

## S E C T . V.

Peter's charge to confirm his Brethren, and his priority of nomination, prove not his Supremacy.

**T**He second Argument of H. T. is this, *He that is by Gods appointment to confirm others in the faith, and is generally set before others in the Scripture, must needs be greater than those others in power and dignity.* But St. Peter, our Saviour's own appointment was to confirm the Apostles in the faith, and is generally preferred before them all in the holy Scriptures, therefore St. Peter was above the rest of the Apostles in power and dignity, and therefore the Head and Primate of the rest.

*Answe.* The Conclusion it self might be granted, and yet the supreme Headship not proved. The power (aid Hart Conf. with Rainold, chap. I. divis. 2.) which we mean to the Pope by this Title of Supreme Head is, that the Government of the whole Church throughout the World doth depend of him: in him doth lie the power of judging and determining all Causes of Faith, of ruling Councils as President, and ratifying their Decrees; of ordering and confirming Bishops and Pastours; of deciding Causes brought him by Appeals from all the coasts of the Earth, of reconciling any that are excommunicate, of excommunicating, suspending, or inflicting other Censures and Penalties on any that offend, yea, on Princes and Nations; finally, of all things of the like sort for governing of the Church, even whatsoever toucheth either preaching of Doctrine or practising of Discipline in the Church of Christ. Now a person may be above others in power and dignity, yea, the Head and Primate of them, and yet not have this power. The Lord Chief Justice of one of the Benches, the Speaker of the Parliament, Chair-man of a Committee, Duke of Venice, President in a Council of Bishops, the Head of a College, the Dean of a Cathedral, may have power and dignity above other Justices of the same Bench, over Counsellours in the same Council, over Knights and Burgesies in the same Parliament, Prelates in the same Council, Fellows in the same College, Canons in the same Chapter, and in a sort Primates and Heads of the rest, yet not such supreme Heads over the rest, as the Popes claim to be. Yea, notwithstanding such power, he may be limited so as that he cannot act without them in making any Laws, or passing any Sentence binding, but they may act without him, and legally proceed against him. So that the Conclusion might be yielded, and yet the Popes Supremacy not proved. The truth is, the Pope claims such a vast and monstrous power in Heaven, and Earth, and Hell, as exceeds the abilities of any meer mortal man to dilcharge, and is, as experience shews, the Introduction to a world of miseries and oppressions. But let us view his proof of the power of Peter, which H. T. ascribes to him.

*The Major, saith he, is proved, because the stronger is not confirmed by the weaker, nor the less worthy to be set before the more worthy, generally speaking.*

*Answe.* This doth not prove his Major, for a person may be weaker and less worthy, and yet above others in power and dignity. Queen Elizabeth was a

Woman

Woman, and so weaker in respect of her Sex, and perhaps less worthy in respect of parts than some of her great Commanders and Privy Counsellours. Will H. T. say she was below them in power and dignity? Many a Father and Master may be weaker and less worthy, and yet superior in power and dignity. Many a Prelate is stronger in knowledge and wisdom, and more worthy in respect of holy life, than many Popes, I will not onely say, than Pope *Joan* and *Bennet* the Boy, but also than *Pius* the second or any other of the best of their Popes; and yet H. T. will not yield such Prelates to be above Popes in power and dignity. Me thinks he should yield *Athanasius* to be stronger and of more worth than *Liberius*, *Hilarius* than *Damascus*, *Bernard* than *Eugenius*, and yet he would be loath to ascribe more power and dignity to them than to the Pope. Nor is it true, that the stronger is not confirmed by the weaker, whether we mean it of moral or natural strength or weakness and confirmation. *Apollos* was confirmed by *Priscilla*, *David* by *Abigail*, *Naaman* by his servant. Nor if by [generally speaking] be meant very frequently, is the speech true, that the more worthy is set before the less worthy. I think in the *Acts* of the Apostles *Barnabas* is more often before *Paul* than after, as *Acts* 11.30. & 12.25. & 13.7. & 14.12,14. & 15.12. I am sure in the Holy Ghost's Precept, *Acts* 13.2. whereupon they were ordained, and in the Decree of the Apostles, *Acts* 15.25. *Barnabas* is first. Will H. T. say *Barnabas* was more worthy than *Paul*? Me thinks a man should be ashamed to utter such frivolous toys in so weighty a matter, and fear to ascribe to a sinfull man so great and immense a Dominion on such slight pretences.

But how doth he prove his *Minor*? *The Minor*, saith he, is proved, I have prayed for thee Peter, that thy faith fail not, and then being at length converted, confirm thy Brethren, St. Luke 22.31. The names of the twelve Apostles are these, the first Simon who is called Peter, &c. St. Matth.10.2. St. Mark 3. St. Luke 2. and *Acts* the 1.

*Answ.* The Text doth not say, Confirm the Apostles in the faith, nor do we finde that they did, but that he doubted as well as they, *Mark* 16.14. yea, there is mention of another Disciples believing the Resurrection afore *Peter*, *John* 20.8,9. yea, *Paul* seemes to have confirmed *Peter* in the faith, when he walked not with a right foot according to the truth of the Gospel, *Gal*. 2.14. & *Acts* 14.22. *Paul* and *Barnabas* are said to confirm the souls of the Disciples, and *Judas* and *Silas* did the same *Acts* 15.32. So that this Act shewes no Headship in *Peter*, nor any privilege at all, much les such a supreme Headship over the Apostles, as H. T. allegeth it for, but a common duty of charity, which not onely may but must be done by an equal or inferior, to an equal or superior. Sure, if *Paul* had known of this as a Privilege in *Peter* he would not have said, that he went not up to the Apostles before him, nor conferred with flesh and blood, *Gal*. 16.17. and that *Peter* added nothing to him, *Gal*. 2.6. As for his being preferred generally before the rest, it is not proved by his being named before the rest: he may be named after, who is preferred before, as *Paul* is after *Barnabas*: nor do the four Texts exprest a general or frequent priority of nomination, three expressing but one and the same act of Christ, and the Catalogue being varied in the order of the rest, some Evangelists reckoning *Andrew* next *Peter*, sometimes *James*, and in like manner the order altered in some others, shewes, that the order of nomination imported no Privilege: yea,

Sometimes Peter is named after Andrew, John 1.44. who had this Privilege to bring Peter to Christ, ver 41. sometimes after Paul and Apollos, 1 Cor. 1.12. & 3.22. and other Apostles, 1 Cor. 9.5. Gal. 2.9. which shews that John and Paul understood not, that any such Primacy or Prerogative was given to Peter by his nomination first, as Papists assert thence; for if they had they would not at any time have inverted the order. And therefore however a Primacy of order may be given to Peter, yet 1. There is no necessity we should yield the acknowledgement of it to be a Duty imposed, much less a perpetual Privilege of Right belonging to him. 2. That such Primacy proves not any Superiority of Power above the Apostles, no more than that the senior Fellow of a College is superior in power above the rest, because he is first written in the College Book, or the Fore-man in a Jury is superior, because he is first called.

## S E C T. V I.

*The late Popes of Rome are not Successours of Peter.*

H. T. adds, *What hath been said to prove St. Peter's Primacy proves also the Primacy of his Successour the Pope of Rome.*

*Answ.* THE proof of a Primacy is short of the proof of a Supremacy, which was the thing H. T. undertook; there is a Primacy of order, where there is not a Supremacy of power. And the ancient Churches which gave the Bishop of Rome the primacy of order afore the Patriarchs of Antioch, Alexandria, Jerusalem, and Constantinople, that is, to sit in a general Council highest, and to have some other Privileges, yet did never acknowledge the Bishop of Rome their supreme Head, but resisted this claim, when it began to be usurped. That Primacy which was given to the Bishop of Rome was given him chiefly because of the dignity and power of the City: Peter's name was after by ambitious Popes used to serve their Design in lifting up the Roman Bishop. But the Ancients did look to the eminence of the City, as being the Seat of the Empire in their preferring of the Roman Bishops: from whence when the Seat of the Empire was translated to Constantinople, the Bishop of it was made a Patriarch, equal to the Bishop of Rome, and for a time contended for preheminence above him. It was not at first by reason of Peter's imagined Headship, or any succession to him, that the Bishop of Rome was preferred before other Patriarchs: but by reason of the amplitude and eminency of Rome, as the third Canon of the second Constantinopolitan, and the eight and twentieth of Chalcedon Councils shew. As for Succession to Peter it is contrary to Scripture, that the Apostles should have Successours as Apostles, sith they were only to be Apostles, who were Witnesses of Christ's Resurrection, which neither the Roman Bishops, nor any after the Age in which the Apostles lived, could be. That they were either fixed Bishops of certain places, or did appoint any to succeed in their Apostleship is false. All Apostles were by special election of Christ, those that came after were by election of men, and succeeded the Apostles in preaching the Gospel, but not in Apostleship, nor did the Apostles make Bishops

shops of certain places their Successours, but every Pastour, who preached the faith aright, was their Successour, and so are all Gospel Preachers at this day. John Calvin at Geneva did succeed Peter more truly than Pope Aldobrandin, or Barberin, or Ghisi, or any other of the Popes for many hundred of years. Till the Popes prove themselves Preachers of the Gospel as Peter was, they vainly talk of Succession to him. As of late they have been they have been Successours to Simon Magus rather than to Simon Peter.

