts that were without the Empire; but we have no large or particular Histories of them, partly because that they were not so much literate and given to writing as the *Romans* and the *Greeks* were; and partly because they were in Wars with the Empire, or did not communicate by Correspondence with them; and partly because their Books were not in any Language which the *Greeks* or *Romans* understood. How long was it ere the Empire had much acquaintance with the *Syriack* or *Samaritan*, *Persian*, *Arabick*, or *Ethiopic* Versions (or Books) after they were extant; and how few of the many Books that by Travellers are said to be in *Abissinia*, *Armenia*, or *Syria*, are known to us to this day? How little know we of the old Christians, of *St. Thomas*, and those parts? And how full and satisfactory a Testimony doth *Alvarez* profess, that he saw himself (even a large Stone with memorial Inscriptions of it digged up) that the Christian Religion had been in *China*, when otherwise he could not hear of one word by Tradition or History that could notice such a thing. How little know we now of the case of *Nubia* and *Togdus* while they were great Christian Kingdoms?

doms? How little know we at this day of the state of the *Armenians, Georgians, Mingians, Circassians*, &c. How little was known of the great Empire of *Albassia* till the *Portugall*, opened the way for *Quito* and his Companions the other day. *Facobi* de *Virriaco* tells us of more Christians in those parts of the World than all the *Greeks* or *Latins*; when he was at *Jerusalem*, where he had notice of them. *Brocardus* that lived there, also tells us of their great numbers, so of their great piety, being better men than the very Religious of the Church of *Rome*; and yet how little notice was there then of their Writings or their do. He saith they were free from the Heresies of *Nestorianism* and *Eutychianism* which we charge them within *Europe*, and yet the *Papists* to charge them still, that they may seem to have reason for condemning them, fearing that their non-subjection to the Pope will not seem enough with impartial men.

SIR, 6. And as to the great Confidence that they seem to place in their Succession to St. *Peter*, and Christs words to him [*on this Rock I will build my Church*] and *to thee I give the Keys, &c.* and [*feed my sheep*]. I have oft answered it more fully than is fit again to recite; but these few hints I would commend to the Reader,

1. That we affirm that **Peter** was among them as a fore-man of a Jury and no more ; and so **Christ** spake to the rest in speaking to him; and the same power is given to the rest : The Church is said to be built on the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, **Jesus Christ** being the head Corner-stone] Is not this as much as is said of **St. Peter** ? **Christ** gave them all the power of Holy Ghost and the remitting and retaining sins, binding and loosing, which is the **Keys** which he gave to **Peter**. And they are all sent forth to feed **Christ's** Sheep : Now the Fathers give as high Titles of to others as to the Pope, yea and to **Peter** ; see what I have cited in my *Key* for Catholics, page. 175. 176. and what **Gastner** hath cited out of **Dionysius, Tertullian, Basil, Jerome, Augustine, Theodorit, Gildas, Nicphorus** &c. Cin. 395. 396.

2. *Peter* never exercised any authority over any of the rest of the Apostles: He called them not; governed them not; There is mention of *Paul's* reproving him, Gal. 2. but none of his reproving them. *Sciliches* being among them and greatly lamented, they are never directed to unite in *Peter* as the way to Concord, nor to have recourse to him to end them. Nay, when the over-va-luers of *Peter* made one party in the Schism among the *Corinthians*, *Paul* feels to take them off that way, and set *Peter* in the same rank with himself and *Apollos*, as Ministers, only by whom they believed, calling them Carnal for faying, *I am of Cephas*, never calling them to unite in him as the Head of all: And had this been necessary, what had this been but to betray the Churches?

3. The Apostles were never properly Bishops, but of a higher rank: Bishops were the fixed Over-seers of particular Churches, and no one had many: But Apostles only planted them, and governed them for their Confirmation, and so passed on from one to another, and had care of many such at once. If any one Church might pretend superiority by virtue of succession it would be *Jerusalem*, and next that *Ephesus*, where it is said that *John* the Beloved Disciple was as Bishop, and which hath continued to this day.

loved Disciple was as Bishop, and with that title continued to rule day after day.

4. The Apostles as such had no Successors, nor as Bishops in any distinct Seats: The same Christ that called Peter called the rest, and called especially the Beloved Disciple, to whom, on the Cross, he commended his Mother, when Peter had denied him; and he promised to be with them to the end of the World: But no Bishops on Earth ever pretended to superiority over any other Churches, as the Successors of the other eleven Apostles: Where are those Seats, or where ever were they? If the Apostles Successors must rule the Churches as such, tell us which be the other eleven, and which be their Dioceses, and of what extent? Nay, it is considerable, that even in the times of domination, there were but five Patriarchates ever set up, and not twelve, and not one of those claimed Power by virtue of succession from any Apostle. *Constantinople* never pretended to it: *Alexandria* claimed the honour of succession only from St. *Mark*, who was no Apostle: And *Jerusalem* from *James*, (whom Dr. Hammond laboured to prove to have been none of the Apostles, but a Kinsman of Jesus: Only *Antioch* and *Rome* claimed succession from Peter, and *Antioch* as his first Seat; but they did on that single account claim Power then over other Churches. And seeing the Church is built on the Foundation of Apostles and Prophets, and that all the Apostles, 1 Cor. 12. are mentioned together as the noblest Foundation, Members or Pillars, and the People chidden sharply by Paul for making *Cephas* a Head: What reason have we to believe that Peter only hath

perpetual Successors fixed to a certain City, and that no other of all the Apostles have any such : What word of God will prove that *Peter* hath left his Power at *Rome*, and no other Apostles, no not one: hath left theirs to any Place or Person on Earth ; yea, and that he left it more to *Rome* than to *Antioch*, when *Antioch* claimed the first Succession from him, and *Rome* but the second ; and when *Milus* and others have laid so much to make it probable, that *Peter* never was at *Rome* ; and when it is certain that *Paul* was there, and those old Fathers, that from some word of one of *Ensebius* his doubtful Authors, do say, that *Peter* was at *Rome*, and Bishop there, do also say that it was the Episcopal Seat of *Paul* ; and when it is certain that no Apostle was any-where a Bishop, *formalist* but only *eminent*, as being not fixed, nor fixing their Power to any Seat. And Dr. *Hammond* giveth very considerable conjectures, That if *Peter* and *Paul* were both at *Rome*, they had divers Churches there, *Paul* being the Bishop of the Uncircumcision, and *Peter* of the Circumcision only, (from whence we may see that the Spirit of God in his Apostles judged that there might be more Churches and Bishops in one City than one, (much more over a thousand Parishes) though as the contrary Spirit prevailleth, the contrary Interest and Opinion prevailed with it.

These things premised the Reader must know, that the Rate of the Controversie between Mr. Terret, almid Mr. Johnson, and me is this. Finding the Church of Rome in possession of an abundance of Errors and Vanities, he would not only persuade us that *they are of God*, and have ever *been the same*, because it is so with *them now*, but also conclude that *these Caruncles are essential to Christianity* and the Church, and that we cannot prove that there is a Church and Christians, unless we prove that we have had from the Apostles a continued succession of their Errors: As if a man could not prove himself to be a man, unless all his Ancestors from *Adam* had the French-pox or the *Leprosie*.

On the contrary I maintain that the Church of Christ (which is his Body) is effluanted by true consent to the Baptifmal Covenant (which is our Chriftening) and integrated by all the additional degrees, that this Covenant is expounded in the Creed, Lord's Prayer, and Chriftian Decalogue. (The Lord's Supper is but the *same Covenant* celebrated by other *figurs* not for Effence but Confirmation) That all that confent to the celebrated *Baptifmal Co- venant* *haurily*, are Members of the *inviolable Church*; and all that *profefs confent* (in Sincerity or Hypocrifie) are *offible Members* (*coram Ecclefia*). That the true Church of Chrift hath no other Head than Chrift himfelf; no Vicarious Universal Head, Pope nor Coun- cil; That the Proteftants profefs themfelves Members of no other Universal Church but that of which Chrift only is the Head, and all Chriftians (at leaft not call out) are Mem- bers; that this Chriftian Church hath been vifible to God by real confent, and vifible to man by profefed confent from the firft being of it to this day: And when they ask us, *Where was your Church before Luther*, we fay, where there were Chriftians before *Luther*. Our *Religion* is nothing but fimple Chriftianity: We are of no Catholic Church but the Univerfal- ity of Chriftians; We know no other, but lament that the pride of the Clergy growing up from *Parochial* to *Diocesan*, and from *Diocesan* to *Metropolitan*, and *Patriarchal*, and thence to *Papal*, hath invented any other; and that the Serpent that tempted *Eve* hath drawn them from the Chriftian fimplicity. They deny not the fucceffive vifibility of Chriftianity and the Chriftian Church: We defire no more; we own we know no other Religion

BUT the Roman Artifice here comes in, and when their **HUMANE UNIVERSAL** HEAD hath made the grand Schism of the Christian World; hence they have learnt to make Christians of no Christians, and no Christians of Christians, as Pride and Ignorance serving this upstirring interest please. Their Doctors are not agreed whether any more be necessary explicitly to be believed to Salvation, than that *there is a God*, and that *our works shall be rewarded*, without believing a word of Christ or the Gospel; and whether they that believe not in Christ are Christians; or whether being no Christians, yet they are Members of the Christian Church: And the greater part are here on the wider Latitudinarian side; (as you may see in *Dr. S. Clarke's Problems, Diss., Nos. Gtas.* and in the words of this *W. F.* before answered.)

And yet these charitable men conclude that two or three parts of the true Christian world (*Abassines, Coptes, Syrians, Jacobites, Georgians, Armenians, Greeks, Moscovites,* &c.)

And in
Rev. 21,
the new
Jerusalem
was built
on the
twelve
apostles as
twelve
precious
stones.

Seft. 7.

Sept. 8,

Protestants) are all out of the Church of Christ, though their own Fryars that have lived among some of them in the *East*, profess that they are no Hereticks, and are better Men than the *Papists* are, and none worse of Life than the *Roman* Party. And whence is this strange difference? Why, it is because that these are none of them subject to the *Pope*; which it is supposed that those are that believe only that there is a God and a *Reward*. (But how is this their only explicate Faith, if they must also believe that the *Pope* is the *Vice-Christ*.) And some of them tell you further, that he that should so far believe his Ghostly Father, the Priest, as to hold that he is not bound to love God, because the Priest tells him so, is not only excusable, but he meriteth by it: So much more necessary to Salvation is it, to love the Priest, than to love God.

vid. S.
Clar. ubi
sup.

Self. 9. And yet after all this, their own Leaders confess, that it is no Article of their Faith, that the *Pope* is *Peter's* Successour, and that it is not by Revelation that the Church-Governours must be known; (as I have shewed out of *Ri. Smyth*, Bishop of *Calcedon*, and of *England*; and in the fore-confuted Writings of *W. F.*)

Self. 10. The things that I maintain are, I. That the Protestants Religion, and Church, being only the Christian as such, had an uninterrupted succession as such, (which the *Papists* deny not.) II. That the *Papal* Church as such, cannot prove its constant visibility and succession, Nay, (though it be their part to prove it) we are ready to prove; 1. That it is a Novelty. 2. That it hath been often, and notoriously interrupted; and their *Papacy* hath not had any continued succession of Men truly *Popes* by their own Laws and Rules, and in their own Account.

CHAP. I.

The Confutation of W. J's Reply.

Self. 1. **T**HE first regardable Passage in *W. J's* Reply, is, p. 53, 54. Where he maintaineth; that [*whatsoever hath been ever in the Church by Christ's Institution, is essential to the Church*;] and nothing merely *Integral*, or *Accidents*. Because I had omitted the word [*ever*] in the Confutation, he taketh that as the Insufficiency of all that I said against him; and challengeth me still to give an Instance of any Institution not essential to the Church of Christ, that hath been ever in it.

Self. 2. But, Reader, is Perpetuity any proof of an Essential? He was forced to confess, that as other *Societies*, so the Church hath *Accidents*; but he saith, no *Accidents* instituted have been ever in it.

Self. 3. It may be we shall have a Quibble here upon the sense of the word [*ever*], whether it was from *Evangelizing*, or from the *Creation*; or before Christ's Incarnation, or before his Resurrection, or the forming of his Church by the Spirit in the Apostles? But in Consistency with his own Cause, (which is) That the *Papacie* hath been ever in the Church, he must take up with this last sense.

Self. 4. Well, Let us see what work these Men make, and how they are taken in the Traps that they lay for others: But first he shall have some confuting Instances.

1. Every word of Christ's own Doctrine and Speeches, recorded in the Gospel hath been ever in the Church, and instituted by Christ; but every word of Christ's own Doctrine and Speeches, recorded in the Gospel, is not essential to the Church: Therefore, every thing instituted by Christ, that hath been ever in the Church, is not essential to it.

If you say, that it was not all written till after some years, it was yet all in the Church, even in the Minds of them that wrote it, and the other Apostles, and in their Preachings as is like. If you say that all this is essential, alas, then if false Copies have lost us a word the Church is lost, and these Churches that received not some words, were Unchurched.

That Christ suffered under *Pontius Pilate* hath been ever in the Church's Creed; and yet the Name of *Pontius Pilate* is not essential to Christianity.

2. The

3. The Administering the Lord's Supper in both kinds (Bread and Wine) hath been ever in the Church, and of Christ's own Institution: Is this essential to the Church? Perhaps some will have the impudence to say, that it is not now in it, because the *Pope* hath cast it out: but it is now in all the rest of the Church. And we might as well say, the *Papacie* is not now in, because other Churches do reject it.

3. Prayer in a known Tongue was ever in the Church, and of Christ's Institution; and yet you think it not essential to it.

4. The use of the second Commandment as such, (*Thou shalt not make to thy self any graven Image*, &c.) was ever in the Church; and yet you have left it out of the Decalogue.

5. The Office of Deacons hath been ever in the Church since their Institution, *Act. 6*. yet few think them essential to the Church.

6. Christ himself washed his Apostles Feet, and taught them to do the like, which was used in those hot Countries where it was a needful Act of Ministry: but yet it is not essential to the Church.

7. Baptism from the beginning, as Instituted by Christ, was Administered by dipping over Head in Water; but you take not that to be essential to the Church.

8. The Lord's Day's holy Observation, as Instituted by Christ and his Apostles, hath ever been in the Church: and yet many of your Doctors do equal it with other Holy Days, and make it not essential to the Church.

9. Christ and his Apostles distinguish Essentials from Integrals and Accidents in their time; therefore they are still to be distinguished: And it is a strange Society that hath not ever had Integrals and Accidents. Christ, Instituting Baptism, saith; *He that believeth, and is baptised, shall be saved*: Thus the Essentials. Yet he saith, *Teach them to observe all things whatsoever I have Commanded you*. But all those are not Essentials; for Christ himself distinguished Tything Mint, Annise, and Cummin, from the great things of the Law: And yet saith, *These ought ye to have done*. And *St. Paul* saith, *The Kingdom of God is not Meat and Drink; but Righteousness, and Peace and Joy in the Holy Ghost*, &c. And yet more than these were then a Duty.

All things were to be done decently, and in order: And yet, who ever said, but you, that all this is essential to the Church?

Christ by his Apostles, instituted, that Collections for the Poor should be made on the first Day of the Week: yet is not that essential to the Church.

10. Afflictions are Accidents of the Church, and of Christ's appointment, and have been ever there; and yet are not essential to it.

11. All the numbers of Christians, and the higher Degrees of Gifts and Grace, have been of Christ, and ever in the Church; and yet it is not essential to it, that Christians be just as many as they have been, or of such measures of Gifts and Grace; for even *Perfection* is a Duty.

12. Few of your own do think that extreme Unction is essential to the Church, and that if it ceased it would be no Church. The like may be said of many other things.

But see how these Men Unchurch themselves; For if this be true, then the Church of Rome can be no true Church. For it hath cast off that which they call Essential! Were it but the Cup in the Lord's Supper, and Publick Prayers in a Known Tongue, the change hath Unchurched them. These Consequents fall on them that will Unchurch most of the Church of Christ.

But Page 55, 56. he saith, [*That he doth not say, that every such thing must be necessarily believed by every Member: No, nor the belief of the Pope's Supremacy; but to such only to whom they are sufficiently propounded.*]

Answer. 1. And yet these Men tell our People, to affright them, That they cannot be saved out of their Church, or in our Religion. And now it is not essential to believe the *Pope's* Supremacy.

2. But who can ever know what will pass for a [*sufficient propounding*] while twenty degrees of Mens Capacities, make twenty degrees of Proposal respectively sufficient; what Man of Reason can believe that such self-confuting Disputes as yours, are a sufficient Proposal of the *Pope's* Supremacy? And sure the Christian Empire of *Abassia* then had no sufficient Proposal, when but lately your Emisaries told them, that they never heard from the *Pope*

till now, because he could not have access, or send to them. (Q. Whether that Empire be true Christians through so many Ages, seeing they received not the Scriptures on the Authoritative Proposal of the Pope, or Papal Church; and yet confessedly were never bound to believe the Pope's Supremacy?)

3. By this account all Christians essentially differ from each other in their Religion; and Christianity is a word of such monstrous ambiguity, that it significeth as many several Religions as there be persons in the World, whose divers Capacities maketh diversity of proposal become necessary or sufficient to them.

Secl. 7. But he saith, that these are all essential to the Church, though not to the several Members. More difficulties still: 1. How shall we ever know the Church this way? If the belief of the Popes Supremacy be essential to some, and only to some, how many must they be that so believe? Will one serve, or one thousand, to make all the rest Church-Members that believe it not? Or how many will this Eleven extend to? Why then may not the belief of Italy prove all the World to be the Church.

2. How cometh another mans belief, to be of such saving use to others; If you say, that it is not his belief, but their own (who believe not) then all the World is of your Church that want sufficient proposal: And Unbelievers are Christians, or of the Christian Church, so be it they never heard of Christ: and so all the unknown World, and Americans, and most of the Heathens are of your Christian Church.

And why may not the Pope be saved then without believing his own Supremacy. (I verily think that there is not one Pope of twenty that believeth his own Infallibility.) Doubtless some illiterate or ill-bred Popes have had but very defective Proposals of their own Supremacy, it being rather affirmed by Flatteries than ever proved to them.

Secl. 8. [Pg. 57. (Having first called for *ipse* in my words, because the Printer had put *as*) for *ipse*] he turneth his former assertion (*whatsoever hath been ever in the Church by Christs institution is essential to it*) into another; [*Because Christ hath instituted that it should be for ever in the Church, it is essential*.] And this yet more plainly shameth the asserter than the former; For no man can deny but that Christ hath instituted, 1. That every word of the Canonical Scripture should be ever (after its existence) in the Church; 2. And that no Ministers should preach any thing but truth in the Church; 3. And that no man should commit any sin at all; 4. And that the Eucharist be delivered in both kinds, in remembrance of Christ, till he come, &c. And yet sure all this is not essential to the Church.

Page 58. He would persuade me that I miscite *Ex. Sta. Clara*, and that he saith not that *Infidels* may be saved, but only those that have not an explicit Faith in Christ, (through inexcusable ignorance) and that he saith not that it is most of the Doctors Opinions, nor that any may be saved who are out of the Church: and that my Friends will be sorry to seeme so defective in my Citations, and he hopes I will mend it in the next.

Ans. That I will, if plain words transcribed be any amending: but I cannot amend your deceitful dealing. 1. I did not say that *Sta. Clara* saith *They may be saved out of the Church*, but that such are in your Church, and so may be saved who indeed are no Christians, and so not of the Church indeed. 2. We know of no Faith in Christ, but that which you call [*Explicit Faith in Christ*]. Common custome calleth those *Infidels* that never heard that there is a Christ, or who he is, or hearing it doth not believe it: And he cannot believe it that doth not hear it. Most of the Infidel and Heathen World profess to believe Gods veracity, and that all that he saith is true; if this be an implicate believing in Christ, almost all the Heathen World believeth in him; use Names and Words as you see cause: There are

Infidels in our use of speech. 3. The place in *Santa Clara* is pag. 113. besides 109, 110. &c. the words are too large to be transcribed; he citeth many Authors to prove such in the Church and saved; where after much to that purpose he saith, "What is clearer than that at this day men may be saved without an explicit belief of Christ: For in that sense speaks the Doctor concerning the *Few*: And verily whomever my illustrious Master hold with his Learned Mr. *Herrera*, I think that this was the Opinion of *Securus* and the Common one,] and he citeth many for it. Read the rest your self in the Book, and I desire your pretence that this is unjust Citation. I cite none of this as if I were handling the question whether any besides Christians are saved. But whether the Nations that never heard of Christ be Christians and Members of your Church.

But

But pag. 60. he will prove [*that nothing which Christ hath instituted to be ever in the Church is accidental to the Church: For every accident is separable from the subject, without destroying the subject whose accident it is: But what Christ hath instituted to be ever in his Church, is inseparable from it.*]

Ans. 1. What if it were not an Accident, must it therefore needs be Essential? Are there not Integral parts that are not Essential parts.

2. You that boast so greatly of your Logick faculty should not so absurdly erre, as you do in your major. Do you not hereby deny all proper accidents which agree as omni & soli, ita & semper? Is not *Risibility* an accident of man and yet inseparable? 2. Is not quantity inseparable from a Body or natural substance? 3. What the *Porphyrians* speak of an Intellectual separation, you ignorantly or deceitfully apply to an actual eventual separation. If Christ had been otherwise put to death than by crucifying, or else where than at Jerusalem; if his Bones had been broken, if he had not had the same integral parts and accidents of Body as he ever had, he had been Christ still: But yet it was Logically impossible that any of these should have been otherwise than they were, they being fore-decreed of God, if the Sun should cease moving, illuminating, heating you may say it would be still the Sun: But yet it is certain, that these accidents are eventually inseparable from it. If you will cause Humidity to cease from Water, or separate Gravity from Earth or Stone, &c. I shall think you have made them other things. 4. But to instance as you do in such a being as [*the CHURCH*], dishonoureth your boasted Logick greatly: The ratio formalis of a Church is Relation; and Relation is an accident; and to say, that accidents may all be separated from the Church without destroying it, is to say, that Relation may be separated; that is, the Church from it self, or formal Essence without destroying it. Do you conquer by such disputing as this?

It was by such that you had your boasted printed victory over such great Logicians as Bishop Gunning and Bishop Pearson? Can you also prove that all accidents, that is, Relation, may be separable from Families, Schools, Kingdoms, without destroying them? I hope you will not say that you mean that the separation destroyeth not the humanity of the Members, and that this is the subject you mean: for no more would *Apostasy* or *Unchurching* them destroy Humanity. 3. And (that no part may be found) your minor is false as well as your major. What Christ by his Law commandeth or prescribeth to be in the Church that he instituteth: But all cometh not to pass which Christ commandeth or instituteth. He commandeth us higher degrees of Faith, Love and other Duty than we perform. You say, *No Man may change his institution*; but doth it follow that *no man doth change it*? No man ought to plead for Errour or deceive poor Souls: Doth it follow that therefore you and such others do not so? It is Gods command, that we never sin: It doth not follow that we never do sin: When the Apostles strove who should be greatest, it was Christs institution that they should not seek for domination or superiority as the Princes of the Earth do, but be as little Children, and strive who should be most humble and serviceable, and take the lowest place; and it was St. Peters Doctrine, that Bishops must not Lord it over the Flocks, nor rule them by constraint, but voluntarily; but doth it follow that all this is done by all? no nor by your pretended Head who is made an essential part of the Church.

I conclude then, 1. That many accidents are not separable without destruction of the subject. 2. That many more shall never be separated. 3. That relation is not separable from the Church, (nor numbers neither.) 4. That there are Integral parts which are neither Accidents nor Essentials. 5. That every thing is not ever in the Church (nor in any man) which Christ hath commanded or instituted to be ever in it: (And if that may be in a man which Christ forbiddeth, so may it be in the Church, and so that be absent which he commandeth.) 6. That it is a novel Opinion, contrary to common Reason and all true Theologie, and which a Catechized Child should be ashamed of, to hold, that all that Christ hath instituted to be ever in the Church is essential to it: And so that the Church would be nullified if one word of the Holy Scriptures perished by the carelessness of Scribes or Printers, or if one decent order were changed, or if one Office were depraved, &c.

7. It

Secl. 9.

Smilecti Log. p. 1. disp. 57 qu. 9. pag. 201. Resp. Illam definitiorem Accidentis (possit abesse, &c.) non intelligi de separatione reali accidentis (etiam quinti predicabilis) a subiecto, sed de separatione per intellectum: Quare possit esse accidentis realiter inseparabile a subiecto, & necessario convenire subiecto, & inmen per intellectum erit separabile, & poterit abesse a subiecto salva subiecti essentia, &c. vid. cetera.

aggravateth the error to hold that every instituted *apex* or perfection (for continuance) is *Essential* to the Church; and yet even the *explicit* belief, that *Jesus* is the *Saviour*, is not *essential* to a Church-Member or a Christian. 8. That this Disputer absolutely nullifies the Roman Church, which hath changed the Sacrament, and Prayer, and Church-Officers, &c. which were instituted by Christ to be ever in the Church.

Sec't. 10. But I noted to him, that our question to him was, *Whether the holding such a thing to be instituted be essential to the Church; and not whether the institution is self so: May not the Opinion be but integral or an accident?* Here he replies without blushing. 1. *That thus I yield up the Cause, in naming Integrals, for those are not Accidents.*

Ans. 1. My affirming that the Papacie is as much an Accident as a Leprosie is to a Man, did not make me forget that I was confuting his assertion, that all is *essential* to the Church which is *instituted to be for ever*, (or indeed, which had been ever in it; for that was his saying.) And though Integrals be not Accidents, yet they are not *Essentials*, was this hard to see? And 2. by his now putting in the word *[instituted]* he would make the Reader think that I had granted that the Papacie was *instituted by Christ*.

2. He saith that *[Nothing can be an accident to the Church, which Christ hath instituted to be perpetually in the Church; and consequently the Churches holding any thing to be so, if true, is essential to the subsistence of the Church; if false, is essentially destructive of the Church; so that whether true or false it will never be accidental to the Church.]*

Ans. 1. What work will Interest and Error make. If so, then every Error, and every Sin of the Church is *essentially* destructive of the Church: For Christ hath instituted that the Church shall perpetually hold and teach the truth only, and obey all his commands without sinning. If he say that the Church never hath nor had Sin or Error; I answer, 1. If an essential part of the Church have had Sin and Error, then so hath the Church had: But an essential part (in their account) that is their supposed Head hath had Sin and Error: To pass by *Peters* denying Christ, disavowing him from suffering till he heard, *Get behind me Satan*, *Mat. 16.* his dissembling, *Gal. 2.* sure *Marcellinus* sinfully offered Incense to an Idol, and *Honorius* and *Tyberius* sinned; and it was some sin in those Popes that defiled Wiver and Maids at the Apostolick doors, and that were Whoremongers, and came in by Whores and Poyson, and that were condemned as *Simonists*, *Heretics*, Incarnate Devils, Perjured, Murderers, &c. and that by Councils. 2. If all the particular Members of the Church have some Error or Sin, then so hath the Church: But all the particular Members have, &c. If any Man say that he hath no Sin, he is a Lye and the truth is not in him. 1. *Joh. 1.* And in many things we offend all, *Jam. 3. 2.* &c.

2. Why then doth he accuse us for separating from Rome, if it be as certainly unchurched, as it is certain that they have had Sin and Error? It is certain that the Popes were such as aforesaid, or the Councils sinned that condemned them as such: and it is certain that either the Councils of *Constance*, *Basil*, and *Pisa*, erred and sinned, which decreed that *Councils are above the Pope*, and may condemn and depose him; and thus this is de fide, and the contrary *Heresia*; or else the Councils of *Laterane* and *Florence* erred and sinned that said the contrary. And so of other Instances.

3. But as I have proved the Antecedent of his Argument false already, so his consequence, (that the Churches holding any thing to be instituted for perpetuity, is essential, and the denying, destructive of the essence) would not follow but on two suppositions. 1. That such institutions are not only no accidents, but no Integrals. 2. That every commanded truth is essential, which are both false: For else the institution might be essential, and yet not the believing it such be essential: And he confesseth that such belief is not essential to every Member; nor can he tell to how many, nor to whom *ad esse Ecclesie*; If he say, *To as many as have a sufficient proposal*. 1. Then if none had a sufficient proposal, it would cease to be essential to the Church. 2. Then if any one sin be committed by the Church against a sufficient proposal, the Church is nullified. If he said, it is not known how many must believe *ad esse Ecclesie*, then no man can know whether the Church be nullified or not.

Sec't. 11. He saith, [pag. 64. *So the acknowledgment of it, by all those to whom it is sufficiently propounded, is necessary to make them parts of the true Church, and the denial of it when so propounded binds them from being parts.*]

Ans.

Ans. 1. Still this sayeth nothing to the question, how far and in whom it is essential to the Church. 2. And this unchurched every person that ereth and sinneth against any one word of Scripture after a sufficient proposal; yet this same man said, pag. 36. of his explanations, *[Whatsoever their neglect be to know what is propounded, yet so long as they believe explicitly what is necessary to be believed necessitate medi, and implicitly the rest, they can be no Heretics; for it is not the ignorance though culpable, &c., And do the wilfully ignorant acknowledge it? reconcile these if you can.]*

2. This Unchurchedeth your whole Church; For it is sufficiently propounded, even in express words in the Scripture that there is Bread in the Eucharist after Consecration, (thrice together in 1 Cor. 11.) and that the Church should communicate with the Cup, *[This do in remembrance of me, even to shew the Lords death till he come,]* and that we should not make to our selves any graven Image, nor bow down to it, nor worship it, and that we should pray publicly in a known Tongue, and that Bishops should not Lord it over the Flock, &c. and you erre and sin after this sufficient proposal.

Pag. 36. I had given several Instances (of the *Iberians*, *Indians*, *Americans*, the primitive Christians, and their own Converts) to prove that the belief of, and subjection to, the Pope is not necessary to Christianity or Salvation; to which his answer is very remarkable, *Viz.* [*I never said that all particular persons or COMMUNITIES are obliged to have an express belief or acknowledgment of the Roman Bishops Supremacy, that being necessary to all, neither necessitate medi nor precepti:* It is sufficient that they believe it implicitly in subjecting themselves to all those whom Christ hath instituted to be their lawful Pastors; and when the Bishop of Rome is sufficiently propounded to them to be the Supreme Visible Pastor of those Pastors upon Earth, that then they obstinately reject not his authority.]

Ans. There is some moderation in this, though it utterly overthrow their cause. 1. This fully proveth that the poor *Abassines*, *Armenians*, and such others, (for all the Popish Accusations of them) are neither *Heretics* nor *Schismatics*, for not acknowledging the Pope, whose Supremacie hath not been sufficiently propounded to them: And so that the Church is greater than the Popes Kingdom.

2. This maketh out a receiving of the Popes Supremacie to be no more necessary than the receiving of every Word of the holy Scripture, or tradition, nor than the receiving e. g. of the Cup in the Lords Supper: For all are essentially necessary (say they) when sufficiently propounded.

3. This undeceiveth us; that thought their Doctrine had been that the Scripture and Christianity must necessarily be received by the Proposal of the Papal Church as such, whereas now we perceive that it may be received from the Church though they know it not to be Papal; and We thought it must have been received as from a General Council, or the Church universal; but it seems here, it is needful but that it be from their particular Pastors.

4. By this it seems that there are other Pastors that must be believed, received and obeyed before the Pope, and Subjection to them is of absolute necessity to salvation and Churchmembership, when subjection to the Pope is of no such necessity. How the Pope will take this we know not; but,

5. It leaveth us to new doubts as hard as any of the rest; How to know that such indeed are our lawful Pastors, before we know that there is a Christ or a Pope, and how to know which are they. We perceive now that *Implicite Faith* is not necessarily the believing Pope or Council, but the believing those that Christ hath instituted to be our lawful Pastors.

Qu. 1. But can we know that Christ instituted them before we know that there is a Christ, or that he is true Christ?

Q. 2. Can you be true Pastors without derivation from, and dependence on the Pope; or be so known by the People? O that you would but come into the light and tell us how! And then, Q. 3. tell us why the same People may not take Protestant, *Armenian*, *Abassine* Bishops, or Presbyters for true Pastors, by the same Proof? Q. 4. And doth not the Proof, or Knowledge, that Men are our Lawful Pastors, without knowing that they have Ordination, Jurisdiction, Mission, or Confirmation (as you distinguish them) from the Pope, or are subject to him; also prove that, *quod est*, Men may be our true Pastors without any of these rela-

relations to the Pope? For the *esse rei* is presupposed to the Proof and Knowledge. And in relations the *Fundamentum* entereth the Definition.

I conclude, that being my self unfeignedly and earnestly desirous to know the truth, whether the Pope be the appointed Church-Monarch, of Government of all Christians that dwell on the Face of the Earth; and having diligently read what you, and abundance of your Doctrines which was sufficient to convince my understanding of it, but much to convince me of the contrary. And I may suppose this to be the case of most, who need as clear evidence as I; and therefore, that we are none of us, by your Concession, obliged either *necessitate mediis*, or *preceptis*, to believe you, or to be your Subjects.

And I confess I like the preaching of these Men whose labour is only to *subvert Men to Christ*, and to their *Lawful Magistrates*, and *Domestic Governours*; and to the *Teaching-Condant* of those that speak to them the Word of God's - better than theirs that make it the Foundation of their Religion, to make all Men on Earth their Subjects.

And yet Teachers we acknowledge necessary to our Faith; but it is not first necessary to believe them to be sent by Christ, before we believe in Christ. But, 1. The first Messengers (Apostles) did at once affirm that Christ is the Saviour of the World, and that he sent them to witness his Resurrection, Miracles, and Works; and to preach his Gospel. And the Tongues, Miracles, &c. by which they proved it, was a Proof of both at once; but principally of the former: (For if an un-called Preacher had wrought a Miracle, it would have proved his Doctrine, but not his Calling.)

2. But ordinary Preachers now give us the Evidences of the truth of the Gospel, which were heretofore delivered to the Church. (The Doctrine's self-evidencing Divinity, as it hath the Impress of God's Power, Wisdom, and Love, his Holiness, Justice, and Mercy, with the antecedent Prophecies fulfilled, and the concomitant and subsequent Miracles, and the continued Seal of the quickening Spirit in all Believers.) And by these we are first drawn (by the inward operation of the Holy Ghost) to believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit; before we believe that he sent these Men to be our Lawful Pastors: Yea, without believing them (oft-times) to be our Pastors, or any Pastors at all. We detest those *Self-Preachers* that would make the World believe, that we must believe them to be our Lawful Pastors, and receive them before we believe in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; and receive him. And we detest that false Doctrine that saith, That a *Lay-man* may not convert Souls to the Faith of Christ; and that God's Word and Spirit may not, by his opening that Word, win Souls that know not yet what Ministry Christ hath instituted.

To my Instance of the *Herians* (converted by a Maid) and the *Indians* by *Frumentum* and *Edessius*, he answers, 1. That he can prove the Papacy preach'd to them, as well as I can *Justification* by Faith alone, or any other particular Point of our Doctrine. 2. We must both say that all important truths of Christianity were preached to them; and still you have evinc'd this of the Supremacy to be none of those, it is to be supposed it was sufficiently declared to them. 3. Explaining the Article of the Catholic Church, it's supposed they were told it consisted of Pastor and People united, and that they must obey their Lawful Pastors; in which Doctrine the Pope is implicitly included.

Ans. 1. Our Doctrine (as you call it) is *Christianity*, and I can prove nothing preached but what made them *Christians*; which you confess may be without believing the Pope's Supremacy.

2. A brave Argument: All important truths were preached, Ergo you must prove that this is not one of them. 1. All important truths cannot in reason be supposed to be preached by those two Lay-men, and by a Maid: All essential truths we may suppose preached, or else they could not be Christians. We heard before that you would perwade us that every truth of continued Institution, is not only important, but essential to the Church. Whence you may infer (in your way) that the Maid and the two Lay-men had preached every such truth, and left not one out; or else there was no Christians and Church. 2. It's your part to prove that the Papacy is such an important truth, and not mine to prove the Negative, (which yet I have oft and fully done.)

3. The Article of the Catholic Church was not at first in the Creed, as the old Copies shew: And Baptism was Administered without mentioning that Article.

If holding that [People must obey their Lawful Pastors] will serve, then we are all right: If this be an implicit belief of the Papacy, we are all Papists: yea, perhaps Mahometans and Heathens are Papists too, by such a belief.

To my Instance of the *Herians*, they address'd their Speech first to him, &c.

Ans. 1. Who can tell that Peter did preach his own Supremacy? I prove he did not: Because if he did, it was as necessary to be believed, or not. If not, he preached it not among things necessary: If yea, then had he so preached it, that Text, or some other would have mentioned it: Peter or Paul, or some Apostle would have express'd it on Record; which they have not done, yea have deny'd it.

2. Those that Paul preach'd to, *Act* 16. and other places, address'd their Speech first to him: But both it follow that therefore he was Governour of all the Apostles? How unhappy are great Conquerours that must fight many bloody Battels to win one Kingdom of another Mans, in Comparison of the Pope; who without a blow, or a word of good reason, can hope by such gross Sophisms as these to get the Monarchy of the whole Earth.

To my Instance of those converted by the English and Dutch in the *Indies*, he bids me prove them to be instructed in the true Faith?

Ans. They that are instructed in the *Baptismal Covenant*, the *Creed*, and in general the truth of all the Sacred Scriptures; and are devoted to God by the *Baptismal Covenant*, and taught to conform their *Desires* to the Lord's prayer, and their *Practices* to the *Dialogue*; to live soberly, righteously, and godly; and in love to God and Man, and in good works, and hope of Heaven, are instructed in the true Faith. But such are they in question. *Oo*. Do you so oft say, that less than all the Creed is *necessitate mediis* to be believed? and many of you, not so much as Christ himself; and yet is not all that Protestants teach the true Faith? O Impartiality! Next to my Instance of the *Abassian* Empire, he bids me also prove them to be Orthodox Catholic Christians.

Ans. 1. I must first know what you mean by [*Orthodox* and *Catholic*] which your ill faculty of expounding makes me despair of. If by [*Orthodox*] you mean such as have no errors, I cannot prove it; but it's shame for such erroneous Men as you to demand it. But if you mean but such as hold all the Essentials of Christianity and much more, the former Argument joyn'd with all just Testimonies of them, (such as you have in *Damianus* a *Goat*, *Alvarez*, *Godignus*, &c.) prove it. So if by *Catholic* you mean a *Papist*, I cannot prove it, but the contrary. But if you mean [*Part of the Universal Church*] it's proved as afore.

