

Greeks, Ethiopians, and the rest, that never were subject to the usurpation of Rome, but only (many of them) took him for the *Patriarch prime sedis*, but not *Episcopus Ecclesia Catholica*, or the Governour of the Universall Church. So that here was a visibility of our Church doubly more eminent then among the Romanists: 1. In that it was *the far greatest part* of the Catholick Church that thus held our Religion, to whom the Papists were then but few. 2. In that they did not only hold the *same Positive Articles of faith* with us, but also among their *Rejections*, did Reject the chief of the *Papish errors* as we do. Besides many particular points named in my *Safe Religion*, they Rejected with us, the *Popes Catholick Monarchy*, the pretended *Infallibility of the Pope or his Councils*: the *new form of the Papall Catholick Church*, as *Headed by him*, with other such points; which are the very fundamentall controversies between us and the Papists. So that (besides that the Papists themselves profess our Religion) *the major part of the Catholick Church did profess it, with the Rejection of the Papacy and Papall Church*; and so you may as easily see where our Religion was before *Luther*, as where the Catholick Church, or most of Christians were before *Luther*.

3. And beside both these, our Religion was professed with a yet greater *Rejection* of Romish corruptions, by thousands, and many thousands that lived in the Western Church it self, and under the Popes nose, and opposed him in many of his ill endeavours against the Church and truth, together with them that gave him the hearing, and were glad to be quiet, and gave way to his tyranny, but never consented to it.

Concerning these we have abundant evidence, though abundance more we might have had, if the power and subtilty of the Papall faction had not had the handling of them. 1. We have abundance of Histories that tell us of the bloody wars and contentions that the Emperours both of East and West have had with the Pope to hinder his tyranny; and that they were forced by his power to submit to him, contrary to their former free professions. 2. And we have abundance of Treatises then written against him, both for the Emperours and Princes, and against his doctrine and tyranny: some store of them *Goldast* hath gathered: And intimations of more you have



in their own expurgatory Indices. 3. And we have the histories and professions of the *Albigenses*, *Waldenses*, *Bohemians* and others that were very numerous, and if *Raynerius* say true, they affirmed (about the year one thousand one hundred) that they had continued since the Apostles, and no other Originall of them is proved. 4. Particular evidence unanswerable is given in by Bishop *Usher de Succes. & statu Eccl.* and *Answer to the Jesuites*, and the *Ancient Religion of Ireland*, and in *Dr. Field*, and *Morneyes Mysteric of Iniquity, and of the Church*, and *Illyricus*, and many others. 5. Even Generall Popish Councils have contended and born witness against the Popes superiority over a Council. 6. And in that and other points whole Countreyes of their own are not yet brought over to the Pope. 7. They have still among themselves Dominicans, Jansenists, &c. that are reproached by the Jesuites as siding with *Calvin* in many Controversies, as *Catharinus* and many more in others. Most points of ours which we oppose to Popery, being maintained by some or other of them. 8. But the fullest evidence is the certain history or knowledge of of the case of the common people and Clergy among them, who are partly ignorant of the main matters in Controversies between us (as we see by experience of multitudes for one, to this day) and are generally kept under the fear of fire, and sword, and torments; so that the truth of the Case is this: the Roman Bishops were aspiring by degrees to be Arch-bishops, and so to be Patriarchs, and so to have the first seat and vote, and to be called the *Chief Bishops or Patriarchs*, and at last they made another thing of their office, and claimed (about six hundred years or more after Christ) to be *universal Monarchs or Governours of all the Church*: But though this claim was soon laid, it was comparatively but few, even in the West, that made it any Article of their faith; but multitudes sided with the Princes that would have kept the Pope lower, and the most of the People meddled not with the matter, but yielded to necessity, and gave place to violence, except such as the *Albigenses*, *Bohemians*, *Wickliffists* and the rest that more openly opposed. So that no man could judge of the multitude clearly, which side they were on, being forced by fire and sword, and having not the freedom to profess their minds.



So that in summ, our Religion was at first with the Apostles, and the Apostolick Church : and for divers hundred years after, it was with the universal Christian Church : And since *Romes* usurpation, it was even with the Romanists though abused, and with the greater part of the Catholick Church that renounced Popery then, and so do now ; and also with the opposers of the Pope in the West under his own nose. You see now what Succession we plead, and where our Church and Religion still was.

If any deny that we are of the same Church and Religion with the Greeks, Abassines, and most of the Christian world, (yea all that is truly Christian) I easily prove it. 1. They that are Christians joyned to Christ the Head, are all of the same Church and Religion (for none else are Christians or united to Christ, but the Church which is his Body) But the sincere Greeks, Abassines, &c. and we are Christians united to Christ the Head : therefore we are all of one and the same Church and Religion.

2. They that believe the same holy Scripture, and differ in no essential part of the Christian faith, are of the same Church and Religion : but so do both we and all true Christians : therefore we are all of one Church and Religion.

