

mentators and Disputers. But if all revealed be not of Absolute Necessity, then we may have leave to distinguish between points absolutely Necessary, and the rest. 8. And we would know whether all shall be damned, that know not as much as the most Learned and Wise? if not, then still we may have leave to distinguish. 9. Further we demand, whether any ignorance or error that is culpable, will stand with Charity and Salvation? If not, then who shall be saved? If yea; then we may still distinguish the points of Absolute Necessity from the rest. 10. We demand also, whether the whole holy Scripture be the word of God? If so, then whether we ought not to believe it all as far as we can understand it? And if so, whether it be not all, *de fide* matter of Faith? If not, they must tell us, what part of Gods word is to be believed, and what not. If yea; then certainly men may err *de fide* in points of Faith, and yet have Charity, and be saved: as their disagreeing Commentators, Casuists and Schoolmen do. 11. We would know whether the matters that their Divines are disagreed in, be Revealed by God, or things unrevealed? If not revealed, do they not deserve to be kickt out of the world, for troubling the world so with unrevealed things? If they be Revealed, are they not Revealed to be believed, and so are *de fide*? 12. And we would know whether there be not some things *Essential* to true Obedience, and some things not Essential? If not, then no sinner hath sincere Obedience, and can be saved: If yea; then why may not the same be said of faith? 13. Also we would know, when they baptize the Adult, whether they require any profession of the faith from them or not? If not, they may as well baptize Infidels or Heathens. If they do, then what is that profession? Is it a profession of every particular truth that God hath revealed to be believed? No sure: for then none but Doctors must be baptized. Nor they neither. Or is it a profession of some particular Truths only? If of some only, why of those more than the rest, if they be not the Essentials distinguishable from the rest? And do they make men true Christians by baptizing them, or not? If they do, then sure the Baptismal faith must contain all that is Essential to Christianity. 14. We desire also to be informed by them, what is the use of the Churches Creed, and why they have used frequently to make confession of their

faith? Was it not the whole faith Essential to Christianity which they confest? If not, then it was not fit to be the badge of the Church; or of the Orthodox: if yea; then it seems those Creeds had in them the essentials distinguished from the rest. 15. we would know whether every thing delivered or defined by any General Council, be of such necessity to salvation, that all must explicitly believe them all that will be saved? If so, then whether any Papist can be saved, seeing they understand them not all? If not, then sure a distinction must be made. 16. And we would know how they can countenance ignorance so much as they do, if all things revealed be of equal necessity to salvation. 17. And what mean they to distinguish of Implicite and Explicite faith? Is it enough to believe as the Church believes, and not know what in any particular? then it is not *de fide*, or necessary to salvation to believe the resurrection of Christ, or of man, or the life to come. For a man may believe that the Church is in the right, and yet not know that it holdeth any of these. Is it enough to believe the formal object of faith (which with us is Gods veracity) without the material? Or is it enough to remain Infidels, and only believe that the Church are true Believers? If you hold to this, you make no act of faith, but one (*the believing that the Church, that is, the Pope or Council are true believers*) to be of Necessity to salvation. But if there be something that is Necessary to be *actually* (that is explicitly) *believed*, then must not that be distinguished from the rest and made known? 18. Whence is it that you denominate men *fideles*, *believers* with you? Is it from a Positive faith, or for *not holding the contrary*? If the *latter*, then Stones, and Beasts, and Pagans, and their Infants may be believers. If the *former*, then that Positive faith from whence all believers are denominated must be known. 19. Is not that true faith and all that is essential to Christianity, which doth consist with saving grace or (to use your phrase) with true Charity? If not, then either Infidels and no Christians may have true Charity, or else true Charity may be in the unjustified; or both: If yea, (which doubtless you will yield) then sure men of lower knowledge and faith then Doctors, may have true Charity; and therefore true faith. 20. Lastly, I appeal to your own confessions. *Bellarmino* often distinguisheth between the points that all must

of

of Necessity explicitly believe, and the rest. And *Suarez* in three parts. *Thom. Disp. 43. Sect. 4.* saith of the Article of Christs descending into Hell [*If by an Article of faith we understand a truth which all the faithfull are bound explicitly to know and believe, so I do not think it necessary to reckon this among the Articles of faith, because it is not altogether necessary for all men*] Here you see that *Suarez* distinguisheth between Articles of Necessity to all, and those that are not : and that he excepts even the Descent into Hell from this number of Articles Necessary to all I might cite many more of your writers; but the thing is well known.

But perhaps you'll say, that though all that is *de fide*, be not necessary to be believed explicitly by all, yet implicitly it must. I *Ans.* 1. that which you call *Implicitely* believing is no believing that point, but another point : yea a point that doth not so much as infer that : for it followeth not [*the Church is infallible, therefore Christ descended into Hell.*]

2. And we believe all that is *de fide* with an *Implicitely* faith as well as you : But it is an *Implicitely* Divine faith, and not humane : For we are sure that *All that God saith is true*; and this Divine veracity is the formal object of our faith. And we believe that all that is in Scripture is true, and that all that was ever delivered by the inspiration of the Holy Ghost is true.