## S E C T. VII.

*The Sayings of Fathers and Councils prove not Peter's or the Popes Supremacy.*

OF the Fathers which H. T. cites for the Popes Supremacy the first is out of Damascen a late corrupt Writer, and he cites it out of *Pseudo Dionysius the Areopagite's* tale proved to be such by Dr. John Rainold Conf. with Hart, chap. 8. divis. 2. and from that place, in which the contrary, to what it is alleged for, to wit, Peter's Supremacy, may be evinced, in that the Authour, who ever he were, makes the power of binding and loosing to be given to all the Apostles. There saith H. T. Peter is styled the supreme and most ancient top of Divines: which though it have no credit there, being too much known of the forgeries and dreams in the Writings of Damascen, and that countefit Dionysius: yet were it granted, that Dionysius the Areopagite should have so written, as he saith he did, terming Peter, the supreme and most ancient top of Divines, this would not infer that he was the univerſal Pastour of the Church with such a power of jurisdiction, as this Authour asserts he had over the whole Church, even the Apostles themselves. For this doth not exprefſe supremacy of power, but of knowledge, and asserts his eminency for understanding Theology, to which me thinks H. T. should not annex the supremacy of jurisdiction and power, leſt that ſome ſuch as Aquinas, Andraitius, or ſome other challenge the Popedom, which is ſeldom conferred on any for his eminency in Divinity, but rather the moſt learned Divines are thought unfit for the Papacy: even Cicarella relates in the Life of Sixtus the fifth, that Cardinal Sirlet, though he were a man of great learning, was rejected, as not fit to be chosen Pope: ſuch as Bellarmine, Tolet, Baronius, are not chosen to be Popes, but ſuch crafty men as Paul the third, or ſuch stout ſpirits as Paul the fourth, or ſuch as are great Canonists and Politicians, that know the arts of the Papacy better than the Doctrine of Christ, are chosen for Popes, yea, men ſo ignorant in Divinity, and ſo unfit to take the charge of Souls have been chosen for Popes, that of all the Popes for many hundreds of years paſt there are but a very few who had knowledge in the Mystery of the Gospel, or any measure of godliſſe competent for a Parish Priſt. Yea, Bellarmine lib. de notis Eccles. cap. 9. is feigned to assert that there may be members of the body of Christ, who are no parts of it as a living body, but onely as instruments, leſt otherwise the Pope being proved evil ſhould be uncapable of being Head of the Church in that he is no member of Christ's body, thereby making a dead equivocal member an univocal Head of the univerſal Church, being conſcious that with-

out that shif the Popes would all or most of them be cashiered out of the Church of Christ as not so much as parts of Christ's body, much less Heads, by reason of their notorious pride, luxury, cruelty, perfidiosness, covetousnes, blasphemy, deceit, and whatsoever vice might shew them to be children of the Devil. Nor do the words of *Irenaeus lib. 3. advers. heret. cap. 3.* in the second Age, in which it is said, *All Churches round about ought to resort to the Roman Church by reason of her more powerfull Principaliy, and that it was the greatest and most ancient, founded by Peter and Paul.* For whether the word *coavenire* be to be translated *resort*, or *agree to*, or *go together with*; (which is somewhat uncertain) it cannot be understood of all Churches round about in all parts of the World, for that had been an impossible thing, and contrary to the intent of *Irenaeus* in the same place who directs them that were in *Aia* to *Ephesus* and *Smyrna* for the same end; but he means of the parts of the Western Empire, such as *Lyons* was in *France* where he was Bishop, and such parts as were nearer *Rome*; and it is manifest that he makes *Rome* no more infallible than the Church at *Smyrna* or *Ephesus*, referring the Inquisitor into the tradition Apostolical to apply himself to these, as well as it for information; nor doth he make the resort to be to the Church of *Rome* always, but because at that time there was a succession of men that knew the Apostles, or had the Doctrine of Christ delivered from them, among whom he reckons *Linus* as made Bishop by *Peter* while he lived, and so no Successour to *Peter*; but if *Peter* were a Bishop of *Rome*, (which Papist say, but we deny) there were two Bishops of *Rome* together, yea, he makes the Church of *Rome* to have been founded by *Peter* and *Paul*, not by *Peter* only, by reason of which tradition, though either false or uncertain, he judged there was the best assurance to be had of the Apostles Doctrine about God the Creatour against *Valentinus*, and the rather, because he was acquainted with the Teachers there as he had been with *Polycarpus of Smyrna*, who was an acquaintance of *John the Evangelist*, for which reason he directs also to him. As for the more potent Principaliy, which *Irenaeus* speaks of, whether it be meant of the Church or the State Ecclesiastical or Civil it is uncertain; if of the Civil Principaliy, because then it was the Seat of the Empire, the necessity of resort thither must be because civil affairs would enforce them to go thither upon other occasions, and then they might inform themselves being there most commodiously; if of Ecclesiastical Principaliy, yet there is nothing that shews it meant of universal jurisdiction and power over all Churches, but of a more powerfull Principaliy it had in clearing Doctrines and ordering Church-affairs in those parts by reason of the eminency of their Founders, and succeeding Teachers who were in those times of great note for purity of Doctrine and constancy in the Faith for which they were Martyrs. And indeed were the question now between us and any such as *Valentinus* or *Marcion* concerning the Doctrine which the Apostles taught about another God besides the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the Church of *Rome* had such Bishops as then they had who had acquaintance with the Apostles, or received their tradition from them so near to the Apostles days as the *Roman Bishops* did then, we should also think it meet in such a point wherein we knew they were right to refer it to them to determine. But in so doing we should not acknowledg a perpetual Prerogative of infallible Supremacy over all the Churches in the World annexed to that See,

nor

nor did ever *Irenaeus* intend it, who is known to have opposed *Victor* Bishop of *Rome*, when he excommunicated the *Asian* Bishops for varying from him in the keeping of *Easter*, as *Eusebius* reports, *Hist. Eccles.* lib.5. cap.22,

23,24.

The words of *Origen* in cap.6. *Epist ad Roman.* (waving other Exceptions against Citations out of that Commentary, as being so altered by *Rufinus* that we can hardly know what is *Origen's*, what not) were they as *H. T.* sets them down (which I cannot examine now for want of the Book) yet they prove not *Peter's* supremacy of power over the Apostles. He might have the chief charge of feeding Christ's Sheep, and the Church be founded on him, yet have no jurisdiction over the Apostles, and the Church be founded on the other Apostles as well as on him, as hath been shewed before in this Article, Sect 4.

As for *Cyprian's* words, calling *Peter the Head and Root of the Church*, cited by *H. T.* as in an *Epist. ad Julian*: I finde no such Epistle in *Cyprian's* Works, but in an Epistle *ad Fabianum* concerning Baptism of Hereticks, I finde these words about the beginning of the Epistle, *Nos autem qui Ecclesia unius capit & radicem tenemus*, that is, *But we who hold the Head and Root of one Church, &c.* in which *Peter* is not named, nor do I finde any thing that should infer that by *the Head and Root of one Church*, he means *Peter* but *Christ*, whom in his Book of the Unity of the Church he makes the only Head of his Church, and having alleged immediately before one Baptism, as it is *Ephes.4.5.* it is likely he meant by one Head the one Lord, mentioned *vers.5.* as after also he mentions one Faith, or else the meaning is this, we have remained in the unity of the Church which is one, and the Head and Root of the faithfull: of which several particular Churches are members and branches. Nor, did he call *Peter the Head and Root of the Church*, would it be for *H. T.* his purpose, unless he meant it in respect of universal Jurisdiction and Supremacy over the whole Church belonging to him and his Successours Bishops of *Rome*, which is not proved, and there may be another reason given of such a Title given to *Peter's* person only, because of his eminent confession, *Math. 16. 16.* and his preaching, *Act's 2. & 10. &c.* And though he term the Church of *Rome Peter's Chair*, or rather the Bishoprick of *Rome* or *Peter's* Doctrine and teaching there, yet that proves not he held the Popes Supremacy, but that *Peter's* Doctrine was then held there. Yes, it is certain out of his Treatise of the Unity of the Church, and his Epistle to *Cornelius* mentioned before, and his opposition to Pope *Stephanus*, that *Cyprian* did account all Bishops equal, and the Bishops of *Africa* equal in Jurisdiction to the *Roman* Bishop, and the Pope of *Rome* to be but his Colleague, from whom he dissent, and to whom he denied Appeals, and whom he reproved of ambition and pride, when he sought to impose his Judgement on others, contrary to what *Cyprian* and a whole Synod of *African* Bishops besides *Afri-* ticks held, and therein opposed the Bishop of *Rome*. And therefore it is certain that *Cyprian* never acknowledged the Supremacy of the Pope now asserted.

