

When we tell the Papists of their Licensing Whore-houses at Rome, Bononia, &c. they commonly fly to the words of *Austin*, *lib. de Ordine*, saying [*Aufer Meretrices de rebus humanis, & turbaveris omnia libidinibus, &c. Take away Whores from among men, and you will disturb all things with lusts.*] Though this was written when *Austin* was but a young convert, and it seems that he after changed his mind, yet this shews that our times are far from the abominations of those; and our Pastors are far more strict then *Austin* then was.

4. As for the Holiness of their Church by Ceremonies, as Holy Water, Holy Oil, Relicks, Altars, and an hundred such things, I think it not worth the speaking of: all things are sanctified to us by the word and prayer. We devote our selves and all that we have to God, and then to the *Pure all things are Pure*. We neglect no Ordinance of God that we can know of and enjoy. *He is a spirit, and seeketh such as will worship him in spirit and truth.* This is the Holiness that we look after. But for numbring of Beads, and *Ave Marias*, and going pilgrimages, and such inventions of arrogant men, we place no Holiness in them, as knowing that God desireth not a Mimical or Histrionical worship; and that none knows what will please him so well as himself.

CHAP. XXXV.

Detest. 26. **A** Nother of their Deceits is, by calling us to tell them when every one of their Errors did first begin, and what Pope did bring them in; or else they will not believe but they are from the Apostles.

To this Bishop *Usher* and abundance of our writers have answered them at large. I shall therefore speak but these few, but satisfactory words.

1. It belongs to you to prove the continuance of your Opinions or Practices, more then to us to prove the Beginning.
2. It sufficeth that we prove that there was a time when your errors were not in the Church, and that we can do from the Scriptures and the Fathers, and oft have done.
3. You know your selves of abundance of changes which you know not who

did first introduce. Who first administred the Lords Supper in one kind only? dare you say that this was from the beginning? Who first laid by the standing on the Lords day, and uled kneeling? (forbidden *Can. 20. Concil. Nicen. 1.* and in other General Councils.) *Alvarus Pelagius de planct. Eccles. li. 2. art. 2. fol. 104. saith* [The Church bewaileth the sins of the people, but specially of the Clergy as greater then the sin of Sodom: For we see that faith and Justice have forsaken the earth. The Holy Scripture and sacred Canons are accounted as fables — He's now a man of no knowledge that inventeth not Novelties.] You see that then Novelties were brought in. The same *Vincentius Lirinensis* complaineth of: And not only complaineth of, but giveth Direction what to do in case that [*Novella aliqua contagio, non jam portuinculam tantum, sed totam Pariter Ecclesiam commaculare conetur?* If any novell contagion shall endeavour to stain not only a part of the Church, but the whole Church alike?] And then his advise is to appeal from Novelty to Antiquity, and not to the Pope or the present Church. And withall he addeth that *This Direction is but for* [*new heresies at their first rising, before they falsifie the rules of ancient faith (that is, before they corrupt antient Writers, or can pretend to Antiquity) and before by the large spreading of the venome, they endeavour to corrupt the volumes of our ancestors.* But dilated and inveterate Heresies are not to be set upon this way, because by the long tract of time, they have had a long occasion of stealing Truth: and therefore we must convince such antient heresies and schisms by no means but by the only Authority of the Scripture, if there be need, or avoid them —] *Lirinensis cap. 4. &c.*

Were there not abundance of Novelties introduced, when *Augustine ad Januarium* said that [*They load our Religion with servile burdens, which God in mercy would have to be free, with a very few and most manifest Sacraments of Celebration, so that the condition of the Jews was more tolerable, that were subject to Legall Sacraments, and not to the presumptions of men*] These words of *Austin* your own *Joh. Gerson* reciting (*de vita spirit. anima. lect. 2. par. 3.*) addeth of his own [*Si tuo tempore, &c.* If in thy dayes thou didst thus mourn, Oh wise *Augustine*, what wouldst thou have said in our time: where according to the variety,

and

and motion of heads, there is incredible variety and dissonant multiplicity of such servile burdens, and as thou callest them, of humane presumptions. Among which, as so many snares of souls, and entangling nets, there's scarce any man that walks secure, and is not taken (or catcht.)]

How think you now in the Judgement of *Augustine* and *Gerson*; whether there have any *Novelties* been brought into the Church: and whether all your Presumptions and burdens, and (as *Gerson* calls them) halters for souls, have come from the Apostles, or are your own? When all is thus overcome with Novelty, do you make any question whether any thing be new?