Object. But all that is *de fide* is so necessary, that it will not stand with salvation to believe the contrary, or deny or dis-believe any point of faith. *Ans.* 1. That cannot be true, For no man can prove that a point may not be denied and disputed against by a true Believer as long as he is ignorant that it is true, and from God : the same ignorance that keeps him from knowing it, may cause him to deny it, and gainsay it. 2. Do not your own differing Commentators, Schoolmen and Casuists (on one side at least) dispute voluminously against some Truths of Divine revelation? If you change a mans mind from the smallest error by dispute, do you take that to be a change of his state from death to life? *Anaas Sylvius* thought a General Council was above the Pope : but when he came to be Pope *Pius* the second, he thought the Pope above a General Council ; was this a change from death to life ? It seems by his Bull of Retraction, he

thought so, but so did not several General Councils: was the Catholick Church Representative at the Council of *Basil*, or *Constance*, or *Pisa* in a state of death and damnation for believing the Pope to be subject to a General Council? or was the Council at *Laterane* (another Representative Catholick Church) in a state of death for holding the Contrary? Must either Pope *John* the twenty second, or Pope *Nicolas* be damned because of the contrariety of their Decrees? If the Council of *Toletane* the first ordain that he that hath a Concubine instead of a wife, shall not be kept from the Sacrament, doth it prove them all in a state of death? If *Bellarmino* confess that the sixth General Council at *Constantinople* have many errors, doth it follow that the Catholick Church representative was in a damnable state? If the second Council at *Nice* maintain the corporeity of *Angels*, and the first Council at the *Laterane* maintain the contrary, doth it follow that one of them was in a state of death? I think not: (though I am sure it proves a General Council fallible, when approved by the Pope, and therefore Popery a deceit.) *Bellarmino* sometime tells us of the change of his own mind.

And the Retractions of *Austin* (a better man) tell us of the change of his mind in many things: And yet it followeth not that he was in a state of death and unjustified before.

Object. But all that is de fide is of Necessity to the Salvation of some, though not of all. Answ. 1. If that be granted, yet you must grant us leave to distinguish between Points necessary to be believed by all, and points that are not thus necessary to all. 2. But in what case is it that you mean, that other points are of Necessity to some? 1. Is it to those some that know them to be of Divine Revelation? we easily grant you that: But that is not because the Things themselves are simply necessary to Salvation, but because a Belief of Gods veracity, and the Truth of all that he Revealeth in general, is of necessity: and he that Believeth that God is True (*verax*) cannot chuse but believe all to be True which he knows God revealeth. He that thinketh God to be a Liar, in one word, doth not believe his veracity, and so hath no Divine faith at all. And therefore you need not fear lest any one should be guilty of not believing that which they know.

know is the word of God, but those that take God to be a Lyar, and that is those that take him not to be God, and so are Atheists. But still the thing of Absolute necessity is but first to believe in General that God is true in all his word, secondly and to believe the truth of the essential points of Christianity in particular (embracing the Good propounded in them.) Now its true that secondarily all known Truths are of necessity to be believed, because else our General belief of Gods veracity is not sincere. But yet we must say that antecedently even to that person, these superadded truths were not of Necessity to his Salvation to be believed, because they were not of such Necessity to be *Known*; and if they had not been known, you would say yourselves there had not been such Necessity of Believing them.

But if you go further, and say, that *all that were obliged to know them, or that had opportunity, or the Revelation of the truth, and yet did not, and thereupon deny them culpably, are in a state of death*; I deny that, and shall prove it false. Its true, that a wilfull refusing the *Light*, because men love darkness rather then light, is a certain sign of a graceless wretch. But every culpable ignorance and unbelief is not Damning ignorance or unbelief.

1. Otherwise no man should be saved: For no man is void of culpable ignorance, and consequently of culpable unbelief. Had we never been wanting in the use of means, there's no man but might have known more then he doth. Is there any one of you that dare refuse to ask God forgiveness of your ignorance, unbelief, or the negligence that is the culpable cause of them; or that dare say, you need no pardon of them? 2. If you plead for venial sin, how can you deny a venial unbelief upon venial ignorance? But then I pray you learn more wit and piety, 1. then to say that your venial unbelief or sin is no sin, save as Analogically so called; or 2. then to say it deserves a pardon, or deserves not everlasting punishment. But if you will call it *venial*, because being consistent with the true Love of God and habitual Holiness, and saving faith, the Law of Grace doth pardon it, and not condemn men for it, thus we would agree with you that there is *venial sin*; but then you must yield us that there is venial unbelief.