Note here what valitious Men these are; that save our damn Empires to and fro, as the interest of their arguing requireth. When we prove that the rest of the Christian Church is twice or thrice as great as all the Papal Church; then they tell us that *Greeks*, *Abassians*, &c. are of their mind; and they feign that the *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Abassians*, &c. are all subject to the Pope, and have submitted to him; *Godignus* wrote to requite one of their own Writers that affirmeth the *Abassians* to be for the Pope. But when their Cause bids them say otherwise, then we are challenged to prove them *Catholic Christians*, and *Orthodox*. Had you put me to prove the *Papists* such, you had put me harder to it.

Our next Point is of [*The Visibility of Christ as Head of the Church*, where he saith, p. 65. It is most certainly an invisible Pastor, both in Heaven, and on Earth: For though his Person may be seen there, yet the Exercise of his Pastorship consisting only in spiritual Influences and internal Graces cannot be seen by any Corporal Eye whatsoever: Therefore as a Pastor of the Militant Church he is wholly invisible; so you put a visible Body without a visible Head, all that is visible in the Pastoral Function being performed by visible Pastors; and all that is invisible by our Saviour. So you by a strange piece of Novelty constitute a visible Body, without a visible Head; Of Christ you destroy the visible Church, and frame a Monster.]

Ans. What abundance of Heresies must I charge on such Men, if I judg'd them accord. Head, when they to their terms and rigour of judging? 1. Christ, as a visible Head of the Church, is here visibly deny'd: Whereas, 1. It is not that he is *Visible*, but *Visible*; that we assert. 2. And he was able, and seen till about thirty three years of Age on Earth: He was sent to do Miracles, suffer, rise, whether a Flock on Earth is but a Handful, to the Church Triumphant that see him still in Hea-bead-vent; and it is the false Body. 3. He will come visible in Glory to Judgment. 6. Eve be necessary.

Sec. 14.

Sec. 15.

Sec. 16.

Sec. 17.

by Believer, after a few hasty hours, passeth to the sight of him. 7. And we shall all see him in Heaven for ever.

Compare this now with the Visibility of the greatest Earthly Monarchs, who are never seen to the thousandth Person of their Empires; and rarely to any but their Courtiers: and some of them rarely to the most of them, but to some very few, and quickly die and are seen here no more. And yet may not Christ be called a *Visible Head*. And yet we say but that he is *visible in tantum*, and not *every-where*, nor to *every one*.

2. But it is not his Person that he saith is invisible, but worse than that it is [the Exercise of his Pastors] which he erroneously (that I say not heretically) affirmeth to consist only in *spiritual Influences, and internal Graces*. So that here, 1. He denyeth all Christ's visible teaching and government; while he was on Earth (were his words to be strictly understood); and all his Mission and Commissioning of his Apostles, &c. 2. He denyeth all the Sacred Scriptures, which are Christ's *visible Doctrine*, Laws and Promises; and so the visible Exercise of his Office, as the King's Laws are of his. 3. He denyeth all Christ's visible Administrations by his Officers, Princes and Pastors; as if it were a good Argument, that Christ *doth it not, because they do it*: whereas it is *he that visibly ruleth* (as to the effect here questioned) by them; as it is the visible Government of the King which is exercised all abroad: the Kingdom by his Command. 4. He denyeth Christ's visible Mercies, Provision, Protection, Deliverances of many sorts, which are all parts of the Exercise of his Office. 5. He denyeth all the visible Miracles which Christ hath wrought by others, whilst yet their Church in boasteth of them as if they were their very Foundation, (as I shewed out of *Rom* against *Chilingsworth*, who ultimately resolveth their Faith into them,) and they would have us think that they are *constant things*. If you say that Christ is not seen here: I answer, It is not Christ's Person now whose Visibility he speaks of, but the Exercise of his Office. 6. He denyeth all the visible punishment which Christ himself inflicteth on his sinning People, and on his Enemies, though they are many and notorious; and as God is known by the Judgments which he executeth, *Psalm 9*. So all things and power now are given unto Christ, and he judgeth the World as Lord of all: For the Father judgeth no Man, but hath committed all Judgment to the Son, *Joh. 5. 22*. 7. He denyeth Christ's final visible Judgment, if he hold strictly to his words, That the Exercise of Christ's Pastors is only in *spiritual Influences and internal Graces*. If you say that some of his Instances are not of his Pastoral, but his Regal Offices, I answer that it is but some that you so except. 2. It is a mistake, because his Pastoral and Regal Office are one and the same indeed; not two Offices, but two inadequate Metaphorical conceptions of one and the same Office of Christ: And it belongeth to the Pastor to provide Food for his Flock, to govern them, to fetch them home, and to defend them and destroy the Wolves.

He saith, *all that is visible is done by visible pastors, and all that is invisible by Christ* (in the Pastoral Function,) as if Christ did nothing which they do, or no more than they do. And he reproacheth Christ's Church as doing a *Monstrous*, unless it have some other visible Head: Like Cardinal *Bernard*, see his words in his Book in *Biblioth. Patrum*, that saith; God had not been wise, if he had not made one Universal Monarch over all the World. And when we have fully proved that a mere Humane visible Church-Governour over all the round Earth is impossible, and such Power never was deputed by Christ to any; and that the far greatest part of the Church never owneth, or did own such: Will it not then follow, that his reproach of Christ's Church and Government is unjust and rash?

And would it not follow by the same reason that the Barib, as God's Kingdom, (which Christ also is the King of) is a *Monstrous*, being a visible Body; unless it had one mere Humane visible Head? Are not Men as Men, and governable by the Sword, as visible as Men as Christians, and governable by the Word and Keys? If so (which is undeniable,) Why is the Christian World any more a *Monstrous* without a Monarch Bishop, than the Humane World without a Monarch King?

But pag. 66, 67. he asks [Whether Christ performed immediately any visible Action in relation to the Church?] and saith, *Men will expect that I shew that Christ, not in his Person, but in the Exercise of his Pastoral Headship, works visibly by himself*. Answer, It is but the Person's Visibility that you require, but the Action; that is considered either as it is Agentis, or as in Passe, in the Receiver. The former is seen, if ever, only when

when it is the seen *Motion of a Body*. If the latter, I have named you diverse visible Acts of Christ. But why must [immediate] come in? Doth not my hand write visibly unless I do it without a Pen? How little Government do great Emperours exercise immediately in all their Empire? even none in the far greatest part in all their Lives, but give out their Laws and Mandates to others. What Government hath your Pope exercised immediately in *Assasia, Armenia, Tartary, Persia, yea or Mexico*, much less at the *terra australis incognita*, and all that side of the Earth which *Laſtanium, Augustinus*, &c. denied?

He confesseth that he cited not *Ephes. 4*. to prove the Papacy, but successive Pastors. Reader, think seriously, 1. whether the Pope be not an invisible Head, and his Church a Monster by this mans rules. Doth he rule all his Church immediately or by others? If by others, doth not Christ do so, (and better.) And was Pope *Zachary* the visible Head at the *Antipodes*, when he commanded *Boniface* to excommunicate *Vigilius* for holding such a World under us as we call the *Antipodes*? And is this Pope a capable Head of all the World that denyeth the very Being of them, and holdeth that there is no such thing as so great a part of it? O what a Pastor or Apostle is this that excommunicateth men for affirming the existence of the charge which he undertaketh!

The Answer to W. J's second Chapter.

Whereas W. J. would persuade men that it is first incumbent on us to prove where there hath been a Church in all Ages without the *Roman Papacy*. I first evidenced that it is incumbent on them, as having the Affirmative, to prove that the Universal Church hath been headed by the Pope in all Ages: For 1. our Religion is nothing but *Christianity*, as such: And this they confess hath been in all Ages since Christs and Churches professing it; so that all our Religion being past Controversie between us and them, (which is still to be noted) we have no need to prove that which is not denied; who denyeth that there have been Christian Churches?

But it is their addition of the Papal Sovereignty over the Universal Church which is denied of our de-

by us, and must be proved by them according to the common Rules of Disputation. 2. And the denial of their addition is the *Renunciatio* ^{parture} *consequence*, and no direct and pro- from the per part of our Positive Religion: True Faith is one thing, and the Renunciation of all Errors Romans contrary to it is another thing: The one is such as may be defined; the other in particulars hath possessed no bounds: I can soon say that There is one God the Father Almighty, &c. and in general that I power, deny any other; but if I will undertake to name them all that are worshipped as Gods, and say, e. g. *Sathan, Jupiter, Sol*, &c. are no Gods, I can never know when I have done; and this is but a consequent of my Faith: so it is to believe that *Mahomet, Amida, Zachea*, &c. are no Saviours.

Now if any would bid me prove Where there hath been Churches in all Ages that did renounce *Arianism*, *Macedonianism*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, *Monothelites*, &c. I cannot prove that any did expressly renounce these before they were known in the World; and yet Christianity was the same Religion of the Church without any change before and after.

So W. J's demand upon his Plea of present possession, is as if he should say, *The man of seventy years of Age which is now gray-headed and lame was ever so*: Or the Church which now honoureth St. Martin, St. Thomas Aquinas, as Saints; is the true Church of Christ: And if you cannot shew, as that your Church hath in all Ages so honoured St. Martin, &c. you are not the true Church of Christ. What if it had been [The Church that keepeth Easter-day as now we do, and Christmas-day on the 15th of December, is the true Church of Christ; therefore you must prove that your Church hath ever done so]. Could they prove their Papacy in the Empire as old, it would have the same answer, viz. It was but a part of the Church, and not the whole, that kept Easter and Christmas as we do now; for one part kept Easter on another day, till the Nicene Council ended that Controversie in the East, and Christmas-day on the 6th of January till after the middle of Christ's time; and so in the present case, had it been as ancient as they pretend, it was not Universal.

2. But he saith that [at least, as Patriarch of the West by the Churches grant, they were in full quiet possession of that Right or Power which we contest was lawful.]

Ans. No such matter: We make no such Confession: Those *Protestants*, who think that the superiority of *Patriarchs* is lawful, do hold that it is by *human Laws*; and that if any such Laws were made by that which you call the *Church*, that is, by Councils, it was by such Councils as in such matters received their Power from the Emperours, without which they might not set up one City above another, nor distribute Provinces and Dioceses, and as was done; and therefore that while the Imperial Laws enforced them, they had the Law to bind Subjects to obey them: but when any Kingdom was cut off from the Empire, it was from under those Laws, and under the Laws of their own Prince, and the former decrees of Councils were no Laws to them any longer; though they might by voluntary contract still associate with Foreign Lands.

So that such hold, 1. That while *Britain* was under the *Roman Empire* they owed some respect or obedience to the Pope as Patriarch of the *West*, as *English* men do the Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*. 2. That before and after, they owed him no more obedience than to the Bishop of *Rheims* or *Arles*. 3. That when the *Saxon Kings* permitted the first *English Bishops* voluntarily to subject themselves to the Patriarch of *Rome*, they made themselves Debtors of all lawful obedience which they promised. 4. That when the *Saxon and Danish Kings* Commanded their Subjects such lawful obedience to the Bishop of *Rome*, they owed it him by the obligation of their Sovereigns Laws. 5. And when those Laws ceased their obligation ceased; and when those Laws forbade it, it became unlawful. And so the *Roman Patriarch* had no power in *England* when the King and Law did deny it him, or cease to give it him. This is the judgment of those *Protestants* that think such *Patriarchs* lawful: The other that think them a sinful Usurpation, think that they were never lawful; yet he urgeth us with *what Conscience we ceased to obey them*.

Sec. 3. *Pag.* 74. he saith [Prove that any Church which now denyeth it, hath been always visible and I am satisfied whether that Church always denyed it or no.

Ans. This hath some moderation in it. 1. There hath no Church but that of *Jerusalem* been always visible from the beginning of Christianity; for no other was at first existent.

2. And that was not visible from the beginning of the World.

3. This Church of *Jerusalem* as it consisteth of the most Christians there, now denyeth your Papal Power.

4. The Churches of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, and *Abyssia* now deny it, and have been always visible.

5. The Church of *Ephesus*, and many others of *Greece* that now deny it, have been always visible since *Paul's* time; and *Constantinople* since the first planting.

6. And I pray you note that the Church of *Rome* hath not been always visible, for it did not exist till some years after that at *Jerusalem*. Yea note, that you cannot pretend that the Bishop of *Rome* was the Universal Bishop from the beginning; for you confess *Peter* was first Bishop of *Antioch*, and all that while *Rome* was not the Miltre's Church: And so if you should have the Supremacy, it must be by a change from the first State: Though indeed *Peter* himself never claimed nor exercised any such thing, much less did he ever leave it to a Successor, and least of all as fixed to one City, any more than *St. John's* power was to the Bishop of *Ephesus*. And indeed *Bellarmin* himself dare not deny but that the Seat of the Universal Bishop may possibly be removed from *Rome* to some other place. And then (suppose it were to *Avignon*, or to *Constantinople*) where is *St. Peter's* Successor? How must he be chosen? or how shall his power above others be known, when all the old pretensions fail?

Sec. 2. *Pag.* 78. (till then there's nothing but vain words) When I noted that *They that make Christ corporally present in every Church in the Eucharist, should not say that the King of the Church is absent*.

More of the visibility of Christ. He replyeth [He dispute of a proper visible presence, such as is not in the Eucharist]. *Ans.* You affirm that Christ is there corporally present under the Forms of Bread and Wine; and that the Bread which we see is the Body of Christ and no Bread; and yet that we see not the Body of Christ: Sure we see something or nothing; and if it be something and not Bread, not *Christ's Body*, what is it? But suppose that it be not *Christ's Body* which we see, yet while the Bread is turned into his Body, that which you do see is nearer to him

him than a Kings Crown or Clothing is to the King; and yet if you see the King only in his Cloths, his face being veiled, will you say that he is not a visible King? Doth cladding make Kings, or the Species of the Consecrated Bread make Christ to become invisible? 2. Do you not bow towards him on the Altar? Do you not carry him in procession about the Streets? and do you not constrain all that meet you to kneel down and adore? sure you do not think him to be out of sight, or hearing, or far off, to whom you pray, and whom you so honour as present? As *Paul* said to the *Jews*, *God is not far from every one of us*; so that Christ, who is adorably present in his Body on the Altar, and corporally present in every Receivers hand and mouth, surely hath not yet forsaken the Earth, so far as to be incapable of constituting a visible Kingdom without a Pope.

Pag. 79. I told him that [When they prove 1. That Christ is so absent from his Church that there is need of a Deputy to essentiate his Kingdom, and 2. that the Pope is so deputy, they will have done their work.]

He replyeth [I have proved that Christ instituted St. Peter and his Successors to govern wisely his wholly Universal Church in all Ages.]

Ans. Wonderful! when was it, and where? Let the Reader find any such thing in your writings, for I cannot, no not a word: Had that been done I had contradicted you no longer; but if it be by an Invisible Proof that your Visible Head reigneth, I cannot judge of it.

He next addeth [I press you therefore once more to give an instance of something which hath been ever in the visible Church by Christ's institution, and yet is accidental to the Church.]

Ans. 1. If I have not given you such Instances and Reasons also to prove that all that Christ instituted to continue is not essential, let the Reader say that I have failed you. 2. But if I had not, what is it to your cause; will it thence follow that I have failed a word to prove that Christ instituted the Universal Headship of the Pope? Or rather do you not overthrow it your self by such arguing, seeing 1. the Headship of *Rome* hath not been ever in the Church as you confess. 2. It never was in the Universal Church either instituted by Christ, or received by the Church one hour, but only for a time received by a corrupt oppressed part of the Church. 3. The Pope hath cast out divers things instituted by Christ for continuance, as is proved.

I told him, that though the King were absent [it is only the King and Subjects that are essential to a Kingdom; the Deputy is but an Officer and not essential.]

He replyeth [Tis so indeed de facto: But suppose (as I do) that a Vice-King be by full authority made an ingredient into the essence of the Kingdom, then surely he must be essential.]

Ans. Yes, by very good reason; if he be made essential he is essential: and now I understand what is your proof; you suppose it to be so. But if it be so in our case, then the Pope is essentially so the Churches constitutive Head that when-ever he dyeth the Church is dead, (unless you can say as our Law doth of the King, *Papa non moritur*) and when the Church hath been two or near three years without it was no Church, and when it had two or three Popes it was no Church or two or three Churches.

But saith W. F. [This is evident in our present Subject; for though all the Pastors in Christ's Church be only his Officers and Deputies, yet you cannot deny such Officers are now essential to his visible Church.]

Ans. 1. When I heard the word *Evident*, I lookt for something: But I had nothing but *Whether* [you cannot deny it: and what true Christian ever yet denied it?] But I do not remember that ever I heard it disputed before; affirmed or denied. He that would deny it, will say *Essential* parts of those Corporations, and these Corporations are the noblest integral parts of the Kingdom, but no essential parts of it, so that if the Kingdom should be resolved into a Kingdom gathered Churches are the noblest integral parts of the Universal Church, but not essential: And Pastors are essential parts of those particular Churches: But if all the particulars and Pastors should cease, the Church would be a Church still, while there is a Christ and meer Christians. But this never will be in this world; because Christ will not only have a Church, but a well-formed organized Church.

Those that had rather use the word *essential* of the Pastors will say, that as *soul and body* are

are the only essential parts of a man, and yet the brain, heart, and liver may be called *essential* parts of the body, as distinct from the rest, because without these it is not *corpus organicum*, and so not *humanum* : so though Christ be the only *soul* of the Church, yet Officers may be *essential* parts of his *body* as *organical*, capable of such a soul : And though the other will reply, that this is but a deceiving Metaphor, Christ being not only the *soul* but the *head*, and no organical Members being more than noble Integrals, because if an *Intellectual separation* be made, the Church is a Church still in such a conception. Yet all this is but a Controversie of the aptitude of the word *Essential*, in that case ; we are agreed that Officers shall be in the Church to the end. And yet Saint Paul, 1 Cor. 12. calls them *burges and hands*, and never *heads*, but reserveth that title to Christ alone ; yea even when he speaketh of Apostles. And yet if any Officers were Essential it would be Apostles, who are called *Foundations*, and *Pillars* of the House ; but none of them the Head.

2. But what's all this to our Controversie ? What if Pastors were Essential to the Church, viz. that there be some ? Doth it follow, that the Bishop of Rome is any more essential to it than the Bishop of Jerusalem or Antioch ? If so, then 1. Before Peter is seign'd Bishop of Rome, the Church was no Church : All the while that he dwelt at Jerusalem and Antioch. 2. And then if Rome were burnt, or the Bishop of it ceased, the Church were no Church.

Sir, our true question is, *Whether a traitorous Usurper of Universal Sovereignty, retained by a third part of the Church, and refused by all the rest, be essential to the Church ?* Not as whether the *heads* or *heads*, but a *Seal* or *Cancer*, be essential to the body ?

Self. 5.

After some vain repetitions, pag. 82. he repeateth the sum of his fraudulent Argument, which he calls [The force of his Discourse] viz. [No Congregation of Christians hath been perpetually visible, but that which acknowledgeth the Popes Supremacy : Ergo, No Congregation of Christians is Christ's true Church [now that].]

Ans. I will therefore repeat the sum of my Answer : viz. The word [Congregation] is ambiguous : 1. Either it meaneth a company met together. 2. Or a number of such Congregations owning one Superiour, being part of the Universal Church. 3. Or the Universal Church itself.

Accordingly I answer, 1. That in the first sense a Congregation is called the same, either because the same men live, or because the survivors dwell in the same place, or because they are of the same profession. In the two first respects, it is not necessary that any Congregation continue the same ; for men dye, and places may be conquered or ruined. In the third sense, All true Christian Congregations in the world are of one and the same species (as Christian) from the beginning to this day.

II. In the second sense of the word [Congregation] I answer like as to the former : The men dye ; the places are mutable : but as to the common Christian Profession, they are the same that they have been : but as to the extent of Diocesses, neither you nor we can deny but that they have altered : *Scots, Persians*, and *Doctar Hammond*, who hold that Bishops without Presbyters were first settled, must hold that a Church then was but one Assembly, or no more than one Bishop could speak to. But *de facto* all agree that it was not long before they widened by degrees. And in this sense the Churches of *Abassinia*, *Armenia*, *Jerusalem*, *Alexandria*, &c. are visible and have been from their beginning, and some of them before Rome was. The Churches of *Ephesus*, *Smyrna*, *Thessalonica*, &c. are and have been such. And some Churches are visible which do not acknowledge the Popes Sovereignty, that sometimes did, etc. The Church of *Britain* in *England* and *Scotland* at first owned it not, and after did receive it, and after that cast it off again ; but it is visible and hath been from its beginnings. The Churches of *Denmark*, *Sweden*, *Transylvania*, and divers Countries of *Germany* (were not Churches from the beginning of the Christian Church, nor was Rome it self so, but) ever since their beginnings they have been visible, sometimes obeying the Pope, and sometimes rejecting him : the *Abassin* and several other *Extra-imperial* Churches, never obeyed him : The most of the Churches of the Empire (the *Eastern* and *African*) sometimes obeyed him as the chief : in the Empire by the Laws of the Empire, and sometimes they cast him off when the *Emperors* Empire cast him off : but they never obeyed him as the *Sovereign Bishop* of the whole World.

III. In the third sense of the word [Congregation] as it signifieth the *Universal Church*, I confess that I can shew you no *Universal Church* now visible rejecting the Pope ; for the

Uni-

Universal leaveth out no part, though a corrupt part ; and while *Papists* own him I cannot say that the Universal Church disowneth him ; but I can prove, 1. That the *Primitive Universal Church* never owned any Universal Head or Governour but Christ and his twelve Apostles, whose indefinite charge may be called Universal. 2. That the Universal Church never owned the *Roman Universal Sovereignty*. 3. That the far greatest part of the Church doth not own it at this day ; and therefore if the whole may be denominated from the major part we may say, that now the Universal Church disowneth him.

And now Reader answer these like *Sophisms* and you have answered this man of Art.

1. No Congregation of Christians hath been perpetually visible, but that which acknowledgeth the Patriarchs in the Empire, (at least heretofore.) Ergo no other is the true Church of Christ. Answer. 1. But another is part, and the best part of the Church of Christ. 2. And none that doth, or ever did acknowledge those Patriarchs, was the whole Church. 3. And none of the Church acknowledged them at first, before they were erected.

So, 2. Inf. [No Congregation of Christians hath been perpetually visible, but that which condemneth the Monothelites, the Nestorians, the Eutychians, the Audians, the Luciferians, the Quatodecimani, &c. Ergo no other is the true Church.]

Answer. 1. Part of the Church condemn them, and part never heard of them : And before they rose, none of the Church condemn'd them.

So, another Instance is, [No Congregation of Christians hath been perpetually visible, but that which Administreth the Eucharist only in one kind (without the Cup) and which useth publick Prayers in an unknown Tongue ; and which forbiddeth the reading the Scripture translated without special License, &c. Ergo no other is the true Church.]

Answer. 1. Only a corrupt part now doth these : The most discover it, and none were guilty of it in many Generations. Doth there need any other Answer to such palpable Sophisms ? His Argument plainly should run thus ; [No Congregation of Christians hath been perpetually visible, but that which now owneth the Traitorous Usurpation of the Pope, and the Council of Trent, and of Lateran ; and part of whole Religion is for exterminating, or burning all that will not renounce all belief of Humane Senses, in believing Transubstantiation : and for casting out Princes that execute not this, and allowing Subjects from their Oaths of Allegiance to them ; and which hath corrupted the Doctrine, Worship, and Government of Christ ; Ergo no other is the true Church.]

Answer. A diseased part of the Church only is guilty of this now ; and the whole Church was far from it heretofore.

But pag. 83. he telleth me that he meaneth neither one present Assembly, nor yet one as united in one visible Humane Head ; but abstracting from that also, he it but truly and properly one : whencesoever the Unity is drawn, 'tis all alike to the solution of the Argument.]

Answer. Then sure our business is in a hopeful way, if not as good as ended. Remember this and fly not from it : Our Unity is in Christ our Head : One King maketh us one Kingdom : All Christians are one Body of Christ. Yea, moreover we are one in all the seven Points of Unity required by the Holy Ghost, Eph. 4. viz. We have, 1. One Body, (of Christ, not of the Pope.) 2. One Spirit. 3. One hope of our Calling, (viz. Eternal Glory.) 4. One Lord, (without a Vice-Christ.) 5. One Faith, (summarily in the Creed, and integrally in the Holy Scriptures.) 6. One Baptism, (or solemnized Baptismal Covenant.) 7. One God and Father of all, who is above all, and through all, and in us all : Yea, as to the Integrals, though our Grace hath various degrees, we all receive the inspired Prophets, Apostles, and Evangelists, Authority and Doctrine ; and the ordinary Pastors and Teachers that are sent by the Holy Ghost, and called by the way which God hath appointed ; (though we receive not an Ulurper that maketh himself the Governour of the whole World in Title, while he Governeth not the tenth part of it, nor any according to God's Law ; and who is oft obstructed by Whores and Murderers, and is a wicked Slave of Satan, so judged by his own General Councils.)

We acknowledge that there are among us different Opinions ; but neither for Kind or Number comparable to the differences of the Papal Sectaries among themselves. Not for Kind, such as about Murder, Adultery, Perjury, Lying, False-witnesses ; yea, about the Love of God it self are by the *Fanaticks* charged on the *Feslites*, and proved out of their express words : Nor such as Mr. Clarksen hath collected from the express words of their most famous

Self. 6.

famous Doctors of all Parties: Nor such about King-killing, dissolving Subjects Oaths, &c. as *Mr. Foulis* hath gathered from the express words of your greatest Doctors. And for Number, all the Sects in the World (of Christians) set together, have not half the Controversies and contentious Writings against each other, as your Schoolmen and other Writers of your Church have.

For our parts, we look not that our Union should be perfect, till our wisdom, and holiness, and patience, and we our selves be perfect. They that know but in part, will err in part, and differ in part. We believe that *there are diversities of Gifts, but the same Spirit; and differences of Administrations, but the same Lord; and diversity of Operations, but the same God, who worketh all in all.* For as the Body is one, and hath many Members; and all the Members of that one Body, being many, are one Body; so also is Christ: For by one Spirit we are Baptized into one Body, and have been all made to drink into one Spirit. Thus are we the Body of Christ, (not of the Pope,) and Members in particular. And God hath set some in (this Body) the Church, first Apostles, (not first a Vice-Church,) secondly Prophets, thirdly Teachers; (but no Universal Vicar-Head.) All these are Members, and should to live in love that there be no Schisme in the Body.

Self. 7. But pag. 84. the Man is not satisfied, though I name them, what I mean by [*These Churches united in one Christ.*]

Answer. How should I make a Man know that is unwilling? or how but by naming them by their Country and Profession? I mean, *All the Christians of Abassia, Armenia, Egypt, Syria, the Georgians, the Jacobites; those falsely called by you Nestorians, and Eutychians, the Africans, Greeks, Muscovites, the Britains, Scots, Swedes, Danes, Belgians, Saxons, Helotians, the rest of the Germans, Transylvanians, Hungarians, French, &c.* which now disown the Papacy; who were some Countries never under the Pope, some Countries at first under him, and after rejected him; and some at first from under his Government, next under him, and after repented; and all of them have been Christians from their first conversion to this day. Can I speak plainer?

Self. 8. But Nam. 42. he granteth that *All that are true Christians are one Kingdom, or Church of Christ; but denyeth that these are true Christians.* And pag. 84. He would seem to give some reason for his denial, saying, [*I deny it, if they were independent on the Bishop of Rome.*]

Answer. 1. Even now he abstracts from this: But now they are no Christians, unless they be Dependents on the Pope. Such a Denial is an easie Task, and the sum of all their Writings. But what need there then so many Ambages and large Volumes, to bring out such a short and crude Assertion? Could you not have said this without all the rest, [*He is no Christian that dependeth not on the Pope.*] But is it not incumbent on you to prove it? Undoubtedly it is. 1. In foro Scholastico, as an Affirmer. 2. In foro civili & Ecclesiastico, as an Accuser. And till you have proved it, what need they, or I care for your words? Must all Men pass for no Christian, that a Priest or Jesuit will say are none? Or am I, and all Men, disobliged from loving all those as Christians, whom such as you will affirm to be no Christians? Love is easily destroyed, if this much will do it: But it costeth more than so to canst it.

Self. 9. Pag. 85. He addeth, [*Let them have been as visible as you please, that's nothing to me: so were the Arians, Sabellians, Montanists, &c. Prove they were no more than one visible Congregation of Christians among themselves, and with Orthodox Christians: that's the present Controversie.*]

Answer. I hope we shall find out the Controversie at last; though it seems as hard almost as to resolve it: How oft must I repeat the same Proof? Again my Proof is this, [*Those that are baptized into the Name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, and hold all essential to Christianity; not apostatizing from the whole, or any essential part, are true Christians: But such are they before mentioned.*]

1. That they are Baptized is not denied; and Baptizing is Christening; and supposeth the profession of all that is essential to Christianity; or else it could not make them Christians. 2. No man that professeth himself a Christian must be taken to be no Christian, till he be convicted by lawful proof, because as *freewill* or *hears-consent* to the Covenant of Grace is our Christianity as invisible before God, so Baptism and professed consent to that Covenant are our visible Christianity before men; every man being the Expolitor of his own belief and reso-

reso-

lution: but that these Churches have Apostatized from the whole, or any essential part of Christianity, is unproved, and therefore not to be supposed: As every particular man is to be taken for a Christian who is baptized and professeth it, till his profession be disproved, so much more whole Countries and Churches that profess Christianity, must not be supposed without proof to be no Christians. If a *Rapist* will say to all the men in the City, *prove that you are no Thieves, no Adulterers, no Liarers, no Traytors, or else I will take you for such.* I think they may more justly say, *prove that you are such, or else we will take you for a slanderer.*

And that they are of one Church I prove; [*All Christians are one Church, but these are Christians; therefore of one Church.*]

The major is certain, [*They that are the Members and Subjects of one Christ, are of one Church. All Christians are the Members and Subjects of one Christ, therefore they are of one Church.*]

All that have the seven terms of Union before mentioned out of Eph. 4. are of one Church; but such are these before named.

Here remember, 1. That I plead not for the Christianity of any that are proved to deny indeed any essential point of Christianity; but I will not believe this man, that every thing instituted by Christ (and so every word in the Bible) is such an essential; nor that our Church or Religion is so strange a thing as to have no perpetual, integral parts nor accidents; but what will not some men have a Face to defend? 2. That this same man, hath already maintained that no man is bound to be subject to the Pope to whom he is not sufficiently poundered; and that he confesseth, that it is not yet agreed among them that any more is necessary to Salvation to be explicitly believed, than that *there is a God, and reward for good works*: And yet two or three parts of the Christian World must be no Christians, nor Members of the Church of Christ, because they are not Members of the Pope.

And let it be still remembered to acquit the Eastern and Southern Churches from the Papist charge of Heresie, (as being Nestorians and Eutychians), 1. That the Accusers are to be taken for Calumniators, till they prove it, by all the rules of common Justice.

2. That if they could prove *Discors* e. g. an Eutychian, that's no proof that all the Bishops that adhered to him were such: for it's apparent by the Acts of the Councils that Multitudes adhered to him because they thought him no Eutychian: [*And Deodon de supposito* hath undeniably proved, that *Discors* said but what his Predecessor Cyril hath oft said, whom you approved.] and many because they thought the Judgment unjust that judged him so, and cast him out, and many for the honour of the Seat, yea many for fear of death by the people that were affected to him as their Patriarch, though they understood not the cause in question. He that readeth the Bishops at the Council of Calcedon, part crying out prostrate on the Earth, *miserrimi, miserrimi, non dissimimus*; *ello, kill us here, we dare not go home, if we desert and rally against our Patriarch before another be chosen, the people will kill us*; and another part of them confessing that fear made them subscribe at the Council, at Eph. 2. and some crying out, *Away with them they are Hereticks, who cryed non dissimimus*; may well judge that all were not Hereticks: that clamor called so. 3. If they could prove those few Bishops that were openly accused and noted to be Eutychians, that's no proof that the rest were so. 4. If they could prove that many then were so, that will not prove that those that now there inhabit are so. 5. And of Nestorianism there is less publick shew of proof. 6. And indeed the main Body of the Common People, yea and Clergy, it's most probable never understood the Controversies. 7. Yea he that with judgment readeth the Acts, History, and Debates of those times, may well doubt whether Nestorians, Eutyches, or Discors understood them themselves: and whether the Heresie lay not mostly in an unskillfulness of interpreting of words and expressions. *Discors* solemnly professed that he held neither *division of Nature*, nor *confusion of them, nor transmutation*, and that antecedent to their Union they were two: These are unskillful expressions: But one would think that he that held that Union did neither change nor confound them, must needs mean that they were distinct though not divided: and the Orthodox denied *division* as well as he. And if men had in those Councils but distinguished the senses of the word [*Union*] or [*One*] half as exactly as all Metaphysicks and Schoolmen use to do, it's a great doubt whether it would not have reconciled both Eutyches and Nestorius to the Orthodox, it being most undeniable

that there is a sense of the word in which *Christi Mariti* may be said to be *One*, and a sense in which they cannot be so said: A sense in which he had *two Wives*, and a sense in which he had *but one*: A sense of the word [*person*] in which it might be said to have had two persons, and a sense in which it could not be so said: And he that readeth how *Hieron* was a vile Hereticated for refusing the word *hypostasis*, and what Controversie was about that word and *persons* between the *Eastern* and *Western* Bishops, till it was found out by *Mazianus* and other peaceable men that they meant the same thing, may possibly hope that if such men as are peaceable and skilful in discussing ambiguous terms, and driving unskilful men to understand others, and speak aptly themselves, had patiently searched the business to the bottom, they would have found fewer Heretics than were judged such. And their own Writers have no other Argument to excuse Pope *Honorius*, (condemned for a Heretic by a Council as well as *Nestorius* and *Dioscorus*) but that he understood not the words and was misinformed: And *Nestorius* (whatever some say to the contrary) denied Christ to be two persons: These are his words to Cyril's Papers [*In eo in laudo quod distinctionem Naturarum secundum Dignitatem et humanitatis rationem harumque in Una summat persona prædicat*]. His Heresy lay in two words, 1. That he said *Mary* was not to be called *Dei* *Virgo* *Deipara*, but *Virgo* *Dei* the Mother of Christ: 2. That he said in the Synod, He would not say that *God was two or three months* old; and so Cyril's answer to the objections of the oriental Bishops plainly shew, that the apostles of the word *Deipara* was the Controversie: And he that had but said that *Christus non Quam Deus, sed Qui Deus, et quoniam Deus Unicus humanitati* was born of *Mary*, had been like to have reconciled them all.

However, the number so judged was inconsiderable as to all the Christians in those Countries; and among millions of Christians it is not twenty Bishops thought guilty that are a proof that the Country or Multitude was so.

8. To conclude, the *Papists* themselves ordinarily justify them from that charge, and confess, that the Christians of those Countries are honest harmless men, that understand not what such Heresies are or detect them; as I have before shewed out of *Brochardus* that dwelt at *Jerusalem*, and others. And what man can tell us that millions of professed Christians are *Heretics*, that never declared any such thing themselves. Were it lawful so boldly to censure others, how much more excusable should we be if we judged the Pope and his Followers *Heretics*, who are far more corrupt and erroneous than those whom they accuse, and deny to be Christians?

But page 86, 87, malignity is so hard put to it for some sorry pretensions against Christian charity, and for Unchurching the most of the Church of Christ, that he hath nothing to say but such stuff as this.

"I require the nomination of the determinate Opinions of Societies, as *Hussites*, *Waldenses*, *Nestorians*, *Eutychians*, &c. not of their persons; and therefore I say you nominate not much less persecute you those with whom you begun: Now these were *Greeks*, *Armenians*, *Biblicians*, *Protestants*." So that I speak undeniably of the nomination of Sects and Societies, not of Names and Sir-names and Genealogies of persons: There were different Sects and Professions in different Countries, as *Armenia*, *Abassia*, &c. I require the nomination of which of those Sects or Parties you mean in those Times and Nations, nor what were their Names and Sir-names: nor is it sufficient that you say there were Christians, that is, Christians universally so called or true Christians in all Ages, as *Armenia*, *Ethiopia*, *Egypt*, &c. who denied the Popes Supremacy; or unless you nominate of what Party, Sect, Opinion, or Profession they were, how shall any man judge whether they held or held no Opinion contrary to the essentials of Christianity, and by that become no Christians, &c.

Answer. I would not insult over Men in their sin and folly; but I must say that I reverence that Wisdom and Justice of God which hath made the Evidences of Christian Truth, and the Rights of his Church, and the Obligations to Love and Concord so clear, that Ignorant Malice, trained up in Satan's *Malice* cannot speak against it, without such impudence as this Man here is purloin to exercise. When he denied most of the Church to be true Christians, he put me to prove that they have been such: I convince him that I am not bound to name the Men; and even the County it self may prove but a miserable Seat of Religion; but I prove that Christians that deny the Popes Supremacy, or are none of his Subjects, have

have successively from the beginning inhabited those Countries: And now the Man is angry that I will not call them by the Names which their malice callest on them, but only call them *Christians* of *Armenia*, *Ethiopia*, &c. Their factious Interest taught them to imagine better Men with odious Titles, and I must needs do so too. But, Sir, resume some modesty, if I prove them *Christians*, do you prove them *unchristian* if you can. I prove that they are baptized, and profess all these Creeds which were the Symbol of Christians for many hundred years; and they receive the Holy Scriptures: Do you prove that they invalidate all this Profession, or confess your self a Calumniator. Must I tell you what By-Opinions they all hold, that you may judge whether they are Christians or not? Cannot you judge by their Baptism, Creeds, and Profession of Christianity, till you are told their Opinions in controverted things? Why then said you, that you call not for their Names? How can I tell the Opinions of Men un-named and unknown, but by their Professions? I know not the Opinions of my Neighbours at the next Doors; and must I tell you the Opinions of all the People of foreign Lands. Is this necessary to know a Papist? Cannot I tell you that Men are Papists that profess subjection to the Pope as the Vice-Christ, unless I tell you that they are Molinists, or Dominicans, Franciscans, Benedictines, Jesuits, Jansenists, &c. Their Profession of Christianity is notorious; if you can prove them no Christians, do. I suppose that one of twenty thousand of them never studied the *Eutychian*, or *Nestorian* Controversies, any more than those Christians that died before these Names and Men were born: and I suppose that when these Names came first up, one Pastor of an hundred might side with one of these Sects, which the Ages following little minded, as to any considerable number: and I suppose that some that defended *Eutyches* and *Nestorius* knew not what the Heresie was, and erred not so grossly as those *Jesuits* did about Murder, Adultery, Perjury, &c. whom *Momahis* and the *Jesuit Moralists* describe; nor your common Doctors cited by Mr. *Clarkson*; no nor so bad as the Councils of *Rome*, *Constance* and *Basil* say your Pope have done, nor as others of you say those Councils did; no nor as the Council at the *Laterane*, did in decreeing the Exterminations of all that you call Heretics, and the deposition of Princes that will not exterminate them, and the dispossessing Subjects from their Oathes of Allegiance.