It seems that *Bernard* thought that humane Traditions were too much befriended, when he thus describeth the Assemblies that he approveth, *Epist. 91.* [*Such a Council (do I delight in) in which the Traditions of men are not obstinately defended, or superstitiously observed; but they do diligently and humbly enquire, what is the good, and well pleasing, and perfect will of God.*]

And it seems to me that General Councils by error introduced *Novelties*, when Later Councils were fain to undo what the former had done: For so doth blessed *Augustine* profess they did, saying, *De Baptis. cont. Donat. lib. 2. cap. 6.* [*And Councils themselves that are gathered through several Regions or Provinces, do without any scruple yield to the authority of more plenary Councils that are gathered out of the whole Christian world; and those same plenary Councils do often yield (or give place) the former to the later, when by some experiment of matters, that which was shut is opened, and that which lay hid is known*] Sure here are alterations made even by General Councils that correct one another.

And what should hinder the Introduction of Novelty when General Councils do so often err? Nay if such Councils be Morally and Interpretatively the whole Church, as the Papists say, then the whole Church doth err in the reception of some Novelty, before they declare it by their decrees. If you say, that General Councils cannot err, nor introduce such *Novelties*, your Champion *Bellarmino* and many of your own, will give you the Lie: saith he *De Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11.* [*Neg. potest, &c.*] It cannot be answered that those Councils erred because they were

not lawfull (that is the Arrian and other Heretical General Councils, at that at *Sirmium*, *Millanie*, *Ariminum*, *Ephesus*, several at *Constantinople* disallowed by the Papists) For to most of them there was nothing wanting but the Popes assent. Yea the second at *Ephesus* was altogether like that at *Basil* : For both were called by the Pope ; in both of them the Popes Legate was present at the beginning : from both of them the Popes Legate shortly after went away : in both of them the Pope was excommunicated ; and yet that the Council of *Ephesus* erred, the adversaries will not deny] Hence he concludeth that [the chief Power Ecclesiastical is not in the Church, nor in the Council, the Pope being removed formaliter vel suppletivè.]

And what should hinder, when there is but one mans vote against it, even the Popes, but that Novelty and error may enter at any time ; and when that one man is oft so wicked and Heretical as he is. For General Councils are but a meer name and mockery. The packing of them shews it : the Paucity and non-Universality of them shews it. The Management of their affairs shews it. They do nothing since the Papal reign, but what the Pope will (excepting the condemned Councils) They have no Being till he Will ; nor make any Decrees but what he Will : Nor are their Decrees of any further power, then he is pleased to give them. So that his Will is the sense of the General Council or universal Church. I need not turn you for this to *Sleidan*, or *Vergerius* Bishop of *Trent*, that tell us the Holy Ghost came to that Council in a Cloak-bag from *Rome* : nor to *Essensaus* in *Tit.* 1. pag. 42. seeing *Bellarmino* speaks it out, *De Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11.* saying, [We must know that the Pope is wont to send Legates instructed concerning the judgement of the Apostolick seat, with this Condition, that if the Council do consent to the judgement of the Apostolick seat, it shall be formed into a Decree ; If nor, the forming of the decree shall be deferred till the Pope of *Rome*, being advised with, shall return his answer] And saith *Bellarmino* *de Concil. lib. 2. cap. 11.* [In the Council of *Basil*, *Ses. 2.* it was decreed by common consent, together with the Popes Legate, that a Council is above the Pope ; which certainly is now judged erroneous] And the Council of *Lateran* and *Florence* decreed the contrary. And *Pighius* saith, *Hierarch. Eccles. l. 6.* that [the Councils of *Constance* and *Basil*]

went about by a new trick, and pernicious example to destroy the Ecclesiastical Hierarchy, and instead of it to bring in the Domination of a promiscuous confused popular multitude, that is to raise again Babylon it self, subjecting to themselves, or to the community of the Church, (which they falsely pretended that they Represent) the very Head and Prince of the whole Church; and him that is the Vicar of Christ himself in this his Kingdom, and this against Order and Nature, against the clearest light of Gospel verity, against all Authority of Antiquity, and against the undoubted Faith and judgement of the Orthodox Church it self.]

Mark Papists: General Councils with the Popes Nuncio may bring in Novelties in faith, against the clearest light of the Gospel, and the full Consent of Antiquity; and yet these Councils affirmed their opinions to be *de fide*, and the contrary to be Heretical and Damnable, and contrary to all Antiquity. You see then that Novelties are among you in matters of faith. And the French to this day are guilty of those Novelties, and also charge their Adversaries with Innovation.

