

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. Tonsal Bishop of Durham, de verit. corp. & sanguinis, 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. l. 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. 113. that in his age the use of Images in Churches was not. Claudius Espencæus 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. sect. 9. with others confesseth, that in the most ancient times of the Church, and after the Apostles death Priests had their wives. Harding in his answer to Jewel 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 Paganims made Christians had need in all things to be taught. John Hart in his Epistle to the Reader before the conference with Dr. Rainold in the Towers; 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 civilly, much less to depose them, or give away their Kingdoms: that is no part of his commission. He hath 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 Jewels 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.

S E C T. III.

Protestants have had a sufficient succession to aver their doctrine in the Latin Churches.

BUT I shall add a direct answer to H. T. his argument. 1. By denying his syllogism to be right, as having these words added in the *minor* [or *teners*, &c.] which were not in the *Major*, whereby there is a fourth term which makes a syllogism naught. 2. By denying his *Major*, and as a reason of that denial I say, agreement of doctrine 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 necessary.

cessary. 3. To the *Minor*, though Protestants have not a 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 thirty nine Articles or any other set number of tenets expressly holding and denying all the same points; yet they do agree with Christ and his Apostles in the doctrine of the Christian faith, and the Christian worship; and there hath been a succession in all ages hitherto of Christian professors holding the same points of faith in the fundamentals, although sometimes more purely and conspicuously than at other times; and they have opposed, though not with the like success, agreement, or largeness in every age, the Popish errors now avouched in Pope *Pius* the fourth his Creed and the *Trent* Canons. And for answer to the proofs of the *Major*: I deny, that the *Major* proceeds from the definition to the thing defined, [*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*] being not the definition of the continued succession necessary to the being of the true Church of God; as hath been proved before in the answer to the former Article, *Sec't*, 4. 5. And to the proof of the *Minor*: I answer, that Protestants may have true succession from Christ and his Apostles, and may be esteemed Christians and Catholicks, though they differ in many material points, as long as they hold the same fundamental points, and Protestants, opposing all or some of the chief points of Popery as they arose and were discovered to them, though they did not discern all their errors, nor relinquish all their practices, or the communion of the Churches subject to the Bishop of *Rome's* rule: but they were truly Protestants, however otherwise named, while they did hold the same fundamental truths we hold, and opposed, as they appeared to them, all or some of the Popish corrupt worship and errors, which the Protestants now do. And for proof of this we rightly name the *Waldenses*, *Hussites*, *Wickliffites*, *Albigenses*, *Puritan Waldenses*, *Beringarians*, *Grecians*, of whom writers testify they excepted against the Popes supremacy, purgatory, half communion, transubstantiation, setting up and worship of Images, propitiatory sacrifice of the Masse for quick and dead, invocation and worship of Angels and Saints deceased, seven Sacraments, with other errors of the now Romanists; and yet in the chief points of Christian faith and worship did agree with the now Protestants, as may be gathered from the confessions, and writings of their own, either extant or acknowledged in the histories and writings of their adversaries, such as were *Rainerius*, *Aeneas Sylvius*, *Cochleus*, and others. See *Samuel Morlands* history of the Evangelical Churches in *Piedmont* the first book, by which their confessions and treatises are brought to light agreeing with Protestants. What *H. T.* brings against this is either falsely ascribed to them by the calumnies of their adversaries, whose recitals of their opinions to the worst sense no man hath reason to believe, especially considering their works extant do refute them; and it hath been often complained of, that they have been misinterpreted and misreported; or else, if true, is insufficient to invalidate our allegation of them.

H. T. tells us the *Waldenses* held the real presence, that the Apostles were lay men, that all Magistrates fell from their dignity by any mortal sin, that it is not lawful to swear in any case, &c. *Illicius* in *Catalog. Waldens. Confes. Bohem.* a. 1. and *Waldo* an unlearned Merchant of *Lyons* lived but in the year 1160.

Ans^r.

Ans. Sure he was not altogether unlearned, of whom it is said by some that have seen his doings yet remaining in old parchment monuments, that it appeareth he was both able to declare and to translate the books of Scripture, also did collect the Doctors mins upon the same. Yet were he unlearned, sure he had store of companions among the Romanists, Friars, Bishops and Popes of those times, by one of whom a Bishop was condemned as an heretick, for holding that there are *Antipodes*; and *Paul* the second saith, *Platina* pronounced them hereticks, who should from thenceforth mention the name of the Academy, either in earnest or in jest. The very decrees and Epistles of the Popes in their Canon law shew, that few of them had any skill in the Scriptures or the original languages competent to divines, and who so readeth their writings observingly, shall find that the ablest of their schoolmen in those dayes were very ignorant of the Scripture sense and language. Nor do I think the Popes and generality of Bishops and Priests, and Preachers among the Romanists at this day are men of much learning in the holy Scriptures. So that I presume *Waldus*, as unlearned as he was, was comparable to the Roman Clergy at that time in learning, and for holiness of life, by the relation even of Popish writers, exceeding them as much as gold exceeds lead, and therefore as likely to know the mind of God as any Pope, or Bishop, or Friar at that time. Now clear it is by an ancient manuscript alledged by the *Magdeburg. cent. 12. c. 8.* that the *Waldenses* held, that the Scripture is the only rule in the Articles of faith, fathers and councils no otherwise to be received then as they agree with the Scriptures, that the Scriptures are to be read by all sorts of men, that there are two Sacraments of the Church, that the Lords supper is appointed by Christ, and to be received by all sorts in both kinds, that *Masse* were impious, and that it was a madness to say *Masse* for the dead, purgatory to be a figment, the invocation and worship of dead Saints to be idolatry, the Roman Church to be the whore of Babylon, that the Pope hath not the supremacy of all the Churches of Christ, marriage of Priests to be lawful: with sundry more, which are agreeable to Protestant teners against Papists: which is confirmed, because much to the same purpose *Aeneas Sytavius* in his *Bohemian* history writes of their opinions. Nor is it likely they held what they are said by *H. T.* to have held. For it appears by the dispute between them and one *Dr. Austin*, set down by *Mr. Fox Acts and Monuments* at the year 1179. out of *Orthuinus de gratiis*, that their opinion was, that Christ is one and the same with his natural body in the Sacrament, which he is at the right hand of his Father: but not after the same existence of his body. For the existence of his body in heaven is personal and local: there to be apprehended by the faith and spirit of men. In the Sacrament the existence of his body is not personal or local to be apprehended or received of our bodies, after a personal or corporal manner, but after a Sacramental manner: that is, where our bodies receive the sign, and our spirit the thing signified. And *Illyric. cat. test. verit.* tells us, that it is said to be their opinion, that the transubstantiation is not made in the hand of the conficent, but in the mouth of him that receives it worthily. And though he sets down the words of *Rainerius* as they were, yet he conceives the things objected were calumnies. As for what is brought out of the *Bohemian* confession, *Anno 1535.* it speaks of their tenet then, but not what those in *Gallia* held in and about the time of *Waldus*, who from him were termed *Waldenses*. It is probable

able they might say the Apostles were lay men not ordained, or tradesmen, as Peter was a fisher, Paul a tentmaker, not thereby derogating from the Apostles function, when they were made Apostles, but endeavouring to abate the arrogance of the Bishops and Priests, who appropriated to themselves the title of the clergy (which Peter, 1 Pet. 5. 3. gave to all the flock of Christ) and the power only to translate, read, expound and preach the Scriptures, which the Waldenses held to be free to all men. By Magistrates falling from their dignity by mortal sin, its likely they meant Ecclesiastical, whom they held God did suspend from the exercise of their function, when they lived wickedly, they being not to receive, and so not to consecrate, as I find it in, *Illyric. catal.* or perhaps they meant it, that Magistrates were not to be obeyed in their wicked commands, or (as it is most probable they meant it) it was just with God they should fall from their dignity; and that he by his providence did so order it, not that men might depose them, as Papists have taught, nor that *ipso facto* they cease to be Magistrates. The same thing also *H. T.* saith of the *Wiclefians* out of the council of *Constance*, and imputes to them and to the *Hussites* from the council of *Constance*, that all things came to pass by fatal necessity, misunderstanding necessity of event by reason of Gods decree for fatal necessity, and that all the works of the predestinate are virtues, which arose from their doctrine, that they could not fall from the faith, as if thereby they must hold, that then they could not sin. That the *Waldenses* held it not lawful to swear at all, is not so likely, as that they held the frequency of swearing unlawful, which is made the occasion of their denying swearing to be lawful, by *Rainerius* himself in *Illyr. catal.* or perhaps they rejected monkish vows and oaths of canonical obedience, and many other oaths imposed on men, together with swearing by the Mass, Cross, Rod, on a Book. But if they held all swearing unlawful, they held what *Sixus Senensis*, lib. 6. Biblioth. Annot. 26. saith is conceived to have been held by many Fathers, Origen, Athanasius, Epiphanius, Hilarius, Ambrosius, Chromatius, Hieronimus, Chrysostomus, Theophylactus, Oecumenius, Euthymius, whom he excuseth and endeavours to acquit from error, and so do others the *Waldenses*, *Wiclevists*, &c. as *Birkbeck* in cent. 14. doth *Wicleff* out of his Latin exposition of the second Commandment.

That the *Hussites* held Mass, transubstantiation and seven Sacraments with the now *Romanists*, I find not in *Mr. Fox*, nor doth *H. T.* tell me where I may find it in him; that the *Hussites* or *Wicleff* held all the works of the predestinate to be virtues, or that all things come to pass by fatal necessity (meaning of a concatenation of two causes antecedent to Gods decree, and binding him) is no more to be believed, because the council of *Constance* condemned them, then that *Wicleff* held that God was to obey the Devil, because it was so charged on him, from which his learned works yet remaining do free him. And it is found that the clamorous Jesuits endeavor to fasten the like odious inferences on the doctrine of predestination taught by *Calvin* and other Protestants, which being rightly understood infers them not.

What *Bernard* saith, and *Roger Hoveden* of the *Albigenses*, and *Rainerius* of the *Catharists* might be true of some of those that went under their name, as the *Gnosticks* did of *Christians*, and perhaps some *Ranters* or *Quakers* may do under the name of Protestants. But the errors are contrary to the *Waldenses*, *Wiclevists*

Wiclevists, Hussites confessions and writings yet remaining, and *Rainerius* his own words, that the *Waldenses* or *Leonists* did believe all things well of God, and all the *Articles* which are contained in the *Creed*, do acquit them, and they seem to be the errors of some remnant of the *Manichees*. But perhaps *Bernard* was mistaken in the charge on them, as he was in the accusation of *Petrus Abailardus* and others. The tenets that the universal Church (meaning the *Catholick Church* which we believe in the *Creed*) consisteth only of the predestinate, that they cannot fall from the faith meaning totally or finally, are the opinions of many learned Protestants, and therefore the *Hussites* holding them, may notwithstanding those opinions be reckoned for Protestants. Nevertheless were it true, that the *Hussites* and *Wiclevists* and *Waldenses* taught what *H. T.* saith of them, yet we might alledge them as witnesses against the now *Popish* errors, which they then declared against, and a catalogue of Protestant successors continued from the Apostles in the naming them, rightly formed.

S E C T. IV.

The succession in the Greek Churches may be alleged for Protestants, notwithstanding H. T. his exceptions.

