

incarnation, and I think I may say for half a thousand more, but many not only 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) only 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 only a salutation or honorary worship, not true Latria (or sovereign honour) which it defines to be due to God only, 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,

I Reply, That honour to Images, which Papists will not have to be termed *Latria* or sovereign honour proper to God; the Scripture makes sovereign honour to be given to God onely in a religious respect; to wit, bowing down the body to them, kissing, burning incense, offering gifts, holding up the hands, lifting up the eyes, praying to them, which the Scripture appropriates to God, and denies to images, *Matth. 4. 10. Revel. 19. 10. 1 Kings 19. 18. Exod. 20. 4, 5.* Nor doth the Scripture make such distinction of *Latria* and *Dulia*, but that it forbids such worship to be given to any image of an invisible being, which shews subjection to them, or dependence on them; for such worship is religious, and is an acknowledgement of a Deity in them. The Scripture doth no where appropriate *Latriam* or the sovereign honour or worship due to God onely to offering of sacrifice, but that it also condemns as idolatrous the other acts named, if they be not given to Magistrates or superiors out of civil respects, but to Images, Angels, or Saints alive or deceased in a religious respect as superiors to us to whom we are subject and on whom we depend for help and succour. And therefore this plaister of *H. T.* is too narrow to cover the foul ulcer that came from the false Synod called the second *Nicene*. For what is that *salutation* or *honorary worship*, *H. T.* saith the second council of *Nice* allows to Images? Is it not bowing down to them, which Papists themselves call adoration, and difference from veneration, which consists onely in a decent usage without defiling, defacing, or such usage as shews hatred and contempt of the thing or person represented, such as is done to monuments or treasure laid up to be kept, but not as things set up higher then our selves to be worshipped, for that is plain Idolatry, and the very same with the Gentiles adoration of their Idols? now this did the second *Nicene* Council require to be given to Images, *ut erigerentur & adorarentur*, &c. yea if *Bellarmin. lib. 2. de Imagin. Sanct. c. 21.* say true, that Council should have them adored not only by accident, that is because joyned with the thing adored, but also of themselves as that, in which is the reason of veneration, nor onely improperly that is in the place of another, so as that the proper term of the adoration should not be the Image, but Christ himself, but properly so as that the Image be honoured *ratione sui ipsius* in respect of it self, as he explains his distinctions, *ch. 20.* And this adoration it was conceived by Charles the Great, and the Synod of *Francfurt* that *Nicene* Council intended to give to Images, and was refused by the four books set forth by Charles the Great's authority yet to be seen, and condemned by the authority of the Synod of *Francfurt*, Anno 794. at which were present the Popes legats and did approve of the Synods determination, or dissembled the Popes opinion. I finde not that the *Carolin* books say, that the second *Nicene* Council was not approved by the Pope; if they did, and that they were deprived, it makes the more against the infallibility of Councils approved by the Pope, which those three hundred Fathers acknowledged not, who met at *Francfurt*. The mistake of the Country wherein *Nice* was, is not such, as *Bellarmin* or *Baronius* conceive derogates from the truth of the thing, testified by so many authors of credit, all the ancient historians nearest that time, besides *Hincmarus Agobardus*, and after some English writers as *Hoveden* &c. *Bellarmin* himself, *l. 2. de concil. auth. c. 7.* confesseth it condemned the seventh Synod: and *Platina* in the life of *Hadrian* the first saith, that two worthy Bishops *Theophylact* and *Stephan* held a Synod in the name of *Hadrian* of German and French

Bishops in which the Synod, which the Greeks call the seventh, was abrogated.
 H. T. adds, Ob. The Lateran Council under Pope Leo the tenth Sess. 11. defined a Pope to be above a Council, and the Council of Constance, Sess. 4. defined a Council to be above a Pope. Answ. Neither part was ever yet owned by the Church for an Oecumenical decree or definition, and if it were, it would be answered that the Lateran Council defined onely a Pope to be above a Council taken without a Pope, or not approved; and that the Council of Constance onely defined a Council approved by a Pope to be above a Pope without a Council, which definitions are not contradictory, no more than to say, one part of any thing is bigger then another, and the whole bigger then both; so that from hence it cannot be inferred that either Council erred: nor was either decree approved by the Pope.

I reply, this is impudent outfacing with shifts the truth in things manifest to all that enquire into them. He cannot deny that these contrary definitions were of two Councils which he himself, p. 33, 36. terms *general Councils*, and makes Popes president in both, and both he sets down in his Catalogue made to prove a succession in the Church of Rome, and yet here he denies their definitions to be Oecumenical, what is an Oecumenical definition if that an Oecumenical Council be not? How is it an Oecumenical definition when it determines against John Hus, or against Christs own expresse command for communion under one kinde, and not Oecumenical, when it decrees the supremacy of the Council above the Pope? This is meer juggling of *bocus pocus*, which shews that when it likes them the Council shall be approved, when not, rejected, and thereby take upon them to be above Pope and Council. But if this be the fashion of their Councils who can tell when one decree is contrary to another if these were not? or who can tell when a decree is approved by a Pope if neither of these were? where's the agreement? where's the infallibility they so vainly arrogate to their Church? Martin the fifth expressly confirmed the acts of the Council of Constance in the 45. Session, of which one was in the fourth Session, that every one though of Papal dignity was bound to obey a general Council in the things pertaining to faith. That which Bellarm. l. 2. de Concil. aut. c. 19. saith that he onely approved some things not others, because he said, *sic conciliariter facta* is but a shift; for that expression is not set down by way of limitation and distinction, but explication, noting the reason of approving all because they were done *conciliariter*, as the word *sic* shews, which implies his acknowledgment that they were all so done. Besides he not excepting it expressly could not be interpreted to except that from his confirmation more then any thing else there acted, it might as well be said he excepted the decree about half communion; yea if he had excepted that decree of the Councils being above the Pope he had meerly deluded the Council, that decree being their principal decree, and for which it was called. Add hereto that the words of his Bull thereupon do more fully manifest that he did not except it; and the decree of the Council of Basil called after by virtue of his Bull shews, that they understood it to confirm that decree proceeding against Pope Eugenius conformably to it. And for the other Council that Pope Leo the tenth did not confirm the decree of the Popes being above a Council is contrary to Bellarm. l. 2. de Concil. aut. c. 18. who recites the decree as a proof, and c. 5. reckons it among the general Councils approved by the Pope, as appears, saith he, in that he was

prejudent

president in person. And for the other answer of H. T. it is ridiculous, sith the Councils words are expresse that *any person though of Papal dignity was to obey the general Council*, and the decree was made of purpose to justify their fact in putting down a Pope. And there was no question nor need be, who is above other when both joyn, but all the question is and so the definition must be construed, when they are severed. Yea it would be trifling to say the Pope should obey the Council, when the Pope concurred, for it's all one as to say he should obey himself: and to say the Council is above the Pope when the Council and Pope are one is frivolous, for in all such comparisons the words expresse what each is severally as they stand in competition according to their several authorities, and therefore the similitude of H. T. is frivolous as being not to the purpose. Lastly, with what face can this man say that *neither Council err'd*, when Bellarmin saith c. 7. that *in the Florentin and last Lateran the Council of Constance was rejected in respect of the first Sessions, wherein it defined a Council to be above a Pope*? so that all the wit of man is not able to avoid this objection, but that according to the suppositions of Popish Doctors either a general Council approved by a Pope may erre in a point of faith, or else there is no error in a main point of their faith, when one general Council approved by a Pope contradicts a former general Council approved by a former Pope of greater freedom and celebrity by reason of the Emperours presence and for other causes, which was seconded by another Council not long after, as appears by the next objection, which is thus set down by H. T.

Ob. *The Council of Basil defined, that a Council was above a Pope.*
 Answ. *The decree was not approved, nor any other of that Council, but only such as concerned Church benefices. See Eugenius with Terrecremata l. 2. c. 100.*

I reply, I finde no such distinction in Pope *Nicolas* the fifth his Bull, but that it is confirmed altogether. But it seems when it pleaseth these men the Council shall be approved, when not rejected. So that it is not either the calling of a Council by a Pope, or the universality of the Fathers, or the approbation of the Pope can confirm it, if another Pope reject it, which they will do when it's against their power and profit. And hereby is proved that Popes are vertiginous, that Popery is as mutable as the weathercock, that there is so little shew of agreement, unity and infallibility in Popes and Councils approved by him, that scarce any states are more full of changes in matters civil then they are in matters Ecclesiastical and of faith, nor in any part of the world more disagreement then among Papists.

Further saith H. T. Ob. *The Council of Ariminum defined Arianism.*
 Answ. *It did not, and that equivocal decree that was there made was never approved by the Pope; and the Fathers themselves (who were deluded by the Arians with words that bare a double sense when they perceived the fraud) lamented and renounced the fact.*

I reply, H. T. his own words confirm the objection. For, 1. If the Fathers were deluded by the *Arians* then they were not infallible; and so a general Council approved by the Pope may erre in a main point of faith. 2. If that Council did not define Arianism, how were they deluded? wherein was the fraud but in that the words being of double sense, yet indeed decreed *Arian doctrine*? what need they lament or renounce the fact if it were not so? why doth

doth *Austin* l. 3. *contra Maximinum* c. 14. oppose that council to that of *Nice*, and *Maximinus* allege it for himself if it did not decree *Arianism*? why did *Ruffinus*, *Socrates*, *Basil* cited by *Bellarm.* l. 1. de concil. c. 6. reject it, and *Bel-larmin* reckon it among the reprobate councils, if it were not *Arian*? and that *Pope Liberius* did subscribe to, it is related by *Hierom* in his catalogue of writers in *Fortunatianus*, in his *Chronicle*, by *Hilary* sundry times and others.

Yet saith *H. T.* Ob. The council of *Trent* erred by adding to the Canon of Scripture. *Ans.* It did not: the third council of *Carthage* approved all the same books by name excepting *Baruch* whom they compared with the Prophet *Hieremy*, whose Secretary he was, and this twelve hundred years ago.

I reply, if the council of *Trent* did not erre, *Pope Gregory* the great did, who expressly denied the books of *Maccabees* to be canonical, l. 19. *Moral.* c. 17. As for the third Synod of *Carthage* it was not an Oecumenical Synod, and it is over ballanced by the Synod of *Laodicea* before it, who omitted them. And if the ancients termed the Apocryphal books canonical or divine, they are to be understood according to *Ruffinus* his explication in his Exposition on the Creed, and others, that they were canonical in a sort as being read in the Churches by reason of some histories or moral sentences, but not so as that they were brought to confirm the authority of faith by them.

H. T. further saith. Ob. The Fathers err'd some in one thing, some in another. *Ans.* A part I grant, all together (speaking of any one age) I deny, and they all submitted to the Church and so do likewise our Schoolmen, who differ one by in opinion concerning School points undefined, not in faith.

I reply. 1. That the Fathers of some ages did generally hold errors is apparent in many particulars. *Augustine* held it an Apostolical tradition that the Sacrament of the Eucharist was necessary for infants, as appears l. 1. de pec. merito & remiss. c. 24. and elsewhere, and *Maldonat* on *John* 6. v. 53. saith that it was the opinion of *Augustin* and *Pope Innocent* the first, and that it prevailed in the Church for six hundred years, and yet the council of *Trent*, sess. 21. c. 4. can. 4. saith, If any say the communion of the Eucharist to be necessary for little ones afore they come to years of discretion, let him be Anathema. The like might be said of sundry other points, as that of the *Milkenary* opinion, the souls not seeing God till the day of judgement, &c. 2. That all the Fathers did not submit to the Church of *Rome*, is manifest by the *Asian* Bishops opposition to *Victor* about Easter, to *Stephen* about rebaptization by *Cyprian* and others, to *Boniface*, *Zozimus* and *Celestin* about appeals from *Africa* to *Rome* by *Aurelius Augustinus* and a whole council. 3. That the Schoolmen differ in points of faith defined is manifest in *Peter Lumbard* l. 1. sent. dist. 17. who held the holy Ghost to be the charity whereby we love God, and the dissent from him in that point, the differences about the Popes authority above a council, power to absolve subjects from the oath of allegiance, certainty of faith concerning a mans own justification, Gods predetermination of mans will, and many more yet controverted between *Dominicans* and *Jesuits*, *Fansenists* and *Molinists*. 4. All submit not to the Pope, but some appeal from him to a council, others by withstanding in disputes and otherwise decline his sentence in their cause, of which the opposition against *Pope Paul* the fifth his interdict by the republick of *Venice* about their power over Ecclesiasticks is a famous instance, evidently shewing

shewing that all that live in communion with the See of Rome acknowledge not such a supremacy and infallibility to it as the modern Jesuits ascribe to it.

Yet again, saith H. T. Ob. *St. Augustin tells St. Hierom that he esteems none but the writers of the Canonical books to have been infallible in all they write, and not to erre in any thing.* Answ. Neither do we, we esteem not the writers of councils infallible in all they write, nor yet councils themselves, but only in the Oecumenical decrees or definitions of saith.