Nay what will you say, if General Councils themselves are but Novelties, though they are the foundation of the faith of one half of the Papists (as the Pope is of the other) I say not so, but judge whether your Champion Pighius say so, Hierarch. Eccles. lib. 6. cap. 1. fol. 230. where he saith that [*Concilia universalia non habent Divinam, &c.* General Councils have not a Divine or Supernatural Original, but meerly an humane Original, and are the Invention of Constantine a Prince, profitable indeed sometimes to find out in Controversie, which is the Orthodox and Catholick truth, though to this they are not necessary; seeing its a readier way to advise with the Apostolick seat] How now Sirs? Is your Representative Church the foundation of your faith, a Novelty of Constantines invention; and yet are you in the old way, and must we be put to prove you to be Novelists?

Do you think those Popes did go the Old way, of whom Alvarus Pelagius speaks (*de planctu Eccles. art. 15. lib. 2.*) that [they succeeded in authority, but not in Sanctity, intruding themselves, procuring, bargaining, &c. building Towers and Palaces in Babylon, that is, in Rome according to Hierom] Some foul innovation sure they were guilty of that so re-edified Babylon.

So that this is my first proof that you are Novelists; from the General Accusations of others, and Confessions of your own.

2. Another proof that changes may be, and yet the time and Authors be unknown, is from the instance of other Churches that have been corrupted or subverted by Innovations, and yet the time and authors are unknown. You accuse the Churches in *Habassia* of many errors your selves; and you are not able to tell us when they came in, or who introduced them. The same may be said of the Georgians, Armenians, Egyptians, yea and of the Greeks and Russians. Can you tell us when, and by whom each error was introduced that corrupted the Churches mentioned in the Scripture? as *Corinth*, *Philippi*, *Coloss*, *Thessalonica*, *Ephesus*, *Laodicea*, and the rest: you know you can give us no better an account of this, then we can of the Authors of your Corruptions, nor so good.

You know that among the Primitive Fathers, whose writings are come to our hands, many errors had the Major vote, as that of the *Corporeity of Angels*, (which your second General Council at Nice owned) and their *Copulation with women before the flood*, the *Millenary conceit*, and many more which you confess to be errors. Tell us when any of these came in, if you can (unless you will believe that *Papias* received the last from *John*, and then its no error.) Who did first bring the Asian Churches to celebrate Easter at a season differing from yours? Who first brought the Britains to it? Nay we know not certainly who first Converted many Nations on earth, nor when they first received their Christianity: and how then should we know when they first received each error?

And we find that good men did bring in Novelties; and what was by them introduced as indifferent, would easily by custom grow to seem Necessary: and what they received as a doubtfull opinion, would easily grow to be esteemed a point of Faith. The Presbyters and whole Clergy of *Neocæsarea* were offended with *Basil* for his Innovations, viz. for bringing in a new Psalmodie, or way of singing to God; and for his new order of Monasticks: and they told him that none of this was so in *Gregories* dayes; and what answereth *Basil*? He denyeth not the Novelty of his Psalmodie, but retorts again on them, that
their

their Letany also was new, and not known in the time of Gregory (*Thaumaturgus*) yea, saith he, *How know you that these things were not in the dayes of Gregory?* For you have kept nothing unchanged to this day of all that he was used to] you see what chopping and changing was then in the Church among all sorts, when such an alteration was made in less then forty years. Yet Basil would not have unity to be laid on any of these things, but addeth, [*But we pardon all these things, though God will examine all things: only let the principal things be safe*] Basil *Epist.* 63. Isidore *Pelusiota lib.* 1. *Epist.* 90. saith, that [*the Apostles of the Lord studying to restrain and suppress unmeet loquacity, and shewing themselves Masters of modesty and gravity to us, did by wise Council permit women to sing in the Churches. But as all Gods documents are turned into the contrary, so this is turned to dissoluteness, and the occasion of sin. For they are not affected with deep compunction in singing Divine Hymns; but abusing the sweetness of the singing, to the irritating and provoking of lust, they take it for no better then stage-play songs:*] therefore he adviseth that they be suffered to sing no more.

Here you see 1. That changes had happened about many Divine things. 2. That he adviseth himself the introducing of this novelty, that women be forbidden singing in the Church, because of the abuse, though he confesses it a wise Apostolick Order. So that for Novelty by good men to creep into Gods worship, is not strange.

3. Moreover the Nature of the thing may tell all the world, that neither you nor we can be accountable of the beginning of every error that creepeth into the Church: For 1. The distance of time is great. 2. Historians are not so exact: and what they tell us not, neither you, nor we can know. 3. Much History is perished. 4. Much is corrupted by your wicked forgeries, as hath been oft proved to you. 5. Mixtures of Fables have hindred the credit of much of it. 6. Nations are not individual persons, but consist of millions of individuals: And as it is not a whole Nation that is converted to the faith at once, so neither is it whole Nations that are perverted to Heresie at once, but one receiveth it first, and then more and more, till it over-spread the whole. *Paul* saith that such doctrine eateth like a Gangrene; and that is by degrees, beginning on one part, and proceeding

proceeding to the rest. 7. As I said before, that which is at first received but as an Opinion and an Indifferent thing, must have time to grow into a Custom; and that Custom maketh it a Law, and makes Opinions grow up to be Articles of Faith, and Ceremonies grow to be Necessary things. You know that this is the common way of propagating opinions in the world.