A Catalogue of Bishops, Priests and Laicks in the Greek churches continued in the profession of the same faith with the Protestants against *Popish* errors is alleged by some learned Protestants. Against which *H. T.* excepts. 1. That they rejected the communion of the Protestants, censur. eccles. orientalis. *Answ.* This doth not prove they professed not the same faith with Protestants against *Papists*. For they might upon some differences, upon which perhaps they disagree with the *Romanists*, reject the communion of the Protestants, and yet profess with Protestants the same faith, and oppose the same *Popish* errors.

2. Saith he, they were at least seven or eight hundred years in the communion of the *Roman Church*, as witness the first eight general councils all held in Greece, and approved by the Popes of Rome. *Answ.* To speak exactly, a general council is a black Swan, there having never been any council so general, but that there have wanted messengers from many Christian Churches in the world. The four first councils of the Bishops of the Empire have gotten a great repute in the Christian Churches, and have been accounted as the four *Evangelists*, though the canons extant even of the first *Nicene* council have no such excellency in them, as to deserve so great an opinion. Of the four later, surely the two last lesse deserve the name; the later *Nicene* council being affronted by the *Carolin* council about Images at *Frankjord*, and the eighth by another of the same place of better note, by *Michael* the Emperor and *Photius* the learned Patriarch of *Constantinople*, who sure acknowledged not the Popes Monarchy, but lived and died in contest against them. But neither the four first, nor the four last did ever ascribe to the Pope of *Rome* the monarchy and supremacy, which are now arrogated, nor did they ever receive what they professed, because they professed it, nor doth the desire or acceptance, much lesse

the having the Popes approbation at all prove any authority over them in him, it being a thing usual to seek approbation of men, who have no authority over the seekers, by reason of their esteem for prudence, learning and other qualities, and for the more ready receipt of what they seek to have approved. But the councils determinations, and that with *Anathema* to the gainfayers, shewed that they judged themselves to have decisive power without the Pope, though his consent also were added as useful for some purposes.

3. Saith H. T. *The first revolt was made by the Grecians denying the procession of the holy Ghost from God the Son, they were united again to the Church of Rome in the council of Florence sess. last.*

Ans. 1. The denying of the procession of the Holy Ghost from God the Son, is shewed to be an error only in manner of speaking, by Sir Richard Field of the Church, *third book, ch. 1.* and other learned men. 2. The revolt so long shews the Protestants had predecessors for many hundred years together in opposing the usurpations and errors of the Roman Popes and Churches. 3. The reconciliation at Florence was but an imperfect thing, by persons whose acts were not avowed afterwards, nor did the union hold, but was quickly dissolved. 4. The council of Florence was a council not allowed by that at *Basil*, as being only of a faction to avoid the questioning of Pope *Eugenius*. See *Platina in vita Eugenii. 4.*

4. Saith H. T. *they held transubstantiation, seven Sacraments, unbloody sacrifice, prayer to Saints and for the dead, cens. eccles. orientalis, c. 7, 10, 12, 13, 21.*

Ans. The Grecians hold not any such transubstantiation as whereby the elements are abolished, and cease to be that they were, but whereby they become what they were not, and the transubstantiation they hold is a change of the communicants into the being of Christ, that is partakers of the divine nature, as the Apostle means when he saith *they are the body of Christ*, as Dr. Field proves out of *Damascen, Cyril* and others in his *third book of the Church, ch. 1.* Bishop *Fewel* reply to *Hardings answer*, art. 10. Nor are the speeches of *transubstantiation, transelementation* and such like terms, used by the *Greeks*, any other than lofty hyperbolical speeches, such as the Apostle useth when he saith, *Christ was crucified among the Galatians, Gal. 3. 1* which abound in *Chrysofome, Pseudo, Dionysius Arcopagita &c.* inasmuch, that *Chrysofom* sometimes expresseth the presence of Christ in the eucharist, as if it were sensible, the communicants *touching Christs body, seeing his blood, having their mouths made red by it, sucking his blood, receiving him into our house*, with more of the like, as may be seen in *Chamier. Panstr. cath. tom. 4. lib. 11. c. 9* As for seven Sacraments, the *Greeks* do not teach them to be so many, and no more, nor the unbloody sacrifice any otherwise, then by it to mean a commemoration of the sacrifice of Christ, as *Chrysofom* in his *hom.* on the tenth to the *Hebrews* expresseth it. It cannot be proved that the *Greeks* use such prayer to Saints as the Papists do, directing their prayers to them as hearers, and by vertue of their merits helpers to them that call on them. Neither do they pray for the dead shut up in purgatory (which as I alleged out of *Ruffensis, the Greeks do this day deny*) and there enduring punishment of sense, for deliverance thence, but commemorate the dead, even the most holy martyrs and confessors, and pray for their happy resurrection and acquittal in the last judgement. As for the

the Egyptian Christians and Armenians, what they hold is not so easie to know by reason of their remoteness from Europe, nor what Succession they have had. But this is manifest enough, that they did never submit to the Bishop of Rome as their Head, except what was done at Florence (for which Michael Paleologus the Greek Emperour was abhorred by the Greeks, and denied Burial, and Isidor Arch-bishop of Kiovia in Russia deposed and put to death) or by some obscure persons, whose acts the Churches never owned, and yet there doth not appear sufficient reason to exclude them out of the Catholick Church, notwithstanding such Errors as are imputed to them, nor to question their Succession. Nor is the Protestants pretence to the Fathers of the first five hundred years idle, (it being not false, but most true, and so proved by Jewel and others, and the Answers of Harding and other Romanists proved insufficient) that they were in the most material points Protestants, that is held otherwise than the Romanists now do. And though it prove not a Succession of sixteen hundred years continued, yet it proves a Succession of so long continuance as will make void the popish claim of Succession as peculiar to them, and with any considerate person so far take place as to justify the Protestants opposition against the modern Papist's Errors and Innovations. 'Tis true, those of the sixth 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, than Protestants can now do, in those things which they delivered by word of mouth to them, if they were heedfull, intelligent, and mindfull of what they heard. But what they left in writing we may know as well as they. And experience shews that oft times upon mistakes, and sometimes voluntarily the sayings of men spoken, yea sometimes their very Writings, either by unskilfulness, or negligence, or fraud, are mis-reported, and therefore notwithstanding this reason of the acquaintance of those of the sixth Age with those of the fifth, yet it may be that Protestants may know the minde of the Fathers in the fifth Age as well as those that lived in the sixth. But that those of the sixth Age have protested on their salvation that the Doctrine taught by the Fathers in the fifth Age was the very same with theirs in every point, or the Doctrine now taught by the Romanists was received from them by word of mouth, and so from Age to Age is not true; yet if they should, we have no more cause to credit them, than the Church had to believe the Millenaries and Quartodecimans, because of Papias and others their report of John, with whom they conversed.

S E C T. V.

The Romanists Doctrine as it is now was not the Doctrine of the Fathers of the first five hundred years, nor is acknowledged to be so by the learned Protestants.

H. T. adds a third Argument to prove, that his with other Romanists Doctrines, (in which they differ from Protestants and are opposed by them) are taught and approved by the Fathers of the first five hundred years, which he thinks to

prove by that he hath cited, and shall cite out of the Fathers, and the confessions of his Adversaries, and to that end cites some Speeches of Fulk, Kennitius, Whitgift, Calvin, Whitaker, Peter Martyr, Duditius, Rainolds, Jewel: and then infers triumphantly, therefore the Father of the first five hundred years are not for Protestants, but for us; therefore Protestants are utterly at a loss in the point of continued Succession.

Ans^r. 1. **W**Hat is before cited hath been shewed to be insufficient, and so will what is after, if God vouchsafe me time and strength to that end. 2. Of the passages cited, the two last are not to the purpose, and they are maimedly, and corruptly cited. The Speeches, as they are cited, say not any thing of the popish Doctrine taught and approved by the Fathers of the first five hundred years, but the uncertainty of finding out the truth by their sayings without the Scriptures. And that the dealing of this Author may appear, I shall set down the words as I finde them in *Jewel's Apology*, part. 4. cap. 22. divis. 3. For where these men bid the holy Scriptures away as dumb and fruitless, and procure us to come to God himself, who speaks in the Church and in their Councils, that is to say, to believe their fancies and opinions this way, finding out the truth is very uncertain, and exceeding dangerous, and in a manner a fantastical and mad way, and by no means allowed of the holy Fathers. Which Speech is a most true and savoury Speech, yet not in the least intimating a diffidence of the Fathers of the first five hundred years being for the Papists (the contrary to which Bishop Jewel shewed in his famous Challenge at Paul's Cross, and his making it good against Harding) but only vindicating the holy Scriptures from the foul Speeches of Hofius, Pighius, and other Romanists, and asserting the authority of the holy Scriptures. The other passage which is cited out of Dr. Rainold's Conference (in H. T. it is printed Confess.) cap. 5. divis. 1. is as corruptly and maimedly cited, the words being thus at large, *Indeed Vincentius Lirinensis preferreth this mark (of truth the consent of the Fathers) before the rest, as having held when they failed. Nevertheless he speaketh not of it neither, as that it may serve for trial and decision of questions between us. For what doth he acknowledge to be a point approved, and such as we are bound to believe by this mark? even that which the Fathers all with one consent have held, written, taught, plainly, commonly, continually. And who can avouch of any point in question, that not one or two but all the Fathers held it, nor onely held it, but also wrote it; nor onely wrote it, but also taught it, not darkly, but plainly; not seldom, but commonly; not for a short season, but continually; which so great consent is partly so rare, and so hard to be found, partly so unsure, though it might be found, that himself (to fashion it to some use and certainty) is fain to limit and restrain it.* Which words were found, and are necessary, but not spoken out of any distrust of his cause or imagination, as if the Fathers of the first five hundred years were for the Papists. For in that very conference he largely proves, that not onely the Fathers of the first five hundred years, but also the succeeding Councils and Fathers till the sixteenth Century, did onely yield the Pope a Primacy among other Patriarchs, but not a Supremacy over the whole Church, and that Primacy that was given him was by custome of the Church for the honour of the Imperial City (which was auferible) not because of any grant of Christ, which was irrevocable. *Duditius*

was one whom by *Thranus* his description of him, *Hist* l. 96 towards the end, I know not whether I may reckon among Protestants, though he were an ingenious and learned man, yet there is no reason his words should be alleged as the confession of Protestants. *Peter Martyr's* Speech respects only the point of vows, which is not a point of faith. *Whitaker's* Speech is not of the Fathers of the first 500. years, but of the ancient Church, which might be after, or only in some part of that time. The words of *Calvin*, lib 3 *instit. cap. 5. parag. 10.* are not rightly alleged, being not together as *H. T.* cites them, but injuriously pieced out of Speeches, that are distant one from another. He doth not deny, nor yet expressly say, that it was a custome thirteen hundred years ago to pray for the dead: but whereas it was objected by the Adversaries, he urgeth, that if it were so, it was without Scripture, that it came out of carnal affection, that what we read in the Ancients done therein was yielded to the common manner and ignorance of the vulgar, he confesseth they were carried away into error, but saith not, they were all of that time carried away into error, that some testimonies of the Ancients might be brought which overthrow all those prayers for the dead, that their prayers for the dead were not without hesitancy, that they were different from the popish in divers things. The words of *Whitgists* Defense, pag 473. are mis-cited, being not as *H. T.* cites them, All the Bishops and learned Writers of the Greek and Latin Church too, for the most part, were spotted with the Doctrines of Free will, Merit, Invocation of Saints, but thus, How greatly were almost all the Bishops and learned Writers of the Greek Church, yea and the Latins also for the most part spotted with the Doctrines of Free-will, of Merits, Invocation of Saints, and such like? Surely you are not able to reckon in any Age since the Apostles time any company of Bishops that taught and held so sound and perfect Doctrine in all points as the Bishops of England do at this time. The words of *Kemnitius* I finde not, perhaps because the Edition is not named with the Page. But this I finde in the third part of his *Examen*, pag. 628. *Francof. Edit. 1609.* that he not onely asserted, but also proved, that in the Primitive Church unto two hundred years after Christ born, the Doctrine of the Suffrages, Patronages, Intercessions, Merits, Aid, Help, and Invocation of Saints in Heaven, was altogether unknown, and the reason or account of the veneration of Saints was then far other, as we have shewed, than that which was brought in. I have not *Fulk's* Retenives against *Bristow's* Motives by me, which I imagine is the Book which *H. T.* cites under the Title of *Riot Briston*: but his citing with an *etc.* and so small a shred of the Authour makes me conceive that he wronged *Fulk* by that maimed citation, however sith the confession is but of three Fathers, and the Saints whether living or dead, and their invocation of what sort he meant being not expressed, it serves not the turn to prove his confession of the Fathers of the first five hundred years, holding Popish Invocation of Saints deceased.

