Binnins page 43:79.96. And Pope Eugenins owned this Council ibid.page 4.2. And for the Council of Conflance, Martin the fifth was cholen by it, and prefent in it, and perfonally confirmed it in these words [Qued omnia & fingula determinata, conclufa, & decreta, in materiis fidei per prafens concilium, concliariter tenere & invisiabiliter observare velebat, & nunquam contraire queque mode. Ipfaq; sic conciliariter fatta approbat & ratificat, & non aliter, nec alio mode] (that is, what they did as a Council, and not what private members did) you fee then even General Councils reprefenting the Catholick Church do not only fay that a Council is above the Pope, but make it an Article of faith, and damn these that deny it. (What then is become of Bellarmine and the rest of their champions?)

But perhaps you'l fay, they are but few on the other fide. I answer: yes: Not only most Popes, and the Italian Clergy, and the predominant party of Papilts, but another General Council, even that at the Lateran, under Julius 2. and Leo 10. expressly determine on the contrary, that the Pope is above a General Council. So that here is not only an undenyable proof that General Councils are fallible by their contradicting each other, and that there is a Neceffity of rejecting fome of them, and confequently that the Foundation of Popery is rotten; but also here is one Reprefentative Catholick Church against another Reprefentative Catholick Church, and one Council for one Species of Soveraignty, and another for another Species of Soveraignty. So that undoubtedly it is not the fame Church, that had two heads of feveral forts.

2. And the Nations that are on both fides to this day, are a proof beyond denyall of their division. The French on one fide, and the Italians on the other, and other nations divided between both. So that the thing which they call by one name, is two indeed. But so is not the true Catholick Church.

Object. What though some in England took the King to be the Soveraign, and some the Parliament, and soom thought it was in both (enjunct; did this prove that you were more than one Common mealth?

Anfw. Where the Soveraignty is mixt and not in either alone, if any one shall fet up the one as the only Soveraign, and subject the other to them, they change the form of the Commonwealth, but

do not fet up two Commonwcalths; but if half take one for the Soveraign, and the other half take the other for the Soveraign, they plainly divide the Commonwealth into two : if they do it only in mind, and the fecret thoughts of their hearts, this cannot be known to others, and fo cannot be the ground of a Society : but if they do it by a publike confent and practice, they evidently make two Commonwealths. What elfe brought us into a war which ended not till one party was fubdued ? It is not poffible that one Political body fhould have two Soveraigns fpecifically diffinct. Indeed it may have five hundred natural perfons in the Soveraignty (as in a Senate;) but they are but one Political person, or one summa potestas.

2. But I prove the Minor by another Argument. Where there are two three or four Heads or Soveraigns at once numerically distinct, there are two or three or four Churches. But the Roman Church pretending to be Catholike, hathhad two or three or four Heads at once numerically distinct; therefore it was two or three or four Churches.

The Major is a known truth to all that are verst in any degree in the doctrine of Politicks. It is not only two species of Soveraignty, but two individual Soveraigns that are inconfistent with the numerical Unity of a Political body. Two, or ten, or two hurdred may joyn in one Soveraigney, as one Political perfon (as I faid) but if there be two Soveraigns, there are certainly two Societies: for if both be Supream, neither is Subordinate. The Minor is not to be denyed : for the Papifts lay their very foundation on a fuppoled division : for footh Peter and Paul were both at once their Bishops. And there is not many of them that adventure to tell us, that Peter only was the Supream, and that Paul was under him : but they make them as equals, or coordinate; and fome of them fay, that Paul was the Bishop of the uncircumcifion, and Peter of the Circumcifion (and then Peters Church is confined to the Jews) And they do not tell us, that one Headship was divided between them : For then that example would direct them still to have two Popes, or two Bishops to a Church : fo that Peter being a Head, and Panla Head, they had fure diffinct bodies.

But whether they fland to this or not, they cannot deny their many following divisions. The twenty third schifme (as Wer-

merses

Ja

De.

nerns a zealous Papist in fasciento tempor. reckons them) was between Felix the fifth and Eugenius : of which the faid Wernerus speaking faith, [That hence arose great contention among the writers of this matter, pro & contra, and they cannot agree to this day: for one part faith, that a Council is above the Pope, the other part on the contrary faith. No, but the Pope is above the Conncil. God grant his Church peace, &c.]

e for the

Teras

cher e

t us int

e is not

igns lpe

but out

here the

Rom st fait

three of

of Sore

ent with

or the Perfo

rertail

ordina

beirra

and an

hen i

3.04

15 50.

12 0.

ear

235 201

2 Silhol

caul, ch.

ins all

15 110

Of the twenty fecond schifme the fame Wernerus faith thus, (ad annum 1373.) [the twenty fecond schifme was the worst and most subtile schifme of all that were before it. For it was so perplexed, that the most Learned and Conscientious men-were not able to discuss (or find out) to whom they should adhere. And it was continued for fourty years, to the great (candal of the whole Clergy, and the great loss of souls, because of Herefies and other evils that then sprung up, because there was then no discipline in the Church against them. And therefore from this Urbane the fixtht to the time of Martin the fifth, I know not who was Pope]

After Nicolas the fourth there was no Pope for two years and an half, and Celeftine the fifth that succeeded him resigning it, Boniface the eighth entered, that stiled himself Lord of the whole world in Spirituals and Temporals, of whom it was faid, He entered as a Fox, lived as a Lyon, and dyed like a Dog, faith the fame Wernerus.