4. I have in another Book shewed you out of many of your own writers, the rise of divers of your vanities. And *Usher* hath told the Jesuite more: and so he hath told you of your thriving to your present height, in his Book *de successu & statu Ecclesie*. And so hath *Mornay* in his *Mysterie of Iniquity*, and *Rivet* in the Defense of him against *Coffereus*; and *Pet. Molinæus* hath purposely written a Book *de Novitate Papismi, & Antiquitate veri Christianismi*, shewing the Newness of Popery in the several parts of it. To these therefore I remit you for Answer to this Objection.

5. Can you tell us your selves, when many of your doctrines or practices sprung up? When took you up your *Sabbaths* fast, for which you have been condemned by a Council? You know that when the twentieth Canon of the Nicene Council was made, and when the Canons at *Trull.* were made, it was the Practice of the Church through the known world, to pray and perform other worship standing, and to avoid kneeling on the Lords Day. Tell us when this Canon and Tradition was first violated by you, and by whom? It was once the custom of your Church to give Infants the Eucharist; who first broke it off? It was once your practice to Communicate in both kinds: who first denied the Cup to the Laity? At first it was only a doubtful Opinion, that Saints are to be Prayed to, and the dead prayed for, which came into mens minds about the third or fourth Century? But who first made them Articles of faith? *Augustine* began to doubt, whether there were not some kind of Purgatory: But who first made this also a point of faith? Who was it that first added the Books of the *Maccabees* and many others to the Canon of Scripture, contrary to the Council of *Laodicea*, and all the rest of the consent of Antiquity, which *Dr. Reynolds*, *Dr. Cosin* and others have produced? Who was it that first taught and practised the putting an Oath to all the Clergy of the Christian Church within your power to be true

to the Pope, and to obey him as the Vicar of Christ? Who first taught men to swear, that they would not interpret Scripture, but according to the unanimous Consent of the Fathers? Who was the first that brought in the doctrine or name of Transubstantiation? and who first made it an Article of faith? Who first made it a point of faith to believe that there are just seven Sacraments, neither fewer nor more? Did any before the Council of *Trent* swear men, to receive and profess without doubting, all things delivered by the Canons and Oecumenical Councils, when at the same time they cast off themselves the Canons of many General Councils, and so are generally and knowingly perjured? (as e. g. the twentieth Canon of *Nice* forementioned) These and abundance more you know to be *Novelties* with you, if wilfulness or gross ignorance bear not rule with you; and without great impudence you cannot deny it. Tell us now when these first came up, and satisfie your selves.

One that was afterward your Pope (*Aeneas Sylvius*, Epist. 288. saith, that before the Council of *Nice*, there was little respect had to the Church of Rome: You see here the time mentioned, when your foundation was not laid.

Your Learned Cardinal Nicol. Cusanus, lib. de Concord. Cathol. c. 13. &c. tells you how much your Pope hath gotten of late: and plainly tells you, that the Papacy is but of Positive right, and that Priests are equal, and that it is sectional consent that gives the Pope and Bishops their Majority, and that the distinction of Diocesses, and that a Bishop be over Presbyters, are of Positive right, and that Christ gave no more to Peter than the rest; and that if the Congregate Church should choose the Bishop of *Trent* for their President and Head, he should be more properly Peters Successor than the Bishop of Rome] Tell us now when the contrary doctrine first arose?

Gregory de Valentia (de leg. usu Enchar. cap. 10. tells you that the Receiving the Sacrament in one kind, began not by the decree of any Bishop, but by the very use of the Churches, and the consent of believers: and tells you, that it is unknown when that Custom first begun, or got head, but that it was General in the Latine Church, not long before the late Council of *Constance*. And may you not see in this, how other points came in?

If Pope *Zosimus* had but had his will, and the Fathers of the *Carthage* Council had not diligently discovered, shamed, and resisted his forgery, the world had received a new Nicene Canon, and we should never have known the Original of it.

