

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.

Thus *Bellarmino* opens his juggling *lib. 4. de Eccles. cap. 9.* where he pleadeth Antiquity of Doctrine as a Note of the true Church : And (saith he) *ſam duobus modis, &c.* Two ways we may by this Mark prove our Church. 1. By ſhewing the ſentences of the Ancients, by which we confirm all our tenets, and refute our adverſaries. But this way (saith he) is moſt prolix, and obnoxious to many calumnies and objections. (Mark Papiſts, and take heed of appealing to Antiquity.) The other way (saith he) is ſhorter and ſurer, by ſhewing firſt from the confeſſion of the adverſaries, that our tenets are the doctrine of all the antients, &c.] And indeed if the weakneſs or raſhneſs of any Proteſtants be the Papiſts ſtrength, its time for us to be more prudent : but if it be the Papiſts unhappineſs that cannot underſtand the antients in the antients, but only from the Pope or the Proteſtants, the Fathers are ſain into the hands of Babies as well as the Scriptures ; and the Proteſtants have too little wit if they will join with the Pope in an abuſive interpreting the Fathers for the Papiſts. And thus *Bellarmino* proceeds to cite *Calvin*, and the *Centuriſts*, as giving them the Fathers. But wherein? Forſooth in the point of *Free-will*, *Limbus*, *Concupiſcence*, *Lent*, *Lay baptiſm in neceſſity*, &c. And therefore by our Confeſſions Antiquity is for the Papiſts. And this is their ſhorteſt and ſureſt way. (The more fools we then.) Is not here great diffidence in the Fathers, when they have more confidence in our ſayings then their writings?

But this juggling will not ſerve the turn. Take up the Eſſentials of Popery, and prove a Catholick ſucceſſion of them, and you ſhall win the day. In Explication of my former profeſſions, I here again ſolemnly promiſe and proteſt, that [WHEN EVER I SEE A VALID PROOF OF A CATHOLICK SUCCESSION OF THESE FOLLOWING POINTS, I WILL PRESENTLY TURN PAPIST: OR OF ANY ONE OF THEM, I WILL TAKE UP THAT ONE.] And I provoke the Papiſts that boaſt of Tradition, Succeſſion and Antiquity, to do this if they are able.

1. Let them prove a Catholick Succeſſion, or continuation of this point, that *The Pope of Rome is appointed by Chriſt to be the univerſall Monarch, Sovereign, Governour, Head of the Catholick*

tholick Church, and the Vicar of Christ on earth, and holding the place of God himself, whom all must obey.

2. And that the true and only Catholick Church is a Society thus headed and Governed by the Pope, and that no man is a true member of the Catholick Church, that is not the subject of the Pope as universal Monarch: Nor can any other be saved, as being without the Church.

3. And that the Church of Rome is by Gods appointment the Mistress of all ether Churches.

4. And that the Pope of Rome is Infallible.

5. That we cannot believe the Scriptures to be the word of God, or the Christian doctrine to be true, but upon the Authoritative Tradition of the Roman Church, and upon the knowledge or belief of their Infallibility: that is, we must believe in the Pope as Infallible, before we can believe in Christ (who is pretended to give him that infallibility.)

6. That no Scripture is by any man to be interpreted but according to the sence of the Pope or Roman Church, and the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

7. That a General Council approved by the Pope cannot err; but a General Council not approved by the Pope may err.

8. That nothing is to us an Article of faith till it be declared by the Pope or a General Council; (though it was long before declared by Christ or his Apostles as plain as they can speak.)

9. That a General Council hath no more validity, then the Pope giveth it.

10. That no Pastor hath a valid Ordination, unless it be derived from the Pope.

11. That there are Articles of faith of Necessity to our Salvation, which are not contained in the Holy Scriptures, nor can be proved by them.

12. That such Traditions are to be received with equal pious affection and reverence as the holy Scriptures.

13. That Images have equal honour with the Holy Gospel.

14. That the Clergy of the Catholick Church ought to swear obedience to the Pope as Christs Vicar.

15. That the Pope should be a temporal Prince.

16. That the Pope and his Clergy ought to be exempted from
the

the Government of Princes, and Princes ought not to judge and punish the Clergy, till the Pope deliver them to their power, having degraded them.

17. That the Pope may dispossess Princes of their Dominions, and give them to others, if those Princes be such as he judgeth hereticks, or will not exterminate Hereticks.

18. That in such cases the Pope may discharge all the subjects from their allegiance and fidelity.

19. That the Pope in his own Territories, and Princes in theirs, must burn or otherwise put to death, all that deny Transubstantiation, the Popes Sovereignty, or such doctrines as are afore expressed, when the Pope hath sentenced them.

20. That the people should ordinarily be forbidden to read the Scripture in a known tongue; except some few that have a license from the ordinary.

21. That publick Prayers, Prayses and other publick worship of God, should be performed constantly in a language not understood by the People; or only in Latine, Greek or Hebrew.

