by Hi

Peter s

ied in h

the Ancie

the Apo

, it being

many par his being

is express

not los

And

certain b

gres 2501

ather co

er's See

here is lo

needs be

ion. For

who was

the like

Planis

th been

Rome

delayed in delayed in Nari

A South

are father

rej lo

would

er if he

an the Wri

orrup

mony

e the

b (as

bewitched with their forceries, that such bath been for many hundred years together the Church of Rome. 6. It is also false, that those he calls cheif Pastors, have had a continued succession in the profession of the same Faith with the now Roman, fith it is not denied, that Pope Liberius joyning with the Arians, and subscribing to the condemnation of Athanasius, (as Hierom in his Chronicle and Catalogue of writers, in that of Fortunatianus testifies) did, as Bellarmin acknowledgeth, 1. 4. de Rom. Pont. c. 9. by interpretation, if not expressly, consent to the Arian herefie; and Pope Honorius the first in the fixth Synod at Constantinople, Act. 12. & 13: Pope Agatho being Prefident, was condemned as a Monothelite by hundreds of Bishops, and after by other Synods; besides what is charged on fundry other Popes even by Popish writers, as Anastasius, John the 22. &cc. As for H. T. his Catalogue of Councils, Nations converted, and publick Profesiors of the Romish Faith; it proves much less, that the Church now in communion with the See of Rome, has had a continued succession of Bishops, Priests and Laicks, succeeding one another in the profession of the same Faith, with the now Roman Church from Christ and his Apostles to this time. For, 1. According to his own allegation, the agreement of profession is never in any age entirely the same in points of Faith, afore the fixteenth Century and the Trent Council. In all the ages before, the most he can produce is, that after the five or fixth first Centuries, some in each age held some of the points now held by the Papists, but denied by Protestants; the most we can find in the first ages, is some agreement in rites, and some priviledges of the Roman Bishop, taken either from forged writings imposed on the first Popes, or some sayings of Fathers misinterpreted.
2. He confesseth fundry ages, to wit, the second and third produced no Councils; and that he finds no general council nor yet provincial in the tenth age, in which any controversie of moment was decided. 3. Of those Councils he doth produce, there is no one general Council alleged in the four first Centuries, which was held at Rome, or did acknowledge subjection to the Bishop of Rome, as now they require, and they being all or most of them of the Greek! Church, which did and doth yet deny such communion with the See of Rome, as H. T. means, it is fallly faid, that they prove his continued succession in the Church now in communion with the See of Rome. 4. For the Nations converted and Christian professors in his Catalogue, there were few of them Romans or converted by any from Rome, or had any acquaintance with the Roman Church or Bishops; and therefore to make them witnesses of a succession of Bishops, Priests and Laicks in the profession of the same Faith continued from Christ and his Apostles to this time in the Church now in communion with the See of Rome, is extreme impudence and vanity : nevertheless let's view his Catalogue.

SECT. VII.

The Catalogue of H.T. is defestive for the proof of his pretended succession in the Roman Church, in the first three hundred years.

N the first age he alledgeth Chrift, and St. Peter the Apostle, Linus, Cletus, Clemens, and the Council of the Apostles at Hierusalem, St. Peter presiding Act. 15. as a general Council, and then he recites eleven Roman Bishops from the:

the year 100, and having said somewhat for Peters presiding, and the translation of his chair from Antioch to Rome; he names some Catholick prosessors to the year 100, and the spreading of the Church over all those Countries; to which 5t. Paul wrote his Epistles and some others, as France, Spain, England, and some Catholick prosessors to the year 200, with a falsey, so called Canon of the

Apostles approved in the fix b General Synod.

Anfw. That all this is little to his purpole, appears by confidering. 1. That it is manifeltly falle, which he supposeth. I. That because Christ is the chief Pastor of the Catholick Church rightly so termed, and the Roman Church hath arrogantly usurped the title of the Catholick Church, and the Pope is Bishop of that See 3 therefore the Pope must be succession to Christ in such a peculiar manner, as no other Bishop or Pastor is; and that the title of Vicar of Christ belongs to him peculiarly, which is the ticle blasphemously ascribed to him by flattering Romanists. 2. That Christ hath a successor in his Paftoral office, though the Scripture ascribe to Christ, because of his living for ever, an office which paffeth not to any other, as Aarons did, Heb. 7.24. 3. That Peter is successor to Christ in the Pastoral office he had, and no other Apostle, or Bishop besides the Bishop of Rome; though if there were any that could challenge succession to Christ or Peter, it should be rather the Bishop of Fernsalem the mother Church, if any, where Christ Preached, and as the Apostle and high Priest of our Profession offered himself, being Minister of the circumcifion, Rom. 15. 8. and Peter was Apostic of the circumcifion, Gal. 2. 7. and Paul when he went to fee him (which Romanists make an acknowledgement of superiority) went to ferusalem, Gal. 1017. not to Rome, and if he were President in the Council, Act. 15. as H. T. imagins, it was at Hierusalem, not at Rome. 4. It is falle, that either Christ, or Peter, or the Catholick Profesors he names in the first and second ages, held the same profession of Faith with the now Roman Church in the points, wherein the Protestants, who hold the Doctrine of the Church of England, do diffent from them. 2. That if all were granted, H. T. which he faith about the fucceffion in the two first ages, yet it doth nor amount to the proof of so much as one of the twenty eight Articles he holds in his Manual, or the Articles in Pope Pius the fourth his Creed, to have been held by any of them, not the Popes Supremacy, transubstantiation, invocation of Saints deceased, half communion, worshipping of Images, &c. For Peter might be President at the Council at Ferufalem, he might translate his chair from Antioch to Rome, it might be decreed lawful to appeal from other Bishops to the Bishop of Rome, chief bonour might be given to the Bishop of Rome; yet neither Peter nor the Bishop of Rome the head, visible Monarch or Ruler over the Apostles and the whole Church: mention might be made of oblation and facrifice, yet the maffe no properly so called facrifice propitiatory for quick and dead. There's not a word in any of Christs, or fobn Baptifts, or Peters, or Pauls, or fames, or Fohns, or Fudes Sermons or writings, to prove any of the points of Popery, but enough to the contrary. Nor is there any of the rest of the Martyrs or Confessors alledged of the two first ages, of whom he is able to produce any one fentence of theirs, which may demonstrate their acknowledging of any one of the points now held by the Romanists, which are by the Protestants forenamed contradicted: which will appear by confidering the frivolousness of What

what H. T. here produceth. Peter, faith he, defined, Act. 15. 7, 8, 9, 10. That the fewish ceremonies were not to be imposed on the Gentiles, therefore he had the premacy over the Apostles and the whole Church, as if the defining in a Council or Colledge did prove superiority. By the same reason it might be proved that fames had the premacy, fith he spake least, and according to bis sentence was the decree. Paphnutius in the Nicene Council, as Sozoment I. bift. c. 22. relates, when the Council was about to forbid Priefts the use of wives, defined the contrary, and the Nicene Council approved it; was he therefore the primate over the other Bishops in the Council? as in consequence it is which H. T. adds: Hicrom faith, Peter was Prince and Author of the decree, therefore he had the primacy, that is the supreme headship over the Apostles and whole Church, though being [Prince and Author of the decree] imports no more, but to give fentence first, according to which the decree was framed. But fames who spake after, was he according to whose sentence the decree was framed entirely, however Peter began before; so that by this reason Fames had the primacy, and not Peter. A like in consequent is this, Peter remained not always at Antioch, as all that Church acknowledgeth, nor did she ever challenge the first chair in any general Council, as appears in the Councils, ergo Peter translated his chair from Antioch to Rome : risum teneatis amici? As if Peter did always remain at Rome; or that because we read not of Antioch's challenge, therefore it was not made, or as if the not challenging the first chair, were because of Peters translation of his chair from thence to Rome, whereas the very decree of the Chalcedon Council, Can. 28. gives Rome the first chair because of the dignity of the City, not by reason of Peters supremacy, or translation of his chair from Antioch to Rome, of the same fort of inconsequence is the next. The Council of Sardis (Sardica in Illyria, Anno Domine 400. Western Fathers 300. Estern 76.) decreed, that in cases of Bishops for bonour of St. Peters memory, it should be lawful to appeal from what soever Bishop to the Bishop of Rome, Can. 3. therefore the primacy was in Peter, and after him in the Bishop of Rome. For, 1. This Council (whatever it were) was not in the first or second ages. 2. Nor was it reckoned, no not by the Roman Church of old among Occumenical Councils, much less by the Greeks who refused to be present, as Socrates relates, 1. 2. c. 16. unles Athanafius were removed for not yielding, whereto the Bishops of the East met by themselves at Philippi in Thracia, and made decrees apart saith Sozom. l. 3. 6.10. yea however in the late edition of the Councils at Paris, corrupt devices are used togain the credit of a general Council to it, and for some advantage to the Papacy to make its Canons of authority : yet H. T. makes it to have had but feventy fix Eaftern Fathers, when there were three hundred Western; and the ignorance of any general Councils establishing appeals from Africa to Rome in the fixth Council of Carthage, shews that it was not taken for an Occumenical Council. 3. Nor doth the Canon it felf decree as H. T. fets down, that the Bishop of Rome should have power to receive appeals, and to judge the cause, but in case of the deposition of a Bishop, they permit the Bithop of Rome to deliberate whether the judgement should be renewed, and then confider whether he should send some from his side who might be present at the renewed cognizance of it, and if it should seem meet, also appoint judges out of a neighbouring Province: none of which give the Bishop of Rome a judiciary power.

power, but onely a Directory. Nor was this to be extended to any other than those of the western countreys, the Africans and Greeks ever rejecting it. 4. The very canon it felf expresseth the reason of it, not any divine appointment, or ancient use, the Council of Nice having to the contrary, Can. c. determined that such controversies should be ended in a provincial Council, but it was then proposed first by Hosius, for honour of St. Peter's memory, and the last determination of the cause to be by a Council, Can. 13. 0 14. No betis that which H. T. adds, The Council of Chalcedon, Anno 451. faid, All primary and chief honour according to the Canons was to be kept for the Archbishop of old Rome, therefore this is good evidence that in the first Age the primacy was in Peter and the Pope. For neither doth that Council held in the fifth Age mention what honour or primacy the Bishop of Rome had in the two first Ages, nor doth it ascribe to the Bishop of Rome any superiority, but doth expresly in that very Canon ascribe to the other Patriarchs equality with the Roman Bishop in power, however he were first in order, and this was derermined notwithstanding the reluctancy of the Popes Legates. The rest is as vain. Pope Antherus Anno 238. faid, Peter was changed from Antioch to Rome. Gregory in the fixth Age faid, he knew no Bishop, but is subject to the See of Rome, Epift.62. Ergo, Peter and the Pope had the supreme Headship over the whole Church in the first Age. As if the counterfeit writing of a Pope in the third Age, or the faying of a Pope in the fixth Age of what was then in use (though nor true, fith the Greek Bishops to his knowledge were not subject) without telling them by what means it was fo, were a sufficient proof ejther of right or possession in the first Age of so great a power as the Bishop of Rome now claims. What he adds, that the (falfely fo called) Canons of the Apofiles define, that if any Bishop or Prieft (the oblation (H.T. loyses in the word Ma(s) being made) Shall not communicate to should be excommunicate, as giving Suspition of him who hath facrificed that he hath not rightly offered, Can. 9. approved in the fixth general Synod, therefore the Apostles professed a sacrifice properly so called propiniatory for quick and dead in the Mass, is as frivolous. For neither were those canons made by the Apostles, as many things in them shew. and if they were, private Maffes used by Papifts should be condemned, nor doth it follow there is mention of a Sacrifice and Offering, therefore in the Mass was Christ offered as a propitiatory Sacrifice properly so called, fith it might be termed, as it is in many of the Ancients, an euchariffical or commemorative Sacrifice, not a propitiatory Sacrifice, properly fo called. This H.T. in the two first Ages brings for the proof of his Minor; let us go on to view his catalogue in the next Age.