3. They that are truly regenerate, and Justified; hating all known sin, longing to be perfect, Loving God above all, and seeking first his Kingdom and Righteousness, and accounting all things but as dung in comparison of Christ, these are all of the true Catholick Church, and the true Christian Religion: but such are all that are sincere, both of the Greeks, Abassines, &c. and the Reformed Churches ; as we prove, 1. To others by our Profession and Practice, by which only they are capable of judging of us. 2. To ourselves infallibly against all the Enemies of our salvation in Hell or Earth, by the knowledge and acquaintance with our own hearts, and the experience of the work of God upon them. All the Jesuites in the world cannot perswade me that I love not God, and hate not sin, and prefer not the Love of Christ before all the world, when I feel and know that I do ; till they can prove that they know my heart better then I do.

4. If *Christ* Consent to it, and we Consent to it, then we are all



all ( that are sincere in their profession ) of the true Catholick Church and Religion ( for if *he consent* and *we consent*, who is there that is able to break the match ? ) But Christ consenteth, and we consent : as we prove by parts. 1. *His consent* is expressed in his Gospel, that *whoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life ; and whoever will, may drink of the water of life freely.* 2. And *our consent* we openly professed at Baptisme, and have frequently renewed, and our own souls are acquainted with the sincerity of it, whatever any that know not our hearts may say against it.

5. All that are truly Baptized, and own their Baptismal Covenant, are visible members of the true Catholick Church : ( For it is the very nature and use of Baptisme to enter us into that Church : ) But Greeks, Abassines, Georgians, Armenians, &c. and Protestants, are all truly Baptized, and own their Baptismal Covenant : therefore we are all of the true Catholick Church.

What is ordinarily said against *this succession* of our Church, I have answered in my *safe Religion*. I now add an answer to what another, viz. H. Turbervile in his *Manuall* saith against us in the present point. The easiness of his Arguments, and the open vanity of his exceptions, will give me leave to be the shorter in confuting them.

His first Argument ( pag. 43. ) is this. [ *The true Church of God hath had a continued Succession from Christ:— But the Protestant Church, and so of all other Sectaries, hath not a continued Succession from Christ to this time : therefore, &c.* ]

*Ans.* 1. I pray thee Reader be an impartial Judge what this man or any Papist ever said with sense and reason, to prove that the Eastern and Southern Churches have no true Succession. Let them talk what they please of their Schisme, the world knows they have had as good a Succession as Rome. Are they not now of the same Church and Religion as ever they have been ? All the change that many of them have made, hath been but in the entertaining of some fopperies, common to Rome and them. And if any of these ( which you call Sectaries ) can prove their Succession, it destroyes your Argument and Cause. Me thinks you should not ask *them*, where *their Church* was before *Luther* ?



2. But how doth this Disputer prove his Minor, that we have no Succession? Only by a stark falsehood: forsooth [by the Concession of the most Learned Adversaries, who freely and unanimously Confess, that before Luther made his separation from the Church of Rome for nine hundred or one thousand years together, the whole world was Catholick, and in obedience to the Pope of Rome.

*Answ.* O horrid boldness! that a man that pleads for the sanctity of his Church, dare thus speak so notorious an untruth in the face of the world! At this rate of Disputing, the man might have saved the labour of writing his Book, and have as honestly at once have perswaded his Disciples, that his Adversaries unanimously confess that the Papists cause is best. What if the fifteen cited by him had said so, when I can bring him one thousand five hundred of another mind, and cite him fifteen for one of another mind, is that the unanimous confession of his Adversaries? But unless his Adversaries were quite beside themselves, there is not one of them could say as he feigneth them to say. For doth not the world know, that the Eastern and Southern Churches, far exceeding the Romanists in number, did deny obedience to the Pope of Rome? Would this perswade his poor Disciples that we all confess, that there are, or were no Christians in the world but Protestants and Papists? His first cited Confession is *Calvins* [that all the Western Churches have defended Popery] A fair proof! Doth this Disputer believe in good sadness, that the Western Churches are all the world, or a sixth part of the world? But this is the Popish arguing. What *Calvin* speaks of the Western Churches, that is, the prevailing power in each Nation of them, he interprets of all the world. So he deals with *Dr. White*, who expressly in the words before those which he citeth, affirmeth the visibility of the Churches of Greece, *Ethiope*, *Armenia*, and *Rome*; but only saith, that at all times there hath not been visible distinct companies free from all corruption: which one would think every penitent man should grant that knows the corruption of his own heart and life. It would be tedious to stand to shew his odious abuse of the rest: when they that say most of the word [world] but as it is used, *Luk. 2. 1.* so much of his first argument.