S E C T. VI.

The Answers of P. T. to the Objections of Protestants concerning their Succession are shew'd to be vain, and the Apostacy of the Roman Church proved.

After the rest of his scribbling *H. T.* under the Title of *Objection solved*, saith thus, *Object.* In all the Ages before Luther Protestants had a Church though it were invisible. *Ans.* This is a mere Mid-summer nights Dream, that a Church (which is a congregation of visible men, preaching, baptizing, and converting Nations) should be extant for a thousand years, and yet be all this while invisible, neither to be seen or heard of in the World.

I reply, who frames the Objection as this Author sets it down I know not, sure I am that many of the Protestants do frame it otherwise, that the Protestants had Churches afore Luther, who did oppose popish innovations, and that these were visible, though not to their Enemies, nor in so conspicuous a manner as the Roman Senate or Common-wealth of Venice, and this is no Mid-summer nights Dream any more than that Papists have a Church in England in communion with the See of Rome, and that they have Masses, Baptizing, &c. although it be not known to Protestants, nor so conspicuous as that we know where to go to them. And these Churches have been seen and known in the World, partly separate from the Roman Church, partly continuing within the Roman Church, but yet opposing the papal usurpations and corruptions. As for *H. T.* his Definition of a Church, it is to me more like a Mid-Summer nights Dream. For is the Church a congregation of visible men preaching, baptizing, and converting Nations? Are all the visible men in the congregation, which is the Church, men preaching, baptizing, and converting Nations? May not a Church be a congregation of men that convert not any Nation if themselves be converted, that baptize not others if themselves be baptized, that preach not if they have heard, received and profess the Word preached? Are not Women part of the congregation, which is the Church? Do they preach and baptize? However it is well this Author sets down Preaching and Baptizing as acts whereby the men who are of the congregation, which is the Church, are visible; which is all one with the marks of the visible Church given by the Protestants, to wit, preaching the Word and administering the Sacraments.

H. T. adds, *Object.* The Church in communion with the See of Rome was the true Church till she apostatized and fell from the faith.

Ans. If she were once the true Church, she is and shall be so for ever; she cannot fall, as hath been proved, nor erre in faith, as shall be proved hereafter.

I reply. It is, true Protestants yield that the Churches in communion with the Bishops of Rome were true Churches while they held the faith of Christ entire, and did not by their innovations subvert it, which was in process of time done by altering of the rule of faith, the Apostolical tradition of the holy Scripture into unwritten tradition, the Popes determinations and canons of councils as the sense of the Scripture, or the revelations of the Spirit of God, and by bringing in the Invocation and worship of the Virgin Mary and other Saints, altering the Sacrament of the Lords Supper instituted for a commemoration

ration of his death into a propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead, asserting transubstantiation, and adoring of the bread, worshipping images and reliques, perverting the Gospel by bringing in the doctrines of humane satisfactions for sin, power to fulfill the law, justification by works, and meriting eternal life, instead of free remission of sins to the penitent believer only through the blood of Christ, and justification by faith in Christ without the works of the law. In which points that the Churches now in communion with the See of Rome have apostatized, is apparent by this argument. Those Churches have apostatized, who have left the faith once delivered to the Saints by the Apostles of Christ. But the Churches now in communion with the See of Rome, have left the faith once delivered to the Saints by the Apostles of Christ: therefore the Churches now in communion with the See of Rome have apostatized. The Major is evident from the terms, apostasie being no other thing than leaving the faith once delivered to the Saints by the Apostles of Christ. The minor is manifest by comparing the doctrine of the council of Trent, and Pope Pius the fourth his Creed with the Apostles writings, especially the Epistle to the Romans by Paul, which shews what once the church of Rome believed. For instance it is said, Rom. 15. 4. *For whatsoever things were written aforetime were written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.* 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17. *And that from a child thou hast known the holy Scriptures, which are able to make thee wise unto salvation, through faith which is in Christ Jesus. All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect throughly furnished unto all good works.* Eph. 2. 20. *And are built upon the foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone, which plainly prove the Scriptures use for all sorts, sufficiency, and divinity, and the needlessness of unwritten traditions to guide us to salvation.* Rom. 12. 5. *We being many are one body in Christ, and every one members one of another.* 1 Cor. 12. 12. *For as the body is one and hath many members, and all the members of that one body being many are one body: so also is Christ.* Ver. 13. *For by one spirit we are all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free, ver. 27. Now ye are the body of Christ and members in particular, ver. 28. And God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, &c.* Ephes. 1. 22. *and gave him to be head over all things to the Church which is his body, which prove the Catholick Church to have extended to all believers of Jews and Gentiles, and that they (and not the Roman only, or those that are in communion with it) are that one body or Catholick Church, and that there is no other head of the whole Church but Christ, nor any Apostle above another; and consequently the Roman Church and Pope have no supremacy over the rest of the Churches.* Rom. 10. 14. *How shall they call on him in whom they have not believed.* 1 Tim. 2. 5. *There is one God and one Mediator between God and men, the man Christ Jesus, which prove they then received not the invocation of Saints, nor made the Virgin Mary or any other deceased Saint, Mediators between God and men.* 1 Cor. 11. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28. *after his blaming them for disorder about the Lords supper, he saith thus, For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you, that the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed took bread: and when he*

had given thanks he brake it and said, take, eat, this is my body, which is broken for you: this do in remembrance of me. After the same manner also he took the cup when he had supped saying, this cup is the New Testament in my blood: this do ye as oft as ye drink it in remembrance of me. For as oft as ye eat this bread and drink this cup ye do shew the Lords death till he come. Wherefore whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and blood of the Lord. But let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup. 1 Cor. 10. 16, 17. The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ? for we being many are one bread and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread. Which texts plainly shew, that what is eaten in the Eucharist is bread, and therefore not flesh, and consequently no transubstantiation, that the actions are commemorate signs of Christs death; therefore no propitiatory sacrifice: that bread was to be broken and eaten, therefore not to be whole and swallowed down. Heb. 9. 26. But now once in the end of the world hath he appeared to put away sin by the sacrifice of himself. Heb. 10. 10. By the which will we are sanctified through the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once for all, which shew there is no more sacrifice or offering of Christ in the church of Christ to be continued by a Priest. Rom. 1. 25. who changed the truth of God into a lye, and worshipped the creature besides, or more than the Creator. 1 Thel. 1. 9. ye turned to God from idols to serve the living and the true God, therefore they worshipped not bread, nor crosses, nor reliques as Papists do. Rom. 3. 28. Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law. Rom. 4. 5. But to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted to him for righteousness. Rom. 5. 1. Therefore being justified by faith we have peace with God. Rom. 8. 1. There is no condemnation to them that are in Christ Jesus. ver. 3, 4. For what the law could not do in that it was weak through the flesh, God sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh, and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh, that the righteousness of the law might be fulfilled in us. ver. 18. For I reckon that the sufferings of this present time, are not worthy to be compared with the glory which shall be revealed in us. Rom. 9. 11. For the children being not yet born, neither having done any good or evil, that the purpose of God according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth. 16. So then it is not in him that willeth, nor in him that runneth, but of God that sheweth mercy. Rom. 10. 3, 4, 5, 10. For they being ignorant of Gods righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves to the righteousness of God. For Christ is the end of the law for righteousness to every one that believeth. For Moses describeth the righteousness which is of the law, that the man which doth them shall live in them. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness, and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. Rom. 11. 6. And if by grace, then is it no more of works; otherwise grace is no more grace: but if it be of work, then it is no more grace, otherwise work is no more work. 1 Cor. 1. 30. But of him are ye in Christ Jesus, who of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, 1 Cor. 4. 4. I know nothing by my self, yet am I not thereby justified. ver. 7. who maketh thee to differ from another? and what hast thou that thou didst not receive?

ceive? now if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it? Gal. 2. 16, 17, 21. knowing that a man is not justified by the law, but by the faith of Jesus Christ: we seek to be justified by Christ. I do not frustrate the grace of God: for if righteousness come by the law, then Christ is dead in vain: to which may be added, Gal. 3. 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11. & 5. 4, 5. Ephes. 2. 8, 9. Phil. 3. 8, 9. Tit. 3. 5, 6, 7. 1 John 1. 7. which overthrow forgiveness of sins for our satisfaction, merit of glory by any Saints works, righteousness by works and such other tenets as whereby Papists extol man, and debase the grace of God, which will more fully appear by refuting the shifts of the Romanists in the discussing of the following articles.

As for what H. T. saith here, *if the Church in communion with the See of Rome were once the true Church, she is and shall be so for ever*, it meant of the visible Church militant (of which alone is the question) it must rest either on this proposition, every true visible Church militant is and shall be a true Church for ever, which is proved false by the instances of the Hierosolymitan, Antiochian, Alexandrian, Ephesian, Corinthian and other Churches. Where there are not now churches of Christ, but Mahometans, at least by this authors own doctrine, they were not true churches while the Greek churches revolted from the communion of the Roman which he mentions, p. 47. and it is manifest by Christs threatening, that he would remove the candlestick from them except they did repent, Revel. 2. 5. Or else it rests on this, that every church in communion with the See of Rome is, and ever shall be a true church: but there is no priviledge in Scripture to the church of Rome more than to other churches, much less to every church that is in communion with the See of Rome; yea it is said to the Roman church as well as other churches, Rom. 11. 20, 21, 22. *well, because of unbelief they were broken off, and thou standest by faith. Be not high minded but fear. For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity of God: on them which fell severity; but towards thee goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou (even the Roman church to whom he then wrote) also shalt be cut off.* However if it be proved that the church catholick invisible of the elect and true believers cannot fail, and that a church visible indefinite shall not fail, but be in some place or other more or less conspicuous; in greater or smaller numbers; yet it is not proved that the church militant definite of this or that place shall not fail, nor is there a word in Scripture to prove this the priviledge of the Roman church, or those that are in communion with the See of Rome that they cannot fail nor erre in faith: nor do the words of Fathers rightly understood prove it. But Scripture and experience do plainly refute it. What hath been alleged is examined, the rest will be in its place. I proceed to that which remains in this Article.

