

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 validè 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 Augustin, Epist. 52. 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 Augustin 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 Augustin 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 shiftes 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. Answ. 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? Answ. I have told you already

by the extent and latitude of her power, which is over all. So a particular man is called a General, by reason of his power over all the Army.

I Reply, Protestants do rightly object; that the terming of the *Roman church* catholic, is according to the right sense of words, to speak contradictions, to call that the whole which is not the whole but a part, universal, which is only particular. The Answer is by a Distinction, which is meer non-sense. The Church of Rome as taken only for the congregation of Rome or Italy is a particular Church, as taken for the whole collection of churches holding communion with the See of Rome, so it is universal. But was ever such language used by any Apostle or Ancient to term the Church of Rome any other than the believers dwelling or being at Rome? Did ever any of the first Ages term the congregation of Italy, or the whole collection of churches holding communion with the See of Rome the Roman church? Paul when he wrote to the Church of Rome wrote to all that were in Rome, Rom. 1.7. and Ignatius the Martyr when he wrote to the Church of Rome terms it, the Church which is seated in a place of the Region of Romans, and the old Councils termed the Bishop of Rome, The Arch-bishop of old Rome, to distinguish it from new Rome, and a Roman Synod is always meant of a Synod in the City of Rome. If the new-minted gibberish of these men be received, then the Church of Millain, of Paris, of Toledo, and the rest are all one with the Roman Church, and the Bishop of Millain, &c. the Bishop of Rome. Who would not think that man crazed that should talk or write so? By this kinde of talk the Roman Church should not be one and the Corinthian another, but the Corinthian should write to the Roman Church, charging the Corinthian with Schisms should charge the Roman. But this new canting Language is fit for these Juglers, who have by such terms bewitched silly Papists to receive their new Doctrine.

H. T. saith, As the Roman church is the collection of all churches holding communion with the See of Rome, so it is an universal church containing all particular churches as all the parts are contained in the whole.

I reply, Neither doth he shew any approved Authour for his speech, nor what sort of parts other particular Churches are as they are contained in the Roman as the whole. He will not make it an universal whole which is predicate or said on more churches, in quid, that is, when the question is what the more churches are? to say they are the Roman. For then it were true to say, the church of Naples is the Roman, and so of other churches. If any were asked who is in his wits, What is the church of Naples? Would he say, It is the church of Rome? Nor are other churches essential parts. For then the Roman church should not be, if the churches of Naples, &c. were not: if they apostatize the church of Rome ceaseth to be. Nor will it be said, other churches are integral parts. For then the church of Rome should be maimed, and be but half a church, if they revolted from the faith or obedience to the See or church of Rome. What other parts he means I understand not, nor do I think H. T. distinctly knows himself; but that he is used to this unintelligible Jesuitical non-sense of *Roman catholic church*. Sure before he made this
the

ART. IV. *one Catholick Church not the Roman.* 83

the definition of catholick, that it is nothing else but to be coexistent with all time, and to be spread or diffused over all places: according to which, by terming the church of Rome catholick, he should mean that the Roman church hath been in all places since Christ built his church, and in every place of the world: but both these are palpable Lies, contrary to all Histories and sense: nor in this sense should it be as a whole that hath parts, but be the onely and an ubiquetary church.

But he gives two Reasons of this Title, that it is the Mother Church, and hath power of headship and jurisdiction over all the rest. I reply, 1. that both these are manifestly false. For the Roman Church is not the mother Church in any true sense. It is a saying indeed, that God is a believers Father, and the Church his Mother. But however the Ancients have used it; yet the Scripture saith not so, nor is it in any good sense true. For the church is but a congregation of believers, who are first such afore they are a church: now then the sense must be the church, that is, believers are the mother of believers, that is, the church, which is ridiculous. It is true, it is said, *Gal. 4. 26. The Jerusalem which is above is free, which is the mother of us all*: but that is the Evangelical covenant, *v. 24.* not the church. Nor is there any thing done by the Church, or upon the church, from which in a meer resemblance the church may be termed the mother of believers. They are the Preachers of the Gospel not the church who bring forth souls to Christ. If the term [*Mother Church*] be from hence, that from it the Gospel went forth, it can be meant of none but *Jerusalem*, from whence the Gospel went into all the world, not from the Roman church. Nor is it true, that the Roman church hath the power of headship over all the rest, no not according to the Papists own opinion, which is that the Bishop of Rome hath this power, and that it belongs to his pastoral office: now I suppose they will not say the church hath the pastoral office, or that they are Pastors; if they should, they must make Women, who are of the Church as well as Men, Pastors, and all the Believers (who are the church) Pastors as well as the Bishop, and if the church be Pastors or have power of jurisdiction, who are the Sheep who are to be fed, and over whom this jurisdiction is to be exercised? But if they mean onely by the church universal the Pope of Rome, then all that is to be enquired is who is the true Pope, when enquiry is made which is the true church, and when there is no Pope, then there is no church, and when the Pope is uncertain, it is uncertain which is the church. So ridiculous is the Papists talk and dispute about the church, that there is no tolerable sense can be made with truth of the Roman church being catholick, the mother of churches, having power of Headship and Jurisdiction over all churches. Nor is it true, that the Pope of Rome hath either of right or in possession such power; not of right, as shall be shewed *art. 7.* where it will appear that the claim to it is merely impudent, and arrogant, without any colour of right; nor in possession. For besides the Protestant churches, the Greek churches neither now nor heretofore, when unquestionably orthodox, were ever subject to the Romish Bishop. Yet were these things granted to H. T. that the Roman church were Mother and Head, is this a fit reason to term it catholick? Will any call a mother of twenty children all her twenty children? Will any man call *Julius Caesar*, because *Dictator* of Rome, or the Ro-

man Senate, because Rulers, all the Roman people, or all the people of that Empire? H. T. his instance is frivolous: Though men call the Rulers of an Army the Captain General, yet not a general man, or the universal Army; and surely, if it were allowed, that the Bishop of Rome were universal Bishop, yet in no good sense could he or the Roman church be termed the universal church. But this talk about the Roman catholick church is manifestly ridiculous non-sense or false.

H. T. adds, *Object. You communicate not with us, and many others, therefore your communion is not catholick or universal.* Answ. I grant the Antecedent, but deny the Consequent: For universal communion requires not communion with all particular sects or persons, but onely with all true believers, no, A man that is an Heretick after the first and second admonition avoid. Tit. 3. 10, 11.

Answ. To catholick communion is requisite communion with all Christian churches, though not with all particular sects. And that the Protestant churches are no Hereticks is manifest from their confessions, which agree with the Scripture Doctrine; although Papists do clamorously term them such, and destroy them as such, and therein shew themselves Successours to Nero, not to Peter; whereas Papists are the most manifest Schismatics, and greatest Hereticks that ever were. I pass on to the next Article.

ART.

ARTIC. V.

The *Roman Church* is neither proved to be the Catholick Church, nor the highest visible Judge of Controversies, nor is it proved that she is infallible both in her Propositions and Definitions of all Points of Faith; nor to have power from God to oblige all men to believe her under pain of damnation: but all this is a meer impudent and arrogant claim of *Romanists* that hath no colour of proof from Scripture or Antiquity.

S E C T. I.

The deceit of H. T. is shewed in asserting an Infallibility and Judicature of Controversies in the Church, which he means of the Pope:

H. T. entitles his fifth Article thus, *The churches infallibility demonstrated, and faith, Our Tenet is, that the Roman catholick church is the highest visible Judge of controversies, and that she is infallible both in her Propositions and Definitions of all points of faith; having a power from God to oblige all men to believe her under pain of damnation.* And six pages after p. 70. he saith thus, *Note here for your better understanding this whole Question, that when we affirm, the Church is infallible in things of faith, by the word [Church] we understand not onely the Church diffused over all the World, unanimously teaching, whose Doctrine of Faith we hold to be infallible, but also the Church represented in a Council perfectly oecumenical, (that is to say, called out of the whole world, and approved by the Pope) whose Definitions of Faith we hold to be infallible.*

Ans. **W**E have here a most arrogant proud claim like that of the King of Tyrus, Ezek. 28. 2, 3. *I am God, I sit in the seat of God, there is no secret that they can hide from me.* For what is this less which is here ascribed to meer men, often the worst of men, than the prerogative of the Son of God: surely it's more than Angels have, Job 4. 18: But

But though this Author is bold enough in the title and tender, yet in his after note he hath such subtleties as shew his despair of making it good, and his deceitful mockage of his unwary reader. For, 1. He deals like a sophister that after his arguments states the question. 2. He doth so shift off this infallibility from one to another, that he knows not well where to fix it. Fain he would fasten it on the Pope, as he doth in a manner at last; and *Hart* more plainly confesseth with *Rainold*, ch. 7. divi. 7. *though it befove the Pope to use the advice of his brethren; and therefore I speake of Consistories, Courts and Councils; yet whether he follow their advice or no his decrees are true.* But then the arguments from Scripture and Fathers which speak of the church, not of the Pope, had appeared to be impertinent. Therefore he doth not in plain words disclaim it's infallibility; but saith, *When we affirm the church is infallible in things of faith, by the word [church] we understand not only the church diffused over all the world unanimously teaching, whose doctrines of faith we hold to be infallible.* Wherein you may perceive. 1. Egregious vanity, in making the Roman church Catholick. 2. The Church diffused over all the world teaching. 3. Teaching unanimously, which are all like a sick mans dreams of a golden mountain, there having never been any such thing as this in the world, nor ever is likely to be. 2. Egregious deceit in the terming *this church infallible*, Judge of controversies, propounding and defining points of faith, having power from God to oblige all men under pain of damnation to believe her: which is merely to delude silly Papists speaking of the churches power, which they place in the Pope and so draw them into his net. For I would ask this *H. T.* where or when the Catholick church diffused over the whole world distinct from an oecumenical council did teach, much lesse teach unanimously, or how they know it? he will certainly say, it hath been in councils or the Popes determinations. Why then doth not this Author say plainly, the infallibility and judgement of controversies is not in the Catholick church diffused over the world, according to the meaning of the words (which were indeed to say all believers were infallible) but say, he means not only, which is as if he had said, the Catholick church diffused over the world is infallible, but not it only, when he means it not to be infallible at all: nor doth he deal better in placing it in a council. For, 1. He supposeth such a council perfectly Oecumenical called out of the whole world, as never was nor is likely ever to be. 2. This council he will not have to be infallible without the Popes approbation. 3. He placeth the words [*whose definitions of faith we hold to be infallible*] so as that a reader may conceive either he means the councils or the Popes definitions. However it is certain he makes the council without the Pope not infallible, so that the Pope hath the negative voice. But indeed this Author or many of his fellows at least hold, that if the Pope himself without a council define any point of faith it must be received; yea *Bellarmin* saith 1.4. *de Pontifice Romano* c. 5. *if the Pope should erre in commanding vices or forbidding vertues, the church should be bound to believe vices to be good and vertues to be evil, unless she would sin against conscience.* So that however the church be pretended, it is the Pope who is intended, who is masked under the name of the church, but sometimes termed the Pastor of the Church, as if the same person could be relative and correlative too, Pastor and Church both. And this one person, (as if all knowledge lay in his breast) must be the Judge of all controversies of faith, though perhaps

perhaps an infidel in heart, one of the greatest perverters of the faith of Christ in the world, and the greatest offender, and most justly accused of any in the world, being notoriously and horribly vicious, and maintain manifest sins, (not only erre in doubtful matters, as Bellarmin would seem to limit his speech in his recognition) even these monstrous sins, of breaking oaths and leagues, killing Kings, allowing incestuous marriages, making and worshipping of Images, Yea though he be so unlearned (as it is said of one) as not to understand Grammer, Pope Gregory the great himself understood not Greek, Pope Zachary condemned Bishop Vigilius as an heretick for holding *Antipodes*, though he be feldome a Divine, for the most part a meer Canonist, whose very decrees, Breves and Bulls shew such grosse ignorance and perversings of Scripture, as a graduate in the *English Universities* would be ashamed of, yet he must be Judge of controversies between the most learned Divines in the world and in the most weighty points of faith. Surely were not Papiists either very silly or very Atheistical, or very much bewitched with the *Romish* forceries they would never be so sottish as they are to trust to the Popes definitions in points of faith, but of any other most suspect them, especially considering how much respect to their own gain and greatnesse, how little to the good of mens souls is in all their determinations. No marvail though different parties appeal to the Pope, yet neither stand to his sentence, as of old have been seen in sundry points, and as at this day in the late controversies between *Jansenists* and *Molinists* in *France*.

S E C T. II.

Luke 10. 16. proves not the Roman or Catholick churches infallibility.

BUT let us view the proofs that are brought by H.T. for his monstrous assertion of the Roman Catholick (as he terms it) churches judicature of controversies, infallibility in her propositions and definitions of all points of faith and power from God. to oblige all men to believe her under pain of damnation: where first he brings four arguments for her infallibility. The first is thus. No man by hearing (or believing) Christ can hear an error in faith. But every man by hearing the church hears Christ, therefore no man by hearing the church can hear an error in faith, therefore she is infallible. The Major must be granted, otherwise you charge Christ to be the Author of damning lyes. The Minor is proved 3. he that heareth you (the Church) heareth me, and he that despiseth you, despiseth me. St. Luk. 10. 16. The consequences are both unavoidable.

Ans. 1. The conclusion is not the same with the tenet, which was that the Roman Catholick church is infallible, but in the conclusion is no mention of the Roman church more then of any other church, to wit, the *Hierosolymitan* or *Antiochian*, and so that which was to be proved is not proved. 2. The Minor is denied, and in the proof from Luke 10. 16. is with a shamelesse fraud foisted in (the church) it being certain that at that time there was no Catholick church diffused over the world, much lesse Roman church at all, to whom those words of Christ could be directed, but by [you] are meant either the

seventy Disciples, or the twelve Apostles, as comparing, Luk. 10. 16. with *Matth. 10. 40.* makes it probable. Nor doth Christ say, *he that heareth you heareth me, and he that despiseth you despiseth me* in any case whatsoever, for then the high Priests had heard Christ when they heard *Judas* (who was one of the Apostles) offer and promise to sell Christ for money, and Peter when he denied Christ: but then when the Apostles or seventy spake the words and message of Christ. In which case I grant the church of Rome and Pope, yea and Bishop of Jerusalem, Corinth or any private Christian, though but a woman, are to be heard and are infallible. So that this place is grossly abused for proof of the Catholic *Roman* Churches, or oecumenical councils, or Popes infallibility in their definitions of faith, till it be proved that they define what Christ did before deliver.

SECT. III.

Matth. 18. 17. or 18. 1 John 4. 6. Mark. 16. 15, 16. make nothing for H. T. his claim of the Roman church, or Popes or oecumenical councils infallibility.