I reply, *Augustin Epist. 19. to Hierom* doth not onely say thus, *I confesse to thy charity, that I have learned to give this reverence and honour onely to those books of Scriptures, which are now called canonical, that I do most firmly believe no auctor of them to have erred any thing in writing;* but he adds also, *But I so read others, that how much soever they excel in holiness and doctrine, I do not think it true because they have so thought, but because they could perswade me either by those Canonical authors or by probable reason that it abhors not from that which is true.* Which plainly shews. 1. That he counted only the writers of Canonical Scriptures and those books infallible. 2. That the sentence of others however excellent in sanctity and doctrine, is not to be believed because they so thought. 3. That their sentence prevailed with him so far as it's proof did perswade. 4. That this proof must be by the Canonical Scriptures or probable reason.

H. T. adds. Ob. *St. Augustin Epist. 112. says we are onely bound to believe the Canonical Scriptures without dubitation, but for other witnesses we may believe or not believe them according to the weight of their authority.* Answ. He speaks in a particular case in which nothing had been defined by the Church, namely whether God could be seen with corporal eyes? But the decrees of general councils are of divine authority, as we have proved; and therefore according to *St. Augustin* to be believed without dubitation.

I reply, though he speaks upon occasion of one particular case, yet the speech is universal [but for other witnesses or testimonies (besides the Canonical Scriptures) by which any thing is perswaded to be believed, it is lawfull for thee to believe or not to believe, as thou shalt weigh how much moment those things have or not have to beget faith:] There's not a word of exception concerning a thing defined by the Church; yea the opinion of *Augustin* is full and plain in his second book of baptism against the Donatists, ch. 3. to take away infallibility from any Bishops or councils Oecumenical, which I think fit to translate to shew how contrary it is to *Austin* to make any councils after the Apostles infallible. Who knows not, saith he, the holy Canonical Scripture as well of the old as of the new Testament to be contained in it's certain bounds, and that it is so to be preferred before all the later letters of Bishops that a man may not doubt or dispute of it at all, whether that which it is manifest to be written in it be true or right, but for the letters of Bishops which have been or are written after the Canon confirmed, it is lawfull that they be reprehended, if perhaps in them any thing have deviated (or gone out of the way) from truth, both perhaps by the wiser speech of any man more skilful in that thing, and by the more grave authority of other Bishops, and the prudence of the learned, and by councils. And those councils which are held in single Regions or Provinces are to give place without any windings to the authority of more full councils, which are gathered

out of the whole Christian world, and oft times these former fuller councils may be mended by later, when by some trial of things that is open which was shut up and known which did lye hid, without any smoke of sacrilegious pride, without any swollen neck of arrogance, without any contention of man envy, with holy humility, with Catholick peace, with Christian charity.

Yet once more, saith H. T. Ob. Sr. Athanasius (in his Epistle to the Bishops of Africa) tells the Arians they in vain ran about to seek councils, since the Scripture is more powerful then all councils. Answ. He says it was vain for them who had rejected the general council of Nice, nor doubt we but the Scripture hath in many respects a prebeminence above the definitions of general councils, and a higher degree of infallibility, yet these also are infallible in points of faith.

I reply, the reason of Athanasius shews it was in vain for Arians to seek to councils, because the Scripture was against them, not because the council of Nice was against them, as the very words recited by H. T. shew, who doth well to acknowledge the Scriptures prebeminence, which justifies Protestants who stick to the Scriptures against councils, which do often swerve from them and sometimes oppose them. As for the degree of infallibility (if there be any degrees of infallibility, which perhaps a Logician will deny, infallibility being a meer negation of liableness to error or being deceived) H. T. ascribes to them, it is so uncertain what it is, and so weakly proved, that none that loves his soul should rest on it, and not try, what they hold, by the Scriptures confessedly more infallible. As for the speech of the council of Basil there's no reason why Protestants or others should rest on it, when Papists themselves, even H. T. p. 79. rejects it, and says it was not approved in any decree, but such as concern Church benefices; and yet this man concludes with it's speech about the authority of a general council, as if it were certain. So vertiginous is this Author,



ARTIC. VI.

Sanctity and Miracles prove not the
Roman Church true.

The Roman Church is not demonstrated to be
the true Church by her Sanctity and Mira-
cles.

SECT. I.

The Texts brought by H. T. to prove that the true Church is known by Sanctity
and Miracles are shewed to be impertinent.

H. T. proceeds thus, Article 6. The true Church demonstrated by her Sancti-
ty and Miracles. Our Tenet is, that the Roman Catholick Church is known
and evidently distinguished from all false Churches, not onely by the marks
and properties by us premised, but also by her sanctity and power of doing Mi-
racles, and is proved thus, That is the true Church and lawfull Spouse of
Christ which is eminent for Sanctity of Discipline, and Doctrine, and for
Miracles. But the Roman Catholick Church and no other is eminent for
Sanctity of Discipline and Doctrine, and for Miracles; therefore the Roman
Catholick Church and no other is the true Church and lawfull Spouse of Christ.
The Major for Sanctity is proved by that Article of the Apostles Creed, I be-
lieve the holy Catholick Church, as also by these Texts of holy Scripture;
Christ gave himself for his Church, cleansing her by the Laver of Water
(Baptism) in the Word, that he might present her to himself a glorious
Church, not having spot or wrinkle, but that she might be holy and unspotted,
Ephes. 5. 27. These things ye were (saith St. Paul) but ye are washed, but ye
are sanctified, but ye are justified in the Name of our Lord Jesus Christ,
and the Spirit of our God, 1 Cor. 6. 10. A good Tree bringeth forth good
Fruit, by their Fruit ye shall know them, St. Matth. 7. 17, 20. Strait is the
Gate, and narrow is the Way which leadeth to Life, &c. If thou wilt be per-
fect, go and sell all thou hast, and give to the poor, &c. and come and follow
me

me, St. Matth. 19. 21. *There be Eunuchs who have gelded themselves for the Kingdom of Heaven, he that can take let him take,* St. Matth. 10. 12. *Obey your Prelates, and be subject to them,* &c. Heb. 13. 17.

Ans. 1. **T**He Syllogism is not good, the words [*and no other*] being wanting in the Major Proposition, and, if they be put in, the Major is false. *That which is eminent for Sanctity of Discipline and Doctrine, and for Miracles, and no other, is the true Church and lawfull spouse of Christ.* For a Church may be true and a lawfull Spouse of Christ which is not eminent for Miracles. Else it would go ill with all the Churches since Miracles have ceased, and with the Church consisting of John Baptist and his Disciples. But as it is now expressed by H. T. I grant the Major, though except the words of Christ, Matth. 7. 17. 20. the Texts are all impertinent. The Article of the Creed is not meant of the meer visible church, but of the church which is also the invisible of the elect persons, nor is it meant of holiness of outward Discipline and Doctrine, but of inward real holiness, and so are Ephes. 5. 27. 1 Cor. 6. 10. 11. yea the former is meant of that holiness, which is perfect without spot or wrinkle, when the Church is presented to himself at his appearing, and the other of that sanctifying which is by the Spirit of God, and not onely by Baptism. The Texts Matth. 7. 13. 14. & 19. 11. 12. & Mark 10. 21. Heb. 13. 17. are not expressions of properties, which are marks of the church, but Precepts, and signifie what duty some did or ought to do. Now the doing of some duties is not a mark of the church, as v. g. doing justice, giving to the poor, relieving the Saints, selling all we have, which may be in Infidels; and those duties which are in the three later Texts are special duties of some, and therefore not marks which agree to the whole church, but such as all members are not tied to, every member (not a woman) is not to geld himself, but he that can take it, nor to sell all (Papists make these Evangelical counsels of more perfection than is ordinary) nor to obey Prelates, and therefore in such they are no parts of Sanctity, much less marks of a true church.

SECTION II.

The Sanctity of men in former Ages proves not the holiness of the present Roman Church.

But it is the Minor which is to be denied, of which H. T. saith thus, *Now that the Roman Catholick Church hath abounded with, and brought forth Saints in all Ages (which is a pregnant and convincing proof of our second Proposition) is manifest by the Chronicles and Martyrologies of the whole Christian World.*

Ans. 1. To talk of the Roman catholick church is non-sense as is shewed before. 2. It is scarce good sense to say, *The Church brings forth Saints,* when the church is no other than the Saints or a company of Saints. 3. Were it

it yielded that the Church did abound with and bring forth Saints in all Ages, yet this proves not the sanctity of the church, but of those Saints in it, nor doth it at all prove the sanctity of the Discipline or Doctrine, but of the persons, much less the power of Miracles, the sanctity of the church, persons being often Saints, as *John Baptist*, who have not power of doing Miracles, and unholy persons have it sometimes, *Matth. 7. 22, 23.* and if it did prove any thing it would prove the privilege of the person, not the sanctity of the church.

4. The sanctity of the now *Roman Church* is not proved by the holiness of persons in former Ages, whereof many never were of *Rome*, nor is it likely ever heard of it, some of them opposed the *Roman Church*, and some lived and died in a state of disclaiming of it, and some kinde of excommunication from it, and had they lived to see its pride and wickedness, as now it is, would no doubt have abhorred it with greatest detestation; much less is it proved by the holiness of men dead one thousand or four hundred years, especially when the holiness of those few is obscured by the almost universal ungodliness of their chief Bishops (whom they account their visible Heads, and essential parts of their Church) and Clergy and Laity in *Rome* it self for a thousand years past, which hath been so notorious, as almost all their Historians, and Preachers, and Poets have described it so, as that it may be conceived justly, that *Rome* is and hath been a sink of all uncleanness: *There are verily, saith Bellarm. lib. 4. de notis Eccles. cap. 13. in the Catholick Church very many evil persons: and some of their own Popes, as Adrian the sixth, have confessed by Cheregatus his Legate, that abominations were committed in that holy See, the infirmity passed from the Head to the Members, from the Popes to the inferiour Prelates, in so much that there hath been none that hath done good, no nor one.* Innumerable have been the complaints made by all sorts, and sometimes by the Princes of the *German Empire* of their Grievances by the Popes and Court of *Rome*. Nor do Travellers tell us of any Reformation considerable since the *Trent Council*: their own Writers tell us, there is no Excommunication for the common vices, but onely some Penance, which effects no change in the apprehension of *Sir Edwin Sandys*, if it were not for a little formal abstinence in *Lent* there would be an universal Deluge of vice in *Italy*; so that he who denieth the *Roman Clergy* and Church to be a most unholy and filthy People hath gotten a Whores forehead that cannot blush. There are sins among Protestants, but I never yet met with Writer or Traveller, but would prefer *London* and other Protestant Towns as more free from impurity of body, blasphemy, cruelty, treachery, injustice, Atheism, and such other sins as are not to be named, than *Rome* is, where hath been permission of Whore-houses for Money by the Pope, and the Whores and Bastards of Popes and Cardinals so notoriously domineer.

S E C T. III.

The imagined holiness of Benedict, Augustine, Francis, Dominick, proves not the verity of the now Roman Church.

BUT let us see what *H. T.* saith for their Holiness, *St. Augustine* and his fellows who converted England, when they were received into Canterbury, (saith Hollingshead, *part. 1. pag. 100.*) began to follow the trade of the Apostles, exercising themselves in continual prayer, fasting, watching, and preaching, despising all worldly things, and living in all points according to the Doctrine which they taught. *St. Francis, St. Bener, and St. Dominick*, were all eminent for sanctity of life, as the *Magdeburgian Centurists*, *confes. cent. 13. Col. 11. 79.* But I never yet heard of any Protestant Saints in the World.