Of those which *H. T.* allegeth in the fourth Age, not one of them giveth *Peter* that Supremacy of Jurisdiction over the Apostles and Christians, which the Romanists claim as belonging to the Pope over all Bishops and Churches,

but either a primacy of order, or preheminence of gifts, or zeal, or esteem, or use in moderating in Assemblies. The words which seem to be most fit for it are falsely ascribed to Chrysostom. For however *Trapezuntius* have translated them, yet in the four and fiftieth Homily (as it is in Eaton Print) the words are not as H. T. cites them, *The Pastour and Head of the Church was once a poor Fishermin.* But on Matth. 16. 18. he hath these words, *And I say unto thee, Thou art Peter, and upon this Stone or Rock I will build my Church, that is, on the faith of confession or confessed.* There he sheweth that many should believe, and raiseth up his minde, and makes him Pastour. And after on vers 19. These things he promiseth to give him, *to shew a Fishermin stronger than any Stone or Rock, all the World oppugning.*

If Optatus call Peter the Head of the Apostles, it is meant, as is frequent in Scripture and other Writers, to call the farwardest, and leader, or first in order the Head of the rest. But the words *Apostolorum Caput Petrus inde Cephas appellatus*, gives occasion to conceive these words inserted in Optatus, who it is likely would not have given so inept a derivation of the word *Cephas*, as if it were from the Greek *κεφαλή* a Head.

The words in *Augustin Serm. 124. de tempore* (not as H. T. 12. de 4. temporibus, which sheweth that he cites this passage without reading it, and it is likely he did so in the rest) have no likelihood to be *Augustine's*, those Sermons being nothing like *Augustine's* Writings, nor is it likely that *Augustine* would have called Peter the Foundation of unmoveable Faith, or have made the sin of denying Christ, exiguae culpe, a small fault. The words in the eighty sixth Epistle at *Casulanum* are either deceitfully or ignorantly alleged, they being not the words of *Augustine*, but of *Urbicus*, whom he refutes. For so the words are, Peter also (saith he, that is, *Urbicus*) the Head of Apostles, the Door-keeper of Heaven, and Foundation of the Church, Simon being exinct, who had been a Figure of the Devil, not to be overcome but by Fasting, taught the Romans that thing, whose Faith is declared to the whole World of Lands.

The words of *Augustine*, of whom Peter the Apostle by reason of the Primacy of his Apostleship bore the person, &c. tract. ultimo in *Ioannem*, being recited at large are so far from proving the Supremacy which Romanists ascribe to him, that they are against the principal grounds, by which they endeavour to prove it, and therefore I will recite them at large. This (following Christ) the Church doth, blessed by hope in this sorrowfull life, of which Church Peter the Apostle by reason of the Primacy of his Apostleship bare the person by a figured generality. For so much as pertains to him properly he was one man by nature, by grace one Christian, by more abundant grace one and the same first Apostle. But when it was said to him, To thee will I give the Keys of the Kingdom of Heavens, and whatsoever thou shalt binde on Earth shall be bound also in Heavens, and whatsoever thou shalt loose on Earth shall be loosed also in the Heavens: he signified the whole Church, which in this World is shaken with divers temptations, as it were stowres, flouds, and tempests, and falls not, because it is founded upon the Rock, from whence Peter also took his name: For the Rock is not called from Peter, but Peter from the Rock, Petrus a Petra, as Christ is not called from a Christian, but a Christian from Christ. For therefore, saith the Lord, Upon this Rock will I build my Church, because Peter had said, Thou art Christ the Son of the living God. Therefore be faith, Upon this Rock which thou hast confessed

## ART. VII. *The Popes Supremacy an Innovation.* 169

confessed will I build my Church. For Christ was the Rock upon which Foundation Peter himself also was built. For no man can lay other Foundation besides that which is laid, which is Christ Jesus. The Church therefore which is founded on Christ received from him the Keys of the Kingdom of Heavens in Peter, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins. For what the Church is by propriety in Christ, that is, by signification, Peter in the Rock: by which signification Christ is understood to be the Rock, Peter the Church. In which passage though there are concents not right, yet clear it is that Peter's primacy is here asserted to be only in this that he represented the whole Church, that the Rock on which it is built is Christ, that he had his first Apostleship by more abundant grace in that he was made a figure of the whole Church to signify, its unity, that in him the whole Church had the Keys of the Kingdom of Heavens, that is, the power of binding and loosing sins: which points I presume, the Romanists now will not avow.

That which he cites out of the council of Nice, Can.39. Arab. is but a late devised thing those Arabick canons being forged, there having been but twenty in all in that council, in the fifth of which number the Pope is equalled with other Patriarchs. And the council of Chalcedon Art.16. is falsely alleged, as if it ascribed all primacy and chief honour of the Pope of Rome, sith it makes the Pope and other Patriarchs, equal in Jurisdiction within their circuit or Province, notwithstanding the reluctance of the Popes Legates, and the flattery of some there, and that preheminence which the Pope had was of order or place, not of power, nor that by divine institution for Peter's sake, but by humane allowance, by reason of the dignity of the City of Rome:

---

## S E C T . VIII.

*The holy Scriptures. John 19.11. Acts 25.10,11. Luke 22.25. 1 Cor.3.11.  
overthrow the Popes Supremacy.*

H.T. adds after his fashion, *Objections solved.* Object. Pilate had power over Christ himself. Thou shouldest not (saith he) have any power against me, unless it were given thee from above, John 19.11. therefore temporal Princes are above the Pope. Which is strengthened by Christ's disclaiming a worldly Kingdom, John 18.36. saying, Who made me a Judge over you? Luke 12.14. declining the being made a King, John 6.15.

*Answe.* I Distinguish your Antecedent: he had a power of permission over Christ I grant; a power of Jurisdiction I deny, and so do all good Christians. Nor is your Consequence less to be denied, speaking of spiritual things, and things belonging to Church-government, in which we only defend the Popes Supremacy, and that without all prejudice to Princes and chief Magistrates in their Supremacy of temporal affairs.

I reply, this Objection is most directly against the Popes Supremacy in temporal things, which this Author after Hart, and sundry others, seem not to allow the Pope, though Carcius, Baronius, Bellarmine, and others defend it,

some

170. *The Popes Supremacy an Innovation.* ART. VII.

some ascribing it to him directly, some indirectly in order to spirituals. If H. T. should teach this at Rome, which he doth here, perhaps the Inquisition would catch hold on him for it, there being scarce any greater Heresie accounted of by them than the limitation of the Popes power, unles's it be much altered from what some Ages since was forcibly defended by Pope Boniface the eighth, *that he had two Swords the Spiritual and the Temporal*, ridiculously abusing the words Luke 22.38. spoken by the Apostles to Christ, Lord, behold here are two Swords, and Christ's answer to them, *It is enough*, though Philip the Fair King of France by Nogaret made him see his want of a Sword, when he took him captive at Anagnia, and many of the Popes have maintained the same, and as far as they thought they were able, have practised that power, becoming Judges of Emperours and Kings causes, depriving them, raising War against them by their own Subjects, and some of them either not disclaiming, or animating, or approving the murder of them. Nor doth this Author well free himself from this Objection or the imputation of the Errour of the Popes Supremacy in Temporals, if he deny only such a Supremacy of the Pope in Temporals as he ascribes to Pilate over Christ, whom he would make to have had a power of permission over Christ, not of Jurisdiction. For if Pilate had no other power over Christ than of permission, then he had no more power over him than a usurping Tyrant, then Judas, yea, then the Devil himself had, who had that power of permission, was permitted to put it into the heart of Judas to betray Christ, and was permitted to carry Christ to the Pinacle of the Temple, and to an exceeding high Mountain. A power of permission only may be without all right, and when it is used to do a lawfull act, yet it is unlawfully usurped, whereas in Pilate's sitting in judgement on Christ I do not conceive was any sin, but in his condemnation of him being innocent. Whether I be a good Christian or no, it seems to me, that Pilate had a power of Jurisdiction over Christ, and that Christ was, and ought to be subject to him, as being the Roman Caesar's Deputy, to whom Christ acknowledged some things due, Matth.22.21. and Pilate is oft styled the Gouvernor, Matth.27.2,11, &c. *viximus* the very word used by Peter himself, 1 Pet.2.14. to express those, to whom he commands subjection. And if Pilate had no Jurisdiction, then the people were not guilty of sedition, when they rose against him, nor were bound to be subject to him. But the Scripture makes Barabbas guilty of sin for making insurrection against Pilate, Mark 15.7. and makes it necessary for conscience sake for every soul even in the Roman church; and therefore even the Pope himself, to be subject even to the powers that were, Rom 13.1. who were then Claudius or Nero, and such bloody Infidels as were Persecutours of the Christians, yea, Christ himself is said to be Luk.23.7. εν ἡ Εξολας Ἡρόδου, de Herodis potestate, as in their own vulgar Latin it is rendered, which is all one with that which our English hath [he belonged to Herod's Jurisdiction.] Nor is this any more disparagement to Christ than it was for him to be subject to Joseph and Mary, Luke 2.51. who had doubtless in his minority authority over him, he having taken on him the form of a servant, and was made in the habit of men, Phil.2.7. Yea doubtless, sith he was made under the Law, Gal. 4.4. Christ was subject to the high Priest of the Jews, the Judge and Ruler of Gods people, as Paul acknowledged, Acts 23.5. being a member of the Jewish people, and so liable to the command, Deut.17.9,10,11,12. even in ceremonials

