

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.



5. And Humane it must needs be. 1. For we find that Councils did not declare it as any part of the Law of God, but Ordain it as an act of their own. 2. We find them adding the Patriarchate of *Constantinople*, which was a new seat, neither Patriarch nor Bishop residing there in the Apostles dayes, or long after. 3. Yea we find them giving this new Patriarch the second place, and once making him equal with old *Rome*, which they would never have presumed to do, if they had thought that the Patriarchship of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, or *Rome* had been of Divine Institution: for what horrible arrogancy would that have been, when the Holy Ghost by the Apostles had made *Alexandria* second, and *Antioch* third, and *Rome* first, for a Council to set *Constantinople* before two of them, and equal with the first?

6. And therefore we have reason to think that if Patriarchs be desirable creatures, there may more and more new ones now be made, as lawfully as *Constantinople* was.

7. And we do not think that a General Council or Pope can make a man of one Nation to be Patriarch of the Church in another Nation, that perhaps may be in wars with the Prince of the first Nation: but that each Prince with the Church under their Power, hath more to do in it then either Pope or Council. And if *Portugal* and *France* set up Patriarchs at home, they do as lawfully as the Patriarch of *Constantinople* was set up.

8. And therefore we must needs judge, that to disobey the Pope, or withdraw from his subjection (if he had never forfeited his Patriarchship by the claim of an Universal Headship) were no greater a sin, then to disobey or withdraw from the Patriarch of *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, or *Constantinople*: either the Government by Patriarchs and Arch-bishops is of Gods ordaining and approving, or not: if not (as most of the Protestants hold) then it is no sin to reject any of them. If it be of God, then to reject any of them (though in simple error) is a sin of disobedience through ignorance, but is far from proving a man to be no member of the Catholick Church: for sure Patriarchs are far from being Essential parts of the Catholick Church.

For, 9. We conclude, as in the Papists own Judgement, the Catholick Church may be without the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, or *Antioch*; so may it therefore without the Pope of *Rome*.



## CHAP. XX.

*Detect.* 11. **T**HE great endeavour of the Papists is to advance Tradition: The Council of Trent *Ses.* 4. hath equalled it with the Scriptures, as to the pious affection and reverence wherewith they receive it. On pretence of this Tradition they have added abundance of new Articles to the faith, and accuse us as Hereticks for not receiving their Traditions: And this is a principall difference betwixt us, that we take the Scriptures to be sufficient, to acquaint us with the will of God, as the Rule of faith and holy living: and they take it to be but part of the word of God, and that the other part is in unwritten Tradition, which they equal with this (as afore.) For the maintaining of Tradition it is that they write so much to the dishonour of the holy Scripture, as you may find in *Rushworths Dialogues*, and *Tho. Whites* Defence of them, and many others; so like to the Arguments and Language of the Seekers and Infidels, that we can scarcely know whom we hear when they speak to us.

For the discovery of their desperate fraud in this point, and the right confuting of them: 1. You must distinguish them out of their confusion: 2. You must grant them all that is true and just, which we shall as stiffly defend as they: 3. You must reject their errors and confute them: And 4. You may turn their own principall weapon against them, to the certain destruction of their cause.

Of all these briefly in course.

1. For the first two I have spoke at large in the Preface to the second part of the *Saints Rest*, and in the determination in the first part of my Book against Infidelity. But briefly to touch some of the most necessary things here, 1. We must distinguish the Tradition of the Scriptures, or the Scripture doctrine, from the Tradition of other doctrines, pretended to be the rest of the word of God. 2. We must distinguish between a certain proved Tradition, and that which is unproved and uncertain, if not grossly feigned. 3. We must distinguish between the Tradition of the whole Catholick Church, or the greater part, and the Tradition of the lesser more corrupted selfish part (even the Roman part.) 4. We must distinguish



linguish between a Tradition of necessary doctrine or practice, and the Tradition of mutable Orders. 5. And we must distinguish between Tradition by way of Testimony, or History, or by way of Teaching Ministry, and Tradition by way of Decisive Judgement, as to the Universal Church: suffer them not to jumble all these together, if you would not be cheated in the dark.

2. And then concerning Tradition, we grant all these following Propositions, ( so that it is not all Tradition that we deny. )

1. We grant that the Holy Scriptures come down to us by the certain Tradition of our fathers and Teachers; and that what the seeing and hearing of the Apostles was to them that lived with them, that Tradition and belief of certain Tradition is to us, by reason of our distance from the time and place: So that though the Scripture bear its own evidence of a Divine author, in the Image and superscription of God upon it, yet we are beholden to Tradition for the Books themselves, and for much of our knowledge that these are the true writings of the Apostles and Prophets, and all, and not depraved, &c.