His second is this. *Without a continued number of Bishops, Priests, Laicks, succeeding one another in the profession of the same faith from Christ and his Apostles to this time, a continued succession cannot be had: But Protestants have no continued number, &c.*

*Ans.* And how proves he the Minor? No how at all; but puts us to disprove it; and withall gives us certain Laws, which we will obey when they grow up to the honour of being reasonable. His first Law is, that [ *We must name none but only such as held explicite the thirty nine Articles, all granting and denying the same points that the late Protestants of England granted or denied — for if they differ from them in any one material point, they cannot be esteemed Protestants* ] *Ans.* A learned Law! And what call you [ *a material point?* ] You may yet make what you list of it. If they differ in any point *Essentiall* to Christianity, we grant your imposition to be necessary. But there is not the least Chronologicall, or Geographicall, or other truth in Scripture, but is a *Materiall* Point, though not *Essentiall*. Must you needs know which these *Essentials* are? In a word: *Those which the Apostles and the ancient Church pre-required the knowledge and profession of, unto Baptism.* And because all your fond exceptions are grounded on this one point, I shall crave your patience, while I briefly, but sufficiently prove that *Ment that err, and that in points materiall, may yet be of the same Church and Religion.*

*Argum. 1.* If men that err in points material (that is, precious truths of God, which they ought to have believed.) may yet be true Christians and hold all the *Essentials* of Christianity: then may they be of the same true Church and Religion: But the former is true: therefore so is the later. The Antecedent is proved, in that all truths which may be called *Materiall*, are not of the essence of Christianity.

*Argum. 2.* The Apostle Thomas erred in a *Materiall* point (which is now an *essentiall*) when he would not believe Christs Resurrection: and yet was a member of the true Church: therefore, &c.

*Argum. 3.* The Papists err in material points, and yet think themselves of the same true Church: therefore they must confess that differing in *Material* points may be the case of members of the same true Church. For proof of the Minor, I demand:

Are



Are none of the points *Material* that have been so hotly agitated between the Jesuites, and Dominicans and Jansenists? the Papall party, and the Councill party? The Thomists, Scotists, Ockamists, &c. At least review the Jesuite Casuists cited by the Jansenists Myserie of Jesuitism; and tell us whether it be no whit *Material* whether a man may kill another for a Crown? or may kill both Judge and witnesses to avoid an unjust sentence? Or whether a man should go with good meanings into a Whore-house to perswade them to penitence, that hath found by experience that when he comes there he is naught with them himself? Or whether a man may lawfully lie and calumniate to put by a calumny? Or speak falsely with mentall reservations? Or forbear loving God many years together, if not all his life? Are these points no whit *Material*? You know that one part of you (with a Pope and General Council) are for deposing Heretical Kings, and murdering and stabbing them, and others of you disavow it: Is this no whit *material*? And yet you are all of one Church and Religion. A hundred more of your differences I could name.

*Argum. 4.* From instances of the Fathers that have erred in *Material* points, and yet are taken to be of the same Church and Religion. How many Churches differed about Easter day? what abundance of errors are in your *Clementines*, and other such writers owned by you? *Justin Martyr* was a Millenarie: Numbered divers Infidels with Christians; thought that Angels lived by meat, and generated with Devils, &c. *Athenagoras* thought that second Marriages were comely Adultery and that the Angels fell by the love of women, and begot Gyants of them, &c. *Irenaeus* hath the like: *Theophilus Antioch.* worse: *Tertullian* and *Orrigen* you will confesse had yet worse, *Clem. Alexand.* was for the salvation of Infidels and Heathens: against swearing and many such, besides those before mentioned. *Greg. Thaumaturgus* hath divers, if the confession and other works be his that are ascribed to him. *Cyprian*, *Firmilian*, and the whole Council at *Carthage* were for rebaptizing those baptized by hereticks; Against all Wars and Oaths *Lactantius* (with many more) was a Millenary, and hath too many great errors. I have no delight to rake into their faults; but if it be necessary I shall quickly prove many and great errors by fourty more of them at the least. And yet  
all



all these or most, are confessed by you to be of one Church and Religion.

*Argum. 5.* From your own Confessions. *Bellarmino, lib. 1. de Beat. SS cap. 6.* saith that he seeth not how the sentence of Justin, Irenæus, &c. can be defended from error. Of *Tertullian* he saith, *There's no trust to be given to him:* lib. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 8. *Eusebius* he saith was addicted to the Hereticks. *Cyprian* he saith did seem to sin mortally: de Rom. Pont. lib. 4. cap. 7. *Augustine* is accused by many Jesuites for going too far from *Pelagius*. *Hierom* is oft pluckt by you. And so are many more of the Fathers. And yet you confess some of them at least were of the true Church and Religion.

*Argum. 6.* If there be no perfect concord to be expected till we come to the place of perfect knowledge and happiness, then it is not perfect concord, that is necessary to prove us of the same Church or Religion. But the Antecedent is alas too far past doubt. Therefore, &c.