Object. *The Catholick succession was one succession for the first five centuries.*
 Answ. *You may as well tell me of a white blackmore: a Catholick is not a Protestant, nor a Catholick succession a Protestant succession. Who ever heard of a Protestant Pope? The Catholick church was always governed by a Pope in the first five centuries, as now it is, and hath defined our tenets and condemned yours, as you have seen. It is the very essence of a Protestant (as a Protestant) to protest against the Catholick church, as Lutherans and you have done.*

To this I reply, To an objection of such moment as this is the answer, is but

meer trifling. For he knows, that we mean by catholick succession, not that which he calls catholick succession, to wit of Popes of *Rome*, but that the teachers, who are reputed catholick, whether of the Greek or Latin churches, who have succeeded one after another in the five first centuries of years from Christs incarnation according to the account now used, taught not the doctrine now professed in the Bull of Pope *Pius* the fourth, or in the *tridentin* canons, but that in all or most of the points in difference between Protestants and Papists they taught the doctrine, which Protestants now hold, which hath been proved by *Fewel* and many other Protestant writers. And in this sense it is no more absurdity to call a Protestant a catholick, then to call a spade a spade, a straw a straw. Protestants are truly Catholicks, Papists are but falsely called Catholicks affecting the name, as some that were of the *Synagogue of Satan* said they were *Jews*, and were not, but did lye, Revel. 3. 9. and impudently claiming that which they have no right to, that they may by it as a stalking horse catch ignorant people, who are taken with shews and confident talk, being unable to sift out truth and discern it from pretences. A Catholick succession is in true construction a Protestant succession, and the Popes of *Rome* it self Protestant Popes, teaching in such writings as remain not the now Papal doctrine, but in the main the Protestant, though by some of them excessively magnifying their See, and promoting rites of mens invention way was made for the after corruptions of the Papacy. The term *Pope* was in former times given to other Bishops, Presbyters, yea and Deacons too besides the Bishop of *Rome*, though now the title is appropriated to him, who deserves not the name of *Papa* or *Father*, as it was heretofore used as an honourable title of the reverend and godly teachers and officers in the church of God, nor any other way I know, except it be in the sense in which an *Italian* said of *Innocent* the eighth,

*Osio nocens pueros genuit totidemque puellas :
Hunc merito poteris dicere Roma patrem :*

Many of whose predecessors and successors have made it their work to advance their bastards, rather then beget children to God by preaching the Gospel. It is a notorious falshood, that the catholick church was alwayes governed by a *Pope* in the first five centuries, if he mean by *Pope* a Bishop of *Rome*. Its manifest by many instances, that the *African* and *Asian* churches were not governed by him in the second, third, fourth and fifth centuries, sith they did oppose him, as appears by the contentions between *Victor* and *Polycrates* and others. That which we have seen in *H. T.* or *Bellarmin* or any other writer of the Popish party, hath not yet made it so much as probable, that the *Catholick church* hath now defined the now *Roman tenets*, or condemned the *Protestants*, nor is it of the essence of a *Protestant*, as such, to *Protest* against the *Catholick church*, but against the errors and abominations of the now *Roman party*. Nor hath *H. T.* or any other proved, that the *Protestant teachers* protest against manifest revealed verities, and the very fundamentals of the *Christian faith*, however they do protest against the fundamentals of the new *Popish faith*, the *Popes* monarchy, transubstantiation, &c.

H. T. adds, *St. Augustin, St. Hierom* and many others are divided in their opinions, whether *Linus* or *Clement* immediatly succeeded *Peter*. *Answer*. Be it so, yet they all agreed in this, that the succession was morally continued, to which

which it is a thing indifferent whether Clement immediately succeeded him, as he well might being his scholar, or first Linus, then Cletus, and then Clement, which is now the more common opinion of the church.

I reply, what he means by [morally continued] I understand not, nor know I any sense of that speech, which serves to take away the force of the objection, which is, that if it be uncertain who succeeded Peter immediately, then the tradition of the church unwritten, or not written in the Bible is uncertain, and that too in a main point which is fundamental with the Romanists, the succession of their chief Pastors, upon which the truth of their church and the rule of their faith depends, and consequently the rule of the Romanists whereby to know what we are to believe hath a meer sandy foundation, not being sufficient to build a divine and firm faith upon; and the Protestants are no more to be blamed than the Romanists, if they do not so exactly set down and prove their succession of Bishops as the Papists require, sith the Papists themselves are deficient in their own catalogue, and if the Protestants can prove their faith out of Scripture, though they prove not such a succession as is demanded, they may as well be concluded a true church as the Roman, which answers the two first Articles of H. T. his *Manual of controversies*. Besides the most ancient tradition they have, to wit *Irenæus* l. 3. *advers. hæres.* c. 3. saith that Peter and Paul founded the church in Rome, and then delivered the Episcopacy of the church to be administered to Linus, which was done in their life time, and so Linus did not succeed Peter as Bishop of Rome, for he was Bishop while Peter lived, and so if Peter died Bishop of Rome there were more Bishops together, and *Irenæus* makes them successors of Paul as well as Peter; nor were they successors to them as having the same office with them. For they could not be Bishops of particular places fixed there as now the term is used, it stood not with their commission, which enjoined them to go into all the world, and to preach the Gospel to every creature, nor were they successors to them in their Apostleship, for that particular office ceased with the first Apostles. So that the truth is, this conceit of succession is but a vain conceit, though it be much magnified by H. T. and other Romanists for want of solid proof of their several doctrines out of Scripture or primitive antiquity. I go on to the next Article.



ARTIC. III.

Popish Church visibility not necessary.

Such visibility of Succession, as the *Romanists* require, is not proved to be necessary to the being of a true Church.

SECT. I.

Exterior Consecration and Ordination of Ministers is not necessary to the being of a visible Church: what H. T. requires of Ministers preaching and administering Sacraments is most defective in the Roman Church.

Our Tenet, saith H. T. is, that the Catholick and Apostolick Church of God hath had not onely a continued, but also a visible Succession from Christ to this time, &c. which we prove thus, 1. A Society of men which hath always in it exterior Consecration and Ordination of Ministers, preaching, baptizing, and administering Sacraments must of necessity be always visible. But the Church of Christ is a society of men which hath always in it exterior Consecration and Ordination of Ministers. Therefore the Church of Christ must of necessity be always visible. The Major is proved by evident reason, because those are all outward and sensible actions, which are inconsistent with an invisible society of actors. The Minor is proved by Scripture, Go ye, teaching all Nations, baptizing them, &c. And, Behold, I am with you all days, &c. St. Matth. 28. v. 20. He gave some Apostles, some Prophets, some Evangelists, and other some Pastors and Doctors, to the consummation of the Saints, Ephes. 4. 11, 12.

Ans. **T**HE Tenet and the Conclusion of the Argument differ, the Tenet asserting what hath been, the Conclusion what of necessity must be; the Tenet having for its Subject the holy Catholick and Apostolick Church of God, the Conclusion the Church of Christ indefinite, and both Tenet and Conclusion is granted, but not in this Author's and other *Romanists* sense. It is granted, there hath been a Succession, but not a continued number of Bishops, Priests, and Laicks, succeed-
in

ing one another in the profession of the same Faith, (meaning the now Roman) from *Christ* and his Apostles to this time, which *H. T.* in the former Article makes the Definition of Succession. And visibility of each particular Church is granted, but not of the Catholick as Catholick, which as such is to be believed, not seen. And this visibility it is granted to be of some at some times, not in the same splendor or conspicuity at all times, nor to all persons. But Protestants deny it visible always to all in so glorious and conspicuous an estate, as *Bellarmino* asserts, when he saith in his Book *de Eccles. Milit. cap. 2.* *That the Church is an Assembly of men so visible and palpable as is the Assembly of the People of Rome, or the Kingdom of France, or the Common wealth of the Venetians:* so that we might grant his Tenet and Conclusion, were it not that fraudulently there is more intended than is expressed, which is needfull to be discovered. For answer to it as it is the *Major* is granted, if it be understood of visibility simply, but if meant of such a conspicuous visibility as the *Romanists* assert, it is to be denied. In the *Minor* it is to be observed, 1. That a distinction is made between *exterior Consecration and Ordination*, which I judge to be done, that thereby may be implied the distinction of Bishops (who are consecrated, not ordained) from Presbyters, (whom they ordain, not consecrate) to have been always in the Church of *Christ*, which is not right. 2. That it is asserted that *the Church of Christ is a society of men, which hath always in it exteriour Consecration and Ordination of Ministers*, which is, because he holds a true Church hath always such Ministers. But as I said before, that is not true, no not in the Church of *Rome* in the vacancy of the See, which hath been sometimes long, and therefore it is not necessary to the being of a true Church, that always the exterior Consecration and Ordination be continued, and if it may be intermitted, one, two, or ten years, and yet the Church a true Church, it may be an hundred; and therefore the *Minor* is not to be granted, if meant of exterior Consecration and Ordination of Bishops distinct from Presbyters, and such a perpetuity as is without the least intermission, nor do any of the Texts prove it. For the Precept *Matth. 28. 19, 20.* proves onely it ought to be, not that it shall be; and the Promise, if it do prove that a Succession shall be, yet it doth not prove such a Succession as shall have exterior Consecration and Ordination, but such assistance in Preaching and Baptizing as shall uphold and prosper them in that Work: nor is this assured to any one place, but indefinitely to any persons in any place where this Work shall be continued. And the other place *Ephes 4. 11, 12.* proves not a certainty of the event, which is asserted in the *Minor*, but if the *Gift* be meant of Institution of what ought to be, it notes onely a certainty of Duty, if of Donation of Abilities it notes not an exterior Consecration and Ordination, but an act to be immediately from *Christ* himself, or by his Spirit, and so doth not prove a futurity of such Succession by outward Consecration and Ordination as *H. T.* brings it for.

Nevertheless this Author doth disadvantage his own party by this arguing. For, 1. by this arguing he plainly makes the marks of the Church by which it is visible, Preaching, Baptizing, and administering Sacraments, which doth by good consequence infer that the Protestants do rightly make the Preaching of the Word, and the administering of the Sacraments the notes of the visible Church; which will make well for the Protestants, by whom these are observed.

served; but ill for the Ministers of the Roman Church, chiefly the Bishops of Rome, who neither preach, nor baptize, nor administer Sacraments, but do other acts of other kinds. Nor, to speak truth, is almost any of their Preaching the Preaching of the Gospel, but the Rites of the Roman Church, extolling the Virgin *Mary*, and other Saints excellency, little of the Gospel, or if any part of it, it is likely the History of the Gospel in an historical fashion, little of the mystery; but in stead thereof such Doctrines of humane satisfactions, for sin, merit, of good works, are preached, as do overthrow the Gospel. And for Baptizing, though *Bellarmino* tells us. *lib. 2. de bonis oper. in partic. cap. 17.* that at Rome the old Custom is not abolished of Baptizing the Catechumens at Easter, but among the Papists chiefly in the City of Rome there is no year in which many catechized persons are not baptized at Easter: yet the truth is, there is no right Baptism almost throughout the Churches under the Papacy, there being nothing but watering of Infants with some frivolous Ceremonies, no immersion or plunging into the Water after Profession of Faith, as was in the primitive times, and is the onely Baptism *Christ* appointed, Infant-sprinkling, perfusion, or dipping, being meer Innovations begun after the Apostles ages, and being onely by unwritten tradition (as their own learned men confess) conveyed to the Church, not instituted by *Christ* himself. And for administering the Lords Supper, he that reads their Missals or Sees, their Mass, may easily discern, there is not that done by them which *Christ* appointed, but such a change there is in it from *Christ*s institution, as that it cannot be termed a Sacrament of *Christ*, but a meer ridiculous or abominable device of men, more like a Play than a religious service. 2. When they say that the Church hath always exterior Consecration and Ordination of Ministers, they necessarily put themselves upon it, to prove that it hath been so in the Roman Church, which they can never prove to have been always in the Roman Bishops, much less in their Priests, the Records of their Consecrations and Ordinations being in many respects either none or very doubtfull, at best but humane testimony which is fallible, and if these were certain, yet their own Canons make many things necessary to their Sacraments, specially that sottish conceit of the Trent Council, that the Minister of Sacraments must intend to do what the Church doth, without which there is a nullity in what is done, and yet it is impossible to be proved; and so many things according to their Canons nullifie their Ordinations, as Simony, and other irregularities, of which nevertheless their own Writers accuse a great number of their Bishops and Priests, and sometimes one Pope hath made void the Acts of another, and in despite hath cut off his fingers which did ordain Priests, as *Platina* relates in the life of *Stephan* the sixth concerning the usage of Pope *Formosus*; besides this the Ordination of their Priests is to sacrifice for quick and dead, which is no part of the Ministerial Office which *Christ* required, *Matth. 28. 19. 20.* which being considered, if this be the note whereby the true Church must be proved, no Church in the World hath less proof for its truth than the Roman; but the Exceptions will be so many against their exterior Ordination and Consecration, as will by their own Canons and arguings prove the Roman Church to be no true visible Church at all; and so this Argument will be retorted on *H. R.* Let us go on to his second Argument, onely taking notice that he useth the term [*Ministers*] which other Papists do deride in the Protestants.