22. That the Bread and Wine in the Eucharist, is Transubstantiate into the very body and blood of Christ; so that it is no more true Bread or Wine, though our eyes, tast, and feeling tell us that it is.

23. That the consecrated host is to be worshipped with Divine worship, and called our Lord God.

24. That the Pope may oblige the people to receive the Eucharist only in one kind, and forbid them the Cup.

25. That the sins called venial by the Papists, are properly no sins, and deserve no more but temporal punishment.

26. That we may be perfect in this life by this double perfection.
1. To have no sin, but to keep all Gods Law perfectly. 2. To supererogate, by doing more then is our Duty.

27. That our works properly merit salvation of God, by way of Commutative Justice, or by the Condignity of the works as proportioned to the Reward.

28. That Priests should generally be forbidden Marriage.

29. That there is a fire called Purgatory, where souls are tormented, and where sin is pardoned, in another world.

30. That in Baptism there is an implicate vow of obedience to the Pope of Rome.

31. That

31. That God is ordinarily to be worshipped by the Oblation of a true proper propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead, where the Priest only shall eat and drink the body and blood of Christ, while the Congregation look on and partake not.

32. That the Canon of Scripture is the same that is declared by the Council of Trent.

I will pass by abundance more to avoid tediousness; And I will not stay to enquire which of these are proper to the Papists. But I am resolved so to receive many of them as they can prove a Catholick succession of; that is, that they were in all ages the Doctrine of the Universal Church: And I crave the charity of such a proof from some Papist or other, if they have any charity in them; and that they will no longer keep universal Tradition in their purses.

And I would desire H. T. to revise his Catalogue, and instead of twenty or thirty dead and silent names, that signify no more than Blanks or Cyphers, he would prove that both those persons and the Catholick Church did in every age hold these thirty two forementioned doctrines. And when hath done, then let him boast of his Catalogue. Till they will perform this task, let them never more for shame call to us for Catalogues or proof of succession. But if they are so unkind that they will not give us any proof of such a Catholick succession of Popery, we shall be ready to supererogate, and give them full proof of the Negative, [*That there hath been no such succession of these thirty two points,*] as soon as we can perceive that they will ingeniously entertain it: though indeed it hath been often done already.

But certainly it belongeth to them that superinduce more Articles of Faith, to prove the continuation of their own Articles through all ages; of which anon.

Well! but one of these Articles at least (*the Popes Sovereignty*) H. T. will prove successively, if you will be credulous enough. In the first age he proves it from Peters words, *Act. 15. 7, 8, 9, 10. God chose Peter to convert Cornelius and his company: therefore the Pope is the Universal Monarch.* Are you not all convinced by this admirable argument? But he forgot that Bellarmine, Ragusius (in *Concil. Basil.*) and others of them say, that no Article can be proved from Scripture, but from the proper literall sense. To say somewhat more, he unseasonably

talks of the Council of *Sardis* and *Calcedon*, an. 400. & 451. left the first age have but a blank page.

In the second age he hath nothing but the names of a few that never dreamt of Popery, and a Canon (which you must believe was the Apostles) that *Priests must communicate*. Of which we are well content.

In the third Age he nameth fifteen Bishops of *Rome*, of whom the last was deposed for offering incense to *Saturn*, *Jupiter*, &c. But not a syllable to prove that one of these Bishops was the universal Monarch: Much less that the Catholick Church was for such Monarchy. But to excuse the matter, he tells you, that *the second and third Age produced no Councils* (the greater deceivers then are the Papists that have found us Councils then) and so you have no Catholick succession proved. *Yea*, but he saith, *they have successions of Popes, Martyrs and Confessors, which is sufficient for their purposes*. See the strength of Popery! Any thing is sufficient for your purposes, it seems. *Rome* had Bishops, therefore they were the Universal Rulers of the Church: A strong consequence! *Rome* had Martyrs and Confessors: therefore it was the Mistis of all Churches. Who can resist these arguments? But why did you not prove that your Confessors and Martyrs suffered for attesting the Popes Sovereignty! If they suffered but for Christianity, that will prove them but Christians, and not Papists. Thus you see to the confusion of the Papists, that they have nothing to shew for the succession or antiquity of Popery for the three first Ages. *Yea* worse then nothing: For here he comes in with some of the Decretals forsooth of some of their Bishops. Decretals unknown, till a while ago in the world, brought out by *Isidore Mercator*: but with so little cunning as left them naked to the shame of the world; the falshood of them being out of themselves fully proved, by *Blondell*, *Reignolds*, and many more, and confessed by some of themselves. Here you see the first foundation of Papal succession; even a bundle of fictions, lately fetcht from whence they please to cheat the ignorant part of the world.