ART. VII. *The Popes Supremacy an Innovation.* 171

nials, till they were abrogated, and therefore Christ still upheld their power, *Luke 17.14. Matth. 8.4.* so that I infer that the Pope exempting himself and the clergy from the Jurisdiction of the Emperour doth crois Christ's practise and rule, and that such Popes do arrogate more to themselves than Christ did while he was on earth in the days of his flesh, of whom if the Pope, who is *Viator a Traveller, not Comprehensor* one that hath attained, were Successour, he would follow Christ and subject himself to the Emperour his lawfull Superior, and not (as the Popes have done some hundreds of years) take on him to set up and depole Emperours, nor would Pope Paul the fifth either have by his *Breves* prohibited the taking of the Oath of Allegiance to King James, or taken upon him to command the *Venetian Commonwealth* to abrogate their Laws about Goods of Ecclesiasticks, or have interdicted a whole and so great a State as that was for imprisoning two such notorious Malefactours as were the Abbot of *Nervesa* and Canon of *Vincenza* because Ecclesiasticks. Surely the Popes by such acts shew themselves Successours not to Christ the Son of Man, but to *Antichrist the Man of sin, 2 Thess. 2.3,4.* and are so far from being infallible, that either the Popes doings, sentences and doctrines must be false and horribly wicked; or else Christ's, and Paul's Doctrine, and Practises not right.

H. T. goes on thus. Object. St. Paul says, *At Cæsar's Judgement Seat I stand where I ought to be judged, &c. I appeal to Cæsar, therefore the Emperour is above the Pope.* Answ. St. Paul appealed to Cæsar as to a Judge of fact, not of right, so that your consequence is false.

I reply, If Cæsar were no Judge of right, but only of fact, then Paul did ill to appeal to him to do him right, much more to require every soul to be subject to him in the Epistle to the Romans. And sure if Cæsar were not above Paul and Judge of right, no not in such a cause as that was concerning sedition, then the civil Magistrate hath little authority left him even in temporal affairs, if he may not be a Judge of right concerning the breaking of the peace, of the which Paul was accused, *Acts 24.5.* and concerning which he defended himself, *Acts 25.8.* by appeal from the Jews, vers. 9. And it is strange Paul should avouch Cæsars Judgement Seat, and say he ought to be judged there, if Cæsar were a Judge only of fact, not of right. Would any man take this man to be any other than a man *durioris*, who outfaces so plain a truth, and yet impudently avoucheth his holding the Popes Supremacy in spiritual things and things belonging to church-government without all prejudice to Princes and chief Magistrates in their Supremacy of temporal affairs? But it is not to be expected that we should gather Grapes of Thorns, or Figs of Thistles.

H. T. adds. Object The Kings of the Gentiles over-rule them, but you not so, St. Luke 22.25. Answ. Christ there forbids spiritual Superiors to lord it over Inferiors, so the Greek (*κατακελευσον αὐτῶν*) signifies, yet he there expressly mentions a greater and a lesser, a Superior and Inferior among them.

I reply, This speech of our Lord Christ is in three Evangelists, in *Matth. 20.25. Mark 10.42.* and in these two places there was the same occasion of it, namely, the ambitious Petition of the mother of the sons of Zebedee for her children, and the indignation of the Disciples thereupon, and in these two places

places it is κατακειδεσιν αὐτῷ κατεξοιδέσιν αὐτῷ, in the third of Luke, 25. upon another occasion the strife of the Disciples at Christ's last Supper who of the Apostles should be the greater, our Lord Christ doth expressly determine, the Kings of the Nations, κακεῖσθαι αὐτῶν, καὶ οἱ ἐξοιδότες αὐτῶν ἐπεγένετο καλλίστοι, that is have dominion over them, and they that rule over them are called Benefactors, but you not so, and in all these places in the vulgar Latin (which the Papists are bound to follow) it is, Dominantur eorum, or eis, & possestatem exercit in eos, or potestatem habent ipsum, or super eos, in none of the places doth that Translation express the words, as importing tyrannical rule according to their own will without respect to the good of the persons ruled ; and the translating of it by H. T. [Over-rule] and noting that it is κατακειδεσιν αὐτῷ, as importing a forbidding only to lord it over Inferiors, is not right, it being in Luke 22.25. only κατακειδεσιν αὐτῷ, they have rule over them. And that where it is κατακειδεσιν αὐτῷ, it doth not forbid only tyrannical dominion, but also any dominion at all over one another is apparent from many Arguments in the Text. 1. From the occasion, which was the petition and contention, in opposition to which this answer being made Christ must be conceived to forbid what they sought for, else it had not been apposite to the busines : but they sought not tyrannical dominion, but the higher seat and chief dignity and power, or as Christ's answer, Luke 22.26. δέ μέντοι εἰς τὸν γένος ὡς νεώτεροι, intimates, they strove for seniority or priority of order, and τοῖς αὐτῶν δοκεῖ εἶναι μείζονες, vers.24. and Matth. 20. 27. Mark 10. 44. δεῖται εἰς τὸν γένεσιν πάρεστε, shews, that the thing they sought was not Supremacy, but only priority ; therefore our Lord Christ forbids not only tyrannical dominion, but the higher seat, chief dignity and power, and the affecting seniority or priority over or before one another. 2. From the subjects whose dominion is forbidden, who are termed not Tyrants, but Kings of the Nations, οἱ ἐξοιδότες, that have authority, Luke 22.25. in Matth. 20.25. οἱ ἀρχητες τῶν ἔθνων, the Princes, or Rulers, or Leaders of the Gentiles, καὶ οἱ μεριλοι, and the great ones, in Mark 10.42. yet more diminutively, οἱ δοκεῖτες ἀρχεῖν τῶν ἔθνων, those that seem or are accounted to rule or lead the Nations, καὶ μεριλοι αὐτῶν, their great ones. Which terms do plainly shew that these, whose dominion was forbidden to the Apostles, were the Rulers which were esteemed and accepted by those to whom they were Rulers, and had lawfull authority ; and therefore such rule is forbidden, as the best Rulers used among the Nations, and not only tyrannical, and meer lording it over one another after their own will. 3. The word κατακειδεσιν, however it may be sometimes meant of meer lordly forcible rule against the will and good of the person ruled, yet here it cannot be meant so, sith κακεῖσθαι to use dominion at all, and to have power at all over one another is forbidden, Luke 22.25. as well as κατακειδεσιν, to have absolute, lordly, arbitrary, forcible dominion. 4. This is further confirmed in that κατεξοιδέσιν, is as well forbidden as κατακειδεσιν, to have authority or power, as well as to have dominion, and that which is expressed by the compound in Matthew and Mark is οἱ ἐξοιδότες, the simple, in Luke, which is used still of rule without abuse. 5. In Luke it is forbidden to be called ἐπεγένετο, which is a word that signifies Benefactors, and though to be Benefactors is not forbidden, yet it is forbidden to be so called, that is, to affect that Title, which implies one to be under another, and to

## ART. VII. The Popes Supremacy an Innovation. 173

be beholden one to another, as persons that could gratifie one another in bestowing favours, granting petitions one to another, bestowing preferments or refuse, which doth imply superiority in some sort, and such a dependence one on another as the Apostles were not to have. 6. The additional speech of Christ commanding in stead of dominion *Matth. 20.26,27.* Rather Ministry and Service sheweth he would have none among them superior, but all equal. 7. Christ's propounding his own Example, *Matth. 20.28. Mark 10.45. Luke 22.27.* as that which they were to follow evinceth the same. And though it is true he was their Master and Lord, *John 13.13.* yet both there vers 14,15. and here he propounds himself an Example onely in service. 8. He expresteth that which he would have them to be so emphatically, that he not onely forbids that which all counted unlawfull, to wit, tyrannical rule, but also requires in those places such a mutual debasement, voluntary subjection, condescension, Ministry yielding to each other as takes away all assuming of so much as was lawfull in others, even the taking to themselves priority of order or place, precedence, seniority affected, empire or rule over one another, as the words *Matth. 20.26,27. Mark 10.43,44. Luke 22.26.* do plainly shew. 9. This is confirmed by other places upon a like occasion, *Matth. 18.1,2,3,4. Mark 9.33,34,35. Luke 9.46,47.* in which places Christ resolves them that they should be as a little childe, that assumes not empire, but is humble and accounts others as equal to him. 10. It is further evident from *Luke 22.28,29,30.* that Christ having forbidden Supremacy or superiority in any of them among themselves doth promise them a Kingdom afterwards, and that then they should be in his Kingdom, and eat and drink at his Table, and sit upon twelve Thrones judging the twelve Tribes of Israel in recompence of their abiding with him in his temptations. And in very truth, if there were no more than the consideration of the present state of Peter and the Apostles their despised and persecuted condition and the future accidents that Christ foretold should befall Peter in particular, *John 21.28.* and the rest of the Apostles, *Matth. 24.9.* no man could reasonably imagine that Christ should make Peter a visible Monarch to rule the Apostles and the Church scattered over the World, he himself being in prison and they also, and in so remote places, he unknown to them, and they to him, they having no access or means of access to him, nor knowing where to finde him, but all judicious men must conceive that this device of Peter's Supremacy over the Apostles and whole Church given by Christ is a meer impudent forgery, as was after Constantine's donation to the Bishop of Rome, by which wicked means the Popes have usurped the greatest tyranny that ever was in the World.