The twentieth schifme (faith the same Author) was great between Alexander the third, and four Schismaticks, and it lasted leventeen years.

The nineteenth schisme was between Innocent the second, and Peter Leonis : and Innocent get the better, because he had more on his fide (faith he.)

The thirteenth schisme (saith Wernerus) was between another and Benedict the eighth.

The fourteenth schisme (saith the same Author) was scandalous and full of confusion between Benedict the nimb and five others, which Benedict (faith he) was wholly vitious, and therefore being damned, appeared in a monstrous and borrid (hape; his bead and tail were like an Affes, and the reft of his body like a Bear, Jaying, Ithus appear, because I lived like a beast.] In this schifme (faith Wernerus) there were no less then fix Popes at once. I. Benedict mas expulsed. 2. Silvester the third gets in, but is cast out again, and Benedict restored. 3. But being again cast out; Grego-

E 3

ry the fixt is put into his place; who because he was ignorant of letters (and yet infallible no doubt) caused another Pope to be Consecrated with him to perform Church Offices; which was the fourth; which displeased many, and therefore a third is chosen, (which was the fifth) instead of the two that were fighting with one another: but Henry (the Emperor) coming in, deposed them all, and chose Clement the second, (who was the fixth of all them that were alive at once)

But above all fchifms that between Armofus and Sergius, and their followers, was the fowleft, fuch faying and unfaying, doing and undoing there was, befides the difmembring of the dead Pope, and caffing him into the water. And of eight Succeffors, faith Wernerus, [I can fay nothing observable of them; because I find notking of them but (candalous, because of the unheard of contention in the holy Apostolike sea one against another, and together mutually against each other.]

Reader, wouldst thou be troubled with any more of these Relations? I tell thee nothing but from their own Historians, and that which multitudes of them agree in : I go not to a Protefant for a word. But one Pope in those contentious times, I find lived in some peace, and that was Silvester the second, of whom faith Wernerus (as others commonly) [This Silvester was made Pope by the help of the Devilto whom he did homage: that all might go as he would have it: — but he quickly met with the usual End, as one that had placed his Hope in deceitful Devils.]

Well ! I shall now appeal to reason it felf, whether this were one Church, that for fourty (or fay others fifty) years together had several Heads, some of the people following one, and fome another, and the most Learned and most Confcientious not able to know the right Pope, nor know him not to this day. If England were fourty years thus divided between two Kings, it were certainly two Kingdoms. But the true Catholike Church of Christ is but one.

30

Ch z. mat

CEIV

CHAP. VIII.

Argum. 6. THE true Catholike Church hath never ceased or discontinued, fince the founding of it to this day. The Church of Rome bath ceased or discontinued : therefore the Church of Rome is not the true Catholike Church.

I prove the Minor (for the Major they will grant.) If the Head which is an Effential part, bath discontinued, then the Church of Rome hath discontinued. But the Head hath discontinued: therefore. &cc.

The Minor only needs proof : and that I prove I. There have been many years interregnum or vacancy; when there was no Pope as all. And where then was the Church when it had no Head?

800

the dead

Succellors

Manahara 9

end rogen

of chefe R

orians, a

to a pro

ious tin

fecon

tid how

lecesi

per chis h

Fears R

ng one,

10 Kin like Ch

CNAP

2. There have been long fucceffions of fuch as you confels your felves, were not Apostolical, but Apostatical. 3. Your own Popes and Councils command us to take fuch for no Popes. For example, Pope Nicelas in his Decretals (see Caranza pag. 393.) faith [He that by money or the favour of men, or popular or military tumults is intrudid into the Apostolical feat michout the Concordant and Canonical election of the Cardinall and the following religious Clergy, let him not be taken for a Pope, nor Apostolical, but for Apostatical.] And even of Priest, he commandeth, Let no man hear Mass of a Priest whom he certairly knoweth to have a Concubine or woman introduced Caranza, pag. 395. and ibid. he faith, [Priest sthat commit fornication, cannot have the honopr of Priesthood.]