But in the fourth and fifth ages *H. T.* doth make us amends for his want of proof from the three first. But suppose he do, whats that to a succession, while the three first ages are strangers to Popery? Well! but lets hear what he hath at last. His first proof

proof (after a few silent names) is from the Council of Nice; And what saith that? why 1. It defined that the Son of God is consubstantial to his Father, and true God And what's that to Popery? 2. But it defined the Popes Sovereignty: But how prove you that? Why it is in the thirty ninth Arab. Canon. O what Consciences have those men that dare thus abuse and cheat the ignorant! As if the Canons of the first General Council had never been known to the world, till the other day that *Alphonsus Pisanus* a Jesuite publisheth them out of Pope *Julius* and I know not what Arabick book. These men that can make both Councils and Canons at their pleasure above a thousand years after the supposed time of their existence, do never need to want authority. And indeed this is a cheaper way of Canon-making in a corner, then to trouble all the Bishops in the world with a great deal of cost and travail to make them. But if this be the foundation, the building is answerable. Their Bishop *Zosimus* had not been acquainted with these new Articles of an old Council, when he put his trick upon the sixth Council of *Carthage*, where for the advancement of his power (though not to an universall Monarchy, yet to a preparative degree) he layeth his claim from the Council of *Nice*, as saying [*Placuit ut si Episcopus accusatus fuerit, &c.*] which was that If an ejected Bishop appeal to Rome, the Bishop of Rome appoint some of the next province to judge; or if yet he desire his cause to be heard, the Bishop of Rome shall appoint a *Presbyter* his Legate, &c. In this Council were 217. Bishops, *Aurelius* being president, and *Augustine* being one. They told the Pope that they would yield to him till the true copies of the Council of *Nice* were searched; for those that they had seen had none of them those words in, that *Zosimus* alledged. Hereupon they send abroad to the Churches of the East, to *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. for the ancient Canons. From hence they received several copies, which all agreed; but none of them had either *Zosimus* forgery in; nor the forged clause which *Bellarmino* must have in; much less the eighty Canons of *Pisanus* the Jesuite, or this one which *H. T.* doth found his succession on; but only the twenty Canons there mentioned, which have not a word for the Popes Sovereignty.

And here note 1. That *Zosimus* knew not then of *Pisanus* Canons, or else he would have alledged them; nor yet of *Bellar-*

mines new part of a Canon for the Primacy of the Bishop of Rome. 2. That *Zosimus* himself had not the faith, the wit or the memory, to plead either Scripture, Apostolical Institution, or Tradition, for his priviledge; but only a false Canon of the Council of *Nice*: as looking no higher it seems for his authority. 3. How early the Roman Bishops begun both to aspire, and make use of forgeries to accomplish it. 4. That there was no such Apostolick or Church Tradition for this Roman power, as our Masters of Tradition now plead for; which all the Catholick Church must know. For the whole Council, with all the Churches of *Constantinople*, *Alexandria*, *Antioch*, &c. that is, in a manner all save *Rome* were ignorant of that which *Zosimus* would have had them believe, and *Bellarmino* and *H. T.* would have us to believe. 5. Note also how little the Church then believed the Popes infallibility. 6. Yea Note, how upon the reception of the several Copies of the Nicene Canons, they modestly convicted *Zosimus* of falshood: And how the Council resolved against his usurpation. See in the African Councils, the Epistle of *Cyril* and *Alexandria*, and *Atticus* of *Constantinople*: and the Epistles of the Council to *Boniface* and *Celestine*. In their Epistle to *Boniface* before they had received their answers from other Churches about the Nicene Canons, they tell him that they believed they should not suffer that Arrogancy [*non sumus istum typhum passuri*] But to *Celestine* they conclude more plainly, though modestly [*Presbyterorum quoque sequentium*, &c. i. e.] Let your holiness, as becometh you, repell the wicked refuges of Presbyters and the Clergy that follow them; because this is not derogate, or taken from the African Church by any Definition of the Fathers; and the Nicene Decrees most plainly committed both the inferiour Clergy, and Bishops themselves to the Metropolitans. For they did most prudently, and most justly provide, that all businesses (N.B. all) should be ended in the very places where they begun; and the Grace of the holy Ghost will not (or should not) be wanting to each province: which equity should by the Priests of Christ be prudently observed, and most constantly maintained: Especially, because it is granted to every one to appeal to the Councils of their own Province, or to a Universall Council, if he be offended with the judgement of the Cognitors. Unless there should be any one that can think

think that our God can inspire a justice of tryall into any one man (N. B.) and deny it to innumerable Priests that are congregated in Councill. Or how can that judgement thats past beyond sea be valid, to which the necessary persons of the witness could not be brought, either because of the infirmities of sex, or of age, many other impediments intervening. For that any (i. e. Legates) should be sent as from the side of your holiness, we find not constituted by any Synod of the Fathers. Because that which you sent us by our fellow Bishop Faustinus as done by the Nicene Council in the truer Councils, received as the Nicene, (sent from holy Cyril our fellow Bishop of the Church of Alexandria, and from venerable Atticus the Bishop of Constantinop'le, out of the Authentick (Records,) which also heretofore were sent by us to Boniface your predecessor, Bishop of venerable memory, by Innocent a Presbyter, and Marcellus Subdeacon, by whom they were from them to us directed,) in which we could find no such matter. And do not ye send your Clergy executors to potent men; do not ye yield to it; lest we seem to bring the smoaky Arrogancy of the world (or secular arrogancy) into the Church of Christ, which preferreth the light of simplicity and day of knnility for them that desire to see God. For of our brother Faustinus, we are secure, that the safe brotherly charity in your holinesses honesty and moderation, can suffer him to say no longer in Africa.]