Out of all this I gather, that Christ intended, 1. That there should be no Kingdom, Monarchy, or Empire in any of the Apostles over the rest, or any part of the Church till he came; but that their state should be a state of service in preaching the Gospel, and laying the foundation of Christianity till his coming. 2. That then he onely would be King, and they all equals, sitting upon twelve Thrones with him; and therefore that he would make none of them supreme Monarch over the rest, nor Vicar to himself, as the Pope doth blasphemously and arrogantly challenge.

And for that which H. T. saith, that Christ expressly mentions a greater and a lesser, a superior and inferiour among them, it is frivolously added, sith it is plain.

plain that what in Luke is vers. 26. *he that is greater, he that is chief, is in Matthew 20. 26, 27. Mark 10. 43.* He that would be great among you, be that would be first, and that which is in Matth. 20. 26, 27. let him be in Mark 10. 43, 44. Shall be your Minister, your servant, is in Luke 22. 26. Let him be as the younger, as the Minister; which shews the meaning to be this, If any affect to be as the elder, greater or superior to the rest, be so far from ascribing or yielding to him such precedence, greatness, or superiority, that my will is, that you should account of him as the younger, Servant and Minister to the rest, and so it shall be, ye shall be all equal, none above another. This is the very drift and purport of Christ's determination, that there should be no superiority or inferiority among them, but an equality; and that which H. T. speaks of the mention of superiority and inferiority is meant of superiority that might be affected, but not of any superiority allowed by Christ, it being plainly forbidden.

And for what Bellarmine urgeth from the term *ὑπέρτατος*, as if Christ had appointed one Ruler or Prince in the College of the Apostles, though the term *ὑπέρτατος*, a Leader, is not the same with *ὑπάρχων*, a Prince, or Ruler, yet if it did note Princedom, it is manifested, that Christ speaks of a Prince among them not by due constitution, but by inordinate usurpation; and therefore to infer from thence, as if Christ would have one superior over the rest, when he determines there should be equality, is the act of a man that is resolved to be lustily impudent. By this whole discourse the Objection is fully vindicated against the shifts of H. T. and other Romanists, and stands thus. That Supremacy is not to be yielded to have been granted to Peter which Christ forbade to every one of the Apostles. But to be a supreme Ruler over the rest Christ forbade to every one of the Apostles; therefore Christ forbade Peter to be a supreme Ruler over the rest of the Apostles.

I yet add, that were it granted, that Christ did onely forbid spiritual Superiors to lord it over Inferiors, this very grant would prove the Papal Supremacy, which Popes claim and exercise, to be certainly forbidden. For if ever there were a Superior, that did lord it over Inferiors, the Pope is such a one, yea, I may aver and easily prove it, that let all the tyranny and lording, which any Tyrants or Princes have exercised from the beginning of the World to this day be considered, they will be found incomparable to the Papal tyranny and lording over the Church of God. If this be not the highest lording to impose on mens consciences such Laws as Christ never imposed, to enjoyn the holy, as they term it, inquisition with rigour, to excommunicate, deprive, burn men and women old and young who yield not to the Popes Laws, though contrary to Christ's, to take on him to dispense with Gods Laws, to challenge the defining of all controversies, supremacy over all Councils, power to depose and destroy Emperours and Kings, if they acknowledge not his immense power, yea, if they be not his Butchers to kill their best and most peaceable Subjects, if he once term them Hereticks, to interdict a whole State for limiting by Law Donations to Ecclesiasticks, and imprisoning notorious malefactours, who were Ecclesiasticks, the use of divine service, to subject a King to whipping on the Bare for the death of an Ecclesiastick not by him killed, to depose Emperours for investing Bishops, to canonize Saints, whom he will, to be invocated even such an one whose holiness was disobedience to his lawfull Prince,

Prince, and to have a Feast proper to him, besides innumerable other acts done against the Laws of God and Man I do utterly despair ever to know what it is to lord or tyrannize over others. Surely it is easier to praise *Busiris*, or to justify *Dionysius* of *Syracuse*, or *Nero* of *Rome*, and to acquit them from lording, than the Bishop of *Rome* for many hundreds years last past, if we stand to the Relations of Writers of their own Church, who speak too favourably of them.

H. T. proceeds. Object. *Christ is the foundation (of the church) and other foundation can no man lay, 1 Cor. 3.11.* Answ. Other principal foundation can no man lay, I grant, other subordinate, I deny: for that he himself hath laid, Peter, thou art Peter, and upon this Rock will I build my church, St. Matth. 16.18. and the rest of the Apostles were built on the foundation of them all, although not equally, Ephel. 2.20.

I reply, when it is laid, *Christ* is the Foundation of the Church, and other Foundation can no man lay, it is meant of a principal Foundation not excluding a subordinate. But sith the term [Foundation] as hath been proved before in this Article, *Seft. 2.3.* as applied to the Apostles doth not note settling or upholding by rule or dominion, but by teaching, the Papists who ascribe to the Pope such a Supremacy and Infallibility in teaching, as is proper to *Christ*, do lay another principal Foundation besides *Jesus Christ*, not subordinate, but coordinate to him. Which that they do is proved by two things, which are ascribed by them to the Pope either by himself or with his Council.

1. That they can alter the plain express precepts of *Christ*, as namely in determining, that it is not necessary that other faithfull people besides the sacrificing Priest should drink the Wine in the Eucharist, though the precept of *Christ* is as express for all the faithfull drinking of it; as it is for their eating of the Bread, and that it is not lawfull for a Priest to marry, though the Scripture expressly saith, *Marriage is honourable in all men, Heb. 13.4.*

2. In enjoining under pain of Heresie, Excommunication, and Damnation things to be believed, and practised, which *Christ* never enjoyned to be believed or practised, as namely, Transubstantiation, the unbloody Propitiatory Sacrifice, properly so called in the Mass, Purgatory Fire, confession of all a persons known sins into the ears of a Priest, the keeping of the Vow of a Monastick profession, when the person cannot contain, and to live an idle begging life, when the person is able to work, and hath no other imployment, nor pretends to any, which is usefull to men, besides praying, which is the common duty of all Christians. Now surely he that takes on him to alter *Christ's* commands, and to put his own in stead thereof doth make himself the principal Foundation equal to *Christ*, which is contrary to *Paul*, 1 Cor. 3.11. and to *Christ*, Matth. 23.8,11. and so makes himself a Foundation co-ordinate, as indeed more than *Christ*, however he pretend himself the Vicar of *Christ*, or the authority of the Church for his Warrant. As for that which is said of Peter here, it was answered before, *Seft. 2.3.* that it doth not import any Rule or Dominion, but some peculiar success in his preaching, besides what others had, which was but a personal preheminence derivable to no Successour, much less to the rank of Roman Bishops in these last Ages, who never build the Church by preaching, but pull down Princes, and oppres those that would build up *Christ's* Church. Yet it is observable, that he allegeth Eph. 2.20.

to prove that the rest of the Apostles were built on the foundation of them all though not equally, when the Text doth not at all mention the Apostles being built on the Foundation, but the Ephesian believers, nor are the Ephesian believers said to be built on them unequally, on Peter as the supreme, on others after him; but on them all without any difference, and not only on them, but also on the Foundation of the Prophets, Christ alone being the chief corner-stone.

## S E C T. IX.

Cyprian, Hierome, Gregory; the councils of Constantinople, Chalcedon, Nice, are against the Popes Supremacy.

It is added thus by H. T. Object. St. Cyprian (de unit. Eccle.) says, *The Apostles were equal in digniti. And St. Hierome affirms the church was equally founded on them all, lib. cont. Jovin. Answ.* They were equal in their calling to the Apostleship I grant, in their power of Government and Jurisdiction I deny: And the church was equally founded on them all before a Head was constituted, I grant; after a Head was constituted, I deny, and so do the Fathers, St. Cyprian saying in the same place, that Christ disposed the origin of unity beginning from one (Peter) And St. Hierome tells us, He chose one of the Twelve, that a Head being constituted, the occasion of Schism might be taken away.

I Reply, Cyprian's words in his Book de unitate Ecclesie, are recited above Art. 5. Sect. 6. in which he expressly saith thus, *Hoc erant utique & ceteri Apostoli quod fuit Petrus, pari consortio prædicti & honoris & potestatis, sed exordium ab unitate proficiuntur, ut Ecclesia una monstretur:* that is, That verily were also all the rest of the Apostles which Peter was, endued with equal allotment of honour and power, but the beginning proceeds from unity, that the church might be shewed to be one. So that the very words are express, that all the Apostles were not only equal in their calling to the Apostleship, but also in power and honour, and that Peter was made a Representative of all, yet had no more power and honour than other Apostles; and for Bishops he saith presently after, *Episcopatus unus est cuius a singulis in solidum pars tenetur,* that is, *Bishoprick is but one, of which wholly or entirely a part is held by each.* Which words plainly shew this to be his meaning, 1. That the Episcopacy or charge of looking to the Church of Christ is but one and the same in all the World, even as the Church Catholick is but one and the same. 2. That each Bishop hath but his part, none the whole, none is an universal Bishop over the whole Church. 3. That each Bishop, who hath his part, holds it *in solidum*, that is, *wholly or intirely*, the power and charge is as much in one as another. 4. That Episcopacy was first invested in Peter for all, that Episcopacy might be one, and undivided, and the Church one, so as that no Church break from another, nor any Bishop be above another.