Ans. What a foolish proof is this of his Minor, that the Roman Church and no other is eminent for sanctity of life, because *Benedict* and *Austin* the Monk a thousand years since, *Francis* and *Dominick* five hundred years ago were such in his esteem, and he hath heard of no Saints among Protestants? As if there might be no Saints in the Greek church, though he hear of no Protestant Saints, or as if the Greek church now judged schismatick might not be as well proved or rather better to be eminent for sanctity of life for the holiness of *Chrysostome, Basil, Nazianzen, Gregory Nyssen*, as the now Roman, for the reputed holiness of *Austin, Bener, Francis, and Dominick*. But might there not be Protestant Saints which he hears not of? Protestants are the same with Primitive Christians in their Religion or Articles of Faith and Worship, and as such all the holy Apostles, Martyrs, Confessours, which have been true Christians have been Protestant Saints, as protesting against the Popish corruptions in Doctrine, Discipline, and Worship; so all the holy men who have protested against them in all Ages have been Protestant Saints. Thus *Cyprian* and *Augustin* who protested against the Popes usurpation about receiving Appeals from Africa; *Gregory the Great* who protested against the usurpation of the Title and Power of an universal Bishop, the Synod of *Frankford* which protested against Image-worship were Protestant Saints. And for *Waldus*, and the *Waldenses* that they were Protestants is manifest, and Saints too, their own Works shewed. (See *Morland's History of the Evangelical Churches in Piedmont*) even *Rainerius* their Adversary being Judge. And for *Wickliff, Reginald Peacock, Robert Groshead, Richardus Armachanus*, and many more their Lives were so exemplary as shamed their Adversaries, and yet they were Protestants more or less against Popish Errors and Abuses. It is true, Protestants are not canonized Saints by Popes, who use to canonize for Money or other respects some ignorant superstitious persons, or else active Instruments for their party: but the holiness of Protestants since *Luther* began the Reformation hath been such as hath caused even their Enemies to ascribe much excellency to their eminent Leaders. Notwithstanding *Bolsec's* Lye (of which the wiser Papists are ashamed) yet *Florimundus Raymondus, Papyrius Massonius*, and others, acknowledged *Calvin* to have been a man eminent for strictness of life, and industry in his pastoral work beyond any Papist they could

could name. *Melancthon* is commended even by Papists for his holy, peaceable, and painful conversation in the work of the Lord. The Lives of the chief Reformers shewed them to be such as had the Spirit of God dwelling in them, *Hooper* and *Bradford* in England, *Patrick Hamilton* and *George Wishart* in Scotland were men of exemplary godliness; that I name not late men, such as *John Fox*, *John Dod*, *Richard Grenham*, and many more whose Lives and Works shewed them to have been men of holy conversation, and of much acquaintance with God, whom this Scribler and such like superstitious Papists, who place holiness in observance of humane inventions rather than in Gods commands, obeying the Pope rather than *Christ*, and believing the lying Legends of Friars before the true reports of godly Preachers of the Gospel, having prejudice against them, condemn as Hereticks. Yet they that place holiness in following the Rules of *Christ*, and not humane traditions, do judge them to have been holy and blessed men, such as have had not onely a form, but also the power of godliness. As for what *H. T.* saith out of *Hollinghead* of *Austin* and his followers, it speaks only what they did at the beginning, but it is certain that *Austin* did not so persevere, but that he shewed much pride towards the British Bishops, and so much malice to the *Anchor Monks*, men of more reputed holiness than himself, that he was suspected at least to have been Instigator of a cruel Massacre of two thousand of them for not submitting to him, and receiving the *Roman Rites*. And for his converting of *England*, though I am willing to let him have his due commendation, yet neither is it true that he converted all *England*, and those he did convert he did also pervert by his obtruding the *Romish Orders*, which *Christ* never appointed, whence a great Deluge of Superstition spread over *Britain*, and much discord and misery followed thereupon, as may be seen in the Writers of the *English Histories*. As for *Benedict* who was before *Austin* the Monk, and *Francis* and *Dominick* after, that which I finde in the Relation of their Lives by *Villegas*, translated by *Heigham*, gives me no such cause as to judge them to have been men of such holiness as the Popes and Friars have judged them to be, but at the best deluded persons with the Error of those times, in which holiness was placed in monastical profession, and austere Discipline, which the Apostle counts to be no better than *will-worship*, *Col. 2. 23.* and their talk of their Miracles and Visions are no better than old wives tales, upon the report of which Popes as ignorant as themselves, or otherwise corrupt, have canonized them for their own ends; and the preaching of *Dominick* was against the truth professed by the *Albigenses*, whom *Rainerius* confesseth to have been men otherwise holy in Life and Doctrine, but that they spake against the church of *Rome*, of whose idolatry, pride, cruelty, avarice, uncleanness of body, there is so much in all the Writers of those times as is sufficient to shew, that those men had cause to abhor them, and to fear the yielding subjection to them, who had departed from *Christ*, by their setting up other Mediatours besides him, and changed pure *Christian Religion* into a corrupt mixture of Paganism, *Judaism*, and *Christianity*: the shedding of whose Blood was in a great measure caused by *Dominick's* Sermons, who may be therefore judged a wicked Murderer rather than an holy Saint. That which the century Writers say of these men is but a Relation out of the Writers of the *Romanists*, that they were by them accounted eminent

ment for sanctity according to the opinion of those times: but that they any where ascribed to them real holiness I finde not.

S E C T. IV.

The Roman Church is not proved to be the true Church by the holiness of their Doctrine, but the contrary is true.

H. T. proceeds thus, *Add hereunto what the Catholick Church teaches, that the Commandments are possible, nay, must be kept, she teaches the necessity of Contrition, Confession, and Satisfaction, with many other practices of self-denial; she teaches obedience to Priest, and spiritual Pastours, in things belonging to the soul and the government of the Church; she teaches much fasting, prayer, and mortification; she exhorts to good works, voluntary poverty, chastity, and obedience. The contrary to all which Doctrines are taught by Protestants and other Sectaries.*

Ans. **T**HE Papists teach not onely that the Commandments of God are possible, and that they must be kept (which Protestants teach also) but they also teach, that in this life a person in the state of grace may perfectly keep the whole Law of God, so as not to sin, (except venially, which is with them not a sin properly, as being besides, not against the Law) and thereby be justified, and that many things, which are horrid evils, are venial sins, and that a person may satisfie for them, by Works of Penance, which are for the most part easie things, yea, they teach that a man may by his good works merit of condignity (either by virtue of Gods promise, or the worth of the work) eternal life, yea, that he may do Works of Supererogation, and merit for others, and that thereby is made up a Treasury in the Church, which with the redundance of *Christ's* sufferings may by Indulgences be laid out for others, for the relaxation of their punishment in Purgatory. But this Doctrine Protestants abhor, as being so far from being holy, that they detest it as anti-evangelical, proudly evacuating the grace of the Gospel, and they teach that most blessed, holy, and precious Doctrine of the Gospel, that the most holy meere man is unable in this life, though regenerate according to the measure of renewing grace, he hath to keep the Law of God perfectly, so as to fail in no point, or so as to be justified before God by pleading any Works of his own before, or after Regeneration, or can merit of condignity in proper acception any thing at Gods hands, much less eternal life, but all that are justified are justified by faith in Christ freely by the grace of God through the Redemption that is in Jesus Christ, and that *eterna' life is the gift of God through Jesus Christ our Lord*, and this we are sure as far exceeds in holiness Popish Doctrine as Christ exceeds Moses, the Gospel the Law, the new covenant the old. Protestants teach the necessity of contrition of spirit for sin, and confession of sin to God, and satisfaction to men whom we have injured, if able: but the necessity of confession to a Priest, and such power of absolution and enjoining Penance

Penance, as Papists ascribe to a Priest, and such satisfaction to God for sin, as they teach and practise, we deny, as being injurious to the Blood of *Christ*, an arrogant usurpation of what *Christ* never conferred, but a fruit of ignorance of the nature of repentance, and of the mystery of the Gospel, and a meer Engine to rob the people, and to hold them in slavish subjection to their Priests. We say, that it is true self-denial when *Christ* requires it, and either the glory of God, the truth of *Christ*, and obedience to him must be forsaken, or our goods, liberties and lives, than to deny our selves by not retaining them: but that it is no part of that self-denial which *Christ* requires, nor any part of *Christian* mortification for a man unnecessarily to leave his estate and employment, to whip himself, creep to a cross, go on pilgrimage to *Jerusalem*, and such other things as *Christ* never required, but are meer superstition and hypocrisie. Protestants teach obedience to spiritual Pastours in things belonging to the soul, and the government of the Church, when they teach them to observe what *Christ* commanded: but they justly refuse to subject their consciences to such commands of Prelates and Priests as *Christ* never appointed, but judge it necessary to stand fast in the liberty they have by *Christ*, and not be entangled with the yoke of bondage, which Popes, and Prelates, and Priests, under pretence of the Church (of which they are the least part) about difference of Meats, Marriage, Holy-days, Temples, and such like things endeavour to impose on their consciences and practise, as being injurious to their *Christian* freedom and an heavy burden. Protestants teach much fasting when God calls for it in time of affliction, and for more advantage in prayer, but they reject Popish set fasts, and their mock-fasts, in forbearing flesh of beasts, eggs, milk, butter, yet eating and drinking other food, and drink perhaps more delicious in fulness, as a meer delusion. Protestants teach praying much in spirit with understanding of what they ask with faith, and trust to be heard through the Name of *Christ* for such good things as God hath promised: but they deride justly Popish praying in *Latin* by those who understand not what they say, their saying *Ave Marias* and the Creed for Prayers, their superstitious saying Prayers with Beads by tale, their tying themselves to canonical hours, as more holy than other times, their Prayers for Souls in Purgatory, which is a meer figment, serving onely to affright silly people that they may draw money from them for saying Masses, they detest that most abominable invoking of the Virgin *Mary*, wherein she is extolled as *Author of Grace*, *Mother of Mercy*, having authority over or upon *Christ*. with abundance of wicked Superstitions which are used in Popish devotion to canonized Saints, Crucifixes, a piece of Bread, imagined Relicks of Saints. Protestants press on men true mortification of the sins of the flesh or deeds of the body by the spirit working hatred of the inward lusts, and forsaking the evil practises of them; but they reject the foolish practises of whipping themselves, tearing the flesh with lying on Briars, as they say *Benedict* did, tumbling in the Snow, as they say *Francis of Assisum* did, girding the body with Iron, and lying on the ground, as they say *Dominick* did, which neither subdue lust, nor the Devils temptations, but are like the acts of *Bedlams*, and may be, and perhaps are done out of vain-glory and proud conceit of meriting by them. Protestants exhort to good works, but deny the building of Monasteries to be such, for idle Monks, that in stead of working with their hands that they might give to him that needs eat the bread

to the full, which belongs to the needy poor, under pretence of praying, which is no special function. Protestants teach men to be poor in spirit, to bear patiently poverty, when Gods providence allots it; but the voluntary poverty of Monks and Friars they reject as being a curse, or else a meer hypocritical counterfeiting of poverty, when they enjoy greatest plenty, and live in fulness, as Monks and Friars usually do, or else a meer madness, as in *Anchorites* and *Eremites*. Protestants teach true chastity in Marriage and single life, but they detest Popish vows of single life in Priests, Friars, and Nuns, as superstitious snares, when few of them have the power of continence, and they abhor the tearing of the use of the Marriage-bed in Presbyters unchast and unholy, and most of all the hellish Doctrine of those that teach it to be better for Priests to use Concubines than Wives, and tolerate fornication and other unclean lusts when they forbid Marriage, and excommunicate, and deprive, and imprison, and persecute Priests and Bishops for it. We Protestants teach obedience to Parents and Magistrates, and all that are over us in the Lord: but abhor the Vow of blinde obedience to Superiours never appointed by God, as slavish, and oft-times mischievous and destructive of the necessary obedience due to Parents, and Governours, whom God hath established. All which things being considered, we are fully assured that the Protestants Doctrine in these things is most holy, and the Popish impure, though to men that know not the Scripture it have a shew of wisdom and holiness. Yea, we avouch that there is scarce a Church in the World that is more unholy than the *Roman* in their maintaining the Worship of Images, which hardens the *Jews* from *Christianity*, in their adoration of the Bread they eat as their Maker, which moved *Averroes* a *Mahometan* to prefer Philosophers afore *Christians*, the insupportable Power of the Pope, though a most wicked man by himself, or in a Council of his liking to set down what is to be held in point of Faith, to dissolve Leagues, and break Oaths upbraided by *Amurath* the great *Turk* to *Christians*, to dispense with incestuous Marriages, deny Marriage to Priests, which *Pius* the second a Pope thought fitter to be restored, forbidding some Meats as unclean at some times, the Cup at the Eucharist, and the ordinary reading of the Bible in their own Language to the Lay people, directing men to invoke Saints, teaching them to ascribe salvation to their own Merits, making the man of sin the Vicar of *Christ*, besides what some have taught about deposing and destroying Princes, giving equivocating Answers to Magistrates upon Oath, exempting Priests from subjection to Princes, allowing the breach of faith to those they judge Hereticks, making cursing Parents in passion, and other horrid evils venial sins, allowing great crimes upon the probable opinion of one Doctor, killing a man to vindicate honour, and such other most odious resolutions of cases of conscience of the late Jesuits, which the more sober and honest *Jansenist* in his late Book of the *Mystery of Jesuitisme*, hath discovered; in which there may be found such a Nest of most stinking Doctrines vented by Jesuits, as honest moral Infidels by the light of nature did detest, and from their Doctrines we may truly infer, that *Rome* as now it is, is indeed the *Mother of harlots, and abominations of the earth*. On the other side, though Protestants are not without Errours, yet in the main matters, especially in the Doctrines of the Gospel, and holiness and righteousness of life their Doctrine shines more bright than ever it did in any Church since the Age following the Apostles unto this day.

S E C T. V.

The devotion of Romanists shews not the holiness of the Roman Church, it being for the most part will-worship and pharisaical hypocrisie.