S E C T. II.

Isai 2.2. Matth. 5.14. Psal. 18. (with vs 19.) 4. prove not such a Church-visibility as H. T. asserts, nor the words of Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostom, Augustin.

A Light, saith H. T. always shining to the World, and a City so seated on a Hill that it cannot be hid, must needs be always visible. But the Church of Christ is a Light always shining to the World, and a City so seated on a Hill, that it cannot be hid, therefore the Church must needs be always visible. The Major is manifest by the very terms. The Minor is proved by Scripture; The Mountain of the House of our Lord shall be prepared on the top of Mountains, Isai 2.2. You are the Light of the World, a City seated on a Hill cannot be hid, St. Matth. 5.14. He hath put his Tabernacle (his Church) in the Sun, Psal. 18.4.

*Ans. T*hough the Conclusion might be granted in some sense, yet in the sense meant by the *Romanists* it is denied, and in the Argument the *Minor* is to be denied, and to the proof of it, it is denied that the Texts produced prove it. Not the first. For though the Prophecies, *Is. 2.2, 3.* be meant of *Christ* and the times of the *Messias*, yet, whether by the *Mountain* be meant *Mount Sion* properly, or the Church, or *Christ*, or the *Apostles*; it is certain, that it is meant of that time, wherein the Gospel was at first preached, to which sense *Hierome* expounds it, and the exaltation of the mountain of the Lords house is in respect of the first promulging of the Gospel, (in respect of which, neither at first, nor now is Rome exalted above the Hills) and therefore it is not meant of every particular Church visible, nor of such conspicuity in government and outward appearance as the *Romanists* maintain. The second Text *Matth. 5. 14.* is particularly meant of the *Apostles*, and such Preachers of the Gospel as continued that Work with them, or after them, and doth not foretell what shall be, but declares what they were in existence or duty rather, and their conspiracy is in respect of the Preaching of the Gospel. But this is not spoken of every particular, or the whole Church militant at all times, as if it were so visible, as that every *Christian* might know where to address themselves to them, and have resolution from them in their doubts. The other Text is left to the purpose, speaking of a *Tabernacle for the Sun*, not a *Tabernacle in the Sun*, the *Suns Tabernacle*, not *Gods, put in the Heavens*, (not on earth) as *Hierom* reads according to the *Hebrew*, although the *Septuagint* and *Vulgar* reads, as *H. T.* and *Augustin* in his allegorical way expound it of the Church. But it is frivolous upon *Augustin's* conceit in his *Enarration on the Psalms* to infer a Tenet from a place that hath quite another grammatical sense, which is only argumentative.

As for the sayings of Fathers, the words of *Irenæus lib. 4. advers. Hæres. cap. 45.* are not, that every true Church of *Christ* hath such a continued Succession, and so visible, as that every *Christian* may discern where to repair to it, but only in opposition to heretical Teachers tells us, *God hath set other Teachers in the Church, than those he there opposeth.*

Origen's words Hom. 3. on Matthew, shew what was in his time, not what must of necessity be, and are meant of brightness of doctrine or truth, not of outward glory in a conspicuous rule and state like some flourishing Empire.

Cyprian's words de unit. Eccles. are left to the purpose, being not concerning the visibility, but the unity of the Church, but in neither for the Romanists purpose. The words are thus, *Cut off the River from the Fountain, and being cut off it will be dry; so also the Church clothed with the light of the Lord spreads its beams through the whole World, yet it is one light, which is every where diffused, and yet the unity of the body not separated.*

Chrysostom's words Hom. 3. on Isai 6. are, *that the Church is more rooted than the Heaven, and then adds, let the Greeks learn the power of truth, how it is easier that the Sun should be extinguished, than that the Church should $\alpha\sigma\alpha\text{-}\nu\iota\sigma\tau\omega\mu\alpha$, that is not as H. T. renders it be obscured, but vanish away, as the words following shew, which are, Who had these things? He that preacheth hath founded, the Heaven and the Earth shall pass away, but my words shall not pass away. Whence it is manifest, that he there speaks not of the Churches visibility, but permanency as the Sun.*

Augustin lib. 3. cont. Parmen. cap. 5. tom. 7. against the Donatists saith thus, *Who therefore would not sit in the assembly of vanity, let him not become vain in the type of pride, seeking the Conventicles separate from the unity of the just of the whole world, which he cannot finde. But the just are through the whole City, which cannot be hid, because it is seated on a Mountain, that Mountain I say of Daniel, in whom that stone cut out without hands grew and filled the whole earth. And after, There is no security of unity but in the Church, declared by the promises of God, which being seated, as was said, on a Mountain, cannot be hid: and therefore it is necessary that it be known to all parts of the earth. By which it is manifest, that in opposition to the Donatists, appropriating the Church to their party, he asserts it to be manifest, not by its outward splendour, but its extension to all parts. The words l. 2. cont. Perilian. c. 104. are thus: Ye are not in the Mountains of Sion, because ye are not in the City seated on the Mountain, which hath this certain sign that it cannot be hid, therefore it is known to all Nations, but the part of Donatus is unknown to many Nations; therefore it is not that Church. It is evident he spake of the Church at that time, which was known or manifestly visible to all Nations, not from a potent Monarchy in one City, but its diffusion through all parts of the world.*

SECT. III.

H. T. hath not solved the Protestants Objections against the visibility of the Church.

H. T. adds, Objections solved. Object. The Church is believed, therefore not seen. Answ. She is believed in the sense of her Doctrines, and to be guided to all truths by the Holy Ghost, but seen in her Pastours, Government, and Preaching; wherefore I deny the Consequence.

I reply.

I Reply, Though Protestants deny not the Church militant to be visible in the outward Government and Preaching of the Pastors, yet they deny that it is always so conspicuous as that it may be known to every *Christian*, as an *Assembly of the People of Rome*, or *Common-wealth of Venice*, to which all may resort for direction. Nor by this Argument do they prove that the Church militant is not visible, but that the Church in the *Creds Apostolical and Nicene*, which is one *Catholick and Apostolick*, as such, is not visible, but invisible, being the Object of Faith, not of Sight: nevertheless the Answer takes not away the force of the Objection, if it had been alleged against the visibility of the Church militant. For the Church is believed, not as teaching, but as being, it is the existence of the Church, not the Doctrine of it that is believed, as even the *Trent Catechism* expounds it: now that being *Catholick*, that is according to the *Catechism, consisting of all believers from Adam till now in all Nations*, cannot be the object of sense, but of faith; and therefore the *Catholick Church in the Creds* is the invisible of true Believers, not the meer visible now militant.

H. T. adds, *Object. The Woman (the Church) fled into the Wilderuess, Apoc. 12. 6. Answ. But is followed and persecuted by the Dragon, v. 17. therefore visible.*

I reply, this Answer is ridiculous. For whereas Protestants hence prove, that at some times the Church is hid from men, this Authour saith, *It was not hid from the Dragon*, that is, the Devil, which is not in question. So that it appears he had nothing to answer this Inference, from the *Womans flying into the Wilderuess*, and being hid, that sometimes the Church is so hidden as it were in a Wilderuess, that though it be, yet it is not so visible or conspicuous as that men can discern it so as to repair to it, howbeit the Devil knows where they lurk.

Yet once more H. T. *Object. The Church of the Predestinate is invisible.*
 Answ. *There is no such thing as a Church of the Predestinate. Christ's Church is the congregation of all true believers, as well Reprobate as predestinate. There is in his Floor both Wheat and Chaff, St. Matth. c. 3. and in his Field both Corn and Tares, which shall grow together till the Harvest (the Day of Judgement) St. Matth. c. 13. The Predestinate are as visible as the Reprobate; It is true indeed, their Predestination is invisible, and so is also these mens Reprobation.*

I reply, To save their main Tenet of the Popes being Head of the Church of *Christ*, who is often so wicked as that, if the Church of *Christ* be determined to be of elect persons onely, many Popes cannot be termed Members, much less Heads of the Church, is this audacious Assertion invented, that *there is no such thing as a Church of the Predestinate*, contrary to express Scripture, which mentions *the Church of the first-born written in Heaven, Heb. 12. 23. and the Church elected together with Peter, or those he wrote to, 1 Pet. 5. 13. and saith such things of the Church in many places, to wit, Ephes. 5. 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32. Ephes. 1. 22, 23. &c.* as cannot agree to Reprobates, who cannot be said to be *Christ's body, his fulness, to be loved, sanctified, whom he nourisheth, intends to present without spot*, as he saith there of *Christ's Church*. He that desires more proof may read Dr. *John Rainold* his fourth *Conclusion*, where he proves it fully, both from Scripture and Fathers, that *the*

holy Catholick Church which we believe is the whole company of Gods elect and chosen, which hath not been yet answered that I know. Nor do I see how the fourth Lateran Council could mean otherwise, which determined, as H. T. saith here, *art. 1. pag. 30. that the universal Church of the faithfull is one out of which no man can be saved*, which can be true onely of the Church of the Predestinate. As for what H. T. saith here, *The Church of Christ is the congregation of all true believers as well Reprobate as Predestinate*, it supposeth true believers may be reprobate: but this is false, meaning it of the truth of being opposite to feigned, counterfeit, or in shew onely. For our Lord Christ hath said, *John 5. 24. & John 3. 15, 16, 18, 36.* that such as believe on him shall not perish, come not to condemnation, are passed from death to life, have everlasting life. Nor do the Texts *Matth. 3. 12.* where the Floor is not Christ's Church, but the Jewish people, or *Matth. 13. 30.* where the Field is expressly interpreted *vers. 38.* to be the World, not the Church, speak to the contrary. It is true, *The Predestinate are as visible as the Reprobate*, but they are not merely visible believers as some Reprobates are, who profess faith, which they have not. But the true Church of Christ against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail, *Matth. 16. 18.* contains onely such believers as have that faith which is true, and that Blession of God, which with their faith are invisible, and so are rightly denominated the invisible Church from that which is more excellent, and the Reprobate have not.