2. We thankfully acknowledge that the *Essentials* of the faith, ( and more ) hath been delivered even from the Apostles in other ways or forms, besides the Scriptures: as 1. In the *Professions* of the Churches faith. 2. In the *baptismal Covenant* and *signs*, and *whole administration*. 3. In the *Sacrament of the Lords Supper*. 4. In *Catechisms* or *Catechizings*. 5. In the *prayers and praises of the Church*. 6. In the *hearts of all true believers*, where God hath written all the *Essentials* of the Christian faith and Law: So that we will not do as the Papists perversely do: when God delivereth us the Christian Religion with *two hands*, *Scripture* ( compleatly ) and *Verbal Tradition*, ( in the essentials ) they quarrell with the one hand ( *Scripture* ) on pretence of defending the other: so will not we quarrell with *Tradition* ( the other hand: ) but thankfully confess a *Tradition* of the same Christianity by unwritten means, which is delivered more fully in the *Scripture*: and this Tradition is in some respect *subordinate* to Scripture, and in some respect *co-ordinate*, as the spirits left hand as it were, to hold us out the truth.

3. We confess that the Apostles delivered the Gospel by voice



as well as by writing, and that before they wrote it to the Churches.

4. By this preaching we confess there were Christians made, that had the doctrine of Christ in their hearts, and Churches gathered that had his ordinances among them, before the Gospel was written.

5. And we confess that the Converted were bound to teach what they had received to their children, servants and others.

6. And that there was a settled Ministry in many Churches ordained to preach the Gospel as they had received it from the Apostles before it was written.

7. And that the said ordinances of Baptism, Catechizing, Professions, Eucharist, Prayer, Praise, &c. were instituted, and in use before the Gospel was written for the Churches.

8. And that when the Gospel was written, as Tradition bringeth it to us, so Ministers are commissioned to deliver both the Books, and the doctrine of this Book, as the Teachers of the Church, and to preach it to those without, for their conversion.

9. And that Parents and Masters are bound to teach this doctrine to their children and servants: yea if a Minister or other person were cast into the *Indies* or *America* without a Bible, he must teach the doctrine, though he remembered not the words.

10. We grant that to the great benefit of the Church, the writers of all ages have in subserviency to Scripture delivered down the Sacred Verities, and Historians the matters of fact.

11. And that the unanimous Consent of all the Churches, manifested in their constant professions, and practices, is a great confirmation to us.

12. And so is the suffering of the Martyrs for the same truth.

13. And the Declarations of such consent by Councils is also a confirming Tradition.

14. And the Confessions of Hereticks, Jews and other Infidels, are Providentiall and Historical Traditions, for confirmation.

15. And we profess that if we had any Certain proof of a Tradition from the Apostles of any thing more then is written in  
Scrip-



Scripture, we would receive it : All this we grant them for Tradition.

3. But in these points following we oppose them. 1. We take the holy Scriptures as the Compleat universal Rule or Law of faith and Holy living, and we know of no Tradition that containeth another word of God ; Nay we know there is none such because the Scripture is true, which asserteth its own sufficiency. *Scripture*, and *unwritten Tradition* are but two wayes of acquainting the world with the *same* Christian doctrine ; and not with divers parts of that Doctrine, so as that Tradition should add to Scripture : yea contrarily it is but the substance of greatest verities that are conveyed by unwritten Tradition : but that and much more is contained in the Scripture, where the Christian doctrine is compleat.

2. The manner of delivery in a form of words, which no man may alter, and in so much fullness and perspicuity, is much to be preferred before the meer verbal delivery of the *same* doctrine. For 1. The Memory of man is not so strong as to retain as much as the Bible doth contain, and preserve it safe from alterations or Corruptions ; Or if one man were of so strong a memory, no man can imagine that all or most should be so : Or if one Generation had such wonderfull memories, we cannot imagine that all their posterity should have the like. If there were no statute Books, Records, or Law-books in *England*, our Laws would be but sorrily kept, and obeyed and executed.

2. If all the world had such miraculous memories, yet men are apt to be negligent either in learning or keeeping of holy doctrine ; All have not that zeal that should excite them to such wonderfull diligence without which such a treasure could not be preserved.

3. When matter and so much matter, is committed to bare memory without a form of unalterable words, new words may make an alteration before men are aware : The change of one word sometimes doth make a whole discourse seem to have another sense.