Well said Aurelius ! Well said Augustine ! Well said all you African Fathers ! Had others stuck as close to it as you, the Papacy had been kept from the Universal Monarchy.

Note here 1. That this Council lookt no higher for the power of the Pope and other Metropolitans, then to the Council of Nice, and thought it a good argument, that the Pope had no such power, because no Council had so subjected the African Church : And therefore they never dreamt that Christ or the Apostles had given it him. 2. Note that they evince the Nullity of his pretended power out of the Nicene Council. 3. Note that they took him not to be above a Council, having power to dispense with its Canons. 4. Note that by the Nicene Council, not some, but all business must be ended where they begin, and this Council so interpreted them : and therefore there's no appeals to the Pope. 5. And that he that saith otherwise unjustly chargeth the Holy Ghost to be wanting to the Church. 6. That this order

der is to be held fast. 7. That they took it for a sufficient reason against appeals to *Rome*, because all might appeal to a provincial or general Council. 8. Note that they thought it a thing not to be imagined by a man, that God should give his Spirit to any one man, even to the Pope, to enable him to try and judge, and deny it to a Council, General or Provincial. This seemed to them a thing that none should imagine, so that they little dreamt of the Roman infallibility or power of Judging all the world. 9. Note also that they thought the Pope to be incapable of this universal judgement, were it but by distance, and the natural impediments of age, sex, and many the like that must needs hinder the necessary witnesses from such a voyage or journey. So that they give an Argument from Natural necessity against the Popes pretended Sovereignty and judgement. 10. Note also that they plainly make such judgements to be invalid for want of necessary witness and means of prosecution. 11. And whereas the Pope might object that he could prevent all this by his Legates, they flatly reject that too, and say they find no such thing Constituted by any Synod: so that they both rejected the Popes trying and judging by Legates in other Metropolitans jurisdiction; and they took it for a sufficient ground to do so, that there was no Council had so constituted; little dreaming of a Scripture constitution, or Apostolical Tradition. And if the Pope may neither judge them by himself nor his Legates, he may sit still. 12. Next they convince the Roman Bishop of sending them a false Canon of the Nicene Council. 13. And they shew us here what way the Pope then took to get and keep his Power: even by sending to the secular commanders of the Provinces, (in whom they had special interest by their residence at *Rome*,) to execute their wills by force. 14. And note how the Council plainly accuseth them for this, of introducing secular Arrogancy into Christs Church, that better loveth simplicity and humility and light. 15. And note how plainly they require the Bishop of *Rome* to do so no more. 16. And how plainly they tell him that *Faustinus* his stay any longer in *Africa* will not stand with that honesty and moderation of the Bishop of *Rome* which is necessary to the safety of brotherly charity.

I give you but the plain passages of the Council as they lie before

fore you, and scrue no forced consequences from them. And now let *Binnius* and his brethren go make women and children believe that *it was not Appeals to Rome, but a troublesome manner of tryal* that the Council was against. And let *H. T.* tell men that take him for infallible, of a Nicene Canon for the Popes Supremacy and Monarchy. And let him perswade ideots and dotards that the Catholick Church in the fourth and fifth ages was for the universal Government of the Pope. And so I proceed to his next proof.

Saith *H. T.* [*The first Constantinop. Council decreed the Bishop of Constantinople to be chief next the Bishop of Rome.*]

Answ. 1. You see then that Primacy was but the Institution of Councils, for order sake. 2. You see then that it was grounded on a secular reason; for so saith the Canon [*because it is near Rome.*] 3. You see then that the Popes Primacy was but honorary, and gave him no universal Government. For the primacy here granted to *Constantinople*, gave them no Government over *Alexandria, Antioch, &c.* 4. Yea expressly the second Canon limits all Bishops without exception to their own Dioceses. And so doth the third Canon, expressly affirming [*that according to the Nicene Council in every province, the provincial Council ought to administer and govern all things.*] See now what a proof here is of Catholick succession of the Roman Monarchy! Nay how clearly still it is disproved to that time.