3. And we easily prove all this from the Law of God. It.

is the nature of the preceptive part to constitute Duty only, and the violation of that is sin : But it is the sanction, the promise and threatning that Determines of the Reward and Penalty : Now it is only the old Law of works that makes the Threatening as large as the prohibition, condemning man for every sin : but so doth not the Law of Grace. The precept still commandeth Perfect obedience, and so makes it a duty ; but the promise maketh not perfect obedience the condition of Salvation ; but Faith, Repentance and sincere Obedience, though imperfect. The Law of Nature still makes everlasting Death due to every sin : But it is such a Due as hath a Remedy at hand provided and offered in the Gospel ; and is actually remedied to all true believers. So that as it is not every sin that will damn us, though damnation be due to it (because we have a present Remedy ;) so it is not every culpable ignorance or unbelief that will damn us, though it deserve damnation, because the Gospel doth not only not damn us for it, but pardons it, by acquitting us from the condemnation of the Law. All this may teach you, not only to mend your abominable doctrine about Mortal and venial sin, but also to discern the reason why a man may deny some points of faith that are not of the essence of Christianity, and yet not be damned for it, because the Law of Grace doth not condemn him for it, though he be culpable, because the Law of Grace may command further then it peremptorily condemneth in case of disobedience. It is the *Promise* that makes faith the *Condition of Life*, though it be the *Precept* that makes it a *duty* : Now it saveth not as a *performed Duty* directly, (because the precept gives not the Reward) but as a *performed Condition* : And therefore unbelief condemneth not effectually as a meer sin directly, but as *such a sin* as is the violation or non-performance of that condition. But it is not a belief of every thing that is preceptively *de fide*, which is made the condition of life.

CHAP. XVII.

Detect. 8. **A** Nother of their Juglings is, to extoll the judgement of the Catholick Church as that which must be the ground of faith, and the decider of all Controversies: And to this end they plead against the sufficiency of Scripture, and bend all the force of their arguings and designs, as if all their hope lay in this point, and as if it were a granted thing that the day is theirs, and we are lost, if the Catholick Church be admitted to be the Judge. Hence it is that they cry out against private faith and opinions, and call men to the faith of the Church, and perswade the poor people, that the Church is for them, and we are but branches broken off.

Well, we are content to deal with them at their own weapon, and at that one in which they put their trust. For our parts we know that the true Catholick Church (nor any member of it, *in sensu Composito*) cannot err in any of the *Essentials* of Christianity (for then it would cease to be the Church:) But we have too much reason to Judge that it is not free from error in lesser things. But yet for all that in the main cause between the Papists and us, we refuse not their judgement. Nay we turn this Canon against the Canoneers, and easily prove that the Papists cause is utterly lost, if the Catholick Church be Judge.

But is it the Ancient Church, or the present Church that must decide the cause? Well! It shall be which you will. For the most Ancient Church in the Apostles dayes, we are altogether of its belief, and stand to its decision in all things; and if you prove we mistake them in any thing, we shall gladly receive instruction and be reclaimed. To them we appeal for our *Essentials* and *Integrals*. And for some following ages, we will be tryed by them in the articles of our faith, and in the principal controversies we have with the Papists.

Yea, but this will not serve their turn: It is the present Church that must judge or none: For say they, if the ancient Church had power, so hath the present: and if the ancient Church had possession of the truth, how shall we know it but by the present? I answer, 1. We may know it by the Records of those times far
surer:

surer then by the reports of men without writing: Controversies or numerous mysterious points are sordidly carryed in the memories, especially of the most, even of the Teachers. And for the Records, one diligent skillfull man will know more then ten thousand others. One *Baronius*, *Albaspianus*, *Petau*, among the Papists, and one *Usher*, *Blondell*, *Salmasius*, *Gataker*, &c. among the Protestants, knew more of the mind of antiquity, then a whole Country besides, or perhaps then some Generall Councils.

2. Well! but if you appeal to the greater number, to them shall you go. You must be tried by the present Church; Why then you are condemned. Is it the lesser number, or the greater, or the better that must be judge? You will not say the lesser, as such: If you do, you know where you are. If you say, the Better part shall be judge: who shall be Judge which is the Better part? we are ready to prove the Reformed Churches the Better part: and if we do not, we will give you the day, and lose our cause. But I suppose you will appeal to the Greater part. Content! Then the world knows you are lost. The Greeks, Moscovites, Armenians, Abassines, and all other Churches in *Asia*, *Africa* and *Europe* are far more then the Papists: and your own pens and mouths tell us that these are against you. Many of them curse you as Hereticks or Schismatics; the rest of them know you not, or refuse your government. They all agree against your Popes universall Headship or Sovereignty, and so against the very form of your new Catholick Church: So that the world knows the Judgement of the far greatest part of Christians on earth to be against you in the main, so that you see what you get by appealing to the Catholick Church.