4. But our greater Argument is from the authority of God, and the very nature of the office. An Infidel, or notorion fly ungodly man, is not capable of being a Paftor of the Church (in fen-su composito, while he is such) But the Popes of Rome have been Infidels, and notorioully ungodly men : therefore they were nncapable of being Pasters of the Church (and consequently that Church was Headlefs, and fo no Church.) The Major I prove. 1. Where there is not the neceffary matter and disposition of the matter, there can be no reception of the form: But Infidels and notorioully ungodly men, are not matter fufficiently disposed to receive the form of Paftoral Power: therefore they cannot receive it. The Minor is proved I. As every true Church is a Chriftian

Church (it being only a Congregation of Chriftians that we fo call, in our prefent cafe) fo every Paftor is a Chriftian Paftor : but an Infidel or notorioufly ungodly man is not a Chriftian Paftor : therefore not a true Paftor. 2. Otherwife a Mahometan, Jew, or Heathen may be a true Pope ; which I think they will deny themfelves. 3. If any Disposition or Qualification at all be neceffary to the being of the Paftoral Office (befides manhood) then is it neceffary, that he own God the Father, and the Redeemer (that is, be not notorioufly an Infidel, or ungodly.) But fome qualification is neceffary : therefore, Ge. None can be named more neceffary then this.

And that Popes have been such as I here mention, is proved before. Not to mention Marcellinus that factificed to an Idol, or Liberius that subscribed to the Arrian profession; (for I believe there is an hundred times more hope of their Salvation by Repentance, then of an hundred of their Successors) John the twenty fecond held that the soul dies with the body, of which the Parisians and others condemned him. John the twenty third, as I shewed before, denyed the life to come, and so was an Infidel. The Witchcraft, Poysonings, Simony, Sodomy, Adulteries, Incest, & c. of others, are fufficiently recorded by their own Historians.

CHAP. IX.

Argum. 7. TO the foregoing Arguments, I add the recital of one formerly mentioned, for the use

of all that have the use of their wits and senses. If a man may be sure, that he knows bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when he seeth, seeleth, and tasteth them, then he maybe sure that Popery is a deceit. (This Consequence they cannot question) But a man may be sure that he knoweth bread to be bread, and wine to be wine, when he seeth, feeleth, and tasteth them : therefore, &c.

te

18

Fo

Can

1033

Bel o betw

20 43

Note that I speak of such a knowledge as belongs to men of sound wits and senses, and a convenient object and medium. It is the senses of the whole world that I appeal to, and not of one or two: it is bread and wine that are near us, in the hand or mouth

mouth that I fpeak of, and not at a miles diftance : in the daylight, and not in the dark. So that take the bread and wine into your hand, and judge of it, and let this decide our Controversie. If you can tell whether that be bread or no bread, you may tell whether the Papifts or we are in the right. Those therefore that be not learned and fubtile enough to judge by Difputations and writings of Learned men, may yet judge by their fight and feeling. Either you know bread and wine when you feeit, tafte it, feelit, or you do not. If you do, then the Controversie is at an end : for the seafes of all sound men in the world, will be against the Papifts that fay the bread after Confecration is no bread, and the wine is no wine. But if you cannot know bread when you fee, feel, and cat it, then fee what follows. 1. Then we are fure that the Pope and all his Council are not at all to be trufted : for if fence be not to be trufted, then the Pope and his Council know not when they read the Scripture, and Canons, and Fathers, and hear Traditions, but that they are deceived. 2. Then we are uncertain of any Judgement that Pope or Council can give : for when they fpoke or wrote it, we are uncertain whether our eyes and ears, or reason judging by them, are not deceived in the hearing or reading of their words, 3. How ridiculoufly then do they call for a Judge of Controversies? and what a foolifh guarrel is it that they make, who fhall be the Interpreter of Scriptures, or Judge of Controverfies? For what can a Judge do but speak or write his mind ? and when he hath done, you know not what it is that you hear or read, because your senses may deceive you. Its a far harder matter to understand a sentence or book of the Pope or Council when you read or hear it, then to know bread when you fee, and feel, and eat it. Many thoulands know bread, that know not the Popes fentence, nor a word of a book. 4. And by this rule, it is uncertain whether Scripture be true, or Christianity the true Religion. For we cannot know it but by our fences : and if they are fo uncertain, all our Religion must needs be uncertain. 5. Yea we cannot tell what Revelation to defire that fould end our Com troverfies and make us certain. For if God should fend an Angel or other Meffenger from heaven to decide the Controverfies between us and the Papifts, what could he do more but fpeak it to us as from God ? and we should still be uncertain of what we fee

Succelle

add the l

rce the

sb break

ra Recha

s to men

he hand o

fee or hear : fo that we are left uncurably in our ignorance and Controversies, if Popery be true.

And here you may fee upon what terms we difpute with Papifts, and what hope there is of fatisfying them. We difpute with men that will not believe their own fenfes, or the fenfes of the world. The damned man, Luk. 16. thought if one might have -been fent to his brethren from the dead, they would have believed. And if Abraham fay to them, If they will not hear Mofes and the Prophets, neither will they be perfwaded though one rife from the dead ; we may fay of Papifts, fure, if they willnot believe their own eyes, and ears, and tafte, and know not bread when they fee, and feel, and eat it, how fhould they be perfwaded, though one were fent to them from heaven to refolve them ? Can we think by all our Arguments to make any matter plainer to a man then that Bread is Bread, when he feeth and cateth it ? If this be uncertain to them, what can you prove tothem, or what way can you devife to deal with them? For indeed, if fense be uncertain, we have no certainty of any thing in the world.