Its a considerable Instance that *Usher* brings, of using the Church service in a known tongue. The Latine tongue was the Vulgar tongue, when the Liturgy and Scripture was first written in it (at *Rome* and far and neer it was understood by all,) The service was not changed, as to the language: but the language it self changed; and so Scripture and Liturgy came to be in an unknown tongue; And when did the Latine tongue cease to be understood by all? Tell us what year, or by whom the change was made? saith *Erasmus* (*Decl. ad censur. Paris. tit. 12. §. 41.*) [*The Vulgar tongue was not taken from the people, but the people departed from it.*]

5. We are certain that your errors were not in the times of the Apostles, nor long after; and therefore we are sure that they are Innovations. And if I find a man in a Dropsie, or a Consumption, I would not tell him that he is well, and ought not to seek remedy, unless he can tell when he began to be ill, and what caused it.

You take us to be Heretical: and yet you cannot tell us when our errors did first arise. Will you tell us of *Luther*? You know the Albigenes whom you murdered by hundreds and thousands, were long before him? Do you know when they began? Your *Reinerius* saith that some said, they were from *Silvesters* dayes, and some said since the Apostles; but no other beginning do you know.

6. But to conclude, what need we any more, then to find you owning the very doctrine and practise of Innovation? When you maintain that you can make us new Articles of faith, and new worship, and new discipline, and that the Pope can dispense with the Scriptures, and such like, what reason have we to believe that your Church abhorreth Novelty? If you deny any of this, I prove it.

Pope *Leo* the tenth among other of *Luthers* opinions, reckoneth and opposeth this as Hereticall [*It is certain that it is not in the hand of the Church or Pope, to make Articles of faith*] (*in Bulla cont. Luth.*)

The.

The Council of Constance that took the supremacy justly from the Pope, did unjustly take the Cup from the Laity in the Eucharist, [*Licet in primitivâ Ecclesiâ hujusmodi Sacramentum reciperetur à fidelibus sub utraq. specie, i. e. Though in the primitive Church this Sacrament was received by Believers under both kinds.*]

The Council of Trent say, Sess. 21. cap. 1, 2. that [*this power was always in the Church: that in dispensing the Sacraments, saving the substance of them, it might ordain or change things, as it should judge most expedient to the profit of the receiver.*]

Vasquez To. 2. Disp. 216. N. 60. saith [*Though we should grant that this was a precept of the Apostles, nevertheless the Church and Pope might on just causes abrogate it: For the Power of the Apostles was no greater then the power of the Church and Pope in bringing in Precepts.*]

These I cited in another Treatise against Popery, page 365. Where also I added that of Pope Innocent [*Secundum plenitudinem potestatis, &c. By the fulness of our power, we can dispense with the Law above Law*] And the Gloss that oft saith [*The Pope dispenseth against the Apostle; against the Old Testament. The Pope dispenseth with the Gospell interpreting it*] And Gregor. de valent. saying (Tom. 4. disp. 6. q. 8.) [*Certainly some things in later times are more rightly constituted in the Church then they were in the beginning*] And of Cardinal Peron's saying, lib. 2. Obs. 3. cap. 3. pag. 674. against King James, of the Authority of the Church to alter matters contained in the Scripture: and his instance [*of the form of Sacraments being alterable; and the Lords command Drink ye all of it*] mutable and dispensable. And Tolets [*Its certain that all things instituted by the Apostles were not of Divine right.*] Andradus (Defens. Concil. Trid. lib. 2. pag. 236. [*Hence it is plain that they do not err that say the Popes of Rome may sometime dispense with Laws made by Paul and the four first Councils* —]) And Bzovius [*The Roman Church using Apostolical power, doth according to the Condition of times, change all things for the better*] And yet will you not give us leave to take you for changers and Novelists?

But let us add to these witnesses, some more of your worthies, August. Triumph. de Aucon. q. 5. art. 1. saith [*To make a*

new Creed, belongs only to the Pope, because he is the Head of the Christian faith, by whose authority all things belonging to faith are confirmed and strengthened —] Et Art. 2. [As he may make a new Creed, so he may multiply new Articles upon Articles] And (in *Præfat. sum. ad Johan. 22.*) he saith that [the Popes power is Infinite, because the Lord is great, and his strength great, and of his greatness there is no end] And q. 36. ad. 6. he saith that [the Pope giveth the Motion of Direction, and the sense of Knowledge into all the members of the Church; For in him we live and move and have our being — And the Will of God, and consequently the Popes Will, who is his Vicar, is the first and chief cause of all motions corporall and spiritual.] And then no doubt may change without blame.

Abbas Panormitan. in cap. C. Christus de heret. n. 2. saith, [The Pope can bring in a new Article of faith] And *Perr. de Anchoran. in idic.* [The Pope can make new Articles of faith, that is, such as now ought to be believed, when before they ought not to be believed.]

Turrecremat. sum. de Eccl. lib. 2. cap. 203. saith that [the Pope is the Measure, and Rule, and Science of things to be believed.] And *August. de Ancona* shews us that the Judgement of God is not higher then the Popes, but the same, and that therefore no man may appeal from the Pope to God] (*qu. 6. art. 1.*) And therefore be not offended, if we suppose you to have changes.

