

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

then were besides Commemorations and Thanksgivings, the petitioning of all those following Mercies for them which are not to be received till the resurrection: *Bellarmino* himself proving that though we were certain that the blessed souls shall have a raised glorified body, and be justified in the last Judgement, yet may it be prayed for, because it is yet future. Now we are far from being of another Church or Religion then those that hold such an opinion as this. Saith *Usher* pag. 224. when he had cited many testimonies [In these and other prayers of the like kind, we may descry evident footsteps of the primary intention of the Church in her supplications for the dead: which was that the whole man (not the soul separated only) might receive publick remission of sins, and a solemn acquittal in the judgement of that great day; and so obtain both a full escape from all the Consequences of sin (the last enemy being now destroyed, and death swallowed up in victory) and a perfect consummation of blis and happiness: all which are comprized in that short prayer of S. Paul for Onesiphorus (though made for him while he was alive) [The Lord grant unto him that he may find mercy of the Lord in that day] Yea, divers prayers for the dead of that kind are still retained in the Roman offices; of which the great Spanish Doctor *John Medina* thus writeth, Although I have read many prayers for the faithfull deceased, which are contained in the Roman Missal, yet have I read in none of them that the Church doth petition, that they may more quickly be freed from pains: but I have read that in some of them petition is made, that they may be freed from everlasting pains.] Again there be other prayers (saith *Medina*) wherein petition is made, that God would raise the souls of the dead in their bodies unto blis at the day of judgement.]

You see then, that our Question is not whether the dead may be prayed for: but what prayers may be made for them. And therefore to find that about three hundred years after Christ (more or less) men begun to pray for the dead, is no proof that they were not of our Church or Religion; or that therefore we want succession. It was not a praying to be sooner out of Purgatory that then was used, as Papists do, but a Praying for the mercies promised at the Resurrection: And thus we think it lawfull to pray for the dead; were it not for
Y the

the accidental evil that might follow with them that will misunderstand and abuse it.

And its further to be noted, that as *Pegni*, *Stapleton* and others confess, the Fathers, Greek and Latine, before mentioned, did believe that men had not their perfect Joyes till the Resurrection; and therefore they had the far stronger motive to pray for the dead. And if Protestants had not been partly of this mind (save only that we put not the soul into hidden receptacles, nor anywhere but with Christ) *Bellarmino* had not found so much occasion of that unworthy calumny against *Calvin* for the words cited by him in his *Instit.* as if he denied the beatifical vision, if not the immortality of the soul: Even because he took not *our blifs to be perfect till the Resurrection, but somewhat short of what we shall then be.* Now seeing the Fathers were so commonly of that mind, and the *Greeks* and *Ethiopians* are still of that mind, and *Bellarmino* saith *Luther* and *Calvin* are of that mind, you may see that neither in that nor the point of praying for the dead as used by the ancients, is our distance so great as to weaken the proof of our succession, or make us to be of two Churches or Religions.

And here you may see the differences between the Prayers for the dead which are used by the Papists, and by the Eastern Churches to this day. And yet if upon private unsound opinions any should go somewhat further in this point, it followeth not that such error changeth the faith. I desire the Reader that would have a fuller sight of the face of Antiquity in this point, to read Bishop *Usher* of it in the forementioned Answer to the Jesuite.

3. Another point that they much challenge us about, is, *The Veneration or Adoration of Images, Reliques, and the Cross*, to which I may join, *peregrinations to places esteemed by them to be of eminent holiness.* Concerning *Peregrinations*, you may see by a plain Epistle of *Gregory Nyssen* (in the end of his printed works, but in the midst of a *M. S.* in *Paris Library*) written purposely against going on Pilgrimage to *Jerusalem*, what is to be thought of this. He adviseth even the retired Monasticks even in those Countreyes that were near *Judea*, to forbear such Pilgrimages as dangerous and unnecessary, and not at all commanded

manded in the Scripture. The Papists did as long as they could perswade the world that this Epistle was none of *Gregories*, and when they were made ashamed of that, they would expound it as prohibiting Pilgrimages to none but the Monasticks: And sure if it should be forbidden them, then much more should others be forbidden, that have not the leisure, and pretend not to the devotions which these pretend to. Read but the Epistle it self without either *Molinæus* his notes on our side, or *Gretser's* frivolous answers, and judge as thou seest cause.