4. There are so many carnal men in the world that love not the strictness of that doctrine which they do profess, and so many hereticks that would pervert the Holy Doctrine, that it would purposely be altered by them if it could be done ; and it



might much more easily be done, if it lay all upon mens memories: For one party would set their memory against the others, and (as it was about *Easter* a publick matter of fact) tradition would be set against tradition: especially when the far greater part of the Church turn Hereticks, as in the Arrians dayes, then Tradition would be most at their keeping and interpretation; and if we had not then had the unalterable Scriptures, what might they not have done?

5. A whole Body of Doctrine kept only in Memory, will be soon disjoynted and dislocate; and if the matter were kept safe, yet the *method and manner* would be lost.

6. And there could not be such satisfactory Evidence given to another of the Integrity or Certainty of it, as when it is preserved in writing. We should all be diffident that the Laws of *England* were corrupted, or that Lawyers might combine to do it at their pleasure, if there were no Law Books or Records, but all lay in their memories. If they were never so faithfull, yet they could not give us such evidence of it.

I do not think any man of common reason can heartily believe, that all the holy Truths of God, Historical, Doctrinal, Practical, Prophetical, &c. could (without a course of miracles, or extraordinary means) have been kept through all ages, as well without writing, as with it.

7. And if writing be not necessary, why have we so many Fathers, Histories, and Canons? And why do they fetch their Tradition from these, and ridiculously call them unwritten verities? Are they unwritten, when they turn us to so many volumes for them? And if mans writing be necessary for their preservation, me thinks men should thankfully acknowledge that God hath taken the best way in giving it us in his own unalterable phrase.

3. If they do prove that some matters of fact are made known to us by Tradition that are not in the Scripture, or that any Church Orders or Circumstances of worship then used are so made known to us, (which yet we wait for the proof of) it will not follow that any of these are therefore Divine Institutions, or universal Lawes for the unchangable obligation of the whole Church. If there be some things Historically related in the Scripture, that were obligatory but for a season, and ordain-  
ed



ed occasionally, and ceased when the occasion ceased ( as the Love-feasts, the Kifs of Love, the washing of feet, the abstaining from things strangled and blood, the anointing the sick, the Prophesyings one by one, mentioned 1 Cor. 14. 31. miraculous gifts and their exercise, &c. ) then it will not follow, if they could prove that the Apostles fasted in the Lent, or used the sign of the Cross in Baptisme or holy Ordinances, or confirmed with a Cross in Chrysm, &c. that therefore they intended these as universal Laws to the Church, though I suppose they will never prove that they used the things themselves.

4. We will never take the Popes Decision or bare word for a Proof of Tradition : nor will we receive it from pretended Authority, but from rational Evidence. It is not their saying, *we are the authorized keepers of Tradition*, that shall go with us for proof.

5. And therefore it is not the Testimony of the Papists alone, ( who are not only a lesser part of the Church, but a part that hath espoused a corrupt interest against the rest ) that we shall take for certain proof of a Tradition : but we will prefer the Testimonie of the whole Catholick Church before the Romish Church alone.

6. They that can produce the best Records of Antiquity, or rational proof of the Antiquity of the thing they plead for, though they be but a few Learned Antiquaries, may yet be of more regard in the matter of Tradition then millions of the vulgar, or unlearned men : so that with us, *universal Tradition* is preferred before the Tradition of the *Romish sect*, and *Rational proof* of Antiquity is preferred before *ignorant surmises*. But where both these concur, both *universal consent*, and *records* or other credible evidence of Antiquity, it is most valid.

And as for the Romish Traditions which they take for the other part of Gods word : 1. In all Reason they must produce their sufficient proof that they came from the Apostles, before we can receive them as Apostolick Traditions. And when they have done that, they must prove that it was delivered by the Apostles as a perpetual universal doctrine or Law for the whole Church : and when they have well proved both these, we shall hearken further to them.

2. Either these Traditions have Evidence to prove them Apo-



stolical, or no Evidence. If none, how can the Pope know them? If they have Evidence, why may not we know it as well as the Pope? at least, by the helps that his charity doth vouchsafe the world.

3. If there be any Proof of these Traditions, it is either some Ancient Records or Monuments; and then our Learned Antiquaries may better know them then a multitude of the unlearned: Or it is the Practice of the Church: And then 1. How shall we know how long that practice hath continued, without recourse to the writings of the ancients? The reports of the people is in many cases very uncertain. 2. But if it may be known without the search of Antient Records, then we may know it as well as they.