THE second argument is this. No man can be damned for not believing an error in faith. But every man shall be damned for not believing the church; therefore no man can believe an error in faith by believing the church. The Major is proved, because otherwise God were a tyrant in damning us for not believing a lye, which contradicts himself. The Minor is as evident; he that will not hear the church let him be to thee as an heathen and a publican: so *Matth. 18. 18.* He that knoweth God heareth us, and he that heareth us not is not of God; in this we know the spirit of truth and the spirit of error. 1 *John 4. 6.* Go ye preaching the Gospel to all creatures, &c. He that believeth not shall be condemned, *St. Mark. 16. 16.*

Ans. 1. The conclusion is not the same with H. T. his tenor, and so the proof is in the same manner faulty as in the first argument. 2. The Minor is denied: nor doth any one of the texts alleged prove it: or any thing like it. For, 1. The text *Matth. 18. 17, or 18.* is not as this Author cites it [*he that will not hear the Church*] as if it were an indefinite speech equipollent to this universal [*every man that will not hear the Church*] without which H. T. proves not his Minor, but thus [*but and if he hear not the Church*] restraining it to the brother sinning against his brother: And first, reprov'd singly. 2. Before two or three witnesses. 3. Of whom the Church hath been told. 4. And he doth not obey the Church. 2. The text speaks not at all of believing the Church in a point of faith, but doing right to an injured brother. For the phrase of sinning against a brother, ver. 15. can neither be meant of heresie, or error in faith, no nor sinfulness in life, which is termed commonly (though for the most part mistakingly) a publick scandal, or scandalous practise, but only of a particular injury, such as he, against whom the sin was, might forgive, as is manifest from, ver. 21. and the parable following: whereas to forgive heresies or errors in faith or publick scandalous practises, is not in the power of a private brother. 3. That by [*the Church*] is meant, the Christian Church is

is not certain, fith it is not as *Matth.* 16. 18. [*my Church*] but [*the Church*] nor if it were, can it be understood either of the universal Church diffused over all the world, fith it is impossible for every injured brother to tell his injury to it, nor of a perfectly Oecumenical council called out of the world; for either there never was such a Church, or if ever there were it hath not been in many ages together. *H. T.* confesseth, *p. 7. 25. the second third and tenth ages produced no councils.* Nor if there were in every age or every year, could every injured brother addresse their complaints to them. And the same may be said of the Pope, sometimes there hath been none for some years together, sometimes it hath been uncertain which was the true Pope, sometimes by reason of persecutions and for other causes no access could be to him, sometimes the wronged brother could not travel to him, nor he hear his cause. Nor is there any direction to go to his legate, or any assurance that he can commit his power to another, or that such a legate is infallible. Undoubtedly by [*the Church*] *Matth.* 18. 17. must be meant such an assembly, whether regularly formed, or otherwise occasionally convening, which is of near access, and which is fit to hear the cause and to determin. And I must confesse that I cannot deprehend that by [*the Church*] is meant the meer Ecclesiastical authority, nor is here appointed that disciplin Ecclesiastical, which is termed *the power of the keyes*, to excommunicate hereticks and scandalous livers in the Church, but a direction to a wronged brother how to deal in case of particular injuries, the neglect of which the Apostle *Paul* blames so much in the *Corinthians*, 1 *Cor.* 6. 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7. 4. Neither doth [*let him be to thee as a heathen and a Publican*] import excommunication out of the Church. For it is said, *let him be to thee*, not to the Church, *as a heathen or a Publican*, nor is any power at all therein given to the Church to excommunicate: all that the Church is to do, is to injoyn what the injurious brother should do, that excommunication which is here mentioned is appointed or permitted to the wronged brother. Nor did the being a Publican exclude out of the Jewish assembly or service, *the Publican went up to the Temple to pray*, *Luke* 18. 10. *Matthew* a Publican was a Jew and had the priviledge of a Jew though a Publican: nor was a heathen, as such, damned, there were profelytes, as *Cornelius*, who were heathens, and yet were accepted with God: only the publicans and heathens were such as the Jews would not have familiar arbitrary converse with, as *Luke* 15. 2. & 19. 7. *Acts* 11. 3. appears, and therefore the speech can have no other sense but this: If thy brother who wrongs thee will neither right thee after private rebuke, nor after rebuke before two or three witnesses, nor after the monition of the Church, that is either that particular assembly of Christians to which ye are joyned, or some other competent number of Christian brethren fit to hear such differences, then mayst thou shun his society in such a manner as Jews are wont to shun heathens and publicans, by not going in to them to eat, or inviting them, or other unnecessary society, that so they may know how evil their dealing is and be ashamed and amended. Which is nothing to that Ecclesiastical discipline or juridical excommunication which is at this day arrogantly claimed by Popes even over Emperours, and by other Ecclesiastical prelates for breaking their Canons: much lesse doth this text infer damnation to him that shall not hear the universal Church, or Oecumenical council, or Roman Pope.

The other text, 1 John 4. 6. is lesse to H. T. his purpose. For it speaks not a word of hearing the Catholick Roman Church, or universal, diffused over all the world, or Oecumenical council or Roman Pope, but of hearing the Apostles, and other teachers of the Gospel opposite to false Prophets, ver. 1. who denyed *Jesus Christ to be come in the flesh*, and of hearing them, not in every thing, but in the doctrine of Christs coming in the flesh.

And in like sort, Marke 16. 15, 16. is a plain command to the Apostles, not to the Bishop of Rome or an Oecumenical council, or the universal Church: for then the Pope should be bound to leave his See, and the Bishops in a council to be non resident, and go into all the world, and the Apostles are bid preach, not Popes decrees or councils Canons, but the Gospel of Christ, and the threatening of damnation is not to him that shall not believe the Popes decrees, or the determinations of an Oecumenical council or universal Church, but the Gospel of Christ, which reacheth not them who deny the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, purgatory, humane merits, worshipping images, not eating flesh in Lent, Priests single life, and such other innovations as neither Christ nor his Apostles taught: but such as believe not the doctrine of Jesus being the Christ, and salvation by him alone. Whence it is apparent to any that are not resolved to shut their eyes against manifest light, that none of these texts do prove the infallibility of the Roman Church, or Oecumenical council or Pope, but are impiously wrested to uphold the most cruel tyranny that ever was in the world.

S E C T. IV.

None of these texts Matth. 28. 20. 1 Tim. 3. 15. Matth. 16. 18. John 14. 26. John 16. 23. Act. 15. 28. do prove the infallibility in points of faith of the Catholick or Roman Church, or the Pope or a general council approved by him.

H. T. adds a third argument for the Churches infallibility thus: If Christ be alwayes with his Church, and have made her the pillar and firmament of truth, against which the gates of hell (heresies) shall not prevail, and given her the holy Ghost to assist her to all truth, so that her decisions in an approved general council are the very dictates of the holy Ghost; then is it impossible the Church should erre in faith: But all this Christ hath done for his Church, therefore it is impossible the Church should erre in faith. The sequel of the Major is manifest by the very terms of the supposition: the Minor is proved, going teaching all Nations, &c. And behold I am with you all daies (he is with her teaching) St. Matth. 28. 20. The house of God, which is the pillar and firmament of truth, 1 Tim. 3. 15. The gates of hell shall not prevail against it. St. Matth. 16. 18. He will give you another paraclete that he may abide with you for ever, &c. He shall teach you all things, and suggest to you all things whatsoever I shall say to you (in all points of faith) St. John 14. 26. He shall teach you all truth (no errors) St. John 16. 13. It hath seemed good (say the Apostles in council) to the holy Ghost and to us, Act. 15. 28.

Ans^r. This Author still abuseth his reader by putting his conclusion otherwise

wife then his tenet. For whereas his tenet was, that *the Roman Catholic Church is infallible*; he puts his conclusion thus, [*the Church is infallible*] as if [*the Church*] and [*the Catholic Church*] were all one, and [*the Catholic*] and [*the Roman*] were all one, and [*the Church of Christ*] and [*the visible Church militant*] were the same: which are indeed fallacies, which easily take with silly or prejudiced Papists, that take what is said of the Church to be meant of the visible militant Church, and what is said of the visible militant to be said of the *Catholic Church*, and by the *Catholic* imagin the Roman meant, and by the Roman the Pope. But to discover the vanity of this argument. 1. The sequel of the Major is denied, nor is it manifest by the terms of the supposition. For Christ's presence is with every believer, and he hath made every believer a pillar and firmament of truth, and against every true believer the gates of hell (heresies) shall not prevail, and he hath given the holy Ghost to every true believer to assist him to all truth as well as to the Church, and his definitions are the very dictates of the holy Ghost, when he defines according to Scripture, and yet it is not impossible he should erre in faith. Christ hath made promises of his presence and of his spirit, and his spirit is said to be in and with every true believer, as well as the Church, Rom. 8. 1, 9, 15. 1 Cor. 6. 19. 2 Cor. 1. 22. and 13. 5. Gal. 4. 6. Ephes. 1. 13. 2 Cor. 6. 16. John 10. 16, 27, 28, 29. and yet believers may erre in faith, Rom. 14. 2, 3, 5. 1 Cor. 15. 12. Gal. 3. 1. and 4. 20, 21. And therefore it is not true, which this Author supposeth manifest.

Nor is the Minor true or proved by the texts he brings. For the promise, Math. 28. 20. is not to the Church, but to the Apostles and other teachers, who succeed them: nor is the promise made to them that they should teach no error in faith: but that teaching (as H. T. speaks) or as long as they teach the true faith, he would be with them by assisting and prospering them in their work. The words, 1 Tim. 3. 15. may be meant of the mystery of godliness mentioned, v. 16. thus, the *mystery of godliness is the pillar and firmament, ground or seat of truth, and without controversy great*, which I do conceive after Cameron and others to be the truest exposition, as the same Apostle in other places gives such eulogies to the great points of faith, 1 Tim. 1. 15. and 4. 9. and 2 Tim. 2. 11. and the conjunction *and* ver. 16. doth make it very probable. Nor doth Grotius his reason avoid it: For the mystery even according to this exposition is the subject not the predicate. Others refer it to Timothy, but then it should be in the accusative case. But let it be granted that it is meant of the Church which is said, *that it is the pillar and firmament of truth*, yet it is certain from the very words, that it is meant of that Church in which Timothy was directed how to behave himself, which was the Church of Ephesus, as appears 1 Tim. 1. 3. not the Church of Rome, and therefore must be understood in such a sense as agrees to it: which the Papists themselves will not say was infallible or could not erre in faith. And therefore they must yeild it to be meant either of what they were in duty to be, or what they were actually, thus they were such, as by profession and practice did hold forth, and maintain and uphold the truth in those parts: not that they held nothing but tenets, nor so held forth the truth, but that they might erre and decay in their holding out the truth. For it is certain they did so, Rev. 2. 4, 5. A. 20. 29, 30. The terms [*the pillar and firmament, or ground or seat of truth*]

truth] are but metaphors, and whereas there are these two things signified by hem. 1. The upholding of the truth, so as that otherwise it should fall. 2. The fixing of the truth there, so as that it should abide and be permanent there, doubtlesse the former sense cannot be true. For though God should have no Church on earth or in heaven, no Apostle, Prophet, Bishop, yet his truth would be upheld; *his word is for ever settled in heaven*, Psal. 119. 89. Christ who is the truth, John 14. 6. abides for ever, and the spirit of truth remains for ever, and will uphold his truth. If it were as some of the Romanists say, *the Church only abode in the Virgin Mary at Christs death*, or as others say, *in the time of Antichrist there shall be no sacrifice, nor ceremonies, nor religion*, yet the Gospel of Christ shall be everlasting; as the Angel terms it, Revel. 14. 6. therefore of necessity it must be understood in that sense in which it notes stability, permanency, fixednesse or abiding, and the sense is, the Church is the company among whom the truth abides unshaken, in which sense Revel. 3. 12. it is said, *him that overcometh will I make a pillar in the Temple of my God, and he shall go no more out*. And so ἐσθλός is used, 1 Cor. 7. 37. for stedfast, and 1 Cor. 15. 58. ἐσθλός, ἀμετακίνητος, stedfast, unmoveable are made synonymous, and Col. 1. 13. τῇ πίστει τετυμνωμένοι καὶ ἐσθλοί, grounded and settled in the faith, καὶ μὴ μετακινούμενοι ἀπὸ τῆ ἐλπίδος, not moved away from the hope. So that the meaning is no more but this, the Church of the living God is not a tile which is often shaken and blown down with the winde, but a pillar that abides unshaken, and the seat or ground or basis of truth, where it abides being received and embraced by it. Which is to be understood of the invisable Church of true believers; and though not of every truth, yet of the main truth of the Gospel, as it is termed, Gal. 1. 5. the Word of truth, James 1. 18. the truth, John 17. 17. which is expressed in the next words, 1 Tim. 3. 16. from which he foretels an Apostasie, 1 Tim. 4. 1. and cannot be meant of any truth whatsoever which may be in controversy. For it is certain no meer mortal man, nor all men, were ever so infallible. Which being rightly understood makes nothing for infallibility in all points which the Catholick Roman Church, Oecumenical council, or Pope, or all together shall define, as H. T. would have it. The next text, Matth. 16. 18. is as little to his purpose. For it is not said against the Roman Church, much lesse it is said against an Oecumenical council, or the Pope of Rome, the gates of hell shall not prevail, but against my Church, that is, Christs wheresoever. 2. Nor is it proved, that by the gates of hell are meant hereafter as this Author supposeth. The truth is, however by the modern use the term [hell] is appropriated almost to the place of the damned and the tormented there, yet the word [ᾠδὴς] translated [hell] is either never or not many times used in the bible for that place or those persons, nor was of old the word [hell] appropriated to that place of torment, but meant of the grave or the state of the dead, in which sense it was meant of old that Christ went into hell, that is for a time to abide among the dead, as the learned *Usher* proves in his answer to the Jesuits challenge, ch. 8. and the gates of hell are no more than the gates of death or the grave, as Isa. 38. 10. Psal. 9. 13. &c. is meant. So that the meaning of Matth. 16. 18. is no more but this, the gates of hell, or the grave, that is death, shall not so prevail against my Church, but that I will raise it up at the last day, to life eternal, as our Lord

Lord *Christ* speaks, *John* 6.39. Which being the genuine meaning, it is true onely of the church of the elect, not of the meer visible, nor of that is such a prevalency denied, but that they may erre in faith, however it be assured that it shall not erre in faith finally to perdition.

The next Text *John* 14.26. is ill translated, [*shall suggest to you all things whatsoever I shall say to you*] the words being *ἐπιμνησέτω ὑμῖν πάντα ἃ ἐλάλησα ὑμῖν*, that is, *he shall minde you of all things which I have said to you*: nor is this meant onely in points of faith, as this Authour adds, without any reason in the Text, that he might restrain it to them, in which he would have the church to be accounted infallible, but also in matters of practise; and this is meant onely of the Apostles, as the words [*which I have said to you*] and particularities expressed *vers.* 25, 28, 29. *chap.* 15.27. *chap.* 16.4, 6, 12, 13. shew. And in like manner is the next Text, *John* 16.13. appropriate to the Apostles, to whom the words were spoken. Nor are the words restrained to matters of faith, but extended also to points of practise, and there is a promise of *shewing them also things to come*. Which argues plainly, that it is not a promise to the whole Church, or Pope, or Council, or every particular believer, sith it is certain that to none of these it is verified, they have not things to come shewed to them according to that promise, and therefore it must needs be impertinently alleged by H. T. to prove his *Minor*.

The last Text *Acts* 15.28. H. T. himself confesseth was said by the Apostles in council, not by *Peter* onely, nor by a council without the Apostles, much less by any Bishop of one City as *Rome* is, and therefore proves not any unerringsness in any but the Apostles, nor in them at all times in all points of faith, but onely their not erring in their determination at that time. So that his Texts do none of them prove his *Minor*.