He sets down sisteen Bishops of Rome, whereof the last Pope Marcellinus was condemned in a Council at Sinuessia (if these were such a Council) for his Idolatry, confesset no Councils in the second and third Ages, yet claims a Succession of Popes, Martyrs, and Confessors sufficient for his purposes, and then sets down Decrees of eight Popes in their Epistles, which have been long since proved counterfeit by Dr. John Rainold confer. with Hart chap. 8. divis 3. in which the Forger tells us, that Pope Anacletus decreed Anno Dom. 101. that Priests when they sacrifice to our Lord must not do it alone, (which is against private Masses, and proves not a propitiatory sacrifice properly so called in the Mass) that the Apostles so appointed, and the Roman Church holds (if so then

Headl.

the Roman Church, which now holds private Maffes, holds not the same tenet it did then) if more difficult questions shall arise, let them be referr'd to the Ato-Stolick See (of Rome, which is H. T. his Addition) for fo the Apostles have ordained by the commandment of our Lord (no where extant, nor any way probable) that Pope Alexander decreed, that Bread onely and Wine mingled with Water should be offered in the Sacrifice of the Maß, that Pope Sixtus declared Anno 129, that the facred Mysteries and facred Vessels should not be touched but by facred Ministers, and that the Priest beginning Mass, the People should fing Holy! holy! boly! and that Telesphorus commanded the seven Weeks of Lent 20 be fasted, Epift. Decret. Anno Dom. 139. Pius in his Epistle to the Italians enjoyned Penance for him, by whose negligence any of the Blood of our Lord Should be spilt, Anno Dom. 147. Anicetus tells us, that James was mide Bishop of Jerusalem by St. Peter, James and John, in his Decretal Epistle to the Bishops of France. Soter decreed that no man should fay Mass after be had eaten or drunk. Zepherinus decreed that the greater causes of the Church are to be determined by the Apostolick See, because so the Apostles and their Successors had ordained, Epift. to the Bishops of Sicily, 217: And then H. T. adds, These were all Bishops of Rome, but no Protestants I hope. Which is a ridiculous passage, shewing his folly in triumphing insolently over his Adversaries upon such frivolous Allegations. For, 1. who that knows those times of Persecution confessed by himself, p.7. and therefore the second and third Ages produced no Councils, in which many of the Popes were Martyrs, would imagine that they should busie themselves in making Decrees about sacred places, sacred vessels, hearing of greater causes, fasting in Lent, when they were in danger to be shut up in Prisons, necessitated to hide themselves, wanted perhaps food of any fort by reason of persecution? 2. Or who that reades Authours of those and other Ages does not perceive in those Epistles the style and terms of far later Ages? 3. But were it supposed they were the genuine Epistles of those Popess yet there is no proof from thence of the now Roman faith held by them in the points gainfaid by Protestants, as v.g. Transubstantiation, or the Popes visible Headship over the whole Church. They might call the Eucharist a Sacrifice, yet not properly so called propitiatory for quick and dead. Pius might call the spilling of Wine, spilling of Christs Blood, signified by it, as the Cup is termed the Blood of the New Testament, because it is signified by it, Lent tast, fasting afore Mass, mingling Water and Wine might be appointed, yet no real substantial presence of Christ's Body and Blood taught, the greater causes of the Church, and more difficult questions referred to the Apostolick See, and yet no supreme Headship over the whole Church deduced thence. As for the Tale of Fames his being made Bishop of Ferusalem by St. Peter, Fames, and Fohn, it rather makes against Peter's Supremacy, than for it, fith in that no more is ascribed to Peter than to fames and fohn: so that we may grant him, that they were Popes of Rome, and yet aver they were true Protestants in respect of their Doctrine, though differing in frivolous ceremonies, if the Epifiles alleged had been their own, (which is altogether improbable) and flight the folly of H. T. in triumphing afore the victory.

His catalogue of catholick Professors to the year 300. is in like manner ridiculous, some of them being of the African, Asian, and Greek Churches, that had no such communion with the See of Rome as H. T. makes necessary to the

baing of a true Church; yea it is well known that Cyprian Bishop of Carabage, and other African Bishops opposed Stephen and Cornclius Bishops of Rome about Appeals to Roms, and in the point of Rebaptization of the baptized by Hereticks, which was afterward determined by the authority of the Nicene Council, not by the bare authority of the Roman Bishops. Not is one word brought by H. T. that shews they held the same faith which the Roman Church now holds in opposition to the Protestants. Thus have I examined his catalogue for the first three hundred years, which were the best and purest times of the Church, as being the times of the ten great Perfecutions, and have not found the Succession which H. T. asserts. Let's view the rest.

SECT. VIII.

The Catalogue of H. T. is defective in proof of his pretended Succession in the Roman Church in the fourth and fifth Centuries.

In the fourth Age he begins with a catalogue of catholick Professors to the year 400. of whom some were of the African Churches, some of the Greek, some of the Afratick, some of the Lavin Churches: but he shews not that any one either owned the Popes Supremacy, or the Doctrine of the Romanists, which he maintains against the Protestants. Sure Hierom was no Assertior of the Papacy, who in his Epistle to Euzgrius makes Bishops and Presbyters the same, and the Bishop of Rome of no higher, but of the same merit and Priessor with the Bishop of Eugubium. And for the Nations converted which he meritions, there were some of them, as Indians and Ethiopians, who it is not likely ever heard of the Roman Church, nor had any conversion from them. Nor is it likely that any of them either owned the Popes or Church of Rome's Supremacy, or any point of Doctrine, they now hold in opposition to the Protestants.

As for the fourteen Popes of this century, what ever their succession were, (which is not without queftion) yet that they did affert as due to them fuch a Supremacy as the Popes now claim, or that faith, which now the Papifts hold in opposition to the Protestants, cannot be proved. The same may be said of the two general Councils he mentions in the fourth century, to wit, the first Nicene, and the first Constantinopolitan : which never ascribed to the Bishop of Rome any more power than to the Bishops of Alexandria and Constantinople, nor after them the Ephefin and Chalcedonian in the fifth century. H.T. himfelf faith onely, The first Nicene Council mas approved by Pope Sylvefter, but doth not affirm that either he called it, or was present at it, or was President of it. And it being confessed that Hofius Bishop of Corduba was President there by Bellarmine himself , lib. t. de concil. & Eccl. c. 19. tom 2. controv. he imagines, but proves not Hofius to have been the Popes Legate out of the Council, or any one that was there. And whereas H. T. faith, The first Constantinopolitan Council (Fathers 150.) Pope Damasus presiding, Anno 381. against Macedonius, it is contradicted by Bellarmine in the same place. It is also manisest that the Roman Pope was not President there, but Nectarius Bishop of

Con-

Constantinople: of which thing the cause is, because the Roman Pope was neither present by himself, nor by his Legates. What he adds of Pope Calestin his presiting in the Council at Ephesus against Nestorius, Anno 431. is not true, fith it is manifest from the subscription to the Council, that Cyril of Alexandria was President there, and with him Juvenal of Jerusalem. And though it be faid, that Cyril held the place of Pope Cælestinus, yet that was in giving suffrage to shew the agreement of the Patriarchs, not in presidency, or if in prefidency, yet fo as to be prefident, fuo jure, by his own right, as one of the Patriarchs without deputation from Rome. H. T. adds, The Chalcedon Council (Fathers 600.) Pope Leo prefiding, Anno Dom 451. against Eutyches. But Pope Leo was prefident onely by his Legates, and together with them Anatolius Patriarch of Constantinople, and Juvenal of Jerusalem, did preside. And when the Popes Legates opposed the ascribing to the Patriarch of Constantinople equal authority and privileges with the Bishop of Rome, yet the fix hundred Fathers determined for the Patriarch of Constantinople.

But what do the Councils in these two Ages say for H. T. his Minor? He brings some passages out of the Arabick Canons and the Decrees, as if the Nicene Council afferted the Popes supremacy and the real presence. But those Arabick canons are of no credit, being but lately (as they fay) brought by a certain Jesuit from the Patriarch of Alexandria, and those variously published by Pisanus and Turrian, in which are eighty canons: whereas of old in the Nicene Synod there were but twenty, and the Letter of the African Bishops (of whom Augustin was one) in the fixth Synod at Carthage written to the Pope. of Rome, affuring that the copies of the Nicene canons which Cecilian Bishop of Carthage brought from Nice, and the copies they had from Cyril of Alexandria and Atticus of Constantinople, had not the canon about Appeals to Rome from all parts, which three Bishops of Rome alleged; but the true canons of the Nicene council, to wit, the fifth and the fixth being against the arrogated power about appeals to the Bifhop of Rome, in vain doth H. T. obtrude his nine and thirtieth and the threescore and fifth Can. Arab. for the Popes supremacy and prayer for the dead. And for the canon, that forbids Deacons to give the Eucharist Presbyters being present, (which he bring for the countenancing of the Sacrifice of the Mass) the genuine words of the canon mention not a power in priefts (as he terms them) to offer facrifice, which Deacons have not, but a restraint of Deacons from that giving the Eucharist, Presbyters being present, which they might do in their absence. And for the other restimonies which he setcheth out of the Decretals, for Baptisms, purging away fin, and the unbloody Sacrifice, they are of no validity, being not taken out of the acts of the Council, but the compiler of the canon-law, who thrust into the canon-law all forts of Determinations, whether they were chaff or wheat, genuine or supposititious. And yet if they were genuine they may have a fense agreeing with protestant doctrine.

The Decree of the first Constantinopolitan Council against Macedonius, which decreed the Bishop of Constantinople to be chief next to the Bishop of Rome, proves not that the Fathers then ascribed to the Bishop of Rome such a supremacy of power as now the Popes arrogate over all Bishops, but the constary. For it doth make the Bishop of Constantinople a chief, not under the Bi-

hop

thop of Rome, but next him, and ascribes to him honour and dignity alike with the Bishop of Rome, though in order of mentioning, sitting and some such like acts it prefers the bishop of Rome.

In the first Ephesin council, if Peter were defined Head and Prince of the Apostles, yet they never meant thereby superiority and power over them, but priority in order, and excellency in virtue. The power of binding and loosing sins was not given to Peter any otherwise than to other Apostles, John 20.23.

In the third action (faith H. T.) Pope Leo is called universal Arch-bishop. And it is granted that the Council extolled Leo, yet they made him not Univerfal Bishop over all bishops in the world, but he was styled Occumenical Archbiflop of old Rome, not by the council, but by particular men of the council, which yet did give it to Fohn of Constantinople: but by none was that title then given to either in that sense in which now the Pope claims it ; for that very council did afcribe low mpeofice equal privileges or Segniories to the other Patriarchs with the bishop of Rome, notwithstanding the gainsaying of the Popes Legates; which determination was again confirmed in the fixth Synod at Conffantinople in Trullo in the fixth Age. The fense in which the title of Occumenical, or Universal Bilhop was given to any of the Patriarchs was not given to them as ascribing to them supremacy & power over all bishops, and churches. as afterwards John of Constantinople affected the title, and Boniface of Rome usurped it by the means of Phocas the Emperour, but it was given to each of the Patriarchs for their eminency by reason of their great care of the churches. in like manner as Paul faid of himfelf, 2 Cor. 11.28. Upon me cometh daily the care of all the Churches, which was therefore put on them because of the dignity of their cities, and amplitude of the rule and dominion which was exercised there by the Emperours Lieutenants, by means whereof the bishops of those cities had the advantage of intelligence and affiftance in the ordering of things belonging to many churches in a large compais, even as at this day a Patriarch at London hath an advantage for the ordering of things concerning the British and Irilb churches: the regiment of the churches in those days much following the government of the Empire, as is manifest by the acts of councils and hiltories of those times. It is granted that in the fifth age Pope Leo affected the extolling of Peter, and did it too immoderately, and that the phrase of Peter's doing what the Pope did was in use: and this proves that then ambition had crept in among the bishops, and the affecting of vain titles increased, and that in respect of these things there was great corruption in the Patriarchs and other bishops, which grew to an extreme height afterwards; yet neither in that age nor any other was that power over the whole church, which now the Popes and their flatterers challenge ascribed unto them without control of the sounder part, and is yet to this day opposed by the French popish churches, and some other.

That which is added by H. T. of the Council of Eleberis in Spain, and the fecond of Arles in France, about Priests abstaining from their Wives, or else to be degraded, and that no man who was married could be made a Priest unless a conversion were promised, is but of provincial Synods, not general councils, about a matter onely of Ecclesiastical Discipline, not a point of Faith, about which alone is the Question, whether he can prove such a Succession as he afterts in all ages: besides the Eleberin canon suppose they had then Wives;

and

and it appears that till then they did use them, and that there were married priests: but many being corrupted in their opinions of Marriage by the debasing of it as carnal, and excolling Virginity as meritorious, began to put that yoke on men, which occasioned in after ages the intolerable tyranny of denying Marriage to priests, against Gods allowance, and the practice of former ages.