*Argum. 7.* If the godly and learned Doctors of the Church (and all men) have some (alas how many) culpable errors in matters of Religion (yea of faith, if you call that *de fide*, which we are obliged to believe) then those that have such errors may be of the same Church and Religion: But the Antecedent is so true and evident that I think none but a blind proud Pharisee will deny himself to beg of God daily to pardon and heal his culpable errors. So much to prove that men of errors and differing minds (if not about the essence of the Church) may be of the same Church.

2. But why is it that they must all needs explicitly hold the thirty nine Articles? 1. I pray you tell us, whether all your own Church do explicitly hold and believe all your Articles? that is, all that Popes and General Councils have defined or declared. Dare you say that one of five hundred, of five thousand, doth explicitly believe all this? And why then is it necessary in our case that all must explicitly believe all those Articles? 2. Yea with us it is far more unnecessary. For we take not those Articles for the Rule of our faith, but only the holy Scripture: And therefore you may as well tell us that no man is of our Religion, that did not write or speak all the same words that *Jewell*, *Reignolds*, *Perkins*, or such other have written



ten in their whole works. 3. Its easie to prove for all that, that the sense and substance of those Articles have been owned by the Churches in all ages.

3. But what if we grant your conclusion, that [*else they cannot be esteemed Protestants*] what of that? As if none but *Protestants* were of the same Church and Religion with us. Sure you think we make a sect of our selves like you, and exclude all others from the Church and Salvation as you do! The word [*Protestant*] is not the first denomination of our Religion from its essence; for so we call our selves [*Christians*] only; But it is a title that accidentally accrewed to our Religion, from our *Protesting against your innovations and corruptions*; and our Rejecting the errors contrary to our Religion which you had introduced. Now those that were not involved in your errors as our forefathers were, but lived at a further distance from you, might have no occasion to make such a Protestation; and yet be of the same Church and Religion as we are.

Now to your particular Laws. 1. Saith H. T. [*Let him not name the Waldenses: for they held the Real presence, that the Apostles were Lay men, that all Magistrates fall from their dignity by any mortal sin, that it is not lawful to swear, &c. and Waldo lived but in one thousand one hundred and sixty.*]

*Answ.* 1. We have better assurance of the faith of the Waldenses in their own published Confessions, then from the mouth of their Adversaries. 2. The Lutherans hold the real presence, and yet are of the same Religion and Church with us. 3. The Apostles were Lay-men in the Jews account and sense, as not being *Priests or Levites*, but not in Christians account that believed their mission: and thus thought the Waldenses. 4. They thought that Magistrates and Ministers do by Mortal sin forfeit all the right and title to their office; from which themselves may have comfort and justification in judgement: But they never thought that they were not to be obeyed by others, or that their actions were not valid for the Churches good. 5. Many of the ancientest Fathers thought it unlawfull to swear at all, that yet are cited by you as of your Church. But the Waldenses are slandered in these points. 6. Though Waldo was but about one thousand one hundred and sixty, yet the same Religion and Church under other names, and before those names were fast-

ned.



ned on them, was much elder, as *Raynerius* may satisfie you. So that for all this, the Waldenses and we are of one Church and Religion.

He adds [ *Let him not name the Hussites, for they held Mass, Transubstantiation and seven Sacraments, that the universal Church consisted only of the predestinate, &c.* ] *Answ.* O what a sort of men have we to deal with? The Council of Constance burnt *John Huss* to ashes for saying that there remained the substance of Bread and Wine after Consecration and that Transubstantiation was a new word to deceive men with ] as *Binnins* himself expresseth among their accusations of him: And among the articles for discovery of the Hussites, one was *whether they take it to be a mortall sin to reject the Sacraments of Confirmation, extreame unction and marriage.* ] And yet now *Huss* is burnt for it, the poor lay-Papists are perswaded by their deceivers, that the Hussites were for Transubstantiation and seven Sacraments. Why then did a General Council accuse or receive accusation and witness against him for the contrary? 2. That the universal Church as invisible, and as taken in the first signification, containeth none but the truly sanctified (and so predestinate) we believe as well as *Huss*: though in the second Analogical signification, the Church as visible, containeth all the Professors of faith and Holiness, whether sincere or not. 3. And that they were condemned by the Council of Constance, and *Huss* and *Hierom* burnt after they had a safe conduct, doth shew that the faith of Papists is perfidiousness, (for why should the people be more just then a General Council?) but it shews not that we and they are not of the same Church or Religion: you condemned and burnt those of our Religion too: therefore you thought at least that we are neer kin.