 SECT. V.

There may be good assurance of the Word of God and its meaning, and of our salvation without supposing the churches infallibility.

H. T. adds, *The consequence is confirmed, because were not the Church infallible in things of faith, we could have no infallible assurance at this distance, what were the Word of God, what not, or what is the true sense and meaning of any one Book, or Chapter in the whole Bible, nor consequently of our salvation, since without faith it is impossible to please God, Heb. 11.6.*

Ans. **H. T.** Hath here vented a most poysonous and impious speech, which tends to ruine the Foundation of *Christian Faith*, and to promote *Atheism*, yea in seeking to promote the arrogant claim of the *Roman Bishop* he doth by his arguing quite pull it down. For if there be no infallible assurance without the churches infallibility in things of faith, what is the Word of God, what not, nor what is the meaning of one Book or Chapter in the whole Bible, then there is no certainty but from the Churches testimony of the

the truth of *Christian Religion*, and that being questioned we have no way to convince an Atheist, or Jew, or Mahometan, who deny such infallibility: nor hath the Pope any way to prove his Supremacy or Transubstantiation to be certain points of Faith, but by the Churches infallibility, that is indeed his own saying, in which he that believes him upon no better ground is departed from faith in God to faith in a confessedly sinful, and oft times notoriously wicked man, and so makes not *God's authority the formal motive and object of his faith*, as *H. T.* said pag. 58. falsely the *Romanists* do. Besides how injurious is it to God to make him to have delivered his minde so as none can understand it without the Pope or a Council approved by him, of whom, according to *H. T.* his Doctrine, who saith, pag. 102. *that sense cannot judge at all of substance though it be under sensible accidents*, there is no certainty, whether they be men or not, if we cannot judge of substance by sense. Surely *Christ* did very ill to direct Infidels to search the Scriptures, *John 5. 39* and never to repair to the Church to be resolved in points of faith, if *H. T.* say true. How much doth he abate the credit of the Scripture, who makes it to depend on mens (for such is the Churches pretended infallibility) report, and ascribes it to Popes and Councils, who do oft contradict themselves and one another, which is onely to be had from God and his Word? What is this but as in another case *Tertulian* said of the *Roman* Senates decreeing who should be worshipped as God, *God shall not be God unless man will*, so Gods Word shall not be his Word unless man will. Which is so much the worse in *H. T.* who *Art. 8.* ascribes that assurance to unwritten tradition (of which there is no assurance but from men confessedly fallible, as shall be shewed *Art. 8.*) which he denies to be from Scripture, as if the obscure tradition of unknown persons from Age to Age were more certain than the great written tradition received from Apostles by the whole Church. Besides, how doth he reckon of all other besides Popes and Councils, as if they were all idiots and fools, that they can understand no Chapter of the Bible without the Pope, who hath been sometimes altogether unlearned? What Blockheads would he have men think themselves after all their study of Languages, and Arts, and of the Scripture, that yet they cannot be certain what is the true sense and meaning of *Matth. 4. AEs 8.* or any other Chapter in the Bible, unless the Church, that is the Pope, tell them? Why do not all their Commentators, and Preachers first ask the Pope of the meaning of the Scripture afore they by writing or preaching take on them to expound it? Why doth not the Pope forbid them to expound till they have consulted him? Will he permit them to teach that of which they have no infallible assurance? Why doth he tie men to follow the consent of Fathers, as Pope *Pius* the fourth in his Bull did, if the Fathers yield no infallible assurance of the true meaning of any Chapter in the Bible without the Churches, that is, the Popes or his Councils infallibility? How did it come to pass that the Fathers *Chrysostome, Hierome, &c.* did so well expound the Scriptures as that their consent must be the Rule of modern Exposition? Did they first consult the Church, or the Church them? Pope *Damasus* I believe had more help from *Hierome* to expound Scripture by, than *Hierome* from *Damasus*? Have the Popes any better means to expound Scripture by than the Fathers? or the Fathers than other learned men in these days? Wherein did any of the Fathers exceed *Cajetan, Arias Montanus*, and such learned *Romanists* or any

of all the Popes after the Apostles days in ability to open Scripture? Would not such men as these secretly disdain and smile in scorn, if any should prefer any of the best Expositions of Popes before their own? Will the *Jansenians* or *Molinists* think either the late Pope *Innocent* or the present Pope *Alexander* more infallible in their Expositions than themselves? I trow not: so little is the pretended infallibility of the Church esteemed, when it toucheth themselves, however they make a great noise of it against Protestants, yea some Papists have well preferred the Expositions of later Writers before the Fathers, and Councils, and Popes, giving this for a Reason, that later Writers have had more help in that they have had their own abilities and diligence to boot for finding the meaning of Scripture, besides the Fathers Writings, and may see farther than they did, as a Childe set on a Giants shoulder, as *Banner* did fitly express it. Do not at this day the learned Expositors reject the Expositions of Fathers, and Popes, and Councils? Doth not *Maldonat* the Jesuit expressly reject in his *Commentary on John 6. 53.* the Exposition of that Verse by which Pope *Innocent*, *Augustine* and many of the Fathers followings held the giving the Eucharist to Infants necessary to their salvation, which the Council of *Trent* it self doth condemn? So sottish a conceit hath *H. T.* here vented, that doubtless none but the ignorant sort of Popish Profelytes can believe him in, if they do not resolve not to seem to see what they do see.

But were it granted that the Church were infallible, I would fain know how *H. T.* can demonstrate who or which is that Church which is infallible; or give assurance at this distance from *Rome*, that this or that point of faith is thus determined by that infallible Church. Will he make every Priest, or Legate, or Register of the Pope to be infallible? If not, let him tell me how he is infallibly assured that Pope *Innocent* the third, or the *Lateran* Council did define Transubstantiation, or Pope *Leo* the tenth and the last *Lateran* Council the Popes Supremacy. If he say by universal tradition, or the Records which are kept and are to be seen, and the agreement of opposite parties, (though in the points named there are none of these means which do give such assurance of those determinations as is given by them of the Scriptures) sure me thinks *H. T.* (who makes such determinations to be assuredly theirs upon such or the like Reasons of their credibility) should yield that there is more assurance from these (without the infallibility of the Church) of the holy Scriptures, being Gods Word, and the true sense and meaning of it. Will *H. T.* be more unbelieving than a *Jew* who acknowledgeth the Books of *Moses*, the *Psalms*, and *Prophets*, to be Gods Word? Will he not allow that to a *Christian* which the *Jew* had, to wit, assurance infallible, from *Micah 5. 2.* that the *Messias* should be born at *Bethlehem*, without the Churches infallibility? Will *H. T.* think he can make such men as *Arias Montanus*, or Cardinal *Cajetan*, and other learned *Romanists* believe that they are not certain of the Gospel of *Matthew* to be Gods Word, or of the true sense and meaning of the third, fourth, fifth, sixth, seventh Chapters thereof, without the Churches declaration? Did they gather their Expositions out of Popes Decrees, Canons of Councils, or examine them by them? Does not he know that in many places these and other learned men have interpreted Texts otherwise than Popes and Councils approved by him have expounded them? Do not they know that such

such an attempt would be but an exposing of Popes and Councils to contempt, and make their Canon Law appear ridiculous? What unmercifulness and carelessness of mens souls is there in Popes, Councils, Churches, if they are infallible, that in the space of sixteen hundred years they have not given us such a Commentary on the Bible as may take away all doubts from inquiring *Christians* about the true meaning of the Scripture, and determine all controversies in points of faith? Sure it's fitter work than to enrich their kindred, advance base sons, give audience to Embassadours, over-aw Princes and Emperours, subdue the holy Land. About which Popes and Councils have wasted a world of blood and treasure, when perhaps one Protestant or Popish commentator hath profitably illustrated the whole Bible. Why doth *H. T.* with his colleagues, if they believe what he saith of the infallibility of the church to be true, petition the Pope to do this, or call a council, and at last together do it? To what purpose should any else but Popes and councils study the Scripture, compare copies, revise Translations, examine Interpretation, if there be no assurance in points of faith of the meaning of the Scripture, without the churches infallibility? But alas! how far from infallibility Popes are, and of all men the unfittest to do any thing in this kinde, the shameful disagreement between Pope *Sixtus* the fifth and *Clement* the eighth their Editions of the vulgar *Latin* Bible doth abundantly declare, as may be seen in *Dr. James* his *Bellum Papale*; whereby it may be perceived how miserably and perpetually the souls of *Christians* must fluctuate and be tossed up and down, and at last drowned, if they have no assurance of the meaning of Scripture, but from this pretended infallibility of the church, which is no better to stay a Soul than an anchor of cork to stay a ship. I abhor therefore justly this blasphemous speech of *H. T.* whereby the souls of men must be brought to waver in faith, if they receive it, and not onely sinfull, but also the weakest and worst of men (for such they confess many of the Popes have been) idolized by ascribing that to them which is proper onely to him who cannot be deceived, nor deceive. And I protest, that should the Pope and his Consistory, or general Council, and all the Churches of the World conspire together to say, that the Books of *Moses*, the *Prophets*, the *Psalms*, of the four *Evangelists*, *Paul*, *James*, *Peter*, *Jude*, and *John*, are not the Word of God, yet I am assured not onely by tradition of the *Jews* and *Christians*, but also by the very confessions of Adversaries, and chiefly by the matter of them, which shews it self to come from God, the Spirit of God giving me a discerning understanding thereof, that they are the Word of God, and that the meaning of them is in the main points of faith, as the Articles of the Creed expresse concerning one God and one Lord, his Incarnation, Preaching, Crucifying, Death, Resurrection, Ascension, coming to Judgement, the holy Spirit, the Church of God, forgiveness of sins by faith in *Christ*, Resurrection of the body, and life eternal: which I know by understanding the meaning of the words, and thereby am assured that neither is the Popes Supremacy, nor his and his Councils infallibility, nor his power of granting Absolutions, and Indulgences by his Bull, nor the Transubstantiation of Bread into *Christi's* Flesh, nor the worshipping of Images, nor a Purgatory fire after Death in a part of Hell, nor communion under one kinde, nor Invocation of dead Saints and holy Angels, nor Prayer in an unknown Tongue, nor Justification by Works, nor good Works merit-

ing eternal life, of condignity taught in them. And if I did think I were to doubt of any of these Assertions I should turn Sceptick, and doubt whether there were a *Moses*, or *David*, or *Solomon*, or *Mahomet*, whether I knew the meaning of their words, yea whether there be such a City as *Rome* or *Trent*, such a man as the Pope, such a Council as the *Tridentin*, such Canons as are said to be theirs, or such a Creed as is said to be by Pope *Pius* the fourth required to be confessed by *Romanists*, or that the meaning were as *H. T.* conceives; in a word, I should begin to doubt whether I hear what I hear, should affirm any thing, make any *Confession of Faith*, but think my self to be in a Dream when I write, talk, eat, drink, hear, or do any acts of a living waking man.

As for assurance of our salvation, the denial of which *H. T.* counts an absurdity, I am glad to read it, and that thereby he gives some occasion to question whether he believes the Doctrine of the *Trent* Council, Sess 6. chap. 9. *That no man can know by certainty of Faith, which cannot be false, that he hath obtained the grace of God.* But for my part, as I know that the Doctrine of the *Romanists* is inconsistent with it self, when they teach that the *Priests Absolution* and *ministring Sacraments* doth give infallibly Grace and Remission of Sins, and yet that a man cannot be certain with certainty of faith that he hath obtained Grace. So I am infallibly assured without any Popes, or Councils, or Churches determination of my salvation through faith in *Christ Jesus* by the Spirit of adoption, and hope to please God by faith in *Christ*, though I reject Popes, Councils, Churches, Decrees, or Canons, which are not from the holy Scripture, but unwritten tradition or invention of men, many of them being most foolish and ridiculous toys and abuses of Scripture, more like *Mahomet's Alcoran*, than the Oracles of God.

S E C T. VI.

Neither can the Church oblige men under pain of damnation to believe her Definitions of Faith, nor is there any such judicature as *H. T.* asserts to be ascribed to her: nor do any of the Fathers cited by *H. T.* say it is, but the words of *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, lib. 1. epist. 3. August. cont. Epist. Fund. cap. 5. &c. are shewed not to be for it, but some of them plainly against it.

H. T. hath one more Argument for his *Deitlah*, the Churches infallibility, which is his fourth and last, thus, The Church hath a power from God to oblige all men under pain of Damnation to believe her in her Proposals and Definitions of Faith. But she could not have such a Power from God unless she were infallible in her Proposals and Definitions of Faith. Therefore she is infallible in her Proposals and Definitions of Faith. The Major is proved by all those Texts above cited in the first and second Arguments, as also by the Councils of all Ages, which command all men under pain of Damnation to believe and subscribe to her Decrees and Definitions of Faith, which hath accordingly been done by the Fathers and all true Believers. The Minor is proved

proved by reason, because it were not consistent with the justice, mercy or veracity of God to give a fallible and erring Judge such a power in things of that high consequence.

Ans. 1. **T**HE conclusion is still different from the tenet. 2. The Major is denied, and it is denied that the texts cited did prove it, nor doth the practise of the councils putting anathema to their canons prove it. For, 1. It is not proved they did well in so doing, except when their definitions agree with the holy Scriptures, and when they do so, they do not more then every believer may do, whom they will not say to be infallible. 2. Nor have all the Fathers or true believers subscribed to the decrees of councils and their definitions of faith: nor do the Papists themselves subscribe to those they call general councils; nor to the Chalcedon which gave the Patriarch of Constantinople equal power with the Roman in his Province, and ascribed the Popes dignity not to any grant of Christ to Peter, but to custome out of regard to Rome as the imperial city; nor to the council of Basl or Constance, which made the council above the Pope.

But H. T. adds an argument for the Churches supreme power of judicature. That is the supreme Judge in every cause, who hath an absolute power to oblige all dissenters to an agreement, and from whom there can be no appeal in such a cause. But the Catholick Church hath an absolute power to oblige all that disagree in controverted points of faith, nor is there any appeal from her decision, therefore the Catholick Church is supreme Judge in controverted points of faith. The Major is manifest by induction in all courts of judicature; the Minor hath been proved above by the first, second, and fourth arguments.

Ans. It is denied that the Minor hath been proved, or that there is any other Judge besides the sentence of God in holy Scripture, which can so oblige dissenters in those points. Nor do a great part of Papists themselves at this day, namely the French Papists make such account of the Roman church or Popes judgement, but that they do conceive they may, and sometimes have appealed from them to a general council. Ocham held that the Pope was *hæreticabilis*, that is, might be an heretick, some of them being suspected of heresie have been faine to acquit themselves to Emperours by Apologies, some of them have been condemned as hereticks by general councils, Fathers, universitie of Paris, Gerson wrote a book *de ascribibilitate Papæ*, and the French churches conceive their churches may be without a Pope and well governed by a Patriarch of their own. It is but a new and late invented doctrine of Jesuits and other flatterers of Popes, that the Roman church, or Pope, or a general council approved by him are infallible, nor is there a word in any of the Fathers cited by H. T. to that purpose.