But I know you will say, that all these are Schismatics, or Hereticks, and none of the Catholick Church: But they say as much by you, some of them, and all of them abhor your charge; and how do you prove it? and who shall be Judge whether they, or you be the Catholick Church? You tell us of your succession, and of twenty tales that are good, if you may be Judges yourselves; but so do they say as much which is good if they be Judges. When we offer to dispute our case with you, you ask us *Who shall be Judge*, and tell us *the Catholick Church must be Judge*: But who shall be Judge between you and them which is the Catholick

tholick Church? you will not let us be Judges in our own cause, and why then should you? Are we Protestants the *lesser number* as to you? so are you to all the rest that are against you. And what reason have we to let the *lesser number* Judge over the *Greater*? If still you say, because you are the *Better*, let that be first tryed; but no reason you should there also be the Judges.

So that the case is plainly come to this, *Either the Papists must stand to the Greater number*, and then the controversie is at end: or they must shamefully say, *we will not dispute with you, unless we may be the Judges our selves, though the fewer*. Or else they must lay by their talk of a Judge, and dispute it equally with us, by producing their evidence, which we are ever ready for.

CHAP. XVIII.

Detect. 9. **T**HE most common and prevalent Deceit of the Papists is, by *ambiguous terms to deceive those that cannot force them to distinguish, and to make you believe they mean one thing, when they mean another, and to mock you with cloudy words*. I shall here warn you to look to them therefore especially in three terms, on which much of their controversies lies, that is, the words *Church, Pope, and Council*. For there's but few understand what they mean by any one of these words.

1. When you come to dispute of the Church with them, see that you agree first under your hands of the Definition of that Church of which you dispute. And when you call them to Define it, you will find them in a wood, you will little think how many severall things it is that they call [*the Church*:] For example, sometime they mean *the whole Body, Pastors and People*: but more commonly they mean *only the Pastors*, which are the far smallest part. And sometime they mean the *Church Reall*: and sometimes only the *Church Representative*, as they call it in a Generall Council. But whether they mean the Pastors or People, they exclude all saving the Pope of his subjects, and so by the [*Church*] mean but a *part or sect*. Sometime in the Question

about *Tradition*, some of the French take the [*Church*] for the *community*, (as fathers deliver the doctrine of Christ to their children, &c.) And sometime they take it in its *Politick* sence, for a holy society, consisting of a *visible Head and members*: But then they agree not of that Head, some setting the *Pope* highest, and some the *Councill*. But frequently they take the word [*Church*] for the supposed *Head alone*, as in most questions about *Infallibility*, Judging of *Controversies*, expounding *Scripture*, keeping of *Traditions*, defining points of faith, &c. They say, *The Church must do these*: but commonly they mean the *supposed Head*: And one part mean a *Generall Councill*: and the *Jesuites* and *Italians*, and predominant part do mean *only the Pope*: so that when they talk of the *whole Catholick Church*, and call you to its Judgement, and boast of its *Infallibility* (you would little think it) they mean all this while but *one poor sinfull man*: and such a man as sometime hath been more unlearned then many of your school-boys of twelve or fourteen years of age; and sometime hath been a *Murderer*, *Adulterer*, and (if *General Councils*, or the common vote may be believed) an *Heretic*, an *Infidel*, an *Incarnate Devil*. This man is their *Church*, as *Gresser*, *Bellarmino*, and the rest of that strain profess.

So that if you do but force them to define and explain what they mean by the *Church*, you will either cause them to open their nakedness, or find them all to pieces about the very subject of the *Dispute*.

2. So also when they use the name of [*a Pope*] in disputation, make them explain themselves, and tell you (*in a Definition*) what they mean by [*a Pope*.] For, though you would think this term were sufficiently understood, yet you shall find them utterly at a loss, and all to pieces about it. Let us consider distinctly of the *Efficient*, *Matter*, and *Form*. 1. As to the *efficient cause* of their *Pope*, there must concur a *Divine Institution* (which they can no where shew) and a *call from man* (*Et Nemo dat quod non habet*, what man or men have power to make a *Head* to the *Catholick Church*.) But whether they will call it an *Efficient Cause*, or only a *Causa sine qua non*, *Election* and *Ordination* must go to make a *Pope*. Now either they will put these into their *Definition*, or not. If not, know of them whether a man without *Election* and *Ordination* may be *Pope*: If so, what makes

makes him one? If *Possession*, then he that can conquer *Rome*, and sit down in the chair is Pope: If *not possession*, what then? and why may not any man say, I am Pope? well: but doubtless they will tell you that *Election*, or *Ordination*, or both, is Necessary. If so, then first for *Election*, is it Necessary to the being of a Pope, that some certain persons *Elect* who have the Power, or will any *Electors* serve whosoever? If any will serve, then every Monastery or every Parish may choose a Pope: If there must be certain Authorized *Electors*, see that those be named in the Definition: or at least declared. And then first know whether these *Electors* are *impowered* to that work by *Divine Law*, or by *Humane*: If by *Divine*, let them shew it if they can. In Scripture they can never find who must choose the Pope. And their *Tradition* (if that were a *Divine law*) hath no such precept, as appeareth by the alterations and divers ways. And if it be but by a *Humane Ecclesiasticall Canon*, then it seems the *Papacy* is so too: for the Power received can have no higher a cause then the Power giving or authorizing.