But if this arguing of yours be good, suppose it used with your selves: [It is not enough that you profess your selves Christians and Papists; tell us what other Opinions you are of, or else how can we know that you are Christians?] But we are ashamed of such Methods; when the Law of Nations bindeth all Men, beyond their Profession, to prove that they are, no *Traytors*, no *Theists*, *Fornicators*, *Lyars*, &c. then I may yield that Men professing Christianity must prove further that they are no Heretics, or invalidate not their own Profession: But yet I will not then grant you, that any are obliged to prove this but themselves. How can I prove such Negatives of millions in the remote parts of the Earth? (if they could prove it of themselves.) Call them to do it, if you must have such Negatives proved: But see that you call them one by one: for my Neighbour's error, proven not mine. If I were put to take you and all the Papists in England for no Christians, unless I could prove you to be no *Sectaries*, no Heretics, no Traytors, no Drunkards, Perjured, Fornicators, &c. How were it possible for me to prove it by any one of you? This is one difference it seems between the Justice of the Papal Church-Government and Christ's: And perhaps this is the ground of the Racks and Torments of the Inquisition, to make Men confess what Opinion they are of.

The Answer to W. J.'s third Chapter.

He begins that which he calls his third Chapter, pag. 88, 89, with again repeating his Question thus: [Were they all united in the profession of one and the same Faith, and Unity of external Communion; without whose two it is impossible to be united in Christ.]

Answer. I am afraid those Repetitions will tire the Reader, I have proved them united in one Faith, even the Christian Faith; and in one External Communion in much more of it than is essential to Christianity, viz. in one Baptism, the Lord's Supper, prayer, praise, thanksgiving, confession of Jesus, preaching and reading the Word of God, observation of the Lord's Day, &c. without differing in any thing inconsistent with the Unity of the Body of Christ: But it by the ambiguous word of [Unity of External Communion] you should mean either that they

Sec. 1.

they must meet all in one place, or be all under one Pastor, these you before disowned : And if you mean that they must all have one Book of Liturgie, you know that so had not your *Roman* Church of above 600 years at least, nor yet the *Eastern* Churches, nor any considerable number of them ; every Bishop making his Liturgie, or Prayers, as he saw meet.

If you mean that they must have no differences in any Word, or Ceremony ; and that all are of several Churches, (or half of no Church,) who differ about Meats, Drinks, Days, &c. I shall not believe you while I believe the Scripture, (*Rom. 14.* and *15. 1 Cor. 8. Fam. 3. &c.*) nor till I renounce Humanity, or believe that Men of several Complexions, Statures, or Languages, may not yet be all truly Men ! They that bring it to that, that I am no Christian if I eat not Fish in *Lent* rather than *Flesh*, may Unchristian me next if I eat not my Bread without Cheese, or my Cheese without Bread ; or if I take not the Pope for my Apothecary, or Physician, Lay by the Sword, and Racks, and Fires, and the World will soon laugh down your arrogant Tyranny.

Sub. 2. I demanded his Proof that ever there was a Papist, or almost, one Church of Papists in the World for 400 years after Christ ? And he tells me, that [*the Oration of Pope Celestine's Legats in the Council at Ephesus* proveth it ; and though that Council was celebrated 430, yet in a moral consideration that passeth for 400, &c.]

Ans. What cannot the Jesuits Morals make good ? By them 430 years is within the 400. And by them a Speech of the Pope's Legats goeth for proof of the Judgment of the Council : But what was that Speech it self ? First, Note that the Council was called by *Theodosius* the Emperour, and not by *Celestine*, sending his *Littera Augustales* to all the *Metropolitans*, commanding them to appear at *Ephesus*. 2. That *Cyril*, and not *Celestine*, was sent to at first for help, from the Church at *Constantinople*. 3. That *Cyril* presided : And whereas the Papists feign that he did it as the Pope's Substitute, the Councils Letters to the Emperour expresse, that the Pope's three Legats were the Men that represented his Person, (*Bin. p. 716.*) And that they commended to *Theodosius* the Judgment of the Pope, but as the signification of common consent. 4. And when all is done, these words of *Philip, a Roman Prebiter*, in which this great boast is of, [*Thanking them for so receiving the Pope's Letters*],—*Non enim ignara est vestra beatitudo totius fidei caverorumq; omnium Apostolorum caput beatum Apostolum Petrum extitisse.* And after that *Peter*, the Foundation and Head, had the Keys, and liveth and judgeth in his Successors : But he denyeth not that the other Apostles also had the Keys, and that the Church was built on the Foundation of the Apostles : And these high words spoken to keep up the Pope's greatness in the Empire, were but to maintain his place in Councils ; and never spoken to the Churches without the Empire, nor such Power over them claimed by him : And the Councils Decrees were past before these Legats came, by whose consent *Cyril* was glad to strengthen his Party, having been condemned by *Joh. Antioch. Nestorius*, &c. And doth not *Nestorius* say as much of *Andrew*, (cited by me elsewhere ?) and many a Protestant that taketh *Peter* to have been among the Apostles, as the Force-man of a Jury to the rest, would say the same words : But he intimateth that the Pope is *Peter's* Successor. True, he so supposed him as a Bishop, but not as an Apostle, and therefore not in equality of Power : And common reason will interpret him in the common sense of all the Councils and those times, viz. as having the first place in the Imperial Councils, and being the chief of the Patriarchs in the Empire ; but not as being the Bishop of all the World. There is no probability that this one Man extended his Power further than the Empire, and so that he was a Papist ; and yet you have not proved one in 400 years and more.

But he saith, had not the Council of *Ephesus* consented, they would have contradicted one imposing a *Supremacy* and a *Judge*.

Ans. 1. They never took him for a Judge, any further than as the first Patriarch had the first Seat and Vote. 2. *Cyril* was there the first ; the Legats coming after the Decrees past. 3. *Cyril* was glad of the consent of the *Wise*, it being become too much of the cause of the day ; Whether *Nestorius* or he was the wiser Speaker, and should prevail. 4. What's this to the Government of all the World ? Shew us when that Council subjected any without the Empire, to the Pope, or to themselves. 5. Yea in the Empire, he is blind that seeth not that Councils were above Popes ; and when the major Vote carried it, they condemned Popes as well as others, (as they did *Honorius*, and many since.)

Sub. 3. Pag. 90. You have another Instance of his saying and unlaying. When I named the Churches

Churches of *Ethiopia*, *India*, the outer *Armenia*, &c. that were not under the Pope's jurisdiction, he saith, I must mean that they were never under it ; for if they were under him in any Age, and for any time since Christ, you can never make them an Instance of those who were perpetually in all Ages a visible Congregation of Christians not acknowledging the Pope's Supremacy.

Ans. And yet this same man said before, that he did not put me to prove that in all Ages they did not own the Pope, but that they that own him not now had been a Church any other way truly united : who can answer him that faith and unfaith, and changeth his Cause as the occasion tempteth him ? I have oft told him, 1. I prove that the extra-imperial Churches never were subject to the Pope, unless when any of them by conquest fell under the Empire, or on such an odd accident in some singular instance which I have enumerated in my *Naked Popery*. 2. And that no Church in the whole World owned him as the Bishop of all the World for above 400, if not above 600 years. 3. And that those that owned him not (as *Britain*) at the first, and owned him after and disowned him again, were still Christian Churches united in Christ.

But the man is loth to understand, and pag. 91. saith [You mean all other extra-imperial Nations or some : If all I find the quite contrary ; for the Gothes, successively Inhabitants of Spain, never acknowledged themselves Subjects of the Empire, who yet are now subject to the Roman Bishop, and consequently were and are sometime under him.]

Ans. I have oft and plain enough told you my meaning : This is very cautiously written : 1. If the Gothes in Spain were not subject to the Empire, the old Inhabitants were before the Gothes conquered them, and the Gothes themselves, when by *Theodosius's* leave they dwelt in *Thrace* and near it. And though the Gothes became their Masters, they did not exterminate all the Inhabitants, who had been used to some subjection to the Pope. 2. Yet how little Spain then depended on the Pope is known even by the current of all the *Gothick* Councils, the *Toletans*, *Hispalense*, &c. where their Kings called them, and were oft present, and made certain parts of their Canons, and were over and over magnified, and Canons made for their honour and security, and the due election of Successors, when there was not a word of subjection to the Pope. 3. And you do well in affirming no more but that Spain is now and therefore sometime under the Pope ; that they are now so indeed, their Inquisition witnesseth, nor was it ever in my thoughts to deny it. But what of that ?

He addeth, [And the Swedes and Danes, though now they reject all obedience to him, yet in the year 1500 they acknowledged him, &c.]

Ans. Very true ; and what of all this ! no doubt but long before 1500 the Pope got possession of the *Western* Churches ; we doubt not of it.

But he tells me that to maintain my Cause, I must shew that all the extra-imperial Churches were from under the Pope.

Ans. My Cause is not of your stating but my own. I maintain, 1. That the Pope was never made the Bishop of all the World. 2. And that the Primacy so much mentioned in the ancient Canons was only over, or in the Imperial Churches, and was a humane institution ; and that the Councils and Emperours never pretended to give or acknowledge any more. Nor did the Councils themselves, and all the Patriarchs, pretend to any more, nor dream of governing all the World. 3. That the Churches that were from the beginning without the Empire, were none of them subject to the Pope for above 400 if not 500 or 600 years. 4. That the Empire of *Abassia*, and all the *Eastern* and *Southern* extra-imperial Churches (*Persia*, *India*, &c.) were never under the Pope to this day, save that the *Portugals* and *Spaniards* have lately got some footing in part of the *Indies*. 5. That the whole *Greek* Church, the *Armenians*, *Georgians*, *Syrians*, *Egyptians*, &c. never were under the Pope as Pope, that is, as the Universal Bishop of all the World, but only as the primate of the Empire. 6. That even in that relation he was not properly the Governour of any of the Dioceses of the other Patriarchs, nor the other distinct as Dioceses (*Carthage*, *Jussinians*, &c.) but the prime Patriarch that had the first Seat in Councils, which put in and out Bishops at their pleasure (with the Emperours will) even Patriarchs and all. 7. That those that were under him for some time (as *Britain*) were divers of them from under him before and after.

And yet that the Reader may not mis-understand the matter and this mans importunity, I must repeat the exceptions laid down in my *Naked Popery* pag. 106. 107. and tell him what I grant him.

2. Some Cities that were near to *Scythia* and *Persia*, had Bishops: to whom some Neighbour *Scythians* and *Persians* might be voluntary Subjects.

3. Some Cities and Countries were sometime under the *Roman* Power, and sometimes under the Enemies: (*Persians*, *Parthians*, *Armenians*, *Goths*, *Vandals*, (as *Africa*, &c.) when they were of the Empire their Bishops came to Councils; and when they were under *Heathen* or *Arrian* Princes they took it for their calamity, and were glad of any Communion with the Imperial Churches, and the Honour and countenance of their Relation; and it's like would come among them if they could.

4. Some Bishops that lived in *Heathen* or persecuted Countries, in distress were glad to seek Countenance and help from the *Roman* power; as the *Britains* did from *France*, and a *Basil* and the *Eastern* Bishops did from the *West* in *Valens* his persecution, while yet they took them not for Governours. And some weak Princes that lived near the *Roman* Empire were glad of their Friendship and afraid of their Enmity, and were willing to hold a communion with them in Religion, in which their Clergy should have some dependance on *Rome*, which was the case of the *Saxons* in and after *Gregory* the first's days.

5. Some *Western* Countries that were converted from idolatry by some Preachers subject to the Pope became themselves subjects to that Seat as their Convertors, and in obedience to them that first prevailed with them, which was partly the case of the *Saxons*, and of some Countries of *Germany*, and *Sweden*, *Denmark*, *Poland*, &c.

6. Lastly, when the *Eastern* Empire and Churches forsook the Church of *Rome*, the Pope received a great diminution in the extent of his Primacy (the *East* that forsook him being about twice as big as those that remained under him) but withal a great *Interflow* in increase of his power; for shortly after he claimed the Government of all the *World* as Universal Bishop, not only of the Empire, but the Earth. And after that many that were his Subjects owned him in that relation: And since then, I deny not but that many Princes, without the Empire, have been his Subjects: yea he purposely broke *Germany* and *Italy* into many small Principalities, and free Cities, that they might not be strong enough to resist his claim.

If all these Concessions will do them any good, let them make their best of them. I must intreat the Reader to remember hence-forward what is our difference, and not to expect that I repeat this over and over again when his words invite me to it.

Sec. 6. Page 91. he saith [The Indians were not always extra-imperial, for in the year 163. they subjected themselves to Antonius Pius. And so the Armenians 372. being greivously persecuted for the Christian Faith by the Persians, they rendered themselves Subjects to the Roman Empire. And 1145 they and the Indian Christians subjected themselves to the Pope, and again 1439, and so remain at the present.]

Ans. 1. This maketh against you rather than for you: If your Kingdom extended not so far as the Empire. But indeed these are impertinent words. As it was but a small part of the *Indies* that ever was under the *Heathen Romans*, so it is not their Empire that I speak of, but the *Christians*: for before *Constantine's* days, the *Patriarchs* made no pretence to govern all within the Empire, much less all without. *Pighius* tells you, That General Councils were the device of *Constantine*. I would you had told us, 1. What *Indian* or *Armenian* Bishops were at any General Council before *Constantine's* days, and where that Council was and when? 2. And what *Indian*, or *Armenian*, or *Persian* Bishops were imposed or deposed by the Pope of *Rome*? This undertaking would have tried your strength: but you were wiles.

7. And it was but the nearer *Armenia* that you say yielded to the *Roman* Emperour; and I confess that the part that was under him had Bishops at some few Councils, and are not the men of whom I speak; though even they were soon separated from *Rome*, and were no longer under the *Roman* Papacy.

3. But your Fable of the *Armenians* and *Indians* subjecting themselves to the Pope, and so remaining to this day, may be meet to abuse Women with, that know not your Cheats by a tale of a counterfeit Patriarch; but neither Merchants, nor any acquainted with History that know the World, will believe you, any more than that the *Greeks* are your Subjects, who at *Florence*, compelled by necessity, made far more shew of it than ever the other did. In sum, I heartily wish that all the World were as much the Popes Subjects as the *Armenians* and *Abassins* are, on condition that none were any more your Subjects.

And

And whereas you say, pag. 92. None of these hath been in all Ages a visible Congregation besides that of *Rome*. 1. A repeated contempt is answer enough to a repeated false Historical Assertion. 2. Again, I tell you, that is no question; but whether those that now are none of your Subjects were in all Ages *Christians*. 3. You have not yet proved that there was one *Papist* in the World for 400 years.

You add, [For each of them at one time or other became the same Congregation so that, by subjecting and conforming themselves to the Bishop of *Rome*.

Ans. As true as the *Turk* is subject to you: If some little of the *Indians*, were subject to a *Heathen Antonius*, doth that prove that they and all the *Christians* there were subject to *Constantine*, or to the Pope, when they revolted? And when was *Ethiopia* and *Persia* subject to you? And why do you not blush to say that the *Armenians* are now subject to you? You are like to be good Deliverers of Traditions to us, and *Infallible Decretes*, and *Deciders of Controversies*, that stick not at such notorious fictions? If you had said that *England*, *Scotland*, *Sweden*, *Denmark*, are your Subjects, the fallshood had some more pretence, because you have some among them all.

I next noted, That these Churches profess it to be their Tradition that the Pope was never their Governour. This he denieth and calleth for proof.

Ans. I give you proof. 1. See the words of your own Writers, e.g. *Godignus de rebus Abassinarum* reciting the conference of the Emperours Mother and the *Jesuite*, wherein she professeth it, and the answer of the *Jesuite* confessing it, and *Godignus* confirming it, that they were *Christians* from the time of the *Evangelist* St. 8. or St. *Matthew*, and the Pope had nothing to do with them. 2. When the same Countries do at once profess these two things. 1. That in Religion they follow the Tradition of their Fathers from the *Apostles*, 2. And that the Pope is none of their Governour: let these two together and you must conclude that they suppose their Tradition to be against the Papacy, or that they are Sots; and that these two are their Principles, all the Historical notice that we have of those Countreys by Travellers, Merchants, and Writers, *Papists*, *Greeks*, and *Protestants* assure us; deny it as impudently as you will, I will not tire the Reader with needless History.

I next added, that [No History or Authority of the least regard is brought by your own Writers to prove these under the Pope.]

He replyeth, Yes, those that say, All were under him:

Ans. That is none but Pope *Leo* himself and a few of the Empire, who speak of no *All*, but the *Orbis Romanus*, the whole Empire.

I added [No credible witnesses mention your Acts of Jurisdiction over them, or their Acts of Subjection; which Church-History must needs have contained, if it had been true that they were your Subjects.]

He replyeth, [Is not *Gensbrard* a Witness that Pope *Eugenius* wrote to the Emperour of *Ethiopia* 1437 to send Legates to the Council of *Ferrara* as the *Greek* Emperour had decreed to do, to whose Letters and Legates *David* their Emperour sent a respectful answer, and accordingly sent some of his Church to that Council, as appears by the Acts of the Council, and that 1524 the said *David* and *Helms* his Emperess promised obedience to the Bishop of *Rome* Pope *Clem. 7.*]

Ans. I had rather you had called *Father Parsons*, or *Compton*, or *Garnet*, your credible Witnesses than *Gensbrard*, a late railing *Falshifter*. Such Tales as these be meet for the Ears of none but such as would believe you if you swore that all the *Jews* and *Turks* are *Christians*. Do you think that your obtruding such abominable Forgeries, commonly known by the Learned to be such, and confessed by your own Writers, will not increase our alienation from you? Did you ever read the subscriptions of that Council when you say that the Acts declare that some of the *Ethiopian* Church were there? Why did you not name them? Do we not know how long a Journey it is to *Abassin*, and how much more time the Pope must have had to have sent a message to the Emperour there and received an answer, than the sudden calling of the Council at *Ferrara* (to break another that had deposed the Pope as a *Heathen* and wicked man): could conflict with? and that Council sitting a while at *Ferrara*, removed (by the plague) to *Florence*, was wholly taken up with the *Greeks*, and no mention of any *Abassin* there: We have (by *Dr. Orighon's* Edition) a better History of that Council than *Binnius*, &c. gives us; but nothing of this. Indeed *Binnius* reports the now known

Fable

Fable of an *Armenian* coming too late after the Subscriptions: but we have oft enough heard of your fencible Patriarchs and Bishops, and feigned Nuncios: You can make a Patriarch or Bishop of any part of the World at Rome when you will, and then say that those Churches have submitted to you. These Forgeries are part of your foundation, as Dr. *Willet* hath shewed in his *Zetastylion Papismi*. Why have you no Bishops no Regiment in *Abassia* and *Armenia*? Had it been true that *David* and *Helena* had promised obedience to the Pope, (as *Johann. Paleologus*, the Greek Emperor partly did, and forced some of his Bishops to do in his necessity, hoping for help to have kept out the *Turk*, till they were come home, and then renounced the Act;) What had that been to the Question? One Man and Woman is not the Church; but he that will read but your own *Godignus*, will see the utter falsehood of your pretences to any thing in *Abassia*.

Self. 10. Next he nameth, besides *Gensbrard*, six others, (*Platina*, *Nauclerus*, &c.) that he saith besides the Acts of the Florentine Council, that say that the Armenians and Indians acknowledge the Sovereignty of the Roman Bishop through the Whole World.

Ans. 1. Though he names but his own late Partners, yet he citeth not a word, page, or book of any one of them. If any one of them have to grots a Fiction, it is no more honour to them than to himself: But the Council of Florence, (in whose Acts I should as soon look to find a Fiction as in any, being a packt Anti-Council of a villainous depofed Pope,) hath no such word in any of my Books, but only that which I cited of a forged too late coming of an *Armenian*. And even their own Fiction talks not of his (much less the *Indians*) acknowledgment of the Pope's Sovereignty over the whole World.

Self. 11. He next addeth, [And as to more ancient times gives not the Arabic Translation of the first Council of Nice a clear Witness, that the Ethiopians were to be under the Jurisdiction of the Patriarch of Alexandria, and he under that of Rome?]

Ans. I do not wonder that you use to lead the ignorance in your Disputes into a Wilderness, or Wood of History, under the Name of Antiquity and Tradition, when you know your own Refuges. Reader, the famous Council of Nice hath been predicated, and appealed to, and gloried in by almost all Parties save the *Arians*, for many hundred years after it was celebrated; and the *African* Bishops (of whom *Austin* was one) had a long Contest with divers Popes (for about twenty years) about the true Copy of the Canons: And now the other day comes one *Alph. Pisanus*, and tells us that he hath found a Copy of them in *Arabic*; and this tells you of the *Ethiopian* being under *Alexandria*, by Canon, and forty things more that were not in the Canons which the Church had for above a thousand years: and this is very good Authority with a Papist. And so they can yet determine what shall be in any ancient Council, or Father; as if they had the doing of all themselves. It is but saying, we have found an old Paper that saith so. Why then do you not receive *Eutychius Alexandrinus*'s Reports of that Council, (published by *Selden*), which tells us other improbable things of it, but hath far more appearance of Antiquity than your new-found Canons?

Self. 12. Next I noted that [Their absence from General Councils, and no invitation of them thereto, (that was ever proved,) is sufficient Evidence.]

To this he saith, [I intend to make a particular Tract to prove this, and to evidence the falsity of your Allegation, from undeniable Testimonies of classic Authors, and from the ancient Subscriptions of the Councils themselves.]

Ans. A fine put-off; I do not believe you dare attempt it, for fear of awakening the World to the consideration of this notorious Evidence against you: It is now above sixteen years since our writing, and yet I hear not of your Book. But the Reader need not stay for it; let him but peruse the Subscriptions in your own Volumes of the Councils, *Crab*, *Swiss*, *Binius*, *Niclausius*, and judge whether all the Christian World without the Empire were ever summoned to General Councils, were present at them, or judged by them; any Bishops put in, or out by them; and judge as you see proof.

Self. 13. Next I noted that [Their ancient Liturgies have no Expressions of any subjection to the Pope, though the *Epistols* have corrupted them; which in a Digression I shewed out of *Usher* de success. Eccles. in that instead of *Hic panis est Corpus meum* in the Ethiopick Canon *Universalis*, they have put *Hoc est corpus meum*.]

To this he replyeth, pag. 96. No more doth the Roman Missal, nor that of France, or Spain witness their subjection to the Pope.

Ans.

Ans. That's strange that you have suffered so much of the old form unchanged. *Gregory*, that denyed the Title of Universal Bishop was the chief Author, and the claim of the Monarchy of all the Barth was then put in the Eggs, (even after 600 years,) and came not into the open World till about the time that *Mahomet* came; else undoubtedly your *Lyturgick* Commemorations and Prayers would have had some mention of the Universal Bishop; as well as our Prayers mention the King and Bishops; (especially when it was then the Custom to record and commemorate all the Patriarchs, and greatest Prelates;) and the Imposition would have come forth as by his Authority, as the *Trent* symbolical Oath doth; and as our *Lyturgie* doth by Authority of the King, and Parliament, and Convocation. Surely this is much against you.

Because he knew not the *Scholasticks* mentioned by *Usher*, he questioneth his Citations about the change of the *Ethiopick* *Lyturgie*.

I next added that [Constantine's Letters of Request to the King of Persia for the Churches there, (mentioned by Eusebius in Vit. Const.) do intimate that then the Roman Bishop Ruled not there.]

To this he saith, [Why so? The Pope might command, and the Emperor intreat.]

Ans. 1. This sheweth that the Emperours who used to call Councils, called none out of Persia; for they had no Power there. 2. And withal, Why is there not a Syllable in any Church-History, or credible Author, (that we have heard of,) that mentioneth that ever the Pope sent one Command into Persia; or that ever he corrected, suspended, or depofed any Bishop there, or excommunicated any there; (though indeed that had been no sign of Governing Power, seeing an equal may renounce Communion with an equal Heretical Society, or Person.) Why is there no mention that ever any General Council did any of this? No, nor ever took any such exterior Churches into their care, any otherwise than as Neighbours to help them; nor never made any one Governing Canon for them? And I pray you, How would the Persian King that must be intreated by *Constantine*, have taken it to have the Religion of his Kingdom under the Command of one of *Constantine*'s Subjects? But you have the affirmative, let us see your proof that ever the Pope Governed the Persian Churches.

Next I noted that [Even at home here the Scots and Britains obeyed not the Pope, even in the days of Gregory, (above 600) but resisted his changes, and refused Communion with his Ministers.]

To this he replyeth, [That, 1. This was their error, as our disobedience now is; and Beda so chargeth it on them, that is followeth not that they had never been under the Pope. 2. That they also held that which was condemned as a Heresy, at Nice, yet it followeth not that they were not under that Council's Authority. 3. They also refused Communion with the English Councils.]

Ans. These words signifie what you would have us believe; but let us try what more: 1. Seeing you can bring no word of proof that ever they had been subject to the Pope before: And, 2. Seeing they were found utterly *Aliens* to his subjection: And, 3. Seeing they were found in possession of Opinions, and Customs quite contrary to the Pope's: 4. And seeing they pleaded Tradition for this: 5. And seeing they renounced Communion with those that came to subjugate them: And, 6. Seeing the Pope's Ministers never pretended to any ancient possession in pleading with them, (as you may see in *Beda*;) 7. And seeing we read in *Beda*, *Gildas*, and others, that they had heretofore made use of the assistance of the French Church (by *Germanus* and *Lupus*) as mere Neighbours, without any mention of subjection to Rome: Let the Reader that careth what he believeth, now judge whether ever the Scots and Britains were before subject to the Pope.

2. It is false that the Council of Nice condemned their *Easter-practices* as a Heresy, though they united on a contrary resolution. And as it is certain that that Council had no authority out of the Empire, and so not over Britain when it was out of the Empire, so this British Custom plainly intimateth that Britain had not received the decrees of that Council.

3. That they refused the Communion of the English as *half-Papists*, it is no great wonder: And yet I remember no proof of that at all in *Beda*; but only that asking the English for Pagan Tyrants that conquered and oppressed them, they refused to join with *Augustine* the Monk in preaching to them: It's like taking it for a hopeles attempt in them that were odds to them, and open Enemies, and not to be trusted.

N

Next

SUB. 16. Next I recite the words of their *Reinwardt Const. Waldens. Catal. Bibl. Pat. To. 4. p. 777.* "The Churches of the *Armenians, Ethiopians, and Indians*, and the rest which the *Apostles*, converted are not under the Church of *Rome*: One would think, plain words."

He replyeth, "[No more are you; what then; our question is not of what is done *de facto* for the present, but what *de jure* ought to be done, or hath been done: The Author saith not, These Nations were never under the Church of *Rome*, but are not now.]

Ans. It's no wonder that you desire to be the expositors of the Scriptures (and all other Books;) for that is the only device to make them speak what you would have them. If *Gregory the Seventh* be the Expositor of *St. Paul*, no doubt but *St. Paul* shall be for the power of Popes to depose Kings and Emperours: If *Innocent the Third* be his Expositor, no doubt but by [Bread] 1 *Cor. 11.* he meaneth [no Bread] and by [this Cup] [no Wine.] And I confess there is greater reason that you should be the infallible Expositors of *Reynardus* than of *Christ* or *Paul*; for he was more your own and under your Government. But this *Reynardus* was an unhappy speaker, and if he were here I would ask him, 1. Why do you speak in such a manner as any ordinary Reader would think that you speak *de jure* & *de facto*, and yet mean *de facto* only? 2. Why speak you so as an ordinary Reader would think that you speak *de jure* *statute*, when you mean but *de jure* & *statute* *inordinato*? 3. Why speak you of so great a sin as *Rebellion* against the *Vice-Christ*, and *Schism* from the Universal Church, without any note of reprehension? 4. Why name you the old *extra Imperial Churches* only, and not those that since renounced *Rome*, (as all the *Greek Church*.) if you meant but what you charge the *Greek Church* with? Had you not more easily fastened a charge of *Rebellion* on all those *Eastern Churches* that sometimes acknowledged some primacy of *Rome*, than on those that the World knoweth were never under him? 5. And why do you say also in general, [and the rest which the Apostles converted are not under the Church of *Rome*.] if there were not some special reason for it? We took your meaning to be [Though those in the Empire, and many without it that were turned from Infidelity by the Popes Subjects, be under the Church of *Rome*, the first by the Laws of the Empire and Councils, and the latter by voluntary subjection; yet so are not the Churches which the rest of the Apostles planted without the Empire, as those Apostles were not subject to *St. Peter*.] 6. And why do you so arrogantly accuse such vast Churches as *Armenia, Ethiopia, India*, and all the rest of the Apostles planted; (besides *Peter* and *Paul*) and take them all for Rebels and Schismaticks, and yet bring no word of proof for your Accusations? But the truth is *Reynardus* (though he revolted from the Separatists of his times) was an honest man than the Pope that shall thus be his Expositor; and yet *W. F.* is not the Pope, and therefore I question his partial exposition.

SUB. 17. Next I mentioned the Canon of the Council of *Calcedon* which saith, that the *Fathers* (in Council) gave *Rome* the preeminence, &c. He replyeth, that 1. "[The Greek word is not *Admiratio*, but it is *ἡγεμονία*, exhibited or decreed to *Rome*, as ever before due to it by the right of the Apostolic See of *St. Peter* established there.]

Ans. You are hard put to it when you have no better shift than to useless a Criticism, 1. You know I suppose that *Admiratio* may have a signification as remote from [Dignities] as *Admiratio*, and that your own common Translation is *tribune*; and I desire no more, 2. Is here ever a word in the Canon that saith [It was ever before due?] not a word, 3. Is not the same word used of the giving of equal privileges to *Constantinople*, as its of giving or bestowing it to *Rome*? the same word. And did they mean that this belonged ever to *Constantinople*, and that of Divine Right? You dare not say so. 4. Did they not say that [by the same reason] they judged that *Constantinople* should have equal privileges, because it was the Royal City. And was this famous Council (of which you boast as obeying *Leo's* Epistle) so foolish and absurd as to argue thus [I because old *Rome* had the first Seat assigned to it on this account, because it was the Imperial Seat, and that was because it was ever before its due, as *St. Peter's* Chair; therefore we judge, that by the same reason *Constantinople* should have equal privileges because it is now new *Rome*, the Imperial Seat, though it was never due to it before as the Seat of any Apostle.] O what cannot some men believe we seem to believe! And how much doth it concern your Church to be the Expositor and Judge

Judge of the sense of all Councils; as well as of God's Word.

He addeth that [The Canon saith not that this was the sole reason.]

Ans. 1. But the Canon saith, *This was the reason, and assigneth no other.* 2. And if it made not it the great reason which the Church was to take for the *fundamentum juris*, they would never have laid the Right of *Constantinople* on the same Foundation as by parity of reason.

The plain truth is, (but Interest and partiality cannot endure plain truth) he that will not be deceived by cited By-words of the Ancients, must distinguish between the *Tholos* or *fundamentum juris*, and the *Ratio* or *Motives* of the Statute or Constitution. The first was the Law of Emperours and Councils. This only giveth the Right. The second was prevailing and principally, that which the Canon here assigneth, that *Rome* was the great City and the Imperial Seat; but, as a honorary Title adding to the Motive, they say sometimes that it was the Seat of *Peter*, and sometimes of *Peter* and *Paul*, and sometimes they mention *Paul* alone; and cry, (as at *Ephesus*) *Magnus Paulus Cyrillus Magnus Paulus Constantinus* — But note that they give often the same reason for the Patriarchal honour of *Anioch*, (that it was *Sedes Petri*), and therefore never took this to be either the Foundation of the Right, or the chief determining Motive of the Constitution.

He addeth that, [The elfe it had been a contradiction when the Fathers say that *Dioscorus* had extended his Felony against him, to whom our Saviour had committed the charge and care of his Vineyard] that is, of the whole Catholick Church.

Ans. 1. No doubt but they acknowledged that *Christ* committed the care of his Vineyard, to *Peter*, and every one of the Apostles, and to all Bishops as their Successors, though not in Apostleship; and they acknowledged *Rome* the primate in the Empire: and when *Dioscorus* undertook to excommunicate *Leo*, they supposed that he transgressed the Laws of the Imperial Church; and therefore *Anastolus* in the Council, when the *Indict* said that *Dioscorus* condemned *Flavian* for saying *Christ* had two Natures, answered, That *Dioscorus* was not condemned proper idem, but for excommunicating *Leo*, and for not appearing when he was summoned. 2. Is here any word that saith that the Pope was Sovereign of all the Earth? Both not the Council in that very Letter to *Leo*, say that the Emperor had called the Council, not ascribing it to any Authority of the Pope. And also that the saying, *Mos. 28. Ga. each all Nations*, &c. was delivered to them (which is the care of the vineyard) and not only to the Pope, *Quam nobile olim ipse salvator tradidit ad solvendum.*

But *W. F.* [The true reason why his Canon notwithstanding rather the Imperial Authority of that City, than the right from *St. Peter*, was because it suited better with the pretensions of *Anastolus* Bishop of *Constantinople* and his Complices for the elevation of that See than any other, for they had no other, &c.]

Ans. It's true: But did *Anastolus* and his Complices, that is, the Council, speak sincerely and truly here, or falsely? If truly, that's all that I elte them for; If falsely, as worldly, unconscionable men that were setting up themselves, why boast we of *General Councils*? even of this, and of their words to *Leo*? How can we tell when to trust them? and whether they that subscribed against *Flavian* at *Ephesus*, 2. and after cried *omnes peccavimus*, at *Calcedon*, when they were under a *Martian*, and not *Theodosius*, would not have acquit *Dioscorus*, and condemned *Leo* and *Flavian* again, if another *Theodosius* had come. But if they were credible believe them.

But he tells us that a Law of *Theodosius* and *Valentine* put both reasons together, &c.

Ans. I hold you in what sense even now, even as they put the name of *Peters* Seat as a reason of the honour of *Anioch*, a honorary motive to their Law. And he here confesseth himself, That *Alexander* and *Anioch* had the second and third places, because they were the second and third great Cities of the Empire.

But he saith, that [The *St. Peter* thought it convenient that the highest spiritual Authority should be placed in that City which had the highest temporal power.]

Ans. Say you so? 1. Where is that Canon of *St. Peter's* to be found and proved? 2. If so, then why is not this Canon produced for the regulating of all other Churches? Why doth *Canterbury* take place of *London*, contrary to *St. Peter's* Judgment? 3. And if so, then you are gone many hundred years ago. Why do you, contrary to *St. Peter's* mind, pretend to the highest Ecclesiastical Authority, since *Rome* ceased to have the highest Civil Power?

SUB. 18.SUB. 19.

Power? Should not *Constantinople*, and *Vienne*, and *Paris*, be preferred before *Rome*? You cannot make both your ends meet.

Added, [“That these Councils gave not the Pope any Authority over the extra-imperial Nations.”]

He replyeth [“If they had it before, and by Christ's institution, they need not.”]

I answer, So if *Constantinople* had it before *Christ's institution*, they need not have given it equal privileges; but did they that proceeded by *Envy* of *reason*, believe that either of them had any such Title?

I added some further proof. 1. “Those extra-imperial Nations being not called to the Councils, were not bound to stand to such decrees had they been made.

He replyeth somewhat that is instead of the Book which he promised before; and calleth to me to remember to answer him; and nothing that he hath said is more worthy of an answer; viz. [“How came the Bishops of *Persia*, of both the *Armenia's*, and *Gothia* (which were all out of the Empire) to subscribe to the first Council of *Nice*? How came *Phabammon*, Bishop of the *Cepis*, to subscribe to the first Council of *Ephesus*? How came the Circular Letter written by *Eusebius Casar Palast*, in the name of the Council, to be directed to all Bishops, and in particular to the Churches throughout all *Persia*, and the great *India*? Lastly, if those Bishops were not called to Councils why do *Theodoros*, *Marianus*, *Vistor*, *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, all of them affirm, that to the Council of *Nice* were called Bishops from all the Churches of *Europe*, *Africa*, and *Asia*,” and he citeth the places in the Margin.]

Ans. 1. Here is but two Councils named in which such invited Bishops are pretended to have been; the subscriptions to the rest for many hundred years afforded him no such pretence, no not as to one Country in the World.

2. To the Council of *Nice* there subscribed (unless you will believe *Eusebius Alexandrinus*, the *Presbyterian* Friend, that tells you of strange numbers) but 318, as full Testimony confirmeth. And 3. I desire the Reader to note that these subscriptions have no certainty at all. The Copies of *Crab*, *Binnius*, *Pisamus*, &c. disagree one from another. And *Crab* giveth the Reader this note upon them p. 259, that [“the Collector must be pardoned if he erreth in the assignation or conscription of Bishops or Bishoppicks, especially beyond *Europe*, for though they were four old Copies that he used, yet they were every one so depraved, that the Collector was wearied with the foolish and manifold variations; for never a one of them agreed with the rest.”] This is our notice of the subscriptions; and as I said *Eusebius A.* quite differeth from all.

And 1. whereas he tells us here of the Bishops of *Persia*, there is no mention of any man but one *Johannes Persidis*, and he is said to be *Provincia Persidis*; and the *Romans* named not extra-imperial Countries by the name of *Provinces*; therefore there is little doubt but this was some one that verged on the Kingdom of *Persia*, in some City which was under the *Romans* then, and sometimes had been part of *Persia*. I have oft mentioned *Theodoros*'s plain Testimony saying, that. James Bishop of *Nisibis*, (sometimes under the *Persian*) was at the *Nicene Council*, for *Nisibis* was then under the *Roman Emperor*.