As for *Images*, we allow the Historical use of them, and the setting them up in Churches the *Lutherans* allow, and we dislike it only as dangerous and a needless snare, but take not our selves to be of another Church or Religion from those that are otherwise minded: No nor from those that Reverence them as they respect the persons whom they signifie. But its one thing to use *Images*, and another thing to use them *Popishly*, which is to make them *mediate objects of Divine worship*, yea to worship the very *Image it self*, and the *Cross* and the *sign of the Cross with the same worship as we do him that is signified by them*: So that we confidently affirm, 1. That the Primitive Church did make no use of *Images* at all in the worship of God; no nor endure them in the place of Worship. 2. That when they were first brought in, the *Popish* use of them was still renounced and detested. *Clemens Alexandrinus Protreptic. ad Gent.* saith that [*We are plainly forbidden to use that deceitfull Art*] (of painting or image-making) — And [*We have no sensible Image made of any sensible matter, but such an Image as is to be conceived with the understanding*] *Origen* against *Celsus* lib. 7. page 373, 384, 386. 387. is large and plain against this use of *Images*, as the Protestants are. And the *Eliber. Concil.* C. 36. saith [*Placuit picturas in Ecclesia esse non debere, ne quod colitur, aut adoratur in parietibus depingatur. It seemeth good to us, that Pictures ought not to be in the Church, lest that which is worshipped or adored should be painted on walls*] Some Papists would fain find a sense for this Canon contrary to the words: But *Melch. Canus* plainly saith, that the Council did not only imprudently but impiously make this law to take away *Images*, *Loc. Theol. lib. 5. cap. 4. conc. 4.* I shall cite no more, but intreat the Reader that is willing to be informed how much

Antiquity was against the Papists in the points of Images, to peruse only *Dallens de Imaginibus*, and *Usher in his Answer to the Jesuite and Sermon to the Parliament*: And I provoke the Papists to confute what is in them alledged if they can.

H. T. hath no better shift to save their credit (*Manual* page 319, 320.) then to set their own Schoolmen and General Council together by the ears. The second Council of *Nice* (that did most for Images) did openly renounce the adoring them with Divine honour, and *Tharasius* solemnly professed, *Duntaxat in unum verum Deum latram & fidem se referre & reponere*] They did refer and repose faith and divine worship in the true God alone] But *Aquinas* *sum.* 3. q. 25. a. 3. & 4. maintaineth (as I before observed) that the Image of Christ, and the Cross and the sign of the Cross are to be worshipped with Divine worship.] And what saith *H. Tarberville* to this? Why [*This is a meer school opinion and not of faith with us: Urge not therefore what some particular Divines say, but hearken to the Doctrine of Gods Church.* —] Very good!! Is not this so gross a kind of juggling, that would never down if devout ignorance and implicate faith had not prepared the stomachs of the people? 1. You see here that to contradict the Determination of a General Council, is not of faith with them. But it is not against your faith? Do you give leave to meer school opinions to contradict General Councils? See here what's become of the Popish faith? If the Determinations of Councils be not Articles of faith with you, then you have no faith, but give up your cause: And if they be, then *Aquinas* and his followers are Hereticks. 2. And then see whats become of the Popes Infallibility in Canonizing Saints, that have fainted *Thomas Aquinas* that proves a Heretick by your Law: so that your cause is gone which way ever you turn you. 3. And then see what it is to pray to Saints, when some of them are made Hereticks by your own Laws. 4. And then also see, at what Unity the Church of Rome is among themselves, when it is the very common doctrine of their learned Schoolmen, which contradicteth a General Council: Are you not well agreed that while? 5. And lastly note what a Holy Church you have, when the common sort of your most learned Divines are thus made Hereticks: See Bishop *Ushers* allegations of *Th. Arundels* Provincial Council at Oxford, 1408,

ex Guil. Linwood lib 5. And Jac. Naclantus in Rom. cap. 1. fol. 42. saith [We must not only confess, that the faithfull in the Church do worship before the Image, as some cautelously speak, but that they adore the Image, without any scruple: yea and that they worship it with the same worship as the Prototype: so that if it be worshipt with Divine worship, the Image must have Divine worship —] And Cabrera in 3. part. Thom. qu. 25. art. 3. disp. 2. num. 15. there cited by Usher, saith that it is of faith that Images are to be worshipped in Churches and without: and we must give them signs of servitude and submission, by embracing, lightes, offering incense, uncovering the head, &c. 2. That Images are truly and properly to be adored, with an intention to adore themselves, and not only the samplers represented in them. This Conclusion is against Durandus and his followers, whose opinion by the Moderns is judged dangerous, rash, and savouring of Heresie: and M. Medina reporteth that M. Victoria reputed it heretical: but our conclusion is the common one of Divines. If Images be improperly only adored, then they are not to be adored simply and absolutely; which is manifest Heresie. And if Images were to be worshipped only by way of Remembrance, because they make us remember the samplers, which we thus adore as if they were present, it would follow that all creatures are to be adored with the same adoration as God — which is absurd. 3. The Opinion of Saint Thomas, that the Image must be worshipped with the same act of adoration, as the sampler which it representeth, is most true, most pious, and very consonant to the decrees of faith] Thus Cabrera, who adds that this is the doctrine of Thomas and all his Disciples and almost all the old Schoolmen, and particularly of Cajetan, Capreolus, Paludanus, Ferrariensis, Antoninus, Soto, Alexand. Alef. Albertus Magnus, Bonaventura, Richardus de media villa, Dionysius Carthusianus, Major, Marsilius, Thom. Waldensis, Turrecremata, Clichtovans, Turrian, Vasquez, &c. And Azorius saith [It is the constant opinion of Divines,] Institut. Moral. tom. 1. lib. 9. cap. 6. Yea in the Roman Pontifical published by the Authority of Clement the eighth, it is expressed, that [The Legates Cross shall have the right hand, because Divine worship is due to it See here whether the Pope himself be not an Heretick, and the Pontifical contain not heresie, and the whole rabble of the

Schoolmen hereticks, by contradicting the determination of the General Council at *Nice* 2. which *H. T.* citeth, and the doctrine which he saith is the doctrine of Gods Church, such is the faith and unity of the Papists.