4. If the Pope and Clergy have been the keepers of it, have they in all ages kept it to themselves or declared it to the Church? (I mean to all in common) If they have concealed it, 1. Then it seems it belonged not to others. 2. Or else they were unfaithfull and unfit for the office. 3. And then how do succeeding Popes and Clergy know it? If they divulged it, then others know it as well as they. We have had abundance of Preachers from among the Papists, that were once Papists themselves, as *Luther, Melancthon, Zuinglius, Calvin, Beza, Peter Martyr, Bucer, &c.* and yet these knew not of your truly Apostolical Traditions.

5. And it mars your credit with us, because we are able to prove the beginning of some of your traditions, or a time when they had no being, since the death of the Apostles.

6. And also that we are able to prove the death and burial of many things that have gone long under the name of Traditions.

7. And when we find so lame an account from your selves of the true Apostolical Traditions: You are so confounded between your Ecclesiasticall Decrees and Traditions, and your Apostolical Traditions, that we despair of learning from you to know one from the other: and of seeing under the hand of his Holiness and a General Council a Catalogue of the true Apostolical Traditions. And sure it seems to us scarce fair dealing that in one thousand and five hundred years time, (if indeed there have been Popes so long) the Church could never have an enumeration and description of these Traditions, with the



the proofs of them. Had you told us which are Apostolick Traditions but as fully and plainly, as the Scriptures which you accuse of insufficiency and obscurity, do deliver us their part, you had discharged your pretended trust.

8. And it is in our eyes an abominable impiety, for you to equal your Traditions with the holy Scripture, till you have enumerated and proved them. And it makes us the more to suspect your Traditions, when we perceive that they or their Patrons have such an enmity to the Holy Scriptures, that they cannot be rightly defended without casting some reproach upon the Scriptures. But this we do not much wonder at: for it is no new thing with the applauders of Tradition. We find the eighth General Council at Constantinople, *Can. 3.* decreeing, that [ *the Image of Christ be adored with equal Honour with the Holy Scripture.* ] But whether that be an Apostolical Tradition, we doubt.

9. And if General Councils themselves, and that of your own, should be for the sufficiency of Scripture; what then is become of all your Traditions? Search your own *Binnius*, page 299. whether it past not as sound doctrine at the Council of Basil ( in *Ragnsi Orat.* ) *Sup. 6.* [ *that faith and all things necessary to salvation, both matters of belief, and matters of practice, are founded in the literal sense ( of Scripture, ) and only from that may argumentation be taken for the proving of those things that are matters of faith, or necessary to salvation; and not from those passages that are spoken by allegory, or other spiritual sense* ] *Sup. 7.* [ *The Holy Scripture in the literal sense soundly and well understood, is the infallible and most sufficient Rule of faith* ] Is not here enough against all other Traditional Articles of faith? A plain man would think so. Yea, but *Binnius* noteth that he meaneth that explicitly or implicitly it is so. Well! I confess the best of you are slippery enough: but let us grant this; ( for indeed he so explaineth himself afterward: yet thats nothing for Tradition. He there maintaineth that Scripture is the Rule of faith ( not part of the Rule ) [ *For ( saith he ) when the intellect hapneth to err, as in hereticks, its necessary that there be some Rule, by the deviation or conformity to which the intellect may perceive that it doth or doth not err. Else it would be still in doubt and fluctuate* ———— *it appeareth that no humane sci-*



ence is the Rule of faith. It remaineth therefore that the Holy Scripture is this Rule of faith. This is the Rule, John 20. where he saith, these things are written that you might believe, that Jesus is the son of God, and believing might have life in his name. And 2 Pet. 2. You have a more sure word of prophecy to which ye do well that ye attend as to a light, &c. And Rom. 15. whatsoever things were written, were written for our learning, &c. — And its plain that the foresaid authorities are of holy Scripture; and speak of the holy Scripture, &c. The second part also is plain, because if the holy Scripture were not a sufficient Rule of faith, it would follow that the Holy Ghost had insufficiently delivered it, who is the author of it: which is by no means to be thought of God whose works are all perfect. Moreover if the Holy Scripture were wanting in any things that are necessary to salvation, then those things that are wanting might lawfully and deservedly be superadded from some thing else (aliunde) or if any thing were superfluous, be diminished. But this is forbidden, Rev. 22. From whence its plain that in Scripture there is nothing defective, and nothing superfluous, which is agreeable to its author, the Holy Ghost, to whose Omnipotency it agreeth that nothing deminutely; to his wisdom that nothing superfluously; and to his Goodness that in a congruous order, he provide for the Necessity of our salvation, Prov. 30. 5, 6. The word of God is a fiery buckler to them that hope in him: Add thou not to his words lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar. ] How like you all this in a Popish General Council? and in an Oration against the Sacrament in both kinds.