2. As to the Bishops of both the *Armenians*, the Copies disagree even of the number; of those of *Armenia minor* they name two Bishops, of *Arm. major*, one hath four, another five, another six; and part of the *Armenia's* being in the *Roman Power*, it is most probable that these Bishops were Subjects to the Empire; or if any at the Borders desired for the honour of Christianity to be at the first famous General Council, it signifieth not that any had power to summon them, or did so. The Emperor had not, and that the Pope did it, none pretend that hath any modesty; and they are called in the subscriptions, *The Provinces of Armenia*.

3. And as for *Gothia*, the Books name one Man, *Theophilus Gothia Metropolis*; which no Man well knoweth what to make of; for the Nation of *Goths* were not then Christians. *Socrates* saith that it was in the days of *Valens* that some of them turned Christians, and that was the reason that they were *Armenians*; and that *Wulphilius* then translated for them the Scripture. But if they had a Bishop at the *Nicene Council*, it is evident that he was in the Empire; for the *Goths* then dwell in *Walachia*, *Moldavia*, and *Poland*; and were no other than the *Sarmatians*, that *Eusebius* tells us *Constantine* had Conquered; and tells us how it

even.

even by helping the Masters whom the Servants by an advantage of the War had disposed to so that your Instance of *Theophilus Gothia*, as without the Empire, is your error. *Myraus* calls part of *France*, *Gothia*. Saith *Marcellinus*, Comes eodem anno, (of *Theodos. 1.* after the Council *Const. 1.*) *Universa genti Gothorum Athanaricho Rege defuncto Romano se se império dedit*: This was a great addition. But here *Pisamus* helps us out, and saith, *Episcopus Pamphylus Scytham dixit in vita Constantini*; & *Metaphrastes* addeth *Wulphilius*'s Successor *Eusebius* indeed tells us that there were 250 Bishops (that differs for the common account, and he is one of them,) and that the Bishop of *Persia* was present, (*Vit. Const. 1. 3. c. 7.*) And that there were learned Men from other Countries, *Scythia* being one, (and the Bishop of *Tomys* was called the *Scythian Bishop*;) And that *Constantine* was the Caller of the Council; (not the Pope;) And that he wrote Letters to the Bishops, to summon them to appear at the Council: And who will believe that he wrote his Summons to the Subjects of other Kings? Or if he had, What's that to the Pope? If *Joh. Persidis* were not a *Roman Subject*, that word *he was present* seemeth to distinguish his voluntary presence from the Summons of others. But saith *Euseb. 16. cap. 6. Viitis of Summons were sent into every Province*: And the *Persian* and *Armenian* Provinces are here named with the Bishops. Those that have leisure to search into the *Roman History* may find what Skirt of *Persia*, and what Part of *Armenia* were in the Empire in those times; and it's notable, that when these Bordering Parts were lost, these Bishops were never more at any General Council; neither at *Ephesus*, *Constantinople*, *Nice* 2. &c.

And *Eusebius* there tells us, as the reason why some came from the remotest Countries, viz. some did it out of a desire to see the (famous first Christian) Emperor, and some out of a conceit, that a Universal Peace should be established: And so *Joh. Persidis* might come with the rest.

And though I find not *Pisamus*'s words of *Theophilus* in *Eusebius*, I find *ibid. l. 4. c. 5.* That it was no wonder that even a *Scythian* Bishop should be at this, and other Councils: For though *Rome* had formerly been so far from conquering the *Scythians* that they paid them Tribute, yet *Constantine* disdaining to pay them Tribute, Conquered *Scythia*, and after that *Sarmatia* also: The *Indians*, *Blemians*, *Ethiopian*, and *Persians*, sent honourable Embassies and Presents to *Constantinople*, (c. 7.) as Neighbours; but he was far from summoning their Subjects to his Council, but wrote his Letter to the King of *Persia* only to favour them at home.

Judge now whether here be a word of summoning any one Bishop out of the Empire? or a word of the Pope's summoning them, but the contrary? or any certainty that any out of the Empire were there? And if any were, how inconsiderable their number was, and on what occasion it was like that they were voluntarily there? Nay, it is most probable that there was not one there, by the Circumstances mentioned.

His second Instance is of *Phabammon* at the Council of *Ephesus*.

Ans. 1. Mark what kind of proof this Man pretendeth to, when he nameth, 1. But one Council after *Nice*. 2. And but one Man, and no Summons; much less that a Pope summoned all the Christian World.

2. But what is that he meaneth? The Copies are the *Egyptian* Christians: *Egypt* was known to be in the Empire. If he mean that the *Abassins* are here called the *Coptes*, and their Bishop here, he is very shameless, and few Men of understanding will believe him. It's plain by the manner and place, in the Subscriptions, that [Coptis] there, signifieth a City; being put in the *Genitive Case* singular, as the others are: It's not [Phabammonis Episcopo Coptorum:] but *Phabammonis Coptis*] and is put in the midst of the Imperial Bishops, by *Binnius*: (But *Crab* hath no Subscriptions at all:) But was there any City of that Name? Yes, and amongst those Bishops that were most frequent at the *Eastern Councils*: *Ferrarius* out of *Strabo*, *Plutarch*, *Plutomy*, and others, saith, [Coptos Cana, i. e. *Rhanusio*, *Urbs* & *Emporium* *Egypti* *fuit Thebaidis* ad Nilum, quo mercato ex India per sinum Arabicum aduocata zera iumentis deferbantur a Thebis 44. mill. pass. in B. 8. *Babylonem versum, a Berenice urbe ad sinum Arabicum 258. ab Alexandria vero supra 300. ubi inavagati inveniuntur. Admirationis Statu*, l. 1. *Theb.* [Coptos & *erisani* *augentia flumina Nilii*.]

You see now with what Ignorance and cheats the unskilful are deceived by these Disputes, and the Pope pretendeth to the Monarchy of the World.

Sist. 23:

His last proof is out of *Theodoret*, *Mar. Vitor*, *Eusebius* and *Socrates*, That to the Council of Nice were called Bishops from all the Churches of Europe, Africa, and Asia.

Ans. Would any Man, not blinded by prejudice, understand this of any other, than all the Bishops of Europe, Africa, and Asia, which were in the Empire; when he knoweth, 1. How much of these three parts of the World were in the Empire. 2. That the Emperour wrote a Letter to the Bishops to summon them. 3. That he had no power out of the Empire. 4. How ill it would have been taken to have summoned, or called the Subjects, before he had requested their Princes to send them? Certainly *Constantine* would have written to their several Princes, and not first to them. 5. His Letters to the King of Persia for the Churches there, shew this, in which yet he never presumed so far as to desire that they might come to his Councils. 6. No History mentioneth any such things, as any summons to any one extra-imperial Bishop. 7. And to end all doubts, the Subscriptions shew that they were not there; shall we not believe your own Books, and our own Eyes?

He citeth *Theodor. l. 1. c. 7.* I suppose he meaneth his *Eccles. Hist.* for in that he mentioneth the calling of the Council; but hath not a word of what this Man doth cite him for: But *cap. 55.* he saith that [*Eusepius totius, & Africae, quibus etiam maxima pars Asia imperio positus est Constantinus*]. Yet this is too largely spoken. *Socrates* hath no such words besides his Recitation of the words of *Eusebius*: *Eusebius* indeed saith, That the Bishops were called out of all these Provinces, and who ever questioned it! Not a Syllable in any of his cited Authors of any Call, or Summons, to any one Man out of the Empire. These are the Foundations of the Roman Monarchy.

Sist. 24.

But I had almost over-past his mention of *Eusebius*, Bishop of Caesarea in Palestine's Circular Letter, writ in the Name of the Council, to be directed to all Bishops; and in particular, to the Churches through all Persia, and the Great India.

Ans. 1. If it had been the Pope's Letter, it would with these Men have proved his Sovereignty of the Earth: But alas, it was *Eusebius's* Letter.

2. It's strange, if *Eusebius* was as great an *Arrian* as you commonly suppose him, that the Council should chuse him to write the circular Letter, and that you had not feigned that he did it as the Pope's Vicar.

3. If writing a Letter would prove a Governing Power, I would write a Letter to Rome presently, that I might be the Governour of the Pope; and then I would command him to lay by his Ambition, and recall his rebellious and bloody Decrees, and to let the Christian World have peace.

4. But the man tells me not by one word, where to find any such Epistle of *Eusebius*; In *Eusebius* there is none such; nor in *Socrates*; nor in *Theodoret*, nor in the common Histories of the Councils: whence is it that *W. J.* fished it out? At last I found in *Pisanius*, his new-invented History of that Council, the Title of Circularis Epistola Scripta ab *Eusebio*. But not a word that it was written to the Churches of Persia or India, nor any other by name, much less without the Empire; nor a word that it was written by him in the name of the Council. All these are *W. J.'s* forgeries. But the words *and Margin* open all the matter; *Socrates* and others tell us that *Eusebius* having staggered in the beginning of the Council (and being as you commonly say an *Arrian*) when he saw how things would go, subscribed to the Council, and left his own Flocks should censure him or differ from him, he wrote in his own name a Letter only to his own flock, giving them the reason and sense of his subscription; and indeed he seemeth therein to pervert, and to give an *Arrian* sense of the word *deus deo* [saying] "To be of one substance with the Father, signifieth no other thing, than that the Son of God was in nothing like the rest of the Creatures, but altogether like to the Father alone that begat him, nor begotten of any other than of the Father's substance and essence;" to which thus far forth right and reason required that we should condescend. This prevailing Letter to *Caesarea* the Author of *Pisanius's* Story, calleth [a Circular Letter] Ignorantly, and *W. J.* added the rest; and thus these men prove what they list; and this is their proof of Universal Tradition and the Papal Sovereignty of the World.

He concludeth [You will not forget to answer these questions in your next.] And I think I have

I have not forgotten it, nor failed to evince his worse than forgetfulness; and that the Councils then extended but to the Roman Empire, and consequently the Papal and Patriarchal pretensions, to no more (and even of the Popes Western Diocesses, the number of Bishops at those Eastern great Councils were not considerable, nor yet any Agency of the Pope in and about them.)

W. J.'s Fourth Chapter answered.

I next added (for he begins his Chapter in the middle of a Section,) 2. That the Emperours called and enforced the Councils who had no power out of the Empire. Sist. 1.

To this he saith ["Called they them alone? had they not the Authority of the Roman Bishop joyned with them, or rather presupposed to theirs? prove that the Emperours called them."]

Ans. Shall I prove it to those that have read the Histories of the Councils, or to them that have not? If to them that have not, I cannot prove it or any such matters, but by desiring them to read it: If you tell a Woman that it is ten thousand years since the World was created, and I tell her it is not 6000, neither of us proveth to her what we say, but she will believe him that she liketh best: But to him that hath read, or will read, the History, I disdain the Task: Must I write Books to prove that there were such men as *Constantine* or *Theodosius* in the World? I will be none of that many Teacher that hath read the full history of the Councils of Nice, First and Second, of Ephesus, First and Second, of *Constantinople* First, Second, Third, Fourth, Fifth, &c. of *Sirmium*, *Armenium*, and many such, as cannot see that the Emperours called them without any previous Call or Authority of the Pope; some (as *Nice*) the Emperour called immediately by his own Letters without a word of the Popes interposing Authority or Call: Most of the Emperours wrote to the Patriarchs and *Metropolitans* to call the Bishops under them: Sometimes to the Patriarch of *Alexandria* first (if not only) to call the rest; sometimes to him of *Constantinople*; and sometimes to all the five; and if the Pope did at any time send a Bishop or two and a Priest thither, you thence pretend that the Pope called the Council.

He addeth ["Had not the Emperours power to signify to those extra-imperials that a Council was to be celebrated, and to invite them at least?"]

Ans. Yes, sure, even at the *Antipodes*; but when the History tells us that he commanded and oft threatened them if they came not, and that he wrote to them, and the men are named, what signifieth your question?

W. J. ["Could not the Bishop of Rome, or other under whose Jurisdiction they were respectively, notify to them the celebration of the Council, and require their presence in it? you cannot but see this."]

Ans. I cannot but see your shame when you open it. 1. Could not an Angel from Heaven have called them? yes no doubt: but no History saith that they were so called, but tells us how in another manner.

2. The word [Jurisdiction] signifieth so much of your Brout and interest, that you are resolved at least to keep up the name and supposition; and when you do but adde [ours all the World] it maketh me remember Christs temptation [All this will I give thee:]; but it is too strong a temptation for the Pope to over-come. But you would have gratified me much if you had told me what Patriarch's Jurisdiction in those times, the Churches in Persia and India, and the rest that were extra-imperial, did belong to? or where I may find any notice of the Summons that the Pope or any Patriarch sent them to any of those ancient Councils.

3. I told him that ["the Diocesses which these Bishops were related to are described and expressly confined within the verge of the Empire; vid. *Blondel de primatu*."] Sist. 2.

To this, 1. He taketh it for a Fob to be referred to *Blondel*. *Ans.* Look then in your own Cosmographers, and even in *Ambrosius Autranus* his *Nicolaus Episcopatum*, (abating his Fiction of the submission of the *Abassian* Emperours, and such-like in him; and his Confession that his Book had next to nothing of the Patriarchate of *Alexandria*;) He tells you that the *Armenia major* and *minor* were in the Province of Pontus, *Scythia* in the Province of

of *Thracia*, &c. And that you may know who it was that gave these Jurisdictions, he tells you how *Justinian* gave his Name to a City of *Bulgaria*, subjecting many Bishops of *Dacia*, *Dardania*, *Asiana*, *Pannonia*, &c. to that Arch-Bishop; with this addition, *sed & ille ab ipsi consecratur, & eadem iura super eos habent, quae Papa Romanus habet super Episcopos sui subditos.* (Was that all the World then?) Novell. 119. § 28.

He next citeth *Pisanius's Nicene Canons*, giving the Pope Universal Power, and the Bishop of *Alex.* and *Antioch* extra-imperial Power; and he promisseth hereafter to justify these Canons. But in the mean time, I shall as much regard his Citations out of *Ejop's Exaltis*, or out of *Genebrard*, or *Cochleus*.

He saith, [The Council of *Calcedon*, c. 28. giveth to the Bishop of *Constantinople* Authority over the barbarous Nations near those Parts; that is, such as were extra-imperial, such as that of *Russia*, and *Muscovia*.]

Ans. Is not this a confident Man? 1. The Council saith only that the [Bishops of the fore-said Dioceses (naming only, *Pontus*, *Asia*, and *Thracia*,) which are among the barbarous, shall be ordained by the Throne of *Const.* And who knoweth not, that the word *Diocesi* signified then a part of the Empire? and that many of the barbarous, so called then, were within the Empire? such as were the *Scythians*, *Goths*, (or *Getæ*, or *Savromates*,) which *Emilius* saith were Conquered by *Constantine*? But is here any mention of *Russia*, or *Muscovy*? 2. And how long after this was it that all History tells us the *Muscovites* and *Russians* (that were not *Goths*) were converted to Christianity?

So that here is not a Syllable in all that he hath said for Popery, except the Canons of *Pisanius* and *Turrian*, which they must better prove before we take them to be of any just regard: It is not the word of *Papissus Romanus*, or any late Jesuite that can suffice us.

I added lastly that *Patriarchal Privileges* were ordinarily given by the Emperours, who added and altered, and sometimes set *Rome* highest and sometimes *Constantinople*. His many vain words against this I will not tire the Reader with reciting: Every man knoweth it that knoweth Church-History: Why else in the days of *Mauricius* and *Phocas* was one set highest at one time, and the other at another time? How else came the Bishop of *Constantinople* to pretend to Universal Primacy?

His marvel, that I translate *Pontifex Pope*, as if never man had so done, as if we had never read *Bellarmino de Pontifice Romano*, and others that so speak, &c. is a vain digression not worthy an answer, nor the rest.

I will here briefly recite some undeniable Reasons which I have given pag. 100, &c. of my *Mixed Popery*, to prove what we have been all this while upon.

1. That the Papal Power was not held to be *jure divine*, but *humano*. 1. It stood by the same right as did the other Patriarchs; but it was *jure humano*.

2. The *Africans*, *Aurelius*, *Augustine*, &c. of the *Carthage* Council, enquired not of God's Word, but of the *Nicene Canons* to be resolved of the Papal Power.

3. The whole *Greek Church* heretofore and to this day is of that Judgment; for they first equalled and after preferred *Constantinople*, which never pretended to a *Divine Right*; but they were not so blind as to equal or prefer a humane right before a Divine.

4. The fore-cited *Ca. 28.* of the Council of *Calcedon* expressly resolves it.

5. Their own Bishop *Smith* confesseth that it is not *de fide* that the Pope is *St. Peters Successor jure divino*.

II. The *Roman Primacy* was over but one Empire; besides all the Reasons fore-going I added, That the Bishop of *Constantinople*, when he stood for to be Universal Bishop, yet claimed no more; therefore no more was then in contest, but Power in the Empire.

III. That Councils then were called General in respect only to the Empire; I proved by ten Arguments, p. 104. 105. adding five Exceptions.

Page 114. he had put a Verse under the name of *Pope Leo*, with a Testimony, &c. I shewed that there was no such; and he confesseth the Error, but he supposeth a confident Friend of his put it into his Papers, and now saith the Verse was *Proper's*, and some words to the like purpose are *Leo's de Nat. Ret. Proper* (he saith) is somewhat antecedent than *Leo*, and less to be excepted against.

Ans.

Ans. 1. He was *Leo's* Servant, even his Secretary, as *Possinus* and *Rivet* have shewed; and so his Words and *Leo's* are as one's. 2. It is in a Poem where liberty of phrase is ordinarily taken. 3. No wonder if *Caput Mundi* be found in a Poet, either as it is spoken of *Mundo Romano*, or as *Caput* signifieth the most excellent, great and honourable: And so *Rome* it self is oft called by Historians *Caput Mundi*, before and since Christianity entered it. And it may well be said that this was *Pastoralis Honoris*, though not *ex Pastoralis Regimine Universalis*; For one Bishop was a *Caput* or chief to others *Pastoralis Honore*, that was not their Governour; as the chief Earl, or chief Judge among us, is to the inferiours. 3. And the Pope did *Nihil possidere armis*. 4. And *Tenere* and *Regere* be not all one. He may be said thus [*Tenere*] in that the Religion which he professed had possession of more than the *Roman Empire*, and he was the Chief Bishop in honour of that profession. The sense seemeth to be but this, [*As great a honour as it is to be the Bishop of the Imperial City of a Conquering Empire, it is a greater to be the Prime Bishop that Christian Religion which extendeth further than the Roman Conquests.*] He citeth a sentence as to the same fence out of *Prosper de Vocat. Gent. l. 2. c. 6. viz.* [*That the Principality of the Apostolick Priesthood, hath made Rome greater through the Tribunal of Religion, than through that of the Empire.*] Which I take to be the true sense of the Poet: but to be greater by Religion than Empire is no more to be Ruler of the World, than if I had said so of *Melchizedeck*, that he was greater as he was *Priest of the most high God*, than as he was *King of Salem*. But there is in the cited place of *Prosper* none of these words, nor any about any such matter at all; but there is somewhat like it in *cap. 16.* which indeed is expository. *Ad cuius rei effectum credimus providentia Dei Romani regni latitudinem preparatam, ut Nationes vocande ad Unitatem Corporis Christi, prius jure unius consociarentur imperii; quamvis gratia Christiana non contenta sit eisdem limitibus habere quos Roma, multosque jam populos sceptro Crucis Christi illa subdidit quos armis suis ista non domuit. Quae tamen per Apostolici sacerdotii principatum amplior facta est arce Religionis quam solio potestatis.* All this we acknowledge that *Prosper* then said about 466 years after *Christ*, being *Pope Leo's* Secretary, and seeing the Church in its greatest outward Glory: The Unity of the Empire prepared for the greatness of the Church, and those that were United in one Empire were United after in one Religion, and yet the Gospel went further than the Empire; and *Rome* it self became more honourable in being the seat of the most honourable Christian Bishop, whose Religion extended further than the Empire, than in being the Imperial Seat of Power.

The words which he citeth of *Leo*, I made the lightest of, because he was a Pope himself, and pleaded his own cause more highly than any of his Predecessors, and lived so late; but yet the words do

See. 6.

do not serve the *Papists* turn; for he at large sheweth that his meaning was, that *Rome* which was *domina mundi*, before it was *Christian*, (and yet not the Ruler of the World) was prepared to be the Seat of *Peter* and *Paul*, that even the outer Nations, by their Neighbourhood to the Empire, might be capable of the Gospel; which is a certain Truth. *Ut huius inenarrabilis gratia per totum mundum diffunderetur effectus, Romanum regnum divina providentia preparavit; cuius ad eos limites incrementa perducta sunt, quibus cunctarum undiq; gentium vicina & contigua esset universitas. Dispositio namq; divinitatis operi maxime congruebat, ut multa regna uno confunderentur imperio, & cito pervius haberet populus predicationi generalis, quos unus teneret regimen civitatis. Nec mundi dominum times Romanum, qui in Caipha domo expaveras sacerdotis ancillam.* And mentioning *Peter* and *Paul* at *Rome*, he saith, *ut eos in Corone, cui caput est Christus, quasi geminum constituerit lumen oculorum, de ipsorum meritis atque virtutibus, quæ omnem loquendi superant facultatem, nihil diversum, nihil debemus sentire discretum; quia illos & electio pares, & labor similes, & finis fecit æquales.*

And in the next Sermon, expounding *super hanc petram*; thus saith, [*super hanc, inquit, fortitudinem æternam ætrnam templum, & ecclesia mea calo inferenda sublimitas, in huius fidei firmitate consurgit. Hanc confessionem porta Inferi non tenebunt, &c.*]

And of *Tibi dabo claves*—[*Transiit quidem in Apostolos alios vis illius potestatis; sed non frustra uni commendatur, quod omnibus incimetur: Petro enim singulariter hoc creditur, quia cunctis ecclesia rectoribus Petri forma proponitur: Maquet ergo Petri privilegium ubique; expius fertur aequitate iudicium, nec nimia est vel severitas vel remissio.*—

So *Petrus Chrysologus* expoundeth *super hanc petram*, Sermon. 74. p. 69. 1. and many others.

But it is the way of these Men, to take some Sentence that soundeth, as they think, for sufficient Proof of their Foundations.

Leo in his Epistles to *Anatolius*, and to the Emperour *Martian* against him, Ep. 54. p. 131. layeth all the Privileges of the Churches on the Council of *Nice*, [*Privilegia ecclesiarum sanctorum Patrum Canonibus instituta, & Venerabilis Nicena Synodus fixa decretis, nulla novitate mutari, &c.* He saith, that no later Council, though of greater number, can alter any thing done in the Council of *Nice*;— and so none of their Rules for the Church's Regiment. And in many other Epistles (to *Pulcheria*, &c.) he over and over accuseth him as breaking the Statutes of the Fathers, and Councils, but not the Institution of *Christ*, or his Apostles.

Next

Next he citeth *Leo's* Epist. 82. to *Anastas*. But it is in the 84th. and he that will but read it will easily see, that it was but in the Empire that *Leo* claimed the final Decision and Appeals. S. 8. 9.

And once more I here appeal to any impartial Man that ever read over all the true Epistles and Decretals of the Popes themselves, and findeth that none of them for 400, if not 500 years, were ever sent to any extrajudicial Church, as any way exercising Authority over them; yea, and till after 600 (when *Gregory* sent into *England*) they wrote but to their own Missionaries, or but by way of Counsel, as any Man may do; whether he can believe they then arrogated the Government of all the World. S. 8. 10.

In the rest of this Chapter there is nothing worth the answering, but that he saith, (to prove *Ethiopia* under the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*.) That, 1. Some Learned Men think *Ethiopia* is included in *Egypt*. 2. That *Dr. Heylin* and *Rosse* did regard *Pisanus* his *Nicene Canons*; and their Authority is more than mine.

Ans. 1. You are a Learned Man, who take *Thracia* to have been without the Empire; and must I therefore be of the same mind? If your Learned Men cannot distinguish between *Egypt*, an imperial Province, and the vast and distant Kingdoms of *Ethiopia*; What's that to me? Is it enough to confute any evident truth, that there was found some Man that was against it? 2. Nor is the Name of *Heylin* and *Rosse* of any more Authority to prove the Antiquity of a late-produced Script, against all the Testimony of the Fathers and Councils near those times, than your own naked Assertion would have been. Is not this a pitiful Proof, that *Pisanus's* Canons are authentick and ancient, because *Dr. Heylin* and *Rosse* regard them? If you had any better Proof, Why did you not produce it? S. 8. 11.

An Answer to W. J's fifth Chapter.

The thing that I asserted is, 1. That the Pope had never any Governing Power over the whole Earth. 2. Nor anciently over any out of the Empire. 3. Nor a proper Government of the other Patriarchs, or exempt Provinces within the Empire: But that he was (principally for the honour of the Imperial Seat, and next as to honour, the Memorial of *St. Peter*) voluntarily by Councils and Emperours, made the prime Bishop of the Empire S. 8. 12.

Empire; *Alexandria* first, and *Constantinople* after, the second; *Antioch* the third, &c. And that not the Pope, but the Emperours, and General Councils were the chief Rulers of the Imperial Churches. But in these Councils the Bishop of *Rome* had the first Seat, and *Alexandria* the second: And that this Bishop of *Rome* had but one Voice ordinarily in Councils, but sometimes he claimed a Negative Voice; and sometimes Councils have condemned, excommunicated, and deposed him: And in his absence, the Bishop of *Alexandria* had the same Power as he, when present, had.

Now, *W. J.* here citeth some Testimonies truly, and some falsely, to prove that which I deny not; that sometimes the last Appeals were made to him, and other Priviledges allowed him, which belonged to the first Bishop of the Empire. I think it but an injury to the Reader to examine them any further. If he will read the Histories and Fathers themselves, he needs not my Testimony: If he will not, my Testimony is no notifying Evidence to him.

And upon the perusal of the rest, I find nothing in this Chapter needing, or worthy of any further Answer: And I am sensible that fruitless altercation will be ungrateful to wise and sober Men.

An Answer to W. J's. Sixth CHAPTER.

§ 1. I Noted that under the Heathen Emperours, Church-Associations were but by Voluntary Consent; and yet then they called in none without the Empire. To this he Replyeth: 1. *Denying such Consent.* 2. Saying, *They could not call them that were Extrajurisdictional to sit with them.*

Ans. 1. I would he had told us how Provinces were distributed while Emperours were Heathens, if not by Consent: Doth he think that the Pope did it all himself? Did he make *Alexandria*, *Antioch* Patriarchates, and divide to all other Bishops their Seats and Provinces? If he say this, he will but make us the more wary of such a Disputant; for he will never prove it.

2. And if by Consent they could not call any without the Empire, then none were Called, which is the Truth.

§ 2. But he cometh to his grand Proof, That the four first Councils were Universal as to all the World: 1. Because they are called *General* and *Oecumenical Councils*, by themselves, by the *Canons*, by *Histories*, by the *whole Christian World*; by the *Fathers*, by *Protestants*, by our *Statute-Books*, by our *thirty nine Articles*, and by *Orthodox Writers*. To all which I Answer, Even in *Scotland* the Presbyterians have their *General Assembly*, which yet is somewhat less than all the World: And as for their Phrase of *Totius Orbis*, So it is said in the Gospel, that all the World was Taxed by *Augustus*. He is very easily perverted, that ascribes Names at Councils, which were within the Empire, can yet believe that they were the Bishops of all the World, because he readeth the name *Oecumenical* and *Totius Orbis*.

§ 3. But he argueth from the Reason of the thing. 1. *Councils were gathered for the Common Peace of Christians.*

Ans. The Peace of the Christian World is promoted by the Peace of the Empire. 1. As it was the most considerable part then of the whole Christian World. 2. As the welfare of every part conduceth to the welfare of the World. 3. As it is Exemplary and Counselling to all others, but not by Authoritative Command and Constraint.

§ 4. Secondly, He saith, *Else any obstinate Hereticks might but have removed to the Extrajurisdictional Church, and been free.*

Ans. 1. He might, no doubt, have been free from force, unless his own Prince were *Did not the* of the same mind. 2. But he could not have forced the Imperial Churches to have owned *him as Orthodox*, nor to have forborn renouncing Communion with him. 3. And surely *Goths live* if it was Heresie which he was guilty of, it was so before it was declared so by the Council, and therefore might be so known by that Extrajurisdictional Church to which he should remove, *Empire in Power?*

§ 5. Thirdly, The same Answer serveth to his third Reason: That *If any Imperial Country were from the Empire, they would be free*; not free from other Mens disowning or rebis was at the Council of Nice, for Nisibis was then under the Roman Empire.

§ 6. Fourthly, The same Answer sufficeth to his fourth Reason: That a Nation Conquered would have been brought under the Council, and Faith would have depended on the Fortune of War.

Ans. True, If Faith were no Faith without a General Council's determination; and if there was no Faith in the World before there was a General Council, nor any Christian before *Constantine's* time. What if only a Provincial Council had Condemned any Heresie? Consider how far the Extrajurisdictionalists had been Obligated by it. The Truth and Reason of the decision would have Obligated them.

§ 7. Fifthly, He saith, *It would follow, that the Kingdoms that are now fallen from that Empire should have no Successive defending Obligation to the four first General Councils.*

Ans. Not at all as Subjects to Men dead and gone, nor as if the Canons of those Councils were a Law properly Divine, and so bound us as meer Subjects of God; nor yet as Subjects to the present Patriarchs of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. whose Predecessors made

And how much less can you call the *Nestorians* or *Eutychians*, or the *Aboissins*, *Syrians*, *Armenians*, &c. Hereticks, when you know them not, and know not the sufficiency of their proposals? And to know that a proposal was sufficient to *Nestorius*, *Eutyches*, or *Dioscorus*, doth not prove that there was such sufficient proposal to all others that go under such names either then or now. Who knoweth not that an unlearned man hath need of clearer and offer teaching than the Learned; and one that by Education is prepossessed with contrary conceptions hath need of more than the unprejudiced; and one that is corrupted by sensual lusts hath need of more than the temperate? And what man is well able to judge of the measures of sufficiency as to other men: much less to whole Nations whom we know not.

2. But as to your Minor, which by the word [*as sufficiently*] sheweth that you take sufficiency as it hath degrees, here you seem plainly to absolve all the Hereticks in the world, e.g. As if a *Montanist* were no Heretick unless it be as sufficiently, in degree revealed that Christ hath two wills, as it is that he is the Christ and rose again, or as if an *Arrian* were no Heretick, unless it be as sufficiently revealed that Christ is *equal* to the same substance with the Father, as it is that he dyed.

3. And the supposition in your Minor is notoriously false, (that all Hereticks have as sufficient a proposal of all they deny, as of that which they believe.) For if the meaning of the words revealing be not equally plain and intelligible, then the proposal is not equally sufficient. But &c.

Can any man not blinded by fiction believe that God hath no more plainly told us that Christ dyed, rose and ascended, than that he hath two distinct wills, or that he hath but one person, or that his mother is to be called The parent of God, and one that did beget and bring forth God, and that God dyed, yea or that Christ is God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, and yet *equal* to, not only from the same substance, but the same substance? Though these are equally true, they are not equally clear and evident. Do the *Quarodocimans*, the *Luciferians*, the *Jovinians* deny Truths as sufficiently proposed, as that there is a God, or a Christ?

If you say that though they be not equally proposed in Scripture, yet they are by Councils or Traditions.

I Answer 1. Were they no points of Faith, nor the denial Heresie, for 300 years before the first General Council? 2. When they of *Constance* and *Basil* are for the Supremacy of Councils as *de fide*, and they of *Lateran* and *Florence* against them, when the Council of *Basil* decreed the Immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary, and yet you take it for a controverſie, &c. are these as sufficiently proposed, as that there is a God or Christ? 3. When *Petavius* cleth the words of most of the Doctors or Fathers that wrote before the Council of *Nice*, and of *Eusebius* himself that was of the Council, and subscribed it, as being for *Arrianisme*, or dangerously favouring it, did all these Fathers think that the proposal of *equal* was as sufficient as of a God or Christ.

§. 15. He taketh upon him to clear his Argument by two deluding instances, which suppose an equality in the revelation: But he that knoweth not, 1. that it was long before all the Canonical books were equally known to be Gods word. 2. And that yet it is not equally certain what Councils are true, and what Traditions. 3. And that there is great difference between one Text of Scripture and another in intelligible places (else why do their Expositions so disagree) yea, of Councils too. 4. And that the Hereticks have still pleaded Scripture and Tradition, and Councils, as well as the Orthodox (as the *Eutychians*, &c. did the Council of *Nice*;) all equally professing to believe Scripture, Tradition, and true Councils, but not equally understanding them: I say, he that knoweth not all this, knoweth not the matters of Fact which should be known in this Dispute.

But how he will excuse the Papists from Heresie by his Reasoning, I know not, e.g. *Christ Instituting his Supper, saith equally: 1. This is my Body, and This is the New Testament. 2. And equally saith, Take, Eat and Drink this.* The Papists, 1. Do not believe that literally this Cup is the New Testament, though equally said. 2. Nor do they believe that they must Drink of it, though equally Commanded. Ergo, by W. J's Arguing, The Papists believe not that the Bread is literally Christ's Body, or that it must be Eaten because of Christ's Truth or Authority that spake it, else they would have believed both.

§. 16. He addeth a Supposition like the rest, that a Calvinist is assured, that the Pope is

not the Antichrist, by the same Authority which he acknowledge to be the sufficient proposer of the Articles of his Faith. And yet here may lie one of his usual Equivocations: The Authority of the Author and prime Reveler of the Gospel is one; and the Authority of the prime Instrumental Revelers is another. The first is Gods, the second is the Prophet and Apostles: Tell us where either of these say that the Pope is not Antichrist. But the Authority of a distant Messenger and Teacher is of a third rank: A Drunken or Fornicating Priest may be such a Messenger or Teacher, and may give an Infidel those Reasons of the Faith, which by Gods Blessing may bring him to Believe. And it is possible such a Priest (and a Synod of such) may say that the Pope is not Antichrist, and another Synod may say he is.

§. 17. I came next to Answer a question of his own, whether I take the Church of Rome and the Protestants to be one Church? I Answered, that They have two Heads, and we but one: As they are meer Christians united in Christ, they are one Church with us; as Papists united in the Pope they are not. And if any so hold the Papacy, as not really to hold Christianity, those are not of the Christian Church with us; otherwise they are, though a Corrupt, Distast, Erronious part.

To this he saith, Who ever called a King and his Viceroy, a Captain and Lieutenant two Heads? The Pope is a dependent Officer.

Answer. 1. But if you distinguish between a Visible Head and an Invisible, and say, that the Pope only is the Visible Head of the Church as Visible, and that Christ is only the Invisible Head by Influx; and that it were a Monstrous Body if it had not such a Visible Head (as you do): 2. And if this Visible Head be an usurpation, never owned by Christ; then I have reason to distinguish the Policy which is of Gods making, from that which is an Usurpation, and of Mens relations accordingly.

If any King should say, I am a Vice-God, or Gods Viceroy to Govern all the Earth, and that by Gods Appointment, and none can be saved that Obey me not; I would distinguish between the World, or particular Persons, as Gods Subjects, and as this Vice-Gods Subjects.

§. 18. But he saith, Is it possible for two Persons to be Papists, and one to destroy his Christianity and the other not?

Answer. Yes, very possible and common: That is, one holdeth those Errors which by consequence subvert some Article of the Christian Faith, but as to the words not understood, or not understanding the consequences; or only speculatively, and at the same time holdeth the subverted Articles (not discerning the contradiction) fastly and practically; and other doth the contrary. Even as a *Montanist*, or a *Nestorian*, or *Eutychian* may either be Truth, or one that is contrary. This should seem no strange thing to you; for even a Man that professeth only Christianity may do it, but *Nomine tenet*, not understanding it; or superficially and not practically, and be no true Christian indeed.

§. 19. When I express my hope that even he and I as Christians are of one Church, he will not believe it, 1. Because I am of a Church by my self, neither of theirs nor any other part. 2. Because I have no Faith.

Answer. It seems then that meer Christianity is no Faith, and that there are none of the meer Christian Church but I. But who will believe the latter, and when will he prove either?

An Answer to W. J's Seventh CHAPTER.

§. 1. TO his Question, why we separated from them? I Answered, that as they are Christians we separate not from them: As Papists we were never of them, but our Fore-fathers thought Repentance of Sin to be no Sin. If by Popery they separate from us, they are damnable Separatists; if they do not, we are of the same Church, whether they will or not.

¶ To this he saith, That we separate from them as much as the Pelagians, Donatists, Acacians, Luciferians, Nestorians, and Eutychians did from the Church.

Answer.

Ans. 1. The *Doctrinal Errors* and the *Separation* are of different consideration. The *Pelagians* Erred as some *Dominicans* say the *Jesuits* do. The *Donatists*, like the *Papists*, appropriated the Church to their own Bishops and Party; we do none of this. *Lucifer calaritanus* was too Zealous against the *Arrians*, not communicating with them upon fo short Repentance as others did: But they went not so far, as *Crab* saith the *Roman Council* in *Sylvester's* day said, that *Received no Repentance before forty Years*: Nor so far as the honest *Elberine Council* in the number of Years of Mens exclusion from the Communion. I take *Lucifer* for Erroneous and Schismatical, but not comparable to the *Papists*, who err far more, and yet separate from most of the Christian World. These Schismaticks named by you Sinned by unjust separation from the *Imperial Churches* near them, but they did not separate from all the World save themselves, as the *Papists* do. And if you believe History, you will find that some of them did not separate themselves, till they were Anathematized and cast out by others. *Nestorius* retired and Lived four Years in great repute in his Old Monastery near *Antioch*. The *Novatians* were too scrupulous of joyning with Wicked Priests and People: And your Writers say, that Pope *Nicholas* forbade hearing Mass from a Fornicator Priest. I had rather be in this of the Pope and the *Novatians* mind than of those *Catholic Priests*.