But they will say still that though all these worship the very Cross and Images themselves, and that with Divine worship, yet there be some of a better mind, that do but worship God by the Image, such as *H. T. &c.* *Ans.* And do you think that rational Pagans did not know as well as you that their Images were not Gods themselves, and so worshipped them not as Gods, but as the representers and instruments of some Deity? *Lactantius Instit. lib. 2. cap. 2.* brings them in saying thus [*Non ipsa, &c.* We fear not them, but those whom they represent, and to whose names they are consecrated] And *Arnobius* thus [*Deos per simulachra veneramur: It is the Gods that we worship by Images*] And *Augustine* thus reporteth the Pagans sayings [in *Psal. 96. Non ego lapidem, &c.* I do not worship that stone, nor that Image, which is without sense] And in *Psal. Psal. 113. cono. 2.* [*Nec simulachrum, nec demonium colo, &c.* I worship neither the Image, nor a Spirit in it; but by the bodily likeness I behold the sign of that which I ought to worship.] Yea that many of them renounced the worshipping of Devils, appeareth by *Augustines* report of their words, in *Psal. 96.* [*Non colimus mala demonia, &c.* We worship not evil spirits: It is those that you call Angels, that we worship, who are the powers of the great God, and the Ministers of the great God] To whom *Austin* answers [*Would you would worship them (that is, honour them aright,) then you would easily learn of them not to worship them*] And doubtless few could be so silly as to think there were as many Jupiters or Apollos as there were Images of them in the world. So that you see here that some of the Pagans as to Image-worship disclaimed that which the Papists ascribe to them, viz. Divine worship.

Oh but saith *H. T.* tell us not of particular Doctors, but of the Doctrine of Gods Church. *Ans.* What not of Saint Thomas? What! not of the Army of School Divines before mentioned? What! not of the [*Communis sententia Theologorum:*] the common judgement of Divines? for so they call it; What? not of that which is *de fide*, or consonant to it, and whose con-

trary

trary is herese, or savours of Heresies? (as they say of *Darandus* opinion) what! not of Pope *Clement* the eighth and the Roman Pontifical? (pag. 672.) wonderful! are all these *nobody* in your Church? O admirable harmony that is in your united Church!

But you can agree to leave out the second commandment lest the very words should deter the people from Image worship; and to make an irrational division of the tenth to blind their eyes. And yet you cry up the Testimony of the Fathers, when you are fain to hide one of the ten commandments, so that thousands of your poor seduced followers, know not that there is such a thing. No wonder if you cast away *Gregory Nyssen's* Epistle against *Pilgrimages*; and *Epiphanius* his words (in the end of his Epistle to *Johan. Herosol.*) against Images; and if *Vasquez* (in 3 *Thom. disp.* 105. c. 3.) contrary to the plain words do fain that it was the Image of a prophane or common man that *Epiphanius* puld down; and *Al. Cope* (*Dial.* 5. c. 21.) say, that the epistle is counterfeit and not *Epiphanius's*: and if *Bellarmino* (*de Imag.* c. 9.) and *Baronius* (*ad an.* 392.) say that this part of the Epistle is forged: and if *Alphonf. a Castro.* (*cont. Hæres. de Imag.*) reproach *Epiphanius* for it as an *Iconoclast*: so well are you agreed also in the confutation of the Fathers Testimonies, that any way will serve your turn, though each man have his several way. Fair fall *Vasquez* that plainly confesseth, that indeed the Scripture doth forbid not only the worship of an Image for God, but also the worshiping of the true God in an Image: but saith that this commandment is now repealed, and therefore under the Gospel we may do otherwise. (*Vasq. li. 2. de Adorat. Disp.* 4. c. 3. *Seet.* 74. 75. & c. 4. *Seet.* 84.)