But to this H.T. (they fay H. Turbervile) in his Manual of Controversies faith thus. [Answ. Substance is not the proper and immediate object of sense, but colour, quantity, &c. Nor can sense judge at all of substance though it be under sensible accidents, unless it be the subject of those accidents, and have a sensible and corporal manner of being, which the Body of Christ neither is, norbath in that Sacrament. It bath a spiritual manner of being, and is not the subject of the accidents of bread; they are mithout a subject by Miracle; therefore no wonder, if sense be deceived in this matter. Here Sense and Reason must vail bonnet to faith, and submit to the Authority of God revealing, and the Church propounding; they are no competent fudges what God can do by his Omnipotence.] Thus H.T.

Repl. And is this all that these Rabbies have to fatisfie the world that it is not Bread and Wine which is seen, and felt, and tasted! Let us first take notice of the by-passages of his answer, and then reply to the substance. I. Is not this like the rest of their contradictory imaginations? That Christ hath not a Corporal manner of Being in the Sacrament: and yet it is not. Bread, but his Body that is there: yea before pag. 207. he faith, We

06

ar,

ma

Job

chin

bay

F We maintain not his Corporal, but real and fpiritual prefence in the Sacrament. So that either they affirm that his Body is prefent, and yet deny his Bodily prefence; or elfe they affirm his Bodily prefence, but not his Corporal prefence. Moft learnedly ! We fhall at last be taught to distinguish between Bodily and Corporal! But is not the Juggle in the word [Manner ?] Perhaps the Corporal prefence is not denyed, but the Corporal manner. Anfw. I. Yes, in terms its faid [We maintain not his Corporal presence 2. And can a Body be present, and not in a Bodily manner ? And why is [Spiritually] put as contradiftinet? Sure when Paul faid our Bodies shall be raised (piritual bodies, he thought that they were nevertheless bodies for being fpiritual; and therefore it is nevertheless a Bodily manner of presence, for being a spiritnal manner. But it by the Corporal presence or manner (denyed) be meant nothing but the qualities and quantity by which it is fit to be the Object of our fenfes, why had we not this plainly without jugling ? To fay Chrift is present in Body but not fensibly, is plainer English, then to fay that he is prefent in Body but not Bodily prefent.

2. Note alfo that he calls them [The accidents of bread] and yet faith [they are without a subject] And fo doth the Explanation of the Roman Catholike Belief, and their ordinary writers fay that the Body of Chrift is under the forms of Bread and Wine; and yet fay that Bread and Wine are none of the subject of those forms.

e any mu

be feel

ou prom

anychia

o his Ma

the prop

his cropan

o fatisfie

nd felt, so

his aniwe

ke the reft of

he laith

not a et it is no

em?

3. Note also that he professeth Transubstantiation is a Mira. cle, and fo every ignorant, drunken, adulterous Prieft of theirs hath the gift of Miracles, which he worketh as oft as he confecrateth : No wonder if Miracles be the glory of their Church. and the proof of their Infallibility ; But let us come to the fubstance of his Anfwer.

I. He tells you that substance is not the proper and immediate object of fense, but colour, quantity, &c. But J. Is not the Mediate Object [Proper] as well as the Immediate? 2. But what gather you hence? be it a Proper or improper Object, I hope we may yet have leave to believe that Realon by the help of fenfe doth judge as infallibly of Substances as Accidents. If you think otherwile, then all the forementioned confequences are undenyable. You know not whether the world faw Chrift on

36

carth: or whether he were crucified, dead, buried, rofe, or afcended: It might be but colour and quantity which men faw; and when Chrift told them a fpirit hath not fl fh and blood as ye fee me have, they might have answered, the fee no flefb and blood, but colour and quantity: And Thomas had then small reafon to be convinced by seeing and feeling, when he faw but colour and quantity, and felt but quantity and quality. By this reasoning the world is not fure that ever there was a Pope of Rome, but the Colour of a Pope, or other accidents. And you know not that there is any earth under your feet, or that you are a man, or have a body, because your sense perceive but the accidents of it.

2. But what manner of men did H. T. imagine he had to deal with, when he puts off his Readers with fuch an answer as this? Mark Reader the unfaithfull dealing of these men, and how grofly they abufe poor people that follow them with meer deceits. The Question or Objection which he undertook to answer was, Whether sense telling us that it is Bread after the Confectation be deceived ? To this he takes on him to give an answer, and cunningly speaks to another question, and passeth this by. Its one question, Whether sense can infallibly discern Christ in the Sacrament, if be were there, or discern that he is not there? and another question Whether sense can infallibly discern Bread and Wine, and know whether they be there? The laft was the question in hand : but he flily answers to the first instead of it ; and tells us, that sense cannot judge of substance, though under sensible accidents, unless it be the subject of those accidents, and have a fenfible and corporal manner of being, which the body of Chrift neither is nor hath in the Sacrament.] And fo goes on. And what of all this? [therefore Christ may be in the Sacrament and you not dif-, cern him by fense] Well : and whats that to the question ? O Sir, is it not the holy truth of God that you are about ? and fhould you thus abuse it, and the fouls of men? you knew the queftion is, Wheeber sense (and the intellect thereby) be infallible in judging Bread to be Bread when we fee, feel and eat it ? Had you never a word to fay to this? to perfwade men that they have eyes and fee not, and hands and feel not, or that the world knoweth not certainly what they feem to know by feeing and feeling ? I pray you hereafter deal by us as fairly as Bellarmine did (and yet