The next proof of *H. T.* is from the third Act of the first Council of Ephesus, *that Peter yet lives and exercises judgement in his Successors* [*Answ.* He turns us to look a needle in a bottle of hay. That Council is a large volume, containing six Tomes in *Binnius*, and not divided into Acts. But I suppose at last I have found the place, *Tom. 2. c. 15.* where the words [*that Peter was the Head of the Apostles*] though nothing to their purpose, are neither spoken nor approved by the Council, but only by *Philip* a Presbyter, *Celestines* Legate. And the Council, though specially moved by his concurrence to extoll *Celestine* to the highest, yet 1. Never spake a word of his Governing power or Sovereignty, but only his consent: And when they mention the Roman Church, it is only their consent which they predicate. 2. And they extoll *Cyril* equally with *Celestine* [*Novo Paulo Celestino (they forgot Peter) Novo Paulo Cy-*
villan.]

rillo: ——— *Unus Celestinus, Unus Cyrillus,*] &c.

The next witness brought is the Council of Calcedon, as calling Leo Universal Archbishop and Patriarch of old Rome, and sentence is pronounced against Dioscorus in the names of Leo and Saint Peter.] *Answ.* 1. This is but one of your common frauds. It was not the Council that called him universall Archbshop, but two Deacons in the superscription of their Libels, viz. *Theodorus* and *Ischirion*. And were they the Catholick Church? 2. By [*Universal Archbishop*] its plain that they meant no more then the chief in dignity and order of all Archbishops; and not the Governour of all. 3. I have shewed you before that this very Council in its Canons not only give the Bishop of Constantinople equal priviledges with the Bishop of Rome, but expressly say that Rome received this primacy of order à patribus, from a Council, because it was *Sedes Imperii*, the seat of the Emperour. I thought I had given you enough of this Council before. Sure I am when *Bellarmino* comes to this Canon, he hath nothing to say for his cause, but plainly to charge this famous fourth General Council with lying or falshood, and to say, that the Pope approved not this Canon. But approved or not approved, if this was the Catholick Church representative, sure I am that their testimony is valid to prove that there was then no Catholick reception of the Roman Monarchy as of God, but contrarily a meer primacy of Dignity and Honour given it newly by men.

In the sixth age he had not one Council to pretend it seems for the Roman Sovereignty, for he cites none, but about other matters (of which anon.)

In the seventh age (which he calls the sixth) though then the Sovereignty was claimed by *Boniface*, he citeth no Council for it niether.

In the eighth age (from the year seven hundred) he cites the second Council of *Nice*, as approving an Epistle of Pope *Adrian*, wherein he saith that the Roman Church is the Head of all Churches.] *Answ.* 1. But whether *Adrian* himself by the Head meant the chief in Dignity, or the Governour of all, is a great doubt. 2. But whatever he meant, the Synods approving his Epistle for Images, is no proof that they approved every word in it. 3. Yea *Tharadius* seems to imply the contrary, calling him only *Veteris Rome primas & testatorum principum successor*; as if his Sea had

had the Priviledge only of being the Primate of *Rome*, and not the Ruler of the world. 4. But if this Council did (as it did not) openly own the Papal Sovereignty, it had been no great honour to him: For as in their decrees for Images they contradicted two Councils at *Constantinople*; and that at *Frankford* contradicted them; so might they as well contradict the Church in this: Even as they defined *Angels to be corporeal*, which the Council of *Laterane* afterward contradicted. But the plain truth is, it was the scope of *Adrians* Epistle as for Images, which they expressed themselves to approve. And that their Image-worship it self hath no Catholick succession, me thinks they should easily grant, considering not only, 1. That there is nothing in the first ages for them. 2. And that *Epiphanius* and many before him speak expressly against it. 3. But specially that there have been more General Councils of those ages against them then for them, and that before this of Nice decreed for them, the representative Catholick Church (except still the Pope be the Catholick Church) did condemn them.

I suppose by this time you will think it needless for me to follow *H. T.* any further in his Catalogue. I am content that any impartial sober person judge, whether here be a satisfactory proof of a Catholick succession of the *Papal Sovereignty*, when through so many ages, they bring not a word for any succession at all; much less that it was owned by the Catholick Church: and least of all that all the rest of Popery was so owned.

Object. But at least some other points of Popery are proved by *H. T.* to have such a succession. Answ. Peruse his proofs and freely judge. Two of the thirty two Articles which I mentioned before he speaks to: The one is that *Bishops, Priests and Deacons should abstain from their Wives, or be degraded.*] But 1. The Council which he cites for this, is but a Provincial Council in *Spain* in the fifth Age: and whats this to Catholick succession? 2. The Evidences for the Antiquity of Priests marriages are so clear and numerous, that I will not thank any of them to confess their doctrine a Novelty. 1 *Cor.* 9. 5. *Have we not power to lead about a Sister, a Wife as well as other Apostles, and as the brethren of the Lord and Cephas?* I hope they will not deny that