ART.



ARTIC. IV.

One Catholick Church not the Roman

The Church of Rome is not that one Catholick Church, which in the Apostolick and Nicene Creeds is made the Object of Christian Faith.

SECT. I.

Unity in non-fundamentals of Faith and Discipline is not essentially presupposed to the Universality of the Church Militant.

H. T. to his fourth Article gives this Title, The true Church demonstrated by her Unity and Universality; and then saith, Unity being essentially presupposed to Universality, I thought it not improper to joyn these two in one Article.

Ans. I F this Authour had meant to deal plainly, he should have told us what Unity is essentially presupposed to Universality, and how the true Church is demonstrated by her Unity and Universality. Unity in general is so far from being essentially presupposed to Universality in general, that the contrary seems more true, that one is not universal, Unity not consistent with Universality, it being in effect as if it were said, One is many or all; yet I deny not some unity in special may be essentially presupposed to some universality in special. There are many sorts of unity which Logicians and Writers of Metaphysics reckon up, in respect of which it is certain, that the true Church of Christ cannot be said to be one, as it cannot be said to be one with generical or specifical unity; for that is not essentially presupposed to universality of time and place, but is abstracted from it. But he seems to mean unity in Doctrine, Discipline, and Faith, by the words following. Universality likewise is manifold, as Logicians and Writers of Metaphysics shew, as there is an universality of predication, of essence, and existence. Now this Authour seems to mean universality of existence for time and place, and his meaning is this, that unity of Doctrine, Discipline, and Faith, is essentially presupposed to universality of existence

istence for time and place: that is, that Church which hath not the same Doctrine, Faith, and Discipline, which all Churches of *Christ* in all times and places have had, is not the true Church of *Christ*, and that which hath is the true Church of *Christ*. Now these Propositions I grant, if meant of Doctrine, and Faith in the Fundamentals, but not if meant of meer outward Church-discipline, or Doctrine, and Faith in points not fundamental, having learned from the Apostle, *1 Cor. 3. 11, 12, 13, 14.* that *some may build Hay and Stubble, that is, some errors upon the foundation Christ, who yet may be saved: which they could not be, if they were not of the true Church of Christ, or, that is no true Church of Christ, which consists of such.* In like manner, the Apostle *Rom. 14. 2.* expressly tells us in the Church of *Rome, one did believe he might eat all things, and another did eat herbs, one esteemed one day above another, others esteemed every day alike, and yet God received them both, and they were Gods servants, v. 3, 4, 5.* And that in Discipline there may be disagreement, yea, Schism, and disorder, is apparent from the Church of *Corinth, 1 Cor. 1. 11, 12. & 5. 1. & 6. 7. & 11. 17, &c. & 14. 26. & 15. 12.* who are termed the Church of God, *1 Cor. 1. 2.* And therefore without distinction and due limitation (which this Authour omits) his Position is not true. But let's view what he writes.

 S E C T. II.

The antiquity of H. T. his saying of the Roman Church its unity and universality is shewed.

Now, saith H. T. that the church of Rome is both perfectly one, and also universal for time and place is thus demonstrated.

Ans. **H**ere again this Authour deals sophistically, putting the Roman church for the true church, as if they were the same, and not explaining what he means by the Roman church, which may either signifie the church that is in Rome, which is the expression of the Apostle, *Rom. 1. 7.* or the Church where ever it be, which holds the Roman faith. And this Roman faith may be either the faith in all points which now at this day the Bishop, and Priests, and People, dwelling at Rome hold, or which the Christians at Rome held in the days of Paul, and some Ages after. If it be meant in this this last sense, the true Church is no more the Roman church than *Corinthian*, nor so much as the *Hierosolymitan*, whence all churches received the faith: if in the former sense, the term is not according to the ancient use either in Scripture or ancient Ecclesiastick Writers, though I conceive it so meant by this Authour. *To be perfectly one* is also ambiguous: it may be meant either that they have not the least disagreement in Doctrine, Discipline, and Faith, or they hold the same Faith and Doctrine in the main, or points fundamental. *To be universal for time and place*, may be either meant thus, that the persons now termed the Roman church are universal for time and place. But this is contrary to sense, it being known by it, that they were born within a certain definite time, at certain definite places, not in all times, and every place existent:

Rest: or that the faith which now the *Romanists* hold, is that which in all times and places the true church of God hath held. And this we deny if it be meant of the Articles in Pope *Pius* the fourth his Creed, and are willing to put all our controversies to this issue. But *H. T.* looks quite awry from this, as will appear by viewing his dispute, which is thus.

S E C T. III.

Unity under one visible head without division in lesser points and disciplin, is not proved from 1 Cor. 10. 17. Ephes. 1. 22, 23. John 10. 16. 1 Cor. 1. 10. Act. 4. 32. John 17. 11. and the Nicene Creed.

H. T. saith, *The argument for unity. The church of Christ is one body, one fold or flock (of which he himself is the supreme invisible head, and the Pope his deputy on earth the visible or ministerial) But the Roman Catholick church and no other is this one body, one fold or flock; therefore the Roman Catholick church and no other is the church of Christ. The Major is proved, We are one bread and one body as many as participate of one bread. 1 Cor. 10. 18. He hath made him (Christ) head over all the Church which is his body. Ephes. 1. 22, 23. There shall be made one fold and one Pastor. John 10. 16. I beseech you, that you all speak one thing, and that there be no Schisms among you, but that ye be perfect in one sense and one judgement. 1 Cor. 1. 10. The multitude of believers had one heart, one soul. Act. 4. 32. Christ prayed that his Disciples might be one. St. John 17. 11. I believe one holy Catholick and Apostolick church. The Nicene Creed.*

Ans. 1. **T**he thing pretended to be demonstrated by her unity, was the true church, after he changeth it into this, that the church of Rome is both perfectly one, and also universal for time and place is thus demonstrated, here the conclusion is the Roman Catholick church and no other is the church of Christ. By comparing of which it is apparent, that this Author supposeth the true church, the church of Rome, and the Roman Catholick church to be synonymous or diverse names of the same thing, which is supposed but not proved, nor yielded, nor can be true, as shall be shewed after. 2. This Author pretends to demonstrate by this argument, the church of Rome to be perfectly one, which should have been his conclusion, whereas not heeding his words he makes it the Minor. 3. He puts in by a parenthesis in the Major many words which are not in the Minor, though they belong to the middle term, which should be the same in both premises: nor is any proof brought for them here; to wit, that the Pope is Christes deputy on earth, the visible or ministerial head of that church, which is one body, one fold or flock. 4. That the Major might be for his purpose it should have been thus; that church which is one body, one fold or flock (of which he himself is the supreme invisible head, and the Pope his deputy on earth the visible or ministerial) and no other is the church of Christ, but such is the church of Rome, ergo. But as it is now framed it is in the second figure of all affirmatives, which is against Logick rules, and makes the syllogism naught, as the very freshmen know. But to it as it is now framed

Answer. If the words [*and the Pope his deputy on earth the visible or ministerial*] be lett out, the *Major* is granted in this sense, that the universal church of Christ are one body by unity of one spirit and faith of the fundamentals, and one flock by unity of one head, and supreme Pastor. But in *H. T.* this sense it is most false, that it is one by the same faith in every point without any difference in lesser points, or without any divisions in rites and disciplin, and in subjection to one universal Bishop on earth, as Christs deputy and the churches visible head. Nor do any of the texts prove it in this sense. For the first doth not expresse what all Christians were in respect of their state; but profession, and the unity is not derived from either subjection to one universal Bishop on earth, or agreement in all points, but from participating of one bread in the Lords Supper. For it is not to be read as this Author after the vulgar translation reads it [*as many as partecipe of one bread*] but [*for we all partake of one bread*] it being in Greek *οἱ πάντες* and in some copies of the vulgar [*nam omnes*] as in the *Plantin* edition by the *Lovain* Divines 1574. I finde it in the margin: so that the meaning is this, we do shew our selves one body, one bread, forasmuch as we all partake of one bread in the Lords Supper.

The next text, *Ephes. 1. 22, 23.* proves only that the church is one body by unity of one head, to wit *Christ*, as *H. T.* rightly interprets it. And the third text, *John 10. 16.* also makes the whole church one flock (as it should be read) not one fold, in respect of one Pastor, which the very words, *ver. 11. 14, 15, 16.* do shew plainly to be Christ himself, who gave his life for them, and no other; and therefore none of these texts derive the unity of the church from subjection to the Bishop of *Rome* as visible head or chief Pastor. The next text, *1 Cor. 1. 10.* doth only prove that the church ought to be of one mind and one judgement without Schisms, not that they are, or must be, if they be the true church, but the text proves the contrary, that they may be a true church though there be Schisms, and difference of judgement among them. The fifth, *Acts 4. 32.* only proves that the church at *Jerusalem* once were so (at which time they had also all things common, which doubtless *H. T.* will not say must or doth agree to the whole church at all times) but not that the whole church shall be so still. The last, *John 17. 11.* is a prayer of Christ that it may be so, and so will be accomplished, but by the words, *ver. 21, 22, 23.* it seems most likely not to be till they be consummate in glory; or if afore, yet certainly the unity cannot be meant of unity in every thing; for so *Peter* and *Paul* did not agree, as *Gal. 2. 11, 12, 13, 14.* it appears, but of such unity in communion with God, and aiming at his glory, as is only in the elect by vertue of Christs indwelling by his Spirit: which is nothing to the unity which *H. T.* here requires as peculiar to the *Roman* church. The passage of the *Nicene* creed proves only an unity of the church, but not an unity by agreement in all points and subjection to one Catholick Bishop on earth. So that *H. T.* after his fashion cites many texts, but not one for his purpose.

S E C T. IV.

It is notoriously false that the Romanists are perfectly one, or have better unity, or means of unity than Protestants, and H. T. his argument for the truth of the Roman church from its unity proves the contrary.