The catholick professiours he mentions to the year 500. were many of the Greek and other churches, who, though they held communion with the bishop of Rome in opposing the Heresies then risen, yet did neither a cknowledge the Popes supremacy now challenged, nor held the Doctrine the Romanists now

teach in opposition to Protestants.

As for the Nations converted, Scots, French, the Martyrs of Africa, which he mentions, it is not shewed, that either they were converted by any from Rome, or acknowledged subjection to him as the supreme occumenical bishop, or held what the Romanists now hold against Protestants. And thus have I shewed the insufficiency for the proof of his Minor of the catalogue of H. Tof the first five hundred years, within which he included his Demonstration, which were better than the later, though not without their corruptions. I proceed to view what he saith of the fixth and other ages following.

SECT. IX.

The defect of H. T. his Catalogue for proof of his Succession in the fixeh, sewenth, eighth, ninth, tenth Ages is shewed.

T. in his catalogue from the year of Christ 500. reckons up thirteen chief Pastors, one general Council, the second Constantinopolitan Pope Vigilius presiding (Fathers 165. An. Dom, 553.) against Anthimius and Theodore: but Bellarmine himself consessed by Light Anthimius and Theodore: but Bellarmine himself consessed by Vigilius Bishop of Rome was then at Constantinople. As for that which Bellarmine cites out of Zonaras in the life of Justinian, he cites it maimedly. For Zonaras said not that onely Vigilius was Prince of the Bishops who were present, but with him Eutychius of Constantinople and Apollinaris of Alexandria. What H. T. mentions of the definitions of the council is nothing against the protestants, nor for the Pa-

pacy.

Occar

That which he allegeth out of the third council of Carthage is disorderly placed in the sixth age, it being held, as is said, in the year 397, and is of doubtfull cradit, sith it mentions Pope Boniface as then living, though he sat not, according to Onupbrius, till the year 419. but it matters not what it was, sith it was but a provincial Synod: and of the canons cited by H. T. the first is onely about a point not of Faith, concerning the celebrating the Mais, Fasting; the other, which terms the Apocryphat books as canonical, may be expounded, according to Hierom's distinction, that they are canonical to form manners, not to inform faith. Yet this may be observed by the way, that the six and twentieth Canon of the third Council of Carthage, which was authorized by the sixth general council holden at Constantinople, in Trullo, as it is

D 3

alleged

alleged by Gratian in the Decrees dift. 99. de primatibus, and by Pope Pelagius approved, denies to any the title of Chief Prieft, or Prince of Priefts, but alows onely this Title, Bishop of the first See : whereupon the Glossaith, that even the Bishop of Rome was not to be called the Universal Bishop.

The determination of the Council of Mileris about Childrens Baptifm is disorderly placed in the fixth age, being said to be held in the year 402. and being no general council about a point not gainfaid by most protestants, is impertinent to prove a succession of affertors of the Roman Doctrine opposite to the

protestants.

That which he allegeth out of the Cafar Augustan Council, which decreed that Virgins Should not be vailed till after forty years probation, makes against the Papifts, who in the Trent council, allow it fooner, and practife the vailing

of them afore they are twenty years old.

That which he adds of Pope Fohn the first his Decree, that Mass ought not to be celebrated, but in places confecrated to our Lord, unlefs great neceffity (hould enforce it, because it is written, See thou offer not thy holocausts in every place. which the Lord thy God bath chosen, Deut. 12. shews the Popes ignorance or Fudaifm, who applies this to the Mass, which was meant of Femish facrificing in the Levitical Law, and makes the Mass to be an offering of an holocaust, and every place confecrated by a bishop, the place that God chooseth, and also the vanity of this Scribler, who puts in his catalogue such an impertment testimony to prove a succession of the affertors of the Roman faith, which I scarce think any lober papist would make any part of his faith against protestants. nor do I think the papifts in England would be content to be tied to that

In that which he adds of Catholick Profesjors to the year 600. he doth not thew that they acknowledged the bishop of Rome's supremacy or the now Roman faith. Yea Columbanus in this age, and after Aidanus, Colmannus, and

others lived and died in opposition to the Romans about Easter.

That Austin the Monk converted England, is onely true of some part of it. and it is true also that he did in many things pervert them, and it is said he was an instigator of the murder of many British Christians better than himself : but that either he, or Pope Gregory that fent him, held the same supremacy of the pope, which now popes claim, or the now-Roman faith opposite to the protestants cannot be shewed. On the contrary, it is manifest enough, that Gregory the great refused the Title of Universal Bishop, as profune, and sacrilegious, and accounted the assumer of it to be a fore-runner of Antichrift, lib 4. coift. 32,34,36,38,39. 6 lib.6. epift. 30. he allowed not Worthip of Images in his Epistle to Screnus bishop of Marfeiles, he allowed priests wives, nor did tie men to follow the order of the Roman church, which flews the popes then not to have been altogether so bad as in the next age. In which and throughout the rest of his Catalogue he can hardly shew a Pope that lived either the life of a Christian, or did the Office of a pastour of the church of God, if any, fure not many : but in stead of Christian pastours a generation of men of an ambitious and luxurious spirit, contending with Emperours and Bithops for worldly greatness, perfecuting godly Christians, living in pomp, riot, and all kinde of wickedness, are set down as chief pastours of the universal church.

In the seventh age he reckons up nineteen Popes, whom he terms chief Pastors: of them the second is Boniface the third, who obtained of Phocas the Emperor (who by treason had gotten the Empire, slaying his Lord Mauritius and his children) the title of universal Bishop, derested before by Gregory the great, as profane and facrilegious; and Honorius the fult, is the fifth condemned in the third Constantinopolitan Council, in which H. T. laith, there were Fathers two hundred eighty nine, Pope Agatho presiding, Anno Domini 680. against the Monothelites, and that in it were condemned Sergive, Paulus, Petrus, Cyrus, and Theodore, who most impiously taught, but one will and operation to be in Christ. But this Author deceitfully conceals it, that the same Council in the thirteenth action, did solemnly condemn Honorius the Pope of old Rome as a Monothelite together with the rest; and again in the Greek edition the first Chapter, and that Pope Agutho in his Epiftle to the fixth Council, doth anathematize his predecessor Honorius as a Monothelite, and Pope Leo the second, in his Epistle to Constantine the Emperor, inserted in the eighth action of the fixth Synod, which was also done in the second Nicene Council, termed the seventh synod in the last action.

As for that which H. T. adds of the definitions of the fixth Council against

Je 130

ry place or crificis, and all and all

of in

be was

nacy of that that

acrile, lib 4

nording sesting the rolling th

Priests marriage, not giving grapes, mingling water and wine, adoration of the Crosse, consideration in him that binds and looseth, invocating Saints; it is not worth while to infift on the examination thereof, partly because some of the definitions serve not the purpose; for though it be granted, that there ought to be a particular knowledge of the fin of him that is to be absolved by his confession of it, yet is not thereby the necessity of Popish suricular confession proved, or the Priests power judicially and authoritatively to absolve, and remit fins established, partly because they are not all points of faith, but either of disciplin, as about the marriage of men in orders, or of Ceremonies, as about the mingling of water and wine in the Eucharist; and partly because it is doubtful whether those Canons are truely ascribed to that Council, there being some reasons tending to the contrary, and partly because if they were their determinations, there is little reason to ascribe any authority to them, after the first fix hundred years barbarism, and many corruptions being gotten into the Christian Churches, and the simplicity of the Christian profession very much changed into contentions about Bishops Sees, Ecclesiastical priviledges, humane ceremonies, and such like abuses: yet, were all granted which he allegeth of the councils definitions, neither the now Roman supremacy nor faith is proved, nor from the Catholick professors, as he terms them, or Nations converted are either of them avouched in that age.

In the eighth Century things grew worfe. In it H. T. reckons thirteen Popes, among whom there's not a man, of whom their own writers relate any thing that belongs to the Pastors of the Church of Christ, to wit, the Preaching of the Gospel; but their intermedling with the business of the Empire and Kingdoms, making Kings monks, contentions about images in Churches, enlarging their dominions, building walls, making decrees about shaven crowns and such like toyes. Two Popes, Zacharias and Stephen the second, can hardly be acquitted from being finfully instrumental in the deposing of

Childerick King of France, and the traiterous usurpation of Pepin.

As for the second Nicene Council, in which H. T. faith, were three hundred

Succession no proof for Romanists. ART. I.

and fifty Fathers, Pope Adrian presiding, Anno Domini 787. against image breakers, in which were decreed for images in Temples, and the veneration and worship of the Saints, Reliques, Images, and the Council of Sens about traditions, though these things are but a sew of the Popish doctrins, yet we grant, ditions, though these things are but a sew of the Popish doctrins, yet we grant, ditions, though these things are but a sew of the Popish doctrins, yet we grant, ditions, though these things are but a sew of the Popish doctrins, yet we grant, that then the Popes had gotten to such heighth as to justle Emperors, and that the Churches in Communion with the Papacy were in that age and the rhat the Churches in Communion with the Papacy were in that age and the rhat the Churches in Communions of men and decrees of Bishops were following so corrupt, as that traditions of men and decrees of Bishops were more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written Word; and that thereby placing of images more regarded than the written word in the Roman Churches to the Papacy were in that age and the redards the word in the Roman Churches to just all on the Roman Churches to just all

And for the Catholick Professors, such as venerable Bede and others, though they were tainted with the superstitions of those times about monkery, and ceremonies, and ecclesiastical dignities and orders, yet that they held the now Roman faith cannot be demonstrated, nor that the Nations mentioned to be converted were converted to it. And for the miracles mentioned there is no credit to be given to them, many such tales having been made, or such miracles counterfieted in those dayes for deceiving the ignorant people: nor were they done in such manner and to such purposes, as the miracles of Christ and

his Apostles were by which the Gospel was confirmed.

In the nineteenth age H. T. reckons up eighteen Popes, omitting the mention of one of them as a woman; though a great number of Popish writers set her down as Pope, and relate the story of her sitting in the chair some years, till she travailed with child in procession. But if that were not true, yet the things related by themselves of Formosus, Stephanus, Romanus shew cruelty and wickedness in the Popes of that age, one hating and undoing what another had done, and thereby shewing that they were rather of Cadmus, than St.

Peters race.

And for the fourth Constantinopolitan Council (Fathers one hundred and one) Pope Adrian presiding, Anno Domini 869. against Photius, and for the Pope and images, and against temporal Princes medling in the election of Bishops; it is an argument, that the Roman Bishops were gotten then by many wicked practices to a great heighth of unjust power. And the deposition of Photius for reproving the Emperor, together with his opposition of the Pope (whose works extant do shew him to have been of more worth for learning than any Pope in that age) and the Epistle of Ulderick Bishop of Auspurg to Pope Nicolas the first, in which he rebukes the wickedness of Popes in denying marriage to the Clergy, do prove that the doctrin and tyranny of the Popes of Rome, did not freely pass without controlleven in that age, which by the consection of Genebrara himself, Chron. 1.4. was an unhappy age for want of any writer of worth in the Latin Church.

As for the Catholick professors mentioned by H. T. in this age, that they were all of the Roman church, or professed her faith is not shewed: nor that the Nations converted, were either converted by the Roman Bishops, or owned their now claimed supremacy or professed faith; H. T. saith the Russians were

converted

yet wer age of the state of the

serys and the not

oned to

there is a fach min

years, till years, and ley and

another

chan Su

red sed d for the

man

tion o

earning to gentle

converted by a Priest sent by the Emperor Basilius, and therefore had their conversion from the Greek church whom they followed, and with whom they now hold communion, not acknowledging the Bishop of Romes supremacy to this day, and therefore that instance is manifestly against H. T. his purpose.

In the tenth age are reckoned twenty fix Popes, whereof there's scarce any that may be termed a Christian, much less a chief Pastor of the Christian Their own stories tell us of some of them that got the Popedome by means of Mororia a notorious whore, others by cruel practifes; one, to wit Sylvefter the second, by the help of the Devil, whose agents they were in bringing a deluge of ignorance and wickedness into the world, which made that age to be termed a miserable age, in which were neither famous writers, nor Councils, nor Popes that cared for the publick, by Bellarmin in his book of Ecclefiastical writers, and of it H. T. here faith, in this tenth age or century I find no general council, nor yet provincial in which any controversie of moment was decided. So that by his own confession, his catalogue of councils fails him. And for his succession of chief Pastors, it is of such persons and so uncertain a succession, and by such irregular ways, as yellds proof that Rome was the Synagogue of Satan, not the church of Christ. Of the catholick profesors added, some of them, as Dunftan, &c. were such, as it may be well doubted whether they are in heaven or in hell. And for the Nations converted, it is not proved they were of the now Roman faith.