But of this point I shall say no more now but this. 1. Many Christian Churches do reject Images from their Churches and worship as well as Protestants. 2. More reject statues that reject not pictures. 3. Many that keep them, worship not them, nor God in them, or by them, as by a mediate object. 4. General Councils have been against Images, that want nothing but the pleasure of the Pope to make them of as good authority as the Council that was for them. 5. That Council that was for them (*Nice 2.*) condemneth the Schoolmen and Pope *Clement* himself as Hereticks, for

for worshipping them, or the Crofs with Divine worship. 6. I again urge any Papist to answer *Dallaus* book rationally that can. 7. To spare me the labour of saying more of the judgement of the ancient Catholick Church against the Popish use of Images, I desire the Reader to peruse what *Cassander* an honest Papist hath written to that end, *Consultat. de Imag. et simulac.* who begins thus [*Ad Imagines vero sanctorum quod attinet, certum est, initio predicati Evangelii aliquanto tempore inter Christianos, praesertim in ecclesiis, imaginum usum non fuisse, ut ex Clemente & Arnobio patet: Tandem picturas in ecclesiam admissas ut rerum gestarum historiam exprimentes &c.* —] And he produceth abundance from antiquity against the present Popish use of them.

4. Another point in which the Papists pretend to better Countenance from Antiquity than we, is the point of the *Corporal presence with Transubstantiation*: But of this there is so much said by multitudes of our Divines, that I shall now say no more, but desire the studious to Read at least Bishop *Ushers* Answ. to the Jesuite of it, and *Edmundus Abertinus de Eucharistia*: a Treatise so full of evidence from Scripture, Reason, and the judgement of the Fathers, that I boldly challenge all the Papists in the world to give a tolerable answer to it, that is a better then that is given.

When we have thus shewed them the stream of Antiquity to have been against them, they pass us by, and thrust into the ignorant peoples hands, a few musty scraps of abused words, which are answered and cleared over and over: Thus do *H. T. D. Bailly*, and others.

5. In the point of Satisfaction and Purgatory, besides what *Sadeel*, *Chamier* and others have said, *Usher* and the foresaid *Dallaus* in a full Treatise have shewed the Papists nakedness from Antiquity, so that modesty should forbid them to pretend the Fathers for them any more, if any modesty be left.

6. About their Fasts (though that be no essential of Religion) both the time, manner &c. is so fully spok to by the said *Dallaus* in another just volume *de Jeuniis*, that Popery in this also is openly condemned by the Fathers in the view of the impartial considerate world.

The point of Free will, and most of the rest in which they imagine that we dissent from Antiquity or the Eastern Churches,

I have spoak to already in my first Book against Popery. I had thought to have gone through the rest particularly, at least the rest mentioned by *H. T.* and *D. Bailly*; but finding them so frequently and fully handled already, I will forbear such labour in vain.

CHAP. XXVI.

Detect. 17. **A** Nother of the Papists Deceits, and one of the Principal that they support their cause with, is, *A false interpretation and application of all the sayings of the Fathers, which they can bne force to a shew of countenancing their supremacy.* That you may find out their jugling in this, I shall shew you some of of their Footsteps more particularly.

1. *Any claim that their own ambitious Bishops have made to a further power then was due to them, they use as an Argument for their universal sovereignty:* when as we deny not but that there was too much pride and Ambition in their Prelates (which is all that this will prove;) even in some that otherwise might be good men. We deny not but that *Zosimus* would fain have extorted a confession of his usurped power, and a submission to it from *Aurelius, Augustine,* and the rest of the *Africane Council.* But yet he could not do it. We confess that *Leo* the first, and *Gregory* the first, and others, were very busie for the extending of their power: And that the *Romane Bishops* were long endeavouring to have put the halter on the *Africans* heads, yea and long about the *French* before they got them under. And shall these partial ambitious men be the witnesses? And because they would have had more power, doth it follow that it was their due?

2. Again, if they find that any distressed Churches or Bishops have but sent to Rome for help, they presently gather thence that they took the Pope to be *Christs Vicar General.* As when *Chrysostome* sent to *Innocent*, and *Basl* and the rest in the East did send so oft for help into the West, when as the reasons were but such as these;
1. Because *Rome* during the Emperors residence there, was the place where life or death was last pronounced on every mans
cause

cause by the secular power: and therefore the Bishop of *Rome* had the greater opportunity to befriend other Churches. 2. And afterwards *Rome* had a great secular influence on the Empire. 3. And because in the divisions of the East about *Arrianisme*, they thought the countenance of the Orthodox in the West might have done somewhat to turn the scales. 4. Because the Bishop of *Rome* being taken for the Patriarch of the first place, his voice might do much against an adversary.