H. T. adds. *The minor is made evident (even to the weakest understanding) by the present manifold Schisms and divisions, which are now among Protestants and all other Sectaries, as well in doctrine as government, whereas Catholics are perfectly one both in disciplin and doctrine, all the world over, even to the least Article or point of faith, being all united to one supreme invisible head, Christ Jesus, and all subordinate to one visible and ministerial head, the Pope his Vicar on earth; we all resolve our selves in points of faith into one safe and most unchangeable principle, I believe the holy Catholick church, we look on her as the immediate and authorized proponent of all revealed verities, and the infallible Judge of controversies; God himself being the prime Author, and his authority the formal motive and object of our faith.*

Ans. 1. The Protestants are not Sectaries nor divided from the Catholick church, but from the now Roman party, who are really a faction divided from the Catholick church holding a new faith never established till the *Tridentin* council, though with an impudent face *H. T.* avouch a most palpable falsehood of the *Romanists* universality, and arrogates to the *Roman* the title of Catholick church. Nor are the now divisions of Protestants in doctrine or government such as cut them off from the unity of the Catholick church, they own Christ their head, and faith in him, which is sufficient to save them, and even by this Authors next argument, enough to make them members of the Catholick church. *2.* The Schisms and divisions of the Papists have been and are as great as the divisions of the Protestants. In former ages there were many Schisms even in the church of *Rome* between the several Popes at one time, and the factions among the people about Popes and Emperours and other quarrels. *Onuphrius* reckons up thirty. *Bellarmin* himself twenty six Schisms one after another, sometimes one Pope condemning what another had done, and excommunicating and persecuting Emperours, Antipopes, and all that have adhered to them. Besides the contentions about the *Virgin Mariæ* immaculate conception, about the superiority of a council above the Pope, about Priests marriages, election of Popes, investiture of Bishops have been so great, and frequent, and of long continuance, as their own histories shew, that they far exceed the Protestants divisions. The divisions in this last age, and some at this day, to wit, in and since the council of *Trent* between *Catharinus*, *Soto*, *Vega*, *Andradisius* about certainty of salvation; *Pighius* and others about inherent righteousness, the *Spanish* and other Bishops and the *Papalins* about the divine right of Bishops and their residence, not deriving their Episcopacy from the Pope; the *French* churches not acknowledging the Bishop of *Rome* above a council, nor yet receiving the *Trent* council: the two Popes *Sixtus* the fifth and *Clement* the eighth, about the vulgar translation both enjoying each of their editions and no other, as the right copy to be received under penalty of a curse, though one in many places contradict the other (as

Dr. James in his *Bellum Papale* shews, from which no Papists have or can vindicate the two Popes) the divisions in England and Ireland between the secular Priests and the Jesuits about Episcopal jurisdiction and visitations, between Papists in Italy, at Venice, and in England about the Popes power in temporal things over Princes, in France and England about the lawfulness of killing Kings excommunicated by the Pope, in England and France about Jesuitical equivocation, at this day between Dominicans and Jesuits, *Fansenists* and *Molinists* about Gods predeterminations, efficacious and sufficient grace, and mans freewill have been and are at this day as great or greater in respect of the things in which they differ, the continuance of them, the parties differing and their bitterness one to another, then the Protestants divisions, and therefore the brag of H. T. concerning the Popish unity, that *Catholicks* are perfectly one both in discipline and doctrine all the world over, even to the least article or point of faith, is a falshood apparent to all well read scholars, though the simple English Papists, from whom the truth of these things is concealed, are made to believe by their Priests disguises and pretences as if it were so. Nor doth that which H. T. here saith, save the matter, and if it did, the Protestants have as good a plea for themselves, notwithstanding their divisions, in respect of means for unity. For, 1. The Papists all the world over are not so subordinate to the Pope as to acknowledge his superiority to a council, but that they have and think they may appeal from the Pope to a general council, which may judge the Pope an heretick and depose him, yea and take away the Pope altogether if they see it necessary, nor do the *Fansenists* acquiesce in the late Pope *Innocents* determination at this day, nor do the *Sorbonists* in France acknowledge the Popes power in temporals, or the *Venetians* the Popes power to interdict their state and meddle with their government in exempting Ecclesiasticks from their jurisdiction. 2. That which he saith of the *Catholick church* as the immediate and authorized proponent of all revealed verities, and the infallible Judge of controversies is either nonsense or false, or that which Papists reject in Protestants. If they mean by the *Catholick church* the Pope, or the Pope with his Cardinals, or a council, it is ridiculous nonsense to call any or all of them the *Catholick church*, which, according to their own *Tridentin Catechism*, contains all believers from Adam to this day, or that shall be hereafter, and according to this Author, p. 59. is coexistent with all times, and spread or diffused over all places; or if it be understood according to good sense, it is most false. For the *Catholick church* properly so called as it is in the Creed, is neither mediate nor immediate proponent of all revealed verities, much less authorized thereto, nor do Papists so look on them. For many of the Papists go no further than the present Pope or council, or their Priests, (who only are to most the immediate proponents) but rest in their determinations and adhere to what they determine with an implicate faith and blind obedience, never enquiring what all believers have held or done before them. Nor is it possible they should have resolution from the *Catholick church* properly understood as in the Creed it is believed: for it is invisible, they never did together express their determination in all points of faith, have varied in many, nor could it be known to others of their own time if they had, much less so the believers of this age. Nor is the *Catholick church* fit to be the mediate or immediate proponent of all revealed verities, nor fit for such an authority

as to be infallible Judge of controversies: for to say the Catholick church is such, is to say the universality of believers is such, of whom a great part are women, a great part ignorant persons altogether uncapable of such an office: yea it is contrary to the Apostle Pauls resolution, 1 Cor. 12. 28, 29. who tells us, *that God hath set some in the Church, first Apostles, then Prophets, thirdly Teachers,* not the church to be teachers, which is all one with proponents of revealed verities, but teachers in the church: and these are denied to be all the church, when he saith, ver. 29. *Are all teachers?* And to make them infallible is contrary to the Apostle. Rom. 3. 4. where he saith, *let God be true, and every man a liar,* surely then not an infallible Judge of controversies: yea should this be granted, it would bring all confusion into the churches of God. Nor can the speech have any good sense, that *the Catholick church is Judge in controversies,* but this which Protestants indeed rightly teach, that every man is to judge for himself, not for others with a judgement of discerning what doctrine or points of faith he hears, and receives, yet requiring upon pain of damnation that they be careful in examining what they embrace, which the Papists do so much inveigh against falsely, as if it were a leaving every man to his private spirit, though they do in this no otherwise than Papists must of necessity, yeild to each man when the determinations of Popes and councils are ambiguous, as they were in the council of Trent, and are often in the Decrees, Breves and other edicts of Popes, as is manifest by the writers on the Canon law, and disputes about the councils and Popes meaning, in which are so many ambiguities that there is scarce a point in which there are not many opposite opinions. If Pappus have overcounted, who reckons out of Bellarmins alone two hundred thirty seven contradictions in Popish writers; yet he that reads Bellarmins controversies, shall finde very few questions, in which the Schoolmen and other Papists do not gainsay each other. And as for their resolution into the principle, *I believe the Catholick church.* They are not agreed what the church is from whom they may have resolution, whether the Pope, who is with them the church virtual, or a general council, which is either never, or very rare, which they call the church representative, or the uniform consent of the Fathers, according to which only the profession of faith of Pope Pius the fourth requires all Papists to receive and expound the holy Scriptures: and yet this uniform consent of Fathers is either a nullity, it being scarce found in any point, or it is impossible to be known. H. P. by his words pag. 108. resolves his faith into the next precedent age and so upwards, and here pag. 30. into the church, and this church is, pag. 70. *not the whole church* (which yet is all one with the Catholick) *but a council approved by the Pope,* into whose authority they finally resolve their faith; for though they pretend to resolve it into the Scripture, yet as it is expounded by the church, pag. 109, 113. which is the Pope. So that whatever pretence they make of resolving their faith into the church as the proponent, or God as the Author; in conclusion they acquiesce in what the Pope dictates by himself or with a council approved by him. As for the Scriptures the Papists are not all agreed which be the Canonical Scriptures, which nor: nor can they set down certain rules to know what are the unwritten traditions of the church, which they are to admit and embrace with a like affection of piety as the written Word, as the Trent council decreed, sess. 4. nor can they have any bottom to rest on by their principles; sometimes one

Pope and one council crossing another, some having been condemned in general councils as hereticks: nor can they tell, but by information of others, as Priests or Carriers, of their Bulls or Breves (which are many of them not only fallible, but also false, as some of their own have complained) what the Popes determine, and what fraud is used in procuring Popes Bulls or Breves sometimes is many ways testified, as that the Bull of *Pius* the fifth, wherein *Queen Elizabeth* was excommunicated and deprived, was gotten in a fraudulent way by *Morton* and *Webb*; there is no certainty from the reports of others what the Pope determines, except a man hear him preach, or pronounce sentence, or

Watson quodlib. p. 252, 260, 343.

see him write and seal, he must rely on the testimony of those that may and are like enough to deceive. Nor if a man see or hear the Pope decree, can he be certain whether he *spake from Peters chair*, or determine what is to be believed by the whole church (out of which case they say he is fallible) or give his opinion as a private Doctor. So that it is most false, that either Papists agree as *H. T.* saith, or resolve themselves into one safe and most unchangeable principle, or have any infallible judge of controversies, or have God himself for the prime Author, and his authority the formal object and motive of their faith: but their faith in what they differ from us rests only on mens sayings, for the most part ignorant and wicked (for such have been most of the Popes for a thousand years) whom they follow against the plain and confessed words of the Scripture, as in their communion under one kinde, worshipping of Images, and ascribe to them power by their authority to declare new Scriptures and Articles of faith, and make the Scripture only to be believed because of the churches determination, that is the Popes, which in respect of us they make of more authority than the Scripture, and so make the churches, not Gods authority, the formal motive and object of their faith. So that if unity be a note of the church, of all others the Popish church can lay least claim to it, and *H. T.* his argument may be retorted. The Catholick church is one, the *Roman* church is not one, therefore the *Roman* church is not the Catholick church. On the other side the Protestants have better unity and means of unity than Papists. For however they differ in ceremonies and discipline, yet in points of faith they differ little, as may appear by the *harmony of their confessions*, which shews agreement in their churches; however in explication of points private Doctors differ, and they have a more sure principle and safe in owning one Master even *Christ*, and one certain rule to know the minde of God, to wit the holy Scripture, which the Papists themselves make the object of faith, and the translation into the *English* tongue makes plain in the chief points to be believed, so that every ordinary man may be certain what it delivers concerning them, and this translation appears to be certain in those things, by comparing it even with the Papists own *English* translation at *Rhemes* and *Domy*, which had they left out their corrupt Annotations and permitted it to be read (as God requires) by all sorts of persons, the falshood and errors of Popish Priests would soon appear, and be rejected by all that love truth.

S E C T. V.

The argument of H. T. from the unity of a natural body, is against him and for Protestants.

But H. T. adds a second argument for the unity of the Catholick church thus. As a natural unity and connexion of the parts among themselves, and to the head is necessary for the being and conservation of a natural body: so the spiritual unity and connexion of the members amongst themselves and to the head, is necessary for the being and conservation of a mystical body. But the church of Christ (as I have proved) is a mystical body. Therefore a spiritual unity and connexion of the members amongst themselves and to the head, is necessary for the being and conservation of the church of Christ. The Major is proved by the parity of reason, which is between a natural and mystical body; for as a natural body must needs dye, if all it's parts by which it should subsist be torn and divided one from another; so also a mystical body perishes, if all it's members be divided from one another, and from the head (whence it hath it's spiritual life) by Schism and heresie.

Ans. **T**Hough it be that this argument is only from a similitude, which doth only illustrate not prove, as Logicians say truly, and there be such disparities between a natural body and a mystical, as are sufficient to shew the weaknes of this arguing; as namely, that there are no parts vital in the mystical body besides the head, as the heart, liver and lungs are in the natural, that some parts of the head it self may be cut off, as the ears, and nose, and yet the being, though not the integrity of the body continue, that there are some parts that have not life, as hair, and nayles, (as some conceive) that the parts receive not life from the head, but the head and the rest from the soul: yet sith the conclusion is true, and the argument with its proof many wayes against the Popish tenets, I grant it, and observe, 1. That the unity which is proved hence, is not of the universal visible church; the truth of which Papists and this Author go about to demonstrate by it's unity, but of the mystical. For in this mystical body the unity is spiritual by faith, and the members have spiritual life from the head. But in the Catholick church (of which the disputes are) according to *Bellarmin. l. 3. de eccl. milit. c. 10. &c.* are many dead members, secret infidels: so that this argument proves not the Catholick visible by it's unity, but the Catholick invisible of true believers. 2. This argument is not to prove the unity of the church by subjection to the Roman Bishop, by which H. T. would demonstrate the unity of the church, but by the unity to that head whence the body hath it's spiritual life and motion, which sure is Christ only and not the Bishop of Rome. 3. This similitude, if by [head] were meant the Pope, cannot evince the purpose of this Author. For there have been Schisms in the Roman church of one Pope and his party against another, and yet the unity of the Catholick church in the profession of the same faith continued. Whence it follows, that Schism doth not take away the unity of the church Catholick without heresie, but only disorder, distemper and disquiet it. And therefore though it were granted (as it is not) that Protestants

restants were Schismatics in dividing from the See of Rome, yet they might be united to the Catholick church, and it's being and conservation continued as long as the unity of faith is continued, and untill it be proved that Protestants have departed from the unity of faith once delivered to the Saints (which he can never do) in vain doth H. T. go about to prove they are not united to the Catholick church.