SECT. X.

The defect of H. T. his catalogue of succession in the eleventh and twelfth age is (heroed. .

N the eleventh age are reckoned eighteen Popes worse, if it may be, as bad as any in hell; most of them magicians, if their own writers speak truth: from Sylvester the second, to Gregory the seventh, all Necromancers, faith Benno a Cardinal of Rome; fobn the seventeenth or eighteenth, H. T. himself is not resolved whether, so uncertain is his succession on which he builds the truth of his church. Their practiles were to poylon one another, and to let up one King and Emperor against another to advance their own greatness, and to domineer over the greatest Princes by the terror of their excommunications, and giving away their dominions: which was brought to a stupendous heighth by Hildebrand, otherwise Gregory the seventh, under whose reign Saran seems to have been let loose for the executing of vengeance on the Emperors, that had so adored Popes, as to become their vasfals (whom Pope Gregory the great acknowledged his Lord) and committed fornication with the whore of Babylon.

Of councils H. T. names but one, telling us, that in this eleventh age about the year 1049. Berengarius an Archdeacon of Ghent (of Aniou he should have faid, mistaking Gandavensis for Adegavensis) began to broach his heresic (he should more truely have said the doctrin of Christ, his Apostles, the Fathers, even Gelafius himself Bishop of Rome, in the first five hundred years,

But

and of the most learned to that time) concerning the B. Sacrament, affirming it to be only a fign or figure of the body and blood of Christ, not his true body and blood; for which, faith H. T. he was condemned in the council of Lateran under Pope Nicolas the second, 1057. As also in the Roman council under Pope Gregory the seventh, Anno 1073. where he abjured his herefie in open council, and died a Catholick after divers penances done for bis fin. But methinks H. T. should be ashamed to mention Berengarius his forced abjuration, in which Pope Nicolas made him lay, I believe that the body of our Lord Fefus Christ lensibly and in very deed is touched with the hands of the Priests, and broken with, and rent, and ground with the teeth of the faithful, de con. dift. 2. Ergo Berengtrius, which occasioned the gloss it self to say, unless you warily understand these words of Berengarius, you will fall into a greater heresic than ever he held any. And for his Catholick profesfors and Nations converted, wherein or how far they avowed the Popes supremacy, and the now Roman faith is not shewed by him; nor do I believe he is able to prove, that they did avouch the Popes supremacy which is now challenged, or in all things the now Roman doctrin, though Romish superstitions, and the excessive esteem of the Popish Bishops did very much corrupt men in those days. If the ignorance devotion of one Henricus the Emperor with his wife, make any thing for the credit of the Roman papacy; the flory of another Henricus, to wit, the fourth, his wife and childs usage by Gregory the seventh and other Popes is such, as that it demonstrates the Popes of those times to have been no successors of Peter, either in doctrine or practice, but devils incarnate rather than men. And however Anselms learning seem to credit the papacy, yet in many points of doctrin he is not for the now Roman tenents, as where he faith on Rom. 12. Salvation consisteth not in mans merits, but in Gods grace, and his contention with the King of England, being animated by the Pope is an evidence, that the faith of Christ was not so much professed then as the greatness of Bishops, and the unrighteous ways of Clergymen.

In the twelfth age are reckoned up eighteen Popes and three Lateran councils, of which Popes it will be hard for H. T. to shew what their faith was, or to prove they did orderly succeed, especially confidering how many Antipopes were fet up, and what abominable practices were used to get up into the chair. and how wickedly they lived, as men that cared not what rebellions they raifed. what wars and bloodsheds they caused, not against insidels, but of subjects against their foveraign Christian Emperors; not for the Gospel of Christ, or their lawful liberties, but for the Popes most impudent claim of freedom from fubjection to Emperors, and investiture of Bishops and Abbats, things which Tesus Christ and his Apostles never granted, but commanded the contrary, Their own writers tell us so much of them, specially of Calixtus the second, Innocent the second, Adrian the fourth, Alexander the third, and their monstrous pride in oppressing and insulting on the Emperors, beyond what is to be found in any Priests of Pagan Gods towards the Princes of the earth, as thews them to be inspired by the devil, not guided by the Spirit of God. H.T. adds three Lateran councils for instauration of discipline, for the right of the Clergy, for reformation, with prefidency of Calixtus the second, Anno 1122 of Innocent the second, Anno 1139. Which he tells us defined little in matters of controversic, and so by his own confession prove not his succession in the

profession

profession of the fame faith. As for the ends in those two councils, which he mentions, all the instauration of disciplin therein was concerning monks in the former, and in the later, the right of the clergy was about the Bishop of Romes power in civil things at Rome, and exempting of clergy men from the Senate and Consuls of Rome. Wherein the Romans desired to be restored to their ancient power in civil things, but the Pope and his council withstood it, anathematizing them that laid hands on a clergy man, yet limiting the Bishop of Rome in some fort. These are the great bufinesses of three hundred at one time, and one thousand Bishops and Abbats at another time. Which may shew how little the Popes and councils then regarded Christs doctrin or precepts, but minded the upholding their own inventions and their usurpations of power.

The third Lateran Council, saith H. T. (Fathers three hundred) for reformation, Pope Alexander the third prefiding, Anno Domini 1179. condemned Waldenfis the Merchant of Lyons, who taught the Apostles were lay men, that lay men and women might consecrate and preach, that clergy men ought to have no possessions or properties, that oaths were unlawful in all cases, that Priests and Magistrates by mortal fin fell from their dignity, and were not to be obeyed, &c. His tenents were here defined against, and he himself ana-

thematized.

eem of a

19 for the following of the following of

an couns

2 W3S, OF

ntipoper

he chain he salices

rift, o

om from

gs white

But suppose all this were true that he so taught, and that the Pope with his council condemned him, what is this to prove H. T. his minor, that a council in that age professed the same faith with the now Roman against the Protestants? Are the contrary tenents any of the Articles, which in his Manual of Controversies H. T. defends against the Protestants? do the Protestant churches in their confessions avow the same, which he here saith the council ascribed to Waldensis the Merchant of Lyons? but to shew the ignorance of this scribler, the person who was Merchant of Lyons in France was Petrus Waldus, from whom his followers were termed Waldenfes, whom I find to have been condemned in some council at Rome about that time, but in the Lateran council 1179. I find other decrees about Priefts continency, the number of horses clergy men might have in their visitations, and the exemption of Ecclefiafticks from the judgement of Laicks, which it feems were the great bufinels of reformation. As for the Waldenses there is no cause to believe adversaries in their accusations of them, especially such ignorant and malicious men as the Friers and Monks of former and later times have been. Befides the experience which after ages yeilded about their belying Wicklef, Hus and others; our own times yelld many examples of Papifts falfly reporting the tenents of Protestants. Though Bellarmin be more ingenuous in setting down the Protestants doctrin than many other writers, yet there's scarce a controversie, wherein he doth not deal deceitfully in representing the Protestants doctrin or their arguments and answers. But the writings, professions, apologies put forth by Balthafar Lydius in Latin, shew that the opinions of the Waldenses were not such as the Papilts represent them, and the words of Reinerius an inquifitor and enemy to them in his book of inquifition concerning them, doth more truely acquaint us what they were, which are thus, that whereas all other seeds by the immanity of their blasphemies against God do make men abbor them, this of the Lyonists (the same with the Waldenses) bath a great shew of

E 2

sodline(s.

godliness, because they live justly before men, and do believe all things well of God, and all the articles which are contained in the Creed; only the Church of Rome they do biaspheme and bate. And now we have more full knowledge of them, by Mr. Morlands history of the Evangelical Churches of Piedmont. As for the Catholick professors H. T. adds in this age, though Bernardus Abbas, commonly called St. Bernard be reckoned as a professor of the new Roman faith, and it is not denied that he was superfitious in some points; yet he freely noted divers corruptions then arising, as the feast of the Virgin Maries conception, which tended to uphold the conceit of her freedom from fin, Ep. 174. ad can. Lugd. the opinion of merits, ferm. 1. de annunt. of justification by works, Luga. the opinion of p. 190. of freewill, de grat. & lib. arb. of keeping the law, cant. fer. 50. of seven Sacraments, fer. 1. de Cana Domini, of uncertainty of Salvation, ep. 107. and the Popes greatness in temporalities, 1. 2. confid. ad Eugen. And for Hildegardis the Nunne, her speeches and prophe cies shewed her dislike of the proceedings of the clergy even of the Popes. Noribertus and some others were noted for their superstitious waies of Monkery, Thomas Becket of Canterbury, for his obstinacy against his Prince Henry the fecond, whom he traiteroufly opposed to uphold the wickedness of the clergy, and others named, whether they were of good or bad, note it is of little moment, fith its not denied there were too many then infected with the Roman errors and superstitions. Nor is it of much advantage, that Nicolas the Monke, after Pope, converted the Pomeranians and Norwegians, that Pope being bad enough, and the conversion, if to Romish superstition, rather than Christian faith, little crediting the Romish Church.

SECT. XI.

The defect of H. T. his catalogue of succession in the thirteenth and fourteenth ages is shewed.

IN the thirteenth century are fet down feventeen Popes as chief Paftors, of whom the first is Gelasius the second, who was first in the former age; but I imagin, though it be not noted in the Errata, for Honorius the third who was a bloody Bishop, as others before him, setting up Emperor against Emperor, cruel Friers against the godly Waldenses, besides other wicked acts he did. The like were Gregory the ninth, in whose time the bloody factions of Guelphs and Gibellius happened, and Innecent the fourth whom Robert Grofthead Bithop of Lincoln withstood, contemning his excommunication, and being dead was such a terror to this wicked Pope as to hasten his death. Nicolas the third, whom H. T. makes the converter of the Pomeranians and Normegians, raised the quarrel between Peter of Arragon and Charles of France for Sicily, whence grew the massacre of the French called the Sicilian Vespers, and the last and worst of them , Boniface the eighth is said to have entred like a Fox, reigned like a Lyon, died like a dog. H. T. adds two general Councils: the fourth Lateran council (Fathers 1285.) Pope Innocent the third presiding, Anno 1215. And tells us, that this Council defined that the universal Charch

of the faithful, is one out of which no man is faved. Which definition we approve, and thereby the doctrin of the Protestants is confirmed; who teach, that the Catholick Church we believe, is the invisible Church of true believers; and that the Catholick Church is not only the Roman Church, and those who subject themselves to the Bishop of Rome, and profess the same faith with the now Roman Church: but all the believers who believe the doctrin of the Gospel taught by Christ and his Apostles, though they neither know nor own the Roman Church in the things therein held against the Proteltants, nor acknowledge any superiority of the Bishop of Rome, are members of the Catholick Church; and that it is not the Church of Rome (which is failly called Catholick) out of which none can be faved, but the universal Church of the faithful; in which who ever is by true faith in Christ he may be saved, though he disclaims the Bishop of Rome as Antichrist, and the faction or party joyning with him as the Synagogue of Satan; and confequently, that it is not as H. T. faith in his Epiftle to the Reader, the most important controversie to know the notion and authority of the Church; but to know the true faith, by which alone the true Church is known; and it is a most impudent affertion, which H. T. takes on him in his first Article to maintain, that the Church now in communion with the See of Rome is the only true Church of God, unless he can prove none are believers but they. So that this very definition of the Lateran council is sufficient to overthrow the main drift of H. T. in this book, and to shew how heedless or impudent a writer

H.T. tells us also that the fourth Lateran council defin'd in the profession of faith, can. 1. that the true body and blood of Christ is in the Sacrament of the Altar under the forms of bread and wine, the bread being transubstantiated by the divine power into the body, and the wine into the blood. Which is granted, if it be true, that the Council it self did define any thing, and not Pope Innocent himself three years after the Council. Platina saith in his life, that many things then came into consultation indeed, and yet not any thing could be. openly decreed. But were it the Council or the Pope alone that thus decreed. it was a most bold and presumptuous act in either or both to make that a point of faith, of which, as Bellarm. tom. 3. cont. l. 3. c. 23. confesieth. Scotus in quartum fent. dift. 11. 9. 3. Said, that the tenent of transubstantiation was no tenet of faith before the Lateran Council, and Scotus and Cameracenfis expresly say, that neither by words of Scripture, nor by the Creeds, nor sayings of the ancients are we compelled to the tenet of transubstantiation. And Cardinal Cairt. in 3. Aq. q. 75. art. 1. Saith, that nothing out of the Gospel doth appear to compel us to understand these words [this is my body] properly. To the same purpose fohn Fisher Bishop of Rochester, contra capt. Babylon c. 1. For which reason Cuthbert Tonstall. 1. of the Eucharist, p. 46. Said, perhaps it had been better to have left every curious man to bis conjecture, concerning the manner of Christs body being in the Eucharist, as before the Lateran Council it was left at liberty, and therefore he was oft heard to say, if he had been present at the Lateran Council, be would have endeavoured to per wade. Pope Innocent to have forborn the decreeing of transubstantiation as an article of faith. And indeed the reason of the Council is so grosly absurd, that had there been any understanding men at the making of the decree, it's likely it had not passed.