15

la

an

th

De

101

OF.

we will thank you for nothing) who quite gave away the Roman caufe by granting and pleading [that finse is infallible in Positives: and therefore we may thence say, This is a Body because I see it; (and so this is Bread or wine because I see, feel and tasteit) but not in Negatives: and therefore we cannot say, this is not a Body because I see it not] I pray you give over talking of the Pope, or Church, or Religion, or Men, if you are uncertain of substances which are (suppose but per accidentia) the Objects of your fense. And take nothing ill that I write of you, till you are more certain that you fee it, and know what you see.

3. But you'l fay Senfe and Reason must here vail bonnet to faith. Ans/w. In the Negative cafe let it be granted, and any cafe where faith can be faith. But if fenfe (and the Intellect therewith) be fallible in Positives, so that we cannot know Bread when we see and eat it, faith cannot be faith then. What talk you of faith, if you credit not the foundest fenses of all the men in the world, when sense and reason are presupposed to faith. How know you that faith here contradicteth fense? You'l fay, because the Church or Scripture faith : This is my Body: and that there is no Bread? But how know you that there is any fuch thing in Scripture? or that the Church so holdeth? you think you have read or heard it: But how know you that your fense deceived you not? He that cannot know Bread when he seeth and eateth it, is ualikely to know letters and their meaning when be feeth them.

See more of my answer to such Objections in a Book entitled The Safe Religion, p. 241. to 248.

The fimpleft Reader that hath honefty and charity, is fecured againft Popery by the firft Argument, which he may make good to his own foul againft all the Jefuites on earth. And he that is unable to proceed on that account, may by the evidence of this laft Argument confute any Papift living, if he be a man of fenfe and reafon. And having brought all our controverfie fo low, that fenfe it felf may be the judge, I fhall go no further in Argument, as thinking it vain to ufe any reafon with that man that will not believe his own eye-fight, nor the fight, and feeling, and tafte of all the world befides.

F 3

CHAP. X.

· ...

Come now to the next and principal part of my task, which is to open to you their Deceits, and give you Directions for the difcovery and confutation of them, that by the help of these you may see the Truth.

Detect. 1. Remember this ground which they have given you, that If you prove them guilty but of any one Error in points of belief determined by their Church, you thereby disprove the whole body of Popery, as fuch. For you pull up the foundation which they build on, and the Authority into which they refolve their faith. They will grant you, that if they are deceived by the Church in one thing, they have no Certainty of any thing upon the Churches credit. So that if you read Pauls dilcourse against Praying in an unknown tongue, or the many precepts for our reading and meditating in the Law of God, or the like, and can but perceive that the Popish Latine fervice, or their forbidding men to read the Scripture, Ge. are contrary hereto, or if you find out but any one of their Errors, you cannot be a Papift if you understand their Profession.

But it is not fo with us: for though we know that the Scripture and all that is in it is of infallible Truth, and that every true Chriftian (while fuch) is infallible in the Effentials of Chriftianity; (for elfe he were no Christian) yet we profes that we know but in part, and that our own Writings and Confessions may poffibly in fome things be belides the fenfe of Scripture; and there being much more propounded in Scripture to our faith, then what is of absolute necessity to falvation, we may poffibly after our fludying and praying miftake in fome things that are not of the Effence but the Integrity of Christianity, and are neceffary to the Melins effe, the ftrength or comfort, though not to the being of a Christian. So that every Error in their faith destroyes their grounds, and fo their new Religion; but fo doth not every Error of ours.

b

60

for

Pul

nin

ther

firm

callic

no Gr

7.A0

100732

Day G

Or to speak more distinctly; let us distinguish between the Fides que & qua; their Objective faith, and our Subjective faith. I. Their Objective Faith hach Errors in it, but ours hath none by their own confeffion: For theirs is all the Decrees of their Popes and

and Councils : and ours is only the Holy Scripture, which they confeis to be infallible. Our own writings do but fhew how we understand the Scriptures, and fo whether our fubiettive faith be right or not. 2. We confess that it is not only possible but probable, that we are miftaken in fome lower points, about the meaning of the Scriptures, and yet our foundation is still fure. But they have in a fort confounded their Subjective and Objective faith : and one believes it on that account because others do believe it ; and lo one age or part do but feck for the Object of their faith in the Actual faith of the other. Yea 3. They conclude that every point which is of faith, that is, thats determined by the Church to be fo, is of fuch neceffity to falvation that no man can be faved that denyeth it or that doth not believe it (if fufficiently proposed.) But we are assured, that though all that is in Scripture be most true, yet through misunderstanding, Tome points there propoled to our faith, may poffibly be denyed and difputed against by a true believer ; and yet his falvation not be overthrown by it. The Papilts cry out againft us for diftinguifhing between the Fundamentals (or effentials) of Religion and. the Integrals : but we know it to be neceffary.