H. T. goes on thus, Her Churches are open and Divine Service said not onely on all Sundays and Holy-days, but every day in the week, and that the greatest part in the forenoon. There is five times more preaching and catechizing, and ten times more fasting and praying in the Catholick Church than in the Protestant; her Sacraments are more, and more frequented, and in stead of an innumerable multitude of religious men and women that are in the Catholick Church, who have freely forsaken all things to follow Christ, and totally relinquished the riches, pleasures, and preferments of this life to serve him in the remainder of their days in vows and practises of holy poverty, obedience, and chastity, Protestants have an innumerable company of Sects and Sect-masters that daily spring out of their stock, such as are continually broaching new Heresies, and always at defiance one with another.

Ans^r **T**HE Popish devotion is so far from proving the holiness of the Roman Church falsely and most impudently termed the Catholick Church, that it rather proves them a Synagogue of Satan than a Church of Christ. Their Churches as they term them, stand open, but that which is to be seen or heard in them is more like the Temples of Pagan gods than Christian Assemblies. In the primitive times Christians had no Images in their places of meeting, but Popish Temples are full of Images and Pictures, and the service to them like the Pagans to their Idols, bowing down to them, burning Incense before them, offering gifts to them, lifting up and adoring a piece of Bread, with a great deal of outward pomp of Lights, Garments, garnishing of the house, attendance of Officers, suiting better to womanish and childish persons than holy spiritual Christians. Their Mass, which is that they glory in, is nothing like the Institution of Christ, nor used to that end for which he appointed his last Supper to be continued, but a meer shew with many ridiculous gestures, motions, actions, with Lamps burning in the day, Copes and Garments in imitation of the Jews, which make it unlike the primitive simplicity of Christians, which was without them many hundreds of years. Their many Holy-days were justly heretofore complained of as a great grievance to people, and it is a great happiness to be freed from them all, as begetting idleness, luxury, and penury, the Lord's Day excepted, which is no where among them observed as a Day set apart for God, and spent in Prayer, Hearing, Reading the Word of God to the edification of the people, and such other Duties of Religion as God hath prescribed, but after some time spent in hearing Mass, and Even-song, the rest of the day is spent in feasting, sporting, and in many places in such worldly affairs, as shew little minding of God or any heavenly affections. Their Churches are open in the week days upon an ignorant and superstitious conceit, as if God would hear them there by reason of the consecration of the place, or the Relicks of some Saint, or some other fond imagination which their Priests, or ancestors instill into them, and therefore they

say there their *Ave-Maries* and *Pater-nosters* by tale, without understanding, or attention to what they say or do, or to God, but observing onely their gestures after their manner, stay out their time without learning any thing which may improve them in *Christian* knowledge, but in their houses in the mean time calling upon God with understanding and feeling of their wants, the reading of holy Scriptures is neglected, and many other Duties which should be done are omitted, and which is worst of all much wantonness and other evils occasioned (if credible persons say true) and cloked by the often repair of persons to their Churches. That there is more Preaching and Catechizing among Papiests than among Protestants is strange news to me, nor do I think any *London Merchant* or other person who hath travelled into *Italy* or *Spain* will believe it. What now is done I cannot speak of mine own knowledge, as having not travelled into those Countreys; but what I finde in Authours whom I have great cause to believe, makes me, who have known *London*, *Oxford*, *Bristol*, *Worcester*, and other parts of *England*, and their Preaching and Catechizing, conceive, that *H. T.* tells here a manifest untruth. However it is easie to discern by reading the Sermons and Catechisms of both, which are printed, that their preaching and catechizing, how often soever it be in respect of Gospel doctrine, spiritual truths and holy directions comes as short of the *English* Protestant Preachers Sermons and Catechizing as Lead or Dross doth of Gold. When *Drury* preached at *Black-Frier*, his Sermons were of Popish Penance, and such like superstitious points of Popery. The History of the Quarrels between Pope *Paul* the fifth and the Common-wealth of *Venice* by *Frier Paul* tells us, that it was found in the Rules of the Jesuits when they were expelled out of *Venice*, that this was out of their Instructions to be very sparing in preaching of the free grace of God, and the relation of their Doctrines in the Book of the *Mystery of Jesuitism* published by a *Fansenist*, shews what kinde of Doctrine the Jesuites now the popular Preachers instill into the people of *France*. Their fasting and praying, if it be such as their Casuists describe, is a nullity or a mockery, that which they call fasting being onely a change of food, sometimes such as a Glutton would choose to please his appetite, and differring a Meal for some hours, which is no fasting, and their praying no ascending of the minde to God, or making known their requests to him, but saying words many of them that contain no Petitions, like Parrots without understanding, and in a great part calling upon deceased Saints and Angels. The multitude of their Sacraments shews the grossness of their ignorance and greatness of their Superstition, Matrimony being no Sacrament of the new Law given to *Christians* for the sanctifying of them, but an Institution of God before the Fall of *Adam*, common to all mankind for the lawfull propagating thereof, *Unction* being no ordinary Rite for sanctification, but a sign of a special gift of healing, Penance is no special Sacrament, but the common Duty of all men, Auricular Confession is an unjust Imposition, Priests authoritative judicial Absolution is a meer Delusion, Confirmation is either a fond imitation of the Apostles act in giving the holy Ghost, or else is in its genuine use an Appendix to Baptism. Orders is a Rite proper to the Clergy, as it is termed. The Eucharist and Baptism are indeed holy Ordinances of *Christ*, not to give grace by the work done, but by the one to testifie our profession, the other our remembrance of his Death: neither name nor thing of Sacrament, as Papiests define it is from Scripture.

Scripture, nor is any thing almost right in Papists doctrine or use of these rites, but their use of them is almost quite changed into another thing, then what Christ instituted, and therefore the more they are frequented, the less is there of true Religion and the more of vain superstition. There's far better administration of the Lords Supper among the Protestants, who use it after Christs institution to remember his death: not as Papists for a propitiatory sacrifice for quick and dead with addition of many histrionical mimical inventions of men, and mangling it by the half in keeping the cup from the laity, and making a private Masse of a communion. Baptism is better administred without addition of oil, cream, and spittle, and *Ephphatha*, and such toys as Papists use. Ordination is better used by Protestants who ordain Preachers of the Gospel, not sacrificing Priests. And yet in these and in other matters some things may be better'd, which through the great aberration from the primitive institution remain yet to be amended. As for the multitude of religious men and women as he calls them, not only the relations of Protestants, but also of Popish writers give us cause to think there's little of religion or morality in them except gluttony, idleness, whoredom, and other lewdness be religion. The common proverb makes a Friar a lyer. If they freely forsake any thing it is not to follow Christ, but *Bennet, Francis, Dominick, Bruno, Ignatius* and such like hypocrites, by following whom there is more reason to judge they forsake Christ, then by adhering to their rules to adhere to Christ, there being none more malicious and bitter and cruel enemies to the sincere preaching and profession of the Gospel then Friars, Monks, Nunnes, and especially the damned crew of *Jesuits*, who have been within one hundred years and somewhat more authors of more bloody warrs, massacres, cruel persecutions, treasons, murders and other hellish villanies then ever such a number of men besides were guilty of since the world stood. Is any man of such a sottish spirit as to believe that these men have relinquished the riches, pleasures and preferments of this life to serve Christ the remainder of their lives, who knows what goodly structures they live in, what full tables they have, what great revenues they are enriched with? will any man that views the very ruins of Abbys, Nunneries, Pories and other houses, which they termed religious here in *England*, that reads the catalogue of their revenues at the end of *Speeds Chronicle* judge these relinquished the riches of this life? Are the Monastery of *St. Laurence in Castile*, the Colledge of *La Flech in France*, with innumerable more in those countries, and in *Germany, Italy, &c.* Cottages for poor Almshouses? what an arrant gullery and cheat is this of this frontlesse scribler to perswade *English* people, that their votaries have relinquished all riches when they possesse revenues in some countries equal to Kings and Princes, fair Palaces, full tables, good cloathing, great attendance, large command of tenants with furniture and provision of all sorts of things commodious for this life in their convents? And to say they serve Christ when all the world knows the Monks serve none but their own bellies, and the *Jesuits* are true to none but the Catholick Bishop and Catholick King, who may perhaps in time finde them as pernicious to themselves as they are to other Princes and States, what a monstrous fiction is it? their vows and practises are not of true but counterfeit poverty, and if it were voluntary poverty indeed which they make shew of, it would be the more sinful, God no where directing men to cast away their estates, but to use them.

as good stewards, yea to work with their hands the thing that is good, that they may have to give to him that needs, Ephes. 4. 28. not to live of almes, when they might by labour. The obedience which they vow and practise is more then is due to any but God and our Lord Jesus Christ, it is an impious thing to vow blinde obedience to any meer man as they do, and it is in the practise very frequently derogatory from the obedience they owe to those whom God hath appointed their superiors, for by it they exempt themselves from the obedience due to Parents and powers ordained by God, and for the most part, that they may serve the Pope a meer usurper, disobey their governors, whereby they incur damnation of God. Rom. 13. 1, 2, 3, 4. Their vow of single life, which he calls chastity, is ungodly, tying them to that, which is not many times in their power to observe, and therefore exposeth them to sin, and deprives them of Gods own ordinance, to wit, marriage, which they make a Sacrament, and say is for sanctification, and yet count it unholiness for persons not prohibited by Gods law to use it, and they fill the world with whoredom, adultery and other impure lusts. Their severall sorts of votaries, what are they but severall sectaries? nor are Protestants more divided then *Franciscans* and *Dominicans* and *Jesuits*, *Secular Priests* and *Regular* in their opinions and rules, which make bitter and eager contentions among them. The different opinions among Protestants is no more an argument against them then against the law of *Moses*, that there were sects among the Jews of *Scripturists* and *Cabalists*, *Pharisees* and *Sadducees*, or against the Christian Religion, that there were *Nicollaitans*, *Gnosticks* and other sects among the primitive Christians. No marvel Protestants differ considering how much darknesse Popery brought into the world, and what subtilty, and arts, and diligence Papists use to further our differences, with all falshood disguising themselves and creeping into Churches, putting on any habit and vizard that they may corrupt the Churches and scatter them, as many sad stories shew, particularly that of the *Romish* Emissary, who feigned himself a converted Jew and was baptized, that he might corrupt and divide the Church of the baptized. But were all said by *H. T.* for the Papists holiness, true it is no more then what Pharisees did and might say for themselves, they kept the Sabbath and other Jewish festivals; they went often to the Temple to pray, they fasted often, they prayed in the Synagogues and at the corners of the streets, they spared no cost nor pains to make proselytes, they gave almes frequently, they paid tithes, they observed the traditions of the Elders, they kept the law, enlarged their phylacteries, and yet were not the true church, being adversaries to Christ and his Apostles. And the same may we truly say of Papists notwithstanding all their pretended holiness, which is no better then pharisaical, much if not all of it being according to the commands of men not after the commands of Christ, which are broken by them to keep their own traditions, that they are not the true church of Christ but are enemies to it, hating them that go about to discover their errors and corruptions, and endeavour to reduce them to the doctrine and service of God according to the Scriptures, and consequently may be judged in their devotion hypocrites, as Christ censured the Pharisees. The Protestants shew themselves to be *Christ's* true Disciples and Church, in their liberality for the preaching the Gospel, and charitable uses, of which the *Appendix to D. Willet's Synopsi* is a good proof & their zeal for Christ in rejecting to the death Popish innovations, and keeping close to *Christ's* Do-

Strine and appointments, whereby they are proved to be the true Church of Christ, and if some of them go further than others in reforming, and so are divided, it is the same which happened to Christians even in Rome it self, Rom. 14. 2. 5. about Meats and Days, yet each of them sincerely seeking the truth are received of the Lord, whilst Papists are rejected, who obstinately persist in their Errours and abuses, of which they are admonished, casting Gods word behinde their back, and hating to be reformed, Psal. 50. 17.

S E C T. VI.

The power of working miracles is no certain mark of the true Church.