I will delay you now which no more instances, then those of *Basil's* time from the East. *Eusebius*, *Meletius*, *Basil*, and the rest of the Orthodox, being both pestered with the *Arrians*, and all to pieces also among themselves, do send for help to the West. (*Basil. Epist. 69.*) But to whom? and for what? Not to the Bishop of *Rome* only, nor by name, but equally to the Bishops of *Italy* and *France*, without any mention of the *Romane* power. And it was not that the Pope might decide all by his sovereign power, which certainly was so neer a way to their relief, that no wise man can imagine them so mad as to forget it, if it had been a thing then known and approved of. But only they desire that some may be sent to help them to be the stronger party in a Synod, or at least some one to comfort them, and put some countenance on their cause. And *Epist. 70. Basil* writeth himself (in the name of the rest:) but to whom [*To the Bishops of France and Italy.*] and *France* before *Italy*, without taking notice of an universal Head of the Church at *Rome*. And what doth he so importune them for? not that the Pope would decide the controversy: but that they would acquaint the Emperour with their state (because the West had an Orthodox Emperour, and the East an *Arrian*) or send some to them to see how it stood with them: so that it was but either help from the Emperour, or countenance from the number of Bishops (because they were over voted quite at home) that they desired. So *Epist. 74. Basil* again writes, [*to the Bishops of the West;*] (and so no more to the *Romane* Bishop then the rest,) and he giveth these as his Reasons [*For, (saith he) what we here speak is suspected, as if we spoke through private contention. — But for you, the further you are remove from them by habitation, so much credit you have with the people, whereto is added that the grace of God helpeth you to relieve the oppressed: And if Many of you unanimously decree the*

same

same things, it is manifest that the multitude, will produce a certain reception of your opinion.] Wonderfull! if there were then a Vicar General of Christ at Rome, that it never came into their mind to crave his decision or help, as such?

O but say the Papists, that was because they had to do only with the *Arrians*, that cared for no authority that was against them. *Answ.* 1. But would these *Arrians* have so much regarded the votes of the *French* and *Italian* Bishops, yea or a few men sent from them, and yet not regard the Head of the Church? The *Arrians* sure had heard of this Headship, if any had. And would not the Orthodox desire so much as a word from Rome for this advantage? 2. But it is false that they were only the *Arrians* that they called for help against. They expressly say, that it was also because they were divided among themselves, (by personal quarrels.) How importunately doth Gregory Nyssen afterward call for help from others, and telleth *Flavianus* in his *Epist.* to him, of their misery as if all were lost? And the only sad instance was, that *Helladius* (counted a good Bishop) had proudly neglected him, and made him stand at his door (when he went to visit him) a great while before he was let in; and then did not bid him sit down; and then did not speak to him first but two or three strange angry words. This was the great business. But to proceed with *Basil. Epist. 77.* he falls to chiding the Western Bishops, for not sending to them, nor regarding them and their communion: and to touch their pride, he addeth, [We have one Lord, one faith, one hope: Whether you think your selves the Head of the universal Church: the head cannot say to the feet, I have no need of you; or if you place your selves in the order of other Church-members, you cannot say to us, we need you not.] And would you here believe that the Papists have the faces to cite this passage of *Basil*, for their Headship; because here is the word *Head*! When as its plain, 1. That *Basil* by the *Head* means but the chiefest part, and not the sovereign power. 2. That he speaks to all the Bishops of the West, and not only to the *Roman* Bishop. 3. That he doth it as a smart reproof of their arrogancy, and not in any approbation at all. But any thing will serve them. More from *Basil* I shall have occasion to mention anon.

3. Nore also, that when the Papists find but any Heresie condemned by the Bishop of Rome, they cite this as a testimony of their Sovereignty: As if other Patriarch and Bishops condemned them not as well as they; Or as if we knew no that the Church desired the most general vote against Hereticks, and therefore would be loth to leave so great a Bishop out.

4. And when they find the Pope excommunicating forreign Bishops, they cry up this as a Testimony of his Headship: As if we did not know, 1. That to refuse Communion with another Church or Bishop is no act of Jurisdiction over them. 2. That other Bishops have made bold also to excommunicate the Pope: I'll now but recite those words of Nicephorus lib. 17. cap. 26. which you use to glory in (as many do in their own shame) [*Vigilius* (saith he) proceeded to that insolency, that he excommunicated *Mennas* for four moneths. And *Mennas* did the same by him: But *Justinian* being moved to anger with such things, sent some to lay hold on him. But *Vigilius* being afraid of himself, fled to the Altar of *Sergius* the Martyr, and laid hold on the Sacred Pipes, would not be drawn away till he had pul'd them down—] But by the Mediation of the Empress *Theodora*, the Pope was pardoned, and *Menna* and he absolved one another. A fair proof of the Vicarship! 3. And so it was, that Pope *Honorius* was condemned for an Heretick by two or three General Councils.

5. Also when they meet with any big words of their own Popes (as I command this or that) they take it for a proof of the Vicarship: As if big words did prove Authority. Or as if we knew not how lowly and poorly they spoke to those that were above them. As *Gregory* the first for instance, was high enough towards those that he thought he could master: but what low submissive language doth he use to secular Governors that were capable of overtopping him? And what flattering language did his successors use to the most base murderers and usurpers of the Empire?

6. Another Roman deceit is this; When they find any mention of the exercise of the (now thriving) Roman Power, over their own Diocese or Patriarchal circuit, they would hence prove his universal Power over all. And by that Rule the Patriarch of *Alexandria* or *Constantinople* may prove as much.