The words of Irenæus l. 3. c. 40. are cited maimedly by H. T. they are entirely thus. For where the Church is there is also the spirit, and where the spirit of God is, there is the Church and all grace, but the spirit is truth. By which it may appear, that truth is ascribed to the Church by reason of the spirit, and that by the Church he means not only the Roman, but any where the Spirit of God is: and in the words before he sets down the truth he means, to wit, that if one God and salvation by Christ, which he terms the constant preaching of the Church on every side, and equally persevering having testimony from Prophets,

Prophets, and from Apostles, and from all Disciples. By which it is manifest that he commends no other preaching of the Church then is in the Scriptures, not the definitions of any now existent Church, or after Church without the Scriptures.

The next words of *Irenaeus* are not (as here *H. T.* cites them *l. i. c. 49.* there being not in my book so many chapters) but *l. 4. c. 43.* and are alleged by *H. T. art. 4.* and answered by me before *art. 4. sect. 7.* The other words of *Irenaeus*, *The Church shall be under no mans judgement, for to the Church all things are known, in which is perfect faith of the Father, and of all the dispensation of Christ, and firme knowledge of the holy Ghost, who teacheth all truth,* I finde not any where as he cites them. In *l. i.* there are not sixty two chapters, and in *l. 4. c. 62.* (which I suspect by his former quotation he would have cited) the words are thus. After he had said, *ch. 53. such a Disciple (meaning who had read diligently the holy Scripture which is with the Presbyters in the Church, with whom is the Apostolical doctrine) truly spiritual receiving the Spirit of God, &c. judgeth indeed all men, but he himself is judged of none,* in several following chapters sets down various hereticks whom he shall judge, and *ch. 62. faith, he shall judge also all those who are without the truth, that is the Church, but he himself is judged of none.* For all things constant are known or manifest to him, both the entire faith in one God omnipotent from whom all things are, and in the Son of God Christ Jesus our Lord, and the dispositions of him, by which the Son of God was made man; the firm sentence which is in the spirit of God, who causeth the acknowledging of truth, who hath expounded the dispositions of the Father and Son according to which he was present with mankind as the Father willet. By which any one may perceive, that *H. T.* (if these were the words he meant) hath corruptly cited them, mangling them and perverting them to prove an infallibility and supreme judicature of the Roman Church, or Pope for others; which are meant of every true spiritual Disciple and his private judgement for himself, and in the main points of faith, and according to and by means of the Apostolical doctrine of the Scriptures, which is the very doctrine of Protestants concerning the judgement, which each Christian may have and hath in points of faith, and the certainty of it according to the Scriptures; which while he follows he is judged of none, nor needs any ones judgement, Popes or others, to define what he shall believe.

The words of *Origen*, *That only is to be believed for truth which in nothing disagreeeth from the tradition of the Church. And in our understanding Scripture, &c. We must not believe otherwise than the Church of God hath by succession delivered to us,* prefat. in lib. periarth. Whether they be rightly cited I know not, having not the book to examine them by, and by his other citations, as by his citation of *Origen*, *art. 4.* where the same words, as I conceive, are cited somewhat otherwise (which are answered *art. 4. sect. 7.* before) the words [from the Apostles] being here left out, and his *&c.* here I suspect fraud. Yet if the words be as he cites them they prove not what he brings them for: there being no restriction to the Roman Church, much lesse to the Pope: nor is the tradition of the Church said to be that which is unwritten, and other then is in the Scriptures, and the faith which by succession the Church is said to deliver, is not meant of any of those points, which the Pope would obtrude

on the Church of God, and Protestants reject, but in probability the points of faith which were in the Apostles Creed professed at baptism, which *Irenaeus, Origen, Tertullian, &c.* were wont to hold forth against the hereticks of their times, and Protestants do still avouch.

The words of *Cyprian de unitate Eccles.* are not meant of the Roman Church, but of the Church throughout the whole world (as the words precedent shew) and the freedom from adultery and the uncorruptednesse, and chastity of the Church cannot be meant of every visible Church as if it were free from error, but of the true Spouse of Christ: nor is the true Spouse of Christ free from error of any sort, but that which is in the main points of faith concerning the Father, Son and holy Spirit, as the words following shew: nor is he said to be separated from the promises of the Father, or not to have God for his Father, who divides from the Church of Rome and hath not it for his mother: nor are all other Churches said to be adulteresses, who hold not with the now Roman Church, but he who divides from the Catholick church, nor hath it for his mother, of whom he had said, *Illius semina nascimur, illius lacte nutrimur, spiritu ejus animamur*, whence it appears that he meant the church to be his mother, who is born again with the same birth, baptism or faith, nourished by her milk, that is the Word of the Gospel, and animated by the same Spirit. And of this it is granted, that whoever is so severed from the church of Christ; that is the multitude or number of believers throughout the world, who profess and are baptized into the common faith, and are nourished by the same Gospel, and quickened by the same Spirit, they are divided from God, and have not him for their Father. But this proves not that he that is divided from the now Roman church is divided from God. But there are other words of *Cyprian* cited by him as found *Epist. 55.* in mine edition at *Basil 1578. l. 1. Epist. 3.* as *Bellar.* also cites them *l. 4. de Romano pontifice c. 4.* which are thus set down by *H. T.* To Peters chair and the principal church, infidelity or false faith cannot have access: in which he would insinuate, 1. That the Roman church is the principal church. 2. That by reason of Peters chair there, no error in faith could come to that church. But the words being rightly and fully set down, and the Epistle being read throughout, it will appear that *Cyprian* had no such meaning as this Author would put upon him. The words are these. After these things (which he had related before concerning the crimes of some excluded by him out of the church of Carthage) as yet over and above, a false Bishop being constituted for themselves by hereticks, they dare saile and bring letters from Schismaticks and profane persons to Peters chair and the principal church, from whence sacerdotal unity arose, and nor think them to be Romans, whose faith the Apostle declaring is praised, to whom perfidiousness cannot have access. In which I grant the Roman church is called the principal church from whence sacerdotal unity did arise, and the See of Rome Peters chair: the reason of which speech is plainly set down by *Cyprian* himself in his book *de simplicitate Prælatorum, or de unitate Ecclesiae* in these words. The Lord speaketh to Peter, I, saith he, say to thee, that thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church, and the gates of hell shall not overcome it. I will give to thee the keys of the Kingdom of heaven, and what things thou shalt binde upon earth shall be bound also in the heavens, and what things thou shalt loose upon earth shall be also loosed in heaven. And to the same after his resurrection, he saith, Feed my sheep. And

although

although to all the Apostles after his resurrection he bestowed equal power, and saith, As my Father sent me I also send you, receive the holy Ghost; if ye remit sins to any, they shall be remitted to him, if ye hold them to any, they shall be held: yet that he might manifest unity he hath disposed by his authority the rise of the same unity beginning from one. Verily the other Apostles were also that which Peter was, endued with equal allotment of honour and power, but the beginning comes from unity, that the church may be shewed to be one. And a little after, which unity we ought firmly to hold, and vindicate, chiefly Bishops who are President in the church, that we may prove also Bishoprick it self to be one and undivided. Let no man deceive the fraternity with a lye, let no man corrupt the truth of faith with perfidious prevarication. Bishoprick is one of which by each entirely a part is held. By which words it is manifest, that Cyprian made the Roman church the principal church, not because the Bishop of Rome was above any other in honour and power, or that Peters chair was more infallible than other Apostles chairs; or that a supremacy over the whole church did belong to the Pope of Rome (for he expressly saith, that the other Apostles were the same that Peter was, that they were endued with equal allotment or fellowship of honour and power, and that in solidum, wholly and entirely (that is as much one as another) each Bishop held his part in the one Bishoprick:) but because he made the unity of Episcopacy to have its original from Christs grant to Peter, Matth. 16. 18. that all Bishops might be as one, none arrogating more to himself than another. And that this was Cyprians minde, appears, 1. By the words in his Epistle to Pope Cornelius presently after the words which H. T. cites: where against the practise of those that sailed to Rome to bring thither letters of complaint against Cyprian, he saith, But what cause is there of their going and declaring their making a false Bishop against the Bishops? For either that pleaseth them which they have done, and they persevere in their wickedness, or if it displeaseth them and they recede, they know whether they should return. For such it is decreed by all us, and it is equal alike and just that every ones cause should be there heard, where the crime is admitted, and to several Pastors a portion of the flock is ascribed, which each Pastor should rule and govern, being to give account to the Lord of his own act; it is meet verily, that those over whom we are president should not run about, nor break the cohering concord of Bishops by their subtilous and fallacious rashness, but there plead their cause where they may have both accusers, and witnesses of their own crime, unless to a few desperate and wretched persons the authority of the Bishops seated in Africa seem less, who have already judged of them, and by the weight of their judgement have damned their conscience bound with the many snares of their sins. Which words shew that Cyprian denied the authority of the Bishops of Africa to be less then the Bishop of Rome, and that persons should appeal from them to Rome; but asserts, that they ought to stand to the judgement of their own Bishops, and that a portion of the flock is given to each Pastor, which he ought to rule and govern, and thereof must give account to the Lord, not the whole to any one, no not to the Bishop of Rome; and therefore he ought not to receive the letters and complaint of the divided party from Cyprian, nor to take on him to judge their cause, but to remit them to their own Bishops. 2. It appears by the fact of Cyprian, who opposed Stephen Bishop of Rome in the point of rebaptizing the baptized by hereticks (as his Epistle to Pompeian shews) and joyned with Firmilianus and other Bishops

shops of *Cappadocia, Cilicia and Galatia* excommunicated by Pope *Stephen*, and so involved in the same censure, in which state he died without repentance for ought is known, and therefore conceived not the Pope infallible, or his judge or himself subject to him: but counted *Stephen* an usurper over his brethren by reason of his imposing his decree on others, and censure of dissenters. And for the words in the Epistle to *Cornelius* they are not as *H. T.* cites them, To *Peters chair* and the principal Church, infidelity or false faith cannot have access: But to the Romans, meaning not only the Bishop, but the rest of the church, and by *perfidia* there is meant not any infidelity or false faith whatsoever, but those perfidious persons and their treacherous action in breaking from *Cyprian*: nor doth he say that *perfidiousness* could have access at no time, but not at that time, which he ascribes, not to the privilege of the place, but their constancy in the faith heretofore praised by Paul, and to the providence of *Cornelius* their Bishop, and their own vigilancy, as the words in the end of the Epistle shew, *Although I know there your fraternity, to wit, being fenced by your Providence, and also wary enough, by their own vigilancy, cannot be taken with the poisons of hereticks, nor deceived, and that so much the magisteries and divine precepts prevail with them, as the fear of God is in them, yet our overabundance of carefulness or charity hath persuaded us to write these things to you, being indeed not altogether out of fear of Cornelius, of whom he takes notice in the beginning of the Epistle.* Marvailing enough, when he observed by his letter that he was somewhat moved by the threats and terrors of them that came, and therefore doth earnestly press him to take courage and to withstand them. Which being rightly understood, the speeches of *Cyprian* concerning the Roman constancy and the inaccessibleness of perfidiousness to them, appear only expressions of his confidence and good hopes, not of any certainty that it would be so; much less of any infallibility of their Bishop or church; and this he did to engage them to withstand the schismatics, it being a great argument with persons to be constant to those who express their confiding in them and their expectation thereof. And therefore he would have his Epistle read to the most flourishing Clergy there presiding with *Cornelius*, and the most holy and most ample common people or Laity, that if any contagion of poisoned speech and pestiferous sowing had crept in, it might be all put off from the ears and breasts of the brethren, and the entire and sincere love of good men might be cleansed from all filth of heretical detraction: which shews that he conceived them liable to such contagion and pollution, and that he was not certain that they were then altogether free. All these things being considered, it will appear that these passages of *Cyprian* are so far from proving the infallibility and supreme judicature and supremacy of the Pope and church of Rome, which *H. T.* asserts, that they prove the contrary.

The words of *Lactantius* l. 3. c. ult. that it is only the Catholick Church that hath the true worship of God, this is the well-spring of truth, the dwelling place of faith, &c. are true, but nothing to the purpose, it being a meer dream that the Roman and Catholick church are the same; nor if they were, do they prove infallibility in all definitions of faith, or supreme judicature in controversies of faith, but the enjoying for themselves the true worship, truth and faith. The words of *Cyriel of Jerusalem*, that the Roman faith commanded by the Apostles cannot be changed, l. 3. c. 4. in apolog. cont. *Ruffinum*, we subscribe to, who

professe

profess our ready reception of what faith the Apostles commanded. The words of *Vincentius Lirinensis* adv. hares. c. 41. are thus (not as H. T. cites them) In the antiquity of the Church two things are vehemently and studiously to be observed, unto which they ought altogether to stick who will not be hereticks; the first if any thing were anciently decreed by the authority of an universal council from all the Priests of the Catholick Church: which is nothing to the later councils approved by the Pope, nor doth prove that the ancient councils were infallible, much lesse that the church or Pope of Rome are infallible. Nor are the words of *Augustin* (which I finde not l. 4. de bapt. c. 4.) I know by Divine revelation that the spirit of truth teacheth it all truth, if they be as H. T. cites them, for his purpose. For if by [it] he means the church, it follows not he means the Roman church, and if the spirit teach it all truth, it cannot be meant of all truth simply, nor at all times. But I finde these words l. 4. de bapt. contra Donat. c. 5. In vain some, when they are overcome by reason, object to us custome, as if custome were greater then truth, or that were not to be followed in spirituals which is to the better revealed by the holy Spirit. This is plainly true that reason and truth is to be put before custome. The words of *Augustin*, epist. 118. c. 5. are not fully set down by H. T. They are thus, If the authority of divine Scripture prescribe which of these (speaking about offering and fasting) is to be done, it is not to be doubted that that is to be done which we read. In like manner also if any of these things the whole Church through the world doth frequent. For to dispute whether we are so to do is of most insolent madness. Where, 1. He means it of rites not determined in Scripture, not in points of faith. 2. Neither doth he count it madness to dispute against the use of the Roman church; yea he makes it a rule which he had from *Ambrose* to fast as they did at *Millan* when he was there, and as they did at *Rome* when he was there, Epist. 86. ad Casul. no nor to dispute against the whole church of one age, but against the whole church in every age.

Other words of *August. cont. epist. fundam. c. 5.* are brought by H. T. and urged often by *Romanists* for the asserting the authority of the church above the Scripture, thus. And I my self would not believe the Gospel, were it not that the authority of the Church moves me to it. But the words are not thus rightly alleged. For, 1. The word [Catholick] is left out, which shews he meant it not of the Roman onely, and some words following seem to extend it to the church comprehending the Apostles, or, if restrained to the church of that age, it is meant of those that presched the Gospel to him. 2. The words [ego vero evangelio non crederem nisi me Catholica Ecclesia commoveret autoritas] are not well rendred by H. T. as if they did declare his purpose for the future, or that he would not believe the Gospel or any other reason, but the Roman, or present universal churches authority. For this had been an impious speech in this sense, and unfit for a holy man, much more for a Bishop, and contrary to many passages of the same Author; as particularly, lib. confes. 9. c. 5. in which he saith, that God would not have given so excellent an authority to the Scripture through all lands, unless he would that by it God should be believed. But either he used the Imperfect tense for the Præterperfect after the *African* dialect, as he doth in a like speech in his book de beata vita, sic exarsit omnes illas vellem anchoras rumpere, nisi me nonnullorum hominum existimatio commoveret: where commoveret is used for commovisset, which is the same word here used, and

and so the sense is, *I my self verily had not believed the Gospel unless the authority of the Catholick Church had moved me*, noting thereby the occasion of his first believing, not the sole Reason or Motive of his present believing, and to this sense the speeches, *Obtemperavi dicentibus credere Evangelio, ipsi Evangelio catholicis predicantibus credidi, recte credidisti catholicis laudantibus Evangelium, quibus præcipientibus Evangelio credidi, per eos illi credideram*; which expresse the means by which he believed, and that was not authority of empire in the Church by reason of their infallible Function, and right to define what is to be believed, but the credit of their persons by reason of their holiness, honesty, wisdom, and such other acts of Gods providence mentioned in the Chapter before, which held him in the Church.