As for the words of Hierome, lib. 1. advers. Jovin. they are thus. *At dicit, super Petrum fundatur Ecclesia, licet id ipsum in alio loco super omnes Apostolos fiat,*

ART. VII. *The Popes Supremacy an Innovation.* 177

flat, & cuncti claves regni cœlorum accipiant, & ex aequo super eos Ecclesiæ fortitudo solidetur: tamen propterea inter duodecim unus eligitur; ut capite constituto schismatis tollatur occasio: that is, But thou sayest (who arguest for Marriage) upon Peter (a married man) the church is founded, although that thing in another place is done upon all the Apostles, and all receive the Keys of the Kingdom of Heavens, and equally upon them the strength of the church is established: yet therefore among twelve one is chosen, that a Head being constituted the occasion of Schism might be taken away. In which words it is manifest that he makes the other Apostles equally Foundations of the Church with Peter, and to have the Keys of the Kingdom of Heavens, and terms Peter not a Head in respect of Power or Jurisdiction over the rest, but in respect of Order, that for want of it no occasion of Schism might be. Which to have been the minde of Hierome appears fully in his Epistle to Eusebius, in which he determines that in the Scripture Bishops and Elders were the same, that Peter calls himself a fellow-elder, and John an Elder, but after one was chosen who might be set before the rest, that was done for a Remedy of Schism, lest each one drawing to himself the church of Christ might break it. And then he makes the Church and Bishop of Rome equal with other Churches and Bishops.

If, saith he, Authority be sought, the World is greater than a City. Wheresoever there is any Bishop either at Rome, or at Eubium, or at Constantinople, or at Rhegium, or at Alexandria, or at Tanis, he is of the same merit, and of the same Priesthood. Power of riches, and humility of poverty, makes a Bishop neither higher nor lower. But all are Successours of the Apostles. Whence these things may be inferred, 1. That Bishops are not above Elders originally. 2. That their superiority is by positive order. 3. That the Apostles were Elders. 4. That all Bishops are their Successours. 5. That the Bishop of Rome is not above another Bishop. 6. That the Authority of Rome is less than of the World.

Yet further saith H.T. Object. One Body with two Heads is monstrous. Answ. Not if one be principal, and the other subordinate or ministerial only, as in our present case: so Christ is the Head of the Man, and the Man of the Woman, 1 Cor. ii. without any monstrosity.

I reply, to make a thousand metaphorical subordinate ministerial Heads of the Church of Christ may be without monstrosity. But to make a supreme visible Head over the whole Church, ascribing to him such a power as agrees to none but Christ, nor can be exercised by any but Christ for the good of his body, hath monstrosity in it, or rather treason against Christ. But such a Head is the Pope made by H.T. therefore this conceit of him and other Papists induceth monstrosity. The Minor is partly shewed before, and may be fully proved by instancing in the acts of power the Pope takes to him, in defining what the whole Church is to believe, what is the sense of Scripture, receiving Appeals from all places, judging causes, setting up and putting down Kings and Bishops, and many more, wherein he arrogateth and usurpeth that power to himself, which doth only agree to Christ, and can be exercised by none but him.

Again saith H.T. Object. St. Gregory rejects the name of Universal Arch-bishop as Antichristian, lib. 7, indict. 2, Epist. 96. Answ. He rejects it

## 178 The Popes Supremacy an Innovation. ART. VII.

as it excludes all others from being Bishops, I grant; as it onely signifies one to be supreme and above all others, I deny, and so doth he himself, laying in the same Book (Epist. 62.) if there be any crime found in Bishops, I know no Bishop but is subject to the See Apostolick. And lib 4. Indict. 13. Epist. 32. The care and principality of the church hath been committed to the holy Apostle and Prince of the Apostles St. Peter, yet is not he called Universal Apostle, as if there were no other Apostles but he. You see in what sense he rejects the word (Universal.)

I reply, Gregory not onely rejected the Title of Universal Arch-bishop or Patriarch, but also rejected it as proud, wicked, perverse, profane, blasphemous, and the Usurper of it as a Fore-runner of Antichrist, and not onely as not agreeing to the Bishop of Constantinople, but also as not agreeing to him or any of his Predecessours, lib. 6. Epist. 24. & lib. 4. Epist. 32. & 36. None of my Predecessours consented to use this profane name of Universal Bishop: none of my Predecessours ever took upon him this name of singularity, neither consented to use it. We (the Bishops of Rome) do not seek nor yet accept this glorious Title being offered unto us. Nor in the sense onely as H. T. denies it due to the Pope, as if it excluded all others from being Bishops, but even in the sense in which the Pope now usurps it. For, 1. He rejects it in the sense in which John of Constantinople did affect it. But he did not affect it as thereby assuming to himself to be the onely Bishop, but the supreme, which appears, 1. In that a Synod of the Greek Bishops did agree to give it him, *Habita Synodo scipsum Patriarcham universalem creasset*, that is, Holding a synod he had created himself universal Patriarch, Platina in the Life of Pope Gregory. But doubtless the Synod would not give him the Title as importing him the onely Bishop, for then they should have unbishopt themselves, which neither he nor they did. 2. Gregory when he chargeth him with his arrogating that Title to himself tells John himself, lib. 4. Epist. 38. that he sought this Title that he might seem to be under none, and he alone before all, that he endeavoured that by the appellation of universal Bishop he might put under himself all the members of Christ, that he desired to be called in the World not onely the Father, but also the general Father, that he desired by that word of elation to put himself before Bishops, and to hold them under him, which shews he affected not to be accounted the onely Bishop, but the supreme. 3. He affected no more than what after Boniface the third of Rome obtained of Phocas, as appears by the words of Platina in the Life of Boniface the third, who speaks thus. Boniface the third a Roman by countrey obtained from Phocas the Emperour, yet with great contention, that the See of blessed Peter the Apostle, which is the Head of all churches should be both so called and accounted by all: which place indeed the Church of Constantinople endeavoured to challenge to it, sometimes evil Princes favouring, and affirming that in that place should be the first See where the Head of the Empire was. And Baronius Annal. Eccles. at the year 606. relates the Decree of Phocas thus, that the Roman Bishop alone should be called oecumenical or universal, but not the Constantinopolitan. And Bellarmine lib. 2. de Pontif. Rom. cap. 31. saith, They would equal the See of Constantinople to the Roman, and make it universal, speaking of the Greeks in the busines of John of Constantinople; whence it may be plainly gathered, that the thing which the Patriarchs of Constantinople affected, was

not to be accounted the onely Bishop, so as that none but he should be accounted a bishop, but that he should be the Head or Supreme of all Bishops by reason of the Seat of the Empire there, and that this *Gregory* disclaimed as proud.

4. That was affected by *John*, which he and *Cyriacus* his Successour used for twenty years, but neither of them used it so by word or deed, as to exclude others from being Bishops as well as themselves (for in *John's* own writing to them extant in the body of the *Roman Greek Law*, he terms them fellow-servants, Metropolitans, and Bishops, to whom he writes, and others in their Writings to the Patriarch of *Constantinople*, when they term him *ecumenical Arch-bishop*, yet style themselves Bishops and fellow-priests) but they would be accounted supreme or prime Bishops of the whole Church, so as to be under none, but above all.

2. It is proved that *Gregory* rejected the Title of Universal Bishop in the sense of the supreme Bishop, in that he, *Regist. lib. 11. Epist. 54.* resolves thus *If any man accuse a Bishop for whatsoever cause, let the cause be judged by his Metropolitan. If any man gainsay the Metropolitan's judgement, let it be referred to the Arch-bishop and Patriarch of that Diocese, and let him end it according to the Canons and Laws.* And for what he addeth, that if a Bishop have no Metropolitan nor Patriarch at all, then is his cause to be heard and determined by the See Apostolick, which is the Head of all Churches, it is added beyond the Canons of Councils and Laws of Emperours, and though it prove that he claimed a reference of causes in difference between Bishops within his Patriarchate, yet not where there were other Patriarchs to which the Bishops were subject, much less through the whole World. And that he termeth the See of Rome the Head of all Churches, doth not prove a Supremacy of Government by any institution of Christ, but a preheminence of order and some Ecclesiastical Privileges, by reason of that Cities being the Seat of the Empire. And hereby is understood what *H. T.* cites out of the seventh Book *Epist. 62.* of *Greg. Epistles, Indict. 2.* that it is not meant of all Bishops universally, but of the Bishops within that Patriarchate, but this was in case of fault only, for it follows, *But when no fault requires it, all according to reason of humility are equals:* So that *Gregory* doth not by that speech shew that he had an universal supreme Jurisdiction and power over all Churches, so as that they were subject to his commands and determinations in points of faith, but that he accounted the African Churches subject to his reproof, as he had a common care of the Church every where, in which *Gregory* himself and all other Bishops and Churches are subject to any Bishop wheresoever. Certainly *Gregory* had most absurdly argued against the arrogance of *John of Constantinople*, calling the Title of universal Bishop new, profane, proud, blasphemous, foolish, perverse, and him a Fore-runner of Antichrist who ever should use it, if he had imagined it belonged to himself, or any Bishop of Rome.