H. T. adds. *The Major as to the power of miracles is proved by these promises of Christ. He that believeth in me, the works that I do he shall do and greater, St. John 14. 10. Those that believe in me these signs shall follow, in my name they shall cast out devils, they shall lay hands upon the sick and they shall be whole, St. Mark, 16. 17.*

Ans. I Deny that the truth of the Church or persons that do miracles is proved from these texts, though the miracles done in Christs name prove the truth of Christs being the Son of God and his doctrin. For the power of miracles is not given by God to prove the persons to be true believers, but the thing they assert and would confirm by them to be true. It is true that these promises are made to believers, yet not to all believers, nor at all times; and it is true also, that some whom Christ will not own, will have to allege that in Christs name they have cast out devils and done many wondrous works, Mat. 7. 22. that the man of sin, 2 Thes. 2. 9. should come after the working of Satan with all power and signes and lying wonders, that the Magicians of Egypt did by their enchantments sundry things like those miracles which Moses did, Exod. 7. and 8. that the beast with two horns like a lamb, and who should speak as a dragon should do great wonders, so as to make fire to come down out of heaven on earth in the sight of men, Revel. 13. 13. that our Lord Christ foretold, Matth. 24. 24. that there should arise false Christs and false Prophets, and should shew great signs and wonders, in so much, that if it were possible they should deceive the very elect, and therefore God premonished his people, Deut. 13. 1, 2, 3. that if a Prophet should do a sign or a wonder, and foretel a thing to come, and it come to passe, if it were to draw them away to another God they should not hearken to him, it being onely a temptation whereby the Lord would prove them, whether they love the Lord with all their heart. Out of which I infer, 1. That such miracles as Christ did were so many and so great, as that they manifestly proved him and his doctrine to be of God. 2. That the miracles which believers did in his name did also prove the same. 3. That miracles did not always prove the holiness of the persons doing them. 4. That consequently a company of persons which may do true miracles in Christs name may yet be no Church of Christ: there were some that cast out devils in Christs name who followed not Christ, Luk 9. 49. 5. That a company of persons may be the Church of Christ who do no miracles. *John did no miracle,* John

John 10. 41. Yea Christ himself at some time was restrained from doing miracles, *Matth. 13. 58.* and the Disciples were defective therein, *Luk. 9. 40. 41.*
 6. That there are some wonders which are lying wonders. 7 That these are so like true miracles, that they are very apt to deceive a great part of men.
 8. That the Lord permits these to be for trial of men. 9. That he keeps his elect from being seduced by them. 10. That they are bound to heed whereto these miracles tend, and not to follow them that make shew of them if they tend to Idolatry, and to draw us away from Gods expresse commands and truths revealed in the Scripture. Out of all which I infer, that without examination of the doctrine by the Scripture we are not meerly upon the pretence of miracles to judge men to be true teachers and true Churches, (except they should be so many, great, frequent, open, as Christ and his Apostles were, for I count that speech of *Bellarmin. lib. 4. de notis Eccles. c. 14.* impious that before the approbation of the Church it is not certain with the certainty of faith whether any miracle be true, which if true till the Church approved them there had been no certainty of faith that Christs or his Apostles miracles were true) and therefore miracles are not a sufficient note of a true Church.

SECT. VII.

The Popish pretended miracles prove not the truth of their Church, nor the miracles related by some of the Fathers.

But *H. T.* taking his Major, as to the power of miracles, sufficiently proved proceeds thus. *The Minor is proved by these ensuing undeniable testimonies. First, Protestants and other Sectaries pretend that miracles have ceased ever since Christ and his Apostles time, because they and their Sect-masters have never yet been able to do any, a sure conviction that they want this mark.*

Ans. 1. **P**rotestants do not pretend that all working of miracles is ceased since the Apostles time, but such frequent working of miracles as was in the Apostles time. 2. That they do not for the reason which this author allegeth say so, but because the truth is so, and if they have not been able to do any, no more have the Papists; if they could they would do them to convince the Sectaries (as he terms us) *sith signs are not for them to believe, but for them that believe not, 1 Cor. 14. 22.* And therefore if Papists could do any miracles, surely they would do them openly to convince the hereticks who deny their Popes and Churches infallibility, of which surely we are all such infidels, as that without miracles done by Popes and the Preachers of his vicarship we shall never be brought to believe it. But they choose rather to cheat foolish Papists with counterfeited tricks, as of the boy of *Bilson*, *Garnets* straw and such like devices, then to let any understanding Protestants have any sight of them, who would discover their knavery.

But *H. T.* tells us. *Secondly, histories (as well of enemies as friends) have recorded many famous miracles in all ages wrought by the Catholick Church. The Magdeburgian Centurists, although Protestants (such is evidence and force of truth)*

truth) have recorded many great miracles done by Catholics in their 13. c. of every century for one thousand three hundred years together after Christ. St. Francis of Assisium fifteen dayes before his death had wounds freshly bleeding in his hands, feet and side, such as Christ had on the Croß, and this by miracle, Mat. Paris p. 3. 19. One Paul Form having stoll two consecrated hosts out of a Church sold one of them to the Jews, who out of malice and contempt stab'd it, saying; If thou be the God of Christians manifest thy self, whereupon blood issued out of the host, for which fact thirty eight of them were burnt at Knoblock in Brandenburg, and all the rest of the Jews were banished out of that Marquisate. This is recorded by Pontianus in his fifth book of memorable things, and by John Mandevil a Protestant in his book de locis communibus p. 87. as also by Oliander Epist. 116. p. 28.

Ans^r. 1. The Magdeburgian Centurists have indeed in their several centuries one chapter of marvellous things, but many of them are such as were wrought immediately by divine providence and are liable to various constructions, few of them, done by men in testimony of the truth of any religion, doctrine or Church, and fewer yet of any certain credit. 2. There's no relation of any of them that are said to be done as wrought by the Catholick Church, either Roman or properly so called, however there be some related as done by persons of the Catholick Church, who are more justly to be accounted Protestants in respect of the doctrine they taught then Papists, whom they falsely call Catholics. 3. It is not denied that Socrates l. 7. hist. c. 17. mentions a miracle of Paul a Novatian Bishop, and Augustin. tract. 13. on John, and de unit. Eccles. c. 16. denies not, that the Donatists alleged miracles, and he calls them by contempt *Mirabiliarios*, and judged that the Church was to be judged by Scripture and the miracles by the Church, as Bellarm. confesseth de notis Eccl. l. 4. c. 14. 4. Those that are said to be done by persons of the Catholick Church for the first five hundred years, were not done by persons that held the now Romish doctrine or in confirmation of it or the verity of the now Roman Church. 5. All the rest in all the ages following are of none or very small credit. Gregory the great is himself judged by Romanists to have been too credulous of tales, those *Dialogues* which are said to be his (in which are related some of the miracles which the Papists rely on) being either none of his or shewing too much credulity in him: the rest of the miracles in the legends are so ridiculous fopperies, as even discreet Papists themselves have discredited. Dr. Rainold Conf. with Hart ch. 8. divis. 2. allegeth *Cannus* as in general excepting against the reports of miracles even by grave, ancient, learned holy Fathers, loc. Theol. l. 11. c. 6. and particularly against Gregories *Dialogues*, and Bedes history, and the very *Portesse* as having uncertain, forged, false and frivolous things in them about Francis and Dominick, and he shews that Pope Gelasius and a council of seventy Bishops with him condemned many false stories which were rehearsed in the Roman *Portesses*, if *Essencaus Comment. in 2. Epist. ad Tim. c. 4. digress. 21.* be to be believed. The two pretended miracles which this Author hath chosen for instance have nothing like divine miracles or truth. The miracles of Christ and his Apostles were such as were done openly in the sight of all so as they could not be denied, but even adversaries confessed them, these were things only in private, so as that there might be some device used to delude the sight, or might be fancied to be so by some

doating persons, or might be by the illusion of Satan, which is not improbable to have been used in them, there being great cause to conceive, that in those dayes of darknesse by seeming wonders, apparitions, visions, prophecies, Satan promoted the worship of Saints, especially of the Virgin *Mary*, the opinion of purgatory, prayer for the dead, worship of reliques, by which Idolatry and superstition grew among Christians about and after the time of the second *Nicene* Synod. Nor is there any likelihood that the wounds of *Francis* should appear fifteen dayes afore death, in which time he was likely covered, and not after his death, in which his body being naked they might have been more visible, were not the time afore death more convenient for the imposture. And the like may be said of the other tale. What likelihood is there that a man should venture his life to steale two peeces of bread, or little wafer cakes, or that a Jew should buy one, or do such an act before witnesses, which would bring so much evil on him? the thing seems more likely to have been a devised tale to pick a quarrel with the Jews, as it was in those dayes usual for a pretence to get their goods as it had been done to the *Templars*. Sure there was no justice to burn thirty eight for the fact of one, much lesse to banish all Jews thence. And why was nothing done to *Paul Form*? either it was therefore a meer fiction, like one of those in *Sir John Mandevils* trayailles, or else a device to stir up rage against the Jews, that they might prey on their goods. 6. Were it yielded (as it is not) that there was truth in these relations, yet the most that can be collected is, that God would vindicate *Francis* from some ill opinions or reports of him, not that he might be extolled, as *Horatius Turselin* in his blasphemous *Epigram* did, as if he were comparable with Christ, or that either the Popes supremacy or the order of Friars, or the verity of the doctrine of the Roman Church then, much lesse the truth of the present Roman Church should be confirmed. Nor, if the other accident were true, doth it follow, that God would thereby confirm the opinion of transubstantiation, but the verity of Christs being the Son of God, and we may more justly answer concerning it, then *Bellarmin* doth concerning the miracle of the *Novatian* Bishop, that it was done, not to confirm the *Novatian* faith, but *Catholic* baptism, so the other was done, not to confirm the Popish opinion of transubstantiation, but the Christian doctrine of the man Christ his being the Son of God.

H. T. adds, notwithstanding this confession of adversaries, I will also add some Fathers, of whose relations of miracles it is not worth while to consider whether they were true or not, there being nor one of them that proves this point, that the Church which wants miracles is not the true Church; or that the present Roman doctrine or Church are the true doctrine or Church. That which *Cyprian* and *Optatus* relate, if true, did only vindicate the Lords Supper from contempt, that of *Gregory Thaumaturgus*, whether it were so or onely a report (of which good men were sometimes too credulous) it proves not the truth of the Roman Church, but rather, if any, of the Greek Church which owned not the Popes supremacy, nor their doctrines in that age. Much less is that which he brings out of *Chrysostom* concerning the reliques of *Babylas* for his purpose, sith it is expressly said to have proved against infidels that Christ was the Son of God, and the Idols of the Gentiles were vain things; which no more proves the truth of the Roman then of the Protestant Churches, nor so much as of the Greek Churches who hold the same. That of *Ambrose* concerning his brother

Her *Satyrus* proves not transubstantiation, but rather the contrary, sith *Satyrus* adored not the Eucharist, when he kept it, and that he did keep him from drowning was but a conjecture, nor is it proved that God by that accident approved his superstition, though he might reward his faith and love, of which that was a sign. What *Augustin* l. 22. *de civit. Dei* c. 8. writes of things done in his time are not undoubted, sith some of them are related upon the report of one or more not very judicious, who might enlarge things beyond truth, especially when the custome was of reading the relations to the people, and they were pressed in conscience to divulge them, as there *Augustin* saith was done by him, and it seemed so much for advantage of Christian Religion; some of them might be by medicines working beyond expectation though attributed, as the fashion is, to that which was last used; some of them perhaps fell out according to the course of such diseases, as are said to be cured; that of the healing of two *Cappadocians* hath too much suspicion of counterfeiting, and *Augustin* himself, though he relates somethings of his own knowledge, yet makes none of them like the miracles of Christ and his Apostles, which were more frequent and open and manifest in the presence of the adversaries, as the raising of *Lazarus* and many more were, and therefore he allegeth them for the stopping of their mouths, who called for miracles, rather then for any evident proof of religion, using this very preface in the beginning of the Chapter, *Why, say they, are not those miracles now done which ye say have been done? I may say indeed they were necessary before the world should believe for this that the world might believe. Whosoever as yet seeks after prodigies, that he may believe, is himself a great prodigy, who the world believing, believes not.* But whatever be to be thought of the relations of *Augustin* in that place, certain it is that *Augustin*, ch. 9, 10. useth them not to give testimony to the confirmation either of the truth of the Roman Church or any of their doctrines, nor for the worshipping of *Stephen* the Martyr, or any other of the Saints, but only to prove the resurrection of Christ, to which they in their death gave testimony, and therefore are all impertinent to the purpose of *H. T.* to prove the verity of the Roman Church by them.

S E C T. VIII.

The objections against the proof of the verity of the Roman Church from the power of miracles are not solved by *H. T.*

But *H. T.* takes on him to answer objections thus. *Ob. Miracles have ceased ever since Christ and his Apostles.* Answ. You contradict the plain promises of Christ made to his Church without limitation, as also the histories and records of all Christendom.