2. When you come to know who these *Electors* must be, you open their nakedness. For first if they say, It must be the *Cardinals*, ask them, where then was the Pope when there were no *Cardinals* in the world? And whether that were a Pope or not that was chosen by the whole *Romane Clergie*? or whether those were Popes or not that were chosen by the *People*? Or those that were chosen by the *Emperours*? or those that were chosen by *Councils*? If they tell you that it must be the *Romane Clergie*; Know whether the *Cardinals* be the whole *Romane Clergie*, who are *Bishops* of other Churches, or whether they are not meerly *Titular*, at least many of them? And whether the *People*, the *Council*, or the *Emperours* were the *Romane Clergie*? If they would perswade you, that either the people, or the *Emperour*, or *Council* did not elect the Pope, but only shew whom the *Romane Clergie* should elect, interposing exorbitantly some unjust force, with the Due Election, then all currant History cryeth shame against them, and we will lay the Dispute on that with them readily, though it were with *Baronius* himself. Nothing almost is more evident in the *Papal History*, then that there have been at least these five ways of election among them. Let them put it upon this issue with us when they will.

If they allow of any of these as valid, which ever it be (as they must, or give up their succession) then 1. We would know by what Law of God the Emperour of *Germany* may choose a Head for the Catholick Church, any more then the Emperour of *Habassia*, or the King of *France* or *Spain*? 2. And we would know when the Emperour hath chosen one, and the Clergy another (if not some others a third) whether both were not true Popes, if both parties were authorized Electors? And if yet the People choose one, and the *Romane* Clergy another, and the Cardinals alone a third, and the Emperour a fourth, and the Council a fifth, must all these stand, or which of them, and why? Or if they tell you that it must be the particular *Roman* Church; then 1. If the people of that Church choose one, and the Clergy by major vote another, and the Cardinals a third, which is the true Pope? 2. And then the succession is gone however: For they were no Popes that Emperors or Councils chose.

2. If they shall tell you that it is not Election but Consecration that makes a Pope, yea or that Consecration is of Necessity with Election; then 1. Demand of them whether it be any one whosoever that may Consecrate, or whether this high power be confined to certain hands? If any may serve, or any Bishops, then he that can get three drunken Bishops to consecrate him may be Pope. And then there may be an hundred Popes at once. But if it be confined to certain hands, 2. Let it be put down in the Definition, or at least declared who those are that must ordain or consecrate him. 3. And if they say, that *It must be only the Italian Bishops that must consecrate*, then 1. Know of them by what Law of God they have power to consecrate a Head to the universal Church, when all nations are agreed that *quod perinet ad omnes, ab omnibus tractari debet*. 2. And by what Law they can create or Generate a creature of a more noble species then themselves, as if a beast should beget a man? Or whether this prove not, that as a Bishop at first was but *Presbyter prima sedis*, (like the fore-man of a Jury) and thence sprung an *Archbishop*, who was *Episcopus prima sedis*, and thence a Patriarch, who was *Archiepiscopus prima sedis*; so in process of time, when Pride grew riper, the Pope grew to be *Patriarcha prima sedis*; but not till long after, the Head or Governour of the universal Church, nor *Patriarcha Patriarcharum*; no more then the

the *Archbishops* or *Bishops* were at first *Episcopi Episcoporum*.

But if they can shew us no law of God empowering these special consecrators, any more then others, then where is the *Papacy* that dependeth on it? There is nothing in Scripture to empower the Italian Bishops any more then the Gallicane, Germane, or Asian, to Consecrate a Head for the Catholick Church.

3. But suppose there were, yet we must be resolved whether it be *some* or *all* the Italian Bishops that must do it? If but some, which be they? and how is their power proved? If all or any, then 1. What shall we do when some of them consecrate one Pope, and some another, and some a third, which hath fallen out: which of these is the Pope? If Consecration give the Power, then all are Popes. 2. And still the Papal succession is overthrown while many Popes had no Consecration by Italian Bishops.

Thus you may see what a case the poor Jesuits or Fryars will be in, if you put them but to insert the necessary Electors and Consecrators in their Definition of a Pope.