2. But I think this is a considerable Difference: The Erroneous Schismaticks of those times, much more the proper Hereticks, did finfully withdraw from the Communion of most of the Universal Church, to profess some Error of their own in singular Conventicles. But we, who take meer Christianity for our Religion, do own Communion with the far greatest part of the Church on Earth; yea, with all as Christian, and separate not for Error, but only from Error and Sin: We separate from *Pelagians* as *Pelagians*, from *Novatians* as *Novatians*, and from *Papists* as *Papists*, but not as *Christians*.

You say, No more did they then. I Answer, 1. They separated from Truth, and we from Error, as the Council that condemned him did from Pope *Honorius*. 2. The *Luciferians* and *Novatians* separated Voluntarily; we are cast out by you from Christian Communion, and are counted Separatists unless we will Sin with you, or be burnt as Hereticks. 3. Let the Reader still note the cheating ambiguity of your word [Separation.] The Schismaticks named, separated from *Brotherly Communion*, but we separate from *Tyrannical Usurped Domination*; and are called Schismaticks (not because we will not have such Communion with you in all Christian Truth and Duty, but) because we will not be your *Vassals* or *Subjects*, and Sin as oft as you command us.

§. 2. *Pag.* 155. He saith, That Had we deserted the sole Communion of the Papacy, it might have been some show of Defence; but seeing when we separated from that we remained separated as much from all particular Visible Churches in the World, as that; you have no Excuse.

Ans. If the Reader have not a very gross Head, he shall see your Calumny. As your Church is *Especially* by the *Papal Head*, so far we renounce the very Essence of your Church: None of the rest of the Christian World pretend to any such Universal Head but Christ. Therefore we separate not from their Head, or any Essential part of their Church, as such. We separate as far as we are able from the corrupt Accidents and faults of every Church and Christian, and would fain separate more from our own. As we separate from the *Abusives* in the point of their oft Baptizing, and from the *Moscovites, Greeks, Armenians*, as to their Ignorance and some Mistakes and Vices: And so we would separate from Drunkenness, Fornication, Covetousness, Simony, false Subscriptions, Lies, &c. in any, where we find them in the World: But this is not Schism or separating from the Church. Dare you say that this is not our Duty? Will you joyn in Sin with every Sinful Church for fear of Schism?

§. 3. But he saith, That any *Arrian* will say so, That he separateth not from the Church as Christian.

Ans. We have brave Disputing with a Man that cannot, or will not distinguish between Saying and doing. Doth it follow that an *Arrian* doth not separate from the Church as Christian, because they say they do not? I prove the contrary. He that separateth from the Church for an Essential part of Christianity, separateth from the Church as Christian; but so do the *Arrians*; Ergo: I prove the Minor. He that separateth, as denying the God-head of Christ, separateth

separateth for and from an Essential part of Christianity; but so do the *Arrians, Eunomians, Photinians, Samaritanians, Socinians*, &c. Ergo —

§. 4. Next I opened their dealing with us, that call us Schismaticks, because we will not willingly Sin with them, and be burnt by them, as if it were our Athes that refused their Communion; or because Princes will punish wicked Priests, or as *Solomon* cast out *Abisbar*, and put *Zadok* in his place, or will not be Subject to a Foreign Usurper, &c.

To this he saith, It is a Rhetorical Exclamation and whole Kingdoms condemned by the Popes Canons to the Flames, must take such an Answer as that for their Lives. And he again calls on me to name any Visible Church which we separated not from, which I am awary of answering so oft.

§. 5. He ask'd me whether Subordination and Obedience to the same State and Government, is not as well required to our Church as to our Common-wealth? I Answered, Yes: But as all the World is not one Humane Kingdom, so neither is it one Humane Church. To this he repeateth his old [Visible and Invisible] taking it for granted, that the Church must have one meer Humane Visible Head or Governour (Personal or collective) which yet he knoweth is the great thing which I deny, and he had to prove, which if he did; all his work were done.

§. 6. I Noted that their own Divines are not agreed whether Hereticks and Schismaticks are parts of the Church.

To this he saith, That 1. He speaks of Parts of the Church, as I understand parts: *Ans.* Who would have thought till now but he had spoken as he thought himself.

2. He saith, That I hold that some Hereticks, properly so called, are parts of the Church of Christ, and united to Christ their Head, believing the Essentials of Christianity, and so are Christians, though Erring in some Accidents; and this is contrary to all Christianity, and a Novity never held before by any Christian.

Ans. But such gross Falshoods as yours, and such deccies have been used before by many *Papists*. 1. Where did I say that such as err only in some Accidents, are properly called Hereticks? I distinguished *De re & ratione nominis*, but undertook not to tell from the Etymology of the word, which is the only proper stile of Hereticks; but according to the vulgar use of the word among us, it is taken for one that denieth some Essential. But with such as you I fee it is taken more largely; and I am not sure that at first it was not taken for any Separation or Schism into distinct Sects. All that I say (you may be ashamed to call me so oft to repeat it) is, That 1. Many are called Hereticks by *Papists*, yea, by *Philasterians* and *Epiphanius*, that were true Christians, for ought is said against them (yea, *Philasterius* numbereth some certain Truths with Hereticks, when his contrary Errors are like such). 2. That they that erre in some Accidents may be true Christians, or else I think there is none at Age in the World. 3. That there is much lamentable Schismatick, is no Separation from the whole Church. 4. That he shall be saved that holdeth all the Essentials of Christianity truly and practically. 5. I have proved that your Definitions exclude more from Heretic and Schism than I do.

But it's here to be noted, That this Man maketh multitudes to be under the *Papal Head*, that are no Subjects of Christ our Head; and so that the Pope hath a Church of his own, that is none of Christ's Church.

§. 7. I Noted, That either their Church hath defined, that Hereticks and Schismaticks are no parts of the Church, or not: If not, how can he stand to it and impose it on me? If they have, then their Church that sayeth contrary, (named by *Bellarmine*) are all Hereticks themselves.

He saith, None of mine ever held them parts, as you do; that is, united to Christ by Faith and Charity.

Ans. Is not this Man hard put to it? All this while he hath been Disputing us, and all called by their Usurping censure Hereticks, out of the Church Visible; and calling on me to prove the perpetuity of our Church Visible, and telling me, that without a more Visible Head than Christ it is not Visible. And yet now it is but the Invisible Church as Headed by Christ, and endowed with true Faith and Charity, which these Doctors of theirs exclude. Hereticks and Schismaticks from.

§. 8. *He saith, Arrians are no Christians, denying Christs Essence.*

He replyeth, True, and so do all Hereticks.

I Answer,

I Answer, If indeed they did so, not only in words not understood, but in the *understood* sense, so that this is really their belief, and really *Exclusive* of the contrary Truths. I place no such Hereticks in the Church.

He proveth his charge thus: *whoever denyeth Christs most Infallible Veracity and Divine Authority denyeth somewhat Essential to Christ; but so doth every Heretic, properly called.*

Ans. Away with such Hereticks as do so indeed. For the Minor, he cometh to the old obscurity, *whoever denyeth that to be true which is sufficiently propounded to him to be Revealed by Christ, denyeth Christs Verity and Divine Authority; but so doth every Heretic.*

Ans. I have oft enough shewed, 1. That the Argument is *useless*, because no Man can judge of the *sufficiency* of Proposals (till they come to very high degrees) as to the capacities of other Men.

2. That the Major is false: For a Man that doubteth not of Christs Verity and Authority, may not understand (and so may deny) many Truths sufficiently propounded, hindering the understanding of them by sloth, sensuality, partiality, prejudice, or other faults. Can any Man doubt of this?

3. That his Minor also is false: He may be a Heretic that denyeth that which is not sufficiently propounded, if his own crime either blinding his mind, or forfeiting better proposals, cause the insufficiency.

§. 9. I noted how they charge one another with *Pelagianism*; And he saith, *Not in the point of Original Sin.*

Ans. And is all the rest come now to be no Heretic? Was it for nothing else that they were judged Hereticks? The rest should have as fair play, if your interest were but as much for it.

§. 10. But saith he *who ever, before you, said that the Catholick Church could be divided it self, when it is a most perfect Unity; A grand novelty of yours.*

Ans. This is because I said, that some make divisions in the Church, that divide not from it; much less from the whole. I proved before that in this sense Paul usually speaketh against Schisme or Divisions. As when he tells the *Corinthians* of the divisions among them, &c. But this man would make Scripture and common sense and reason to be grand novelties; may there not be divisions in a House, in a Kingdom, in an Army, in a particular Congregation, as that at *Corinth*; and that after which *Clement* wrote his Epistle to heal? Have there not been abundance of such at *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*? was there no Division in the Church of *Rome*, when parted to one Pope, and part to another for above forty years? Did the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil* meet to heal their Schismes, upon mistake when there was no such thing? And do all their Historians erroneously number their Schisms? Reader pardon my oft answering such bold abuses: These are their arguments that hope to subvert *England*.

§. 11. And his reason is such as would shew him a *Catharist*, viz. *The Church is a most perfect Unity*; If so, than all grace is perfect which is necessary to perfect unity. Then the Popes and Anti-Popes, the warring Papalines and Imperialists, the *Jesuits*, *Dominicans*, and *Jacobites* are all *imperfect Unity*; Then there is no disagreement, of Judgement Will or Practice among any Papists in the world; no Volumes written against other; *Alas*, how far are such words from proving it, or from ending their present Controversies or Wars. *Watson* and *Preston* had scarce perfect unity with *Father Parsons* and the *Jesuits*. Doth perfect unity draw all the blood between *France* and the house of *Austria*, or in *France*, between King *Henry 3d.* and the *League*. It is enough for me to believe that all true Christians have a true unity in Christ, with each as his members, but that this Unity among themselves is sadly imperfect; and so was when they had all the contentions in many General Councils, and when the people have oft fought it out to blood about Religion, and the choice of Bishops, at *Alexandria*, *Rome*, &c. Is this perfection? It is in heaven that we hope for perfect unity, where all is perfect.

§. 12. I told him, *Heretic being a personal crime, the Nations cannot be charged with it, without better proof.*

He saith, if he had. 1. the testimony of one of our Preachers. *Ans.* *Alas* poor Kingdoms

of Christians! that can be proved Heretics if *Pet. Heylin* or any one of our Writers do but say it. 2. He tells a story of *Proffor John* sending to *Rome* for instruction (*Ans.* Confused to oft, and by their own Writers, that it's a shame to repeat it. Nor doth that prove them so much as Papists, much less Heretics.) 3. That their Canon of the Mass, proveth them *Eutychians*, in that they name the three former Councils, and not that of *Chalcedon*. *Ans.* Small proof will serve the turn with such willing men. What if *Dioscorus* made them believe that That Council did condemn the doctrine of *Cyril* (which he verily thought was the same which he defended) and rejected the *Nicene Creed* (which he appealed to), and that they divided Christ? Might not the content of the neighbour *Egyptian* Bishops put them out of conceit with that Council, though they owned no Heretic? Do not your Writers now ordinarily quit them of such Heretic? Do they that disown the Councils of *Constance* or *Basil*, own all the Errors or Schismes which they condemned? You justify the *Abassins* when you tell men that your calumnies have no better show of truth.

§. 13. *Erasmus* laments the Age when it became a matter of the highest wit and subtilty to be a Christian. This seemeth about *Cyrils* dayes, when mens salvation and all the Churches peace and safety was thought to be at stake, upon the controversies, Whether *de Christo Loco* formalis erat materialis erat maxime propria. *An Deus à Sp. Sancto in Virgine conceptus & ab ipsa generatus proprie diceretur.* Whether *Nestorius* was a Heretic for saying that he would not say God was two or three months old. And when poor *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus* for want of skill thought verily they had spoken but what *Cyril* taught them, and became Heretics by it before they were aware; when the grand Question was, whether the word *persona* had such a signification, as that Christs Humane Nature might be called any part of his Person; or whether the Divine Nature, which is infinite, can be *Part*: And whether if the Humane be *Part* *personae*, then that *Personality* which was from Eternity without the Humane, could be the same with that *Personality* of which the Humane was a part? Or if the Humane be no part of the Person, but an Accident, whether it be proper to denominate the Person and Essence from an Accident, so as to say, God was begotten of *Mary*? God was two Months old! God was dead and buried, ascended, &c. And when the whole Salvation of Men seemed to lye on the curiosity, *How far two Natures, or two Wills* so nearly united as to have a communication of Names and Epithets, might he said to be made One? No doubt but in all these the Orthodox were in the right: But it's pity that when *Logick* was so denied in the Council of *Nice*, and *Apollinaris* blamed for too much using it, and the Council at *Carthage* forbade the use of the Heathens Books, yet so many Men must burn in Hell for being no better Logicians or more metaphysical; and all Men to the end of the World must be numbed with them, that do not anathematize them. And that Millions of Ignorant Men and Women in *Abassia*, *Syria*, *Armenia*, &c. that know nothing of these Matters, nor ever heard of them, to whom they are as an unknown Tongue, must all be unchristened and damned as Heretics; yea, for not owning a Council that most (it's like) never heard of. *Alas*, how few in *England*, *Ireland*, or any Country know what the Council of *Chalcedon* did, or ever heard it?

But yet all these Hereticks (two or three parts of the World) have an easie way of Recovery: It is but to believe as the Pope of *Rome* believes, though they know not what, and take him for their Sovereign, and they are safe. But the final Judgment is more Just.

§. 14. *Pag. 169.* He addeth, *The Abassins confess themselves to follow Eutyches and Dioscorus, and therefore there needeth neither Trial nor Conviction.*

Ans. 1. Where is your Proof that they so confess? We will not confess that this is no Slander. 2. *Alas*, how few of them know who *Eutyches* and *Dioscorus* were! 3. And of those that Honour their Names how few know what they held? 4. Your own Writers acquit them of that Heretic. 5. The Truth is, the Tradition of their Country teacheth them to Honour *Dioscorus* for his place sake; but I cannot learn that the Name of *Eutyches* is known or Honoured much by them. 6. O that the Papists had not more and greater Errors than either *Nestorius* or *Eutyches*, and that you condemned not your selves in condemning the *Abassins*.

§. 15. Let the Reader Note, that this Man would first have us believe that the *Abassins* and others, whom they call Hereticks, are Subjects of the Pope, and of their Church,

and yet that they are *Hereticks*, and so that Hereticks are *no parts* of the Church, and yet that they are *parts* of their Church.

His shameless calling for proof that any of their Writers acquit them from these Heresies, shall not tempt me to lose my time in citing them.

§. 16. Next we come to his charge, That the *Greek Church* rejects us as well as they: Therefore the whole Church rejects us. Therefore we are to be rejected (*Hereticks*) or else the whole Church is deceived.

* The *Ans.* 1. * He that never read Church-History, may think that there is some significance in this Cant of, *The whole Church*, and the *universal Church*: But so will not he, that knoweth how the Prelates have usually turned to the stronger side, and that if the *Majority* espouses as be the whole, the whole Church was Orthodox in *Constantines* days, and the whole Church the story was *Arrian* in the days of *Constantinus* and *Valens*; the whole Church was *Eutychian* in *Theodosius Junior's* days, and long *Monothelites*, and *Iconoclasts*, &c.

& *Acacius's* damning each other, addeth these useful citations in the Margin: *In Ecclesiasticis censuris & excommunicationibus, causa imprimis valet, Origen. Cum aliquis exiit a veritate, a timore Dei, a fide, a charitate, exit de castris ecclesie, etiam si per Episcopos vocem minime abiciatur, sicuti & contrario aliquis non recto iudicio foras mittitur: Sed si ante non exiit, id est si non gerit ut mereretur exire, nihil leditur: Interdum n. qui foras mittitur, intus est: Et qui foras est, intus videtur retineri.* 24. *Qu.* 3. *August.* *Custodi intus innocentiam tuam, ubi nemo opprimit causam tuam; praevaldebit in te falsum testimonium, sed apud homines, non apud Deum, ubi causa dicenda est: Quando Deus erit iudex alius testis quam conscientia tua non erit: Inter iustum iudicem & conscientiam tuam, noli timere nisi causam tuam.* 11. *q.* 3. *Quid obest homini quod ex illa tabula vult eum delere humana ignorantia, si de libro viventium non debeat iniqua conscientia.* *August.* 1b.

2. If it prove Men to be Hereticks or Schismatics because the Major part reject them, then the Orthodox were Hereticks when the foresaid *Arrians* rejected them. But you have been so long used to Usurp Christs Chair, that you seem to be grown to believe your selves, that a Man is out of Christs Church, if other Men do but say that he is out. As if you knew not that the Church is to put no Man farther from Christ, but only to declare how far from him they have put themselves. And if any declare more than is true, it doth not separate the wronged Person from Christ. *e.g.* I heard but yesterday divers Persons Excommunicated, some for Teaching School without License, and some for other such like things: Doth it follow, that these are any further out of the Church than they put themselves?

3. But tell us, if you can, when the *Greek Church*, or Patriarch of *Constantinople* did presume to Excommunicate us? You will not tell us. How then doth their rejection signify that we are not of the same Church? The Truth is, the *Greek Church* never declared their mind concerning us: If you will call one Man, or twenty Men the *Greek Church*, you may use your Liberty, but we shall little regard it. In the days of one Patriarch (*Cyril*) he declared for us, and our Reformation: The Papists in Charity get him Murdered. Another (*Jeremias*) declareth his dissent from us; but it is one thing to dissent from some things, and another thing to take Men for none of the Church. If you will charge the *Greeks* to be such Separatists, as to unchurch or unchristen all that they in controversy Points dissent from: We will not believe you in so ugly a charge, till you have proved it. The *Greeks* disown us, and we them, in some lesser things, but neither they nor we presume, to unchristen one another. And if they or we did, it would unchristen none of us, unless we first unchristened our selves.

4. But if the *Greeks* have the supreme authority, as the virtual universal Church, then the Papists have it not; If the Papists have it, the *Greeks* have it not: If neither hath it, who hath it? Neither of you, nor both are the real Universal Church, and neither is *Virtually* the Universal. Therefore if both did Excommunicate us, we are not therefore Excommunicated by the Church Universal.

5. But may the Church Universal erre in Excommunicating, or not? If so, then you have said nothing: If not, you take a General Council to be indeed the Church representative: And then how many of your Popes (Essential parts of your Church) have been Excom-

municated,

and deposed as Hereticks by the Universal Church? And your Church now is but the Successour of (*e.g. Eugenius* the fourth) so rejected: Shew us when ever the *Greeks* did so by our Church or us.

§. 17. I told him, the *Greek Church* claimed but the Primacy or Eupremacy in the Empire, and not the Government of all the World.

At this, he first wondreth, and then takes upon him to disprove it. 1. *Because* if *Gregory* the first had ill reprehended *John* of *Constant.* for claiming the Title of *Universal Bishop*. 2. *Because* *Jeremy* saith, 1. He was *Vice Christi*: 2. And *periswade*th *Lucius*, &c. to be Subject to the Church with them.

Ans. 1. It was the Arrogancy of the Title that *Gregory* reprehended, as sounding like a real Universal Claim, and the reality of an Universal Claim in the Empire. I proved before, that the *Greeks* knew that *Constant.* had no Title, *Jure Divino*, by the Can. 28 of *Chalcedon*, and the notoriety of the thing: And therefore they could not pretend it to be over all the World, where the Empire had no Power. And what need there more proof, than that there is no Evidence brought by you or any, that ever they gave Laws to all the Christian World; or that ever they called Councils out of it, or that ever they set up and put down Bishops in it? Indeed they have Excommunicated *Roman Popes*; but that was within the Empire, (and so did *Alexandria*.) Or if since, (as they do still) it is not as their Governours, but as any Churches may renounce Communion with Hereticks, or Persons incapable of their Communion.

2. And as for *Jeremy*, 1. Will not *Cyril* as much prove the contrary? 2. Is one Man the *Greek Church*? 3. Did every Apostle, or doth every Minister of Christ proclaim himself Universal Head of the Church, when he saith, 2 *Cor.* 5. 19. *We beseech you, Vice Christi in Christs stead to be reconciled to God?* It is one thing to be Preachers in Christs stead to our particular Flocks, and another thing to Usurp Christs proper Office, and be in his stead Universal Governour of the World. 4. And may not one of us, or any Christian persuade a Man to be Subject to the Church of Christ? And if *Jeremias* had a mind to Rule further than the Empire, now the Empire is *Mahometan*, and Subjects Voluntary and free, what wonder is it? We undertake not to Justine him from all Ambition.

§. 18. I told him, out of his *Jeremias*, and his Protonotary *John Zygomalas*, that they confessed Agreement with us [*In continuis & causam fidei præcipue continentibus articulis*] and that [*Quæ videntur consensum impedire talia sunt, si velit quis, si facili ea corrigere possit.*]

He tells me, That, 1. Yet they consent with them in all save the Popes Authority. *Ans.* 1. How far that is from Truth, *Thom.* a *Jesu*, and other of your own will tell you. 2. And the Popes Authority is the ratio formalis of Popery.

2. He saith, That *Jer.* claimeth as Supreme Authority over the whole Church, as the Pope doth. *Ans.* 1. I will not believe it till I see the proof: I find he layeth all his Claim from Councils, and therefore may possibly claim power over those Churches that were in the Empire when the Council of *Chalcedon* gave that power; but I find no more: And if he did, they and we may yet be Christians.

3. He saith, Any of the *Roman Church* might write the like to the Lutherans: But *Zygomalas* supposeth them of two Churches, still united. *Ans.* He supposeth them not in all things of the same mind, nor of the same particular Churches. But he that saith, that we agree in the Articles of Faith, and differ but in lesser things of easie reconciliation, either supposeth both Parties to be Christians, and of one Church of Christ, or else that no Men are Christians that have any Difference, that is no two explicate Believers, perhaps, in the World.

§. 19. I told him, 1. The Patriarch was not the *Greek Church*: Nor, 2. Their lesser Errors prove us of two Religions or Churches.

He Replyeth: 1. But he knew the Extent of his own Jurisdiction: *Ans.* 1. So do not all Ambitious Men: If he do, then the Papists are all deceived; for he pretended, say you, a Jurisdiction over the Pope and his Church.

But the Question between him and the Protestants, was not about his Jurisdiction.

2. He saith, That if the Errors be tolerable, we are Schismatics in Separating from them, and should rather have suffered. *Ans.* To separate from any sin and error, by not consent-

ing or committing it, no Christian denyeth to be our duty: and his supposition that we separated from the Catholic or the Greek Church, is but his continued fiction. We were not under the Government of the Greeks, and therefore not obeying them is no separation; and not sinning with them is no separation: we own them as Christians, and we renounce the sins of all the world, and hate our own more than any others, so far as we know them.

§. 20. To his saying that *It is against Christianity to hold condemned Hereticks to be in the Church*. I answered 1. That I detect that condemnation when, even non-judices, condemn whole nations without hearing one man, much less all speak for themselves, or any just witnesses that ever heard them defend a Heretic.

His Answer is, that I mistake the way of their Churches condemnation: They do not say-whosoever holds such errors let him be accused, or say excommunicate such as hold them, &c.

Answer. There is some hope left then for the Nations that are no subjects of the Pope, unless non-subjection be the Heresie. But hath the Pope gone no further than this? Hath he not put whole Nations under Interdicts?

But he saith those that profess their heresies, or that communicate with them, are esteemed hereticks: and those that profess to disbelieve their heresie, and yet live in communion with them, and subjection to them, are Schismatics.

Answer. 1. Here's new confounding doctrine indeed. If their Canon only condemn indefinitely those that hold a heresie (e.g. *Nestorianism*), taking it to be unfit to say *God dyed or God was born*) must all be taken for hereticks that communicate with any of these, before the person guilty is convicted, and judged? Must every private man be the judge of his neighbour? Every servant, of his Master? Every woman, of her husband? Every subject, of the King; and be burnt for a heretic, for communicating with one that was never accused or condemned? We live then with one another more dangerously than men converse in the time of pestilence. Nay what if the Priest himself admit such to the Communion, must the poor people be burned if they communicate with them in the parish Church: and yet be punished if he do not come to Church and communicate?

2. Laurent, Reader, to think what engines Clergy-tyranny hath made against Christianity Love, Peace, and Concord; to set the world into a war. If the Council, for want of understanding a point of doubtful words, pronounce such words *Heretic*, all people for fear of being burnt and damned, must fly from all as hereticks that they think are for those contrary, and damned words. All our Plowmen and women must be supposed to know that it is heresie, e.g. to say that *Christ hath but one Will*, (though the speaker mean *objectively one*, or *essentially one by union of the divine and humane nature*), or to say that *it was not God that was conceived, and suffered and dyed, and was passible*, (when he meaneth only *formaliter*, not *as God*, but *as he that is God*;) and then every family must have an inquisition, and people must fly from one another, before any judgment. Doth not this give every lad and woman full power of the keys, and every subject a power of judging Kings and Judges.

3. But mark, Reader, how sin condemneth it self, as envy eateth its own flesh, e.g. A general Council condemneth Pope Eugenius as an Heretic, (or *John XXIII.* or others:) The whole Church of Rome continued in communion and subjection to this condemned Heretic (as they did with *Honorius*;) Therefore by their own sentence the whole Church of Rome must be taken for Hereticks.

And if so, 4. See how they justify us for separating from them, when they judge us heretic must reticks themselves if we communicate with them.

Alas, if a wrangling proud Clergy have but ignorance and pride enough to call Gods servants *hereticks*, *Wickliffites*, *Waldenses*, *Lutherans*, *Zuinglians*, *Calvinists*, *Iconoclasts*, *Lutherans*, *Quartodecimans*, &c. hereticks, all families and neighbourhoods are presently bound to fly from one another, as if they had the plague, or were enemies.

And must subjection come in for heresie? If you call our King a heretic, must all his subjects be taken for hereticks for having communion and subjection to him. Will the Popes charge you, or real heresie disoblige us from subjection. And yet will you pretend to be loyal subjects.

§. 21. Have him the proof, that he before called for, from *Thomas à Jesu*, & *Paulus Viridius* (Harris of Dublin against *us*) that their writers vindicate the Greeks from heresie. To which he saith that *I could not but know that he meant of the modern Greeks (as he*

reticks) and not of the ancient fathers, of which Bernard, Aquinas & Paul Harris speak.

Answer. This Answer hath a very bold face if it do not blush. 1. It was the words of *Thomas à Jesu de convers. Gent. a late writer* that I recited, to whose testimony as his he giveth not one word of answer: And *Thom.* in the words cited expressly speaketh of the present Greeks, and it is the very scope of his writing.

2. Thomas cited *ex junioribus Aquinas*. 1. *Iustit. Moral.* l. 8. c. 20. To which he giveth not a word of answer.

3. Paul Harris saith that when the Greeks had explicated their *Patre per filium*, (used in the Council at Florence) they were found to believe very orthodoxly, and catholically, yet doth this man say that Harris speaks of the ancient Greeks expressly contrary both to his drift and words. Is there any dealing with these false hereticians? It's well that no Council hath anathematized falsehood and calumny for heresies, else we must have no communion with such, that have no better means to dispute down christian Love and Concord.

Yea what need I more testimony than that Council of Florence it self, which so judged; and was supposed to heal the breach by explications. Nor is it true that Bernard and Aquinas spoke not of the Greeks in their times as owning the same cause that these do now.

§. 22. I told him, if Greeks and Latines, will divide the Church, and damn each other, they shall not draw us into their guilt.

He saith again that the Church cannot be divided, it is so perfectly One.

Answer. If I have not shamed the Saying, let me hear the shame, though we say, that it cannot have any part totally divided from Christ, for then it were no part; and therefore none is divided relatively or really from the whole body. But if the parts may not have sinful divisions from each other, *secundum quid*, Paul told the *Corinthians* amiss, and the Papists Historians much mistook that talk of about 40 Schisms at Rome, and of the Popes adherents, when part of the body had one head, and part another, for so long a time, and to such sad effects.

§. 23. Next I cited him the express words of their own Florentine Council, professing that the Greeks and Latines were found upon conference to mean the same thing. To which he saith. 1. That it was but a few of them, and that Marcus Ephesus dissented. 2. That they revolted when they returned home.

Answer. 1. See till how they fight against their selves. The seeming concord of this Council (which did the Pope who was newly condemned and deposed by a great general Council, more service than ever any did them) is the great pretence of their false boasting that the Greek Church is subject to the Pope: And yet he teaches us truly to say that it was but a few, and that Marcus Eph. dissented, and that they stood not to it when they came home. The known truth is that the Emperor in distrust constrained some to dissemble in hope of relief, of which when he failed, the submission was at an end. And the Church never consented to it.

2. But as to the point in hand, it is not the Greeks recovery from an error that the Council mentioneth, but the discovery of their meaning which was found to be Orthodox. And though they yet use not the Romans phrase, they never retracted the sense in which they were found to be orthodox.

§. 24. Next, he citing *Nilus* that the Greeks broke off from the Latines for the *[sic] filioque* alone, I recited *Nilus* his title and words at large, professing, that There is no other cause of "disunion between the Latin and Greek Churches but that the Pope refused to deserve the cognisance and judgment of that which is controverted, to a general Council, but he will sit the sole Master and Judge of controversy, which is a thing alien to the Lawes and actions of the Apostles and Fathers. The cause of the division (saith he) is not the sublimity of the point exceeding mans capacity; for other matters that have divers times troubled the Church, have been of the same kind. This therefore is not the cause of the division; much less the Scripture. But who the fault is in; any one may easily tell that is well in his wits. Nor is it because the Greeks claim the Primacy (N. B.) He mentioneth that the Pope succeedeth Peter only as a Bishop, & is named by him, as many other Bishops originally ordained by him do, and that his primacy is a governing power, not given him by Peter; but by Princes and Councils, which he capiously proves.

To this he saith. 1. that yet this may stand with this *[sic] filioque* being the first cause.

Ans. 1. But the question was of the *first cause*. 2. He denyeth it to be *any cause*, but only an Occasion, and the Popes usurpation to be the only Cause: 3. Is it not known that the Quarrel and Breach began long before, about the Title of universal Bishop, though the Greeks did not then excommunicate you?

2. He saith that *By this it's implied that the Greeks agree with them in all things, save the Popes Sovereignty.*

Ans. Doth it follow that because he saith that *this only is the cause of the division of your Churches*, therefore there are no other disagreements? all sober Christians have learnt to forbear excommunications and separations when yet there are many disagreements; and we never denied but the *Greeks* agree more with you than they ought, and specially in striving who shall be great.

S. 25. To his repeated words, that *all those were not distinct congregations*, &c. I told him again, that we are for no congregations distinct from Christians, as such. To which he replyeth again. 1. That *no hereticks say they depart from the Church as Christian.* *Ans.* But if they do so, it's no matter though they do not say so. Whoever departeth from the Church for somewhat Essential to Christianity departeth from it as Christian: but you say your self that all hereticks depart from the Church for somewhat Essential to Christianity: *Ergo*, &c.

Obij. Then they are Apostates. *Ans.* Apostates in the common sense are those that openly renounce Christianity in terms, as such, but those that renounce any essential part are Apostates really, though but *secundum quid*, and not in the usual sense.

2. He intreateth me to name him the first Pope that was the Head of the whole Church in the world. *Ans.* 1. There never was any such; for the whole Church never owned him, *Abulis*, *Perisa*, *India*, &c. never was governed by him to this day; and not past a third or fourth part is under him now. 2. But I must name the first that claimed it: had I lived a thousand years at every Popes elbow I would have ventured to conjecture; but it is an unreasonable motion to make to me that am not 70 years old. I must confess my ignorance, I know not who was the first man that was for the Sacrament in one kind only (without the cup;) nor who first brought in praying in an unknown tongue, or Images in Churches; nor who first changed the custom of adoring without genuflection on the Lords dayes. I leave such Taskes to *Polydore Virgil de Invent. rerum*. Little know I who was the first proud Pope, or Heretical, or Simonical, or Infidel Pope; it satisfies me to know that 1. It was long otherwise, 2. And that it came in by degrees (*nemo repente sit peissimus*.) 3. And that it should not be so.

The rest of his charge against the *Greeks*, &c. requireth no answer; instead of doing it, he tells me he has proved there must be governours of the whole Church; which if he had done, as to any Universal Head, he might have spared all the rest of his labour.

S. 26. I thought a while that he had answered all my book, but I find that he slips over that which he had no mind to meddle with, and among others these following words, (you may judge why.)

P. 115. *Many of the Greeks have been of brotherly charity to our Churches of late: Cyril, I need not name to you, whom your party provoked murdered for being a Protestant. (A worthy Patriarch of Constantinople, who sent us by Sir Tho. Roe, our Alexandrian Sept. and whose confession is published. And why is not he as much the Greek Church as Jeremias?) Melitius, first Patriarch of Alexandria, and then of Constantinople, was highly offended with the fiction of a submission of the Alexandrian Church to Rome, (under a counterfeit Patriarch Gabriel's name) and wrote thus of the Pope in his Letters to Sigismund King of Poland An. 1600. Perspicue ciat Majestas tua nos cum majoribus, &c. Your Majesty may see that we with our Ancestors are not ignorant of the Roman Pope (whom you pray us to acknowledge) nor of the Patriarch of Constant. and the rest of the Bishops of the Apostolical Seats. There is one universal Head, which is our Lord Jesus Christ. Another there cannot be, unless it be a two-headed body, or rather a monster of a body. You may see, most serene King, (that I may say nothing of that Florentine Council, as a thing worthy of silence) that we departed not from the opinions and traditions of the* *East*

East and West which by seven General Councils they confessed, and assigned to us; but that they departed, who are daily delighted with novelties. In the same letter he commendeth Cyril: and what can a Protestant say more against the Vice-Christ and your novelties, and the false pretended submission of the Greeks.

So much to that which he calleth his First part of his Book.

An Answer to W. J's second Part of his Reply.

S. 1. IN this which he calls his *Second Part* there is so much of meer words, or alteration, and of his false interpretation of some particular histories and citations, that should I answer it fully, it would be a great share to the Reader. 1. To weary him. 2. To lose the matter in controversy in a wood of words. 3. And to suppose us both to strive about circumstances, and so to call it by, that I shall not lose so much of my time to foil a purpose. All that I desire of the Reader that would have a particular answer, is, 1. That he remember the answer that is already given to much of it. 2. That he observe that almost all his citations signifie no more, than 1. That both the Romans and other Patriarchs were long striving who should be the greatest, and therefore intermeddling with as many businesses as they could. 2. That the supreme Church-power being then placed by consent and by the Emperors in Councils, the five Patriarchs ought to be at these Councils when they were Universal, as to the Empire. 3. That Rome had the first place in order of these Patriarchs or Seats. 4. That the eastern Bishop when oppressed by *Arians* and persecutions, did fly for council and countenance to the Roman Emperors who held orthodox, and to the Roman Bishops as the first Patriarchs, and as having interest in the Emperors: he that was one of the greatest, might help the oppressed to some relief, having an orthodox Emperor; by which means *Constantinus* was constrained, and *Athanasius* restored; by the threatening of a war by the western Emperor, and not by the authority of the Pope. And the like aid was oft sought from *Alexandria* and *Antioch*. 5. That this man and the rest of them straineth all such words as sound any respect to the Bishop of Rome, any reverence of his place and judgment, any counsel that he giveth to any, any help that any sought of him, as signifying his Government of all the Empire. 6. That he feigneth all such interest or power in the Empire to be a Monarchical Government of all the world. 7. That he and The to these ends leadeth men into verbal quarrels about the sense of many passages in history and fathers, where he knoweth that the vulgar cannot judge, nor any that are not well versed in all those books, which most preachers themselves have not sufficient leisure for. 8. That contrary to the notorious evidence of histories, he maintaineth that no Councils were called without the authority of the Roman Bishop, when the Emperors ordinarily called them, by sending to each Patriarch to summon those of his circuit to such a place, conference and the Bishops of *Alexandria* and *Constant* had more hand in calling them till 700 or 800 years ago, if not much longer than the Pope had. 9. If the Reader can trie all our passages here about, by the books themselves (not taking scraps, but the main drift of Church-history) and the particular authors, I will desire no more of him than to read them himself; if not, nevertheless to believe the report of Mr. J. or me, as certain to him: For how can he know which of us reports an author truly? but to keep to such evidences of Reason and Scripture as he is capable of judging of.

S. 2. When I said that the Emperor (*Theodosius* 2d.) gave sufficient testimony, and those that adhere to *Dioscorus* how little in those days they believed the Popes infallibility or sovereignty, when they excommunicated him, (and the Emperor and civil Officers bare *Dioscorus*. He doth over and over tell me how I defend rebels against a Sovereign, and I have laid a Principle emboldning all Rebels to despise Sovereigns, or prove that they have no authority over them. *Ans.* Alas poor Kings and Emperors, who are judged such subjects to the Priests, that he that pleads for your power, pleads for Rebels against your Sovereign Pope. And that are by these even judged to sheepish, as that by the name of *Rebellion* charged on your defenders, they look to draw you selves to take them for Rebels, who would make you know that you are Princes, and not the subjects of foreigners or your subjects: but yet the instance which I give sheweth the sense of *Theodosius* and others, be it right or wrong.

S. 3. Had:

+ Nicoph. 1. 16. c. 43. And what then? Must the word [*Gensis Savatiorum*] prove that he was out of the Empire, when part of Arabia was in it? But such *Perrarius* Honorius is in *confilio Cal-*
arabis *medanis* *memoriae*; sed in *Palestina* *idua* *ratione* *voluntatis*, *ob quam idem ipsi diversis* *re-*
gibus *conspicuis* *atribuit* *consequit*. And was *Palestina* without the Empire? You see I re-
 sisted to shame your falsehood, by your own *Writers*.

§ 16. XII. The next is, *Constantinus Episcopus Bosphorum in Arabia* *h. folia*.
 Before cited a false named Bishop of the same City; and now he giveth us the true one as
 [Rement] Another Man: Sure a Papist doth not believe that one City had two Bishops at that Council.
 I shewed you before that *Bosra* was in the Empire.
 § 17. XIII. Yet there is one more, and that is, *Subscribit quidam pro Glacio Grassae-*
ans (*Episcopo*). *Grassa* is a City of *Coelosyria*.

Ans. I mentioned him before I noted your instance. And is he therefore out of the
 Empire because in *Coelosyria*? An excellent collection. I told you of *Perrarius*, that it
 is by the Lake of *Gennasareth*, under this Arch-Bishop of *Bosra*: And surely that was as un-
 doubtedly in the Empire, as *Jerusalem* was.