7. Also when they meet with the passages that speak of the elevation of their Pope to be their first Patriarch, in the Roman Empire, or any Power that by the Emperors was given him, they cunningly confound the Empire with the world, and especially if they find it called by the name of the world; and they would persuade you that all other Christians and Churches on earth, did ascribe as much to the Bishop of Rome, as the Roman Empire did. Its true that he was in the Empire acknowledged to be first in order of dignity, because of Rome the seat of his Episcopacy; especially when General Councils began to trouble themselves and the world about such matters of precedency. And its well known from the language of their writers, as well as from the words of *Luke 2. 1.* that they usually called the Empire all the world: And from such passages would the Papists prove the Primacy at least of the Pope over all the world. But put these Juglers to it, to prove if they can, that beyond the Rivers *Me- roes and Euphrates*, and beyond the bounds of the Roman Empire, the Pope did either exercise Dominion, or was once so much as regarded by them, any more then any other Bishop, except there were any adjacent Island or Countrey that had their dependence upon the Empire. I hope they will not deny that the Church extended much beyond the Empire. (Though our History of that part of it be much defective.) And let them prove if they can, that ever any of those Churches had any regard to the Roman Bishop, any more then to another man. Let them tell you where either the Empire of the *Abas- fines* or any other out of the line of the Imperial power, was any whit like-subject to the Pope.

8. But their chief fraud is about names and words. When they meet with any high complemental title given to the Bishop of Rome, they presently conclude that it signifieth his Sovereignty. Let us instance in some particulars, and shew the vanity of their conclusions from them.

1. Sometimes the Roman Bishops are called [*Summi Pontifices*,] the chief Popes: and hence some gather their Supremacy. But I suppose you will believe *Baronius* (their chief flatterer) in such a case as this. And he tells you in *Martyrolog. Roman. April. 9.* that [*Fuit olim vetus ille usus in Ecclesia, ut Episcopi omnes, non tantum Pontifices, sed & summi Pontifices diceren-*

tur—— i. e. It was the ancient custom of the Church to call all Bishops not only Pontifices Popes, but chief Popes] And then citing such a passage of Hierom Epist. 99. he addeth [Those that underst and not this ancient custom of speech, refer these words to the Popedom of the Church of Rome.)

2. As for the names *Papa*, Pope, *Dominus*, *Pater Sanctissimus*, *beatissimus*, *dei amantissimus*, &c. its needless to tell you that these were commonly given to other Bishops.

3. And what if they could find that *Rome* were called the mother of all Churches? I have formerly shewed you, where Basil faith of the Church of *Cesarea*, that it is as the mother of all Churches in a manner. And *Hierusalem* hath oft that Title.

4. Sometime they find where *Rome* is called *Caput Ecclesiarum*, and then they think they have won the cause. When if you will consult the words, you shall find that it is no more then that Priority of Dignity which (not Christ, but) the Emperours and Councils gave them, that is intended in the word. Its called the *Head*, that is, the chief Seat in Dignity, without any meaning that the Pope is the universal Monarch of the world.

5. But what if they find the Pope called the Archbishop of the Catholick Church, or the Universal Bishop? then they think they have the day. I answer, indeed three flattering Monks at the Council of *Calcedon*, do so superscribe their libels; but they plainly mean no more then the Bishop that in order of dignity is above the rest; And many particular Churches are oft called Catholick Churches. There's difference between [A Catholick Church] and [The Catholick Church.] And the Bishop of *Constantinople* had that Title, even by a Council at *Constant. an. 518.* before the Bishop of *Rome* had it publickely, or durst own it: It was settled on the Patriarch of *Constantinople* to be called the Oecumenical or Universal Patriarch. Who knoweth not that Emperours gave such Titles at their pleasure? *Iustinian* would sometime give the Primacy to *Rome*, and at another time to *Constantinople*, saying [Constantinopolitana Ecclesia omnium aliarum est caput: The Church of Constantinople is the Head of all other Churches.] *An. Dom. 530. C. de Episcopis. l. 1. lege 24.* And its known that this *Iustinian* that sometime

time calls *Rome the Head*, did yet when the fifth General Council had condemned *Vigilius Pope of Rome*, permit *Theodora* his Empress to cause him to be fercht to *Constantinople*, and drag'd about the street in a halter, and then banished, till they had forced him to subscribe and submit to the Council: even as they had deposed Pope *Silverius* his predecessor. And *Baronius* himself mentioneth a *Vaticane* Monument which as it calls *Agapetus Episcoporum princeps* on one side, so doth it call *Menna* [the *Apostolick Universal Bishop*:] Which *Baronius* saith, doth mean no more then that he was *Universal* over his own *Provinces*: and if that be so, any Bishop may be called *Universal*. And do not these men know what Council of *Carthage* decreed that the Bishop *prima sedis* should be called neither *Summus Sacerdos*, nor *Princeps Sacerdotum*, vel aliquid hujusmodi, tantum *Episcopus prima sedis*: i. e. Not the chief Priest, or the chief of Priests but the Bishop of the first seat] And how long will they shut their eyes against the Testimony of two of their own Popes, *Pelagius* and *Gregory* the first that condemned the name of *Universal Bishop*?