Well! but perhaps the distinction unsaith all again? No such matter; you shall hear it truly recited. He proceeds thus [ But for the further declaration of this Rule as to that part, it must be known, that the sufficiency of any doctrine is necessarily to be understood two ways; one way Explicitely, another way Implicitely. And this is true in every Doctrine or science, because no doctrine was ever so sufficiently delivered, that all the Conclusions contained in its principles, were delivered and expressed explicitly and in the proper terms: and so it is in our purpose: because there is nothing that any way or in any manner (N. B.) pertains to faith and salvation, which is not most sufficiently contained in the holy Scripture explicitly or implicitly. Hence saith

Austin



Austin [every truth is contained in the Scriptures, latent or patent, as in other sciences Speculative, or Moral and Civil, the Conclusions and determinations are contained in their principles, &c. and the deduction is by way of inference or determination — ]

This is the plain Protestant Doctrine. There is nothing any way necessary to faith or salvation, but what is contained in the Scriptures, either expressly, or as the Conclusion in the premises. Good still ! we desire no more. Let holy Reason then discern the Conclusion in the premises, and let us not be sent for it to the Authority of Rome ; nay sent for some thing else, that is no Conclusion deducible from any Scripture principles : we grant Tradition or Church practices are very useful for our better understanding of some Scriptures. But what is this to another Traditional word of God ? Prove your Traditions but by inference from Scripture, and we will receive them.

Yet let us hear this Orator further clearing his mind [Adding to a Doctrine may be understood four ways. 1. By way of explication or declaration. 2. By way of supply. 3. By way of ampliation. 4. By way of destruction, or contrary. The first way is necessary in every science and doctrine, and specially in Holy Scripture ; not for it self, which is most sufficient, and most cleare in it self, but for us : ( This we all yield ) The second way is necessary to sciences diminutely and insufficiently delivered by their authors, for their supplement : so Aristotle is supplemented by Albertus Magnus, &c. The third way, specially if it be not excessive, is tolerable to the well being, though it be not necessary. The fourth way — assertively is to be rejected as Poyson — Thus are the authorities to be understood, that forbid to add to, or diminish from the Scripture, Deut. 12, 32.

Well ! by this time you may see, that when such doctrine as this for Scripture sufficiency and perfection as the Rule of faith and life, admitting no addition as necessary but explication, nor any other as tolerable, but moderate ampliation ( which indeed is the same, ) I say, when this doctrine past so lately in a Popish General Council, you may see that the very Doctrine of Traditions equaled with Scripture, or being another word of God, necessary to faith and salvation, containing what is wanting in Scripture, is but lately sprung up in the world. And sure the Traditions themselves be not old then, when the conceit of them came but lately into the world.



4. Well : I have done the three first parts of this task : but the chief is yet behind, which is to shew 1. How little the Papists get by their Argument from Tradition. 2. And how much they lose by it : even all their cause.

1. Two things they very much plead Tradition for : the one is their private doctrines and practices, in which they disagree from other Christians : and here they lose their labour with the judicious. 1. Because they give us no sufficient proof that their Tradition is Apostolical. 2. Because the dissent of other Churches sheweth that it is not universal : with other Reasons before mentioned.

2. The other Cause which they plead Tradition for, is the Doctrine of Christianity it self. And this they do in design to lead men to the Church of *Rome* : as if we must be no Christians, unless we are Christians upon the credit of the Pope, and his Subjects. And here I offer to their Consideration these two things, to shew them the vanity of their arguing.

1. We do not strive against you in producing any Tradition or Testimony of Antiquity for the Scripture, or for Scripture Doctrine : we make as much advantage of such just Tradition as you. What do such men as *White, Vane, Cressy, &c.* think of, when they argue so eagerly for the advantage of Tradition to prove the Scripture and Christian faith ? Is this any thing against us ? Nothing at all. We accept our Religion from both the hands of Providence that bring it us ; Scripture and Tradition : we abhor the contempt which these partial Disputers cast upon Scripture ; but we are not therefore so partial our selves as to refuse any collateral or subordinate help for our faith. The more Testimonies, the better. The best of us have need of all the advantages for our faith that we can get. When they have extolled the Certainty of Tradition to the highest, we gladly joyn with them, and accept of any certain Tradition of the mind of God. And I advise all that would prove themselves wise defenders of the faith, to take heed of rejecting Arguments from Providences, or any necessary Testimony of man, especially concerning matter of fact, or of rejecting true Church History, because the Papists overvalue it under the name of Tradition, lest such prove guilty of the like partiality and injuriousness to the truth as the Papists are. And whereas the Papists imagine,  
that



that this must lead us to their Church for Tradition, I answer that in my next observation, which is,

2. We go beyond the Papists in arguing for just Tradition of the Christian faith, and we make far greater advantage of it then they can do. For 1. They argue but from Authoritative Decision by the Pope, under the name of Church-Tradition (excepting the French party) whereas we argue from true History and certain Antiquity, and prove what we say.