§ 18. And now I have done with all his strange proofs, that Extraimperial Bishops were
 at the four first General Councils (or any longer after) and consequently that the Pope is the
 Monarchical Bishop of all the World, and not a National Primate only. And if a Man can
 tell me where to find a cause so betrayed by the shameful failing of so great a Doctor, I am
 yer to learn it. And this is the Man that before promised us a peculiar Treatise to prove
 this very thing; but instead of it, was fain shamefully to put us off with thirteen Names,
 without one proof, but gross Mistakes.

§ 19. But I will say more for him than he hath said for himself: When I read an odd E-
 pistle in *Crab* and *binus* of the *Nestorians* at the *Ephesus* Council to *Callimachus* the King, as
 commanding them to meet at *Ephesus*, and as a very Christian Prince: I wondered who it was,
 having never read of any such King of *Perisa*; and began to suspect that the King of *Perisa*
 might send some *Joh. Plesidis* also thither. But I found neither Name; nor Character, nor
 History, nor the Cities of the Oriental Bishops named encouraged me to any such thoughts.
 But at last *binus* himself, and his Author help me out of my Ignorance, saying, *per Cal-*
limachus *Perfidis* *Regem*. * *Deodasum* *discessit*. *appellat autem eum ob id hoc nomen, quod Per-*
fidis *discessit*. *religionemque suam per praevidendum extindam, restitisset*. And having thus
 done the main business, I think it needless to add to what I said before, to his elations of
 contests in the Empire.

§ 20. Only about this one Council of *Ephesus*, which he mentioneth, I desire the Rea-
 der to note a few particulars. 1. That it is expressly said to be called by the Emperor
Theodosius II. 2. That the Emperor Governed it; both by sending Officers to oversee
 them there, and by determining of the Effects. 3. That no Patriarch had so little to do
 in it as the Bishop of Rome. 4. That *Cyril* presided as Rome's Vicar in his own presence.
 § 21. The Synod as such ruled the greatest Patriarchs; though *Cyril's* Interest, vehemency, and
 copious Speech did prevail. In the beginning in *Crab*, p. 587. you shall find such a Man-
 date as this: To *Philipp* the *Prasbyter* *Pope*; *Callistus* *Vicar* (and therefore *Cyril* was not his
 Vicar) and to *Acadulus*, *Juvethal*, *Flavian*, and other Bishops their Legates, to *Constanti-*
nople. *Ante omnia* *sicut* *Saulcitas* *vestra* *quod cum* *Joanne* *Antiocheno* *et* *omnibus* *Apostolicarum*
consilio *communione* *nullo* *modo* *habere* *debeat*; (and after more Instructions.) *Permittimus*
vestre *sanctitati* *his* *scilicet* *polliceri* *quodam* *ipsi* *communione*, &c. If the Bishop of Rome had
 but given such Mandates and Permissions to them, as they did to *the Vicar* and others, it
 would have been taken for a proof of his Government over them.

§ 22. That it was to the Emperor that they sent Legates, and not to Rome; and that for the
 effectual Judgment which Party should prevail: The Orientals say, in their first Petition,
Nostre *proces* *sunt in* *Judicium* *a* *te* *pietate* *accipimus*: And both sides solicited him long
 hereto; but he kept both at *Chalcedon*, and would not let them so much as come long into
 the City, to avoid their contentions.

§ 23. That what was done at last, as to decision and depositions, was done by the Empe-
 ror: He commanded the deposition of the Leaders of both Parties at first, thinking that the
 way to peace, viz. *Nestorius*, *Cyril*, and *Procopius*. In the second Session of the Orientals,

it's

§ 24. *Adventu* *vestris* *magni* *factissime* *magnifice* *Joannes*, *qui* *tunc* *comes* *omnium* *Lavina-*
rum; *Significantes* *quod* *a* *vestra* *maiestate* *idem* *depositionis* *decree* *sunt*, *tollendaque* *et* *mediis* *sub-*
jectis *offendiculis*, *Islamque* *solum* *in* *Nicæa* *expositum* *a* *Sanctis* *et* *beatis* *patribus* *ab* *omnibus* *con-*
firmandum. And accordingly *Joan.* *Comit* did put them all out, till the Emperours mind
 changed upon second thoughts, and rejected *Nestorius* alone.

§ 25. That these Oriental Bishops were all his Subjects as they oft profess; as in their third
 Petition in *Crab*, pag. 592. *Non* *verum* *tantum* *sed* *et* *nostr* *Rex* *is*: *Non* *enim* *parva* *portio*
Regni *sui* *est* *omnis* *in* *qua* *semper* *religia* *stans* *restitit*, *et* *cum* *hac* *etiam* *aliqua* *Provincia*, & *Dis-*
cipulis *a* *quibus* *congregat* *sumus*.

§ 26. This *Joan. Comit*, in his Letters to the Emperour, giveth such an Account of the
 Fury and Contentiousness of some of the Bishops; especially of *Cyril's* Orthodox party, and
 of their fierceness and fighting one with another, as should grieve the heart of a Christian
 to read it. And had not he and *Candidianus* kept the Peace, and Ruled them (more than
 the Pope did) the two Councils (for two they were) might have tried who should pre-
 vail by Blood: *Cyril's* Council Accused *Nestorius* for keeping Souldiers about him, and not Ap-
 pearing, *Joan's* Council (which was for *Nestorius*) Accuse the *Egyptian* (meaning *Cyril*)
 for Heresy, Turbulency, setting the World together by the Ears, raising Seditions in the
 Church, and expending that Money which was the Poors in maintaining Souldiers to strength-
 en them; *Petri*. 3. *Crab*. p. 592.

§ 27. And that the Pope Governed not of the Empire, nor any of the Patriarchs
 or Christian Prince then, is intimated in these words of the Orientals first Petition, having
 praised him for propagating Religion in *Perisa* (by the Sword) *You may not sit down Religi-*
ous into *Perisa*, *O King*; and while we are at *Discord* among our selves, our matters will not
 firm great (or be much esteemed) there being not among them to be the Judges (or to Judge)
 nor will any Communicate in two sorts of words and Sacraments: So that the *Perissians* were
 not Subject to the Imperial Church Judicatories, when it's said, *There is none among them to*
Judge (or determine) which of the two Faiths is right.

§ 28. And whereas he layeth so much on the Council of *Chalcedon* applauding *Pope*
Leo's Letter, it is notorious that in all these Councils that were for mitigating party against party,
 every side magnified them that were for them, and strengthened them; (as at *Ephesus* one
 cryeth up *Cyril*, and the other *John*, &c.) Yet even those Bishops are fain to Apologize
 for receiving his Letter; it being Objected, that his Epistle was an Innovation; saying,
Let them not *Accept* *to us* *the* *Epistle* *of* *the* *Admirable* *Prelate* *of* *the* *City* *of* *Rome*, *as* *an* *Offence*
of *Innovation*; but if it be not agreeable to the Holy Scriptures, let them Reprove (or censure) it:
If it be not the same with the Judgment of the former Fathers, if it contain not an Accusation
of *the* *Impious*; *if it defend not the Nicene Faith*, &c. So that they rested not on the Au-
 thority of the Author, but the Truth of the Matter, which was to be exposed to Tryal.

§ 29. Note also, That whereas the great Proof of the Papal Monarchy, is, that Rome
 is called off, *Caput* *Mundi*, & omnium Ecclesiarum, & *Sedes* *Petri*: That *Nazianzen* off cal-
 leth *Constantinople*, *Caput* *totius* *mundi*; and it's usual for Councils to call *Jerusalem*, *Mater*
omnium *Ecclesiarum*; as *Constant.* 2. *bin.* p. 529. *Aliarum* *omnium* *Mater*. And *Anti-*
och is ordinarily called; *Sedes* *Petri*, and the City *Theopolis*. *Theodore* saith, That *John*,
chofen *Bishop* *of* *Antioch*, *Ad* *primatum* *Apostolicum* *supra* *gradis* *delectus* *fuit*. *Hist.* 1. 3. c. 17.

§ 30. Note, That whereas *W. F.* maketh himself Ignorant, that ever any Council was
 called without the Pope; and they pretend that his Vicars presided in them, almost all the
 General Councils for six or seven hundred Years, are Witnesses against them: And of the
 first General Council at *const.* *binus* Notes say (p. 515.) *Damasum* *Pontificem* *neque* *per* *se*,
neque *per* *suos* *Legatos* *eidem* *presulisse* *fatemur*.

§ 31. But there is yet another part of our work behind: *W. F.* will next prove, That
 the Fathers of these General Councils, in all their Decrees, Constitutions, and Canons, intended to
 oblige all Christians through the whole World, and thereby demonstrated themselves to have Ju-
 risdiction of the whole Church; and never so much as insinuated, that their Authority was
 limited within the Precincts of the Empire.

Ans. 1. I have proved the contrary at large already. 2. They might well commend their
 Decrees or Judgments to all Christians, on two accounts: 1. For concord sake; it being
 desirable that all Christians should, as much as may be, be of one mind and way. 2. *Ratione*

vi deotte: And so all Churches are bound to receive the same Truth that one is bound to. If the Bishop of the poorest City Excommunicate a Man justly for Heretic, all the Bishops in the World that know it, are bound to deny Communion to that Man; (and so *Cyprian* commended the Bishop of Rome for denying Communion to *Felicissimus*;) partly because they are bound to keep Concord with all Christians, and Order; and partly, because they are bound to avoid Hereticks: And yet such a Bishop is not Governour of all other Bishops; (nor *Cyprian* of the Bishop of Rome.) But let us hear your Proof.

§. 26. 1. Thus (saith *W. J.*) the Council of Ephesus saith, *Their Decrets were for the good of the whole world.*

Ans. I do not mean to search so large a Volume to find where, seeing you tell me not where. When as he is unworthy to be Disputed with that knoweth not, how commonly then the Roman Empire was called *Totus Orbis*; and even the Scripture saith, *That all the world was Taxed by Augustus.* How oft doth *Nazianzen* complain, that the Bishops and Councils had distracted and divided the whole World? And also, that all that is for the good of the whole World, is not an Act of Government of the whole World; e.g. The Works of *Augustine*, *Chrysostome*, &c.

§. 27. II. Saith he, Thus the Council of Chalcedon, A.D. 451. declareth the Church of Antioch to have under its Government Arabia.

Ans. But do you think that no part of Arabia was in the Empire? Look but in the Maps of the Empire, if you have no other notice. And you will be put hard to it, to prove that they meant the rest of Arabia.

§. 28. III. And art. 16. c. 28. (saith he) *That the Bishop of Const. should have under him certain Churches in Barbarous Nations, which you must prove to have been under the Empire.*

Ans. 1. I thought you must have proved, that it was out of the Empire; who undertook to prove it as you affirm it? 2. But seeing Papists lay Mens Salvation upon such skill in History, Cosmography, and Chronology, which this great Disputer had so little of himself, we must study it better for the time come: And I did fully prove to you before, that the *Sauomata*, many of the *Scythians* and *Goths* were conquered, and in the Empire; and *Barbarians* were in the Empire.

And by the way Note, 1. That this Council of Chalcedon, even writing to *Leo* Bishop of Rome, tell him, *That they were called by the Grace of God and Sanction of the most Pious Emperours*, not mentioning any call of *Leo's*. 2. That the Emperour *Martian*, in his Decree against Hereticks, and for this Council, saith, *All Men must believe as Athanasius, Theophilus, and Cyril believed* (not naming the Bishop of Rome;) and that *Cyrl*, *Præfuit Concilio Ephesino*, not saying that the Bishop of Rome did it, or *Cyrl*, as his Vicar: And that the Council-Bishops, contemptuously against the *Romans*, cried out, *They that gain-say, let them walk to Rome; and flood to their last Canon against the Popes dissent.*

§. 29. IV. Next he saith, *Nicephorus*, l. 5. c. 16. saith, *That Leo the Emperour wrote to the Bishops of all Provinces together* (Circularibus per Orbem literis ad Ecclesias missis, *Leo* hæc sic ad omnes Episcopos misit) *which he accounts were above a thousand, to have them subscribe to the Council of Chalcedon.*

Ans. Some Men perceive not when they confute themselves. 1. I tell you, *Totus Orbis* was a common Title of the Empire. 2. Had *Leo* any power out of the Empire? His commands shew that they were his Subjects that he wrote to. 3. Were any called, or wrote to under the Name of Provinces, but the *Roman Provinces*? 4. Do you think that there were not more than a thousand Bishops in the Empire? Yea, many thousands (if poor *Ireland* had as many hundred as *Ninius* speak of.) 5. But remember hence, that if all Bishops were written to, then the Bishop of Rome was written to, to subscribe the 28 Canon of the Council of Chalcedon, which he refused. (as Papists say.)

But indeed the Epistle that *Niceph.* there mentioneth, c. 16. was but to enquire of all the Bishops, whether they stood to the Council of Chalcedon or no, and what Bishop of Alexandria they were for, to save the calling of a new Council; and it is plain he wrote only to his Subjects.

§. 30. V. Next he saith, *The Bishops of the second Armenia, which seem to have been out of the Empire, wrote an Answer; and Adelphus, Bishop of Arabia, Subscribes, among the rest, to this Epistle.*

Ans.

Ans. 1. He tells me not where to find any of this. In *Nicephorus*, there I find it not; 2. But if he know not that part of both the *Armenias* were Roman-Provinces, he may see it in the Titles of the *Nicene Council*, and in the Maps and Histories of the Empire: And of Arabia I spake before.

§. 31. VI. He saith, *The Bishop of the second Messia, which you must prove to have been then under the Empire, writ that the Council of Nice delivered the Faith, totum terrarum Orbem, and style the Bishop of Rome the Head of Bishops, and that the Council of Chalcedon was gathered by Pope Leo's Command.*

Ans. Here is neither Matter nor Authority worthy an Answer. 1. He citeth no Author for what he saith. 2. Whether he meaneth *Messia*, or *Messia*, or *Messina*, they were all in the Empire: But what he meaneth I know not. Since I find in his Errat. [*Messia* r. *Toti*] But where, or what *Toti* meaneth, my Cosmographers tell me not: If it be *Totatium* that he meaneth, it was a City of *Bithynia* under the Arch-Bishop of *Nice*.

But it seems he durst not say it was in the Empire, but instead of proving it in, I must prove it out, without knowing Place or Author. 2. He that yet understandeth not the *Romans Terrarum Orbem*, and he that reading History, can believe that Pope *Leo* called the Council at Chalcedon, is not to be convinced by me, if he maintain that the *Turks* called it.

He tells us (out of no cited Author) of an Epistle subscribed by *Dita*, Bishop of *Odysa* in *Scythia*, which I have nothing to do with, till I know the Epistle: But he should have known that *Odysus* is a City of *Mysia*, near the *Euxine* Sea, within the Empire.

§. 32. VII. His last Instance is considerable, viz. Of the Bishops of Spain, France, and Germany. To which I say, 1. That none but *Rome* much meddled in the Empire after their Conquest: Nor *Rome* much in comparison of *Alexandria*, *Constantinople*, and *Antioch*. 2. I easily confess, that those Churches within the Empire had been settled in their several powers by the Councils at *Nice* and *Const.* did plead the same Canonical Settlement to keep their possession when they were conquered. And that e.g. *Rome* under *Theodorick* and other *Arrians*, was willing to keep their Relation to the Orthodox Churches of the Empire, for their strength: And Neighbours that were under Heathens or *Arrians*, were glad of a little countenance from Councils of great Bishops in the Empire (as *Basil* and the *Easterns* under *Valens*, were from the West, without Subjection to the Pope.)

§. 33. Pag. 116. After some trifling Quibbles, he Answereth my Charge, That their Church is not one, but two; having at times two Heads: The Pope to some, and a Council to others.

To this he saith, 1. That this belongs to them that take Councils to be above the Pope, and not to him, who is of a contrary Opinion.

Ans. It is to your Party in general: I did not say, that *W. J.* was two Churches; but that those called *Papists* are so.

2. He saith, *That they also can answer me with a wit finger; for the Pope is in the Council, and not excluded.*

Ans. Such wet-fingered Answers serve to deceive the Ignorant. The Question is not of the Popes Natural Person, but of his Political: Two *Summa potestates* make two Politics. The Pope in a General Council is not the *summa potestas*, if a Council be above him, and may Judge and Depose him. To be a Member of a Council that hath the Sovereignty, is not to have the Sovereignty: Did you not know this?

§. 34. I urged him as his proper work, to answer these Questions: *Whether the Church, of which the Subjects of the Pope are Members, hath been Visible ever since Christ's days on Earth? And therein, 1. whether the Papacy, that is, their Universal Papal Government over all the Earth, hath so long continued? 2. Whether all the Catholick Church did still submit to it? 3. Whether those that did submit to it, took it to be necessary to the Being of the Church, and Mens Salvation, or only to the more Orderly and better being.*

But he would not be driven to touch at any of these, or prove the perpetual Visibility of the

the

the Church, as Pope, and so he putteth over my last page, I gave over many of his last
 peribolus, telling the reader that I refer him to the perusing of the Histories which
 he hath already, with the General Answers which I have before given: And he will find,
 1. That the Pope was but a National Primat. 2. And that by Humane Institution. 3. And
 under a General Council. 4. Striving upon every Advantage to be greater. 5. Under the
 power of Princes. 6. And when he lost his power over all the other four Patriarchs, the
 West falling from the Empire, he sought to bring the Western Princes under him, and
 obtained a Government over all the World.

The

The Third Part :

A Defence of my Arguments to prove, That
 the Church of which the Protestants are
 members, hath been visible ever since the
 daies of Christ on Earth.

§. 1. **I** began with an Explication of the termes, but this Disputer saith, that *this is of no
 concern to his Argument, nor much to my answer.* *Answer.* It pleaseth not those that
 are all darkness; such Explications as you gave me are indeed of little use.

1. He saith, *I make Believers and true Christians Synonymims, whereas one may
 be a Believer as an unbaptized Catechumen, but is not a Christian till baptized.*

Answer. As a Pope once told one, how little wit in a place of power would serve to govern
 the world: so I fear by this man, how little Reason will serve to set up a Jesuite for an un-
 favorable disputant among the ignorant. The word [Christian] as well as [Believer] signifi-
 eth, 1. A heart-consenter to the baptismal Covenant. 2. Or a Professor of that consent. And

1. Regularly by Baptism. 2. Or without it when it cannot be had. 1. As soon as a man
 believeth and consenteth, he is a Christian before God. 2. As soon as he solemnly professeth
 it, he is an incomplet Christian before men. 3. As soon as he professeth it in Baptism he
 is regularly and regularly a Christian before the Church.

Even as two secretly marrying, are married before God; and when they publish their
 mutual Consent and Covenant (as suppose it were where a priest is not to be had) they are
 irregularly married before men, but solemn Matrimony maketh it a Legal Marriage in
 fore.

And this distinction holds of the word [Believer] as well as of [Christian]. A Believer,
 a Disciple, and a Christian were Synonyms before Popery was born.

§. 2. Next he saith that my words [Subject to Christ their Head] are equivocal. Because
 Subject may signifie but [inferior] and Head but a principal member.

Answer. What is not equivocal to a Jesuite? 1. Did I not put this first, *The Church is the
 Kingdom of Jesus Christ*? 2. When I said it is the whole company of believers subject to Christ
 their head, are not the words significative enough of a governing Head? And did I not adde,
 the consistent part are Christ and Christians, as the *pars imperans* & *subdita*: are there more
 notifying words in use? If there are, tell them me if you can: or was not this a cavil that
 had more of Will and Interest, than of Conscience?

§. 3. I said Protestants are Christians protesting against and disallowing Popery. To this
 he cavils 1. That the name had another original. 2. That the Greeke, Arrian, Antistri-
 thianians, Socinians, Hæreticks, Anabaptists, Familists, Dissemblers, Quakers, are not Pro-
 testants.

Answer. Did I undertake to tell you the first Rise of the name, or only to tell whom I
 meant in my dispute. If I had, the German protestation immediately against a papal
 Edict,

Edict, was principally and finally against Popery, and in that fence is the name continued. But it is not the Name but the Church and Religion that I dispute of. You know that the Name *Reformed Catholic Christians* pleased us better than the Name of Protestants. Were not Christians after they were first called so at *Antioch*, of the same Religion as before, when they were called but *Disciples and Believers*, yea and *Nazarens* by their adversaries?

2. Who would have thought that you had taken *Arrians, Antitrinitarians, Socinians*, or any that deny an Essential part of Christianity, for true Christians? Did you not here oft profess the contrary, and those that are no Christians are not in my definition; those that are Christians, as *Gricks, Millenaries, and Hussites* and most *Anabaptists* with us, are Protestants, but not meer Protestants: they have somewhat more and worse, which giveth them another name? but if Christians protesting against Popery, they are of the same Church universal, as we are.

3. 4. When I call Popery the *Leprosie of some Christians*, he must know whether all the Church was not *leprous* then. 2. And whether men could with a safe Conscience have Communion with any.

Ans. 1. He that saith he hath no sin is a liar, saith *St. John*. All Christians, and therefore all Churches are defiled with sin. 2. All are not equally defiled, I have told you that the Papists are not the third part of the Christian world, and for many hundred years there were none. 3. We must not separate from all Churches that have sin, but we must not willfully sin for their Communion, and we must joyn locally with the best we can, and in spirit joyn with all, as far as they joyn with Christ; is not this plain and sufficient to your cavils?

5. 5. He saith p. 423. that our external profession in the particulars of our Beliefs for rather Disbelief against the Roman Church, sheweth our general profession of Christianity to be false, as the *Arrian* was.

Ans. What is easier than to say so. But where's your proof?

6. 6. After a repetition of his talk against Christ as no visible Head, he cavills at the form of my first Argument; which was this:

"The body of Christians on Earth subjected to Christ their Head, hath been (in it's parts)

"visible ever since the dayes of Christ on Earth.

"But the body of Christians on Earth subjected to Christ their Head is the Church, of which the Protestants are members.

"Therefore the Church of which the Protestants are members hath been visible ever since the dayes of Christ on Earth.

And first he saith that it's out of form, because it hath never an universal proposition. Ans. This is the man that would not dispute but in meer Syllogisms, what need I an universal proposition? If you be to prove that *Cephas* was *Peter*, or *Peter* was an Apostle of the first place, must you have an universal proposition? What Universal must there be above *The Body of Christians*, &c. 2. He saith that the word *Those* Form requireth, should have been *[All the Body of Christians, &c.]* He saith that the word *Those* Form requireth, should have been *[All the Body of Christians, &c.]* when as there is never a *Those* at all in the argument. Is not this an accurate reformer of Syllogisms; that amendeth terms that were not written, and talketh like a dreamer of he knoweth not what? but what is the *[All]* that the man would have had? is it *[all those bodies of Christians]* when we are all agreed that Christ hath but one political body? if I had been to prove that the world that Protestants are parts of hath been visible since *Adam*; or that the God the Protestants worship is Almighty, must I have said, *[All those worlds and all those Gods?]* Nay had I said but *[whatsoever worlds]* or *[whatsoever God]* it had founded ill among men that are agreed that there is but one; sure an expository medium that was but *notus* was enough.

Next he saith that I put more in the medium of the major, than in the medium of the minor, and so it hath four terms.

Ans. Wonderful! This is the man that disputed with our two great Logicians and public professors of Cambridge, Bishop *Gunning*, and Bishop *Perison*, and as a triumphed printed the dispute, and challenged men in London to Syllogistical combats. And now fee how he talketh? 1. He calls that my medium that is no medium at all, but the Predicate. 2. He saith it is not in my minor, where that Predicate was not, nor ought to be but another. 3. He takes an expository parenthesis, which is no part of the proposition, for an addition that maketh

maketh Your termes: When I prove the Church visible, to prevent his cavils I put in a parenthesis, as a thargin, *(in it's parts)* because the whole world or Church is not seen by any mortal man, no not by the Pope that pretends to rule it all, and this no man controverteth. If he had said that there is less in the conclusion than in the premise he had spoken fence, though impertinent; while there is as much as was in the question.

2. He saith, I make the predicate of the minor the subject of the conclusion, and then saith *[This is a hopeful beginning.]*

Ans. O rare triumphant disputer, why should I not make the predicate of the Minor the subject of the conclusion? What Law or Reason is against it, when it is the subject of the question? My Argument is a *definitum ad rem denominatum*, as questioned: the definition or *vis quæ definita* is my medium. How ridiculous hath this *Avilarchus* made himself in his Logic? would not this disputing have been very edifying to such as the Lady that he and I were once to deal with, when he would have bargained that never a word should be spoken by me, nor written, but in a Syllogism as bad as Popery is, I hope it hath some men of more ingenuity and honesty, then wilfully to delude the ignorant, at these low and fordid rates.

3. 7. But from his play he turneth in earnest to deny my Major, and saith *[that Protestants are no parts of that Church on Earth of which Christ is Head]*. And yet many of their Doctors say, that they that have no explicit belief that *Jesus is the Christ*, but believe only a God, the rewarder of works are members of the Church; but no Christians are, save Papists. Just the Donatists, and worse than the Quakers and Anabaptists.

My Argument *[Those that profess the true Christian Religion in all it's Essentials, are members of that Church which is the Body of Christians on Earth, subjected to Christ the Head.]* But Protestants profess, &c.

Here 1. he wanteth form also; *[All]* is wanting: as if a definition, were not Universal or equipollent?

But if *[All]* be in, he denyeth it, because they may destroy the faith by an Error.

Ans. He that so erreth as to deny any one Essential part, doth not truly profess to hold that Essential part, and so not the Essence; as he that denyeth Christ to be God or Man, and yet will say in general that he is the Messiah, his meaning is that one that is not God, or not Man is the Messiah, which is not a profession of all Essential to Christianity; but if he truly profess all that is Essential, and ignorantly think some error consistent with those Essentials, which by consequence crosseth some of them, and would abhor that error if he knew it inconsistent, this man is still a Christian, or else it's doubt whether there be one in the world; if those Doctors say true, that say, that Theology is so harmonious a frame, that the least moral Error doth by consequence cross and subvert fundamental truths: Certainly abundance of such do so, as are collected by *Montanus* and Mr. *Clarkson* out of your Jesuites and school Doctors, and as you find in one another.

But he bids me prove my Major, mark, Reader, what I am put to prove; 1. Either that *Profession* denominateth *[a professor]* (it being only: Christians as visible by profession in question) 2. Or that all the Essential parts do constitute the Essence. And finally I obey a trifter so farre as to trouble you with more Syllogisms for this.

3. 8. But he denyeth the Minor; and saith, that Protestants profess not the true Christian Religion in all it's Essentials.

I proved it thus, *Those that profess so much as God hath promised Salvation upon in the Covenant of Grace, do profess so much as God hath, &c.* Here the trifter wants *[all]* again, and then denyeth the Minor.

I proved the Minor by several arguments. I. All that profess faith in God the Father, Son and Holy Ghost, our Creator, Redeemer, and Sanctifier; and Love to Him, and Absolute obedience to all his Laws, of Nature and Holy Scriptures, with willingness and diligence to know the true meaning of all these Laws as farre as they are able, and with Repentance for all known sins do profess so much as God hath promised Salvation upon, (which I proved by many texts of Scripture) But so do the Protestants, &c.

Here the trifter wants form again, *The Covenant of Grace was left out*, when I cited the *Covenant of Grace* it self, viz. *Joh. 3. 16. 17. Mark 16. 16. Heb. 9. 9. Rom. 8. 28. 1. Act. 26. 18.* And after all this what is it that he denyeth? Why this; that the Protestants have willingness, and diligence to know the true meaning of all the Law of Nature and Scripture.

Ans. This is the man of form, that silly put in [Having willingness] instead of professing it. When he saw and knew that it was not what faith men have (which God only knoweth) but what they [profess] that we dispute of. And whether we profess such willingness to understand, is our words, our oaths, and all our books and confessions published to the world will not prove it, let this mans word go for a disproof; we come now to the Transubstantiation reasoning, where all men Eyes, and Eares, are to be denied.

S. 9. But he addeth a reason, because else they would take the expositions of the universal Church, and not follow novel interpretations and private judgments.

Ans. This Cant must delude the ignorant that never read the history of the Church, nor know the present State of the World. 1. Do not we profess to preferre that which is most ancient, before that which is novel? But these men must have us. e. g. believe that the cup may be left out of the Sacrament of Eucharist, which a Sect lately and sacrilegiously introduced, or else we have a novel and private interpretation of the Sacrament; when the most brazen faced of them cannot deny, that their own way herein is novel, and the contrary as old as Christs institution; and that they are singular, as differing from the farre greatest part of Christians upon Earth. The same I might say of most other of our differences.

2. When did the Universal Church write a Commentary on the Bible? where shall we find their exposition of it? How little of the Bible have General Councils expounded? if you mean not them what mean you? sure all your Laity have not expounded it, nor all your Clergy; yea their Commentaries, yea and Translations fight with one another! where is your Universal Commentary: if you had such a work; will your talk make us ignorant that Papists are not a third part of the Christian world? but if it be Councils you mean, which of them is it that we must believe, and why? That at Constance, and Bassi, and Pisa, or that at Florence, or the Laterane that do fide contradict them? The first and second at Ephesus, or that of Calcedon which contradicted the first indeed, and the second professably? The 28th. Canon of Calcedon, or the Popes that abhor it: The General Councils at Ariminum, Syrianum, &c. when the world was said to groan to find it self turned Arrian: should we at the 2d. Council of Ephesus have followed the greater number, when there was not one refuser of Eutychianism save the Popes Legates, and Binnius faith that sola navicula Petri, only Peters Ship escaped drowning: did Rome follow the most, when Melch. Canus tells us, that most of the Churches and the Arms of Emperors have fought against the Roman privileges? Is it a convincing way to have such a Pope as Eugenius 4th. at the same time to differ from the greater part of the Christian world, and also be damned by his own Church or General Council; and to say, you do not receive all that's necessary to Salvation, nor are willing to know the truth because you take not the expositions of the Universal Church. When you have blinded us so far as to take a domineering fact that liveth not by the Word, but by the Sword and Blood, to be the Universal Church, and all your Decretals to be the Churches expositions of Scripture, and all the Scripture and Fathers that are against you to be novelties, and your many novelties to be all the ancient truth (such as P't. Moulin de novitate Papismi hath laid open) by that time we may think that the Church wanteth an Essential Article of Christianity, which taketh not all the Popes expositions of Scripture.

But seeing this is the great damning Charge against the Protestants faith, I pray you tell us next, 1. Did all the Christian Church want an Essential part of their Christianity, in all those Ages before the Universal Church gave them any expositions of the Scripture? what exposition had they besides each Churches Pastors for the first 300 years. And what exposition did the Council of Nice make, save about the deity of Christ (and Easler day or such things that indeed were deliver'd not as expositions of Scripture but Traditions or rules of order)? And what exposition made any of the old General Councils, save about the Natures, and Person, and Wills of Christ, and Church policies, which Suarez de legib. faith, God made no Law for) where are their Commentaries?

2. Where shall we find any Commentary that the Fathers agreed in, though the Trent Oath is that you will not expound the Scripture but according to the Fathers consent. Your writers tell us that most whole works be come to us, for the first 300 years, were Minervit, Dionysius Petavius hath gathered the words of Arrian doctrine from most of them (lib. de Trinitate) till after the Council of Nice, yea that the chief of the Anti-Arrians, even Athanasius himself, † was for three Gods, telling us that as Peter, Paul, and John were three names, but

one:

one in Essence, that is in Specie, solis the Father, Son and Holy Ghost: when your Doctors tell us, that Justin, Clem. Alexander, Dionysius Alexand. Talianus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Origen, Basilides, and I know not how many more taught Heresie: and Chryssosom, Bassi, and many others that we hoped had been Christians, are noted as fautors of Origen: and even many of the Martyrs were Hereticks, when through the reign of Theodosius, Senior; Arcadius and Honorius, Theodosius, Junior; Valentinian, (to say nothing of Constantius and Valens, &c. of the Arians) yea and of Marcian, Leo, Zeno, Anastasius, Justin, almost all the Churches of the Empire continued charging each others with Heresie: and Councils charging and condemning Councils; Bishops deposing, and cursing Bishops; and Monks as their Souldiers fighting it out to blood; when the obeying or cursing the Council of Calcedon divided the Bishops for many Princes reigns: and when one part called the other Nestorians, and the other called them Eutychians, almost every where; and when after that the Monothelites cause was in many Emperors Reign evermoot one while, and down another; and navicula Petri that alone escaped before, was thus drowned by Honorius (if Councils belie him not and Popes) with the rest. When the very same Bishops (as at Ephesus and Calcedon) went one way in one Council and another way in the next, and subscribed to one Edict e. g. of Basiliscus, and quickly to the contrary of another, and cryed piteavimus, we did it through fear. How should we then know by Fathers, Bishops and Councils, what was their concordant Commentary of the Scripture?

4. I ask you, what exposition of the Universal Church is it that we profess to differ from for our novelties; name them if you can. Either by the Universal Church, you mean properly [all Christians] or [most]. If all, alas, when and where shall we find their agreement in any more than we hold with them? If most, do we not know that the most (two parts to one) are against the Popes Sovereignty, which is Essential to your Church? Do not the Greeks once a year excommunicate or curse you? To tell us now That above two parts of the Christian world are none of the Church, because they differ from the Universal Church, and that the third part is that Universal, which he that believeth is no Christian, are words that deserve indignation and not belief, and without the medium of Swords and Flames, and tormenting inquisitions on one side, and great Bishopricks and Abbies, Wealth, Ease and Domination on the other; had long ago been scorned out of the Christian world.

S. 10. But he also denyeth that we believe with a saving divine faith any of the said myst'ries, and that our Profession general and particular affirmeth it.

Ans. It's like the Devil the Accuser of the brethren will deny it too: of our Hearts we will not enter a dispute: of our Professions, let our books be witnesses: Reader, canst thou believe that we profess not to believe any Christian verity with a Divine faith? yea; but the man meaneth that it is not a Divine faith if it be not from the belief of the Pope and his Party. And how then shall we believe the Popes own authority?

S. 11. II. My 2d. Argument to prove that we hold all the Essentials of Christianity, was "That those who profess as much (and much more) of the Christian Faith and Religion as the Catechumens were ordinarily taught in the ancient Churches, and the Competentes at Baptisme did profess, do profess the true Christian Religion in all it's Essentials: but so do the Protestants, &c. To this he calls for Form again, as if here were no Universal, and then denyceth the Major, but his words shew that indeed it is the Minor: Because the Catechumens professed to believe the Holy Church; which the Protestants do not.

Ans. An unproved fiction on both parts. 1. Shew us in Fathers, Councils, or any true Church-Records; that Catechumens were then used to make any other exposition of those words than we do. Did they ever profess that a Pope or a General Council cannot erre de fide? did they not call many of those Councils General, though violent and erroneous which they cursed? The great doubt then was, which party was the true Church; else they had not so oft rejected and Hereticized many Popes, Patriarches, and the farre greater part of the Bishops, as they did.

2. And Protestants deny no article which ab omnibus; ubique et semper, as Lutherus speaks, was accounted necessary to Salvation: yea it is one reason why they cannot be Papists, but

cause most of the Catholick Church are against the Papacy, and all were against it or without it for many hundred Years after Christ.

Let the Reader peruse *Cyrl, Hicrof, Catch, Auguft*, and all others, that give us an account of the Churches Catechism, and see whether he can find in it, *I believe that the Bishop of Rome is made by Christ the Governour of all the World, and is Infallible in himself, or with his Council; and that we must believe all that they say is the word of God, because they say it, or else we cannot be saved.*

But it is an easie way to become the Lords of all the World, if they can persuade all Men to believe that none but their Subjects can be saved.

3. And what an useles thing do they make Gods Word, that they may set up their own Expositions in its stead? We know that the Word supposeth, that the *Ignorant* must have Teachers: Without Teaching Children cannot so much as learn to *Speak*, And *Oporet discipulum credere sibi humanam*, that is, he must suppose his Teacher wiser than himself, or else how can he judge him fit to Teach him? But what is Teaching, but Teaching the Learner to know the same things that the Teacher doth, by the same Evidence? Is it only to know what the Teacher holdeth? without knowing why? If so, must we know it by Word, or Writing? If by Word only, when and where shall every Man and Woman come to be Catechized by the *Universal Church*? That is, by all the Christian World. Or is every Priest the *Universal Church*? Or is he *Infallible*? And how come Words spoken, to be more intelligible than words written? Doth writing make them unintelligible? Why then are their Councils and Commentaries written? But if *Writing* will serve, why not God's writing as well as theirs? If God say, *Thou shalt Love the Lord thy God with all thy Heart*: Are not these words intelligible till a Pope Expound them? When the Pope permiteth his Calvinists to expound them so, as that Loving God once a Month, or once a Year, will serve for Salvation; and that Attrition, which is Repeating only out of Fear, with the Sacrament of Penance, will also serve. Cannot a Man be saved, that Believeth, Repenteth, and Loveth God upon the bare Commands of God and Scripture, without hearing what all the Christian World or Councils say? If I make to my self no Graven Image, so as to bow down and Worship towards it, by virtue of the second Commandment, will this damn me, because I receive not the Papists oblation or contradiction of this Commandment as an Exposition? If all the Doctrines of Councils be as necessary as the Creed and Scripture, why were not the Councils read in the Church still (three hundred Years before there was any General Council) as well as the Scriptures? And why do not *Hierome, Chrysostome, Auguftine*, &c. Exhort Men and Women to read the Councils as much as the Scriptures? At least, methinks, you should allow the Scripture an Equality with Councils. But if God have spoken that which is non-sense or unintelligible till Councils or Popes Expound it, Scripture is far from having such Equality. Then *Paul* and *Peter* spake not intelligibly, but *P. Paul* 4 and 5. and the Council of *Trent* did: Then Councils may have them that know not Scripture, but Scripture cannot have them that know not the Councils: And do all the Papists, Men and Women, know the Councils?

In short, If a Tyrannical Sect of Priests can get this Monopoly, or Peculiar of expounding all Gods Laws and Word; so that the Scripture will not save any but by their Expositions, it will become more the word of the Pope or Council, than of God: And when all is done, every Priest must be the Pope and Council to us that never saw them, and must be the immediate Object of our *Infallible belief*. And if the Pope can so communicate to us *per a swarm*, the sweetness of participating in his *universal Dominion and Infallibility*, no wonder if Self-love bid them serve his Usurpation.