that Peter had a Wife? 1 Tim. 3. 2, 4. A Bishop must be blameless, the husband of one Wife — One that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity. ver. 12. Let the Deacons be the husbands of one wife, ruling their children, and their own houses well, Tit. 1. 7. If any be blameless, the husband of one Wife, having faithfull children, — The Antient Canons called the Apostles, say, Can. 6. Let not a Bishop or Presbyter put away his own Wife on pretence of Religion. And if he reject her, let him be excommunicated: but if he persevere, let him be deposed.] Let Bellarmine perswade those that will believe him, that this Canon speaks but of denying them maintenance: Canons as well as Scripture are unintelligible to these men. The Canons at Trull. of the fifth and sixth Council, do expressly expound this Apostolick Canon as I do here: and they profess it was the Apostles concession then to the Bishops to marry: and they themselves forbid any to separate Priests from their Wives, and professedly oppose the Roman Church in it, Can. 12, 13. For this Bellarmine, lib. 2. cap. 27. de Pontif. Rom. reproacheth them, and thats his answer. Forsooth, the Pope approved not these Canons: 1. Let *Adrians* words be read, and then judge. 2. What if he did not? Our enquiry is of Catholick Tradition and succession, and not of the Popes opinion. But its easie to bring much more for this.

Another point that *H. T.* proves, is, The same Canon of Scripture which they own: And for this he brings one Provincial Council, *Carth.* 3. as in the sixth Age. An excellent proof of Catholick succession through all Ages. But have we not better proof of the contrary? Let him that would be satisfied peruse these records and judge. *Euseb. Eccles. Hist.* l. 3. cap. 9. vel. 10. and there *Joseph. li. 1. cont. Apion. Constitut. Apostol.* (whosoever was the author) lib. 2. cap. 57. Canon. *Apost. ult. Dionys. Eccl. Hier. cap. 3. Melet. in Euseb. Eccl. Histor. lib. 5. cap. 24. Origen in Niceph. bist. Eccles. lib. 5. cap. 16. Orig. Philocal. cap. 3. Euseb. Hist. l. 6. cap. 25. Tertul. cont. Marcion. Carm. lib. 4. cap. 7. Athanas. Tom. 2. Epist. 39. Et in Synops. Sacr. scrip. Hilar. Pictav. Explanat. in Psalmos. Cyril. (vel. Johan.) Hierosol. Catech. 4. Concil. Laodic. Can 59. Epiphan. hares. 8. & 76. & de Mensur. & ponderib. Greg. Nazianz.*

Nazianz. Carmin. de veris & genuinis libris SS. Amphiloeh. in Balsam. pag. 1082. Hieronym. in Prolog. in lib. Reg. & Proh. in lib. Solom. Et Epist. ad Latam. & passim. Rufinus in Symbolum. But what need I cite any more, when Dr. *Cosin* hath done it in a volume purposely? where this allegation also of the third *Conc. Carthag.* is answered.

AND now having shewed you that Papists cannot prove any Catholick Succession, or Continuation, or Tradition of their Religion, let us consider of their silly shift, by instancing in some by-points common to them with others. Of which I shall say the less because I have spoke to it already in my *Safe Religion*.

And before I mention any particulars, remember that I have proved before that ignorance or difference about many points not essential to Christianity, may consist with our being of one Religion and Catholick Church, and therefore such differences are nothing to the point of succession of the Catholick Church or Religion. This is plain to any reasonable man. And that the Papists may see that for their parts they have nothing to say against it, I shall add to what is said, that they tolerate or plead for the toleration of greater differences among themselves, which yet they affirm to consist with the unity of faith. I will now give you but an instance or two.

The Jesuits maintain, that if a man do but believe in their Pope and Church as infallible, he may (not only as some say, be ignorant of some Article of the Creed it self, and yet be a true Catholick, yea and be saved, but also) believe a false Article as from God and the Church: The former is commonly taught not only by such as *Suarez*, that say the Article of Christs Descent into Hell is not to all of Necessity to Salvation, but by many others in the Doctrine of Implicite faith. The later clause you may see among others in *Franc. Albertinus* the Jesuite, *Corollar. pag. 250.* where his objectors put this case [Suppose twenty Bishops preach to a countrey man a false Article, as if it were spoken by God and the Church: that proposal of the twenty Bishops is so sufficient, that the Countrey man prudently formeth an evident practical judgement, and morally certain,

to believe with a speculative assent the Article proposed by the twenty Bishops, for the Authority of God as the formal reason. Three absurdities seem hence to follow. 1. That the Countrey man should be obliged under mortall sin, to believe the twenty Bishops, and so the precept of faith should bind to believe a falshood. 2. The Countrey man should be in Gods Grace without faith. In Grace, because he commits no mortall sin, yea he obeys the command of believing: Yet without faith, because he believes a falshood opposite to faith, and so loseth faith. 3. God should concur to deceive——To the first Albertinus answereth that its no Absurdity that the command of faith do oblige to believe a falshood, it being not per se, but per accidens. To the second he saith, that the Countrey man doth not lose his grace or faith, because the falshood believed is not formally opposite to the true faith (but materially)——Here you see that a man may hold an Article opposite to the faith materially, and yet not only be a true Christian in grace and faith, but also in so doing obey by accident the command of believing, so be it he believe in their Church. And if that be so, with what face can these men say, that our Church or Religion is new, or not the same with the Greeks, &c. when we have the same formal Object of faith, and differ in no Essential Material point? See here their lubricity and partiality.