Where note 1. That their Tradition is indeed no Tradition: for if it must be taken upon the credit of a man as supposed Infallible by supernatural (if not miraculous) endowment, this is not Tradition but Prophecie. And if they prove the man to be such a man, its all one to the Church whether he say that [ *This was the Apostles doctrine*, or, *This I deliver my self to you from God.* ] For if he were so qualified, he had the power and credit of a prophet or Apostle himself. And therefore they must prove the Pope to be a Prophet, before their kind of Tradition can get credit: and when they have done that, there is no need of it: this their honest Dr. Holden was ware of, upon which he hath so handsomely canvassed them.

2. Note also that such as Dr. Holden, Cressy, Vane, White and other of the French way that plead for Tradition, mean a quite other thing then the Jesuited Italian Papist meanes; and while they plead for universal Tradition, they come nearer to the Protestants, then to their Brethren, if they did not contradict themselves, when they have done, by making meer Romish Tradition to be *universal*.

3. Note also, that when Papists speak of Tradition confusedly, they give us just reason to call them to Define their Tradition, and tell us what they mean by it, before we dispute with them upon an ambiguous word; seeing they are so divided among themselves, that one party understands one thing by it, and another another thing; which we must not suffer these jugglers to jumble together and confound.

2. Another advantage in which we go beyond the Papists for Tradition, is, that as we argue not from the meer pretended supernatural Infallibility or Authority of any, as they do, but from rational Evidence of true Antiquity; so we argue not from a *sect* or party as they do, but from the *Universal Church*:



As far as the whole Church of Christ is of larger extent and greater credit then the Popish party, so far is our *Tradition* more Credible then theirs. And that is especially in three things.

1. The Papists are fewer by far then the rest of the Christians in the world. And the testimony of many, yea of all, is more then of a part. 2. The Papists above other parties have espoused an interest that leads them to pretend and corrupt Tradition, and bend all things to that interest of their own, that they may Lord it over all the world: But the whole Church can have no such Interest and Partiality. 3. And the Papists are but one side; and he that will judge rightly, must hear the other sides speak too. But the Tradition that we make use of, is from all sides concurring; yea Papists themselves in many points.

Yea our Tradition reacheth further then the Universal Church: for we take in all rational Evidence: even of Jews, Heathens, and Hereticks, and Persecutors, that bear witness to the matters of fact, and what was the doctrine and practice of the Christians in their times, and what Books they made the ground of their faith: so that as true Universal impartial naturally or rationally-infallible History or Testimony, differeth from a private, pretended-prophetical assertion, or from the Testimony of one party only; so doth our Tradition excell both the sorts of Popish Tradition, both that of the Papal, and that of the Council party. And now judge who may better boast of or extol Tradition, they or we; and to what purpose, *Cressy, White*, and such men do bring their discourses of Tradition.

2. But yet we have not so done with them, till Tradition have given them their mortal stroke. You appeal to Tradition, to Tradition you shall go. But what Tradition mean you? The Tradition of the Catholick Church? And where is this to be found and known? but in the profession and practice of the Church, and in the Records of the Church. Well then! of both these let us enquire.

The first and great Question between you and us, is, *Whether the Pope be the Head and Sovereign Ruler of the whole Catholick Church: and then whether the Catholick Church and the Romans are of equal extent? What saith Tradition to this?*

1. Let us enquire of the present Church: and there we have the profession and practice of all the Greek Church; the Sy-  
rians,



rians, the Moscovites, the Georgians, and all others of the Greek Religion dispersed throughout the Turks Dominions, with the Jacobites, Armenians, Egyptians, Abassines, with all other Churches in *Europe*, &c. that disclaim the Headship of the Roman Pope; all these do with one mouth proclaim that the Church of *Rome* is not, and ought not to be the Mistress of the world, or of all other Churches, but that the Pope for saying such a claim is an usurper, if not the AntiChrist. This is the Tradition of the Greeks; this is the Tradition of the Abassines: the far greatest part of the Church on earth agree in this. Mark then what is become of the Roman Sovereignty, by the verdict of Tradition; even from the vote of the greatest part of the Church. *Rome* hath no right to its pretended Sovereignty. *Babylon* is fallen by the judgement of Tradition.