But *H. T.* proceeds with his precepts [ *Let him not name the Albigenes: for they held all marriages to be unlawfull, and all things begotten ex coitu to be unclean: They held two Gods, &c.* ] *Answ.* These are not only such falshoods by which you uphold your cause, but the more inexcusable and shameless, by how much the more frequently and fully detected long ago and yet continued in. *Perrin, Vignierius* and many others might have prevented your error: especially Bishop *Usher de Succes. Eccles.*



cap. 6, 7, 8, 9, & 10. who hath given you enough out of your own writers to have satisfied you; and shewed you, that it was from the Arrians and Manichees, inhabiting those Countreyes among them, that the heavy charges of *Bernard*, *Eckbertus Schonangiensis* and others were occasioned. And see by him there cited what the same *Bernard* saith against your Church of Rome, and then judge which he spoak hardlier of.

As for the Cathariks next added, they were not the Puritan Waldenses as you speak, but part of the Manichees: and if such as they are described, we are content to lose their names, and are not ambitious to be reputed their Successors.

He adds [ *Let him not name the Wicklifsians: for they held, that all things came to pass by fatall necessity; That Princes and Magistrates fell from their dignity and power by mortall sin.* ]  
*Ans.* We know by many of *Wicklifs* own books printed and manuscript what his judgement was, what ever your Council at Constance accuse him of. It was a *Divine Necessity* opposed to uncertainty, and to the determination of an unrul'd will, that he mentioneth. And do not your Jesuites lay as heavy a charge on the Dominicans sometimes? and with as great cause may many of your Schoolmen be disclaimed for this as *Wicklifs*, if you will understand him, and them. *Wicklifs* was known to obey and teach obedience to Magistrates. But is it not a fine world, when *Wicklifs* must not be of our Church because he is supposed to deny the power of Magistrates in mortal sin? and yet the Pope and his Council determine that Princes or Lords that will not root out such as the Pope calls Hereticks must be cast out, and their Countrey given to others. It seems you take *Wicklifs* to be some kin to your selves. But we doubt not but he was of the Catholick Church and Religion, and therefore of the same with us.

*H. T.* adds [ *Let b'm not name the Grecians: for they rejected the Communion of Protestants. Censur. Eccl. Orient. They were at least seven hundred or eight hundred year in Communion with the Church of Rome. — they were united to the Church of Rome again in the Council of Florence: They held Transubstantiation, seven Sacraments, unbloody Sacrifice, Prayer to Saints, and for the dead.* ]

*Ans.* If one Patriark, or twenty men reject our Communion,



nion, whats that to the Millions of Greek Christians that never rejected it? And whats that to all Patriarchs before and after that rejected it not? Did *Cyrl* reject our Communion, that hath published a Protestant confession, and was so maligned, and treacherously dealt with to the death, and falsely accused to the Turks by the Jesuites, for his constancy?

2. Do you think the world knoweth not by what inducements you drew a few poor men at *Florence* to subscribe to a certain union with you? and what death the Patriark dyed? and how the Greeks resented his fact? and what a return they made to your Church? I pray perswade your selves that they and we and all are Papists. 3. If the Greeks did disclaim Communion with us, they are nevertheless of the same Church and Religion with us, for all that. *Paul* and *Barnabas* were both Christians when they parted in dissention. If one neighbour in anger call another Traitor unjustly, and say he will have no Society with him, they may be both the Kings subjects and members of one Common-wealth for all that. 4. As to the Greeks opinions, and the Papists false accusations of them, I have spoken already against pretended *Veridicus* in my *Safe Religion*. It is not you nor all the Jesuites on earth that can prove the Greeks and us to be so distant, as not to be of the same Catholick Religion and Church.

You add [ *Let him not name the Egyptians: for they held Transubstantiation and unbloody Sacrifice, as is manifest by their Liturgies; but denyed the proceßion of the Holy Ghost from the Son, and held but one will in Christ.* Godignus de reb. Abas. lib. 1. cap. 28. ] *Answ.* 1. *Godignus* talks not of the *Egyptians* but the *Abassines*. This learned man it seems, is so home-bred, and confined to the Roman Church, that he little regardeth the rest of the Christian world; or else he would have known a difference between the *Egyptians* and *Abassines*: He is likely to know well the true Catholick Church that while. 2. You cannot prove that they hold Transubstantion. Nor shall your bare naming their Liturgy make us believe it. The *Egyptian* Liturgy you tell us not where to find, nor I suppose do you know your selves. An *Ethiopick* Liturgy your compilers of the *Bibliotheca Patrum* have given us, *Tom.* 6. But 1. It hath no mention of Transubstantiation in it, that I can find, but only a



*Hoc est Corpus*, &c. which we say in our Administration as well as they. 2. And I find that Liturgy so contrary to the reports of your own writers concerning the practice of the Ethiopians, (as about the Elevation, Confirmation, &c.) that I must needs conclude, that either the Liturgy or much of it is forged, or that the generality of your own Relators of their practice are grossly deceived, and do deceive, (which is not likely, because they are many, and write at several times, and it is against themselves.) 3. And as for the procession of the Holy Ghost, and the denial of two wills in Christ, some of your own writers profess, that the former in the Greeks, and the later in many others, is found to be but a verbal difference, the same words not signifying the same thing in their esteem as in ours. 4. However, if they would but become the subjects of the Pope, they might be of your Church for all this: and therefore seeing they are the subjects of Christ, we shall take both Ethiopians and Copries to be of the same Catholick Church with us, for all these and many other of their errors.