Sometime they find the Church of *Rome* called *Apostolick*; and so were others as well as that, as is commonly known.

And sometime the Pope is called the *Pillar of the Church*; And what of that? so are many others as well as he; as all the Apostles were as well as *Peter*? The Church is built on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets. That the Pastors of the Church were ordinarily called the *Pillars and props* of it, as by *Nicephorus Gildas*, *Theodoret*, *Basil*, *Tertullian*, *Dionysius*, *Hierom*, *Augustine*, &c. you may see proved in *Gatakers Cinnus* page 395, 396.

And lastly, when the Papists read their Popes called the *Successors of Peter*, they take this as a proof of their Sovereignty. Whereas 1. *Peter* himself had no such Sovereignty. 2. They succeed him not in his *Apostleship*. 3. They are called *Pauls Successors* as well as *Peters*. 4. Others are called *Peters Successors* too as well as they, by the Fathers. 5. And other Bishops ordinarily are called the *Apostles Successors*, and other Churches called *Apostolick Churches*.

I shall only set before them the words of one man at this time.

time, (*Hefychii Hierosol. apud Photium Cod. 269.*) and desire them to tell me whether ever more were said of the Pope, yea or of Peter, then he saith of *Andrew*, calling him [*Chori Apostolici primogenitus, primitus defixa Ecclesie columna, Petri Petrus, fundamenti fundamentum; principii principium vel primitia, qui vocavit antequam vocaretur, adduxit priusquam adduceretur*] i. e. [*The first begotten of the Apostolick Chore, the first fixed Pillar of the Church; the Peter of Peter, or the Rock of Peter, the Foundation of the Foundation; the Principal of the Principal, who called before he was called, and brought (others) to (Christ) before he was brought to him (by any others.)*]

And the same *Hefychius* saith of *James* apud *Photium Cod. 275.* [*Πῶς ἐγκύβητος, &c.* i. e. *With what Praises may I set forth the servant and Brother of Christ, the chief Emperour (or Commander or Captain) of the New Hierusalem; the Prince or chief of Priests, the President or Principal of the Apostles, the Crown or Leader among the Heads, the principal Lamp among the Lights; the principal planet among the Stars; Peter speaketh to the people; but James giveth the Law (or sets down the Law)*] Can they shew us now where more then this is said of *Peter* himself? Much less of the Pope?

CHAP. XXVII.

Detect. 18. **A** Nother of the Principal Deceits of the Papists, is, the forging and corrupting of Councils and Fathers; and the citation of such forgeries. Be carefull therefore how you receive their Allegations, till you have searched and know the Books to be genuine, and the particular words to be there, and uncorrupted.

They have by their greatness obtained the opportunity of possessing so many Libraries, that they might the easlyer play this abominable game. But God in mercy hath kept so many monuments of Antiquity out of their hands, partly in the Eastern, and partly in the Reformed Churches, as suffice to discover abundance of their wicked forgeries and falsifications.

Of their forging Canons, yea feigning Councils that never were, (as *Concil. Sinnessan. Concil. Rom. sub Silvestr.* See Bishop *Ushers Answer to the Jes.* pag. 12, 13. As also of their forging *Constantines Donation*, and *Isidore mercators* forging of a fardell of Decretals; and of their falsifying and corrupting in the Doctrine of the Sacrament, the works of *Ambrose*, of *Chrysost.* (or the *Author operis Imperfecti*.) of *Fulbertus Bishop of Chartres*; of *Rabanus of Mentz*, of *Bertram*, or *Ratramnus*, &c. Read I pray you the words detecting their horrible impious cheats.

But their *Indices expurgatorii* will acquaint you with much more. And yet their secreter expurgations are worst of all.

What words of *Peters Primacy*, and others for their advantage, they have added to *Cyprian de unitate Ecclesie*, see in *Jer. Stephens* his Edition of it, where much more additions to *Cyprians* works are detected out of many *Oxford Manuscripts*.

Andreas Schettus the Jesuite publishing *Basil's* works at *Antwerp* Lat. A. D. 1616. with Jesuitical fidelity, left out the Epistle, in which is this passage following, which should not be lost: speaking of the Western Bishops he saith [verily the manners of Proud men do use to grow more insolent, if they be honoured. And if God be merciful to us, what other addition have we need of? But if Gods anger on us remain, what help can the pride of the West bring us? when they neither know the Truth, nor can endure to speak it; but being prepossessed with false suspicions, they do the same things now, which they did in the case of *Marcellus*, contentiously disputing against those that taught the truth, but for Heresie, confirming it by their authority. Indeed I was willing (not as representing the publike person of the East) to write to their Leader (*Damasus*) but nothing about Church matters, but that I might intimate that they neither knew the truth of the things that are done with us, nor did admit the way by which they might learn them. And in general, that they should not insult over the calamitous and afflicted, nor think that Pride did make for their dignity, when that one sin alone is enough to make us hatefull to God] so far *Basil* in that Epistle left out by the Jesuite; in which you may see the *Romane power* in those daies, in the consciences of *Basil* and such other Fathers in the East.