2. But that's not the worst, you must require them to put his necessary Qualification in the Description. For if no *Disposition* of the Matter be necessary, but *ex quolibet ligno fit mercurius Romanus*, then a Jew or other Infidel may be Pope: which they will deny. And if any *Disposition* of the Subject be of necessity to the Reception of the form, then cause them to put it down. And then 1. It is either *true Godliness*: and then farewell Papacy. 2. Or it is *common honesty and sobriety*: and then still farewell Papacy. 3. Or it is *learning and knowledge*: and then *Alphonfus à Castro*, and others of their own will bear witness that some Popes understood not their Grammar, and one good man being (saith *Wernerus*) *rudis literarum*, was fain to get another Compope to say his offices, (though it happened that they could not agree, and so a third was chosen, and his choice disliked, and a fourth chosen, till there was six chosen Popes alive at once.) 4. If age be necessary, then the Children Popes (one at least) have interrupted the succession. 5. Yea, if the Masculine Gender be but Necessary, Pope *Joan* hath interrupted the succession, unless between forty or fifty of their own Historians deceive us. 6. But all this is the smallest part, the Question

is whether faith in Christ be of Necessity to a Pope? If so, then what will you say to John the twenty third, that denyed the life to come, and to those that have been guilty of Heresie? So that by that time they have put the necessary Qualification of a Pope into their Definition, you shall find them hard put to it.

3. But yet the worst is behind. They be not agreed about the very form of the Papacy: For some say, *He is the Head of all the Catholick Church*: But others with the General Councils of Constance and Basil say, that *he is the Head only of the singular members*, but a subject to the Catholick Church represented in a Council, which receiveth its power immediately from Christ, so that you may see what a case they will be in, if they be but forced to tell you what they mean by a Pope, and to Define him too.

3. And if they use the name of a General Council, call them to Define what they mean by a General Council: some of them will say, *It must be a true Representative of the whole Catholick Church*: so that Morally they are all Consenting to what is there done. But then the doubt remaineth whether there be a Necessity of any certain Number of Bishops? If not; it seems the whole Church may agree that twenty, or ten, or two, or one shall represent them, and be a general Council. But if this must not hold, then *Must All the Bishops of the world be there, or only some, and how many?* Binnius saith, Vol. 1. pag. 313. that [*a General Council is that where all the Bishops of the whole world may and ought to be present, unless they be lawfully hindered, and in which none but the Pope of Rome by himself or his Legates, is wont to preside.*] And vol. 3. pag. 229. *It is when all the Church is morally Represented, the Pope presiding.*] But what a loss are we here at? 1. How prove they that only Bishops should be members of a Council, and not Presbyters?

2. But if that were granted them (without proof and contrary to practise) yet we are at a far greater loss to know what a Bishop is that must here be a member? Is he only the *Primus Presbyterorum* in a presbyterie? Or is he the Ruler of a Presbyterie, (they Ruling the people?) Or is he the sole Ruler of Presbyters and people? And is he to be in every Parish where are divers presbyters? or only in every Class or lesser Synod? or only in every

every County, or Province? Or shall the old Rule stand, that every City must have one? If so, then are not all our Corporations true Cities? And so by any of these Rules, there have been few General Councils in the world. And what word of God is there why *London, Worcester, Canterbury* should have Bishops; and *Shrewsbury, Ipswich, Plimouth* and hundreds such should have none? So that if the very matter of your Councils be so humane and disordered, what is the Council composed of such? As most of them use the term *Bishop*, you would put them as hard to it to Define a *Bishop* almost, as to define a Pope.

3. But suppose they help you over this rub, yet by their Definition they null many General Councils, because the Pope presided not there: even the first General Council itself at *Nice* (whatsoever they boldly feign to the contrary.)

4. And by this Rule, either we never had a General Council, or but few: For instance, At the first Session of the Council of *Trent* (the last and most famous Council) there were but four Archbishops, and twenty two Bishops, taking in the *Titular Bishops of Upsal, Armach, and Worcester*. And at divers other Sessions after, but eight, or nine, or very few more. In the fourth Session which Decreed to receive Tradition with equal pious affection and reverence as the holy Scriptures, and which gave us a false Catalogue of the Canonical Books, there were but the Popes Legates, two Cardinals, nine Archbishops (titular and all) and forty one, or forty two Bishops (titular and all.) Now we would fain know whether this was the whole Church, morally represented? and whether these twenty two, or forty one were all the Bishops of the world, or the hundredth part of them? Yea whether all the Bishops of the *African, Asian*, and other Churches could and ought to have been there?

If they say that most of the Bishops of the world are Hereticks or Schismaticks, and had nothing to do to be there, we are sure that this is but the impudent censure of a sect, that unchurcheth most of Christs Church, for far less faults then it self is guilty of: But how is this heavy censure proved?