Lastly saith H. T. [ *Let him not cite the Armenians: for they hold but one nature in Christ, and that his flesh was changed into his Divinity, and were condemned by the Council of Calcedon.* ]

*Ans.* The Armenians are a considerable part of the Catholick Church. Binnius in the life of *Eugenius* the third saith, their Catholick (so call they their chief Bishop) hath infinite, that is, above a thousand Bishops under him. *Oth. Frisingensis* hath the like.

1. Though they held but one nature in Christ, it was not by permixtion or confusion of the natures, as *Eutiches* imagined, but Conjunction or Coalition: *Nicephor. Hist. Eccles. lib. 18. cap. 53.* And divers of your own writers say the difference is found to be but in words. And even all this they now deny, as you may see in their own Confession published not eighty years ago, *Artic. 26, 27, 28, 29, 30. &c.* 2. That they change the humane nature of Christ into the Divinity, is your slander, and therefore no good argument. 3. That they were condemned by (the five Acts, or in any Act of) the Council of Calcedon, is another untruth: sure you go much upon trust, that dare venture to stuff your book with such falsehoods. But the best is, your simple Papists know not but all is true: they must believe  
you,



you, and cannot disprove you. The Armenians then and we are of one Catholick Church and Religion, notwithstanding all your forgeries and vain exceptions. I know that one or two petty Councils chid them for not mixing water with wine in the Eucharist; and more then that, the Canons of the General Council called *Quinisexti* do condemn the same error as theirs, and also their deputing the Sons of Priests successively to the Priesthood, and not shaving their hair: and their eating eggs and cheese on Saturdayes and Sundayes in Lent. But 1. We fear not to say that we are of the same Church with men that err more then not shaving, or then eating eggs and cheese comes to, or any of this. 2. And remember that this is one of your Reprobate Councils. 3. And one that the third time (when two General Councils before had done it) did *Canon. 36.* give *aqualia privilegia*, equal priviledges to the Seat of *Constantinople* as *Rome* had. So that I think you will have no mind of this General Council. And if any other have judged them Eutichians, though I renounce that opinion, yet I must tell you, that my Charity covereth far greater errors in the Papiests, or else I could not take them for Christians. If the Question had ever been started in a Council, *whether mans soul and body are two Natures or but one*, its ten to one but it would have made another heresie, and yet perhaps the real difference have been no more then it is now there is no Controversie about it. But *H. T.* addeth [ *Protestants pretence to the Fathers of the first five hundred years, is very idle; because were it true, as it is most false, that those Fathers were Protestants, yet could not that suffice to prove them a continued Succession of one thousand six hundred years.* ]

*Ans.* 1. It sufficeth us if those Fathers were *Christians*, as we are, though having no usurper of an universal Monarchy to Protest against, they were not to be called Protestants. 2. It is an idle pretence indeed, to go about to prove a Succession of one thousand six hundred years, by the bare instance of five hundred years: but your idle head hath forged more idle pretences then this, by way of calumination. But yet we may prove the *Antiquity* of our Religion from those Fathers, and the *Novelty* of yours. and a Succession for those five hundred years: and for the rest, if the whole Christian world had been big enough



enough for you to see, you might have discerned our Evidence of a further Succession.

He adds [ 2. *Because those of the sixth age must needs know what was the Religion and Tenets of them that lived in the fifth age, by whom they were instructed, and with whom they daily conversed better then our Protestants can now do; who have Protested on their salvation, that it was the very same with theirs, received from them by word of mouth, &c.* ]

*Answ.* 1. Any thing will serve for the simple that will believe you. But I pray you tell us whether it were all or some of the sixth age that made this solemn Protestation that you mention. If all or most, or the ten thousandth man, tell us where we may find that Protestation. If a few, they were not the sixth age. 2. If Pope Boniface alone was not the sixth age, tell us where that age did Protest on their salvation, that the Bishop of Rome was taken by their Fore-fathers for the universal Monarch and Head of the Church ( beyond his bare Primacy of order ) 3. What age hath protested on their salvation, that the Roman prohibition of reading Scriptures, or of receiving the Eucharist in both kinds, or other points anon to be mentioned, were the Religion of their Fore-fathers, and so from age to age? 4. I pray you tell us where to find this Protestation of the tenth age, which Genebrard, Bellarmine, and others of your own so complain of, as having not learned men, nor any Council, but Apostatical Popes and an ignorant wicked Clergy, that suspected a man of Heresie if he understood Greek or Hebrew, and of Magick or Conjuring, if he medled with Mathematicks? 5. It is legible in the writings of the sixth Age, that they did fetch the doctrine of the fifth age from their writings, and not only from word of mouth. What else mean the preservation of those writings and those numerous citations out of them? Nay more; they would not trust their memories in a General Council for the Canons of the Church: no nor for the Canons of the next preceding Council, no nor for the Common Creed; but had all read and repeated out of the writing before the Council when there was occasion. And let Conscience be free to speak truth for a few sentences, and tell us in good sadness, whether you believe that the Oral Tradition of all the Church did preserve the Knowledge of *Augustines, Epiphanius,*