One Instance more: The second Council of Nice that decreed for Image-Worship, doth yet expressly decree that *Latria*, Divine worship is to be given only to God; Thomas Aquinas *sum.* 3. q. 25. art. 3. & 4. purposely maintaineth that *Latria*, Divine Worship is to be given to the Image of Christ, and to the Cross that he dyed on; and to the sign of that Cross. Here is an Article of their faith expressly contradicted: And yet Aquinas is a member of their Church; And if any say, he is no member, its proved past doubt, for the Pope hath Canonized him for a Saint: So that now it is a part of their Religion to take him for a true believer: And Albertinus hath (as he thinks) proved, that though in many other matters of fact the Pope be fallible, yet in the Canonizing of Saints he is infallible, because of some promise of Gods speciall assistance (if one knew where to find it.) Abundance of such Instances might be brought that prove, that the Papists own men as true believers,

that

that deny or contradict Articles of their faith. But what need we more, then that France and thousands elsewhere are yet members of their Church, that deny the *Laterane* and *Florentine* definition for the Popes Supremacy above a General Council? and when most Papists hold that Angels are incorporeal, contrary to the definition of the said second Council of *Nice*. And therefore by their own law, nay much more, we may well say that those were of our Religion that differed from us in nothing that is in deed or our esteem Essential to the faith. Now to a few particulars.

1. The Papists tell us that [*Fulk confesseth that Hierom, Austin, Ambrose, &c. held the invocation of Saints*] H.T.p.49.

Answ. 1. If any hold that they should desire the departed Saints to pray for them, as they do the living, we have reason enough to take it for their error, but its no proof that they are not of the same Church and Religion with us: As long as they give no part of that adoration or honour to Saints which is proper to God the Father, Son, or Holy Ghost, it is not inconsistent with true Faith and Christianity.

2. But yet we must tell you that the Primitive Church was unacquainted with the Romish prayer to Saints. Till the end of the fourth Century they are not able to prove that ever three men (if any one) were for any prayer to the Dead at all, except such a conditional speech in an Oration as *Greg. Nazianzen* hath [*If holy souls have any care or feeling of such things as these, receive this Oration*] *Orat.* 11. I intreat the Reader that needeth information of the way of Antiquity in this point, to read Bishop *Ushers* Answer to the Jesuite on this point, page 418, &c. Where he saith that [*for nine parts of the first four hundred years, he dare be bold to say that the Jesuite is not able to produce so much as one true testimony out of any Father whereby it may appear that any account at all was made of it*] Where he citeth the full expresse words of the Fathers of those first ages against praying to Saints, as *Origen* in *Jus. Hom.* 16. And in *Rom. lib.* 2. cap. 2. And *Contr. Celsus* lib. 8. page 432, 433, 406, 411, 412. & *lib.* 5. pag. 239. *Tertullian* *Apol.* cap. 30. *Tertullian* and *Cyprian* of Prayer: *Athanasius* *Orat.* 4. *Cont. Arrium* pag. 259, 260. *Eccles. Smyrn.* apud *Euseb. Hist. lib.* 4. &c. I am loth to recite what is there already given you.

3. And when Prayer to the dead did come in, how exceedingly it differed from the Romish Prayers to the dead, I pray you read there in the same Author. 4. And also of those Adorations and Devotions offered by the Papists to the Virgin *Mary*, I desire you to read in the same Author, and Place, enough to make a Christian tremble, and which for my part I am not able to excuse from horrid Blasphemy or Idolatry, though I am willing to put the best interpretation on their words that reason will allow.

5. The Reason why in the old Testament men were not wont to pray to Saints, *Bellarmino* saith was, because then they did not enter into heaven nor see God. *Bellar. de sanct. Beat. li. 2. cap. 19.* So *Sisarez* in the third part, *Tom. 2. disp. 42. Sect. 1.* But abundance of the chief Doctors of the Church for divers Ages were of opinion that the Saints are not admitted into Heaven to the clear sight of God before the day of Judgement (as most of the Eastern Churches do to this day) therefore they could not be for the Popish Prayer to Saints.

And here again observe, that men may be of the same faith and Church with us, that differ and err in as great a matter as this. The Council of *Florence* hath now defined it, that departed souls are admitted into Heaven to the clear sight of God: And yet *Stapleton* and *Francis. Pegna. à Castro, Medina, Sotus*, affirm that *Irenæus, Justin Martyr, Tertullian, Clemens Romanus, Origen, Ambrose, Chrysostome, Austin, Lactantius, Victorinus, Prudentius, Theodoret, Aretas, Oecumenius, Theophilact, Euthymius*, yea and *Bernard*, have delivered the contrary sentence. See *Staplet. Defens. Eccles. author. cont. Whitak. lib. 1. cap. 2.* with *Fran. Pegna* in part. 2. *Director. Inquisitor. com. 21.*

Now as all these must needs be against the Popish Invocation of Saints, so they were against that which is now determined to be *de fide*; Whence I gather (on the by) 1. That the Romish faith increaseth, and is not the same as heretofore. 2. That they had not this Article by Tradition from any of these Fathers, or from the Apostles by them (unless from the Scriptures.) 3. That men that err in such points as are now defined by Councils to be *de fide*, are yet accounted by Papists to be of their Church and faith: And therefore they may be of ours, not-

notwithstanding such errors as this in hand. 4. And note also by this test, whether the Papists be not a perjured generation, that swear not to expound Scripture but according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers.