E 2

in:

Succession no proof for Romanists. ART. I.

For this reason they give of their decree, that to perfect the mystery of unity we our selves may take of his what he received of ours, the bread being transubstantiate into the body, the wine into blood by the divine power, intimates, I. That the bread is transubstantiate into the body and wine into the blood, not either into body and blood, and then he that drinks not the wine drinks not the blood, nor is it faid to be transubstantiate into it as an animate body, fo that that determination makes it a transubstantiation without life. faith that we may receive of his what he receives of ours; which in plain fense intimates, that Christ receives our body and blood by eating and drinking, as we do his. 3. It makes this the mystery of our unity, as if the myflery of our unity by faith were not perfect without this gross Capernairish Cannibalitish eating Christs very flesh made from bread by a Prieft, and drinking his very blood with our mouth, in drinking transubstantiate wine. All which are such gross irrational, unchristian absurdities, as had not the age been blockifh, and Popes and popish writers and people dementate, they would with ab-

horrency have rejected that determination.

H. T. adds, that the fourth Lateran Council, can. 1. defined in the profession of faith, that no man can make this Sacrament, but a Prieft rightly ordained by the keys of the Church given to the Apostles and their successors : which although it be otherwise in the text, Matth. 16.19. expresseth, wherein the keys, not of the Church but of the Kingdom of heaven, are mentioned as given to Peter, not to the Apostles and their successors; yet were it true that the keys were given to the Apostles and their successors, this would overthrow the Popes fupremacy if it be deduced from that gift of the keys. For if Christ himself gave the keys of the Church to the Apostles and their successors, then not to Peter only and his successors, but to other Apostles and their successors as well as Peter, and consequently according to their own principles to other Bishops as well as the Bishop of Rome. As for the definition of the Council, that none can make this Sacrament but a Prieft, then it is to Priefts only that it is faid [do this] (for from those words he deduceth, p. 215. the power to make Christs body) but that is most absurd, for then they only should eat, the deing this being meant plainly of eating the bread, being spoken not to the Priest conficient only, but to all the Apostles at table also, and if so, not only the cap should be kept from the people, but the bread also, contrary to I Cor. 10. 16, 17. & 11. 28.

H. T. tells us that they defined that baptism profits little ones as well as those who are of riper years unto falvation, and condemned the herefor of Abbas foachim, which is nothing against the common tener of the Protestants, though it be suspected, that if Abbat foachim had not been a man, whose reputed holiness and free speeches against the Popes and the clergy troubled them, he might have escaped that censure The definition concerning confession and receiving at Easter are points of disciplin, not part of the profession of faith, and

fo impertinent to the present businels.

H. T. mentions also the Council of Lyons (Fathers one hundred) Pope Gregory the tenth prefiting, Anno 1274. against the Grecians, which is nothing against the common tenet of the Protestants, and that which is added, this hitherto (saiththe Council) the holy Roman Church (the mother and mistris of all Churches) hath preach'd and taught, (besides the non-sense how frequently

foever it be used of the Churches preaching and teaching, who preach not nor teach, but they are preached to and taught) it is but a piece of palpably falle flattery, the Church of Rome being not the mother of all Churches, it being certain, that the Church of Ferulatem was before that of Rome, and the

Ferujalem from above is filed the mother of us all, Gai. 4. 26.

Among his Catholick professor this age H. T. nominates St. Dominick and St. Francis, Institutors of their holy orders of Friers, but how they should be Saints, whereof one was a bloody instigator of war against the innocent sheep of Christ the Waldenses, and the other an observer of humane inventions, with neglect of Gods command to work with his hands the thing that was good, that he might have to give to him that needs, and how they should be called a holy order, who were like to the institutors, bur never appointed by God, I understand not. Many learned men in thole daies demonstrated them to be no holy orders, but a company of men that promoted the Popes usurpations and injuries, to the great mischief of the Commonwealths and Churches of Christians.

Of the Nations converted, the Emperour Cassines, with innumerable Tartarians were not converted by the Church of Rome, nor owned the Popes

supremacy or faith, and therefore are no witnesses for the Papacy.

10 Pulls 10 Pulls deponent the Popel

not to

s as well

s as the chart it that is

o niake

at, the

s those

as Fr

though

mo and mo

In the fourteenth age ten Popes are fet down of whom most fate at Avignon in France, and so could not be Pastors of the Church of Rome : one is Clement the fifth, who chained Francis Dandalus the Venetian Ambasiador under his table to feed with dogs, and loft at the pomp of his Coronation out of his mitre a carbuncle valued at fix thousand florens. Another, John the twenty one, by others fohn the twenty second, whom Bellarmin. de Pontifice Rom. L. 4. c. 14. confesseth to have thought that the fouls should not see God till after the resurrection, though he adds a cold excuse, as if he might to think then without danger of herefie, because no definition of the Church preceded: which is not true if he fay rightly himself, I. 1. de eccl. triumph. c. 2. that the fame, that is, that the fouls fee God afore the refurrection, teacheth Innocent the third (who was one hundred years before Fohn the twenty one, by H. T. his account) c. Apostolicam, extra, de Presbytero non Baptigato. However, if there were no definition, it proves a Pope may teach herefie, fith Hobnithe twenty second did earnestly press this on the Parisians, that they should believe as he did. Of the rest their unpeaceableness in their contention with the Emperor and among themselves in their Schisms, in which one Pope was fet up against another; divers Popes at the same time, one owned by one, another by another, makes the succession so uncertain, that even the Romanifts dilagree in the fucciffion, some putting in Clement the seventh in this age, whom H. T. leaves out, some standing for one, some for others as the right Popes. Belides their cruelty and covetoulnels, pove them rather Butchers than Pastors of the Church of Christ.

H. T. adds one general Council of Vienna (Fathers three hundred) Pope Clement the fifth presiting. Anno Domini 1311. in which he tells us, the Council defined baptism to be necessary for infants, condemned the Begards and Beguines, who held carnal tust done out of temptation to be no sin, and that we ought not to show reverence at the elevation of the body of Christ, which last alone is against Protestants in common. But the Council whether provincial

Succession no proof for Romanists.

32 or general, being swayed by a proud prelate, Clement the fifth, its no marvel it

should make such decrees as then were made.

As for the Catholick Professors, there is scarce a man of any note, but Iro a Canonift, whose profession will be of little weight with considerate men. That an Emperour of Ruffia, if made a Christian, did embrace the Romish Religion, and submit to the Pope, is not likely. The rest of the Nations converted, H. T. proves not to have been converted from Rome, or to have held communion with the Pope, if they did, it avails little to prove H. T. his Minor, that fuch rude people did fo.

SECT. XII.

The defect of H. T. his Catalogue in the fiftenth and fixteenth Ages is shewed,

IN the fifteenth Age he reckons up thirteen Popes as chief Paftours, in which number he leaves out Benedict the thirteenth, though reckoned by others. who with Gregory the twelfth upheld a Schism of three Popes together, till they with John 22. or 23. for divers intolerable villanies were deposed, as Eugenius the fourth was after at the Council of Bifit: of the rest scarce any of worth besides Pius the second, whose Writings remain under the name of Aeneas Sylvius, and the last is Alexander the fixth, Roderique Borgia, who with his fon Cafar Borgia were so infamous for poysonings, covetousness and uncleanness of body, that Rome, though the fink of wickedness, yet yielded few or none worse

in any Age.

H. T. tells us of two general Councils, that of Constance, Anno 1415. against John Wickliff, John Hus, and Hierom of Prague, Pope John the two and twentieth, and Martin the fifth prefiding : but the main end of its calling by Sigi mund the Emperour, was the composing of the Troubles by three Popes together, whom it deposed, and decreed the Council to be above the Pope, which is against the now Roman faith. It is true also, that they condemned fundry Articles of Fohn Wickliff, John Hus, and Hierom of Prague, whereof some were most fallely ascribed to them, as the Works of John Wickliff and other testimonies do shew. And notwithstanding the safe conduct given by Sigismund the Emperour, to the perpetual infamy of the popish party, they judged he was to deliver John Hus to be burned, Seff. 19. whereupon the Emperours solemn faith was broken, and thereupon they were burned, and Wickliffs bones, as they imagined, forty years after his death were digged up and burned in Eng. land, and a most impious Decree made, that, not withstanding Christ's institution and administring in both kindes, and in the primitive Church it were received by the faithfull in both kindes, yet the custom was confirmed of receiving in one, and the requiring it in both judged an errour, and it was forbidden to be given the people in both kindes, Seff. 13. The other Council H. T. mentions is the Council of Florence, (Fathers 145.) Pope Eugenius prefiding, Anno 1439. against many Herestes; which defined Pugatory, the Popes headship. Transubstantiation, the Apocryphal books canonical, the Grecians, Jacobites, Armenians, and Patriarch of Constantinople subscribing this Council, and being reconciled to the church of Rome. But this Council however it hath a shew of

great authority, by reason of the presence of the Patriarch of Constantinople, and some other of the Eastern Christian churches, yet indeed it was of no authority, it being gotten together by a Faction in opposition to the Council of Basi, which was decreed by Pope Martin the fifth, to be ten years after the Council of Constance: and the end of it was to divert the Fathers of the Council of Basil from deposing Eugenius the fourth from his Popedom, which nevertheless they did for his ill Government, and chose Amadeus Duke of Savoy, who was named Felix the fifth, who is omitted therefore by H. T. though by others counted the lawfull Pope : but H. T. thought it best to omit him and the Council of Bafil, which together with the Council of Constance had determined that a general Council was above the Pope, and were not bound to obey him, but might depose him, as the French churches yet to this day do hold, so that they who are termed Catholicks, and owned as children of the church, yet do not profess the now-Roman faith of the Popes supremacy, which H T. and the Jesuited party among Papists the Popes flatterers ascribe to him. As for the presence of the Greeks in the Council of Florence it was of a few needy ones driven out or brought low by the Turks, who yielded to that in the Council for some relief to them in their low estate, which the Greek churches after would not own, nor do yet to this day. And therefore that which H.T. hath done in fetting down the Popes and Councils of this Age is done deceitfully, concealing the true state of things, and so he bath done of Catholick Professors, mentioning some of small worth, but leaving out Gerson, Picus Mirandulanus, and some others, though in communion with the Roman church, and men of more abilities and repute than many of those he sets down, because Gerson held that the Church might be without a Pope, in his book de auferibilitate Papæ; and he and others differ'd in some other points from the now Roman tenets.

As for the Nations converted, which he mentions, they are names of people said to be in Africa; but whether there be such people, or are converted, or what numbers of them have been converted is known onely by the vainglorious Writings of some popish Writers of that fort, who for the extolling of the Papacy, either feign that which is not, or it is likely make a Mountain of a Mole-hill, such conversions as they boast of being not known to other people, though sailing into, and trading in all parts of the

known world.

ets the man

and land

folemn

mes, as

in English

mere 16

H. T. adds his catalogue of chief Pastors in the sixteenth Age and half the seventeenth to 1654. and sets down two and twenty Popes as chief Pastors of the Church. Of them are Julius the second a Warriour; Lee the tenth, who to maintain his Luxury, and for his fifter Magdalen's Dowry, fet Indulgences to sale, himself venting his infidelity to Cardinal Bembus, as if he counted the Gospel a profitable Fable; Paul the third an incestuous father of a Sodomitical fon, whom he cocker'd, full of cruelty and craft, fending an Army with Farnefius to destroy the Protestants in Germany ; Julius the third that created his Ganymede Innocentius a boy Cardinal, and had for his Nuntio at Venice Fohn Casa Arch-bishop of Benevent, who in a book praised Sodomy; Paul the fourth hated by the Romans for his cruelty; Pius the fourth that made the new creed of the Roman church; Pius the fifth that excommunicated Queen Elizabeth; Gregory the thirteenth that let up Stukely to get Ireland for his

Succession no proof for Romanists. ART.I.

base son; Sixtus the fifth that animated the Spaniard in the Expedition against England, 1588. praised fames Clement the Frier, who murdered Henry the third King of France; Gregory the fourteenth who curled Henry the fourth of France; Clement the eighth, who afore he absolved him, proudly lasheth his Embassadour with a Rod; Paul the fifth who had the Title of Vicedens given him, and not disclaimed, who interdicted the Venetians for not obeying his Monitory to revoke their Laws about Ecclefiasticks, and to release two Ecclesiastick prisoners, one a poysoner, another that committed uncleanness in a Temple, and did forbid the taking the Oath of Allegeance in England by Pa-1 emple, and did to the thing against fome of the priests privy to the Gunpolits, without doing any their deteffation of it. Among them all there is not powder Treason, to shew their deteffation of it. Among them all there is not powder I reaching for ies do relate to have been a diligent preacher of the Gospel, but politicians, medling with the affairs of the Kingdoms and Empires of the World, and so no Successors to our Lord Christ, or Peter the Apostle; but their memories are to be abhorred specially by us English as the pests of

mankinde.