CHAP. XI.

Detect.2. WHEN you have brought the matter thus far, and fee that if they have one errour in faith, their whole cause is lost, then consider, Whether it be Possible for. that Dectrine which is fo contrary to Scripture, and to it felf, to be free from all Error. I. How contrary it is to Scripture, I. To forbid the reading of Scripture in a known tongue : 2. And their Publick Praying in an unknown language: 3. And their administring the Lords Supper to the People by the halves, denying them the Wine, and giving them the bread only: 4 And their affirming men to be perfect without fin in this life: 5: And their. calling fome fins venial which deferve a pardon, and yet are truly. no fins : 6. And their abfolure forbidding their Priefts to marry, 7. And faying that there is no Bread and Wine left after the Confecration, with abundance the like : the very reading of the texts may fatisfie you. As for the first, fee Dent. 6.7, 8,9, Dent. 11, 18, 19,200

19, 20. Ifa. 34. 16. Pfal. 1. 2. Neb. 8. Jof. 8. 34,35. Mat. 12. 3, 5. & 19. 4. & 21. 16. & 22. 31. Mark 12. 10, 26. Alts 8. 28. & 13. 27. & 15. 21. 1 Thef. 5. 27. Col. 4. 16. Dent 31.11. Eph. 3. 4. Mat. 24. 15. Rev. 1. 3. 2 Tim. 3. 16. John 5. 39. Alt. 17. 2, 11. & 18. 28. Rom. 15. 4. 2 Tim. 3. 15. Ifa. 8. 16, 20. & 42. 4. Rom. 7. 1. James 1. 25. Hof. 8. 12.

For the fecond, read 1 Cor. 14. For the third, fee Mat. 26, 27, 28. 1 Cor. 11.25, 26, 27, 28. 1 Cor. 10. 16. For the fourth, fee Ecclef. 7. 20. James 3. 2. 1 John 1. 8. Phil. 3. 12. Luke 11. 4. For the fifth, fee Deut. 12, 32. Gal. 3. 10. 1 John 3. 4. For the fixth, fee 1 Tim. 3. 2, 4, 5, 11, 12. Tit. 1. 6. 1 Tim. 4 3. 1 Cor. 9. 5. For the feventh, fee 1 Cor. 10. 16. 1 Cor. 11. 23, 26, 27, 28. Alt. 2. 42. Alt. 20. 7. 11.

2. And that they are contrary to themfelves, appeareth : 1. In that (as I faid before) not only feveral perfons, but feveral Countries go feveral wayes; the French are of one way, and the Italians of another, even in the Fundamentals of their Faith, which all the reft is refolved into. 2. Their Popes have ordinarily been contrary to one another in their Decrees ; which made Platina fay [Following Popes do still either infringe or wholly abrogate the Decrees of the former Popes] And Erasmns faith that Pope John 22. and Pope Nicolas are contrary one to another in their whole Decrees, and that in things that feem to belong to matter of faith | Had we no inftances but of Sergins and Formofus and their following partakers, it were enough. And Celeftines cale puts Bellarmine to filly thifts. 3. That their Councils contradict each other, I have formerly manifested. They confess that the Arrians have had many Councils as General as most ever the Orthodox had : and if it be only the want of the Popes approbation that nullifieth their authority, then let them tell us no more of Councils and of [all the Church] but fay plainly that is but one man that they mean.

But even their approved Conneils have been contrary: As the fixth Council at Conftantinople approved by Pope Adrian, is now confeffed to have many errors. The Council of Neocafarea confirmed by Pope Leo 4. and by the Nicen Council (as faith the Council of Florence Sef. 7.) condemned fecond matriages, contrary to Scripture and the prefent Church. The Council at the Laterane under Leo the tenth determines that the th

100

Kn

130

cann

CEIVEI

41

the Pope is above a General Council; and the Councils of Confance and Basil determine that the General Council is above the Pope, and that this is de file, and its herefie to deny it.

CHAP. XII.

Detect.3. F you enter into Dispute with any Papist, enquire first what he will take for sufficient Prosf, and what common Principles you are agreed on by which the reft must be decided. For men that agree in nothing at all, are not capable of a difpute. For the Principles in which they are agreed, are those that the reft must be reduced to. And when you have made this enquiry, you shall find that the Popish way of Disputing is to forbid you to Dispute, unles you will first yield the caufe to them as beyond difpute : and that they are not agreed with the reft of the world in any common principles to which the differences may be reduced for tryal, and fo that there is no fort of Proof that they will admit of as fufficient : For if there be any ground of Proof at all, it must be I. From the fenfes. 2. Or from Reason. 3. Or from Scripture. 4. Or from the Church: but they will fland to none of all thefe.