5. Nay to make short of it, its plain by this Definition, that a General Council is but a name (at least since the daies when

when the Church lay in a narrow room) and that no such thing is to be expected in the world. For 1. If all Bishops, or half come thither, what shall their poor flocks do the while? 2. How many years must they be travailling from *America, Ethiopia*, and all the remote parts of the Christian world? 3. So much shipping, and provision, and so many thousand pound a man is necessary for the Convoy of many, that alas the poor Bishops be not able to defray the hundredth part of the charge. 4. Abundance of them are so aged and weak, that they are unfit for the journey. 5. Their Princes are some of them Infidels, and some at wars, and will never give them leave to come. 6. They must pass through many Kingdoms of the enemies, or that are in wars, that will never suffer them to pass. 7. The tediousness, and hazards of the journey, with change of air is like to be the death of most of them, and so its but a plot to put an end to the Church. 8. The length of General Councils is such (some of them being ten years, and some (as that at Trent) eighteen years) that so many Bishops to be so long absent from home, is but to give up the Church to Infidelity or Impiety (unless the Bishops be such things as the Church can spare.) 9. When they come together, they cannot many of them understand one another, because of the diversity of their languages. 10. And the Number would be so great, that ten or twenty Council-houses or rooms would not hold them: so that they could not Converse in one Assembly: so that a true General Council now, is but a name to amuse those that think the world is no bigger then a man may ride over in a weeks journey.

6. And yet even this Definition of *Binnins* is ridiculous: For he makes it enough that all the Bishops of the world *may* and *ought* to be there, whether they be there or not. But then what if laziness or danger deterr them or detain them? Is that a Council where Bishops *ought to be* and *are not*? How many must *de facto* be present, *any or none*? Prove if you can that forty Bishops are a General Council, because the rest *ought* to be there. And who shall be judge of each mans case, whether he *could* or *ought* to have been there? will you judge men before they are heard, or their cause known? Your saying that they *ought to have been there*, is no proof.

And yet *Binnins* hath one exception [*unless lawfully hindred*]

Good

Good still! If all the Bishops in the world be *lawfully hindered*, it seems it is a General Council when no body is there: You see now what you put the poor Papists too, if you put them to *define a General Council*, or tell you what they mean by that word.

And therefore I again advise you; let them not besool you with empty or ambiguous words. And when they are all to pieces among themselves, let them not make you believe they are united by agreeing in *One word*, when they are several things that are meant by that one word.

CHAP. XIX.

Detect. 10. **V**Hen they go about from Councils or other History to prove the Sovereignty of the Pope, let them not cheat you by confounding, 1. *An humane Ordinance with a Divine*: 2. *And an alterable point of Order with an unalterable essential part of the Church*: 3. *Or a meer Primacy in the same Order or office with a Governing Sovereignty, or a different Order or office.*

First therefore we would learn of them, whether the preeminence and order of the five Patriarchal Sees, began not about the first General Council to be lookt after, but was settled some while after: For till there were General Councils (such as were so called) there was no great occasion of determining which should have the first, second, or third seat.

2. Or when ever the time was, yet we enquire, whether these other Sees as of *Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria*, or some of them were not *Patriarchal* as soon as *Rome*? and whether Councils that speak of priority or posteriority, do not in the same manner, and on the same grounds, and to the same ends give *Alexandria, and Antioch*, their places, as they give to *Rome* the first place? Surely we find them speaking of them as matters of the same Order and nature, saying, *Rome* shall have the first place or seat, *Constantinople* the second, *Alexandria* the third, *Antioch* the fourth, and *Jerusalem* the fifth. 4. And therefore we enquire whether all these have not the same kind of right to their preeminence, whether it be *Divine or Humane*. And that the very foundation

dation of this Patriarchall order, yea of *Romes* Patriarchall Primacy, (which was the preparative to its universal Sovereignty) was not a meer humane invention, given on occasion of the Imperiall seat at *Rome*; and nor any insutution of Christ to *Peter* and his Successors, I desire you not to take from my word; but all that will not be fool'd out of all Historicall verity by Popish audacity; let them take it from the expresse words of the fourth great approved General Council, viz. of *Calcedon*, which the poor Jacobites and other Churches of the East and South are so reproached for rejecting. In *Act. 16. Binnis pag. 134.* these are their words [*Definitiones Sanctorum Patrum sequentes ubiq; & Regulam, & qua nunc relecta sunt 150. Deo amantissimorum Episcoporum, qui congregati sunt sub pia memoria Imperatore majore Theodosio in Regia civitate Constantinop. Nova Roma, cognoscentes & nos eadem definivimus de privilegiis ejusdem Sanctissima Constantinop. Ecclesie nova Roma. Etenim sedi Senioris Roma; propter Imperium civitatis illius (N. B.) patres consequenter privilegia reddiderunt. Et eadem intentione permoti 150. Deo amantissimi Episcopi aqua sanctissima sedi nova Roma privilegia tribuerunt, rationabiliter judicantes Imperio & Senatu Urbem ornata[m] aquis Senioris Regie Roma privilegiis frui.*] i. e. [We following alway the Definitions of the holy fathers, and the Canon, and knowing those that now have been read of the hundred and fifty Bishops, most beloved of God, that were Congregated under the Emperour of pious memory Theodosius the Greater, in the Royall City Constantinople (new Rome,) have our selves also defined the same things; concerning the Priviledges of the same most holy Church of Constantinople, new Rome. For to the seat of old Rome, because of the Empire of that City, the Fathers consequently gave the Priviledges. And the hundred and fifty Bishops most beloved of God, being moved with the same intention, have given equall Priviledges to the most holy Seat of New Rome: reasonably judging, than the City adorned with the Empire and Senate, shall enjoy equal Priviledges with old Regal Rome.]