A Confutation of a Popish Manuscript on this point.

Just as I was writing this, I received another Popish M. S. sent from *Wolverhampton* to *Sturbridge*, to which I shall return an answer before I go to the next point.

Pap. M. S. An Argument for the Church.

IT will not be denied but that the Church of Rome was once a most pure, excellent, flourishing and Mother Church; and her faith renowned in the whole world, *Rom. 1. 8. & 6. & 16.*
Whites

Whites Def. p. 555. King James speech to the Parliament.
Whitaker in his Answer to Dr. Sanders. Fulk. cap. 21. Thes.
7. Reynolds in his fifth Conclusion.

This Church could not cease to be such, but she must fall either by Apostacy, Heresie, or Schism.

Apostacy is not only a renouncing of the faith of Christ; but of the name and Title of Christianity. No man will say that the Church of Rome had such a fall, or fell so.

Heresie is an adhesion or fast cleaving to some private or singular Opinion, or error in faith, contrary to the generally approved doctrine of the Church.

If the Church of Rome did ever adhere to any singular or new opinion, disagreeable to the common received doctrine of the Christian World, I pray you satisfy me in these particulars.

1. By what General Council was she ever condemned?
2. Which of the Fathers ever writ against her?
3. By what Authority was she otherwise reprov'd?

For it seems to be a thing very incongruous, that so great a Church should be condemned by every private person, who hath a mind to condemn her.

Schism is a departure or division from the unity of the Church, whereby the bond and Communion keld with some former Church is broken and dissolved.

If ever the Church of Rome divided her self from any body of faithfull Christians, or broke Communion, or went forth from the Society of any Elder Church, I pray you satisfy me in these particulars.

1. Whose company did she leave?
2. From what body went she forth?
3. Where was the true Church she forsook?

For it appears not a little strange, that a Church should be accounted Schismatical, when there cannot be assigned any other Church different from her (which from age to age since Christs time hath continued visible) from whence she departed.]

Thus far the Papists Manuscript.

An Answer to the foregoing Argument.

IF the Author of this Argument thinks as he speaks, its a case to be lamented with tears of blood, that the Church of Christ should be abused, and the souls of men deluded by men of so great ignorance. But if he know that he doth but juggle and deceive, its as lamentable that any matter of Salvation should fall into such hands.

1. This Argument I have before answered, *Detect.* 13. The word Church here is ambiguous, and either signifieth, 1. A particular Church, which is an Association of Christians for personal Communion in Gods worship. 2. Or divers such Associations or Churches Associated for Communion by their officers or delegates, for unity sake. 3. Or else it may signifie some one Mistris Church that is the Ruler of all the rest in the world. 4. Or else it may signifie the Universal (Catholick) Church it self, which containeth all the particular Churches in the world.

The Papist should not have plaid either the blind man or the Jugler by confounding these, and never telling us which he means. 1. For the first, we grant him that *Rome* was once an excellent flourishing Church: And so was *Ephesus*, *Hierusalem*, *Philippi*, *Colosse* and many more.

2. As to the second sence it is humane, or from Church custom, so to take the word Church; for Scripture, that I find doth not so use it: But for the thing, we are indifferent: Though it cannot be proved that in Scripture times *Rome* had any more then a particular Church; yet its all one as to our cause.

3. As to the third and fourth senses, we deny, as confidently as we do that the Sun is darknes, that ever in Scripture times *Rome* was either a Mother to all Churches, or the Ruler and Mistris of all, or yet the Universal Church it self. Prove this, and I will turn Papist.

But there's not a word for it in the Texts cited, but an intimation of much against it. *Paul* calleth *Rome* a Church, and commendeth its faith. True, but doth he not so by the *Thessalonians*, *Colossians*, *Ephesians*, *Philippians*, &c. and *John* by the *Philadelphians*, *Pergamus*, *Thyatira*, and others, as well? And will

nor

not this prove that *Rome* was but such a particular Church as one of them?

The citation of Protestants are done it seems by one that never read them, nor would have others read them; which makes him turn us to whole books to search for them, if we have nothing else to do, and to miscited places. But we know that all our Divines confess that *Rome* was once a true and famous particular Church, but never the Universal Church, nor the Ruler of the world, or of all other Churches, in *Pauls* dayes. Would you durst lay your cause on this, and put it to the tryal? Why else did never *Paul* make one word of mention of this Power and honour, nor send other Churches to her to be Governed?