I Reply, 1. The objection is not as *H. T.* frameth it, but that so frequent and manifest working of miracles as was in the days of Christ and his Apostles, and which may be a note of the true Church or doctrine without consonancy to the Scripture hath ceased, and therefore by this mark of it self the Roman Church is not proved to be the true Church. 2. The contradictory to

this is not proved by Christs promises or the Churches records For, 1. The Promises, *John* 14. 10. *Mark* 16. 17. are indefinite in respect of persons and time, and an indefinite proposition is true in a contingent matter, if verified but of some at some times, and therefore these promises may be true of some believers onely, and of the time wherein the Apostles lived, and consequently by the promises it cannot be proved that there must be a power of working miracles in the Church in every age. 2. That they cannot be understood of any age after the Apostles unto this day is manifest, because they are not true of any age after that. For however some miracles have been done, yet not greater then Christ did, which is promised, *John* 14. 10. nor was the speaking with new tongues which is promised *Mark* 16. 17. in any age, but that in which the Apostles lived. 3. These promises are as much made to believers in other Churches as the Roman, but now they grant there's no power of Miracles in any other Church, and therefore they must yield to understand the words with such a limitation as may make the Proposition true, though there be no power of Miracles in the Roman Church. 4. There's no promise of the power of Miracles to confirm the truth of the Roman Church, nor of any other point but the Christian faith, and therefore none of the Miracles done by virtue of those promises prove the truth of the now Roman Church or Doctrine, but onely the true faith, which is believed by Protestants, who believe the Creed as well as Papists. As for the Records, there are very few of them of any certainty after the Apostles days, and Popish Writers themselves do confess, that not onely in their Legends, but also in their Liturgies, fabulous things have crept; so that by saying Miracles are altogether now ceased, or else are very rare, and are unfit to demonstrate the verity of any present Church, is no contradicting Christ's promises, or any good Records of Christendom.

H. T. adds. Object. *Signs and Miracles were given to Unbelievers not to Believers, therefore they are now unnecessary.* Answ. No, they are not, for they very much confirm the immediate care and providence of God over his Church, they excellently demonstrate his omnipotence, and there be many disbelievers still, the more is the pity.

I reply, that Tongues are for a sign to them that believe not, is the Apostles saying, *1 Cor.* 14. 22. not for them that believe; and there is the same reason of other Miracles; and therefore is this justly urged by Protestants, that to believers to prove the truth of Christian Doctrine or of the Christian Church Miracles are unnecessary. Now the Answer of H. T. is quite from the point, when he tells us that they are necessary for other ends. And yet it is not true, that Signs and Miracles are necessary to confirm the immediate care and providence of God over his Church, sith God doth by his ordinary provision either of Teachers, or Christian Princes shew his immediate care and providence over his Church, and by his daily works of the motion of the Sun, and other acts of governing the World demonstrates his omnipotence: nor by his Miracles and Signs hath he shewed so much his immediate care and providence over his Church for the guiding and protecting of them, as his care of unbelievers by bringing them into his Church. And it is true, that there are many disbelievers still, the more's the pity, and if God did see it good it would be a blessed thing if he did vouchsafe the gift of doing Miracles to convert the Indians Moors,

Moors, Tartars, to the faith of *Christ*, and we wish it were true which the Jesuits boast of *Francis Xavier* his Miracles in the East Indies, though *Franciscus a victoria* relict. 5. Sect. 2. and *Josephus Acosta* lib. 4. de Indorum salute cap. 4 12. Blab out that which gives us cause to think that the Relations are but feigned things tending to magnifie the Pope and the Jesuits; there being no such evidence of those things from any persons of credit, who have traded or travelled into those parts. But be they what they will, it is certain God never intended Miracles to prove the Popes Supremacy or the verity of the Roman Church, but the *Christian* faith, and therefore till both or either of them be proved from Scripture, if we be disbelievers we must be disbelievers still, knowing this, that if there should be never so great Miracles in shew done by Popes or Friers, yet we are bound not to believe them without proof of their Doctrine from Scripture, and that if any though an Angel from Heaven preach any other Gospel than that which is written, he is to be held accursed, Gal. 1. 8. 9. And that Miracles are not necessary for proving our calling while we preach the Scripture-doctrine, as *Bellarmino* scribles lib. 4. de notis Eccles. cap. 14. But on the other side, if Papists do not stick onely to Scripture, nor will be tried by it, it is necessary they should produce Miracles of their Popes and Prelates to verifie their claim or new Gospel, of which they are altogether destitute, and have nothing to allege but a company of Fables concerning some foolish Friers, such as *Francis*, *Dominick*, &c. upon the report of silly superstitious Women and doting companions of them, or some juggling tricks in corners done by cheating Priests and Jesuits, which serve for no other purpose but to prove the Priests to be Knaves, and their Popish Profelytes that believe them to be fools. And we have cause to press them as in the next Objection, *Why do not then your Priests do Miracles? we would be glad to see some of their doing.* To which *H. T.* saith, *Ans.* Because of your incredulity as our Saviour told the Jews, *St. Matth.* 17. 19. *Yet they do many in Gods appointed time and place (as the Records of the Church will testifie) though not to satisfie your sinfull curiosity.* See *Francis a Sancta Clara* in his *Paralipomena*, who recounts many great and evident Miracles. I reply, if our incredulity be the onely reason of their not doing them among us, yet me thinks they should do them in Italy and Spain where men have faith in them: But except of a few tales of *Philip Neri*, *Ignatius Loyala*, *Francisca Teresa*, *Isidore of Madrid* an Husbandman, and some other late canonized Saints long after their death sworn by some admirers of them, or credulous receivers of reports concerning things of them not openly done and commonly known as the Miracles of *Christ* and his Apostles were, I hear of none. The *Paralipomena* of *Franciscus a Sancta Clara* or *Davenport*, who endeavoured to reconcile the nine and thirty Articles of the Church of England with the Doctrine of the Church of Rome, that is, Light with Darknes, a little afore these Wars, I never saw, nor do I expect to finde any thing from such a man but fraud and falshood, who had the face to endeavour to draw the Articles purposely framed against the Popish Doctrine to a sense consistent with it. What *Justus Lipsius* writ of the Miracles done by the Idol at *Halles*, and *Ziehem*, *Turselin* of the Chapel at *Laureto*, and such like Relations, there is no man that heeds the Scripture will give any credit to them; but take them either as fictions or illusions of Satan to confirm men in the idolatrous Worship of the Virgin Mary, and to promote the Priests gain, which.

which is a great part of the Roman Religion. But the frequent Impostures of Papists in this kinde, as of the Blood of *Christ* at the Abby of *Hales*, that of *Boxley* Abby, and the holy Maid of *Kent*, related by *Speed* in his *Chronicle* of *Henry* the eighth, at *Orleans* by *Gray Friars* related by *Steidan*, *Com. lib. 9.* at *Bruxels* related by *Meteran*, *lib. 10. hist. Belg.* that of the Boy of *Bilston* near *Wolverhampton* in *Stafford-shire* which is related in a Book of that thing and persons yet alive can testifie of the Priests deceit in it, with many more, give just cause to discredit all such Narrations as meer juggling tricks. Nor have the Legends of Saints, which this man calls the Records of the Church any better credit with the more ingenuous of their own Church, of whom though some mince the matter, calling them *Pious Frauds*, as if Piety might be upheld by Lyes, yet *Ludovicus Vives* freely censured those that made them to have had a *Brasen forehead*, and those that believed them a *Leaden heart*. And therefore it is the more necessary for their Priests to let us see their Miracles, not to satisfie our curiosity, but our consciences, if they will have us converted from disbelief in their Lord God the Pope, (as in the Canon Law he is termed) there being nothing in the Scripture to prove the Roman Churches verity or infallibility, or the Popes Supremacy, as will appear by examining the seventh Article, to which I now hasten, which is intituled, *The Popes Supremacy asserted.*

ART.



ARTIC. VII.

The Popes Supremacy is an Innovation.

The Pope or Bishop of Rome's Supremacy or Headship of the whole Church of God is not proved by H. T.

SECT. I.

Neither is it proved nor probable that Peter was Bishop of Rome, or that he was to have a Successour.

Our Tenet, saith H. T. is that the Pope or Bishop of Rome is the true Successour of St. Peter and Head of the whole Church of God, which hath in part been proved already by our Catalogue of chief Pastours (who were all Popes of Rome) and by the Councils of all Ages, approved by them, and owning them for such, and is yet farther proved thus.

Ans^r. **T**HAT Peter was Pope of Rome hath been said, but never yet proved but by the tradition of the Ancients, who might be as easily deceived in that as they were about *Christ's* age, the keeping of *Easter*, and many other things. Those very men who relate Peter's sitting at Rome as Bishop do not agree about his immediate Successour, whether *Linus*, or *Clemens*, or *Cletus*, as H. T. confesseth here pag. 52. And the relation it self is so inconsistent with that which Paul saith, that by consent he and Peter agreed that Peter should go to the Jews, and had the Gospel of the Circumcision committed to him, his not saluting Peter in his Epistle to the Romans, his being at *Antioch*, and according to *Luke*, and Paul in other places so long a time as they mention in the Acts of the Apostles, and the Epistle to the Galatians, makes it altogether improbable that he should be Bishop at Rome such a time as they say he was, and be put to death

death in Nero's time as the tradition insisted on bears in hand. Nor was it agreeable to *Peter's Office* appointed by *Christ* to be as a fixed Pastour in one place. And if he were settled in any place it is more probable it was at *Antioch*, where *Paul* mentions him to have been, than at *Rome*, nor of his translation of his Seat from *Antioch* to *Rome* is there any proof, but what is by such tradition, as in this and other things appears to be very uncertain and unlikely. Yet were it yielded that *Peter* was Bishop or chief Pastour, how will it be proved that he was to have a Successour? *Paul* it is certain was at *Rome*, and did while he was there, undoubtedly execute the Office of a Pastour, yet Popes do not challenge themselves to be *Paul's* but *Peter's* Successours, however they put *Paul's* Sword in their Arms with *Peter's* Keys, and in their Writings say the Church of *Rome* was founded by *Peter* and *Paul*, and use *Paul's* name with *Peter's* in their Sentences. Nor can indeed in any true sense the Pope of *Rome* be termed *Peter's* Successour. For if he be his Successour, he is Successour in his Work or in his Power. The Work of the Apostle *Peter* was by preaching the Gospel to found Churches to *Christ*, and to that end was to go to several places; but the Pope of *Rome* succeeds not in this, he neither goes up and down unless in a pompous Procession, or to a worse end, nor preacheth the Gospel, nor founds any Churches thereby, nor doth think it his business, but to stay at *Rome*, and there to live in pomp, and wealth, and luxury, and to lord it tyrannously over the Flock of God. Nor is he Successour in his power. *Peter* had power to give the Holy Ghost, *Acts* 8. to strike *Ananias* and *Sapphira* dead, *Acts* 5. But the Pope cannot do these things. Nor in the Government of the whole Church. For this *Peter* onely had not, nor above other Apostles, but together with the rest. Nor was *Peter's* or the Apostles power any such visible Monarchy as the Pope claims, to receive Appeals from all Churches, to appoint Legates to hear parties in all controversies of faith, to be an infallible Judge of such controversies, an infallible Expounder of the Scriptures, determining what is Hereſe, and what of Faith, calling general Councils, crowning Emperours, deposing Princes, dispensing with Oaths, Marriages of persons in near degrees, otherwise prohibited, impose Laws about Fasting, and many other things which God never appointed. Such an Headship of the whole Church as the Pope claims *Peter* never had. Nor is any such thing proved or so much as offer'd to be proved by *H. T.* his Catalogue, which how insufficient it is hath been already shewed. I go on to his Arguments here.

SECT. II.

From being the Foundation, *Matth* 16.18. and feeding the Sheep of *Christ*, *John* 21.15,16,17. neither *Peter's* nor Popes Supremacy is proved.

The first Argument, saith *H. T.* is this, The foundation hath a prebeminence of firmitude and stability before the rest of the building which is founded on it, and the shepherd is Head of his Flock, and above his Sheep. But *St. Peter* next after *Christ* himself was the Foundation of the whole Church, and Pastour of the whole Flock: therefore *St. Peter* next after *Christ* had a prebeminence

heminece over the whole Church, and was Head of the whole Flock, and above all the other Sheep, of which number were the rest of the Apostles.