3. Or else he speaks upon supposition that the Gospel is not believed by reason of its most sincere wisdom, unto the knowledge of which few spiritual men come in this life, then in that case nothing would move him to believe the Gospel but the authority of the catholick church, unto which sense the words *chap. 4.* and the series of the Dispute seem to lead, and *Bellarmino lib. 4. de notis Eccles. cap. 14.* to reconcile *Augustine's* words in his Dispute against *Donatists*, that the Church is not demonstrated by Miracles, but by the Scriptures; and yet against *Manichæus* his Epistle of the Foundation, that the Church is demonstrated by Miracles, not by the Scriptures, but the Scriptures by the Church, saith, that he speaks upon supposition, because the *Manichees* did admit Miracles, but deny the Scriptures, which countenanceth this last sense. Any of these ways which have their probabilities the speech may be right, but not for *H. T.* his purpose. Certainly they ascribe no infallibility or supreme judicature in controversies of faith to the *Roman Pope or Church*. If the speech be not understood in the last sense of not believing the Gospel, but by the Churches authority on supposition of the excluding the innate evidence of wisdom and truth therein, or if the second sense hold not, that he speaks of, what he had not done at first conversion, it is certain the first sense must be acknowledged, that he means it of the *Catholick Church* from the Apostles commending it by the authority of their universal tradition: in other sense, specially that in which the *Papists* allege it, it were an impious speech, and contrary to many other places in his Works. Sure he that reads his first, second, and third Chapters of his second Book of *Baptism against Donatists*, will finde him after *Cyprian* fully against the ascribing to any Bishop on earth supreme judicature over other Bishops, or making any Church or Council infallible; but asserting that the former fullest general councils may be mended by the later, and that there is no determination of any Pope, or Council, or Church to be rested on as infallible in points of faith, but onely the holy Scripture.

After all this empty scribbling of *H. T.* he yet adds, *I now resume the principal Argument, and retort it thus upon our adversaries, The Catholick Church is infallible in all her Proposals and Definitions of Faith. But the Protestant Church (and the like of all other Sectaries) is not infallible in her Proposals or Definitions of Faith, therefore the Protestant Church is not the Catholick Church. The Major hath been fully proved before. The Minor must be granted by our Adversaries, because they have no other way to excuse themselves from being Heretick, in the revolt from our Church, but by falsely pretending the whole Church errs in Faith, and taught Idolatry and Superstition for nine or ten hundred*

dred years together, till they began their blessed Reformation: a most blasphemous evasion (as hath been proved before) by which they have excluded themselves from all possible assurance of true faith or salvation; and therefore to arrogate infallibility to themselves, which they deny to the whole Church, were a most frontless impudence. And then he adds his Note, whom he means by his infallible Church, which is set down in the first Section of the Answer to this Article.

Ans^w. 1. Understanding by [the Protestant Church] that Church which hath been since the year 1517. termed Protestants from the protesting against the Decree made at *Spires*, Anno 1529. (as *Sleidan lib. 6. Com. reports*) the Conclusion is granted: we yield the Protestant Church or Churches are not the Catholick Church, but Members of it, conceiving it would be indeed to hold the Error of *Donatists*, if they should appropriate the Title of the Catholick Church to themselves, or count all out of it that are not of that party, as the *Romanists* do, who are in this Successors to the *Donatists*. But if by [the Protestant Church] be meant the whole number of them, who held the same Faith in the Fundamentals, which now the Protestants hold, so it is the Catholick Church. 2. We deny that the Protestants are justly termed *Sectaries*, meaning by [*sectaries*] a party which hath departed from the primitive Christian faith, or doth separate from the universal Church as it is or was at any time in its integrity. 3. We deny the Major to have been proved, understanding it of the universal Church of this or any Ages in which the Apostles were not, and did not concur in the Proposals and Definitions of Faith. 4. We grant the Minor, but to the proof of it, we say it is utterly false, that we have no other way to acquit our selves from Heresie, than by pretending the whole Church erred in Faith, and taught Idolatry and Superstition for nine or ten hundred years together till the Reformation begun, 1517. yea, we say, that the Errors in Faith, the Idolatry and Superstition we now accuse the Roman Church of, were many of them later than the time of *Gregory the great*, even in the Roman Church, and were opposed more or less, at least some of them, by a considerable party of the Church of *Christ*, who were far better *Christians* than the Popes or Roman Clergy, which condemned and persecuted them as Hereticks. From which crime we are able to acquit our selves other ways than *H. T.* faith we can, chiefly by shewing the agreement of our Doctrine with the holy Scripture and first Churches after *Christ's* Ascension, and the Orthodox Teachers in them, as will appear in answer to his ninth Article. It is a meer frontless impudence in him to charge us with any blasphemous evasion or excluding our selves from all possible assurance of faith or salvation, and to arrogate to himself as if he had proved either. The Reformation which was begun 1517. by *Luther*, and after by *Zuinglius* and others continued, hath been blessed by God, notwithstanding the Persecutions of the Papal party, and the Differences among Protestants. And the Reformation sought in *England* since 1641. hath been blessed, notwithstanding the Troubles and Differences fomented by the Popish and Prelatical parties, as the Preaching of the Gospel by the Apostles and first Preachers was, notwithstanding the Persecutions, Heresies, and Schisms that followed it. Notwithstanding what *H. T.* or any other *Romanist* have said, the Roman Church and Pope have not proved infalli-

ble, but may be proved, and have been, false and heretical, which is in part proved by the Objections following.

S E C T. VII.

The Objections from Scripture and Reason against the infallibility which H. T. ascribes to the Church are made good against his Answers.

H. T. saith thus, *Objections from Scripture and Reason solved.* Object. *All the Israelites adored the golden Calf, therefore the whole Church erred.* Ans. *Moses and the Levites did not, who were many thousands, Exod. 32. Numb 3. 39. therefore both those Propositions are false.*

TO which I reply, that whereas the Romanists do allege to prove an universal Bishop over the whole Church, who by himself or with a Council is an infallible Judge of controversies of faith, Gods ordinance of one high Priest in Israel, to whose judgement all must stand, *Deut. 17.* as Bellarmine *lib. 3. de verbo Dei, cap. 4. &c.* doeth, this Argument is retorted thus, If *Aaron* and the People of Israel were not infallible, then if there were such an universal Bishop over *Christians* as there was over the *Israelites*, and such a Council as the *Jewish Synedrion*, which were to be Judge of controversies, as *Romanists* would have, yet they might be fallible, sith the *Jewish* high Priest and Council who were to be Judge of controversies were not infallible, though they were as much privileged by *Papists* own arguings, who infer their sovereign infallible Judicature of controversies, which they ascribe to the Pope and his Council from the *Jewish* high Priest and his Council. But *Aaron* and the *Jewish* Council and Church were not infallible; for *Aaron* and the Council and Church of the *Jews* did erre, as is manifest by the making the golden Calf, and the peoples motion and concurrence thereto. Now though *Moses* and the *Levites* did not erre, yet the high Priest and the People did, from whole privilege, and not from *Moses* the civil Magistrate, the infallible judicature of the Pope as universal Bishop, and the *Roman Church* Catholick is fetched, and therefore the Answer avoids not the Objection.

H. T. adds, Object. *The Jews Council erred in condemning Christ.* Ans. *No wonder it was not perfectly oecumenical; for Christ himself was then Head of the Church on earth, and the highest Authority was in him, not in the Jews Council; and if the Jews Church could erre, it doth not follow, that the Church of Christ can; for it was built (as St. Paul saith) on better Promises.*

I reply, 1. This Answer which makes that Council not perfectly oecumenical, and therefore no wonder it erred, plainly intimates, that if a Council be not perfectly oecumenical, though it would be otherwise infallible, yet in that case it may erre. Whence it will follow, unless the *Papists* can prove their Councils, which they say are approved by the Pope to be perfectly oecumenical, that is, called out of the whole World, they are not infallible. Now certain it is, that neither the *Trent*, nor the *Lateran* Councils, nor those of *Con-*
stance,

stance, *Basil, Florence*, nor any other Council for a thousand years last past have been so called: yea, sometimes one party hath kept a Council in opposition to another, and Pope against Pope. And from the *Trent* Council, to which they adhere, not onely the *Greek*, and *Asiatick*, and *African* Churches were wholly absent, but also the *French* for a time, and the Council consisted in effect of none but *Italians*, and the Popes Hirelings, some of whom were onely titular Bishops, having never been at the places whereof they carried the Titles, and these by the plurality of Voices served the Popes ends, but in nothing either seriously sought the truth, or reformation of corruption, as the History of the Council of *Trent* written by that intelligent man Frier *Paul of Venice* hath cleared to the World. By which, were it not that Papists are a sort of men that hood-wink themselves, they might see how meer a cheat that Council was, and how justly it was refused by the *French* Papists themselves unto this day. 2. Though *Christ* were then Head of the Church, yet he did not exercise Jurisdiction among the *Jews*, nor act but as Prophet to his Disciples, he did not deny subjection to the Priests, he was circumcised the eighth day, as subject to the Law of *Moses*, presented at the Temple with an Offering, went up to the Feasts, kept the Passover, denied not the Authority of the high Priest, yea, directed the Leper to offer to the Priest for his cleansing, as *Moses* bade him, and *John* notes that the high Priest in that he was high Priest that year prophesied of *Christ's* death, *John* 11. 51. which are sufficient proofs, that if there were a Privilege of Infallibility in the high Priest and Council of the *Jews* it was not taken away by *Christ's* being on earth. But sure then they did erre, and therefore were not at all infallible in their ordinary determinations. 3. It follows, if the *Jews* Church could erre notwithstanding those passages in the *Old Testament* which the Papists bring for the Popes and *Roman* Churches infallibility from their infallibility, then the Popes and *Roman* Churches infallibility is not well proved thence. 4. *St. Paul* doth not say, *The Church of Christ was built on better Promises, than the Church of the Jews*, but that the second Covenant was made a Law on better Promises than the first, is said, *Heb.* 8. 6. But those Promises are set down, *vers.* 10, 11, 12. of that Chapter, of which there is none concerning any, much less a greater degree of infallibility in any chief Bishop on earth, oecumenical Council or Church of *Christians* above the *Jewish* high Priest and Council, and therefore this allegation doth no whit infringe the Objection.

H. T. adds, Object. *St. Peter erred in faith when St. Paul contradicted him to the face.* Answ. No, it was onely in a matter of fact or conversation, according to *Tertullian*, lib. præscript. cap. 23. by withdrawing himself and refusing to eat with the Gentiles for fear of the *Jews*, *Gal.* 2. 12.

I reply, 'Tis true, *Tertullian* saith, that *Peter's* fact was conversationis vitium non prædicationis, a vice of his conversation not of his Preaching, and he shews wherein, that he preached not another God, or *Christ*, or hope. But this doth not shew that *Peter* erred not at all in any point of faith, nor that *Tertullian* thought so: yea the very words of *Paul*, *Gal.* 2. 15. that he did not walk uprightly according to the truth of the Gospel shew, that his practise did infer an opinion contrary to the truth of the Gospel, and the words [*Why compeldest thou the Gentiles to Judaize?*] which could be no otherwise than by suggesting to them that opinion that they must do so, shew, he taught the Gen-

tiles an Errour in a point of Faith contrary to the Decree of the Council, Acts 15.

It follows, Object. Christ blamed the incredulity of his Disciples in not believing his Resurrection, St. Mark 16. 14. Answ. He onely blamed their slowness in believing, not any errour in faith, or loss of faith in them, seeing they had it not before, for they understood not what Christ had said to them of it as appears St. Luke 18. & 1 St. John 20. they did not know all points of faith at once, but by degrees.

I reply, the Question now is of Infallibility not of Apostasie, now it is certain they were not infallible, if they did actually erre, and it is certain they did erre, who did not believe Christ to have been risen from the dead, which was sure an errour in a point of faith, and so much the greater in that it was foretold by Christ himself that it should be, and told by Women, that it was so, and of this number Peter was one after he was termed Peter, and according to the Romanist's Doctrine had been made Prince of the Apostles, and chief Pastour of the universal Church. Now if Peter did erre then in faith, much more may the Popes of Rome, who pretend to be his Successours, and to derive their Privileges from his grant, and consequently cannot pretend to any more than he had.

Again, Object. Every man is a Liar. Answ. In his own particular be it so, yet the holy Ghost can and will teach the Church all truth, he is no friend to truth that contradicts it: and albeit man of himself may erre, yet by the holy Ghost he may be guided so that he erre not.

I reply, The words that make every man a Liar do speak this of man in contradistinction to God's being true, and thereby shew that this is made God's Prerogative to be true without any errour, and that no meer man is such, and therefore not infallible, and consequently neither Roman Bishop, nor Council, nor Church infallible: nor doth the Answer avoid it. For if they be every one a Liar in his own particular, they must be so in a community or Council, as if each person in his own particular be blinde the whole company must needs be so too. I grant, the holy Ghost can and will teach the Church of Christ (meaning the Church of the Elect) all truth necessary to their salvation, and he is no friend to truth that contradicts it: but that he will teach any or all the visible Churches, or their Bishops, and Teachers, or any one Bishop, all truth in any point controverted, so as that they shall be infallible Judges in determining controversies of faith, is more than yet is proved by H. T. or any other. And if man may of himself erre, though he may, by the holy Ghost be guided so that he erre not, then unless it may be known that in this or that Definition of Faith he is so guided by the holy Ghost, no man can rest upon his Definition as infallible. But it is not certain that either a Council or Pope, who are confessedly fallible of themselves, and therefore do implore the holy Ghost's help, as knowing they may erre, are guided by the holy Ghost that they may not erre, but by examining their Definitions by the holy Scripture. For there is no other way to know they have not erred, and consequently such a not erring being uncertain their Definitions can at no time without proof from Scripture (which each person is to try for himself) be a sufficient assurance to build a firm Faith upon, which is confirmed by the next Objection.

Object.

Object. Try all things, hold fast that which is good, 1 Thess. 5. Believe not every spirit, but try the spirits if they be from God, 1 John 4. Answ. Try them by the Churches authority and Apostolical tradition, that is the Touch-stone, not the dead Letter, humane reason, or the private spirit.