6. The Council of *Laodicea* condemned them as Idolaters that prayed to Angels, *Can. 35.* (which *Caranza*, *Crab*, and other Papists have turned into *Angulos*; whose falsification you may see fully detected by the said Bishop *Usher*, *ibid.* pag. 470, 471, 472. Read there also the full Testimonies of *Greg. Nissen*, *Athanasius*, *Epiphanius*, &c. against praying to Saints and Angels, and the detection of *Bellarmines* fraud, that pretendeth the Fathers to speak of the Gentiles Idolatry when they mention the Virgin *Mary* and the Saints, and say expressly they were not to be adored.

But for all this, *H. T. Manual.* page 291, &c. hath Fathers for this Adoration of Angels and Saints. And who are they? The first is *Dionysius*: to which I answer, 1. There is never a such a word in the place cited in *Dionysius*, in the Book that I have at hand, printed *Lugdun.* 1572. 2. We are for praying the Saints to pray for us too, that is, those on earth: And the words cited by him, mention not the Saints in heaven. 3. That *Dionysius* is not *Dionysius* but a spurious Apocryphal Book: Not once known and mentioned in the world till *Gregory* the great's dayes, (six hundred years after Christ) as *Bellarmino* himself saith *Lib. de Scriptor. Eccles. de Dionys.* And *lib. 2. de Monach. cap. 5.*

The second is *Clem. Apostol. Constit. 5.* *Ans.* 1. The words speak only of honouring the Martyrs, which is our unquestioned duty; but not of Praying to them. 2. Its an Apocryphal forgery, and neither the Apostles nor *Clements* Work which he citeth (but any thing will serve these men:) Let him believe *Bellarmino de Scriptor. Eccles. pag. 38, 39.* where he proveth it, and saith that [in the Latine Church, these Constitutions are of almost no account, and the Greeks themselves *Canon. 2. Trul. reject them as depraved by Hereticks, and that the receiving of them is it that misleadeth the Ethiopians.*] See more against them in *Cooks Censurâ*, pag. 17, 18, 19. and *Rivets Crit. Sac. & Dalens in Pseudepigraph.*

The third Testimony of *H. T.* is from *Iustins* second *Apol.*
Ans.

Answ. It is not Praying to Angels that *Justin* seemeth to intend, but giving them due honour, which we allow of. His intent is to stop the mouths of Heathens that called the Christians impious for renouncing their Gods: To whom he replyeth, that we yet honour the true God, and his Angels, &c. —

His Testimony for the third age is only *Origen* (and yet none of *Origen*) First in his Lament. *Answ.* 1. *Origen* there mentioneth the Saints, but not the dead Saints. It may be all the Saints in the Church on earth whose prayers he desireth. 2. If this satisfie you not, at least be satisfied with this, that you cite a forgery that is none of *Origens* works. Not only *Erasmus* saith that [*This Lamentation was neither written by Origen, nor translated by Hierom, but is the fiction of some unlearned man, that by this trick devised to defame Origen:*) But *Baronius Annal. Tit. 2. ad an. 253. p. 477.* witnesseth that Pope *Gelasius* numbers it with the Apocryphals.

But *H. T.* hath a second testimony from *Origen. in Cantic. Hom. 3.* *Answ.* 1. That speaks of the Saints prayer for us, but not of our prayers to them one word, which is the thing in question. 2. But *Erasmus* and others have shewed that neither is this any of *Origens* works. *Sixtus Senensis* saith, that some old Books put *Hieroms* name to it: And *Lombard* and *Aquinas* cite passages out of it as *Ambroses*.

You see now what Testimonies *H. T.* hath produced for the first three Ages, even till above four hundred years after Christ. And yet no doubt but this is currant proof with the poor deluded Papists that read his Book.

2. The next exception to be considered is, *Praying for the Dead:* which they say the ancient Church was for.

Answ. 1. We are for the Commemoration of the holy lives and sufferings of the Saints: and the first sort of the ancients prayers for them began here, as the occasion. 2. We are for thankfull acknowledgement of Gods Mercies to the departed Saints, and to the Church by them. And the first prayers for them were such as these. 3. Bishop *Usher* hath copiously proved that they were Saints, supposed to be in Heaven or Paradise, and not in Purgatory, that were then prayed for: and therefore that it was not the Popish praying for tormented souls that was then practised: And therefore their prayers then