I do not stand to note that this Council was called by *Marian*: that his Lay Officers were called the Judges, or how light the Council made of *Rome* when they said [*Qui contradicunt Nestoriani sunt: qui contradicunt Romam ambulant*] *Bin. p. 98.* Nor

Nor do I stand so much on it, that they gave *Constantinople* equal priviledges. But it may confound all the Papal Juglers on earth to find an approved General Council affirming, 1. That *Romes Priviledges* (even its meer primacy) were given by the Fathers. 2. And that because it was the Imperial City. 3. And therefore on the same reason they do the like by *Constantinople*. 4. And that the General Council of *Constant.* had gone before them on these grounds: so that you have the vote of two of the first four great General Councils, that it was not so from the beginning, nor an Apostolical Tradition, but the act of the Fathers, because of the Imperial City. If a General Council can err, Popery is a deceit. If it cannot err, then the very Primacy of order in the Pope was then but new, and humane, on a Carnal ground, done by man, that might do the like by others, and therefore undo this again.

But say they, *Pope Leo confirmed not this.* Answ. 1. Still then the Church Representative it seems may err, and the Pope only is infallible. 2. *Leo* and his Delegates were offended at *Anatolius* his rising, and the equaling him with *Rome*: but they never excepted one word (that ever I found) against the saying, that it was because of the Empire that *Rome* by the Fathers had the Primacy given it.

And the Reason given by themselves *Concil. Constant. Can. 5.* is, [because *Constantinople* is new *Rome*] But *Binnius* saith that *Rome* receiveth not the Canons of this Council neither, but only their condemnation of *Macedonius*. And he saith [that every Council hath just so much strength and authority as the Apostolick seat bestoweth on it. For (saith he), unless this be admitted, no reason can be given why some Councils of greater numbers of Bishops were reprobated; and others of a smaller number confirmed] *Bin. Vol. 2. p. 515.*

What would you have more Sirs? Do you not see yet what the Popish Catholick Church is; and what they mean when they mouth it out to you, and ask you whether your private Judgment be safer or wiser then that of the whole Church, or of all the Christian world? You see they mean all this while but one man, whom *Gretser* and others plainly confess they call the Church. So that indeed it is General Councils, and all the Christian world or Church that are the ignorant, fallible, and offe-

ring part : and it is one man, (that sometime is reputed an incarnate Devil by a General Council too) that is the unerring Pillar of the Church, and wiser then all they. Do you not see that they make a meer nothing or mockery of General Councils, any further then they please the Pope ? And can you expect that any thing should please them that is against his Greatness, or, as *Julius* the second calls it, [*his holding the place of the great God, the Maker of all things, and all Laws?*] What a vile abuse is it then of the Pope to trouble the world by the meetings and Consultations of General Councils, when he can sit at *Rome* and contradict them infallibly, and, Good man, is fain to save the Catholick Church from the Errors that General Councils (the Representative Catholick Church) would else lead them into : and therefore could he not with less ado infallibly make us Laws, Canons, and Scriptures without them ? For sure that which the Pope can do *against* a General Council, he can do *without* them. If he can Infallibly contradict a General Council, and Infallibly Rule us *contrary* to their Judgement, he may no doubt Infallibly Rule us without them. And therefore of late times they have learnt so much wit, that you may look long enough before you see a General Council. And I think the Council of *Constance* were no better Prognosticators then *William Lilly*, nor no more effectuell Lawgivers then *Wat Tyler*, when they Prognosticated or Ordained Decennial Councils : And I will be judged by all the world.

And here also you may see what account the Papists make even of the first General Councils. Its all one with them to judge others Hereticks for contradicting especially the four first General Councils (compared to the four Evangelists) as the Scripture it self : and yet (who would have thought it) they profess themselves to reject the Canons or Decrees of both these, the first of *Constantinople*, and that of *Calcedon* in part.

And, now I think on it, by this priviledge I cannot see but the Pope is priviledged from all possibility of being an Heretick personally. But these things are on the by, I return to the point in hand, which is to prove to you, that not only the Romish Universal Monarchy and Vice-godhead, but even its Patriarchal Primacy was no Apostolical Tradition, but an Humane Institution, founded on this Consideration, that *Rome* was the Imperial Seat and City.