I reply, If Christians are to try all things, then they are to try the Churches authority, and therefore the Churches authority can be no Rule of trial. And indeed the Precept had been ridiculous, if he had bid them try the Churches Definitions whether they were good or no, and the spirits whether of God by the Churches authority, unless the Churches authority were to be tried by something else, which were of it self credible. For when the Church defines, for examples sake Transubstantiation, to try this by the Churches authority is no more but to enquire whether the Church hath defined it, if we must rest on its authority without examining its proof, which would be all one as to say, Try not at all what the church propounds, but believe it. But it is a vain Rule till we know who are the church, by whose authority, and what is their authority by which we must try: especially considering it is not agreed among Papists whether a Pope or council jointly or severally be the church: even *H. T.* pag. 70. speaks as if he would fain take in all, but is doubtfull on which to fasten. Nor are they agreed whether the Pope or council be superiour, nor which council is approved, which reprobate, nor how far that which is approved is so. The Rule is more uncertain when council is against council and Pope against Pope. The truth is, Papists contrary to the Apostles Precept are not allowed by their Doctrine to try what their church, that is, their Pope and Prelates teach them, but they are bound to believe them with an implicit assent without any trial or explicit knowledge. As for Apostolical tradition, we like it well to try by it, if it be in truth and not in pretence only Apostolical tradition: in which case we are to take heed that we be not deceived by such sayings as pretend to be from the Apostles, but are not. The Apostle *Paul* 2 Thess. 2. 2. tells us there were such pretensions in his days, of which he warns Christians, and our Lord *Christ* commands *Revel.* 2. 2. the Angel of the Church of Ephesus in that he had tried some that said they were Apostles and were not, and had found them Liars. As for some of those things which Ancients have called Apostolical tradition the Papists themselves do reject them, as the opinion of the *Millenaries*, the keeping of *Easter*, as the *Quartodeciman* held, the giving the communion to Infants, and many more; and therefore all Apostolical traditions so termed cannot be the Rule of trial; nor can they give us any sure Notes by which we may distinguish genuine Apostolical tradition unwritten from them that are supposititious. It is true, the oral tradition of the Apostles, while they lived, and there was access to them might be fit to be a means to try spirits by: but the relation of *Irenæus* lib. 2. adv. hæres. cap. 39. about *Christ's* age, and the censure given of *Papias* in *Eusebius* plainly shew how quickly such traditions came to be mistakes: and the very reason of *John* 1 Epist. 4. 1. doth take us off from trying by such tradition, because of the multitude of deceivers, and therefore requires that such spirits as pretended tradition should be tried by an unerring Rule, which is the holy Scripture.

But *H. T.* takes up the blasphemous reproach which some impudent railing Papists have heretofore given to the holy Scripture, when it bids us not try by

the dead letter, by which he means the Scripture in contradistinction to unwritten tradition. Which sure is not the language of the holy Ghost, but of such impure mouths, as in love to their Romish Idols endeavour to disgrace the holy Scripture. 'Tis true the Law engraven in stone is termed, 2 Cor. 3. 6. the killing letter, yet not of it self, for elsewhere, Act. 7. 38. the law of Moses is termed the living Oracles, but by accident, in that it could not give life, Gal. 3. 21. in that it was weak through the flesh, Rom. 8. 3. it did kill, that is condemn men as guilty of sin, and so accursed by it, Gal. 3. 10. But on the contrary the Word of God is termed living, Heb. 4. 12. the word of life, Phil. 2. 16. And our Lord Christ bids the Jews search the Scriptures, because in them they did think they had eternal life, John 5. 39. and John 20. 31. These things are written that ye may believe that Jesus is the Christ the Son of God, and believing ye might have life through his name. So that justly may H.T. with such other as before him have done the like, be charged with impiety in his disparagingly terming the holy Scriptures, especially of the New Testament, the dead letter, which Paul calls the word of life.

But it's likely he meant that the Scriptures cannot hear both parties, and so pronounce sentence in a point of controversy. If this be his meaning he might term the churches sentence printed or written in parchment, and Apostolical tradition unwritten the dead letters, as well as the holy Scriptures. For surely the authority of the church in an Oecumenical council approved by the Pope, suppose the Trent council approved by Pope Pius the fourth, and the Apostolical tradition doth no more hear or speak then the Scripture. And it sure discovers an extream perverseness and malignity of spirit in Papists that refuse to be tried by Scripture as being dead, and require a living Judge to end controversies, when the council and Pope and Apostolical tradition they would try by are as much dead as the Scripture: which there is reason to conceive they do as foreseeing that if their proselytes would try their doctrines by the Scripture they could not stand.

As for humane reason no Protestant that I know makes that the rule by which he is to try the spirits, nor his own private spirit, if by it be meant his own councils. But we say that every man is to make use of his own reason or judgement of discretion, and the ability of his own intelligent spirit, as the instrument or means by which he is to try whether that doctrine which is propounded to him be according to holy Scripture, and in this he doth no more then Christ requires, Luke 12. 57. yea, and why even of your selves judge ye not what is right? without the use of which it is impossible for men to make trial as men. And this the Papists themselves must allow men to do according to their own principles. For how else can they hear and believe the church, if they do not use their reason to know the church, and what it saith: they must make men blocks or brutes if they allow them not the use of reason to try by. When H.T. brings arguments from texts of Scripture, Councils, Fathers, common sense and experience (as his title page pretends) would he not have men to use their reason to try whether he do it rightly? would he have us go to a council approved by the Pope to know whether his arguments be good? what a meer mockery is this of men to write books, to teach peoples and yet not permit people to use humane reason to try their tenets whether they be according to Scripture, Council, Fathers, common sense and experience, as if we must not

onely

only take an Oecumenical council approved by the Pope, but also H. T. and every Popish writer, whose book is licensed to be infallible? If he write, is it not that we may read, and will he have us read and not judge, and can we judge without humane reason? But it is the fashion of these men to write and speak in points of controversie, but not to permit their Disciples, unless they judge them firm to them whatever they meet with to the contrary, to examine their adversaries tenents, arguments and answers by reading the Scripture and such impartial writers as would discover their deceit, but either by some device or plain prohibition to deter them from searching after the truth, that they may rest on the Popes and prelates determinations without examining.

H. T. further adds, *Obj. The Church may erre at least in points not fundamental.* Answ. All that God hath revealed is fundamental, at least for the formal motive of belief, to wit, the Divine authority revealing (though not always for the matter) and if it be once sufficiently proposed to us by the Church, as so revealed, we are then bound to believe it, so that their distinction of fundamentals and not fundamentals is idle: Besides if the Church be infallible in fundamentals, then Protestants are Schismaticks at least in revolting from her in points not fundamental, or necessary to salvation, and sin against charity by accusing us of Idolatry.

I reply 1. Sure this exception is idle to argue the distinction of fundamental and not fundamental points of faith, which the users of it take from the matter, according to which he confesseth all is not fundamental that God revealeth to be idle, because all is fundamental which God revealeth at least for the formal motive of belief; to wit, the divine authority revealing, in respect of which the Authors, who use the distinction, acknowledge all fundamental likewise, as Dr. Potter, Chillingworth and others, who make those articles of faith fundamental, which in respect of the matter are necessary to salvation to be explicitly known and believed by all: nor is it by them denied, but if it be sufficiently proposed to us by the church as so revealed, all that is revealed by God we are then bound to believe, otherwise we should deny Gods infallibility and veracity. But we deny the bare determination of the church, that is a Pope, Oecumenical council, or prelates to be a sufficient proposal without proof from Scripture or other demonstration, that the revelation is divine. 2. It is an idle inference which he makes, that because Protestants grant the church doth not erre in fundamentals; therefore the Roman church doth not erre or is infallible in fundamentals. For that which we grant of the church is meant of other churches besides the Roman. 3. It is idle that he chargeth Protestants with schism at least in revolting from the church for points not fundamental. For he cannot prove the Protestants did or do revolt from the church, but from the Roman court fashion, nor that they revolted till they were driven out by excommunication and cruel persecution, and could not enjoy communion without yielding to sin, nor that they revolted at all for those errors, which are about points not fundamental; but for the errors about points fundamental, to wit, one Mediator, salvation by faith in him, not by our own works, &c. 4. It is idle that he imputes to the Protestants uncharitableness for accusing Papists of Idolatry, when their profession and worship is openly Idolatrous in their adoration of bread, Images, wooden crosses, invocation of Saints deceased, of Angels with other innumerable practises used and maintained by them.

them about crosses, reliques, feasts of Saints, Temples dedicated to them, vows, swearing, Priests of them, of which their own Liturgies, Canons, writers are undoubted witnesses. 5. The framing of the Protestants objection by H. T. against the infallibility of the Pope or his council is idle, sixth it is urged by Protestants against them by shewing its errors even in fundamentals, that Popes and councils approved by them have been heretical. 6. His answer is much more idle, in that it is not at all to the argument by him brought, which in form is this. That church which may erre in non-fundamentals is no infallible judge of controversies. But the Roman church, whether Pope or council by him approved may erre in non-fundamentals, Ergo the Roman church is no infallible Judge of controversies. Now in his answer, there is neither denial of Major, Minor, nor conclusion, but only a denial of the fit use of one term in the premises against which his own exception is but idle, as hath been shewed, yea and if there be no such distinction of fundamentals and non-fundamentals in points of faith the objection is more strong against them. For then if it be proved that the Roman church errs in points of faith, it errs in fundamentals, if all points of faith be fundamental, which will prove not only the fallibility, but also the nullity of the Roman church: and so H. T. will pull down what he endeavours to build up.

But H. T. goes on thus. Ob. Those things only are fundamental which are absolutely necessary to salvation, and every man is bound explicitly to know and believe. Answ. If this were true, the Bible or written Word (which you will have to be the only rule of faith and Judge of controversies) were not a fundamental; for faith depends not essentially on writing, but on hearing: many were good Christians and saved before any of the new Scripture was written or received among them, the first Gospel being not written till seven or eight years after the death of Christ.

I reply, 1. This scribbling is idle also, in which that is brought in as Protestants objection against the infallible and supreme judicature of the Roman church in controversies of faith, which is only an explication of one term they use in their dispute against the assertors of it. 2. It is idle that he saith they will have the Bible or written Word to be the only Judge of controversies, when some of them, as Chillingworth whom he after names, Answ. to Char. Maint. part. 1. ch. 2. p. 114. deny it properly to be the Judge of controversies, but make it only the rule of faith, or the rule to judge by, yea p. 75. H. T. himself chargeth this on Chillingworth (as if he had forgotten what he said, p. 73.) that right reason is the only Judge of controversies, and others, who term the Bible the Judge of controversies do not make it the only Judge, but the Spirit of God by it, and the teachers of the church and each believer for himself by it. 3. It is idle again that he makes that an absurdity which they will not own, when Chillingworth Answ. to Char. Maint. part. 1. ch. 2. p. 114. and some others do grant that the Bible or written Word is not a fundamental point of faith in their sense, because if the matter of the Bible should be believed by one that never saw or heard of a Bible, yet he should have a true faith to salvation: And yet they make it necessary to be believed by all to whom it is made known. 4. It is yet more idle, that he gives that for a reason why it should be absurd to say the written Word is not fundamental; to wit, for faith depends not essentially on writing, but on hearing, which concludes it is not absurd. For if faith depend

not essentially on writing, but on hearing, which concludes it is not absurd. For if faith depend not essentially on writing, then is the written Word not fundamental, for that is not fundamental without which faith may be. § It is idle which he saith in opposing writing to hearing, whereas faith may be by both, and if he had spoken accurately, he should have said, not by seeing, but by hearing, or not by writing, but by speaking. 6. It is idle also and false, that faith depends essentially on hearing. For then it could never be that deaf men should believe for want of hearing. 7. That which he adds to confirm it is as idle. For though there were good Christians afore the Gospel was written, yet it being written upon supposition there were no other means but writing to beget faith, it would depend essentially on writing. 8. This discourse of H. T. overthrows himself and his party. For if faith depend essentially on hearing, not on writing, then they have not faith who read, except they hear the infallible Judge, whether Pope or council approved by him, nor is the point of faith sufficiently proposed, unlesse it be delivered *viva voce* , and if so, there is no Papist hath faith, but he onely who hears the Pope speak by word of mouth from his chair, or a council approved by him speak with audible voyce, the reading of the Trent canons, or the Popes Bull is not sufficient to beget faith, much less the hearing a Priest or Prelate tell us their determination. By which it may appear, that if H. T. his dictates hold, then there is neither church nor faith among the greatest part of Papists. 9. All this discourse is idle, because Papists themselves do grant in effect the distinction he excepts against; and his own words do in a manner confesse it is right, as the objectors explain it, and therefore in this is but a meer humour of quarrelling, as having a minde to say somewhat against Mr. Chillingworth and Dr. Potter, the Lord Falkland and Dr. Hammond, who have fully beaten them out of this their last hold of the infallibility of the Roman church, which they would fain have fortified, being unable to keep the field in the several points of controversie between us and them.

H. T. goes on thus. *Ob. In Gregory the greats time the discipline and doctrine of the Church was altered and corrupted. Ans. That cannot be, for from Gregory the greats time to this day even the least substantial part of either hath not been lost, or changed as is visible in all the councils, liturgies, and constitutions of the Church.*

I reply, this is so notoriously false, and the contrary so fully demonstrated even out of the confessions of Popish writers themselves, and in the points of the Popes supremacy, out of Gregory himself, l. 4. Epist. 32, 34, 38, 39. in the point of worshipping of Images in his Epistle to Serenus, and in other points by Bishop Morton in his first book of the Protestants appeal against Brerely his Apology, that were not this Author resolved to out-face the most manifest verities against the now Roman tenents, he would never have vented so grosse a falsehood. The very confessions of Popes, the decrees of reformation even in the Trent council prove the contrary to what H. T. saith. *Claudius Espencus com. in 2 Tim. c. 4. digres. 21. confesseth that toyes and lyes were in almost all their portesses.* And if there were no more to prove this Author an egregious liar; yet this is enough (which is apparent to all the world) that they have had councils opposing councils about the superiority of a Pope above a council since the time of Gregory the great, and even in their Missals and Bibles many things have been changed and purged, *Clemens* the eighth hath altered many things in *Sixtus* the fifth his Bible, and thereby shewed how corruptions have crept into their own authentick translation.

H. T. adds. *Object.* That which may happen to any one particular man or Church may happen to all : but it may happen to any one particular man or Church to erre in faith, therefore to all. *Ans.* I distinguish the first proposition, that which may happen to one may happen to all in a divisive sense I grant, in a collective I deny, and granting the second proposition I deny the consequence ; for it proceeds from a divided to a compound sense, and is as equivocal as this. That which may happen to any one egge in the Parish may happen to all. But it may happen to any one egge in the Parish to go into your mouth at once, therefore it may happen to all the eggs in the Parish to go into your mouth at once.