And now I pray consider to what purpose is the rest of your reasoning? What is it to me, whether *Rome* be turned either Apostate, Heretical, or Schismatical, any more then whether *Jerusalem*, *Ephesus*, *Philippi*, or any other Church be so faln? If you are not faln I am glad of it; if you are I am sorry for it; and so I have done with you (unless I knew how to recover you.) Would you not laugh even at the Church of *Jerusalem* that was truly the Mother Church of the world, if they should thus reason [We are not faln away: therefore we must Rule over all the world, and no man is a Christian that doth not obey us?] This is the sport you make in the cheating of souls.

Well; but let us follow you, though our cause be not concerned in it. 1. I answer, that we accuse you not of renouncing the name of Christ. 2. We must needs fear, that according to your own definition of Heresie, you are guilty of many Heresies.

And to your Questions, I answer. 1. I pray you tell us what General Councils did ever condemn one half of the Heresies mentioned by *Epiphanius*, *Augustine* or *Philastrius*? Was there ever a greater rabble of Heresies then before ever a General Council was known? and were they dead and buried before the first General Council was born? 2. Did you not smile when you wrote these delusory Questions? How can a General Council condemn you, or any great part of the Church: for instance the Greeks, &c. If you be not there its not a General Council? And will you be there to condemn your selves? you have more wit and less grace then so. And I pray, what General Coun-

cil did ever condemn the Greeks, for those many errors charged on them? If the Greeks themselves were not there, it was not a General Council; so considerable a part are they of the Church. And what General Council hath condemned the Abasines, Egyptians, &c.

3. Do you think General Councils are so stark mad or horribly impious, as to condemn so many Kingdoms with one condemnation, for Heresie? Why, they know that men must be heard, before they be condemned, and a Kingdom consisteth of many millions of souls. And it is not enough to know every mans faith, if we know the faith of the King, or Pope, or Archbishop, or Bishops: And how long shall they be examining each person in many Kingdoms?

4. But yet I can say more of your Church then of others. He that kills the Head, kills the Man: Your Usurping Head is an Essential part of your New-formed Church: But your Head hath been condemned by Councils; therefore your Church in its essential part hath been condemned by Councils. Do you not know that all the world (as well as the feigned Council *Sinuessan.*) condemned your Pope *Marcellinus* for Offering to Idols? Know you not that two or three General Councils condemned Pope *Honorius* as a Monothelite? Yes: no doubt you know it. Know you not that the second General Council of *Ephesus* condemned and excommunicated your Pope? And that the Council of *Basil* called by him did the like? If you do not, see *Bellarmines* parallel of them *de Conciliis lib. 2. cap. 11.* Do I need to tell you what the Council of *Constance* did? Or for what *John 22. alias 23. and John 13.* and other Popes were deposed by Councils?

2. And for Fathers, do I need to tell you how many condemned *Marcellinus, Liberins, Honorius* and others? How oft *Hilary Pictav.* (*in fragmentis in recit. Epist. Liberii*) doth cry out *Anathema tibi Liberi, prevaricator*: presuming to curse and excommunicate your Pope. Need I tell you what *Tertullian* saith against *Zepherinus*: Yea what *Alphonsus à Castro* and divers of your own say against *Liberins, Honorius, Anastasius, Celestine*; and tell us that many Popes have been Hereticks? At least give us leave to believe Pope *Adrian* the sixth himself. Read *Dom. Bannes* in 2^m 2^a q. 1. art. 10. Where he proves

proves at large against *Pighins*, that a Pope may be an *Heretick*, and laughs at *Pighins* that now after two hundred years would prove them false witnesses, which write that Pope *Honorius* was condemned for an *Heretick* by three Popes, viz. *Agatho*, *Leo* the second, and *Adrian* the second.

3. But perhaps you'll say, that though your Popes have been condemned by Councils, yet so have not your maintained doctrines. *Answ.* Yes, that they have too. Did not the Councils at *Constantinople* condemn the Doctrine of the second *Nicene* Council for Image-worship, and the Council at *Frankford* do the like? And those two at *Constantinople* were as much General as your Council of *Trent* was, and much more.

And yet that same Council at *Nice* did condemn the doctrine of *St. Thom. Aquinas*, and your Doctors commonly of worshipping the Image of Christ, and Cross, and sign of the Cross with *Latria*, divine worship.

And did not your General Councils at *Laterane* and *Florence* declare that the Pope is above a Council, and that they cannot depose him? &c. And yet your General Councils at *Constance* and *Basil* determine the contrary as an Article of Faith, and expressly affirm the former to be *Heresie*. See then your own doctrine, even in a fundamental point condemned by General Councils of your own (which side soever you take, the Popes, or the Councils.)