H. T. mentions two general Councils the last Lateran Council Pope Julius the second and Leo the tenth prefiding, 1512. I finde not the certain number of Fathers, it was a general Council. But Bellarmine lib. 2. de concil. auth.cap. 17. faith, Some doubt whether it were truly general: and there was reason, fith it was called by a Faction adhering to fulius the second to establish his tyranny in opposition to another party gathered in France to establish the pragmatich Sanction. But what did this Council define ? The foul of man immortal, and that there be as many humane fouls as bodies, anathematizing all such as obstinately defend or hold the contrary in the communion of the Church of Rome, Seff 8. A point which a Council of Philosophers might have decided. However it intimates there were that did then hold or teach the contrary in the communion of the church of Rome, and that Pope John the two and twentieth his Doctrine was not quite extinguished : but this Council is of little account among a great party of the Papifts themselves. It is the other Council the Council of Trent Pope Paul the third and Pius the fourth prefiding against Martin Luther and his fellow Protestants, Anno 1546. of which he laith, The definitions are conformable to those of all precedent general Councils for us, and against Sectaries, as our Adversaries know, and cannot deny. But this is most false, it being by Bishop Fewel, and many other learned Protestants averred and proved, that the Decrees of that Council in many points about the Popes power, half communion, transubstantiation, worshiping Images, and other points are contrary to the Gouncils and Fathers for the first five hundred years at least. And for this Council not onely Sleidan, but also Frier Paul, a man greatly honoured by the Venetian Senate for his learning, prudence, and integrity in his Hiftory of the Trent Council hath shewed, that it was nothing but a meer packed and fraudulent conventicle of a crue of prelates, most of them Italians, some meerly titular, and the Popes pensioners and parasites, few of them who had any knowledge in the Scripture or Divinity, but canonifts, courtiers, and school-men, who understood not the Protestants Doctrine in the great point of justification by faith, carried on by Paul the third, Julius the third, Pius the fourth, and their Legates to cheat the World by innumerable artifices, not onely hindring the freedom of speech of the Protestants in

the Council, but also of some of the popish Bishops, when they endeavoured to recover the right of Bishops taken away from them by the Popes, in so much that not onely the Protestants have protested against it, but also the French Kings, by their Bmbassadours and Parliaments, and it is not owned by the French popish churches unto this day, and the vanity and impiety of its Decrees hath been detected by Kennitius, Calvin, and innumerable learned protestants, besides what may be gathered from the contrary Writings of persons, who were there, as Catharinus, Soio, Vega, and others; in so much that if men were not blinded with prejudice and saction they would easily discern that Council to have been a corrupt Synod justly to be detected.

As for the catholick professours he mentions, their profession adds but little credit to their cause. For what advantage is it to prove the truth of the Roman Tridentin Doctrine that it was professed by Catharina a woman, or Ignatius Loyola a lame Souldier, the hypocritical Deviler of the Order of Fefuits, the Incendiaries of the Christian States, and corrupters of Christian Nobility and people by their abominable Devices in refolving cases of conscience sutably to the lufts of men rather than the will of God, (as is shewed in the late book of the Mystery of fesuitism) or by Edmund Campian a bold talkative calumniator, and a traiterous zelot for the Popes tyranny, or by William Allen an English Fugitive, who wrote feditious books to apologize for Stanley's Treachery, and to provoke Queen Elizabeth's Subjects to Rebellion against so good a Prince? And for the great multitudes converted in Italy, Spain, Germany, India, Japonia, China, by Priefts and Religious of the Roman Church, and likewife some confiderable persons of the English Nation, even in the beat of Persecution, they are short of that which was undertaken of the conversion of Nations. The conversions in the West Indies have been by horrid cruelties of the Spaniards depopulating many countreys, in which were millions of people, to get their Treasure, not to the faith of Christ, but to the Roman yoak and superstitions against their will, which hath made Christian Religion odious, and the Name of God to be blasphemed. Those of China and Faponia are fictions, or so obscure, as that they are not considerable. The conversions in Spain, France, Germany, Polonia, have been by fire and faggot, the bloody Inquifition, persecutions, Massacres, and such like arguments fetcht from Hell. The hot perfecution of Papifts here in England is, as all know that know England, a meer fiction : some mulcts and restraints have been put on popish persons, but none put to death meerly for being Papilts, but for that which the Law made Treason, being forced to it by their incessant traiterous practices, and yet these also are executed sparingly. The conversions to Popery in England have been by various artifices upon various inducements, whereof none of them is evidence from the canonical Scripture of the truth of populh Doctrine (they dare not flick to it without help of unwritten tradition, and the Popes or his Councils explication, which they must receive though contrary to the exposition of their own most learned and judicious Writers in their Commentaries) but the devices which they use are calumniating Protestant Writers, mis-representing their Doctrine, forging Writings of the Ancients, purging out of them fuch passages as make against them, which do take effect by the levity of some, prejudice, discontent, or some such like ill affection of others. And though

of control of the con

What he adds of multitudes of provincial Councils omitted, all establishing the Roman tenets over the whole World, it is because they are no where to be found, but the emptiness of this his Catalogue is a sure eviction that there is not consent of Nations or Ages on behalf of the Papifts.

SECT. XIII.

In which the Close of H. T. is retorted.

Nd for his close I thus retort it. Now let any rational and difinteressed man be judge whether the Fathers of the first Councils for five or fix hundred years were true Protestants or Roman Catholicks (that is, whether they have taught and defined Protestant or Roman catholick Doctrines) and doubtless when he hath well read their Writings he will say, not Roman Catholiks, but true Protestants, and so by consequence all Ages, and countreys which have received and approved them for Orthodox, by humbly submitting to their Decrees, to wit, all Ages since Christ's time, who with his holy Apostles and the orthodox Fashers and Councils for many hundred years taught Doctrine contrary the now Roman Tridentin faith. Therefore let no Papift or Sectary, such as H.T. is, (who like as the Donatifts excluded all from the Church, who were not of Donatus his party; so he excludes all from the Church of God, who are not of the Bishop of Rome's party, and thereby thews himself a Schismatick divided from the Catholick Church) delude himfelf and his ignorant and credulous followers, with a pretence to Council, feeing there is no one to be found for them (speaking of General and Occument cal Councils for the first five or fix hundred years which were the best) which hath defined and taught their positive Doctrines, but all have more or less condemned all or fome of them, according to the occasions then emergent, and in particular that which Dr. Fohn Rainold in his Conference with Hart, cap. 9. divis.4. faid stands yet good, that all Christian Churches, except the crue of abe Italian Faction, have and do condemn the Popes usurped Sovereignty over the whole Church of Chrift, and that no Council did give him that vifible Monarchy be now usurps, and the fesuited party now ascribe to him till the last Lateran

chere

whether and Catho.

ys which as to distance the state of the sta

thereby

ide him

ncil, fa

Cumin Cumin less con

1, (A)

he cruel gnty st Lateran Council under Pope Leo the tenth, 1512. After which it was oppofed by the University of Paris and the French church, and even in the Trent council there was a party which strugled against it in right of Bishops, though they were overborn by the Romifb devices, and the multitude of Italians. Even at this day the Fesuits have not brought all the Papists under the Popes girdle :: which makes the Pope cautelous how he determins controversies among his own party, least the condemned party appeal from him to a council, and the oppressed Kingdom set up a Patriarch of its own. So that I may say it is an impossible task for this Scribler H. T. or any of his party to make a true catalogue of chief Pastors or Councils, or approved Doctors in all ages for the Popes supremacy, transubstantiation, communion under one kind, worshiping of images, invocation and worshiping of deceased Saints and their reliques; but a better catalogue may be made of more godly persons (with whom their Popes for this one thousand years are not to be compared, their own writers being Judges) who have opposed these doctrins of the now Romanists, as hath been shewed by many learned men to the eternal confusion of Popish novelties, then this Author hath here, or any Popish writer elsewhere hath made, to prove a fuccession of Pastors, Councils, Professors and Nations avouching the present Roman opinions, which were never so avouched or enjoyned as now they are in Pope Pius the fourth his new Creed, till about one hundred years ago. And to this insolent demand, where was your Church before Luther? Protestants may reply to Papists, where was your church which believed, as you now do, before Boniface the third, Gregory the seventh, Innocent the third, and Leo the tenth ? The speeches of the Fathers for the churches continued fuccession, do none of them prove the major of H. T. his Syllogism, that is the only true Church of God, which has had a continued succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time, meaning it of local personal succession, of which H. T. means it, but only of succession in holding the same doctrin. Nor do any of them prove H. T. his minor, that the church now in communion with the See of Rome and no other, has had a continued succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time, for they were all dead above a thousand years afore this time. All that can be proved, is that in case of herefies or Schisms they made ule of the succession in the Roman church, (which was then less tainted then some others) to repress them, yet so as that they alleged a succession in other churches as well as it, but none ever, as this Author, held it necessary, that all churches should own the Bishop of Komes supremacy, or the Roman churches communion how corrupt soever they should prove; only while they continued uncorrupt in the faith they held communion with them, and fo should we, if they would embrace the primitive purity of doctrine and worship, which Peter and Paul and other Apostles first taught in the churches of Christ, of which that at Rome, though not the first, yet was one of the most famous, and vill their declining of great efteem.

7-35

SECT ..

SECT. XIV.

H. T. bath not folved the Protestants objection.

H. T. takes upon him to solve objections against the Churches continued.

J. succession, and saith thus. Obj. Elias complained that he was less alone, seeing the church then saited. Answ. He spake significant for God himself told him in the same Chapter, ver. 18. that he had seven thousand at that time in Israel (where he was) who had not howed their knees to Baal: and in the Kingdom of Juda there was then publick prosession of the true religion in Hierusalem, paralip. 22. 14, 15. So that consequence is

To which I reply, this author shews himself deceitful in setting down our tenet and argument, and flighty in his answer. For the tenet of the Protestants is not, that the Church hath failed, and that there is no continued succession of men in the visible Church, who have held forth the truth against Popish innovations. But that sometimes they have been by persecution so obscured, as that however they have been discernable among themselves, yet not fo to adversaries, and to others of their brethren at a farther distance; nor perhaps have they been so conspicuous, as that a catalogue might be made of the succession of Pastors and people in the same place in every age, but ofttimes they have been so dispersed, as to be in one age or time in one Country, and another time in another; and that the monuments of their being and doctrine, have been in part lost and in part obscured by inundations of barbarous nations, perfecutions of Popes and Popish Princes, and their knowledge and profession hath been sometimes larger, sometimes less, and still misreported by adversaries. Nevertheless, that is, though they have been in such obfcurity, they have been true Churches of Christ; and notwithstanding we cannot prove such a succession in any one City or Country of Pastors and people in every thing agreeing with us, yet we may be a true Church as long as we hold the true faith once delivered to the Saints, and now upon record in the holy Scriptures, though we submit not to the Pope as chief Pastor, nor own the now Roman doctrin in the articles required in the Bull of Pope Pins the fourth to be professed over and above the ancient Creeds. In a word this we affert, that the defect of a catalogue fuch as H. T. requires, and the obscurity of professors nullifies not the verity of the Protestant Churches. And this is proved by the objection thus. If there were a true Church in Ifrael in Elias his days, which was so hidden as that Elias knew them not, and so could make no catalogue of them ; then there may be a true Church. whose professors may be so obscure, as that neither in the same, nor in after ages a catalogue of them can be affigned. But so it was; as appears by Elias his complaint, and Gods answer, 1 King. 19. 10, 14, 18. Ergo, there may be a true Church whose professors may be so obscure, as that neither in the same nor in after ages a catalogue of them can be affigned. Now what doth he anfwer? that Elias spake figuratively, because God said there were seven thou-

fand

fand non-Baalites left in Israel, and that there was a Church in fudab then, and

therefore the consequence false.