I. Begin at the bottom of all, and know of them whether they will take that for a Valid Proof, which is fetcht from lenfe, even from the foundest senses of all men in the world, suppofing a convenient object and Medium ? If they will not take this for Proof, how can you dispute with them? Or what Proof can be admitted, if this be not admitted ? We have this advantage in dealing even with those Heathen that have blotted out much of the Law of nature it felf, that yet they will yield to an Argument from sense.

But if they would yield to the Validity of this proof, then they give away their cause, seeing fense telleth us that it is bread which we fee, and feel, and eat after the Confectation. They know this; and therefore they must difown and deny this fore of proof.

2. But will they then admit of Proofs from Reafon? No that cannot be, if proof from fenfe be not admitted. For Reafon receiveth its object by means or occasion of the fenfes, and must needs

mines a

needs be deceived if it be deceived : And Reason hath not a principle that it holds faster, then that sense is to be credited ; that this is white or black which my own eyes and the eyes of all other men do fee to be fo: and fo that this is bread which we all fee, and And therefore the Papifts tell us that feel and taste to be so. Reason must stoop to faith, that is, they will not fand to Reason It feems they when it contradicteth the doctrine of their fect. are in some parts of their Religion unreasonable. But I would know, whether they have any Reason to be unreasonable. If they have, then why might not our Reason be valid as well as their Reason which they bring against Reason? by which they contradict themselves. For if Reason be vain, why Reason they to proveits Vanity or invalidity? But if they have no Reason against Reason, let them confess it, and offer us none, and then their disputes will do no harm. We eafily yield, that we have Reason to believe Gods Revelations, about those things which we had no Rea-Sonto believe if they were not Revealed: And that many of those Revelations are above Reason, to far as that Reason cannot discern the truth of the thing without them ; yea it would rather judge the things improbable : But yet Revelations are received by Reason, and inform Reason, and not destroy it; nor do they so contradict Sense or Reason, as to make that credible which Sense and Reason have sufficient ground to judge false.

So that here we must break with a Papist, even where we might join in dispute with a heathen. And how will Papists deal with Heathens if they will deny the proofs from *fense and reason*? 3. But will they stand to the Validity of *Proofs* from Scripture?

3. But will they faile to the value of 1700 of two of the No; For 1. They take it to be but part of Gods word, fo that we may nor argue Negatively, [It is not in the holy Scripture: therefore it is not an Article of faith or a Law of God] For they will prefently appeal to Tradition. 2. And even fo much as is in Scripture, though they confess it to be true, yet they confess it not to be by us intelligible, and will not admit of any proof from it, but with this limitation that you take it in that fence as the Holy Mother Church doth bold, Oatb to take it in that fence as the Holy Mother Church doth bold, and bath held it in, and never to take or interpret it but according to the unanimous fenfe of the Fathers.] So that they muft know what fenfe all the Fathers are unanimous in before they can admit mit.

in

they wi

mit a proof from Scripture. And before that can be done, above a Cart-load of books mult be read over or fearched : and when thats done, they will find that most texts were never medled with by most of those Fathers in their writings; and in those that they did meddle with, they difagreed in multitudes, and where they difagree they are not unanimous; and there the Papifts are fworn to believe no fense at all. And if they would have come down to a Major vote, it is no fhort or easie matter to gather the votes. And if they know the Fathers unanimous confent, yet mult they have the fense of the present Church too: And is it not all one to make your adversary the findge of your cause, as the fudge of your Evidences and all your proofs?

4. Well, but at least may we not hope that they will stand to the Judgement of the Catholick Church? And if fo, we will not take it for our adversary? No: they will not do fo neither. For I. When they deny proof from fense and reason, they must needs deny all thats brought from the Church : For the Church cannot judge it felf but on supposition of the infallibility of fense. 2. And when you argue from the judgement and practice of the greater part of the Church, they prefently difclaim them ail as Hereticks or Schilmaticks, and will have no man be a Valid witnels but themselves. The Greeks, the Æthiopians, the Armenians, the Protestants, all are Hereticks or Schifmaticks fave they; and therefore may not be witnessen in the cale. So that you fee upon what terms we ftand with the Papifts, that will admit of no proofs upon the Infallibility of Sense or Reason, or the sufficiency of Scripture, or the testimony of the Catholick Church, but only from them felves.

CHAP. XIII.

Detect. 4 UNderstand what the Papists mean when they are still calling to you for a fudge of Controversies.

If you would dispute with them, they are presently asking you, [Who shall be the judge?] and perswading you that it is in vain to dispute without a living Judge : for every man will be the Judge himself; and every mans cause will be right in his own eyes, and all the world will be still at

G 2

odds

odds till we are agreed who shall be the Judge.

To help you to fee the fense of this deceit, and then to confute it; I. You may easily observe that this is the plain drift of all, to perfwade you to make them your judges, and yield the cause instead of disputing it. For it is no other judge but themfelves that they will admit. Yield first that the Pope or his Council is the judge of all controversies, and then its folly to dispute against them : fo that if you will yield them the cause first, they will then dispute with you after.