If you have the faces again to say that all these are Hereticks or Schismatics, and therefore have no vote, we answer. If a minor party, and that so partial and corrupt, seeking Dominion over the rest, may step into the Tribunal, and pass sentence against the Catholick Church, or the greatest part of it, blame not others, if on far better grounds they do so by that part. And for shame do not any more hereafter use any such self-condemning words, as to ask any Sect, [ *How dare you condemn the Catholick Church? Do you think all the Church is forsaken but you, &c?* ] And let us ask you, as you teach your followers to ask us, [ *If we must turn from the Universal Church to any Sect, why rather to yours then another? why not as well to the Anabaptists, or other party, as to the Papists?* ]

But your common saying is, that the *Greeks, Protestants, and all the rest were once of your Church, and departing from it, they can have no Tradition but yours, for their spring is with you.* To which we answer. 1. The vanity of this your fiction shall by and by be answered by it self. 2. You say so, and they say otherwise: why should we believe you that are a smaller, partial and corrupted part? 3. Well then let us go to former ages, seeing it is not the present Church whose voice you will regard (only by the way, I pray forget not, 1. That you do ill then to call us still to the Judgement of the *present Church*, and dare not stand to it. 2. And that you do ill to perswade men that the greater part of the Church cannot err, if you sentence the



greater part as Schismatics or Revolvers. ) But how shall we know the way and mind of the ages *past* ? If by the *present age*, then the greater part giveth us in their sence against you. If by the Records of those times, we are content to hear the Testimony of these. And first when we look into the Antients themselves, we find them generally against you ; and we find in that which is antiquity indeed, no footsteps of your usurped Sovereignty, but a contrary frame of Government, and a consent of antiquity against it. 2. When we look into later History we find, how by the advantage of *Romes* temporal greatness and the Emperors residence there your greatness begun, and preparation was made to your usurpation, and how the translation of the Imperial Seat to *Constantinople* made them your Competitors, yea to begin in the claim of an universal Headship ; and we find how it being once made a question, you got it by a murdering Emperor resolved on your side for his own advantage. We find that it was long, eventill *Hildebrands* dayes, before you could get any great possession, for all this sentence. It would but be tedious here to recite our Historical Evidence : we refer you to what is done already by *Goldastus* and *Bishop Usher de stain & success. Ecclesiar.* and in his *Answer to the Jesuits Challenge*, and in his Discourse of the Antient Religion of *Ireland*, &c. specially by *Blondel* in his French Treatise of Primacy, and *Dr. Field*, and many others that have already given you the testimony of Antiquity. More then you can give a reasonable answer to, I have produced in my Book called the *safe Religion*. In plain English, instead of *Apostolical Tradition for your Sovereignty* ; we find that eight hundred years after the dayes of Christ, you had not neer so much of the Catholick Church in your subjection, as you have now : that at four hundred, or five hundred, if not till six hundred years after Christ you had no known part of the world that acknowledged your universal Sovereignty ; but only the Latine Western Church submitted to the Pope as their Patriarch, and the *Patriarch prima sedis*, the first in order among the Patriarchs : and that before the dayes of *Constantine* and the Nicene Council, he was but a Bishop of the richest and most numerous Church of Christians : and we see no proof that of an hundred years after Christ he was any more then the chief Presbyter of a particular Church.



If all this will not serve, we have *National Evidences* beyond all exception, that the Ethiopian Churches of *Habassia*, the *Indians*, *Persians*, &c. were never your subjects to this day. That *England*, *Scotland*, and *Ireland* here in your Western Circuits, were not only long from under you, but resisted you, maintaining the Council of *Calcedon* against you, and joyning with the Eastern Churches against you, about Easter day, &c. And that the Eastern Churches and many great Nations, (as *Tendue*, *Numbia*, &c.) that now are revolted, were never your subjects, and some of them had little to do with you.

And yet if all this will not serve, we have your own Confessions. I have elsewhere mentioned some: *Canus Loc. Theol. lib. 6. cap. 7. fol. 201.* saith [ *Not only the Greeks, but almost all the rest of the Bishops of the whole world, have vehemently sought to destroy the Priviledge of the Church of Rome: and indeed they had on their side, both the Arms of Emperors, and the greater number of Churches: and yet they could never prevail to abrogate the Power of the one Pope of Rome* ] Mark here whether the Catholick Church was then your subjects, when the greater number of Churches, and most of the Bishops of the whole world, as well as the Greeks were against you, and vehemently fought against your pretended priviledges.