And for what *H. T.* allegeth, that *John* claimed to be universal Bishop, as excluding all others, it is but an absurdity which *Gregory* prested him with, as following upon it, not acknowledged by *John*, but rather denied, as when we urge men with absurdities following their tenets which they do not own; and how he urgeth, it appears from his words, *lib. 4. Epist. 38.* when he saith to *John*, *Thou desirest to tread under the name of Bishops in comparison of thy self,* which shew that he charged him not to have affected the Title of Universal

Bishop, as if he would be the onely Bishop absolutely, but comparatively to himself, in that sense as he which is singular in some thing is said to be alone, and as he who is not what he was, is said not to be; and so *Gregory* chargeth him as if by consequence he would exclude all others, and unbishop them in comparison. And yet if *Gregorie's* words were understood to condemn no more than this, that any should arrogate to himself the Title of Universal Bishop, as if he were the onely Bishop and others but as his Vicars or Substitutes, all that *Gregory* imputes to the use of that Title in this sense falls on the late *Roman Bishops*, who deny that any Bishop hath power of Jurisdiction but from them, that Bishops are not immediately by divine right, but mediately from the Pope, concerning which what passed in the Council of Trent may be seen in the History of Frier *Paul* in the seventh and eighth Book, in which may be seen how stily the *Italians* and *Jesuits* held it, and the Pope eluded the *Spanish Bishops*.

Lastly, that *Gregory* did disclaim such a Supremacy as Popes now usurp is manifest from the obedience which *Gregory*, lib. 1. Epist. 32 lib. 2. Epist. 61. 31. lib. 7. Epist. 1. and elsewhere acknowledged, he did owe to *Mauritius* the Emperour as his sovereign Lord, and in that Epistle in which he writes to *Mauritius* about *John's* usurpation by *Sabinian Pope* next after him petitions that the most pious Lord *Mauritius* would vouchsafe to judge that very busines which was in controversie between *John of Constantinople* and himself about the Title of universal Bishop, which he denied to *John* or to himself: nor was *Gregorie's* own election to the Papedom counted valid without the confirmation of *Mauritius* the Emperour, as by the relation of his Life in *Platina* appears: which things are inconsistent with that Doctrine which the Papists now hold about the Popes Supremacy.

H. T. adds. Object. The first Constantinopolitan Council and the Council of Chalcedon decreed the Constantinopolitan See, to be equal with that of Rome. Answ. In certain Privileges I grant, in original Authority or Jurisdiction I deny, and so doth the said Council of Chalcedon, saying, We thoroughly consider truly, that all Primacy and chief Honour is to be kept for the Arch-bishop of old Rome, Action 16. Nor was that Canon of the Council of Constantinople ever approved by the Pope, though it owned the Church of Rome to be the See Apostolick, and sought but Primacy in the second place and after it.

I reply, 1. Though it had been gainsaid by the Bishop of Rome, yet there was no reason the opposition of one Bishop should weigh down the common consent of the rest. 2. It is apparent that the Popes approbation was not then judged necessary, but that the Synod could determine without him. 3. That Canon of the first Council of Constantinople was not gainsaid by the Pope that then was, nor many years after. 4. *Gregory the Great* esteemed the four first general Councils as the four Gospels without exempting that Canon. And it is manifest that the Council gave Prerogatives of Honour to the Bishop of Constantinople next after the Roman, because it was new Rome. And the Council of Chalcedon expressly determined that the Bishop of Constantinople should have *soe* *equal* Privileges with the Roman, which Privileges were the same that old Rome had, which could not be the first place in the Council, but was Power and Jurisdiction, and this they determined

## ART. VII. *The Popes Supremacy an Innovation.* 181

notwithstanding the regret of the Popes Legates, who could not obtain any more than what was allotted the Bishop of Rome in the sixth Canon of the Nicene Council, of which H. T. saith.

Obj. *The Council of Nice saith, Let the ancient custome be kept in Egypt, Lybia, and Pentapolis, that the Bishop of Alexandria hath power over all these, because the Bishop of Rome also hath such a custome.* Answ. *The Bishop of Rome had a custome to permit such a power to the Bishop of Alexandria; the Greek Text saith, Because to the Bishop of Rome also this is accustomed, which argues him to be above the other.*

I reply, this Answer is frivolous, or rather impudent. For the same thing is allowed to the Bishop of *Alexandria*, which was accustomed to the Bishop of *Rome*, but that was not a power to permit any thing to the bishops of *Egypt*, *Lybia*, and *Pentapolis*, but to take care of the Churches therein as their Metropolitan, namely, to look to the Ordination of bishops and composing of Differences. And the meaning is, that each of those bishops of *Rome*, *Alexandria*, and *Antioch*, should, according to the custome of the bishop of *Rome* in his, look to the ordering of the Churches each in his Province, as *Rufinus* expresseth the Canon, and the *Arribick* and other Interpreters, and *Paschasius* the Popes Legate in the Council of *Chalcedon* alleged it thus, that the Bishop of *Alexandria* should have ἐξοντα power over all, because so it was accustomed to the Bishop of *Rome*. Which cannot be meant of all simply; For then it should have been thus meant, the bishop of *Alexandria* is to have power of all, because the bishop of *Rome* hath power of all; and so the bishop of *Alexandria* should be supreme bishop as the Pope, and so in stead of one visible supreme Head there should be more, which *Romanists* brook not, but it must be meant of equal power and charge given to the bishop of *Alexandria* in his Province with that which by custome the *Roman* had in his. And for the inference from the words [*Because to the Bishop of Rome also this is accustomed*] that it argues him to be above the other, it is vain, it proving onely the bishop of *Rome*'s power to have been the Pattern of the bishop of *Alexandria* his powers, but not greater, yea, it proves an equality between them, sith it ascribes the same to the one which was accustomed to the other.

---

## S E C T. X.

Of the Emperour's calling Councils, Pope Joan, Papists killing Princes excommunicate, not keeping Faith with Heretics.

H. T. proceeds. Obj. *The Emperors heretofore called and presided in General Councils.* Answ. They called them instrumentally I grant, by way of spiritual Jurisdiction I deny. And they presided also in them for peace and ornament true; for definition or judgement it is most false: that always was reserved to the Popes. I will not sit among them as Emperour (saith Constantine in his Epistle to Pope Leo about the sixth General Council) I will not speak impertinently with them, but as one of them, and what the Fathers shall ordain I will execute. Emperours subscribed Councils, not in order to constitution, but execution.

tion. God (saith Constantine to the Nicene Council) hath made you Priests, and given you power to judge us, but you may not be judged of men. In Ruffino.

I reply, that the Emperours called the first General Councils, it is so manifest out of the Writings of the Councils extant, that H. T. could not deny it; that they called them instrumentally, (meaning doubtless as the Popes instruments) is so far from truth, that the Popes sought to the Emperours to call them, as Leo Epist. 24.26.23. and in the sixth General Council at Constantinople (of which H. T. speaks) Pope Agatho saith, that he took care that they should go to the Council according to the command of the Emperour, pro obedientia quam debuit, out of obedience he did owe to the Emperour. It is true, the Emperour did not call them by way of spiritual Jurisdiction. We conceive nor, that the calling of persons to meet to consult of matters of Religion to be a point of spiritual Jurisdiction, who ever he be that calls them, whether Pope or Emperour: calling an Assembly is no part of Jurisdiction at all, it may be lawfully done by a brotherly invitation in many cases, and the Assembly may be by agreement without any superiority. Nor is there any spirituality in it, except in reference to the end, which doth not make it an act of spiritual Jurisdiction any more, than a Fathers, or Mothers, or Masters, causing servants or children to meet to pray or learn a Catechism, or when King Lemuel's Mother made him learn holy Lessons, Prov. 31.1. H. T. here saith, The Emperour's subscribed to Councils in order to execution: and he mentions it as allowable, which hath as much of spiritual Jurisdiction as the calling of the Council, and yet he will not say, it was an act of spiritual Jurisdiction. And for presiding it is certain, that Constantine the great did not only for ornament or peace, but also for direction or moderating their actions preface in the Nicene Council, and that the Emperors Subscriptions were for definitions, judgement, and constitution, it is apparent from the form of their Subscriptions; nor were the Councils Determinations counted binding Laws without the Emperours confirmation, nor did the first Christian Emperours execute what the Pope or Council would have them, but the Councils and Popes did supplicate the Emperour to execute their Decrees, and sometimes did at the Emperours command execute his Decrees, though it is true also that the best Emperours did in their presiding and calling of Councils decline magisterial Impositions on the consciences of Bishops, and Determinations of Faith, but were willing to learn from them the truth, and in such matters did refer the trial of Bishops to other Bishops, whom they chose, as in the cause of Athanasius, and sometimes to others, as in the cause of the Donatists.