ring

sgall services of the services

But to shew the flightiness of this shifter (for I cannot term him rightly a respondent) 1. He tells us not what figure he used, nor in what words, nor what lense the speech bears according to that figure, nor how it serves for his purpose to avoid the objection. I do not conceive what figure of speech he or any man can imagin in that speech [I am left alone] unless he meant Ironically, I am left alone, that is not left alone, which were a frantick conceit, or an Hyperbole, or a Synecdoche of a part for the whole, one for many : but fuch an Hyperbole or Synecdoche would make the speech non-sense [1, that is a few or many are left alone | For this were non-lense and self contradicting, and contrary to the intent of the speech, [1] being in the first person and that doubled, [few or many] in the third : to fay [few or many are left alone] when [alone] excludes few, many, any more then one: to fay [they feek my life, that is of few or many when [my] notes only him that spake, to wit Elias, and no other: to fay [I have been jealous, that is a few or many have been jealous] besides the citation, Rom. 11. 3. Kaira Carriolles Movo the occasion, end of the speech, and answer of God thew such an exposition would be the conceit of a man extreme shallow or impudent. And his reason is as ridiculous, God himself told Elias in the same chapter, ver. 18. that he had seven thousand at that time in Israel (where he was) therefore Elias spake figuratively, when he complained he was left alone, 3 Kings 19. Nay the contrary follows, that he did not speak figuratively, because God corrects him, and shews his mistake in saying he was left alone, that is, there were no more besides himself left. 2. But yet if it were granted that the speech is figurative, and the meaning as H. T. would have it, it no whit avoids our objection, that the Church of God, though confifting of seven thousand, yet were so obscure that they appeared so few to Elias, as that he took himlest to be left alone. As for the other exception of the Kingdom of Juda, it takes not away the objection as the Protestants frame it, but as H. T. frames it, it is not our obje-Aion; and so though the consequence be falle, yet it hurts not us, who gather not hence the failing of the Church, but the obscurity of it, and that there may be a true Church, which is so hidden, that it is not discerned at fome times, no not by fuch an eminent Prophet as Elias; and so though we cannot shew our Church in every age before Luther, yet there might be then, and we may be now a true Church for all that.

The next objection he brings is, that though Arian herefie infected the whole world, Ergo, &c. and answers, you mistake, the sury of that listed not full four years, viz. from the council of Ariminum to the death of Constantine, and that only in the Eastern Churches, the Western seeling little or nothing by it. St. Augustin answers the Donatists objecting the same; that even the canonical Scriptures have this custome, that the word seems to be addressed to all.

when it reaches home only to some few, Epist. 48.

To which I reply, If the Arian fury lasted but four years, and in the Eastern Churches only, yet it might have been more than one hundred, and then the succession had ceased, and the Eastern Churches then were so obscure, that a catalogue of professor could not be given, though there were doubtless then true Churches in the East. But it is false which H.T. writes, that the Wessern

Succession no proof for Romanists. ART. I.

Western sell little or nothing by the Arian sury, for in Italy the Arians prevailed so far, as to bring Liberius Bishop of Rome to subscribe to the council of Arianium. Nor do I know how the words of Augustin yeild any thing in answer to the objection, that in the time of the Arian prevalency the Church was so obscured, that the whole world seemed to be Arians; therefore the was so obscured, that the whole world seemed to be Arians; therefore the logue of it's pastors and protessors at all times cannot be framed. For suppose the meaning of the speech should be, that the words concerning the number of the meaning of the speech should be, that the words concerning the number of the meaning of the speech should be, that the words only to some few; yer, Arians seem to be addressed to all, when they reach home only to some few; yer, Arians seem to be addressed to all, when they reach home only to some few; yer, Arians seem to be addressed to be discerned, they serve to prove there may be were, obscured so as not to be discerned, they serve to prove there may be Churches, which are so hidden as that a catalogue cannot be framed.

But the objection is further pressed thus. Object, St. Hierom fays, the whole world groan'd and admired to see it self become Arian (in his book against Luciferius.) To which H. T. faith. Aniw. If she wondred, she knew not when it was done, if the grouned, the approved it not being done, therefore the major part were fill Catholick. To which I reply, if H.T. did not prefume he should meet with filly readers, he would not have thus frivolously inferred from those words which were delivered to shew the Arians to be the greater part, that the major part was still Catholick. For who knows not that the expression is Rhetorical and the meaning this, that Arians prevailed so much, that the whole world, that is all the churches of the East and West were so infected, that they were burdened with Arians as a man that groans under a burden, and that on such a sudden, as that the accident was as it were a wonder ? now from such Catachrestical metaphors to infer as if they were proper, that while the world was Arian, it knew not it was done, or approved it not, is all one as to fay, when they were Arians they knew not, nor liked Arian doctrine. that is while they were Arians they were not Arians, which is to make Hieroms fpeech felf-contradicting.

But H. T. adds, Let St. Hierom answer for himself. The Bishops (saith be against Luciserius) that did the fast of Ariminum were deluded (viz. by the new Creed there made, which might have born a good sense) sew desending the fast, and some lamenting it. And St. Augustin tells us, that the church then appeared in her most constant members, Athanasius and others, ep. 48.

To which I reply, It is true, that when they came to see their error they did lament it, yet were for the time Arians, and though Athanasius did not yeild to subscribe to it, yet Liberius Bishop of Rome did. And I believe H. T. his fellow Papists will not allow his speech, that the decree made at Ariminum might have born a good sense. It is added by H. T. thus. Obj. The church will fail in the time of Antichrist according to that, unless there come a revolt first, &c. 2 Thes. 2.3. Answ. No, she will not; she shall then suffer great persecution, Apoc. 20.8. and therefore shall be to suffer smany will revolt, all shall not.

I reply, that if the revolt be of so many and the persecution so great, as that they shall be dispersed and obscured so as not to appear; it is sufficient to prove the succession to be then either so interrupted as not to be, or so obscured as not to be discerned by enemies or brethren surther off, and so as that the making a catalogue of Pastors and professors in that

age, cannot be expected justly from the churches in after ages, which is enough for our purpose to shew, that the defect of such a catalogue shews not the nullity of the Protestant churches, nor is with any justice or reason such a catalogue of Pastors and professors in all ages required of them by Papists: Yet, however this Author conceives, his fellows the Rhemists, Annot. on 2 Thes. 2.3. think the Apostasie shall be so great, as that Antichrist shall pull down generally all kind of religious worship, saving that which must be done to himself alone: nor is that, Apos. 20. 8. to the contrary. For neither is it certain that time is the time of Antichrists reign, nor, if it were, doth it appear, that the thing done is afore the end of that reign.

But H. T. adds. Obj. What if men would not persevere? how then? you hold freewill, I hope. Answ. With St. Augustine to the Donatists, as if the holy Ghost were ignorant what would be the freewill of men, which yet foreseeing, he foretold that the church of Christ should endure for ever.

de unit. Ecclef. cap. 12.

I reply, what Protestant hath thus objected I know not. The possibility of the militant churches ceasing, is sufficiently proved by the holding of the acts of freewill to be undetermined, or undeterminable by God. Nor doth the answer avoid it. For though, if the answer be good, the futurition of the churches failing follows not from the holding of freewill; yet it shews not but that it may be, and perhaps it will be hard for him to avoid the objection, that if mans will be not determined by Gods decree, which is meant by freewill among that fort of writers: then the Holy Ghost cannot foresee that the church militant will endure for ever, it being in reason impossible, that there should be certain foresight of that which is not certain to be afore that act of freewill in man which God himself cannot determine : A certain prescience of that which is purely contingent, may be or not be before it, notwithstanding any purpose in God, is according to all principles of reason impossible. If this Author hold with many of the Romanists mans freewill, not to be determined by Gods decree and influx on the will of man, or the Jesuits middle knowledge, he hath enough of Papifts to oppose him. I have fufficiently shewed the futility of his dispute in the first Article of his Manual, the second follows.

G

ART.

ARTIC. II.

Protestants Succession sufficient.

Protestants have that Succession, which is sufficient to demonstrate them to be a true Church of God.

SECT. I.

Protestant Churches need not prove such a Succession as Papists demand.

ART.2. H.T. thus disputes, The true Church of God hath had a continued Succession from Christ to this time, and shall have from hence to the end of the world, as hath been proved. But the Protestant Church (and so of all other Sestaries) hath not a continued Succession from Christ to this time. Therefore the Protestant Church is not the true Church of God. The Minor (which onely remains unproved) is cleared by the concession of our most learned Adversaries, who freely and unanimously consess, that before Luther made his separation from the Church of Rome for nine hundred or a thousand years together the whole world was Catholick, and in obedience to the Pope of Rome, there being no Protestants any where to be found, or heard of. Let therefore our Enemies be our Judges, Calvin, Hospinian, White, Norton, Bancrost, Jewel, Chamier, Brochard, Whitaker, Bucer, Perkins, Bale, Voyon, Bibliander.

I hath not been proved, that every true Church of God hath had a continued Succession from Christ to this time: many true Churches have had no Predecessors, and so no Succession, there being none before them, they had not been primitive if there had been precedent, and sundry Churches have been true Churches, who have had none after them in the same place, when their Candlestick hath been removed. And therefore it is most false, which he here vainly saith he hath proved, that the true Church of God (meaning every true Church of God, without which his Marior is not universal, and so his Syllogism naught) hath had a continued succession; (meaning without interruption of persons, which may be named in the same place, prosessing the same Faith with the now Roman Church in every point, which

which is his meaning and is onely for his purpose) from Christie this time : he hath not proved it, no not in the Roman Church, nor in those that are in communion with it under the Pope. Nor hath he proved at all that every true vifible Church on earth shall have such a continued Succession from hence to the end of the world. The prophecies he alleged are shewed not to speak what he averres. And for his Minor, though it is granted, that the Protestant Church under that name, as so termed, hath not been ancient, yet the Protestant Church in respect of that Faith they hold hath been from the beginning, and hath continued as the Church of God in persecution sometimes more, sometimes less pure, sometimes larger, sometimes smaller, sometimes more obscure, fometimes more conspicuous, sometimes in one place, sometimes in another, and in respect of their Protestation against popula Doctrines, the Popes Supremacy, Transubstantiation, half-communion, propitiatory Sacrifice of the Mals, prayer in an unknown Tongue, Worship and Invocation of Saints, and other popish Errours, it hath had Churches and persons who have, as they have been urged on them, opposed them, sometime more, sometime fewer, sometimes in a more open, sometimes in a more secret way, as persecution permitted, and God ftirred up their spirits. It is most false, that the most learned Adversaries of the Romanists do freely and unanimously confess, that before Luther made his Separation from the Church of Rome, for nine hundred or a thousand years together, the whole World was Catholick, and in obedience to the Pope of Rome, there being no Protestants any where to be found or heard of. Sure the Grecians were part of the World, and H. T. himself confesseth here pag. 48. there was a Revolt of them from the Roman Church after leven or eight bundred years, and they were united again to the Church of Rome in the Council of Florence, Seff luft, which himself saith, p. 3 4 was in the year 1439. So that by his own account their Revolt was fix hundred years at least, besides what is manifest of the Arminians and others. And sure the Hussies, Wicklevists, Waldenses, and those who went before them (whom Rainerius saith, Some counted to have been from Pope Sylvester's time, some from the Apostles) were a part of the whole World, and many Protestants: Illyricus, Fox, White, with others, deny to have obeyed the Pope of Rome afore Luther, and averrethat they were, though not in name, yet in truth Protestants in some at least of the chief points against the now popish Doctrine. And therefore that which H. T. hath recited in this Speech is manifest untruth. Yea Dr. Richard Field a learned man, in his Appendix to his third Book of the Church, hath proved it notwithstanding Brerely his wonderment, that the Western Churches afore Luther were Protestant, and the maintainers of the new Roman Faith onely a Faction in it. And Mr. Perkins hath demonstrated in his Demonstration of the Probleme this Position, No Apostle, no holy Father, no found Catholik for twelve bundred years after Christ did ever hold or profess that Doctrine of all the Principles and Grounds of Religion, that is now taught by the Church of Rome, and authorized by the Council of Trent. Nor do the Speeches of the Proteffant Writers amount to that which he produceth them for. He himself allegeth p.41. out of Augustin Epist.48, that even the Canonical Scriptures have this custome, that the word seems to be addressed to all, when it reaches home onely to some few, and thereby he would interpret the complaints that were made of the whole world becoming Arian, when Athanasius, and others were not.