*Epiphanius, Chrysostomes, &c.* doctrine, so much as their writings do? Is the doctrine of *Aquinas, Scotus, Gabriel, &c.* yea the Council of Trent preserved now more certainly in mens memories, then in writing? If so, they have better memories then mine that keep them, and they have better hap then I that light of such keepers. For I can scarce tell how to deliver my mind so, in any difficult point, but one or other is misunderstanding and misreporting it; and by leaving out or changing a word, perhaps make it another matter: so that I am forced to refer them to my writings: and yet there by neglect they misinterpret me, till I open the book it self to them.

6. Either the Fathers of the fifth age are intelligible in their writings, or not. If they be, then we may understand them I hope with industry. If they be not, then 1. Much less were their transient speeches intelligible. 2. And then the writings of the sixth age be not intelligible, nor of any other: and so we cannot understand the Council of Trent (as the Papists do not that controvert its sense voluminously,) nor can we know the Churches judgement.

7. By your leave, the Roman Corrupters take on them so much Power to make new Laws and new Articles of Faith *quoad nos*, by definitions, and to dispense with former Laws, that unless they are all Knights of the Post, they can never swear that they had all that they have from their Fore-fathers.

8. Well! but all this is the least part of my answer. But I grant you that the sixth age understood and retained the doctrine of the fifth age, and have delivered it to us. But that there were no Hereticks or corrupters, you will not say your selves. Well then! the far greatest part of the Catholick Church did not only receive from the fifth age the same Christian Religion, but also kept themselves from the grossest corruptions of the Pope and his flatterers, that were then but a small part: And thus we stick to the Catholick Church succeeding to this day, and you to an usurper that then was newly set on the Throne of universal Sovereignty. So that your chief Argument treadeth Popery in the dirt: because the greater part of the Catholick Church not only in the fifth and sixth age, but in the seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth, thirteenth, fourteenth, fifteenth and sixteenth ages, have been aliens or enemies to the Roman universal



Monarchy: therefore if one age of the Church knew the mind of the former age, better then the Pope did, we may be sure that the Pope is an usurper.

The third Argument of *H. T.* is, that *the Fathers of the first five hundred years taught their teners: therefore its impossible they should be for the Protestants.* *Answ.* 1. Protestants are Christians, taking the Holy Scriptures for the Rule of their faith. If the Fathers were Christians, they were for the Protestants, but its certain they were Christians. If you could prove that they were for some of your mistakes, that would not prove them against the Protestants in the doctrine of Christianity, and the holy Scriptures; and so that we are not their Successors in Christianity, and of the same Church, which was it that you should have proved, but forgot the question. And of this we shall speak to you more anon.

Well! by this time I have sufficiently shewed the succession of our Church: and continuation of our Religion from the Apostles, and where it was before *Luther*, and given you the Catholick Church instead of a dozen or twenty names in each age, which it seems will satisfie a Papist; but yet we have not done with them, but require this following Justice at their hands.

Seeing the Papists do so importunately call to us for Catalogues and proof of our succession, Reason and Justice requireth that they first give us a Catalogue of Papists in all ages, and prove the succession of their Roman Catholick Church: which they can never do while they are men.

And here I must take notice of the delusory ridiculous Catalogue wherewith *H. T.* begins his *Manual*. His Argument runs thus [ *That is the only true Church of God, which hath had a continued succession from Christ and his Apostles, to this day, (very true:) But the Church now in Communion with the Sea of Rome and no other, hath had a continued succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time: therefore, &c. —* ] For the proof of the Minor he giveth us a Catalogue. And here note the misery of poor souls that depend on these men, that are deluded with such stuff, that one would think they should be ashamed the world should see from them.

1. What if his Catalogue were true and proved, would it prove.



prove the Exclusion, that [no other Church:] had a succession? Doth it prove that *Constantinople*, or *Alexandria* had no such succession, because the Romanists had it? where is there ever a word here under this Argument to prove that exclusive part of his Minor?

2. And note how he puts that for the Question that is not the Question between us. A fair beginning! The Question is not about Churches in Communion with you, but about Churches in subjection to you: But this is but a pious fraud, to save men by deceiving them. The Ancient Church of *Rome* had the Church of *Hierusalem*, *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Ephesus*, and many a hundred Churches in Communion with her, that never were in subjection to her.