But by that time every Woman must be sure, 1. That the Pope is Christs Vicar General indeed. 2. That with a Council he is Infallible. 3. And that Gods Revelation must be received only on this Deliverers Authority. 4. And the fence of all on his Exposition. 5. And know how Men believed the first three hundred Years before such Popes or Councils ever were. 6. And can tell certainly which Councils be true, and which false; and which of them must be believed, and which not. 7. And is sure that every Priest doth Infallibly Report all this to her. 8. And doth give a true Exposition of each Council, before another Council do Expound them. 9. And be sure that she hath all that those Councils have made necessary, and have not had a sufficient proposal of more. I say, by that time

time all this certainty be attained, the Popish Faith will appear to be harder work than they think, that hear Deceivers say, *believe as the Church believeth, and you shall be saved.*

Judge how far the Pope Exalteth himself above God, when it is thus confidently told us, That we, (nor no Men) *believe with a Divine and Saving Faith any one word of Gods*, if we believe it merely because God hath given it us in the Sealed Scriptures, and add not the Expositions of the Papal Church.

§. 12. My next Argument was, "Those that explicitly profess the belief of all that was contained in the Churches Creeds, for six hundred Years after Christ, (and much more Holy truth)" and implicitly to believe all that is contained in the Holy Scriptures, and to be willing and diligent for the explicit knowledge of all the rest, with a resolution to Obey all the will of God, which they know, do profess the true Christian Religion in all its Essentials: But so do the Protestants, &c.

Here again the Formalist wants Form: An Enumeration of particulars in a Description, is not equal to an Universal with him, unless he read [AU.] And then he deniyeth the Major: 1. Because our General Profession is contradicted in particulars.

Ans. 1. Bare Accusation without Proof, is more easie than honest. 2. There is a contradiction direct, and understood, which proveth that the Truth is not believed; and a contradiction by consequence not understood, which stands with a belief of the Truth. The latter all Men in the World have, that have any Moral Error. 3. O what self-condemning Men are these! How certainly hath a Papist no true Faith, if abundance of contrary Errors nullifie Faith.

His second Reason is, *You distinguish not between implicitly contained in general Principles, and explicitly contained in the Creed and Scriptures.*

Ans. A very Logical Answer. To what purpose should I do it?

His third is the strength, "Creeds and Scriptures are not enough; Traditions and General Councils, in matters of Faith, must be believed."

Ans. 1. I would matters of Practice were more at Liberty than Princes were not bound to Murder or exterminate all their Subjects as Hereticks, that will not be Hereticks and inhumane; and to Rebel perditionally against those Princes that are Sentenced by his Holiness for not doing it. 2. Alas, who can be saved on these Mens terms? If the belief of all the Creeds, and all the Scriptures, be not a Faith big enough to save him? Anyer, perhaps, you may hear again, that Men may be saved without any of all this, save believing that there is a Rewarding God, and that the Pope and his Subjects are the Infallible Church Universal. And it is but proving [an insufficient proposal] and we are delivered from Traditions, Councils, Scriptures, Creeds and all. And never was the proposal of Councils more insufficient, than when Councils were most frequent; when in the Reign of Constantius, Valens, Valentinian, Theodosius, Arcadius and Honorius, good Theodosius junior, Marcian, Leo, Zeno, Anastasius, Justin, Justinian, and long after; Anathematizing one General Council, and crying up another; and setting Council against Council, was too much of the Religion of those times.

4. Again, he deniyeth, that Protestants, not excus'd by Inevincible Ignorance, believe any Article with a Saving Faith.

Ans. Easie Disputing: Cannot a Quaker say so too, by us and you? But how unhappy a thing is Knowledge then; and how blessed a thing is Inevincible Ignorance, which may prevent so many Mens Damnation?

§. 13. I proved the Major by the expresse Testimony of many Papists, *ad hominem*: To which he saith, It is to no purpose: For our Question is not, if what is to be believed expressly only, but of what is to be believed both expressly and implicitly of all Christians respectively.

Ans. Reader, Judge with what Ingenuity these Men Dispute! And how they make nothing of giving up all their cause, and yet Cane on with any of the most senseless words! He had largely enough told us before, that the belief of General Truths explicitly is the Implicit belief of the contained particulars, though unknown to the Believer. I am now proving, that Protestants explicit Faith leaveth out no Article necessary to be explicitly believed. To this end I cite *Bellarmine* and *Cotterius* (and after many others) confessing what I say in plainest words, even the sufficiency of our enumeration. He deniyeth none of my proof, as to explicit belief: And do we need any more? Is not all that which he calleth explicit

beliefs

beliefs, the meer denomination of the *Explicit*, from the particulars implied in it? Can any Man want an *Implicit* belief, that *wanteth* no *Explicit* belief? If I am not bound explicitly to believe that the Pope and his Council is the universal Church, or the infallible deliverer of Traditions, or Expounder of Scripture, or my rightful Governour; how am I bound, or how can I be said to believe Implicitly their unknown Doctrine or Articles of Faith?

What is my *Implicit* belief of Scripture-Parables; but my General belief that all the Scripture is Gods Word, and true? And what is *Implicit* belief of Popish Traditions in particular, but the *explicit* belief that all Popish Traditions in general are true? If therefore these Disputers confess the sufficiency of our *explicit* necessary beliefs, and yet damn us for the insufficiency of our *implicit* beliefs, they shamefully contradict themselves, and give up their cause.

§. 14. Next I thus Argued, "If sincere Protestants are Members of the True Church, as intrinsically informed (or as Bellarmine speaks, Living Members) then professed Protestants are Members of the true Church, as extrinsically denominated (or as it is visible) consisting of Professors: But the Antecedent is true; Ergo, so is the Consequent."

To this (when I had given the Reason of the Consequence undeniable) and said, I prove the Antecedent or Minor, he saith, "You prove, say you, your Antecedent or Minor, which is a Syntax in Logic, and deserves a Formula, for a Minor can be an Antecedent."

Ans. For this Mans sake, I will know a Man better than by his HeSaying, before I will go to School to a boaster. Reader, 1. What is that Error in Logic that is called a Syntax? I thought Order or Concord had been no Error: I confess my self not wise enough to understand this great Logician. And his Formula is too ready, which must be used for Syntaxes, when it is more used for violation of Syntax. 2. *Risum tentatis*: Can no Antecedent be a Minor (so did Dr. Peter Heylin tell me before him, in his *Criticism* Epistolare?) I suppose I shall never hear a third say so. What's the matter, that the Boys Laugh at this, and say, that to deny the Antecedent of an hypothetical Proposition, and to deny the minor is all one? Is it that Boys have made all our usual Logicks, and now these two Logick Doctors have Reformed them? Or hath this Man pretended to be a Champion in that Art, in which he is like the Novices? He had hit it if he had held to his offer to Dispute before a Lady (a Girlie) only in Syllogism by the Pen; for this with her might have past for current and invincible Logic.

§. 15. I proved the Minor thus: All that by Faith in Christ are brought to the undesigned Love of God above all, and special Love of his Servants, and undesigned willingness to Obey him, are Members of the True Church, as intrinsically informed. But such are all sincere Protestants, &c.

This Minor the Man denyeth, and saith, That Protestants have not these things.

Ans. 1. Mark how hard this Man is put to it to renounce his Charity: He cannot do it without denying what he granteth. A *pious* Professor of any Religion, is one that really is what he professeth to be: He denyeth not that Protestants profess to Love God, &c. And yet he denyeth the Minor, that sincere Protestants do love God: As if he that sincerely professeth to Love God, doth not Love him. These are Papist's Syllogisms.

2. Note, That this Man seemeth to know all Protestants Hearts better than they do themselves, and can prove them all Hypocrites that Love not God.

3. But by this you see how he reproacheth all those Protestants that turn Papists, as having all been but before but graceless ungodly Hypocrites: And what wonder then if they turn?

4. But it may be his word [formally] is a cheat. A Protestant is a Christian renouncing Popery: It is his Christianity which containeth his Love to God: His renouncing Popery, is but his freedom from their sin. And, perhaps, the Man hath a mind to call this the Form of Protestants: But I hope his Talk shall not deprive us of the Love of God, or of our Neighbour. In the mean time, any Man that can truly say, that he is not an ungodly Hypocrite without the Love of God and Man, hath Argument enough to Answer any Papist in himself.

5. Again, Reader, mark how much these Men magnifie themselves, and how much they vilifie the Word and Works of God. Let a Man see all Gods wonderful Goodness in his Works, and in his Mercies to himself and all Mankind; let him read and believe all the wonderful Love of the Father, and Grace of the Son that is described in all the Scriptures: Let him believe the Promises there Recorded of Everlasting Glory; and All this is insufficient

cient to cause him savingly to Love God or Man: But let him but add the belief, that the Pope is the Governour of all the Earth, and that he and his Council must be believed in all their Traditions and Expositions, and then the work will be done, and he may Love God undesignedly, and be Loved by him. The Holy Ghost will not work by the Scripture, unless we take the Pope for the Expofitor: Yea, more; if a Man never heard of Scripture, or if he believe not in Christ, for want of the Pops sufficient proposal, he may Love God, and be saved, so he do but believe that the Pope, with his Council, is a sufficient proposer. And is there any account in Reason to be given of this Strange Phenomenon, why a Man can Love God, if he believe in the Pope of Rome, and yet cannot Love him by all his Works and Mercies, with the benefit of all the Scriptures? Or is it as very a Miracle as Transubstantiation, and Sanctification by Holy-Water, or the Opus operatum, and one of those Miracles that prove the Church of Rome to be all the Church on Earth.

§. 16. But he repeateth again the third bare Reason, Had they this, they would never have disobeyed and disbursed all the Churches in the World.

Ans. That is, the Pope and his Priests, who are against the far greatest part of the Christian World, and Yearly Anathematized by the Giths; who, when they had lost the Primacy of the Eastern part of one Empire, have tried to make up the loss, by laying Claim to all the Earth. O! of what consequence is Obedience to an Ambitious Pope of Priest, in comparison of Obedience to all the written Laws of God?

§. 17. I proved the Minor two ways: 1. If this (the Love of God, &c.) be in our professions, then the sincere are such indeed: But this is in our profession: Ergo, —

Of this he denyeth the Minor, It is not in our profession. What, not that we Love God, and are willing to understand and obey his word? Is he not driven up to the Wall, even to another denial of all Mens Eyes and Ears? Do not I profess it while I write these words? And have not I professed it in sixty Volumes and more? And do not Protestant Libraries contain such professions, and their Pulpits ting of them every Lords Day? What is a Profession, but words and writings? And are not these Audible and Visible to the World? And yet the denying (not of the sincerity) but the very Being of them, is the Papists confusion of us.

§. 18. Secondly, I proved it from our Knowledge and Sense of our own Affs. When I know and feel my Love, shall I believe a Pope that never saw me, that tells me I do not know or feel it?

To this, his easy Answer serveth: He saith, I do not feel that I truly Love God or his Servants; if I be a Formal Protestant, my Heart deceives me.

Ans. No wonder if all these Priests are Infallible, that know all our Hearts so much better than we. But who shall be Judge? The true searcher of Hearts? If the Fruits must be the Evidence, I should rather fear that such Murders of hundred thousands as killed the weaklings, albigens, French, English, Dutch, &c. were like to be without Love, than all those meek and Godly Protestants that I have known; for no Murderer hath Eternal Life.

But forme is sometime taken for figure, and set outward appearance only: And such Formal Protestants, as have but the cloathing of Christianity, have not indeed the Love of God.

§. 19. He addeth, what would you say to an Arrian, a Turk, or Jew; that would use the like knowledge or feeling?

Ans. The same that I would do to a bloody Papist: And I would tell him, that if a Arrian think that he is a Prince, or a Fool that he is Wife, or a Beggar that he is a Lord, or an illiterate Man that he is Learned, it doth not follow, that no Man can know that he is a Prince, or a Lord, or Wife, or Learned. I would tell him, that there can be no effect without the adequate cause; nor is there a cause where there is no effect: And he that perceiveth not Gods amiable nels in the necessary demonstrations of it, cannot Love that Goodness he perceiveth not; nor can any desire or seek the Heaven, which he believeth not. And I would tell him, that he that believeth not in a Redeemer or a Sanctifier, cannot Love him, nor can he Love Believers and Godly Men, as such, who knoweth not that they, as such, are Lovely: And that if really he Love God and Holy nels, and the hopes of Heaven before this World, it will work in his seeking them above the World: If you had Argued rationally against our Love of God, and Holy nels, from any proved defect in the necessary cause (which is in you), we had been Obligated thankfully to hear and try your words. But let Reason

Reason judge e.g. whether that man be like to love this world best, and be loth to leave it, who looketh to go at death into the flames of Purgatory, or he that looketh to go to the glorious presence of his Redeemer. And whether he be like to Love God best, that looketh to be tormented by him in those flames, or he that looketh to passe into heavenly perfect Love: Christ telleth us that *forgetting much* causeth Love; If a man were to torment you so long, would it make you love him? or at least is it a good proof that Protestants Love not God, because they believe not that he will torment them in flames, but presently comfort them.

S. 20. II. My 2d. Argument to prove the perpetual visibility of our Church, *was this*, [The Church whose Faith is contained in the Holy Scriptures, as its rule in all points necessary to Salvation, hath been visible ever since the days of Christ on Earth.

But the Church whose Faith is contained in the Holy Scriptures as it's rule in all points necessary to Salvation, is it of which the Protestants are members.

Therefore the Church of which the Protestants are members, hath been visible, &c.

Here he wanteth Form again, because the predicate of the Minor is the Subject of the conclusion, and then he distinguisheth of the Major, of containing involutely in General principles, he granteth it, but it expressly he denyeth it.

Ans. 1. The marvellous Logician it seems is but for one mood or figure, but by what authority or Reason?

2. He denyeth that the Churches Faith in all points necessary to Salvation is expressly contained in the Scriptures. I proved the contrary ad hominem, before, out of Bellarmine and Colerus plain words; and shall by and by further prove it. Mark again the Papis value of the Holy Scriptures, he that expressly believeth all that it expressly delivereth, and no more, say these men, cannot be saved: and yet if they believe none of it, but a *rewarding Ditty* say most, or some part of the Creed say others, men may be saved if they do but believe that *all is Gods word and truth* which the Pope and his Priests or Councils say is such.

Next he distinguisheth of [all things necessary to Salvation to be by all distinctly known and expressly believed,] and so he granteth the Scripture-sufficiency: Very good! Now all that is so necessary to a distinct knowledge and expressly belief is there. But of [all things to be Believed implicitly and distinctly known,] he denyeth it. These distinctions, supposed (saith he) I deny your Consequences.

Ans. Here is all new still: 1. He calleth this Conclusion my Consequence; (and reciteth it) 2. What he meaneth by things to be distinctly known by all, and yet Believed but implicitly, is past my understanding, having to do with that man that hath all this white described *implicit* beliefs; by the express Belief of some *new General Truth*. And must men know all that distinctly, which they believe not distinctly but in their general? the man fur was confounded, or confounded me! The General to be Believed is the Pope and Councils authority in *proposing and expounding Gods word*. (This is their saving Faith:) the Belief of all that they propose is implicitly contained in this; but must all this be distinctly known by all, and yet not expressly Believed? The first would damn all that know not every one of their Councils decrees, &c. the 2d. will shew that they Believe nothing at all; for he that knoweth distinctly what the Pope saith, and yet Believeth it not distinctly, cannot Believe the general of his veracity.

Salvian. de Gubern. 1. 3. p. 62. si scire vis quid tenendum sit, habes literas sacras. Pirardus in Prefat. & Hierom. in hym. a. Aquinas 22. 9. 1. ad 10. ad 1. & de Verit. disp. de fide q. 10. ad 11. 5. Status in Prolegom. in sect. 1. 6. Grig. Armin. in Proleg. e. g. q. 1. art. 2. Resp. fol. 3. 4. 7. Guili. Ruffinus de Legib. c. 16. p. 26. 8. Bellarmine again de verbo Dei li. 10. c. 10. ad arg. &c. And then I most fully proved it out of the ancient Church-Doctors.

But to all these he giveth such frivolous Answers, that it irketh me to weary the Reader by

re.

repeating and answering them. And he that will faithfully peruse the Authors words, I think will either need no other confusion of him, or is incapable of understanding one when he seeth it.

The fore-quoted contradiction of *sufficient explicite*, and yet not *sufficient implicit* is the chief: and next a vain supposition, that, to say that Scripture is sufficient to all Theological points and conclusions, is less than to say, it is sufficient to necessary *Articles of Faith*; and if any of them speak of the Churches exposition, he denyeth the Scripture-sufficiency as a rule: and yet their Councils need exposition too.

S. 22. III. My 3d. Argument for our Churches perpetual visibility was: If the Roman Church (as Christian, though not as Papal) hath been visible ever since the days of the Apostles, then the Church of which the Protestants are members hath been visible ever since the days of the Apostles: but the Antecedent is their own. Therefore they may not deny the Consequent.

Here he wants Form again, because [as Christian] is in the Antecedent and not in the consequent.

Ans. He might have seen that it is but an *Expository* term in a parenthesis, and so the same exposition in the consequent is supposed.

Next he saith, that it is a fallacy, a *secundum quid ad simpliciter*.

Ans. So then the Church as Christian is not the Christian Church, but *secundum quid*; but we that know no other, profess to be of no other, nor to prove the visibility of any other, than the Church as Christian. Let them prove more that pretend to any other.

Next he saith, that [the Protestants have been visible as Christians] is all that can be pretended: and yet that also he denyeth, for they believe not one Article with an infallible, *supernatural, divina* Faith.

Ans. 1. The question is, whether they profess not so to do: nay rather, whether their *objective* Faith, (that is, all the Creed and Holy Scriptures) be not *infallible*, of supernatural Revelation and Divine; he that denyeth this seemeth an Infidel. But if all the members of the Church must have an *actual subjective* Faith that is of *supernatural, divine* infusion: Then

1. No hypocrite is a Church-member; 2. And no man can know who is a Church-member besides himself. 3. And so the Church of Rome is invisible; this is clear.

2. I must not too oft write the same things; if the Reader will peruse a small Treatise of mine called *The certainty of Christianity without Popery* he shall soon see whether the Papis Faith or Ours be the more certain and divine: Of which also I have said, more in my Treatise called *The safe Religion*; and Mr. Post in his *milk of the Roman Faith*.

S. 23. I here shewed that having proved our visibility as Christian, I need not prove a visible as Papal, any more than he that would prove his humane Genealogie, having some leprous Ancestors, need to prove that all were leprous.

Here he denyeth Popery to be Leprosie, and again fallily tells us, that if it were so, all the visible Church in the world was leprous; which needs no more confusion than is oft given it.

S. 24. He tells me how an. 1500 the Pope was in possession, and we dispossessed him without order, &c.

Ans. An old Cant, but 1. I have fully proved that he never was in possession of the Government of the Christian world. 2. Nor in the Empire or any other Princes dominion, but by humane donation and consent; as the Arch-Bishop of Canterbury is in England. 3. And that they that gave him that power, may on just reason rake it away. And that the Bishop of another Princes Country, cannot stand here by his authority, when he hath lost the Government of England himself.

S. 25. IV. My 4th. Argument added more than my Thesis required, viz. "If there have been since the days of Christ, a Christian Church that was not subject to the Roman Pope as the Vicar of Christ and universal Head and Governor of the Church, then the Church of which the Protestants are members hath been visible, both in it's being and in it's freedom from Popery. But the Antecedent is true: Ergo so is the Consequent."

To this 1. he wants the word [ever] in the Antecedent. And yet before abated it, but he knoweth that [since] was put for [ever since.] 2. He saith, I suppose that the sole denial of the Popes Supremacy constitutes the Church whereof the Protestants are members. Ans. In despite of my, frequent professions to the contrary; who still tell him, that our Christianity and Relat.

Relation to Christ and one another makes us Church-members : and our freedom from the Papacy is our renunciation of an Ufurper.

§. 26. I proved my Antecedent 1. from the *express words of the Council of Calcedon can. 28* which he answers as before, where he is confuted.

* S. 27. 2. My 2d. proof was from the silence of the ancient writers *Tertullian, Cyprian, Athan. Nazianzene, Niffene, Basil, Optatus, Augustine*, &c. that ufed not this argument of Popes power over all the world as of Divine Right, to confute the Hereticks that they had to do with: when two words had expeditiously done all, if this had then been Believed.

Here he saith, *Their authors have proved that the Fathers did so.*

Ans. Soon said, and as soon denied. The books are in our hands, as well as yours. I will now instance but in *Cyprian* and the *African Churches* in his dayes, and in *Augustine*, and the same Churches in his dayes.

1. Did *Cyprian* and his Council believe *Stephens* Universal Monarchy, when he opposed his judgment with so much vehemency, and set the Scripture against his plea from tradition? Let him that will read his Epistles of this (too long to be recited) believe it if he can. And when he twitted his arrogance in Council, with *nemo nostrum se dicit Episcopum Episcoporum*.

2. The plea of *Aurelius*, *Augustine* and the rest of the *African Bishops* I have formerly recited, of which *Harding* saith, that the *Africans* seduced by *Aurelius*, continued twenty years in *Schism* from *Rome*: and did *Augustine* and all the rest then believe the *Popes* Sovereignty even in the Empire?

I did plainly show that if the *Donatists*, *Novatians*, and all such Sects had believed the Roman Sovereignty and Infallibility, they had not so differed from them; if they did not believe it, the Fathers would have taken the nearest way, and wrote their Volumes to convince them that this Papal Rule was it that must end all their contentivities, (instead of writing voluminously from Scripture and the nature of the cause:) which they did not.

§. 28. My 3d. proof was this [The Tradition witness'd by the greater part of the universal Church saith, that the Papal Vicarship or Sovereignty is an innovation and usurpation, and that the Catholick Church was many hundred years without it. Therefore there was then no such Papal Church.

Here the man is angry, and faith, *It is an abominable untruth set down by a sore-head of brass.—A man in his right wits would not have the confidence to utter so loud a falsehood,—and all the world will see that I am one of the most unsufferablest out-facers of Truth and assertors of open Falshood that ever set pen to paper : yea, it brings in the talk of Rebellion against his Majesty, &c.*

Answer. The apprehensions of men are very different, when reading (it's like) the same books left to their passions; doubt on one side, and him so vehemently confident on the other. My proof is this. 1. The greatest part of the Universal Church doth now deny the Papal Authority. 2. The greatest part of the Universal Church do suppose and say that they hold herein to the ancient truth which was delivered down from the Apostles. 3. Therefore the greatest part of the Universal Church do hold that the ancient truth delivered from the Apostles doth teach them to deny the Popes Universal Sovereignty; and consequently that it is an innovation and usurpation.

consequently that it is an *inimicivitas* and a *persecutio*.
 1. As to the first, it is a matter of *prefat. facti*, such as whether *most of England* (speak English). 1. That the great Empire of *Abissinia* renounce the Pope, (and plead tradition for English). 2. That the great Empire of *Abissinia* renounce the Pope, (and plead tradition for English). *Godignus* the Jesuite (besides others) fully testifies, and justifies *Pet. Massius, Ribade, Nica* and other Jesuits against a new author that fairly they were subject to the Pope. He tells us that they take the *Romans for Nestorian Heretics*, p. 218. 228. &c. and that they received never to be subject to the Pope, that he that told them otherwise misinforme them, yea faith one of the Jesuites, pag. 330. *I think the Emperour had rather be under the badvell yoke of the Saracens*, than under the mild and gentle Empire of the Roman Pope. It's true that many errors they have, and many more are charged on them, which they deny, and believing that *Disforus* was the true follower of *Cyril* and the Council of *Ephesus*, and that *Leo* and the Council of *Calcedon* were *Nestorians* (of which more anon) they are for *Disforus* against *Leo* and the Council. But few if any of them understand the bottom of that controversy. And the Emperor told the Jesuite that he fairly charged errors on them, and his mother faith *[seeing your Faith and ours do nothing differ, but are the same, why do you strive to trouble civil minds without cause?]* The Jesuite answereth, *I certainly as*

firm to your Majesty, that if you had no other Errors, this one, that you are separated from the Pope of Rome, the Vicar of Christ on Earth, is enough and too much to your everlasting destruction.

II. To this the replied, that *his* and *her* Country were subject to the Apostles Peter and Paul, and first to Christ himself. The Jesuite answered, I deny that they are subject to Christ, that are not subject to his Vicar. — Saith the, neither I nor mine deny obedience to St. Peter, we are now in the same Faith that we were in from the beginning, if that were your right: who first was the Pope, and Generations was there no man found that would waver on this right: — In the answers the Pope of Rome that is the Pastor of the whole Church of Christ, could not in the years past send Teachers into Abissia, &c. — She answered, To change the old Customs and Rites, and receive new ones, is a matter full of danger and offence. He answered, that their Faith was old and had nothing new, &c. p. 323, 324, 325. The Emperor also spake to the like purpose. p. 319, 320, 321.

So that it is confelld by the Jesuites and best information from *Abassia*. 1. That they abhorre or refuse the Papal Government. 2. And that for this they plead Tradition and Antiquity.

And the same is notorious of the *Greeks, Armenians*, and other Oriental Churches. How large they were in the East when *Jacobus de Vivriaco* was there I have formerly shewed out of his words, who faith that those Eastern Christians were more than either the *Greek* or *Latin* Church: and as the *Greeks* anathematize the Pope every year, so the rest are known to reject him. To say that these are *Herticks* and not the Church, is but to beg the question, and fitter for contempt than an answer. That all such rejecters of the Papacy are the same greatest part of professed Christians is past doubt. 2. And that *Greeks, Armenians*, &c. are *heretics* Tradition and the judgment and custom of their fore-fathers for what they hold, is as great proof, that I will not vainly waste time in citing authors to prove it. Even the *Papists* confess it when they tell us that these Churches joy with them in pleading for tradition.

Is not then the conference clear, which *W. F.* is so angry at? I know not what can be said against it, unless that both the *Greeks* and *Protestants* do confess that once they were under the Pope: but the *Greeks* say that they were never under him as Governor of the *whole Christian world*, set up by God, but as the *Primate* of one Empire set up by man, upon such reasons (the Seat of the Empire) as are alterable as well as unnecessary. I have proved this fully before, 1. From the words of the Council of *Calcedon*. 2. From their equaling and after preferring the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who pretended not to a *Divine Right* and that as over all the world; and they were not so proud as to set up a *humane Law*, above that which they believed to be divine; many other proofs I gave.

And even the Protestants hold that in rejecting the Papacy they follow the Tradition of the Church of Christ, however some Countreys where they live and their progenitors fell under the Papal error or terror.

There are some late Papists that think that what is held in this age was certainly held in the former, and that no Countreys Tradition can be false: Which is contrary to all experience. But if other Countreys Tradition may be false, so may the Roman.

Niceph. faith of the Armenians, [They do these things from Tradition, which reflect on no Reason; and their ancient Legislators and Doctors, do calumniously boast that Gregory the Bishop of great Armenia delivered them by hands, &c l. 18. c. 54.]

And the *Abassians* that received the Gospel from the Eunuch and *St. Matthew*, being before too much addicted to some Jewish ceremonies and never cured of them, retain them as by *Tradition* to this day.

And it is known how Tradition differed about Easter-day and the *Millenaries* opi-

By all this it is evident that most of the Christian world take the Religion which they hold to be that which by *Tradition* the Church received for the Apostles; and therefore most being against the *Papacy*, think *Tradition* is against it. And the Tradition of two parts of the Christian world, especially those next *Jerusalem*, is more regarded as such, than the Tradition of the third part only that is contrary; unless better *Historical proof* make a difference.

§. 29. 4. My 4th. proof was [*Many Churches without the virge of the Roman Empire never*

subjected themselves to Rome (and many not of many hundred years after Christ): Ergo there were visible Churches from the beginning to this day, that were not for the Roman Bishop.

To this he saith, If I can prove (as I have proved) that any one Extra-Imperial Church was subject to the Bishop of Rome, and you cannot show some evident reason why that was subject rather than all the rest, I convince by that the subjection of all. Now it is evident that the Churches of Spain, France, Britain, of France, and Germany, when divided from the Roman Empire, were as subject as the rest, &c.

Theodorick and his Successors were willing that Rome, when it was their regal seat, should claim the greatest power over the Churches of other Princes Dominions.

Ans. 1. Yes, and much more, Rome it self was then under Theodorick, and other Arian Goths; and those Rulers gave them their liberty herein, and being Heretics, no wonder if the Bishops chose to continue their former correspondency and Church-order, to strengthen themselves. Here is then a special reason why Rome felt and the rest of the Churches should voluntarily continue. 1. Their old custom, when under the Empire, had to let them. 2. Their strength and safety invited them. 3. It was their voluntary act.

2. But what's this to those many hundred years before, when the Empire was not so diminished? Though even till after *Gregorius* daies (an. 600) the Britains obeyed you not; yet I told you that when Pagans or Arians conquered any parts of the Empire, the Christians would still be as much under the old Christian power as they could: which made the Major Armenia, when subdued by the Persians, crave the Romans Civil Government, and revolt to the Emperor and kill their Magistrates, even when they were not governed by the Pope at all.

§. 30. Here he repeateth what he had frivolously said before of the Council of Nice (with an odd supposition as if India were in America) and then betaketh himself to prove out of the Fathers the Roman Sovereignty; but with such vain citations that I dare not tire the Reader, with repeating and particularly answering them. 1. They being at large answered by *Chamier*, *Whittakers*, and many other Protestants long ago; and many of them or most by my self in my key, and my former answer to him. 2. Because it is needless to him that will peruse the Authors and Histories themselves, and useless to him that will not. 3. This general answer is sufficient. 1. Part of them are the words of spurious books, as *St. Denis*, an interpolate Book of *Cyprian*, some new found *Chaldaick*, *Nicene* Canons, &c. 2. Part of them say nothing of the Pope, but only of *St. Peter*, as being the first of the Apostles, but not as the Governour of the rest. 3. Part, or almost all of them, speak only of an Imperial Primacy, that mention the Pope. 4. Part of them speak only of an honorary pre-eminence of Rome and the Church there. 5. Some speak only *de facto*, that at that time the Church of Rome had kept out the Arian, *Nestorian*, and *Eutychian* Heretics, more than the rest did (which was because they had more orthodox Emperours,) and therefore that those sects that then differed from them were not in the Right, nor in the Church. 6. Some are only the commendations of Eastern Bishops persecuted by the Arians in the East, that fled to Rome for shelter. 7. As high words are often given by Doctors and Councils themselves of *Cyrl* and other Bishops of *Alexandria*, and of Bishops of *Jerusalem*, *Antioch* and *Constantinople*, as those that are acquainted with Church-writings know. There needeth no longer confusion of his Citations.

§. 31. My fifth proof was, that The Eastern Churches within the Empire were never subjects of the Pope. He denyeth this Antecedent; I proved it (as formerly from the *Africans* Letters to *Celestinus*, and the words of *Basil*, &c.) So farther: 1. Because the Pope chose not the Patriarchs of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Jerusalem*, or *Constantinople*, nor the Bishops under them. 2. He did not ordain them, nor appoint any Vicar to do so, nor did they hold their power as under him: To both these he saith, [It was not necessary, &c.] But their Patriarchal power was from him.]

Ans. Prove that and you do something, but no man verifieth in Church-writings can believe you; I remember not to have met with any learned Papist that affirmeth it, (that the Pope set up the other four Patriarchs): it is notorious in history, that the Churches of *Jerusalem* and *Antioch* were before the Church of Rome, for *Alexandria*, *Antioch* and Rome were made Patriarchates together, and no one of them made the rest; and the other two were added since.

He proveth it because, he restored and deposed those Patriarchs as occasion required.

Ans. 1. Tell this to those that never read such writings, Princes and Councils did see them.

them up, and cast them out as they saw cause; it were tedious, (and needless to any but the ignorant) to recite the multitude of instances, through the reign of all the Christian Emperors till *Phocas* time; how little had the Pope to do in most of their affairs? 2. They frequently set up and deposed one another, (far often than the Pope did any;) Dorth that prove that they were Governours of each other accordingly? 3. Councils then judged all the Patriarchs Roman and all, as is notorious. 4. The Pope sometime when he saw his advantage, and saw one side striving against another; would set in to shew his ambition, as the prime Patriarch, to strengthen himself by such as needed him, and usually was against him that was likest to overtop him (as neighbour Princes in War are afraid of the strongest) and that was usually the Bishop of *Constantinople*.

3. I said They received no Laws of his to rule by. He replyeth The *Laws* and *Canons* of the Church they received, and those were confirmed by his authority.

Ans. But did he make them any *Laws* himself? by the Church your mean Councils; and those made *Laws* for him; therefore he was their subject. He had but a voice, and was not so much as a speaker in the Parliament: some Councils you confess he neither presided in, nor any for him (as *Binnius* confesseth of Council *Const.*) He had little to do in any of the Councils for 500 or 600 years, less by far than the other Patriarchs.

4. I said they were not commanded or judged by him. He replyeth I have evidenced they were commanded and judged by him. Ans. Reader, the solution of such historical controversies is by reading the histories themselves. Read thoroughly the histories of *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Soraxment*, *Theodoret*, *Evagrius*, *Procopius*, *Vidlor*, *Nicéphorus*, &c. and judge as you see fit, and as cause: especially if you will also read but the works of *Iræulian*, *Cyprian*, *Naxianzen*, *Basil*, *Hilary*, and the true Acts of the old Councils.

5. I added the equalizing the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, which he denyeth against the express words of the Council. I might add the after preferring the Bishop of *Constantinople*, cause the Emperor; is *Justinian's* making *Justiniana prima* and *secunda*, to be absolute and under no Patriarch, as was *Carthage*; and faith *Pe. 4. Marce* and many others, *Hiracles*, *Pontus* and *Asia* long. The managing of many Councils without him, and passing Canons (as *Calced.* and 28.) against him: The whole Council of *Ephes.* 2. going against his Legates, and that under a most pious and excellent Prince *Theodorus*. 2. that used *Cyrl* and made him President, *Ephes.* 1. and *Dionysius Ephes.* 2d. and countenance this Council against the Pope.

When *Zeno* carried on his *Henoticon* and *Anastolus* his Reconciliation, how little did he, or any of the Eastern Churches stick at the Popes dissent? No nor *Justinian* when he turned to the Heretic of the *Aphthartodocites*, and when he drag'd *Vigilius*, as some Historians say, with a rope; instances might be multiplied.

§. 32. My 6th proof of the novelty of the Papal Sovereignty was from the testimony of their own greatest Bishops, where I cited *Grig.* 1st. his words to plain and large against a Universal Bishop or Pastor, as plainer can scarce be spoke, and answered *Bellarmin* words against it; and I shall take the impartial Reader to need no more answer to it. I then even to read the words of *Gregory* themselves; only noting, that this *John of Constantinople* that claimed the title of Universal Bishop, was a man of more than ordinary mortification and contempt of worldly things; for his poverty and great fasting called, *Johannes jejunius*, and *Gregory* was of so little power himself (being then out of the Empire under other powers but that which no Bishop at all had right to. The case is most plain.

§. 33. My 7th proof was, The Papists themselves confess that multitudes of Christians, if not most by far; have been the opposers of the Pope, or none of his Subjects: Therefore there have been visible Churches of such.

To this [He granteth the antecedent of Christians not universally so called, but of no others.]

Ans. Here he intimateth that most of the professed Christians of the world were not universally Christians by profession, but equivocally only and who will easily believe such Teachers, as unchristen most of the Christian World. Any Sect may take that course; their fence is this, none are Christians indeed but only those that are subjects to the Pope; therefore all the Christian world.

world are his Subjects: Just so the Donatists, and some Foreign Anabaptists, take it but for granted, that none are Christians but those that are Baptized at Age; and then the Inference will be plausible, that all the Christian World is against Infant-Baptism.

§. 34. To *Aetia Sylvius* (Pope *Pius 2d.*) words, *that small regard was had to the Church of Rome, before the Nicene Council: He* replyeth, that he meaneth, not so small, as not to be the Head of all other Churches; *lest the Council of Nice had introduced a new Government.*

Ans. His words are plain, and all History of those times confirm them. No one Church, before the Council of *Nice*, had any Government over others, but what was for micer Concord, by free consent; at least, before *Constantine* gave it them. And in the Council of *Nice*, there is not a word that intimareth, that the Pope was Ruler of all the World of Christians; but his power is mentioned, as limited to his Precincts; and the like given to *Alexandria*. Yet Innovation, in giving power to Patriarchs, is no wonder in Councils: How else came *Constantinople* and *Jerusalem* to be Patriarchs? Was it not by Innovation?

§. 34. Next he saith, *I cite Goldastus; but where, the Lord knows.*

Ans. I perceive the Man is a stranger to *Goldastus*, who hath gathered a multitude of Old Writers against the Papacy, for Princes Rights, and bound them in many great Volumes, *De Monarchia, & Constitut. Imperial.* I cited no particular words, but all these great Volumes of many Authors of those times, shew the opposition to Papal Claims.

§. 35. His saying, *That the Schismatical Greeks were not univocal Christians*, is no more regardable than the *Greeks* Anathematizing *Papists*.

§. 36. My plain Testimony of their *Reverius*, *Armeniorum Ecclesia & Ethiopum & Indorum & cetera quas Apostoli convertunt non subsum Ecclesia Romanae.* He first cavils at my saying [were not under.] instead of [are not] not seeing that I only recited the Assertion, as uttered by *Reverius* so long ago; and must I not say, that he saith, *then they were not under*, if he so long ago say, *They are not?*

2. But he would persuade the Credulous, that this speaks of them but as Schismaticks; as *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, *Constantinople*, are not now under *Rome*, but have been.

Ans. But those that will be satisfied with forced abuse of words, may believe anything that a Priest will say. The context confuteh you: You do not pretend that *India* turned from you, and was under you. By the Churches Planted by the Apostles, he plainly meaneth those without the Empire, as being none of the Provinces put under the Bishop of *Rome* nor of old claimed by the Pope.