nand ontinu

he Min g learn made years | Nerch

Bancro yon,

hath any portion of the control of the co

And he might have so interpreted the Speeches he allegeth of Hospinian and the rest. I have not all the Books he citeth; but some of their words I finde not as this Author would have them. Bishop Femel having said, pag. 208. And to be short, all the World this day crieth and groaneth after the Gospet. adds, And all the ethings are come to pass at such time as to any mans reason it might seem impossible: when all the World, the People, Priests, and Princes were overwhelmed with ignorance: when all Schools, Priests, Bishops, and Kings of the World were sworn to him, that what soever be took in hand they would uphold it. Which Speeches are to be understood onely of the Western Empire, as when it is faid Luke 2.1. A Decree went out that all the World should be taxed, it is meant onely of the Roman Empire; and when folin 12. 19. The World is gone after him, it is meant by an Hyperbole, of a great part. fo the words of Bishop fewel are to be understood as is usual in such rhetorical expressions, though the words are not as this Authour sets them down, that the whole World, Princes, Priests, and People were bound by Oath to the Pope Fewel Serm. on Luke 11. In like manner when Calvin faith, lib. 4. inftit. c. 18. feet. 18. that the abominations of the Mass presented to drink in a golden Cup bath so made drunk all the Kings and People of the Earth, from the first to the last, he alluding to the words Revel. 18.3. is to be conceived, as in that Scripture and many more, to be understood by an excess of Speech a great part, in comparison of whom the rest are as if they were not. To the same purpose were the words of Perkins Exposition of the Creed, vol.1. pag. 260. col.2.c. as the whole period recited shews, which is this, And during the space of nine hundred years from the time of Boniface, the Popish Herefie, to wit, of the Popes Supremacy, spread it self over the whole Earth, and the faithfull Servants of God were but as an Handfull of Wheat in a Mountain of Chaff, which can scarce be discerned. The next words of Dr. White himself in the same period thews his meaning to be of freedom wholly, and of appearing conspicuously, and to the World visibly to be seen by all, and separated from the rest. For thus it follows, And whether any company at all, known or unknown, were free from it wholly or not, I neither determine nor greatly care. Nor do I question but that the same is the meaning of the rest, if their words were rightly cited, and the Reader might perceive how they are wrested by H. T. against their meaning : and they wrote those expressions in like meaning with those passages of holy Scripture which complain of corruption as universal, when the greatest or most conspicuous part are so, as Plalm 12.1. Micah 7.2. Phil.2.21.

SECT. II.

The Argument of H. T. to prove the nullity of the Protestant Churches for want of Succession is turned against the Roman Church.

(3

H.T. further argues thus, Without a continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks succeeding one another in the profession of the same Faith from Christ and his Apostles to this time, a continued Succession cannot be had. But Protestants have no continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks, succeeding one another from Christ and his Apostles to this time in the profession

1.6.1

den o

ft to

scriptul

in con

sole w

bundat

Pop

e perio

or the from buch and the

of the same Faith or Tenets, the nine and thirty Articles, or any other set number of Tenets expressly holding and denying all the same points. Therefore Protestants have no continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time. The Major is manifest, because it proceeds from the Definition to the thing defined. The Minor is proved, because Protestants have never yet been able, nor ever will, to assign any such number of men whom they have succeeded in their nine and thirty Articles, or Luther in his Augustan Consession, when he revolted from the Catholick Church, no nor yet any one single Diocese or Bisop.

Answir. This Argument is thus justly retorted; Without a continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks, succeeding one another in the profession of the same Faith from Christ and his Apostles to this time a continued Succession cannot be had. But Papists have no continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks, succeeding one another from Christ and his Apostles to this time in the profession of the same Faith or Tenets, the Canons of the Trent Council, the Articles in the Bull of Pope Pius the fourth, or any other set number of Tenets expresly holding and denying all the same points: therefore Papilts have no continued Succession from Christ and his Apostles to this time. The Major is manifest, because it proceeds from the Definition to the thing defined. The Minor is proved, because Papists have never yet been able, nor ever will, to affign any fuch number of men, whom they have succeeded in their Trent Canons, and the Articles of the Creed injoyned to be professed and sworn to in the Bull of Pope Pius the fourth. If any man pretend to such a Catalogue, let him name none but such as held explicitely the Doctrine of the Tridentin Canons, the Roman Catechilm, the Articles of the Creed injoyned by Pope Pius the fourth his Bull, all granting and denying the same points, that the late Faction of Romanists or Italian popish Sectaries granted and denied, or that our new Reformers the Jesuites deny and grant; for if they differ from them in any one material point they cannot be esteemed Catholiks. Let him not name Christ, Fohn Baptist, Peter, Paul, or any the Apostles, or the Roman Church in their days. For they did not admit and embrace the now called Apostolick Ecclesiastick traditions unwritten, and other observances and constitutions of the Roman Church, nor held it the right of the Roman Church to define the true sense and interpretation of holy Scripture to be received by all, nor truly and properly seven Sacraments of the new Law instituted by our Lord Fefus Christ; and necessary to the salvation of mankinde, nor allowed the received Rites of the Roman Church used in solemn administration of all the Sacraments, nor all the things which concerning original fin and justification were defined and declared in the Council of Trent, nor did acknowledge that in the Mass is offered to God a true proper and propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead : and that in the holy Eucharist is truly, really, and substantially, the body and blood with the foul and Divinity of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into his body, and of the whole substance of the wine into his blood, which conversion the Roman Church calleth Transubstantiation, nor that under one kinde onely all and whole Christ, and the true Sacrament is received, nor that there is a Purgatory, and the fouls detained there are holp by the Suffrages of the faithfull, nor that the G 3

Protestants Succession sufficient. ART. II.

46 Saints reigning with Christ are to be worshipped and prayed unto, nor their Relicks to be worshipped, nor that the Images of Christ and the Mother of God, always a Virgin, and other Saints are to be had and retained, and that to them honour and veneration is to be given, nor that the power of Indulgences (such as the Pope grants) was left by Christ in the Church, nor that the use thereof is most wholesome to Christ's people, nor that the Roman Church is the holy Catholick and Apostolick Church, nor the Mother and Mistress of all Churches, nor that true obedience is to be vowed and fworn to the Bifhop of Rome, nor that he is the Successor of Peter, nor that Peter is the Prince of the Apostles, and Vicar of Fesus Christ. Neither let them name the Popes Councils or Fathers for the first five hundred years, for they held not these points. Papilts pretence to the Fathers of the first five hundred years is very idle, because were it true, as it is most falle, that those Fathers were Papists, yet could not that suffice to prove them a continued Succession of fixteen hundred years. Secondly, because those of the fixth Age must needs know better what was the Religions and Tenets of them who lived in the fifth Age by whom they were instructed, and with whom they daily conversed, then our modern Papifts can now do, and they have not protested on their salvation that it was the very same with the now popish Doctrine, nor that they received it from them by word of mouth, and fo from age to age: and finally, because if our Tenets in which we differ from Papifts, and are opposed by them, be taught and approved by the Fathers of the first five hundred years, then it is wholly impossible they should be for Papists and against us. But our Doctrines (in which we differ from Papifts, and are opposed by them) are taught and approved by the Fathers of the first five hundred years. Therefore it is impossible that the Fathers of the first five hundred years should be for Papists and against us The Major is manifest of it felf. The Minor is proved 1. By what hath been already cited out of those Fathers, as also by what shall be cited out of them in the following dispute. 2. By the ingenuous confessions of our Adversaries. Cardinal Cusanus in his second Book of Catholick Concord, cap. 13. faith, The Pope is not the universal Bishop, but the first above or among others. Cardinal Beffarion of the Sacrament of the Eucharist, We reade that these two onely Sacraments were delivered plainly in the Gospel. Cardinal Cajetan. tract, ac Indulg. cap. 1. There can be no certainty found touching the beginning of Indulgences: there is no authority of the Scripture, or ancient Fathers, Greek or Latin, that brings it to our knowledge. Durand. in lib.4; fent. dift. 20. qu 3. Of Indulgences few things can be faid of certainty, because the Scripture speaks not expressly of them. Cardinal Fisher Bishop of Rochefter, Affert. Luib. confef. art. 18. pag. 86. Touching Purgatory there was very little mention or none at all, among the ancient, as the Greeks to this day believe it not : which words are cited by Polyd. Virgil. lib. 8. de invent. rerum. cap. r. Cardinal Bellarmine, lib. 5. de Just. cap 7. For the uncertainty of our own rightcoulness, and for avoiding of vain-glory it is most fure and safe to repose our whole confidence in the alone mercy and goodness of God. Cardinal Cajetan in z.part. 2. Th. qu. 80. art. 12. qu 3. The custome of the peoples receiving the Wine endured long in the Church. Georg. Caff in his Defence of his Book entituled [De officio pii viri] Saith, The use of the Blood of our Lord together with his Body in the ministring of this Sacrament, is both of the institution of

Christ,

the state of the s

indro

wha

oders

it Was

t from

if out

aught wholly

es (in

COVED

chac

Aus

hath

ut of

Ad-

sp.13

ibele

ijeah ingin

ib.4

15 21"

416

to fee

Christ, and observed by the custome of the whole Church for above a thousand years, and unto this day of the Eastern Churches. And although the use of one kinde came up about the year 1200. yet the most learned of those times never taught that it was necessary so to be observed. Tonstal Bishop of Durham, de verit, corp. & fanguinis, p. 46. till the Council of Lateran it was free for all men to follow their own conjecture concerning the manner of Christs presence in the Eucharist. Polydor Virgil. de invent. rer. 1 6. 13. afore the Index Expurgatorius put them out, had these words, By the testimony of Hierom it appears how in a manner all the ancient holy Fathers condemned the worship of Images for fear of Idolatry. Cassand. consult. tit. de imag. It is verily manifest out of Augustin, writing on Plal. x13. that in his age the use of Images in Churches was not. Claudius Espencaus a Bishop in Tit. c. 1. many hundred years after the Apostles by reason of the want of others, Priests were married, Greg. de Val.tom. 4. disp. 9. punct. 5. fect. 9. with others confesseth, that in the most ansient times of the Church, and after the Apostles death Priests had their wives. Harding in his answer to Fewel on the third Article; Verily in the primitive Church this was necessary, when the faith was in learning. And therefore the prayers were made then in a common known tongue to the people, for cause of their further instruction, who being of late converted to the faith, and of Painims made Christians had need in all things to be taught. Fohn Hart in his Epiftle to the Reader before the conference with Dr. Rainold in the Tower; In truth I think, that although the spiritual power be more excellent than the temporal, yet they are both of God, neither doth the one depend of the other. Whereupon I gather as a certain conclusion, that the opinion of them who hold the Pope to be a temporal Lord over Kings and Princes, is unreasonable and improbable altogether. For he hath not to meddle with them or theirs civily, much less to depose them, or give away their Kingdoms: that is no part of his commission. He bath in my judgement the Fatherhood of the Church, not a Princehood of the world: Christ himself taking no such title on him, nor giving it to Peter or any other of his Disciples. Bishop Fewels challenge and performance is known, Bishop Mortons Catholick Apology and Appeal, besides many other books are extant; by which it may be plainly discerned, that Papists have not the Fathers of the first five hundred years for them, and that even the learned writers of the Popish party have vented so much in their writings, as yeilds an apology for Protestants in all or many of the points in difference between Protestants and Papists.

SECT. III.

Protestants have bad a sufficient succession to aver their doctrin in the Latin Churches.

Que I shall add a direct answer to H. T. his argument. 1. By denying his fyllogifin to be right, as having these words added in the minor [or tenets, &c.] which were not in the Major, whereby there is a fourth terms which makes a syllogism naught. 2. By denying his Major, and as a reason of that denial I fay, agreement of doctrin with Christ and his Apostles in the main points of faith and worship, though there be no Bishops nor Priests is sufficient to a true Church; and such succession as H. T. requires is not neceffary.