Ans. **T**He Headship and pastoral power which H. T. would prove to be due to the Pope is not a guidance onely by teaching, but a princely dominion, so as that all may appeal to him, none from him, his sentence must be obeyed by all under pain of damnation in matters of faith, and must be judged infallible, and 'tis likely he holds with Bellarmine, lib. 4. de Rom. pont. cap. 5. *that if the Pope should erre by commanding vices, or forbidding virtues, the Church should be bound to believe vices to be good and virtues to be evil, unless it would sin against conscience; and if he dissent herein from Bellarmine, yet in the Canon Law distinct. 40. such an absolute dominion is given him, that though he should draw innumerable souls with him to Hell, no man must say to him, Why dost thou so?* and some Flatterers of the Pope have given him all power in Heaven and Earth, yea, and more than Christ had, in Purgatory also, allowing no Appeal from the Pope to God, as *having one Consistory with God, calling him our Lord God the Pope;* nor did I ever read or hear that any Pope hath by any Censure corrected such blasphemous Titles, but they have by their commands contrary to Gods, dispensing with his Laws, deposing Emperours, and innumerable other practises shewed that they owned such power as theirs. Now sure this power was never given to Peter, nor any such like power under the term of a *Foundation*, which is for the ruine, not for the establishing of the Church, nor under the charge of *feeding*, especially of anothers Sheep, of whom he is no Owner or Lord. Is this to feed Christ's Sheep, to do what he will with them, appoint what Penance he will, put what Laws he please on the Sheep, to excommunicate, deprive of Civil and Ecclesiastical Dignity and Office at pleasure? such a Supremacy is indeed so like that which Paul foretold concerning the man of sin, 2 Thess. 2. 4. *that he opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped: so that he as God sitteth in the Temple of God, shewing himself that he is God;* that till I meet with some more likely than the Popes to be there meant, I shall take it be a part of my Creed, that the Pope of Rome is the very Man of sin there meant. And for this H. T. who gives such a supreme Headship to Peter and the Pope over the other Apostles, so as to make him a Shepherd, to rule, excommunicate, deprive, Fohn, James, Paul, as his Sheep, it is so monstrously false an Assertion as none but he that hath sold himself to teach Lyes would ever assert it. As for his Syllogism it is most grossly naught, as having four terms at least. The term [*hath a preheminece of firmitude and stability before the rest of the building which is founded on it*] being different from this in the Conclusion, [*had a preheminece over the whole Church*] and so likewise are these [*the Foundation*] and [*the Foundation of the whole Church*] and therefore the Major should have been [*the Foundation of the whole Church hath a preheminece over the whole Church*] the Minor thus, [*Peter next after Christ is the Foundation of the whole Church*] and the Conclusion thus, [*Peter next after Christ had a preheminece over the whole Church*] or else thus, [*The Foundation hath a preheminece of firmitude and stability before the whole Church*. But Peter next after Christ is the Foundation, therefore Peter had a preheminece of firmitude and stability before the whole Church] now neither of these Conclusions had been the

the point to be proved, but might have been granted, and the Assertion not gained. And in the other Metaphor the Syllogism hath the same fault. For in the Major it is [*Head of his Flock, and above his Sheep*] in the Minor it is [*Pastour of the whole Flock*] and in the Conclusion not [*Head of his Flock and above his Sheep*] but [*Head of the whole Flock, and above all the other Sheep*] and there is added too this tail of which there is no offer of proof [*of which number were the rest of the Apostles.*] Now to discover besides the fallacy in the form the deceit in the matter of this Argument, it is to be considered, 1. That the Metaphor of a *Foundation* doth not at all import Rule or Government, but inchoation and support, and therefore is unfit to prove that Rule and Power of Government which *H. T.* derives from it. 2. That he that is a Shepherd is Head or Lord of his own Sheep, but a Shepherd is not Lord or Head of anothers Sheep of which he is no Owner; and therefore though he is to rule and feed them, yet he is not to rule them after his own will, but the Owners, nor is he to take the profit of the Sheep, but the Owner is to have it, the Shepherd is not to look, but for his pay and encouragement according to the will or contract of the Owner. Now the Flock of *Christ* were none of *Peter's* Sheep, nor were all the Sheep of *Christ* universally taken to be fed by *Peter*, for then he should feed, that is, rule himself, who was one of the Flock, and so excommunicate himself, absolve himself; and sith the Pope hath *Peter's* power, if he be one of the Sheep of *Christ*, by this Doctrine he is to rule, that is, to excommunicate, absolve, and deprive himself. And for the other Metaphor of a *Foundation* it hath the like absurdity: For if *Peter* be the Foundation of the whole Church, and the term [*Foundation*] imports the ruling of the whole Church, *Peter*, who is a part of the Church, is the Foundation of himself, and the Pope of himself, and sith he is the Vicar of *Christ*, he is in stead of *Christ* to himself, and so hath preheminance over himself, and the Pope in like manner; yea, unless they deny the blessed Virgin *Mary* to have been one of *Christ's* Sheep, they must assert *Peter*, and after him the Pope to have been the Foundation and Shepherd of the blessed Virgin *Mary*, to have had a power to rule, excommunicate and absolve her. The truth is this, the pressing of a Metaphor beyond that for what it is used draweth with it many absurdities; and therefore the Metaphors of *Foundation* and *Building*, *Shepherd* and *Sheep* can infer no more than that use of these which the Authour of the Speech intended by them, which what it is will be considered by examining the Texts brought for proof. And for the Arguments, if they did conclude the thing in question they should be thus framed, or to this purpose. *He that is the Foundation or Builder of the whole Church of Christ, hath supreme unerring dominion or rule of the whole Church of Christ. But such was Peter, and by consequence the Pope of Rome. Ergo. Again, He that is to feed all the Sheep of Christ hath dominion or rule as aforesaid. But that was Peter, and consequently the Pope of Rome is to do. Ergo.* In both I should deny the Major understood of the under Foundation, Builder, and Shepherd, though it should be yielded by concession of an impossibility, yet he should not have such a supreme unerring Rule thereby: and I deny the Minor also, and in both as they stand or should stand, there are many Propositions in these and his forms expressed or implied, which are apparently false. As, 1. That every Foundation of the Church hath preheminance of firmitude above every Building founded on it. There were

were some as firm in the Faith as the Apostles, and of the Apostles some as firm or more firm than *Peter*. 2. That every Foundation or Builder of the Church hath rule over it. 3. That the Metaphor of a Foundation or Builder do note Rule or Dominion. 4. That as applied to *Peter*, they note in him supreme unerring Rule or Dominion. 5. That he that is a Shepherd is Head of his Flock. 6. That he is above his Flock. 7. That the person that is bid to feed *Christ's* Sheep is bid to feed the whole Flock of *Christ* universally taken. 8. That the charge of feeding them is as much, as have supreme dominion, be a visible Monarch over them. 9. That the Bishop of *Rome* is *Peter's* Successor in that charge and power which *Christ* committed to him over his whole Church. 10. That what is said of *Peter* in this point is true of every Bishop of *Rome* be he never so unlearned and vicious. All which I have distinctly noted, that it may appear upon how many suppositions the Popes Supremacy hangs, and yet how loose, and empty of proof from Scripture or Reason the Disputes of Papists are about this which is with them a fundamental point of their Religion, in so much that were it not for the heavy curse, that is befallen Papists, that sith they receive not the love of the truth, that they might be saved, they should believe Lyes, that they might be damned, 2 *Thess.* 2. 10, 11, 12. it could not be that understanding persons among them should ever assent to the claimed Supremacy of the Pope over the whole Church upon these Reasons.

But let us view what is said here. *The Major is proved, because the Foundation supporteth the rest of the Building (we are built on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Cornerstone, Ephes. 2. 20.) and the Shepherd hath a power to govern his whole Flock.*

Ans. The Argument framed hence must be this, *That which supporteth the Building hath a preeminence of firmitude and stability before the rest of the Building which is founded on it. But so doth every Foundation. Ergo.* But the Major is not true of personal Metaphorical Foundations, of which we now speak, not of material proper Foundations. A man may be a Foundation of a Common-wealth, and support it by his wisdom, and example, and authority, and yet not have a preeminence of firmitude and stability above that Common-wealth founded on him or it; and so in the founding of the Church, a man that founds it may fall away, and yet the Church stand firm. Neither is the Minor true of every personal metaphorical Foundation, he may be said to be a Foundation, that is, begin a Church or Common-wealth who doth not after support it. The Text *Ephes. 2. 20.* proves neither of the Propositions, nor do I know to what purpose it is produced, except to prove *Peter* to have been a Foundation; But then it proves not *Peter* alone, but the rest of the Apostles and Prophets to have been Foundations, and so proves no preeminence to *Peter* above them, which is the Assertion of this Authour. But to me it is doubtfull whether the Apostles are termed Foundations. 1. Because this seems to be appropriated to *Christ*, 1 *Cor.* 3. 11. 2. Because it is not said, *We are built on the Foundations*, but *the Foundation*, and therefore seems to have this sense, ye are built on that Foundation which the Apostles and Prophets have laid, not, which they are, and so the genitives are of the efficient, not of the subject, and the Foundation must be that Doctrine or truth they declared, of which *Christ*, that is, the Doctrine or Faith of *Christ* is the chief Corner-

stone. Nor is this against that which is *Revel. 21. 14.* that the names of the twelve Apostles are written in the twelve Foundations of the Wall of the new Jerusalem. For that may be said, because they were chief workmen in the laying of the Foundation, as *Paul* saith of himself, *1 Cor. 3. 10.* according to the custom of master-builders, whose names are written in their work, not because they were themselves the Foundations, as the twelve Tribes, *vers. 12.* in the twelve gates, because by them entrance was in the Old Testament, they being prime beginners of the people of *Israel*. Yet if they be said to be Foundations, they were Foundations as the Prophets were, to wit, by their preaching: nor doth their being Foundations prove their Rule or Dominion any more than the Prophets being Foundations; and certainly *Peter* is here made no more a Foundation than the rest. The other proof seems to be this. *He that hath power to feed and govern his whole Flock is Head of his Flock, and above his Sheep. But every Shepherd hath such such power. Ergo.* The Major is denied. A Parish-priest hath power to feed and govern his whole Flock, of which a King may be a part, and yet he is not Head of the King, nor above him in dignity or authority, nor perhaps in knowledge. And the like may be said of his Physician.

S E C T. III.

The Text *Matth. 16. 18.* proves not any Rule or Dominion in *Peter* over the Apostles, but a promise of special success in his preaching.

H. T. adds, *The Minor is proved, Thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my Church, St. Matth. 16. 18.* (the whole was built on him.)

Ans. **T**HE Argument seems to be this. *He who is the Rock on which Christ would build his Church he was next after Christ the Foundation of the whole Church. But Peter was the Rock on which Christ would build his Church. Ergo.* In which there are these things supposed. 1. That the term [Rock] is as much as a Foundation, and so it is not the absolute quality of firmness onely, but also the relative use of a stone or a rock in buildings which is imported by it. 2. That the term [Rock] notes *Peter's* person. 3. That it notes *Peter's* person alone. 4. That it notes *Peter's* person as being a Rock so as no other, but *Christ*, was a Rock as he was. 5. That the Building upon this Rock notes *Peter's* person in respect of his singular Rule not given to other Apostles. 6. That he was the Foundation next after *Christ*. 7. That the Church comprehends the militant Church visible. 8. That it notes the whole Church of *Christ* even the Apostles themselves: each of these is to be examined. 1. The term [*πίτρυς*] here used, whether it be translated [Rock or stone] I deny not to denote not so much the absolute property of stability, as the relative use of a foundation in a Building. 2. Though some of the Ancients make *Christ* the Rock, others the confession of *Christ*, or the faith in him, which *Peter* had professed, yet by reason of the occasion of the speech, and the Preface [*I say unto thee*] and the commemora-

tion of his Name [*Thou art Peter*] and the allusion to that Name in the choice of the word [*πέτρος*, or *Cephas* in Syriack]. I deny not that by [*this Rock* or *stone*] is meant *Peter's* person, nor thirdly, that it notes his person alone, nor fourthly, that it notes *Peter's* person in a singular manner, so as that there is something peculiar to *Peter* intimated thereby. But I deny, 1. That it notes *Peter's* singular Rule or Dominion not given to other Apostles. 2. That he was so a Foundation next after *Christ* as that the other Apostles were laid on him as a stone supporting them, as is the conceit of some of the *Romanists*. 3. That the term [*Church*] notes the visible Church as visible. 4. That it notes the whole visible Church universally taken. And each of these I prove thus.

1. If the term [*Rock* or *Stone*] note *Peter's* person as becoming a Foundation or Foundation-stone by such an act as notes not any Rule or Dominion, and was common to other Apostles with *Peter*, then it doth not note *Peter's* singular Rule or Dominion not given to other Apostles: but the term [*Rock* or *Stone*] notes *Peter's* person, as becoming a Foundation or Foundation-stone by such an act as notes not any Rule or Dominion, and was common to other Apostles with *Peter*. Ergo. The Major is of it self evident. The Minor is thus proved. That act whereby *Peter's* person became a Foundation or Foundation-stone was *Christ's* building his Church on him. But that act notes not any Rule or Dominion, and was common to other Apostles with *Peter*. Ergo. The Major is of it self evident. The Minor is proved thus. The act whereby *Christ* built his Church on *Peter* was *Peter's* preaching of the same Doctrine which he professed. But that act notes not any Rule or Dominion, and was common to other Apostles with *Peter*. Ergo. The Minor I take for granted: Papists do not ascribe Rule or Dominion to Priests that preach, and other Apostles preached *Christ* as well as *Peter*. Now that *Christ* builded his Church on *Peter* by his preaching is proved thus. That act by which and no other the Church of *Christ* is said to be built, is that act whereby *Christ* built his Church on *Peter*. But it is the preaching of the Doctrine that *Peter* professed and no other act by which the Church of *Christ* is said to be built. The Major is evident of it self. The Minor is proved, 1. By those places which speak of building the Church, they still import teaching not rule, as appears by an induction, *Acts* 9.31. *Rom* 15.20. *1 Cor.* 8.1, 10. & 10.23. & 14.4, 17. *Gal.* 2.18. *1 Thess.* 5.11. *1 Pet.* 2.5. and the compound Verb used *Acts* 20.30. *1 Cor.* 3.10, 12. *Ephes.* 2.20, 22. *Col.* 2.7. *Jude* 20. and the Noun *Rom.* 14.19. & 15.2. *1 Cor.* 3.9. & 14.3, 5, 12. *2 Cor.* 10.8. & 12.19. & 13.10. *Ephes.* 4.12, 16, 29. do all shew that the Building of the Church or Saints is by instruction, not by rule, the work being sometimes mutual, as *1 Thess.* 5.11. *Ephes.* 4.10. *Jude* 20. and sometimes the matter by which the building is, being for informing and teaching, as *Ephes.* 4.29. and sometimes the Builders are termed Teachers, as *Ephes.* 4.11, 12. and that Text *Ephes.* 2.20. (which *H. T.* allegeth) the Building being by Prophets as well as Apostles can be understood of no other Building than by teaching, therefore so also must be understood *Matth.* 16.18.