3. And if the Papists can but prove themselves true Christians, I will quickly prove that the Protestants are in Communion with them still, as Christians, by the same Head (Christ) the same spirit, baptism, faith, love, hope, &c. though not as Papists, by subjection to the same usurper.

4. Our question is of the *Universal Church*: And this man nameth us twenty or thirty men in an age that he saith were professors of their Religion: And doth he believe in good sadness that twenty or thirty men are either the universall Church, or a sufficient proof that it was of their mind?

5. But principally, did this man think that all, or any besides their subjects had their wits so far to seek, as to believe that the persons named in his Catalogue were Papists, without any proof in the world, but meerly because they are listed here by *H. T.*? Or might he not to as good purpose have saved his labour, and said nothing of them?

6. But what need we go any further? we will begin with him at his first Century, and so to the second, and if he can prove that Jesus Christ, or the Virgin *Mary*, or *John Baptist*, or the Apostles, or any one of the rest that he hath named, were Papists, (much more all of them) I am resolved presently to turn Papist. But unless the man intended to provoke his reader to an unreverent laughter about this abuse of holy things, one would think he should not have named *John Baptist*, that was dead not only before *Rome* had a Church, but also before the time that *Bellarmino* and his Brethren pretend that *Peter* received



ceived his Commission, to be the universall Head. And did not this writer know that Protestants can give him the same names as for them? and if printing them be proof, their proof is as good: If it be not, what proof shall we have? Our proof is the Holy Scriptures, written by the Inspiration of the Holy Ghost in those times. Thence we prove that the first Church held the same belief as we have: yea, though it be not incumbent on us, we will thence prove that the Catholick Church was not then Papists. Why else do we still appeal to Scriptures, and they refuse to stand to the tryal of it any otherwise then as expounded by the Pope, but that we are confident, and they diffident of them? We know the Apostles faith from the Apostles; but the Papists will not know it but from the present Church of *Rome*. They tell you the Apostles were for them: but how know we that? Why by the testimony of the next age: and where is that testimony? Why the third age received it; and how is that proved? Why because the fourth age was of their mind; And how prove you that? Why in the upshot, because the present age is of their mind: Why but most Christians of the present age, are against them: yea, but they are none of the Church: It is only the present Church of *Rome*. Well! but the present Church of *Rome* represented in a General Council may err. 1, but the Pope cannot in *Cathedra* and in approving a Council. So that the summ is this: If the Pope himself may be judge, the Apostles were Papists: But if the Apostles may be heard themselves, they were none.

I make no doubt (though *Bellarmino* deny it,) but other Churches can prove as good a succession as the *Romane*, as to Bishops; And poor *Bellarmino* after all is fain to give up this Mark as insufficient to prove a true Church. *Lib. 3. de Eccles. cap. 8. Dico secundo, Argumentum à successione legitima adferri à nobis precipue ad probandum non esse Ecclesiam ubi non est hæc successio, quod quidem evidens est: ex quo tamen non colligitur necessario, ibi esse Ecclesiam ubi est successio.* By his own confession then, succession will not prove the Romanists a true Church.

But as to a succession of Religion, and a continuation of the Catholick Church, for my part, I am so far from declining it, in argumentation, that I here solemnly profess to all the Pa-  
pists



pists that shall read these words, that, AS SOON AS I SHALL SEE ANY CERTAIN PROOF, BY CATALOGUE OR ANY OTHER WAY, THAT THE CATHOLICK CHURCH, HATH SUCCESSIVELY FROM AGE TO AGE BEEN PAPISTS, I WILL TURN PAPIST WITHOUT DELAY: AND I CHALLENGE THEM TO GIVE US SUCH PROOF IF THEY CAN.

Nay if they will prove that in the first age alone, or the second, or third alone, the Catholick Church were Papists, I am am resolved to turn Papist: Nay I am most confident they cannot prove that in any one age to this day, the Catholick Church were Papists.

And as to *H. Ts.* Catalogue, I return him further answer, that no one named by him in the first age had any one of their errors: And no one named by him to the year four hundred, (I may add, to the year six hundred, if his false catalogue be truly corrected) was a Papist; so well hath he proved the Popish Succession.

But for the plainer opening of this, I shall add the discussion of another of their deceits.

#### CHAP. XXV.

*Detect. 16.* **A** Nother notable fraud of the Papists, is, to confound all their own errors and corruptions together, and then to instance in some of those errors that are common to them with some others, and to omit the Essentiall parts of Popery: And so they would make the world believe, that if they prove the Antiquity of any points in difference between them and us, they do thereby prove the antiquity of Popery (and so of the succession) And so they would make our Religion also Essentially to consist in every inferiour difference between us.

Suffer them not therefore thus to juggle in the dark, but distinguish between the Essentials of Popery, or the main difference between them and us, and the other errors, which are not proper to them alone.