And (by the way) how *Tertullian* revered them, you

may see *lib. de pudicit. pag. 742.* where he calls *Zepherinus*, as we say, all to naught: And the *Asian* Bishops condemning of *Victor*, with *Irenaeus* his reproof of him; *Cyprians* and *Firmilians* condemning *Stephen*: *Marcellinus* his condemnation by all: *Liberius* his being so oft Anathematized by *Hilary Pictav.* the resistance of *Zosimus* and *Boniface* by the Africans, &c. shew plainly in what esteem the now-infallible universal Head was then among the Fathers, and in all the Churches. But when the Papists come to the mention of such passages, what jugglings do they use? sometime they silence them: sometime they pass them over in a few words that are buried in a heap of other matters: sometime they bring in some forgeries to obscure them. But commonly they make a nose of wax of Councils and Fathers, as well as of Scripture, and put any ridiculous sence upon them that shall serve their turns, though perhaps six men among them may have five or six Expositions.

An Epistle of *Ciril of Jerusalem* to *Austin* is forged by one, that their *Molanus* calleth *A barbarous impostor* (*Hist. Imag. l. 3. c. 36.*) about the miracles of *Hierom*; where Purgatory and other errors are befriended. When as *Ciril* himself dyed thirty years before *Hierome*. And yet *Binsfeld*, *Suarez* and other of the most learned Papists stick not to make use of this forgery for all that.

But it would be tedious to recite their particular forgeries. The studious Reader may find many of them discovered up and down by Bishop *Usher* and other of our Writers. And for his fuller help, I advise him to read Dr. *Reignolds de Libris Apocryph.* and Dr. *Th. James* his corruptions of the Fathers, and *Scultetus* his *medulla patrum*: yea of the Papists themselves, read *Sixtus Senensis* his *Bibliothec.* and *Bellarmin.* *de Scriptorib. Eccles.* and *Possevinus Apparatus*, and *Erasmus* censures on the Fathers which he dealt with: But especially let him not be without *Cook's censura Patrum*, and *Blondell on the Decretals*; to which also add *Rivets Critica Sacra*, and *Dallens de Pseudepigraphis.*

Of their abominable Legends I shall say nothing, but that the wiser sort of themselves are ashamed of them. And if any Ancients have abused the Church by shameless forgeries, the Papists make use of such as confidently as if they were the word of God.

For

For instance, Let any man but read over the Books of *Basil* Bishop of *Seleucia* (if it be his indeed) of the life & Miracles of *Thecla*, and try his faith upon it, whether he be able to believe that *Thecla* stood so long at the window to hear *Paul* while all those daily applications and orations were made to her? that *Demas* and *Hermogenes* were there to stir up the people against *Paul* as a deceiver, under the cloak of being his companions; that any of those Orations recited are true, when the Author like a professed fabler useth to say [I suppose thus or thus they said:] that her Mother *Theocleia*, and her lover *Thamiris* were on the sudden so cruel as to burn her, while they are said so much to burn in Love to her; that when *Thecla* had formed her body like a Cross, and cast herself into the flaming pile, the flames in reverence of the Cross, became as a Chamber to her, covering her like a vault from the peoples sight, and not approaching her; and that the earth making a grievous noise, the showrs and hail destroyed the people, and *Thecla* went her way without observance, finding *Paul* and *Onesiphorus* hid in a Sepulcher at prayer for her: that *Paul* permitted her to cut her hair, and change her habit, and become his fellow traveller; that *Alexander* the Governour was so inflamed with her beauty at *Antioch*, even before she came in full sight of the people in the City Gate, that he could not forbear, but presently must leap upon her like a mad dog; that she tore his Cloak, and threw off his Crown, and so saved her Virginity; that for this she was cast and tyed to wild beasts, and the Lyons conched to her, and one *Lyonesse* fought for her, and killed the rest that assaulted her; that yet they turned more upon her: that she leaped into the Fish pond among the devouring Sea Calves; and that fire from Heaven came down into the water, and there made her a chamber, and saved her from those Sea-beasts; that *Falconilla's* soul appeared to her Mother *Tryphæna* to beg *Thecla's* prayers that she might be admitted into heaven, telling her how much *Thecla* was admired in Heaven. (She knew who was admired in Heaven before she could be let in:) that at *Thecla's* prayers she was admitted into heaven; (but tells us not where she was before:) that when *Thecla* was again tied to wild bulls, and fire set to their posteriors to enrage them, the fire killed them, and burnt the bonds, and she was unhurt. That *Thecla* again puts on mans cloaths, and seeks *Paul*; (whether she wore breeches I find not;) that