S E C T. VI.

The universality, which Matth. 28. 20. Eph. 4. 12, 13. Luk. 1. 33. John 14. 15, 16. for time, Psal. 85. 9. Isa. 2. 2. Matth. 28. 20. for place is meant, agrees not to the now Roman church, but better to the Protestants.

But H. T. proceeds thus. *To be universal for time and place is nothing else but to be coexistent with all time, and to be spread or diffused over all places. But the church of Christ from the time he hath founded it hath been coexistent with all time, and shall be to the worlds end, and hath and shall be spread over all nations, therefore the church of Christ is universal (or Catholick) for time and place. The Major is proved because the definition and the thing defined are convertible. The Minor is proved by Scripture for time, St. Matth. 28. 20. Ephes. 4. 12, 13. St. John 14. 15, 16. St. Luke 1. 33. For place, Psal. 85. 9. Isa. 2. 2. St. Matth. 28. 20.*

Ans. 1. The conclusion should have been, the Roman Catholick church and no other is the church of Christ, and the argument thus. That church which is universal for time and place, and no other is the church of Christ. But the Roman Catholick church and no other is universal for time and place, therefore the Roman Catholick church and no other is the church of Christ. But so the Major had not been true of any church existent in one age, nor the Minor true of the present Roman church; but it is contrary to all sense and histories which relate the occurrences of the world, specially in the churches of Christ. *2.* As the argument is framed here by H. T. the conclusion is granted being thus understood, that the church of Christ is not confined to Israel only, but extended to all Nations indefinitely and aptitudinally, though not definitely and actually extended to every Nation. For some nations never were actually the church of Christ, nor any church of Christ among them, though there was no restraint by Christs command of preaching to them. But if it be understood of actual coexistence with all times and all places so the Minor is not true: nor the Major, as I conceive the meaning of the term [Catholick] in the Article of the Creed, *I believe the holy Catholick church:* nor is that the definition of the church Catholick, that it is actually coexistent with all time, and to be spread or diffused over all places: but it is termed Catholick, because it is not confined to one Nation, and comprehends all the believers of any Nation, Jew or Gentile; nor do the texts he brings prove any other universality. For Matth. 28. 20. proves not such an universality, as that there shall be no interval of time or particular place, wherein the church shall not be existent. But that Christ would be with them that preach the Gospel all dayes till the end of the world, so as that they had liberty to preach

the Gospel in every place, and should finde his assistance while they did preach, not that alwayes in each day there shall be a Church of Christ on earth, much lesse that there shall be a church visible conspicuously to all in every Nation of the earth. The like is the sense of *Ephes. 4. 12, 13.* which is, that Christ hath given various gifts till all come to the unity of faith: but this proves not there shall be a continuance of the Church on earth in every age, much lesse so conspicuously visible as that it may be known to all, much more lesse in every place. *John 14. 15, 16.* is yet farther from the purpose as containing a peculiar promise to the Apostles: if it be meant of any Church it is the invisible of true believers, not of every or any meer visible Church, wherein many have not the spirit of Christ at all, much lesse abiding with them for ever. The text *Luke 1. 33.* doth not prove that there shall be in every age or time a Church on earth, but that Christs dominion shall never end. The texts *Psal. 85. 9. Isa. 2. 2.* are thus meant, that not only the Jews, but also all Nations, that is, all other people by faith shall be admitted to the Church of God by faith as well as Jews; now this proves not, that there shall be in every place on earth a Church of Christ. But *H. P.* adds.

I resume the Argument and make it thus. 1. That church which is not universal (or Catholick) for time and place is not the church of Christ. 2. But the Protestant church (and the like may be said of all other Sectaries) is not universal (or Catholick) for time and place. 3. Therefore the Protestant church is not the church of Christ. The Major hath been proved before. The Minor is proved, because before Luther (who lived little above sixscore years ago) there were no Protestants to be found in the whole world, as hath been proved by us, and confessed by our adversaries. To which you may adde, they have never yet been able to convert any one Nation from infidelity to the faith of Christ, nor ever had communion with all nations, nor indeed any perfect communion among themselves: therefore they cannot be the Catholick Church.

Ans. The Major, *That church which is not universal for time and place is not the Church of Christ,* if meant of actual or aptitudinal universality is not true. For the church of the Jews afore *Cornelius* was converted by *Peter* had been no church of Christ, which was actually, yea and aptitudinally, that is according to *Peters* and other Christians circumscribed their opinions and intentions to be confined to the Jews: and therefore no other church than on earth were or was believed by *Peter* and those who contended with him, *Act. 11. 2.* and yet there was a Church of Christ before, as is manifest from *Act. 2. 47.* But if the Major be understood of universality of faith thus, *That church which is not universal for time and place by holding the faith once delivered by the Apostles to the Saints is not the church of Christ,* it is granted: but in that sense the Minor is false, *the Protestants church is universal for time and place:* that is, holds the same faith, which was in all places preached by the Apostles and Apostolical teachers to believers. And in this sense Protestants have been in every age before *Luther*, and have as really converted Nations from infidelity to the faith of Christ as the Popish church or Teachers, and have had more perfect communion with all Nations and among themselves then Papists, as such, have had, and the Papists have not been so, but have held a new faith, not embraced by a great part of Christians, nor in all places received or known, nor for many hundreds of years taught in the churches, but lately by the *Italian* faction.

faction devised to uphold the Popes tyranny and their own gain. And therefore I retort the argument thus. That church which is not universal (or Catholick) for the time and place, is not the church of Christ. But the Popish *Roman* church is not universal (or Catholick) for time and place, but is of late standing, therefore it is not the true church of Christ.

SECT. VII.

The words of Irenæus, Origen, Lactantius, Cyril of Hierusalem, Augustin are not for the universality of H. T. which he asserts the Catholicism of the Roman church, but against it.

AS for the words of the Fathers, which *H. T.* allegeth on this Article, they are not for *H. T.* his purpose to prove, that that is the only true church which is subject to the Bishop of Rome, or that the *Roman* church is the Catholick church, but they prove the contrary. For the words of *Irenæus* l. 4. adv. hæreses c. 43. are these. *Wherefore we ought to obey those Presbyters which are in the church, those which have succession from the Apostles as we have shewed, who with the succession of Bishoprick have received the certain gift of truth according to the pleasure of the Father: but to have the rest suspected either as hereticks and of evil opinion, or as renters and lifted up and pleasing themselves, or again as hypocrites working for gain and vain glories sake, who depart from the original succession and are gathered in every place. For all these fall from the truth.* By which it may be perceived. 1. That *H. T.* omitted lundry words which would have shewed that Presbyters and Bishops were all one. 2. That *Irenæus* requires that those to whom he would have obedience given, be such as have not only succession of place, but also *the certain gift of truth.* Whence it follows. 1. That this speech doth not prove that we are to obey only the Bishop of Rome, or the *Roman* Church, but any Presbyters. 2. That the succession required is not confined to Rome, but extended to any place. 3. That succession to any of the Apostles as well as *Peter* is termed original succession. 4. That Presbyters who in any place depart not from the truth are in the church. And therefore this place is so far from proving the necessity of unity with the *Roman* church, or that it is the Catholick church, that it proves the contrary.

The words of *Origen* are not for *H. T.* which require no other doctrine to be kept, but that which is by order of succession from the Apostles, and remains in the church to his time. For neither do they say, the church is only the *Roman* church, nor that doctrine to be kept which remains in it, or that which is delivered from *Peter* only, or by order of succession from his chair, or is delivered by unwritten tradition: but that which is delivered any way from the Apostles by succession in any place.

The words of *Lactantius* are lesse for *H. T.* which do not at all call the *Roman* the Catholick church, nor say in it only is Gods true worship and service and hope of life, but in the Catholick church, that is the Church of true believers all over the world, as the words of *Cyril of Hierusalem* next alleged do shew, in which is nothing for *H. T.* or against us.

And

And for the words of *Augustin* in his Book *de vera religione*, cap. 7. We must hold the communion of that church which is called catholick both by her own and strangers, they are maimedly recited, *Augustin* saying, that we are to hold the Christian Religion and communion of that church, not onely which is named catholick, but which is catholick, and is named catholick; and cap. 6. he explains what is meant by *Catholick church*, per totum orbem valide latèque diffusa, spread over the whole World firmly and largely, and of the Religion which he terms the *History and Prophecy* of the temporal dispossession of the divine Providence for the salvation of mankind to be reformed and repaired unto eternal life. Whereby it may be perceived, that he neither accounted that *Christian Religion*, which is about the *Bishop of Rome's* power, or any of the *Popish Tenets* which *Protestants* deny, but the *Doctrine* of Salvation by *Christ*, nor the catholick church the *Roman* onely, but the *Christian church* throughout the World, which consists of them, who are named *Christians*, *Catholicks*, or *Orthodox*, that is, *Keepers of integrity*, and *followers of the things which are right*, as he speaks cap. 5. And for the words of *Augustine*, *Epist. 152.* that whosoever is divided from the catholick church, how laudable soever he seems to himself to live, &c. he shall be excluded from life, they are impudently appropriated to the *Roman church*. For a few lines before *Augustine* declares whom he calls the catholick church, that which is spread over the earth, which is designed by the divine testimonies of holy Scriptures, which beginning from *Hierusalem* increased in places in which the *Apostles* preached, and have written the names of the same places in their *Epistles* and *Acts*, and was spread over the other *Nations*. So that clearly *Augustine* tells us it was not the *Roman Church* onely which he meant by the *Catholick*, but also the *Corinthian*, *Ephesian*, *Thessalonian*, and all the rest in the world. And therefore it is apparent that neither this nor any other *Father* understood by the *Catholick Church*, the *Roman* onely, and those who acknowledged the *Bishop of Rome's* Supremacy, nor did they hold a necessity of union with it.

S E C T. VIII.

That it is non-sense or falshood to term the *Roman Church* the *Catholick Church*, and the *shifes* of *H. T.* to avoid this *Objection* are discovered.

H. T. adds, *Object.* The *Roman Catholick Church* is a particular Church, therefore it is not *Catholick* or *Universal*. *Ans.* I distinguish your *Antecedent*, the *Roman Church* as taken onely for the congregation of *Rome* or *Italy*, is a particular Church, I grant: as taken for the whole collection of Churches holding communion with the *See of Rome*, I deny it. For so it is an *universal Church* containing all particular Churches, as all the parts are contained in the whole, and in this acception also it is called the *Roman church*, because the particular *Roman church* is the mother church, and hath a power of headship and jurisdiction over all the rest. *Object.* How can a church of one denomination be universal? *Ans.* I have told you already