§. 37. I cited *Melch. Canus* words, *Loc. 1. 6. c. 7. fol. 201. Not only the Greeks, but almost all (or most) of the rest of the Bishops of the whole world have vehemently sought to destroy the Privileges of the Roman Church; and indeed they had on their side both the Arms of Emperors, and the greatest number of Churches; and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the one Roman Pope.*

To this, he saith, *That 1. Canus speaks of different times, not conjunctly. 2. And he taketh them not for univocal Christians.* And here he finds a Root of Rebellion, q. d. *Most of the Countries Rebelled against the King, Ergo, he had no Authority over them.*

Ans. Our Question here was only of the matter of Fact: Whether, *de facto*, most of the Bishops and Churches have not been against the Papacy? This *Canus* asserteth, therefore I seek no more. And when you have proved them no Christians, or Rebels, I shall consider your Proofs. 2. Had he meant only the most of the Bishops and Churches, *per vires*, it had signified nothing to his purpose: For that had been no strength, but might have been some inconsiderable Town at a time. 3. But that all Church-History may help us better to understand his words; that tell us oft it was [at once] specially when *Binnius* said, that at *Eph. 2. Concil.* only Peter's Ship escaped drowning.

As to his Cavil at my Translation, Whether [Ab aliis plerisque totius orbis Episcopis] be not to be Translated, if not [almost all the rest] at least [most of the rest of the Bishops of the whole world] rather than [very many others] I leave to the ordinary Readers Judgment.

And as for either *Canus* or his own saying, that all these (the Greeks and most of the Bishops of the whole world, the greater number of Churches, and the Armed Emperors, were all Schismaticks, Hereticks, and no Christians but Equivocally; it is no weak proof of the falshood of their Cause and Tyranny, that cannot stand without unchristening most of the Bishops

shops and Churches in the World, with such Emperours: *Canus* his confession of the Historical Truth may be pleaded by me, while I hate their Robbing Christ of the greatest part of his Church, because they are not the Popes.

§. 38. My Eighth Proof of the Novelty of the Papal Sovereignty, was from Historical Testimony, that the Papal Sovereignty was no part of the Churches Faith, nor owned by the Ancients: This is done at large by *Blouet de Primatu*, and *Pet. Moulin, de Novitate Papismi*, *Asher, Field*, of the Church, *lib. 5. Chaucer, Whitaker, Jo. White*, and many other. I instanced only in many Historians, *Regino, Heyman, Contract. Marian; Scotus, Benvenutus de Rambaldi*, and others; that say, *Phocas* first constituted (saith one, or) Boniface obtained of *Phocas* (say others) that the Church of *Rome* should be the Head of all Churches.

To this, 1. He thinks I have forgot my first Thesis, because he forgot that when I had proved by three Arguments my Thesis, in the fourth, to satisfy their importunity, I proved it with the Addition, that there hath been a Christian Church still visible that Obedyed not the Pope; and so added ten more Arguments to prove this Negative or Exclusionary part.

After he cometh to this again, and would have [ut Caput esset] to be no more than an acknowledgment of a controverted Title: But at least the *Primus constituit* confuteh that; and it is not at *diceretur, haberetur, or denuo esset*. He citeth *Platina*, as if it were a wonder for the Popes Household Servant to say, that it was his Right.

2. But I specially note, that both what is said of *Phocas*, and by him, of *Julianum, Gratian*, &c. who constitute and command this Primacy and Subjection to it, shew that it was but Imperial, as to bounds and Authority.

I before mentioned *Suarez* himself, in his Excellent Book, *De Legibus*, saying, *That God hath made no Laws of Church-policy: And if so, not of the Papacy.*

§. 39. I noted their Novelty out of *Platina*, in *Gregor.* saying, *What should I say more of this Holy Man? whose whole Institution of the Church-Office, specially the Old one, was Invented and Approved by him: which Order I would we did follow; then Learned Men would not at this day abhor the reading of the Office.*

Hence I Note, 1. That all their Church-Office was new, being *Gregory's* Invention (though, no doubt, much of the Matter had been in use before that form). 2. Therefore the maintainers of Tradition cannot prove that, because th-y thus Worship God now, therefore they always did so. 3. *Gregory's* Invented Office (hardly received in *Spain*) was so altered in *Platina's* time, that Learned Men abhorred the Reading of it. 4. Why might they not corrupt Church-Government (where Ambition had a thousand times greater baits) as well as Church-Offices? This is their Antiquity and consanquity: This *M. J.* thought meet in science to pass by.

§. 40. My Ninth Proof of the Novelty of the Papal Sovereignty, was, *If the Generality of Christians in the first Ages, and many (if not most) in the latter Ages have been free from the Essentials of the Papists Faith, then their Faith hath had no Successive Visible Church professing it in all Ages: (but the Christians, that are against it, have been Visible.) But the Antecedent is true: The Antecedent I proved in twelve Instances.*

To this he saith, *It followeth not, that though our Church, as Papal, had no Successive Visibility; the Church, whoso of the Protestants are Members, had ever since Christs time on Earth, a Successive Visibility: when you have proved this Consequence, I Oblige my self to answer your Instances; and so he durst not meddle with that matter, but puts it off.*

Ans. Reader, see here what an Issue our Dispute is brought to: Can you with a plain-er? I proved that our Religion, being nothing else but Christianity, our Church hath been still Visible, because it is confessed, that the Christian Church hath been still Visible. But the *Papists* must have us prove also, that our Church hath been still Visible, as without Popery. I now prove Popery a Novelty; and doth not that then fully prove my Consequence, that the Christian Church was Visible without it? And I prove, that this Novelty of Popery is yet received but by the third part of Christians (of whom I am persuaded ten to one are either compelled to profess what they believe not, or understand it not): Therefore the Christian Church was once wholly, and is yet mostly without Popery. I know not when a Cause is given up, if here he give not up his Cause.

§. 41. Twelve new Articles of the Papal Faith I named: 1. That the Pope is above all Generals

General-Council; Decreed at *Later.* and *Florence*. 2. Contrarily, That the Council is above the Pope, and may Judge him, &c. Decreed at *Basil* and *Constance*: True before, as a point of Humane Order, but not made ever an Article of Faith. 3. That the Pope may Depose Princes, and give their Dominions to others, if they exterminate not all their Subjects that deny Transubstantiation; Decreed at *Later.* *sub Innoc.* 3. 4. That the Body and Blood, together with the Soul and Divinity of our Lord *Jesus Christ*, is truly, and really, and substantially in the *Eucharist*; and that there is a change of the whole substance of Bread, into the Body, and of the whole substance of Wine, into the Blood, which they call Transubstantiation. Decreed at *Trent*, and proved new by *Ed. Albertinus*, Bishop *Cousin's* History of *Trent*, and by my self. 5. That the *Eucharist* is rightly given and taken under one kind (without the Cup.) Decreed at *Constance* and *Trent*. 6. That we must never take and Interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers. See the *Trent-Oath*; whereas, 1. We have no certainty whom to take for *Fathers* (a great part being called both Fathers and Heretics by the Papists.) 2. And they greatly disagree among themselves. 3. And have not unanimously given us any fence at all of a quarter of the Bible (if of the hundredth part.) 7. That there is a Purgatory, and that the Souls there detained, are helped by the Suffrages of the Faithful. 8. That the Holy Catholic Church of *Rome* is the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, (and yet it is the Catholic, that is, the whole itself.) 9. That Traditions are to be received with equal pious Affection and Reverence as the Holy Scripture. 10. That the Virgin *Mary* was conceived without Original Sin: Decreed at *Basil*. 11. That the people may not read the Scripture Translated into a known Tongue, without a special License. 12. That the Books of *Maccabees*, and other such, are part of the Canon of Faith; (against which, see Bishop *Cousins*, and Dr. *Jo. Reynolds*.)

See in Dr. *Challenor's* *Credo Eccles. Cath.* sixteen of their Novelties.

See *Dallaus*, *De cultu Latinorum*, their Worship proved new.

All this *us. 7.* passeth over.

S. 42. My Tenth Argument was, If multitudes (yea, the far greatest part) of Christians in all Ages, have been Ignorant of Popery, but not of Christianity; then there hath been a Succession of Visible Professors of Christianity, that were no Papists: But the Antecedent is true; *Exgo*, &c.

Here I brought full proof of the Antecedent: 1. From the Ignorance which they themselves accuse the *Aethiopians*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, *Russians*, &c. of; and the Protestants also. 2. The known Ignorance of the far most of the Vulgar, in their own Church. 3. The Papists' charge on the Council of *Chalcedon* and others, about their power. 4. The difference of the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*, and *Later.* and *Florence*, about their Essentials. 5. The large proof brought by Dr. *Field*, *Append. l. 3.* *Pottier*, p. 68. (Bishop *Morton* *Apolog.*)

To this, he Answers as to the last, by notorious giving up his cause, neither granting nor denying, That there hath been a Succession of Visible Professors of Christianity that were no Papists; which he saith, is all that I prove.

Answer. And what need I more? Is not the Succession of the Church, as Christian, granted by him? Therefore, if I prove it also Successively Christian without Popery, I know not what else the Man would have.

But he saith, *Arrians* may say so too.

Answer. *Arrians* are not Christians. If his meaning be, that, besides our rejecting Popery, we have some other Heresy which unchristeneth us. 1. That's nothing against my Argument, which is but *Christians' Visibility*. 2. Why did he never tell us what that Heresy is? Would he not, if he could? And was he not concerned to do it? 3. It's known, that it is our rejecting Popery; that is the Heresy they charge us with; as to any other, we defend their Accusation. And 4. If any individual person be Accused, let it be proved: Our Religion Objective is justified by themselves from Heresy, and all positive Error: For it is nothing but the Sacramental Covenant, briefly explained in the Creed, Lords Prayer, and Decalogue; in the Essentials, and in that and the Integrals all the Canonical Scriptures: So that our proof of our Churches' Visibility, as Christian, and not Papist, is all that Reason can require of us: And to this Task is done.

S. 43. After

S. 43. After these Arguments, I added some Testimonies of Historians, which shew how *Much-Came* words, *de facto*, are to be understood; and how the word [Catholic Church] was then taken; and how small a party the Papal Sovereignty had in the very worst times, viz.

Rog. Hovenden & Mat. Paris, in H. 2. shew, that it was, *Avias leges consuetudinis Anglie*, which the Pope here Damned, and Anathematized all that favoured and observed them. Here is Tradition, Antiquity, and the immutability of Rome.

The German History, collected by *Rubeus*, *Pistorius*, *Freberus*, and *Goldastus*, fully shew, That the Papal Tyranny only kept under by a Turbulent Faction, the greater part by fraud and force, which never consented to them.

The Apology of Hen. 4. the Emperor, in M. *Freberus*, To. 1. p. 178. saith, "Behold Pope *Hildebrand's* Bishops, when doubtless they are Murderers of Souls and Bodies; such as deservedly are called the Synagogue of Satan: — Yet they write, that on his and on their party, is the Holy Mother-Church. When the Catholic, that is, the Universal Church, is not in the Schism of any * Side (or Party) but in the Universality of the Faithful agreeing together by the Spirit of Peace and Charity — And p. 179. "See how the Minister * Where of the Devil is besides himself, and would draw us with him into the Ditch of per-was it a ditch: Who writeth, that God's Holy Priesthood is with only thirteen (N. B.) or few more then? Bishops of *Hildebrand's*; and that the Priesthood of all the rest through the World are separated from the Church of God (our Mr. W. J. would say, that only these thirteen Bishops were *Antiochian Christians*;) when certainly, not only the Testimony of *Gregory* and there was *Innocent*, but the Judgment of all the Holy Fathers agree with that of *Cyprian* — that nothing he is an Alien, profane, an Enemy, that he cannot have God for his Father, that holds but "not the Unity of the Church: — And p. 181. But some that go out from us, say, and Schismatists write, that they defend the party of *Gregory*; not the whole, which is Christ's, which among various is the Catholic Church of Christ (so the Catholic Church and the Popes Set are different.) And p. 180. But our Adversaries (that went from us N. B.) not we from them) Popes at use thus to commend themselves — We are the Catholics; We are in the Unity of the Church. So the Writer calls them [Catholics] and us, that hold the Faith of the Holy Fathers, that consent with all good Men, that love Peace and Brotherhood, — Us he calls Schismatics, and Heretics, and Excommunicate, because we resist not the King, — He addeth, out of *Isidore*, Etymol. l. 8. "The Church is called Catholic, because it is not as the Conventicles of Heretics, confined in certain Countries, but diffused through the whole World: Therefore they have not the Catholic Faith, that are in a part, and not in the whole, which Christ hath Redeemed, and must Reign with Christ: They that confess in the Creed, that they believe in the Holy Catholic Church, and being divided into Parties, hold not the Unity of the Church; which Unity, Believers being of one Heart and Soul, properly belongs to the Catholic Church. So far this Apol. of the Emperor.

Here you see what the Catholic Church is; and that the *Papalines* were then a little Set of thirteen, or a few more, Bishops. And now, Reader, open thine Eyes and Judge, whether the Emperor, and all the rest of the Western Churches, besides all the rest (a greater part) of the Christian Word, are therefore no *Univocal* (but *Equivocal*) Christians, because a Papal Faction, and an Equivocating Jesuite may call them so. All this the prudent Disputer thought best to Answer by silence.

S. 44. I added (because of their noise of Heresies charged on the *Abassines*, *Syrians*, *Armenians*, *Greeks*, *Protestants*, &c.) 1. That they differ in greater matters, yea, *de fide*, than many things which they call Heresies are. 1. I repeated the differences of their Councils (*Confl.* and *Basil* against *Later.* and *Florence*, &c.) 2. *Pignius* words, *Hierarch. Eccl. l. 6.* That these Councils went against the undoubted Faith and Judgment of the Orthodox Church itself. 3. That St. *Thomas Aquinas*, and other Doctors, differ from the second Council of *Nice*, in holding the Cross and Image of Christ to be worshipped with *Latria*. 4. I added a large Testimony of the Theological Faculty of *Paris*, under their Great Seal, against one *Job. de Montfione ordinis predic.* recited in the end of *Lombard*; Printed at *Paris*, 1557. p. 426. where they shew, that (though *Thom. Aquinas* was a Canonized Saint) we may believe that part of his Doctrine was Heretical. And the same they say of *Cyprian*, *Jerome*, &c.

Jerome, Augustine, Lombard, Gratian, Anselm, Hugo de St. Victor, &c. To all this he Answereth by Silence.

S. 45. At last (in vain) I importuned him to prove the perpetual Visibillity of their Papacy (but could not prevail) citing their Authors that make the Pope to be the Church, and the whole strength of Councils.

S. 46. I added a few Miscellaneous Testimonies against their Foundations.

1. The first Council of Ephes. under Cyril, in *Epist. ad Nestor. in Pet. Crab. Tom. 1. fol. 515.* Petrus & Johannes aequales sunt ad alterutrum dignitatis.

2. Bishop Bromhal's citation of *Comment. in Epist. synodal. Basil. p. 31. & 40. Impri. Colon. 1613.* saying, The Provinces Subject to the four great Patriarchs, from the beginning did know no other Supreme, but their own Patriarchs: — And if the Pope be a Patriarch, it is by the Church, &c.

3. Cassander, *Epist. 37. D. Zimnio* (p. 1132.) saith, of Monucius, the Bishop of Valentia (highly praised by Irenaeus, &c.) that he said, "Si sibi permittatur in his tribus capitulis, uti forma publicarum precum de ritibus baptisimi, de forma Eucharistiae, five missae, Christianam formam ad normam praese ecclesiae instituat, &c. confidere se quod ex quinque, ginta millibus quos habet in sua Dioecesi ad praesentem disciplinam ecclesiae adversus quadraginta millia ad Ecclesiasticum unionem, sit reducturus." Here you see what their Antiquity and Tradition is.

4. A closer passage I noted out of Cassander, *Epist. 42. p. 1138.* To all this I find no Reply.

S. 47. In the conclusion, I Answered a late paper that I received from him, wherein he humbly intreateth me to declare my Opinion more fully, whether any professed Hereticks, properly so called, are true parts of the universal Visible Church of Christ, so that they compose one universal Church with the other Visible parts.

I wrote him so plain and full an Answer to this, that I shall only refer the Reader to the perusal of it, instead of any defence.

To this he concludeth with such a Discourse, that would make a Man lament that such distracted stuff should be thought sufficient to deceive poor Souls. He rants at me for distinguishing fluff: He must have had me directly Answer his Question with *Yes* or *May*; and instead of Answering, ad rem, to have entered an idle controversy with him, which of all the sorts commonly called Hereticks, are properly so called. And when no Man can resolve us, whether [properly so called] must be expounded by Etymology, or by the Canon; and by what Canon? Or by the Fathers Catalogues, and by which Fathers (Epiphanius, Philastrius, Augustine, &c.) or by common custom, or by the Pope? How should ever this idle controversy of [properly so called] have ever come to any Resolution, unless by making himself the Judge.

Yet could the Man absurdly say to me, "We are not agreed what the universal Visible Church is: what of that? Are we not agreed there is such a thing? Think you or I what we will of the definition of it, 'tis sufficient to give an Answer, pro or con, to my Question, whether Hereticks be true Members of the Church: And it will be time enough to explicate what you mean by the universal Church, when your Answer is impugned." See you not again, that whatsoever you or I understand by [Heretick properly so called] we both agree that there are Hereticks properly so called; and that's enough to Answer my Question, &c.

Answ. It would be irksome to Answer such a Man (if I knew whether this came from Ignorance or Dishonesty) were it not for the necessity of the simple. Is it not a wearisome thing to talk with a Man that must have a Disputation upon terms, whose fence we are disagreed of, and that abhorreth explication of doubtful words? As if, when the Question is, Whether *Canis*, properly so called, do generate, or do give suck? And I distinguish of *Canis caelestis* & *Terrivis*, and of *Canis Mas* & *femina*, and say, that only *Canis Terrivis* Genereth, and only *Canis femina* giveth suck. He should have ranted at me for distinguishing, and said, *We are agreed, that Canis there is, properly so called; and therefore you should Answer without distinguishing.* Let him that studyeth deceit, dwell in darkness, and choose

Confu-

Confusion, but he shall not so draw me from the Light, and cheat me into a foolish Game at Words.

S. 48. But seeing he will not endure a distinction of Heresies, nor tell us how we may know which are properly so called, I must suppose that he would have me Judge by the Men that Ancient Catalogues or Rolls, or else by the *Popes*, or by the Council's nominations. are so quick in

dammning and avoiding Men, as Hereticks, for a word not understood, can keep Communion with wickedness freely. Pope Gregory 2d. wrote to Boniface, who asked him, whether he should eat and drink with Debauched Priests and Bishops, that he should Admonish them to attend; but if they would not, yet not avoid Familiarity with them, it being likelier to reclaim them. And ordinarily Drunkards were endured.

Read the Epistles of Pope Zachary to Boniface, seconding Gregory's, bidding him not avoid wicked Livers, that are Orthodox, but all Hereticks: And one Heretic was holding that there are Antipodes.

Reader, I will give thee but a little touch out of the Ancient Catalogue of St. Philastrius, and Judge whether all his Hereticks are damned or unchristened.

I. Of the Hereticks since the Apostles: The eleventh were those that kept not *Easter* at the right time, (for which *Vistor* would have the *Asian* Churches Excommunicate; but *Irenaeus* as well as *Socrates* and *Zozomenus*, &c. thought much otherwise of the case.) Our Old Britains and Scots then were all out of the Church.

II. His twelfth Heretic is that of the *Milkenarius*, and so a great part of the Holy Fathers, before the Council of Nice, were Hereticks.

III. His twenty seventh Heretic is, of those called *Artozyrite*, for Offering Bread and Cheese at the Oblation.

IV. His 28 Heretic is, of the *Ascodrogeite*, that in the Church set *New Vessels*, and put *New Wine* into them.

V. The 29th sort of Hereticks are called *Passalorinichite*, that put their Fingers on their Mouths, and imposed silence on themselves (it's like with limitation, else they could not converse with Men.)

VI. 30. Some thought, that all Prophets ended not with Christ.

VII. The 33d. is the *Excalcatorum*, that were for going without shoes (like some Fryars.)

VIII. The 34th. was that of *Novatus*, who (erroneously) thought, that those that denied Christ, or Sacrificed, or Offered to the Heathens Idols after Baptism, might be pardoned indeed by God, but not received again into the Church: Differing but one step till they are dying, and to some at Death.

IX. The 41. Hereticks thought, the Epistle to the Hebrews was not Written by Paul, but by Barnabas, or Clement; and the Epistle to Laodicea, by St. Luke.

X. The 42. are the (Orthodox) *Melitanian*, that Communicated with the Catholics, and some Hereticks too.

XI. The 45. Heretic doubted of the diversity of the Heavens.

XII. The 47. Heretic being Ignorant that there is another common Earth invisible, which is the Matrix of all things, do think that there is no Earth but this one.

XIII. The 48 Heretic thought, that Water was the common Matter, and was always, and not made with the Earth.

XIV. The 49 Heretic denied, that the Soul was made before the Body, and the Body after joyned to it; and did believe, that God's making them Male and Female first, was to * So Jacob Beth- * male; and the Soul was made the sixth day, and the Body the seventh. men.

XV. The 50 Heretic thought, that not only Grace, but also the Soul it self, was by God breathed into Man.

XVI. The 51 Heretic is *Origen's*, that thought our Souls were first Coelestial Intellects, before they were incorporate Souls.

XVII. The 52. thought, that Brutes had some Reason.

XVIII. The 54. thought, Earthquakes had a Natural cause.
 XIX. The 55 Hereſie Learned of *Tismigius*, to call the Stars by the Names of Living Creatures (as all Aſtronomers do.)

XX. The 56 Hereſie thought, that there were not many Languages before the Confuſion at Babel.

XXI. The 57 Hereſie thought, that the name of a [Tongue] proceeded firſt of the Jews, or of the Pagans.

XXII. The 58 Hereſie doubted of the Years and time of Chriſt.

XXIII. The 59 Hereſie thought (as did many of the Ancient Fathers) that Angels begat Giants of Women, before the Flood.

XXIV. The 61 was, that Chriſtians were after Jews and Pagans.

XXV. The 62 Hereſie ſaith, that Pagans are Born Naturally, but not Chriſtians; that is, that the Soul and Body of man are not daily Created by Chriſt, but by Nature.

XXVI. The 63 Hereſie ſaid, that the number of Years from the Creation, was uncertain, and unknown.

XXVII. The 64 thought, that the Names of the Days of Weeks, Sunday, Monday, (Lune, &c.) were made by God firſt, and not by Pagans; as being named from the Planets (an Error no doubt.)

XXVIII. The 66 Hereſie was, that Adam and Eve were blind, till God opened their Eyes to ſee their Nakedneſs.

XXIX. The 67 Hereſie imputeth the ſins of Parents to their Children (of which, ſee my Diſputations of Original ſin.)

XXX. The 68 Hereſie was, of ſome troubled about the Book of Deuteronomy.

XXXI. The 69 Hereſie thought, that thoſe that were Sanctified in the Womb, were Conceived in ſin.

XXXII. The 70 Hereſie did miſtake about the diviſion of the World, thinking it was Deſcribed firſt by the *Greeks, Egyptians, and Perſians*, when it was done by Noah, &c.

XXXIII. The 71 Hereſie thought, that there was a former Flood, under Deucalion and Pyrrha.

XXXIV. The 72 Hereſie ſaith, that Men are according to the twelve Signs in the Zodiac, not knowing that thoſe twelve Signs of the Zodiac are divers Climates, and habitable Regions of the Earth.

XXXV. It's well that he makes it the 74 Hereſie, that Chriſt deſcended into Hell, to offer Repentance there to Sinners, contrary to *in Inferno quis conſtitutus ſibi?*

XXXVI. The 75 Hereſie doubted of the Nature of the Soul, thinking it was made of Fire, &c. (as many *Greek* Fathers did.)

XXXVII. The 77 Hereſie is, about God's hardening Pharaoh, &c. where the *Dominions* are deſcribed.

XXXVIII. The 79 Hereſie is, that the *Psalms* were not made by David. (It was David that ſaid, *By the Rivers of Babylon we ſate down and wept; when we remembered Sion*; and that deſcribed all the Temple-matters before the Temple was made, and the Captivity, and the Return.) And this Hereſie denyeth the equality of the *Psalms*, as if they were not all written and placed in the Order that the things were done. (dangerous Hereſie.)

XXXIX. The 80 Hereſie thought, that God's words to Cain. [Thou ſhalt Rule over him] were properly to be underſtood, whereas the meaning was, Thou ſhalt Rule over thy own Evil thoughts, that are in thy own ſtrength.

XL. The 81 Hereſie did not well underſtand the Reaſon of God's words to Cain, giving him Life.

XLI. The 82 Hereſie did think, that the Stars in the Heavens had their fixed place and courſe, not underſtanding that the Stars are every Night brought out of ſome ſecret place, and ſet up for their uſe (as a Man-lighteth up Candles for his Houſe) and at Morning return to their ſecret place again, Angels being Preſidents and Diſpoſers of them (as Servants of the Candles in a Houſe.)

XLII. The 83 Hereſie doubted (as ſome late Expoſitors) of the Book of Canticles, left it had a carnal ſence.

XLIII. The 85 Hereſie thought, that the Soul of Man was Naturally God's Image, before Creation.

XLIV. The

XLIV. The 87 Hereſie thought that really four living creatures mentioned in the Prophets praised God.

XLV. The 88 Hereſie thought the Levitical feaſts were literally to be underſtood, not Council, knowing that it was the eight feaſts of the Church that was meant.

XLVI. The 90 Hereſie preferred the Tranſlation of *Aquila* before the *Septuagint*. Roman, ſub Zecha. an.

XLVII. The 91 preferred a Tranſlation of thirty men before the *Septuagint*. 743. ana.

XLVIII. The 92 Hereſie preferred another Tranſlation of ſix men before the *Septuagint*. thema.

XLIX. Another Hereſie preferred the Tranſlation of *Theodotion* and *Symachus* before the *tizech Septuagint*.

L. The 94th Hereſie preferred the Scriptures found in a veſſel after the Captivity, Monk that pre- before the *Septuagint*. Clerk or

LI. The 96 Hereſie thought that *Melchizedek* had no Father or Mother, not perceiving ſumeth, that it was ſpoken of him as Learning that which his Father and Mother never taught him. comam

LII. The 97 Hereſie hold that the Prophet *Zachary* of Faſts, is to be properly under- laxatz, ſtood, when it is but for the four Faſts of the Church, viz. Chriſtmas, Eaſter, Epiphany, to wear long hair.

LIII. The 98 Hereſie, holdeth that *Solomons* great number of Wives and Concubines is literally to be underſtood, but it is of diverſity of gifts in the Church.

LIV. The 100th. Hereſie thought that the meaſuring cord in *Zachary* was to be under- ſtood of meaſuring *Jeruſalem* literally, when it meant the choice of Believers.

LV. The 101 Hereſie not underſtanding the myſtical ſence of the Cherubim and Seraphim. in *Iſaiab*, are troubled about it and in doubt: (which myſtical ſence is myſtically there opened.)

LVI. The laſt Hereſie think that one of the Cherubims came to *Iſaiab*, and with a coal Pope Za- touched his Lips, and that it was an Angel or Animal with fire; when it is two Teſtaments, chary tells and the fire is Gods Grace.

3. p. 209.) How dangerous it is and bad for Chriſtians to eat Javes, and Rooks, and Badgers, and Hares, and Wood-horſes. And he tells him when Lard muſt be eaten, viz. not before its dried in.

the ſmoak or boiled on the fire: or if it be eaten unboiled, it muſt not be till after Eaſter. Alſo how- there muſt be three great lamps, ſet in a ſecret place of the Church after the ſimilitude of the Taber- nacle, which muſt be kept burning, and others at Baptiſms lighted by them.

Reader, wouldſt thou have yet more unchriſtend and damned than all theſe? I will now go over all *Epiphanius*'s catalogue left I tire thee. Doſt thou not perceive in this hereti- eating ſpirit, a great deal of mans Pride and Ignorance (that I ſay not ſury) and of Gods cuſt,

and Satans triumph?

§. 49. But all this is but jeſting in comparison of the confuſion and bloody ſtir that Coun- cils and their adherents made about Hereſie; condemning and curſing one another: The Hiſtory of which is one of the greateſt ſcandals on the Chriſtian Religion that ever beſell it ſince its Being. I purpoſe, if God enable me, to write more reaſonably of this ſubject; and not to drown it in ſuch a rambling diſpute as with this man.

In the mean time if you get a book of *David De rodons de ſuppoſite*, proving *Nestorius* Orthodox, and *Cyril*, and the firſt Council of *Ephesus* as well as the 2d. to be Hereticks, even *Eutychians*, with *Celeſtine* and many other Popes and Ancients, it will ſhew you that which is not commonly obſerved: I thought for my part I am perſwaded that that which is not commonly obſerved: is wronged (but Gods judgment was juſt for his over ſereneſs againſt others as Hereticks) ſo *Cyril, Eutychus, Diſcorus*, (all of a mind no doubt) on one ſide, and the Orthodox on the other; did all three Parties (for the generality of them) differ but in ſecond notions and words, for want of ſkill to diſcuſs ambiguity, or of patience and impartiality to hear: each others explications.

§. 50. And if yet Hereticks are all out of the Church, think what a caſe the Church is in when the *Abſinines, Copſis, Arminians, Syrians, Jacobites, Neſtorians, Eutychians*, &c.) and the Greeks and Proteſtants are Hereticked by the Papiffs; and the Papiffs curſt and ex- communicated by the *Greeks* and others: and *Marcellinus, Honorius, Liberius*, and many other Popes Hereticked by Fathers, or Councils; yea *John 23, Eugenius 4th* and others.

condemned as Hereticks of the most odious sort by Councils, and the Pope being an Essential part of the Church, the Church consequently hereticated or damned with them : and so all this mans arguments are to prove that the Popes and their party were none of the Church as being properly called hereticks, if Councils know who are properly so called.

§ 51. But if yet this be not enough by that time, you have considered how many Councils have hereticated one another, and so the Church Hereticated the Church, you will think that they left no Church on Earth.

§ 52. But if you go yet further and mark how the Councils at *Lateran* and *Trent* have hereticated all that believe their own or other mens fencences (that bread is bread and wine is wine,) and judged such to extermination or flames, you may doubt whether they have not hereticated and damned Man as Man, making Humanity and Sense a Heresie.

§ 53. In all this I advise all to be truly tender of every truth of God, and enemies to all Error ; but, Reader, if thou discernest not, that when Satan could not turn all men from practical Faith and Holiness, by worldly interest and fleshy lusts ; how he made it his last game to make Religion a game at words, or rather a word-warre, or a *Logomachie*, and to destroy the Love of God and Man, the life of Christianity and Concord, Peace and Humanity it self, by pretence of *Orthodoxie* and *Truth*, and contending for the Faith : and how the Proud, and Worldly, and Ignorant part of the Clergy, become the Plague and Fire-brands of the Church, by pretending zeal against Heresies and Errors ; and if thy Soul lament not the doleful mischiefs which the Church hath by this plague endured, thou seest not with my Eyes, nor feelst with my Heart : which I speak with freedom and constrained grief, while I doubt not but these firebrands that have Hereticated *Papists*, *Jesuits*, *Irregulars*, *Clement Alexand.*, *Origen*, *Dionys. Alexand.*, *Tertullian*, *Cyprian*, *Tatianus*, *Athenagoras*, *Lactantius*, *Chrysostom*, *Eusebius*, *Socrates*, *Socumen*, *Rufinus*, *Cassianus*, *Hilary Pictav.*, *Hilary Ayrat.* and abundance more such, will Hereticate me also, were it but for lamenting their rage.

§ 54. But our Champion *W. J.* (having vented his Spleen on the by, about ministers favouring of Rebels, with some false insinuations as if he thought we had never read the Councils, and Epistles, and Warres, nor all the expresse citations of the *Papists* Doctrine of King-killing gathered in folio by *Hen. Fowles* of *Pop. Treasons*) cometh to prove by argument that *Hereticks properly so called are no members of the Church.*

Before I answer them, I intreat him to tell me, 1. Whether then those many *Papists* Doctors are, members of the Church that maintain the contrary. 2. Whether their Church be well agreed in it self. 3. Why the Baptism of Hereticks (that change not the form) is counted valid, and *Cyprian* accounted Errorous for denying it ? Yea and the ordination of Hereticks too. But yet I grant him that Hereticks are out of the Church that knowingly deny any Essential part of Christianity.

§ 55. His first Argument is from *Tit. 3. 10, 11.*

Apoc. 1. Paul bid, 2 Thess. 3. avoid disorderly walkers, and yet to admonish them as brethren.

2. But I grant it of such Hereticks as *Paul* there speaks of ; make him the judge of your [properly so called] and we shall agree. Yea I grant it of such as *John 23. Eugenius* 4th. and many other Popes have been ; and I doubt whether I may not grant it you of a true knowing *Papist* as such.

§ 56. His 2d. Argument is from *1 John 2. 19. They went out from us, &c.*

Apoc. 1. But it's said they were not of us. 2. Some go out from particular concordant Churches, that go not from the whole Church. 3. But we grant it, for all that, of such proper Hereticks as *St. John* mentioned. Call no other Hereticks and we agree with you:

§ 57. His next Argument is from *2 John v. 9, 10, 11.*

*Apoc. Of such also we never deny it, but all that speak against any less necessary point of Scripture or Tradition, be not the deniers of Christianity, called the doctrine of Christ. If they be, all men living are like to be Hereticks, but specially the *Papists*.*

§ 58. Next he referreth me to their dispute against *Dr. Gunning* and *Dr. Pearson* called *Schism unmarked* ; which I have perused to little purpose. And then he citeth divers Fathers, which I have not the vanity to answer to a man that will not first agree what we mean by Hereticks, it being true of many so called by the Fathers, and false of others ; even such as

Phila-

Philastrius hath named : I believe the *Novatians* erred, and yet as farre as I can discern by history, if serious piety be the way to heaven, I think it probable that proportionably to their different numbers, there are more of the *Novatians* in heaven than of their adversaries.

§ 59. He repeateth his Reason, because all Hereticks evacuate the formal object of Faith.

Apoc. 1. I dare say I have sufficiently answered that. 2. I grant that none is a Christian that doth not believe that God cannot lie, and that his word is all true.

§ 60. But he saith, Though Hereticks proudly persuade and delude themselves, that they assert for the infallible authority of God to such Articles as they believe, yet they attribute not an infallible authority to God, because what they believe not, is sufficiently proposed.

Apoc. If this be not fully answered, let it prevail. Must the Christian world be Hereticated by such fortifish stuff as this. 1. When will he make me know how his sufficient proposals may be discerned. 2. And how the Hereticaters can know the sufficiency of the proposals to others ? Even many Kingdoms of men that they never saw : seeing variety of Capacities, Opportunities, Educations, Temptations, &c. maketh that insufficient to one that is sufficient to another. 3. When will he prove that the plainest Scripture is no sufficient proposal, till the credit of the *Papal* Clergy make it so : and yet that the obscure volumes of militant Councils (that curse one another) are sufficient proposals. 4. Or that the word of a Jesuite is a sufficient notice to us, what is in the Councils ? or what is their sense. 5. Or who shall expound dark Councils to us, when there are no Councils in our age in Being. 6. How shall we know that a culpable neglect of a sufficient proposal (through prejudice or temptation) may never stand with Faith ? If so, is there any man living that is not an Infidel or Heretic ? I challenge any man living to dare to make good, that he never erred or doth erre in any point revealed in Scripture or Councils, against sufficient proposal (taking [sufficiency] as it is commonly in the controversy of [sufficient Grace]). What if a man through culpable negligence, know not how many years it was from *Adam* to the flood, or know not who was the Father of *Arphaxad*, &c. when there are sufficiently proposed ? Doth this prove that he believeth not Gods Veracity ? As if there were not other sin that could frustrate any one sufficient proposal.

7. But it is the fate of rash condemnners to condemn themselves most notoriously ; If the plain words of Scripture, in the institution of the Cup in the Eucharist, against praying in an unknown tongue, &c. If the sensible evidence of Bread and Wine to all found Senses putes as this of *W. J.* and others like him ; nor the Cant of [the Church and all the world] by a partial Sect ; but if Scripture, the Tradition and Judgment of the most of Christians, condemned as Hereticks, to be avoided by all good Christians. But I have more Charity for some of them, than herein they exercise to themselves, (or others.)

And in particular I will be so far from partiality, as to profess that though *Pope Honorius* was an anathematized Heretic in the judgment of the 6th. and other General Councils, and of his Successors Popes, I am not one of those that take him really for such, in *W. J.* sense ; as held a Doctrine that did unchristen him. Nay I take his Epistles to *Sergius* read from a Pope, except some of *Leo's*, and few more ; and I think that his counsel for to avoid contention, to forbear both the name of [Two operations] and of [one operation] and leave it to Grammarians, and hold to plain Scripture-words, was honest counsel. And the heretivating of him and the rest by that Council increaseth not my veneration, but my great dislike of Hereticating Councils and the factions of the Bishops : it was not long after (under the Emperor *Philippicus*) when another General Council for great, as it's said it consisted of Innumerable Bishops at *Constantinople*, revoked, undid, and destroyed all this that was done against *Honorius* and the *Monothelites* at the said 6th. Council ; so ordinarily did General Councils condemn each other.

But what I say in excuse of *Honorius*, I must say also in excuse of *Sergius Constant.* For he said but the same that *Honorius* did, viz. that he would have had the controversy, and the names of [Two] or [One] Operation laid by ; and yet *Binnus* can call *Sergius* a lying Heretic, while he (with others) excuseth *Honorius* for the same.

And on this occasion, I will conclude with a note out of the two Epistles of *Cyrus* to *Sergius*.

gus, read in the same 6th. General Council ; which hath this title : "*Deo honorabili meo*
"Domino benigno, Principi Paſtorum, Patri Patrum, univerſali Patriarchæ Sergio à Cyro humili
"uſtro. I would know whether the Pope can ſhew that ever any one of his Predeceſſors
 had higher titles given him than theſe. And if theſe prove not an univerſal Sovereignty of
 the Patriarch of *Conſtantinople*, whether the like or leſs will prove it for *Rome* ? if you ſay
 that it was but an Heretick that gave it him: I anſwer 1. That's nothing to the matter in hand.
 2. He was but ſuch a harmleſs Heretick as *Honorius*. 3. The Council reprehended not the
 title. Many ſuch inſtances might be given of as high titles given to *Jeruſalem, Alexandria,*
Antioch, Conſtantinople, as *Rome* pretendeth for the proof of its Univerſal-church-monarchy.
 And if it prove no ſuch power in others, it proveth it not in the Pope.

F I N I S.