*Rainerius* (supposed) *contra Waldenses Catal. in Bibliotheca Patrum, Tom. 4. pag. 773.* saith [ *The Churches of the Armenians, and Ethiopians, and Indians, and the rest which the Apostles converted, are not under the Church of Rome.* ] Read and blush, and call *Baronius* a parasite. What would you have truer or plainer? And what Controversie can there be, where so many Nations themselves are witnesses against you? And you may conjecture at the numbers of those Churches by what a Legate of the Popes that lived among them, saith of one Corner of them, *Jacob. à Vitriaco Hist. Orient. cap. 77.* that the Churches in the Easterly parts of Asia alone exceeded in multitude the Christians both of the Greek and Latine Churches ] Alas, how little a thing then was the Roman Catholick Church!

If all this were not enough, the Tradition of your own Catholick Church is ready to destroy the Papacy utterly. For that a General Council is above the Pope, and may judge him and depose him, and that is de fide, and that its Heresie to deny it, and that all



*all this is so sure that ne unquam aliquis peritorum dubitavit, no wise man ever doubted of it, all this is the judgement of the General Council of Basil, with whom that of Constance doth agree; And whether these Councils were confirmed or not, they confess them lawfully called and owned, and extraordinary full: and so they were their Catholick Church Representative; and so the Popes Sovereignty over the Council is gone by Tradition: but thats not the worst. For, if a free General Council should be called, all the Churches in the world must be equally there represented: And if they were so, then down went the usurped Head-ship of the Pope: For we are sure already that most of the Churches in the world are against it: and therefore in Council they would have the Major vote. And thus by the concession of the Roman Representative Catholick Church the Pope is gone by Tradition. So that by that time they have well considered of the matter, me thinks they should be less zealous for Tradition.*

## CHAP. XXI.

*Detect. 12.* **A** Nother of the Roman frauds is this: *They perswade men that the Greeks, the Protestants, and all other Churches, were once under their Papal sovereignty, and have separated themselves without any just cause: and therefore we are all schismatics; and therefore have no vote in general Councils, &c.* —

A few words may serve to shew the vanity of this accusation.  
 1. Abundance of the Churches were so strange to you, that they had not any notable communion with you. 2. The Greek Churches withdrew from your Communion, but not from your subjection. If any of the Patriarchs or Emperours of Constantinople did for carnal ends at last submit to you, it was not till lately, nor was it the act of the Churches, nor owned, nor of long continuance. So that it was your Communion and not your subjection that they withdrew from.

2. And as for us of the Western parts, we answer you, 1. We that are now living, our Fathers, or our Grand-fathers, were not of your Church: and therefore we never did withdraw.

2. There



2. There were Churches in *England* before the Roman Power was here owned : And therefore if it was a sin to *change*, the first change was the sin, when they subjected themselves to you ; and not the later, in which they returned to their ancient state.

3. And for the Germanes or English or whoever did relinquish you, they have as good reason for it, as for the relinquishing of any other sin. If they did by the unhappiness of ill education or delusion, submit to the usurped Sovereignty of the Pope they had no reason to continue in such an error. Repentance is not a Vice, when the thing Repented of is a vice. Justifie therefore your usurpation, or else it is in vain to be angry with us for not adhering to the usurper, and the many corruptions that he brought into the Church.

## CHAP. XXII.

*Detect. 13.* A Nother deceit that they manage with great confidence, is this; say they, *If the Church of Rome be the true Church: then yours is not the true Church, and then you are Schismatics in separating from it: But the Church of Rome is the true Church; For you will confess it was once a true Church: when Paul wrote the Epistle to the Romans: and if it ceased to be a true Church, tell us when it ceased, if you can: If it ceased to be a true Church, it was either by heresie, or Schism or Apostacy: but by none of these: therefore, &c.*

A man would think that children and women should see the palpable fallacy of this Argument; and yet I hear of few that the learned Papists make more use of. But to lay open the shame of it in brief I answer 1. The deceit lieth in the ambiguity of the word [*Church.*] As to our present purpose, observe that it hath these several significations. 1. It is taken oft in Scripture for one particular Church, associated for personal communion in Gods Worship. And thus there were many Churches in a Countrey, as *Judea, Galatia, &c.* 2. It is taken by Ecclesiastical writers often for an Association of many of these Churches for Communion by their Pastors; such as were Diocesan, Provincial, National