I reply, I know not whose argument this is : Dr. Rainold in his *Thesis* saith thus, but it may happen to every Church which may happen to any : certainly what happened to the Church of Jerusalem, which had much more ample promises, then ever the Church of any City. As it is formed by this Author I think the Major is not universally true : but being formed thus, that error which may be in each man and church singly, and it's not assured shall be removed from them met together, may happen to them so met. But error in faith may be in each man and Church singly, and it's not assured to be removed from them met together, therefore error in faith may happen to them so met. The Major is I conceive without question. The *Minor* consists of two parts. 1. That all men and Churches singly or severally may erre in faith, I think will not be denied. That the Popes as private Doctors may erre in faith it's not denied, by the stiffest assertors of the Popes infallibility. That any particular Church also, even the Roman, may erre it's not denied, the infallibility, which H. T. would have to belong to it, is as Catholick, and this must be when the whole Church diffused over the world unanimously teach a point of faith, or it's representative in a perfectly Oecumenical council called out of the whole world and approved by the Pope. 2. That to none of these is such infallibility assured, which is proved in that there is no promise of such infallibility to any of them. The texts urged by H. T. in this article yeild not that promise : nor that text *Mar.* 18. 20. For, 1. Christ may be in the midst of men, and yet they not infallible. *He walks in the midst of the Churches,* Revel. 2. 1. yet they might and did erre in faith. So God hath promised inhabitation to every true believer, and walking with them, 2 *Cor.* 6. 16. and yet they were not infallible. 2. If infallibility were there promised, it was promised to two or three gathered in Christs name, and so to a Church neither collectively nor representatively Catholick. 3. The promise is but conditional upon supposition of being gathered together in Christs name, which whether any council be, it is uncertain to us. As for H. T. his distinction and application they seem to me to favour of unskilfulnesse in the meaning of Logick terms. A proposition is true in a divided sense which is not true in a compound, when the predicate agrees to the subject considered as at different times upon an alteration ; as when it is said, the blind see, the deaf hear, the dumb speak, this is not true in a compound sense, that at the same time that persons are blind, deaf, dumb, they see, hear, speak, but in a divided sense. But the Major proposition as set down in the objection, is understood of the same time without alteration. And so it is not true, that it proceeds from a divided to a compound sense. Nor is there any consequence in the proposition, as he unskilfully speaks, but the proposition is a simple or categorical proposition. As for his similitude of eating eggs they may be kept for his breakfast as now being unreasonable.

But he proceeds. *Object.* The Apostles were not each of them to depend on the decrees of the Church. *Answer.* True, the Church was to depend on them as on the first masters and proposers of faith, who had each of them a peculiar prerogative of divine assistance and infallibility in matters of faith, yet were they each consonant to other in all their doctrines of faith, and whatever was taught by any of them was stedfastly believed by all.

I reply, H. T. saith in his Epistle to the reader, that it is agreed by all parties that Christ our Lord hath founded and built a Church in his own blood, which was the only Mistress of divine faith, and sole repository of all revealed truths at least for an age or two; which if true, then the Apostles were in that age to depend on their decrees. But here he eats his words, in the Epistle the Church was the sole Mistress of divine faith, here the Church was to depend on the Apostles, as on the first masters and proposers of faith. How these hang together I understand not. That which he saith here of the Apostles is very true understanding by masters, not Lords but teachers. The Church neither now nor in any age was Mistress of faith, it is not the Church in right sense, that is the teacher or propounder of divine truths, but the learner. It is the meer sophistry of Papists to term the Pope and Prelates the Church, and to call a hundred or two of Bishops, some of them meer titulars without any Diocese, such as never knew what the office of a Bishop was, nor ever preached the Gospel to any people, the Catholic Church. The concession that the Apostles had each of them a peculiar prerogative of divine assistance and infallibility in matters of faith proves, that this was not Peters prerogative, and if it were a peculiar prerogative to each Apostle, then it descends not to any successors, and so by this Authors own words the infallibility of the Pope or council is a meer figment. Nor is infallibility to be sought from any, but Christ and his Apostles doctrine, who do still propound matters of divine faith to us in the holy Scriptures. Nor hath the Church of Rome any more privilege of keeping or conveying to us the truths revealed by the Apostles then that at Jerusalem, Antioch, Ephesus, Alexandria or any other which the Apostles founded, and therefore Irenæus, Tertullian and such of the Fathers as direct us to repair to the Apostolic Churches for establishment against hereticks direct us to other Churches, where the Apostles preached, besides the Roman.

It is further objected, the Church hath now no new revelations, nor can she make now any new points of faith, therefore we are not bound to believe her definitions. H. T. Answers, I grant the antecedent, but deny the consequence, for though she can make no new points, yet she can explicate the old, and render that clear, which was before obscure, and can define against new heresies.

I reply, The grant of the antecedent is sufficient to prove, that if the Church, as it is termed, teach any other points of faith then were revealed to the Apostles, we are not bound to believe her definitions, and consequently she must prove her definitions by Apostolical tradition, and not only say they are Apostolical, ere we are bound to believe them, it being still to be heeded, which Paul saith, Gal. 1. 8. If he or an Angel from heaven, or any man preach (I may add or believe) any other Gospel then what was preached by Paul, and received by the Galatians he is accursed, and consequently each person is to examine and judge for himself whether that which is preached or defined for him to believe by Pope or council agree with the Apostles Gospel or no, and if the Church can

onely explicate the old, then an heresie cannot be made by a council, which was not before; and if Pope *John* the two and twentieth his tener condemned in the council of *Constance* were heresie after the council condemned it, it was so before, contrary to what *Bellarmin* saith, l. 4. de *Rom. pontif.* c. 14. and it follows he that can best explicate the old and render it clear which was before obscure, hath the best title to infallibility, and if the Church or Pope have no new revelations, then he must explicate by study, and so not by preogative of his chair, but by ability in languages, arts, and other knowledge, in which if he have lesse knowledge (as certainly some if not all the Popes for a thousand years have had, one of them, as *Alphonfus a Castro* saith, not understanding *Grammer*, and one of them being necessitated to substitute another to do divine offices for him, by reason of his ignorance in literature) there is lesse reason to adhere to their explications then to others who have more skill therein: *Arias Montanus*, *Vatablus* and such other learned men are to be relied more upon for explications and definitions in points of faith then the Pope or Bishops, if they be such as were in the *Trent* council, of whom it is manifest by *Frier Pauls* history of that council, that there were scarce any of them learned in the Scriptures, especially in the main point of the Gospel concerning justification by faith, then it is unjust to tye men to follow the Fathers, who had lesse skill then others in interpreting Scripture, as the learned of the *Roman* party do often shew in their writings, then did *Innocent* the third ill to make a new point of faith in defining transubstantiation, which was but an opinion before, as *Scorus* and *Tonsil* have asserted, then it is monstrous tyranny beyond all that ever any tyrants before practised to burn to death men, women, children, old and young, Bishops and Noblemen for not holding it, then are the Popes and Popish party guilty of shedding a sea of blood in *England*, *France*, *Belgia*, *Germany*, *Italy*, *Spain*, *Poland* and elsewhere, for denying transubstantiation, the Popes supremacy, and such other new tenets as Popes have thrust on the *Christian* Churches, then hath Pope *Pius* the fourth done wickedly in imposing on men a new Creed, and Popish Doctors do ill in justifying it, and not opposing it. But is not this a mockery to say the Church may not do it, and yet they do it, and *H. T.* avoucheth it? what else are their tenets of receiving the eucharist under one kinde, of worshipping images, of purgatory, invocation of Saints, indulgences, service in an unknown tongue, monastick vows with many more but new points of faith? and is it not all one to make new points of faith, as by authority onely without any agreeableness to the meaning of the words, so to explicate the Scriptures, as that they shall be wrested to maintain that which is not there taught, and that condemned as heresie which is not contrary to them? Rightly said *Chillingworth* *Ans. to Char. Maint. part. 1. ch. 2. num. 2.* Tyranny may be established as well by a power of interpreting laws as by making them: and so doth the power of *Rome* set up the greatest tyranny that ever was in the world by usurping this vast power of being an infallible interpreter of Gods laws (though in their Prefaces to their corrected editions of their missals, and the vulgar *Latin* translations of the Bible they confesse they used the help of learned men, and one Pope alter what a former did) and Judge of controversies from whom none may appeal, and all are bound in conscience to stand to his definitions.

H. T. saith further. *Object.* The spiritual man judgeth all things, 1 Cor. 2. 15.

12. 15. *Ans.* By the Rule of Apostolical tradition I grant, by humane reason or the private spirit I deny, and such a spiritual man is in the Church as a part in the whole, not out of it, with Sectaries.

I reply, It is true, the spiritual man judgeth all things by the Rule of Apostolical tradition, I mean that which is truly and confessedly Apostolical in the holy Scriptures, not by that unwritten tradition which Papists falsely call Apostolical. And it is true also that the spiritual man judgeth all things by humane reason not as the rule of faith, but as the Organ or means of discerning, as the buyer judgeth whether he hath measure by the Ell as the rule, and by the eye as the Organ by which he compareth the thing bought and the Ell together. And if by private spirit be meant nothing but his own ability to discern, the spiritual man judgeth by his private spirit, and so doth a Papist, that judgeth by the rule of the Councils definition, and Popes approbation, judge what his Priest suggests to him to be such by humane reason, and his private spirit. Nor can it be otherwise, if the judging be his act, but it should be by humane reason, unless we imagine a man as a man to act without reason. However this is clear by his confession, that a spiritual man is not only the Pope, or the Catholick Church, but a part in the whole, and that he not onely receives all that the Church propounds, but judgeth, and therefore doth not rest on the judgement of the Church with a blinde assent, and that he is in the Church nevertheless, and this supposeth that a spiritual man is not to presuppose the Church, or Pope, or Prelate, or Priest, infallible, but to examine what they say, and to judge for himself whether they speak right or not.

H. T. proceeds thus. *Object.* Right reason is the onely Judge of controversies, therefore every mans private reason must be Judge for himself. *Ans.* The Antecedent I have sufficiently refuted, and I also deny the Consequence, as the most gross and unreasonable Assertion of all others, (though Mr. Chillingworth's chief ground) which appears thus.

I reply, No Protestant that I know saith, Right reason is the onely Judge of controversies, and therefore there was no need of refusing it. Nevertheless in what he hath said before about this point, he hath refuted nothing, except it be a sufficient Refutation to say without any reason or proof for it, that we must not try all things by humane reason or the private spirit, which is a way of refusing, fit enough for this Scribler, though unfit for a Disputer. 2. Nor do I think any Protestant makes that consequence, which is here set down; whereas he ascribes it to Master Chillingworth he had dealt honestly if he had quoted the place, that we might without reading a whole Book have found it. If I mistake not, Master Chillingworth, chap. 2. part. 1. Sect. 104. of his Answer to Charity maintained against Knot, asserting a necessity of a personal Judge in points of controverſie concerning the Christian faith; that the Scripture was not, and therefore the church must be it, saith, Scripture is not a Judge of controversies, but a Rule to judge them by, being understood of all those that are possible to be judged by Scripture, and of those that arise among such as believe the Scripture, that it is not necessary that all controversies should be decided, that in doubtful things there is no necessity they should be determined, but that each should bear with other, and he is safe that useth means to finde the truth though he miss it, that fundamentals are plainly delivered in Scripture, that the most unlearned may understand these by the translation.

ons of places on no side gainsaid, that each mans own reason is Judge for himself, that there is no such personal Judge appointed by God, as Knot would have, that his Reasons from the necessity of a personal Judge in civil controversies hold not in this matter, that every mans particular reason is that by which he is to judge whether this or that Doctrine be agreeable to Scripture, that even according to the way of the Papists the giving of the Office of Judicature to the Church comes to confer it upon every particular man. For, 1. Before any man believes the Church infallible he must have reason to induce him to believe it so, else why do they set down Arguments to prove it. 2. Supposing they are to be guided by the Church they must use their own particular reason to finde out which is the Church, and to that end Popish Doctors give notes and marks whereby to discern it, which are to no end, if a Christian must not use his reason to judge whether they be right or no. So that in effect this is Mr. Chillingworth's Argument, as I conceive it, There is neither a necessity of an infallible personal Judge among men to determine all controversies in Religion among Christians, nor is any such appointed by God, but each is to try for himself what is taught, and even by Popish Writers own way he must use his particular reason to discern the validity of their proofs for the Churches infallibility, and which is the Church, which must be his guide by the marks of it, therefore it must of necessity be yielded, that every mans particular reason must be Judge for himself. Now this which H. T. unskilfully calls the consequence, it being the consequent onely, is no unreasonable much less gross Assertion, and may very well be Mr. Chillingworth's ground in answering Knot, notwithstanding that which here H. T. produceth to the contrary.

First, saith H. T. *As contradicting the Word of God, wherein we are taught, that the things which are of God, no man knows but the Spirit of God, 1 Cor. 2.11. No man can say Our Lord Jesus (with true faith) but in the holy Ghost, 1 Cor. 12.3. By which grace we are saved through faith, and that not of our selves, for it is the gift of God, Ephes. 2.8. We are not sufficient to think any good thing our selves as of selves, but our sufficiency is from God, 2 Cor. 3.5. We must captivate our understanding to the obedience of faith.*

I reply, Mr. Chillingworth's tenet being rightly understood contradicts none of these Texts. For, 1. when he saith, Every mans private reason is to judge for himself, he means whether this or that be the meaning of the Scriptures, and whether that which some say is revealed in Scripture be so or not, so that the judging which he asserts is of things revealed by the words wherein it is revealed, not a finding out what is not revealed. But 1 Cor. 2. 11. speaks of a knowledge of invention by search into the things without revelation, a knowledge of invention, not of discretion, as the words vers. 10. shew, But God hath revealed them to us by his Spirit, for the Spirit searcheth all things, even the deep things of God. Now Mr. Chillingworth (so far as I discern) did never assert, that every mans private reason by its own search could ever finde out the mystery of the Gospel, had not the Spirit revealed them to the Apostles, and they to us, but that each mans private reason since the Apostles have revealed them in their Writings may judge whether that which one Teacher saith is the Apostles meanings, be truer than what another saith, he makes Reason not the Judge of the Spirits revelation, but of mens interpretation and inference. 2. When Mr. Chillingworth makes each particular mans reason or his private

private Spirit, the Judge for himself, he means right reason, not every fancy which hath no proof, and that reason which he calls right reason must be rectified by the Spirit of God and his influx upon the understanding, and so the Text 1 Cor. 12. 3. is not against Mr. Chillingworth. 3. When he means that every private mans reason or private Spirit is a Judge to each man, he conceives (as the matter of his discourse lead him to speak) this judgement to be onely of the meaning of the speech, wherein the things revealed are made known, whence comes a speculative notional knowledge, upon which a bare dogmatical faith follows, but he asserted not right reason rectified by common influx of the Spirit, which understands onely the true meaning of such a Text or the truth of such a Proposition, to be sufficient without a special work of the Spirit of God enabling a man to see the beauty, worth, goodness of the things thus believed above any other thing propounded to be chosen, to beget an affective practical knowledge, which begets faith of adherence, of which 1 Cor. 12. 3. Ephes. 2. 8. 2 Cor. 3. 5. & 10. 5 are to be understood. So that Mr. Chillingworth's Assertion rightly understood doth well consist with these Scriptures, it being no whit contradictory to these speeches, that no man can know by his invention the mystery hid in God but by the revelation of the Spirit, and yet when it is revealed each mans private reason may judge of the meaning of the Scriptures in which it is revealed, and whose Doctrine is most agreeable to those Scriptures, and though no man can fiducially and electively say, *Jesus is the Lord but by the holy Ghost*, yet without the sanctifying and renewing or indwelling of God's Spirit a person may by his private reason understand the meaning of this speech, *Jesus is the Lord*, and assent to it upon credible motives with a bare dogmatical faith. And though saving faith be the special gift of God to his Elect, yet in working faith God useth mans reason to understand what he is to believe, and to judge it to be true, and as H. T. saith here, p. 77. *The discourse and approbation of reason is always a previous and necessary condition to our deliberate and rational acts of faith, and the very acts themselves, are acts of reason.* And though we are not of our selves sufficient to think any good thing, yet our selves do think good things, and by reason rectified by God's Spirit do judge them to be good. And though we are to captivate our understanding to the obedience of faith, yet that obedience of faith to which our understanding is captivated is by the assent of the understanding upon the apprehensions which our reason hath of the good of that we assent to, and that which we obey.