And did not the sixth Council of *Carthage*, of which *St. Augustine* was a principal member, not only detect Pope *Zosimus* forged Canon of *Nice*, but also openly and prevalently resist and reject your *Usurpation*, and refuse your Legates and Appeals to you? If you would cloak this, believe your own Pope *Boniface*, *Epist. ad Eulaliu*, saying [*Aurelius* sometime Bishop of *Carthage*, with his Colleagues, did begin, by the Devils instigation to war proud against the Church of Rome in the times of our Predecessors, *Boniface* and *Celestine*.]

And if you have learnt to except against this Epistle, see your Bishop *Lindanus* justifying it, *Panopl. l. cap. 89*. Or at least believe your Champion *Harding* against *Jewels* Challenge, art. 4. sect. 19. [After the whole African Church had persevered in schism the space of twenty years, and had removed themselves from the obedience of the Apostolick seat, being seduced by Au-

relius Bishop of Carthage. } Again note, that *Austin* was one of them.

But you'll say, that this was not a General Council : *Ans.* True ; for when part riseth against part, it cannot be the whole that is on either side.

Moreover do you not know that the Greeks have condemned you oft ? And truly their Councils have been much more General then yours at *Trent* was, where about forty Bishops altered the Canon of Scripture, and made Tradition equal with it. I think verily this one County would have afforded a far better Council of a greater number.

But let me once more name one General Council that hath condemned your very foundation ; and that is the fourth General Council at *Calcedon* before mentioned, *Act. 15. Can. 28. & Act. 16.* where you may find, 1. That the ancient Priviledges of the Roman Throne were given them by the Fathers (in Council) 2. That the Reason was, because *Rome* was the Imperial City. 3. They give Equal Priviledges to the seat of *Constantinople*, because it was now become *New Rome*. 4. That the Roman Legates would not be present at this act. 5. But the next day when they did appear, and pretended that this act was forced, the Bishops all cryed [*No man was compelled : Its a just decree ; we all say thus ; we all approve it : Let that stand that is decreed ; its all right.*]

6. Here specially note that this General Council thought they needed not the Popes Approbation for the validity of their Decrees, when they pass them, and take them for valid, even contrary to the will of the Pope. Speak you that bear the least reverence to a General Council. Did this Council think that their Decrees were invalid, if the Pope approve them not ? You see, if you be not wilfully blind, they did not. And who is now to be believed ? *Bellarmino* and his party, and the present prevalent party of the Papists, that say, Councils not approved by the Pope are invalid or without authority ; or the Council of *Calcedon* that thought otherwise ?

7. Note that the Popes Legates called this [*An humbling, and depressing, and wronging of the Papacy, and therefore entred their dissent : see Bellarmine's Confession lib. 2. de Pontif. cap. 17. Binius notes on this Council. Baronius an. 451.*]

8. Note

8. Note also that the shifts of *Bellarmin*, *Binnius*, *Baronius*, *Becanus*, *Gretser*, &c. are apparently false, that say this Canon was surreptitiously brought into the Council: for *Aetius*, *Ast.* 16. openly professed the contrary, and all the Bishops professed their consent to the last.

9. Note also that this is one of the four Great Councils which the Papists themselves compare to the four Gospels; and in it were six hundred and thirty Fathers.

10. Note also that this great Council is against them, and on the Protestant side in the very foundation of all our differences, Whether the Roman Privileges be *jure divino* or *humano*? And though it be but the Privileges, and not the now claimed Vicarship that was in Question, yet the Conclusion is the stronger against them, because the lesser was denied.

But their last shift is, that this Clause or Canon was not approved, and so is Null. 1. Mark then you that wrote this Manuscript, that we have General Councils against you; but we want the Popes Approbation. And in good sadness was that the meaning of your Question [*What Council, that is, what Pope condemned our Church?*] Can it be expected that this one man should condemn himself? or can you be no Heretick till then?

2. But let it be so this once. Did not your Pope approve of this Council, when *Gregory* the first did liken it with the other three to the four Gospels? and said of this [*Tota devotione Com-plector: integerrima approbatione custodio*] I embrace it with my whole devotion; I keep it with most entire approbation] *Greg. 1. Regist. l. 1. Epist. 24. cited in the Decrees, Dist. 15. c. 2.* I think this is expressly a full Approbation, not without excepting any part only, but excluding all such exceptions. And the like Approbation of *Geladius* in the Roman Council is cited there also in the Decrees, *ibid. pag. 33.*

I did also before instance the sixth General Council against you, approved by Pope *Adrian* in his Epistle to *Tharadius* in the second Nicene Council.

And indeed it is no hard matter to prove you condemned by your own Popes also. If you could but understand the plainest words in a matter that is against your opinions and wills, there needed no talk to perswade you that Pope *Gregory* the first con-