2. But what is to be faid to the pretence of the Neceffity of a Judge? I answer, I. Its against all reason and experience to think that all enquiries or disputes are vain, unless there be a Judge to decide the cafe. A Judge is a Ruling decider ; not to fatisfie mens minds, fo much as to preferve Order, and Peace, and Juffice in the Society. But there are thousands of cafes to be privately discussed, that we never need to bring to a Judge. Every Husbandman, and Tradelman, and Navigator, and other Artificer doth meet with doubts and difficulties in his way which he laboureth to Difcern, and fatisfieth himfelf with a Judgement of Difcretion without a Ruling Judge. We cat, and drink, and clothe our felves, and follow our daily labours without a Judge, though we meet with controverfies in almost all, what meat or drink is best for quality or quantity, and a hundred like doubts. Men do marry, and build, and buy, and fell, and takePhyfick, and difpatch their greateft worldly bufinefs without a Judge. Judges are only for fuch controverted cafes as cannot well be decided without them, to the attaining of the Ends of Government.

2. Is it not against the daily practice of the Papifts to think or fay that all difputes and controversies must have a Judge? Who is the Judge between the Nominals, Reals and Formalists, the Dominicans, Franciscans and Jesuites, in all those controversies which have Cartloads of Books written on them? Their Pope or Councils dare not Judge between them. Do they not daily dispute in their Schools among themielves without a Judge?

3. Understand well the use and differences of Judgement. The fentence is but a means to the execution; and Judges cannot

not determine the mind and mill of man : but preferve ontward Order, if men will not fee the truth themfelves. Me thinks the Jesuits that are so eager for free will, should easily grant that the Pope by his definition cannot determine the Will of man. And they fee that Hereticks remain Hereticks, when the Pope hath faid all that he can : And if he can cure them all by his determinations, he is much too blame that he doth not. Andifa mans mind be to be fettled, an Infallible Teacher is fitter then 2 Judgement then being for Execution, when you ask, ludge. Who shall be the Indge? I answer that Indgement is either total, absolute and final : or it is only to a certain particular end, limited, and subordinate, from which there is an Appeal. In the former cafe, there is no Judge but Chrift, and the Father by him. No abfolute decision can be made till the great Judgement come; and then all will be fully and finally decided. And for the limited present Judgements of men, they are of several forts, according to their feveral Ends. When the question is, Who shall be corporally punished as an Heretick? the Magistrate is fudge; For coercive punishment being his work, the Judgement must be his alfo. But when the question is, Who shall be excommunicated as an Heretick, as Gods Law hath told us who in specie, and fo is the Rale of decifion about individuals : fo to try individual perfons, and cafes according to this Law, belongs to the Governours of the Church : but not to the Governours of other Churches a thousand miles off, that never received such an authority, and are not capable of the work : but to the Governours of the Church in which the party hath Communion, and into which he shall at any time intrude and feek communion. And all men have a Indgement of difcerning that are concerned in the Execution.

there a

store to

ere be

So that if a difputing Papift will fay that his bulinefs is not to Dispute with you, but to Excommunicate, or hang, or burn you for an Heretisk, then I confeis, its all the reason in the world that you should first agree of the Judge. But why the Pope should be the Judge, I know not, unlefs it be in his own charge.

G 3

46

11

CHAP. XIV.

Detect. 5. W Hen you have proceeded on these grounds, the Papists will tell you, that in their may there is an End of Contro versies, but in yours there is none : For if you mill not stand to ones Judgement as infallible, you may difpute as long as you live before you come to an End.

To direct you in discussing this part of the Deceit also: 1. We confess that on earth there will be no End of all controversies among the best: nor of the great controversies which falvation lyeth on, between the believers and the unbelievers: that is, there will be still Infidelity and Heressie in the world, and errour in the godly themselves. 1. Hath it not been so in every age till now? And why should we expect that it should now be otherwise? 2. Doth not Paul tell us that here we know but in part, and prophessie in part? and when is it that that which is imperfect will be done away, but when that which is perfect is come? While we know but in part, we shall differ in part.

2.Hath your way put an End to controverfies any more then ours? Are you not yet at controverfie with Infidels, Whether Chrift be the Redeemer. and with Hereticks whether he be true eternall God? Are you not yet as full of controverfies among your felves, as any Chriftians on the face of the earth? I do not believe but in the many Volumes of your Schoolmen, Cafuifts, and Commentators, I can fhew more controverfies yetdepending, then you can find amongft any fort of Chriftians in the world; yea then you can find among all other Chriftians in the world fet together.

3. And is there any thing in your way that better tendeth to the deciding of controverfies then in ours? Nothing at all; but contrarily, you have made more Controverfies then you have ended. For, I. We have a Certain infallible Rule to decide our controverfies by, even fuch as you confels your felves to be infallible; Even the Holy Scriptures: but you have an uncertain Rule, even the Decrees of your Popes and Councils, and the many Volumes of the Fathers, which are at odds among themfelves; your very Rule is felf-contradicting, and your Judges are togen

ther by the ears (as hath been shewed.) 2. Our Faith confisteth in those points which are granted by your the

this

cide