But saith H. T. Secondly, because divine revelations are not to be admitted or rejected for their seeming consonancy or repugnance to every mans private reason, but for the authority of the Church proposing as the immediate motive, and the Authority of God revealing as the highest Motive of our Faith into which it is ultimately resolved, nor can any thing be more rational than to captivate and even renounce private reason, where God the Author of Reason commands it.

I reply, I doubt not but Mr. Chillingworth would have said so too, and have counted it an injury done to him to suggest it (as H. T. seems to do) to any as if he meant otherwise, provided that by the authority of the Church proposing be meant, not the pretended infallible authority of the Church or Prelates of it, but either the infallible authority of the Primitive Church comprehending

the Apostles, or the probable and credible authority of the present Church or Teachers in it. But it is likely H. T. meant it of the infallible authority of the present Church or Prelates of it, which is not yet proved, and till it be Mr. Chillingworth's Assertion is not overthrown.

H. T. adds, *Thirdly, because if every mans private reason is to judge for himself in matters of Religion, then all the Heresies that ever yet were in the World were good and sound Doctrines; for there was never any Sect of Hereticks who did not pretend both to Reason and Scripture for their Tenets (how damnable soever) and some of them such as were unanswerable by humane reason, setting aside the Churches authority and Apostolical tradition: for who can prove by private reason or by all the reason of man against the Arians, that a spiritual and indivisible substance (such as God is) could beget a natural Son of himself without a Mother? or against the Sabellians and Trinitarians that the same indivisible essence or divine nature can be at once in three distinct persons, the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost? or against Nestor and Eutiches, that one person can subsist in two different natures, the Divine and Humane in Christ, which notwithstanding are high Fundamentals in Christianity. In all these and many others private reason must either bend the knee and be captivate to faith, or become Atheism.*

I reply, I conceive Mr. Chillingworth would have said so too, to wit, that private reason must bend the knee, and be captivate to faith in points revealed, though it cannot comprehend how things revealed should be so, and yet his Assertion hold, that each ones private reason is to judge these to be matters of faith; and it will judge them to be so by the evidence it hath, that these are divine revelations, which right reason knows to be so from the agreement with the Scriptures without the present or late Churches authority or unwritten traditions, though termed Apostolical. And those Tenents which a private mans reason findes to be agreeable to holy Scripture, though the whole Church of this or former Ages since the Apostles days should judge them Heresie, and the Nicene or any other Council condemn them, yet is that person to hold them as truth, provided he do use his reason aright to discover the truth. And though it be that Councils may be and have been usefull, when good choice hath been made of persons and undue practises to mis-lead and over-awe them have been removed, yet as Nazianzen in his five and fiftieth Epistle ad Procopium complained, *that he knew no good issue of them*, so he that shall examine the carriage of things in Councils, even the best of them since the Apostles days will finde reason not to take any thing from them on trust meerly by reason of their authority, and for the Councils which have been above a thousand years by reason of the activity and prevalency of Factions, and the unlearnedness of most of the Bishops in them will find more reason to be jealous of what Councils have determined, them to acquiesce in them. Nor will it follow, that if this judgement be allowed to every private man, then all or any Heresies what soever have been good and sound Doctrine, but that those who have pretended Reason and Scripture have abused both. Nor is H. T. his Reason of force, because Hereticks pretend to reason and Scripture, therefore every one is not to judge for himself, and all Heresies were sound Doctrine, any more than this, cavillers pretend Law and Reason, therefore Judges that use their knowledge in the Law, and their Reason in passing Sentence do justifie cavillers,

lers, or determin no better then cavillers. Were the Churches authority infallible, hereticks might and did pretend to it's authority, and Apostolick tradition, and therefore notwithstanding these, yet heresie may be taken for sound doctrine as well as if private reason be made a Judge for each ones self: yea many heresies have alledged unwritten tradition, and have had some council or other perhaps more and more numerous to patronize them then the Orthodox: so that I may say, setting aside the holy Scripture (which is now the rule by which to determine what is error, what not) neither the Churches authority, nor unwritten tradition can prove a point to be heresie or extirpate it, but rather propagate and establish error, as by experience is manifest, there being never more heresies established and propagated by any one, or more private mens following their reason, then have been by the Popes and Councils supposed to be Oecumenical and infallible, nor is there any greater cause of erring then the confidence of infallibility, nor any error so fast rooted as that which is decreed by men that will confesse no error. As for those heresies which he reckons as *unanswerable by humane reason*, if he mean they are *unanswerable by humane reason*, how or in what manner the things opposed by them are, it is granted: but of this Mr. Chillingworth doth not make humane reason Judge: if any humane reason cannot comprehend how a thing should be, nor can answer all objections, yet if it judge that God hath revealed it is so, it is to believe it, even as Mary was to believe her having a son though she knew not how. *Luk. 1. 34.* That which each mans reason is to judge, is not how a thing can be which God hath revealed is or shall be, but whether it be so revealed, and this he is to do not by a blind assent to what the Church or his teachers say, but by *searching* (as the Bereans did *Act. 17. 11.* with Gods approbation even when Paul preached to them) the Scriptures whether they say right. And if the Scripture say the contrary to what those named hereticks say, then are their tenents to be rejected, of which each persons reason is to judge for himself he being to be saved or damned according to his own faith: if not, the determination of councils against it is not to be received. And this manner of judging by reason, will neither promote heresie, nor Atheism, but on the contrary, if the Popes, Councils, Churches determination be counted infallible, it will perpetuate an error if once received, as too much woful experience shews in the Roman Papacy, wherein the error of transubstantiation though it be such as is so contrary to Scripture, reason, sense, Fathers, that a man unprejudiced would think them meer mad men, or phrenetick persons who hold it, yet it is by Papis maintained (I dare hardly say, by the learned believed) most obstinately and furiously to this day.

Finally, saith H. T. because if private reason were the only Judge of controversies, it would evidently follow the general councils of all former ages (which have commanded all persons under pain of damnation to obey their definitions and submit to their decrees) were the most tyrannical and unjust assemblies that ever were, in usurping such a power over mens consciences, and consequently, that there neither is nor ever was any such thing on earth as a Church (or obliging guide in matters of faith) and Church Government,

I reply, though Mr. Chillingworth say not private reason to be the only Judge of controversies, nor denies the Church or Council to be Judge of controversies, but only the infallibility of them; yet, if he did say either, neither

of these things would follow which *H. T.* makes consequent thereon. For notwithstanding such saying he might deem councils to have followed Scripture, and therefore not unjust in those commands, and that there was a Church and Church government obliging men in matters of faith though not by virtue of their own authority, yet by virtue of Gods revelation in the holy Scriptures. Nevertheless (if I may be allowed to speak my judgement freely) I do think that if not all, yet most of the Councils termed general have been for more then one hundred years too unjust and tyrannical in their commands, usurping the words of the Synod at *Ferusalem*, *Act.* 15. 28. too arrogantly, as if their authority were equal to the Apostles, and imposing on mens consciences burdens too intolerable, and that this hath been a most pernicious engine of Satan to cause divisions and mischiefs in the Church of Christ. And certainly if any have followed humane reason and a private spirit in deciding controversies of faith, and judging matters of religion they have been Popes, and the Councils approved by Popes, who do almost in every thing, in some things expressly, forsake the Scripture, and adhere to their own reason in their Canons and Decrees: and Papists who receive their determinations do forsake the guidance of Gods Spirit and follow humane reason and a private spirit.

H. T. saith further. *Ob.* You therefore believe the Church to be infallible, and whatever else you believe, because you judge it reasonable to believe it, and your very act of faith it self is an act of reason: therefore reason is the only Judge of controversies. *Ans.* The discourse and approbation of reason is alwayes a previous and necessary condition to our deliberate and rational acts of faith, and the very acts themselves are acts of reason, not discoursing but simply assenting: All this I grant, yet I deny your consequence, because our acts of faith are not ultimately resolved into private reason (which faith often is enforced to captivate) but into the authority of God revealing, and the Church proposing. I believe it (saith Tertullian) because it is impossible (viz. to humane reason.)

I reply, 1. Chillingworth makes not reason the only Judge of controversies, nor any Protestant, therefore the conclusion is ill fathered on them. 2. The reason of *H. T.* his denial of the consequence is insufficient. For it supposeth the consequence to imply, that our acts of faith are ultimately resolved into private reason, and this private reason judging that onely to be true, of which it conceives how it is possible. But the truth is, they that make reason the Judge of controversies neither resolve ultimately their acts of faith into private reason, neither do they conceive they have reason to believe onely what they conceive how it is possible to humane reason, but resolve their faith into Gods authority as the formal and ultimate reason of their believing, and make their reason onely the means or instrument by which they finde that God hath revealed that which they believe, not excluding their teachers credit, and Churches example as a fit motive to hearken to it as a thing credible. Which opinion is confirmed by this authors own words, making faith an act of reason, and discourse and approbation of reason alwayes a previous and necessary condition to it, and therefore in all acts of faith, even when it rests on the Churches Authority, yet each mans private reason is the Judge for himself discerning in controversies why he is to believe one and not another; all the difference is, the Papist thinks he hath reason to believe transubstantiation, Popes supremacy, &c. because he takes the Church of Rome or Pope to be infallible. The Protestant doth

doth not believe them, because the Scripture doth not say thus, which alone he takes for an infallible rule to judge by in such controversies. Whether Papists faith be ultimately resolved into the Authority of God revealing hath been before considered: a little and will more in that which follows. To *Terrullians* words I can return no answer till I know where to finde them. As they are here cited they seem not right.

Yet again saith *H. T.* Ob. There is no Apostolical tradition for the Churches infallibility. Answ. Yes a more universal one, then for the Canon of the Scripture it self: (which notwithstanding you believe on that score if at all) For there is not any one book either of the old or new Testament, which hath not been rejected by some heretick or other: if therefore it be a sufficient proof of an universal tradition for the whole Canon of Scripture, that some one or two general Councils have set down the number and names of all the books of Scripture, though not without some variety, and that the Fathers have given testimony to them, some to some books, some to others, but few to all; and that the Church in after ages hath accepted them for such, how much more universal is the tradition for the Churches infallibility, which is virtually decided and attested by the Anathema's and definitions of all the general Councils that ever were, condemning all who did not humbly obey, and subscribe to them, every decision being attested by all the Fathers (no one contradicting or condemning the stile) and most unanimously accepted by the whole Church of after ages.

I reply, the speech of *H. T.* here, that there is a more universal Apostolical tradition for the Churches, that is not only the Church diffused over all the world unanimously teaching, but also the Church represented in a Council perfectly Oecumenical (that is to say, call'd out of the whole world and approved by the Pope), it's infallibility in definitions of faith then for the Canon of the Scriptures it self, is so monstrously false, and so pernicious, as tending to the undermining of the fabrick of Christian Religion, that it shews an impudent face and an impious heart in the assertor. For, 1. The tradition of the Canon of the old Testament is by the whole Nation of the Jews from Moses to Christ, and from Christ and his Apostles, who have testified that to them were committed the Oracles of God, Rom. 3. 1, 2. and this witnessed by the Jews unto the death, and by the complement and events verifying it. And though it be, that some hereticks have been adversaries to the Law and Prophets, yet scarce any but such as have been little better then phrenetick, have denied it to be divine, however they have conceived them not binding. And for the Canon of the new Testament, though some parts have been a little while somewhat doubted of in the second and third ages by some few, yet the rest have had universal and undoubted tradition from the Apostles and Evangelists, and primitive teachers, who witnessed the truth of the doctrine by many evident undeniable divine miracles, and by their martyrdoms, by which also in after ages many of the Fathers and other Christians gave testimony to it, and since the Churches Greek and Latin, Protestant and Popish, Heretical and Orthodox in Asia, Africa, Europe have attested it as divine. But for the Churches infallibility in that sense, in which this Author means it, how little hath been brought appears by the answer here made, and that much may be said against it will appear by that which follows. Yea I dare boldly say, that (as *H. T.* holds it) no one Council or Father of esteeme held the Churches infallibility in the first thousand years from Christ's

incarnation, and I think I may say for half a thousand more, but many not onely of those who are reckoned for hereticks by *Romanists*, but also such as have been judged Catholicks have opposed it in the second and third ages, yea whole Nations, Emperors, Kings, and states have opposed the definitions, which the so termed Generals Councils approved by the Pope have made, and many learned men have written against it, none died for it in that time, nor were any miracles wrought to confirme it. Nor hath the questioning of some few of the books of Scripture, either by some hereticks or a few Fathers for a while abated the credit of those parcels questioned in the Churches of Christ throughout the world. So that if it were true, that we believed the Canon (as I know nothing but uncharitableness can make this Author question whether we do) onely on that score (as we do not) yet we have far more abundant tradition for it then is for the Churches imagined infallibility. 2. I say the *Anathema's* and definitions are neither formal nor virtual proofs of an universal tradition or attestation to the Churches infallibility. For, 1. p. 7. He confesseth in the second and third ages were no councils, nor in the tenth, in which any controversies of moment were decided, p. 25. and therefore here this universal tradition fails. 2. Those that were not approved by the Popes, but rejected by them, and those which were not Oecumenical have not used such *Anathema's*, and yet H. T. thinks not his infallibility proved thereby. 3. That they did well in using such *Anathema's*, or the Church in submitting to them may be doubted. 4. But if that be yielded that they did well, yet surely they did not set their *Anathema's* to their decisions, because they took themselves to be infallible either by their own authority or the Popes approbation; yea it is certain the Councils did set to their *Anathema's*, when they opposed the Popes and deposed them, and defined themselves above him. And even the Council of *Trent* put their *Anathema's* to their definitions afore they were tendered to the Pope, or *Pius* the fourth had approved them: but they took it they might set their *Anathema* to their definitions, because they thought them right, though not themselves infallible in them. And thus may any particular person pronounce *Anathema*, as *Paul* did, *Gal.* 1. 8, 9. and yet not be thereby demonstrated infallible. So vain is this no better then blasphemous speech of H. T. which will further appear by examining what follows.

SECT. VIII.

The objections of Protestants against the Churches infallibility from Fathers and Councils are vindicated from the answers of H. T.

He saith. Objections from Fathers and Councils resolved. Ob. The Council of *Frankford* condemned the second *Nicene* Council for giving sovereign honour to images, as you may see in the Preface to the *Carolin* books. Answ. The second *Nicene* Council allows no such honour to images, but onely a salutation or honorary worship, not true *Latria* (or sovereign honour) which it defines to be due to God onely, *Act.* 1. 7. The *Carolin* books are of no authority, they say that Council was not approved by the Pope, which is false, and that it was held at *Constantinople* in *Bythinia*, whereas *Constantinople* is in *Thracia*.
I reply,