2. It is further proved from *1 Cor.* 3.10. where the Apostle tells the *Corinthians*, that as a wise Master-builder he had laid the Foundation, and that Foundation which he laid was Jesus Christ, *vers.* 11. and *vers.* 5. he shews how that

that was, to wit, in that he was a Minister by whom with Apollos the Corinthians believed, and that thereby they were God's Building, and God's Husbandry, vers. 9. to wit, by his planting, Apollos watering, and God's increase, vers. 6. which can be referred to no other acts but teaching or preaching of the faith of Christ, in which Paul counts himself a Master-builder, that built not on Peter's foundation, or any others, Rom. 15. 20. and his edifying is there the effect of his Evangelizing or Preaching the Gospel, and consequently the building of the Church, Matth. 16. 18. must be interpreted to be by preaching the Gospel.

3. It is further proved by those places which make the Foundation of the Building special Doctrine, such as are Heb. 6. 1. 1 Cor. 3. 11. Rom. 15. 20. whence it follows, that the building of the Church is by Doctrine, and Matth. 16. 18. must be understood of it, not of Rule or Dominion. Yea, the Council of Trent it self, Sess. 3. terms the Creed the firm and only Foundation, against which the Gates of Hell shall not prevail; and thereby intimates the Foundation, Matth. 16. 18. to be chief points of Christian Doctrine.

4. By the appositeness of the Phrase to signifie planting and increasing of knowledge and strengthening by teaching, not imposing commands by way of Rule or Empire. No where is a Prince said to edifie, but Prophets, Apostles, and other Teachers; nor is Excommunication, Ordination, calling of Councils, and such acts as shew Dominion termed Edification, but teaching and reprovng, 2 Cor. 13. 10. therefore such princely power as the Popes claim cannot be meant by building Christ's Church, Matth. 16. 18.

5. The same may be proved from the matter of the Promise, Matth. 16. 18. which is not of what power Christ would give to Peter, but of what Christ would do by him, and consequently cannot be understood of supreme power, but of singular work.

6. The end of the power, which the Pope claims, is for the exalting of himself, and his visible Monarchy, but the thing promised Matth. 16. 18. is not the advancement of Peter, but the use of him for setting up his Church. The Popes power is (as all experience witnesseth) for the destruction of the Church, not for edification; and therefore is not meant Matth. 16. 18.

If any say, How then hath Peter something singular ascribed to him? I answer, in that he did first begin to lay the Foundation of the Churches after Christ's Ascension by his preaching, as Acts 2. & 3. & 4. & 10. appears: and seems to be observed by Peter, as the accomplishment of Christ's Promise, Acts 15. 7. who used Peter at the first more eminently than any other, though afterwards he chose Paul, who did labour more abundantly than the rest, 1 Cor. 15. 10.

2. The second thing that Peter was not so a Foundation next after Christ, as that the other Apostles were laid on him, as a stone supporting them, is proved 1. From Ephes. 2. 20. where the building of the Church is said to be on the Foundation of the Apostles and Prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief Corner-stone, in whom the whole Building compacted together groweth to an holy Temple in the Lord; therefore the Apostles and Prophets have equal place in the Building, and it is Christ, and not Peter, in whom all the Building is fitly framed together. 2. From Revel. 21. 14. where the Wall of the City of new Jerusalem is said to have twelve Foundations, and not one singular one supporting

porting the rest, but the Foundations are as many as the Apostles, none of whom is the Foundation of the rest.

3. That the term [*Church*] *Mat. 16. 18.* notes not the visible Church as visible, is proved, 1. In that it is termed *Christ's Church*, but the visible as visible is not termed *Christ's Church*, but as it is invisible by faith and *Christ's Spirit* dwelling in it. 2. In that *Christ* promised, that *the Gates of Hell should not prevail against it*. But they have and do prevail against the visible Church as visible, many visible Churches have been corrupted and perish.

4. That [*my Church, Mat. 16. 18.*] is not the whole Church universally taken is proved in that 1. Then the whole Church universally taken should be built by or on *Peter*, but that cannot be true, sith a great part of the Church specially of the *Gentiles* was built by *Paul*, and he denies he built on another's Foundation, *Rom. 15. 20. 1 Cor. 3. 10.* 2. Then *Peter* should be built on himself, sith *Peter* was part of the universal Church, and the *Virgin Mary* should be built on *Peter*, which are absurd.

Which things being evinced it appears, 1. That this was a Promise to the singular person of *Peter* of a singular success of his preaching which no other had, and so belongs not to any Successour. 2. That it is not a Promise of Government and Jurisdiction, (in which *H. T.* placeth *Peter's* Headship, pag. 75.) for that *Christ* expressly forbade, but of singular honour to *Peter* in his happy success in preaching the Gospel, recompensing his readiness to acknowledge *Christ*. And this *Christ* had elsewhere promised, *Luke 5. 10.* under the Promise of being a *Fisher of men*. Now this is nothing to the Dominion claimed by the Pope. As for being a *Rock on which the Church of Christ might be built*, we would most gladly it were true, that the Pope were such, we should then honour him and kiss his Toe: but as he is and hath been for many hundreds of years, he is to be judged the Butcher who hath slain the Saints of God, and a tyrannical *Antichrist* domineering over the Church of *Christ*.

I marvel that *H. T.* saith nothing here of the *Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven*, which the Pope is painted with, as having them in his hands, and by which he was wont to claim his power. But perhaps he findes it too short for the proof of that peerless power which the Pope claims, sith even in the Council of Trent and the *Roman Catechism* in handling the Priests and Bishops power of Absolution, the *Keys* are in their hands, and so it is no more than others have beside the Pope: therefore I need not insist on that here, sith *H. T.* hath thought fit to omit it.

SECT. IV.

John 21. 16, 17, 18. proves not *Peter's* Supremacy over the whole Church.

But he adds, And for a Reward of *Peter's* special dilection (for he loved *Christ* more than all the rest of the Apostles) he said to him, Feed my Lambs. Feed my Lambs, Feed my Sheep, St. John 21. 17, 18. (a Commission to feed all without exception.)

Ans.

Ans. **T**He Argument seems to be this, He to whom, as a Reward of his special dilection, by which he loved Christ more than all the rest of the Apostles, Christ said, Feed my Lambs, Feed my Lambs, Feed my Sheep, St. John 21. 17, 18. and thereby gave him a Commission to feed all without exception was Pastour of the whole Flock. But this was Peter. Ergo. Here four things are supposed, whereof not one is true. 1. That Peter loved Christ more than all the rest of the Apostles. For neither were all the rest of the Apostles there, nor doth Christ or Peter say, he did love Christ more than they did, but only puts a question, which may either have this sense, Lovest thou me more than thou lovest them? or more than they love me? And this probably was put to him to minde him of his former forward Profession, and shamefull denial. 2. That Christ made Peter a Head, or gave him a supreme Dominion under the term of Feeding. But, 1. The words are ποιμαίνε and βόσκει; now βόσκει signifies not to rule, but onely to provide pasture, or to cate, as ποιμαίνω also doth, Jude 12. being intransitive: both of them where they are enjoyned to Apostles, Bishops, or Presbyters, note teaching, not imposing Laws on persons, excommunicating, depriving, and such like acts, as Popes claim as belonging to them as Pastours, as may appear by viewing the places Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16. 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2, 3. Acts 20. 28, 29, 30, 31. Mark 6. 34. 1 Pet. 2. 25. and therefore if it prove Supremacy of Power, Jurisdiction, and Government in Peter, it proves every Bishop, and Presbyter to be also a supreme Head, and Governour over the Church of God. 2. That Peter had no such Headship of Government, and Jurisdiction given him in those words John 21. 17, 18. is proved by the description of the persons to whom these acts of feeding were to done, they are the little Lambs and Sheep of Christ, nor Goats, now to the Lambs and Sheep of Christ no act of lordly rule, such as imposing Laws, excommunicating, depriving, or the like acts, in which the Pope placeth his power of Jurisdiction could be lawfully done, nor did Peter any such acts: but teaching them, being guides to them, directing, exhorting and comforting them, (which the Pope regards not to do) were to be done to them. Wherefore it is plain, that lordly rule was not appointed by Christ, but fatherly care and tenderness in that injunction, and that which Christ enjoined in his Commission to Peter is that which the Pope neither regards to do, nor thinks it his work, but another thing, to wit, princely dominion, which Christ forbade. 3. The third thing supposed is, that because the terms are indefinite, [my Lambs, my Sheep] therefore he meant all his Lambs and Sheep, even the whole Catholick Church; which if true, then it is false which Paul saith, Gal. 2. 7. that the Gospel of the uncircumcision was committed to him, and the Gospel of the circumcision unto Peter, and vers. 9. James, and Cephas, and John, did sin against Christ's command in giving to Paul and Barnabas the right hands of fellowship, that Paul and Barnabas should go to the Heathen, and James, Cephas, and John to the Circumcision, and Paul did ill to style himself the Teacher of the Gentiles, 1 Tim. 2. 6. and he should have boasted in another mans line or rule, 2 Cor. 10. 15. sith all places had been within Peter's line or rule, and he did ill to say, Rom. 15. 15. that the grace of God was given to him that he should be the Minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, and never mention Peter's Supremacy, no not in that very Epistle which he wrote to the Church of Rome so much as once naming him, who was (if Papists say true)

the Universal Bishop and Bishop of Rome, and sate there at that time, when he wrote that Epistle: nor doth Paul salute him, when he salutes many of less note. As for that which H. T. infers from the not exempting of any, therefore he comprehends all the Sheep and Lambs of Christ, it is very frivolous. For an indefinite term is not all one with an universal, unless the matter so require it, but in such kinde of speeches as these it notes onely indefinite particulars, as Gal. 2. 10. they agreed that we should remember the poor, that is, so many as we could; and when Christ bids, Math. 10. 8. Heal the sick, cleanse the lepers, raise the dead; it is meant without exception of any, yet not an injunction to heal every individual, or to raise every dead person, but such as there was occasion of healing and raising. And when Mark 16. 15. the Apostles are bid to preach the Gospel to every creature; the Command is to preach to any one without exception, yet not to every individual, which had been impossible; so here Peter is bid to feed any indefinitely, yet not all universally; which had been an impossible task. 4. It is supposed that John 21. 16, 17. was a Commission conferring power, authority, rule, and that over the very Apostles themselves, and that as a privilege conferred on Peter for his special dilection of Christ. Whereas the thing enjoined him is work requiring skill and care, not dignity or authority of empire, and hath nothing in it of jurisdiction, as a Judge or Commander, but of faithfulness and diligence as a servant and guide. And in this the Apostles were equal to him. H. T. himself confesseth here, pag. 97. *The Apostles were equal in their calling to the Apostleship;* to which this of feeding the Sheep of Christ belonged; and therefore Peter reckons himself but a fellow Elder, and requires other Elders to feed as well as himself, 1 Pet. 5. 1, 2. Acts 20. 28. the Elders of Ephesus are appointed *ποιμαίνειν ἐκκλησίαν* *ἑαυτῶν*, to feed the Church of God, (which is as large an expression as is John 21. 16, 17. and therefore doth infer as much Headship in them as in Peter) And Paul counted himself not behinde the very chiefest Apostles, 2 Cor. 12. 11. and Peter added to him nothing, Gal. 2. 6. and therefore Paul derived nothing from him, but was equal to him. And to bid Peter to feed the Apostles had been to bid him feed the Shepherds. The Doctrine of the Gospel is not termed the Doctrine of Peter, but of the Apostles in common, Acts 2. 41. even when Peter had converted persons, and they were together, nor did they go to preach with Peter as their Shepherd, or by his direction, but by agreement, Gal. 2. 9. yea, they sent Peter to Samaria, Acts 8. 14. nor was this work of Feeding, John 21. 16, 17. a privilege conferred on Peter for his special dilection, but a task enjoined to him because of his more open denial, three times charged on him, as he thrice denied Christ, and used as a stay of Peter's weakness, rather than a mark of his worthiness, much less a proof of his Supremacy.