H. T. adds. Object. What think you of Pope Joan? Was she an universal Bishop also? Answ. I think him rather a particular Fool who can believe so gross a Fable: It was the credulous Relation of one Martinus Polonus a silly man (the only Author for it, though Protestant Writers have falsely cited others) who hath sufficiently discredited his own Narration; For he tells you, she was born at Mountes in England; (there having never been any such place heard of) and that she was bred up at Athens, an University not then in being, but destroyed many years before, a pretty likely tale.

I reply, that it was the Relation of more than one appears by *Platina* his words, which are, *Fere plerique omnes affirmant, &c.* almost all affirm it. Protestant Writers have produced rightly particularly Mr. *Alexander Cook* in his *Dialogue of Pope Joan*, a full Jury of Writers relating it, and those some of them before *Martinus Polonus*, and as credible Historians, as those times yielded, besides the signs of the truth of the Relation, which are vindicated by him and others from the shifts by which *Onuprius* and such like Dawbers have endeavoured to evade their testimony. And me thinks *H. T.* writes too *grossly* in conceiving him a particular Fool that can believe it, when *Platina*, *Sabellinus*, *Antoninus*, *Leonicus Chalcondyla*, *Marianus Scotus*, *Sigibertus Gemblacensis*, *Matthaeus Palmerius*, *Volateranus*, *Nauclerus*, *Christianus Massenus*, *Joannes Parisiensis*, *Theodoricus Niem*, *Ravissius Textor*, and others could believe it. As for the Exceptions here made, it is not true, that *Martinus Polonus* saith, that Pope Joan was born at Mountes (he would say *Meniz*) in England, the words are *Joannes Anglicus natione Moguntinus*, that is, *John English* by nation of *Meniz*, which may be true, that she had the name of *English* by descent, yet born at *Meniz* in *Germany*, as many a man born in *England* hath the name of *Irish*, *Scot*, *French*, and I think *Turberville* is a *Norman* name, yet presume *Henry Turberville* was born in *England*. And for *Athens*, that it was then destroyed, and no University is affirmed by him, not proved, but the contrary is shewed to have been probable out of the Subscription of the sixth Council, by the seventh Council, out of *Paulus Aemilius*, and others by *bishop Jewel Defence of the Apol. part 4. ch. 1. divisi. i.*

*H. T.* adds. Object. You Roman Catholicks, as I have heard, (if the Pope excommunicate a Tyrant or heretical Prince) hold it lawfull for his own Subjects to kill him. Answ. You have heard a loud slander, we abominate and detest the Doctrine. It is defined by the Council of Constance, and therefore of faith with us, that it is heretical to affirm it lawfull for a Subject to kill his Prince upon any pretence whatsoever. *See. 15.*

I reply, What you now hold I know not, there are causes of jealousie of you, that having found it disadvantageous to you, you disguise your selves and conceal your opinions till it may be for your advantage. But sure heretofore the many Attempts against Queen *Elizabeth* by Popish Priests, especially of the Jesuites Order, some whereof were with the privity or instigation of Cardinals, if not Popes of Rome, the seditious Writing of *William Allen*, who was therefore thought fit by the Pope to be made a Cardinal, with *Parsons*, *Creswell*, and such like, the Bull of Pope *Pius the fifth*, the Gun-powder Treason against King *James*, and the Parliament 1605. with the acts and speeches of *Faux*, *Garnet*, *Greenwell*, *Hall*, and others, and Pope *Paul the fifth* his Breves against taking the Oath of Allegiance with *Bellarmino's Letter*, and the Writings thereupon did make it appear then, that, how loud soever it might be, yet it was no slander to charge Roman Catholicks with that Doctrine. The praising of *James Clemente's* fact in killing *Henry the third of France* by Pope *sixtus the fifth*, the attempt of *Peter Barrier*, of *John Chastel* a Novice of the Jesuites, and the execrable Murder of *Henry the fourth* by *Ravillac* confessed to have been by the instigation of Jesuits, and *Mariana's book*, with many other things caused the University and Parliament of *Paris* to charge some Roman Catholicks with that Doctrine: which it's not likely they would have done.

done, and the King a while banish the *Jesuits* had there not been sufficient Proof. Yea since that time the books of *Bellarmino*, and *Santarellus* have been condemned by the University and Parliament of *Paris*, as teaching that Doctrine, and yet more books have been vented tending to the same, as in the Writings of *Suarez* and other *Jesuits* may be found. Nor did I ever hear, that the Pope did by punishing the Traitors in *England* when they fled to *Rome*, or by condemning the *Jesuit* Doctrine of killing Kings acquit *Roman Catholicks* from this accusation. Yea whereas King *James* towards the end of his Reign propounded nine Questions to be answered by *John Fisher the Jesuit*, it is observed by Dr. *Francis White*, that he doth decline to answer directly the ninth Question about deposing Kings and giving away their Kingdoms, alleging that it touched a controversy between the Pope and Princes, in which he makes shew of loathness to interpose, having a Letter dated, Aug. 1. 1614. from the general of his order not to write any thing thereof, having found it an unhappy course, but never declared against it, nor took the Oath of Allegiance, though the State knew it was easie for their general to alter the order, or to make an other order in private, and whatever order their general give, yet they are tied to do what the Pope requires of them. And the answers of the *Jesuits* about *Santarellus* his book approved by their general, that they in *France* then disavowed the Book, yet withall acknowledged, if they had been at *Rome* they would have done as their general did, shewed that they had disavowed that Doctrine out of fear, and that at *Rome* it was held for curse it. What they still hold may be seen in the mystery of *Jesuitism*, and other Writings.

As for what *H. T.* allegeth out of the Council of *Constance* it satisfieth not, sith all *Roman Catholicks* allow not that Council, which deposed the Pope and chose another, and determined the Council to be above the Pope, yea, *Mariana de rege, &c.* lib. 1. cap. 6. answers thus, But that Decree I finde not approved by Martin the fifth the Roman Pope. Nor indeed can Papists hold that which *H. T.* sets down as the Council of *Constance*'s definition, but that they must gainsay what the fourth Lateran Council under *Innocent the third* determined concerning the rooting out of Hereticks. Nor are Princes secured by the determination of the Council of *Constance*, or *H. T.* his avouching it to be of faith, sith perhaps it is but one Doctor's opinion, or if it be the faith of more or all, yet they can hold King killing, and yet hold that Doctrine, alleging that a Priest is no Subject, nor a person excommunicate his Prince, and that however he may not kill him upon any pretence whatsoever, yet he may do it upon the Popes Excommunication as a just Sentence of a superior Judge; the words in that Council, Sess. 15. (left out here by *H. T.* whether fraudulently or no, his own conscience can tell best) being, non expectari sententia, vel mandato judicis cuiuscunque, The Sentence or Mandate of any Judge whatsoever being not expected, which have a shew of limiting their other words, and intimate their allowing the killing of a Prince, when there is a Mandate or Sentence of a Judge, such as they conceive the Pope to be. Nor have we any cause of confidence in *H. T.* as free from such devices, if we mark what follows.

Object. *Mariana the Jesuit printed the opinion.* Answ. True, by way of Probleme

## ART. VII. The Popes Supremacy an Innovation. 185

Problem he did, but his Book was condemned and publickly burnt by a Provincial Council of his own Order.

I reply, Doth H. T. think the Book is not now to be seen to detect his falsity? Or that the Memorials of these things are lost, who goes about to excuse Mariana or the Order of Jesuits in this manner? Mariana did in his first Book of the Institution of a King, chap.6. write that James Clement by killing Henry the third King of France with a poisoned Knife had gotten himself ingens nomen, a great name, that we consider from all memory that they were greatly praised who attempted to kill Tyrants, and that it is a wholesome cogitation, that Princes be persuaded if they oppress the Common-wealth, if they be intolerable in vices and filthines, that they live in such a condition that not onely of right, but with praise and glory they may be killed. Which that they were more than a Probleme appears from his own words, This our Sentence certainly comes from a sincere minde. And the sad event of Ravillac's killing Henry the fourth of France by the inducement of that Book, and the Edict of the Parliament of Paris the eighth of the Ides of June, 1610. set down in the Continuation of Thuanus his History, Tom.4 lib.3. upon which his Book was adjudged to be burnt: but that his Book was burned by a Provincial Council appears not, nor is it set down by H. T. when nor where, nor is it likely to have been burnt by a Provincial Council till after the Sentence of the Parliament of Paris, that thereby they might salve the credit of their Order.

But it is added. Object. At least you hold the Pope can dispense with your Allegiance to Princes, and if he dispense you are not bound to keep any faith with them or any Hereticks. Answ. We hold that our Allegiance to Princes is not dispensable by any Authority on earth; and are as ready to defend our Prince or civil Magistrate with the hazard of our lives and fortunes even against the Pope himself if he invade them, as against any other Enemy. We esteem our selves obliged to keep faith even with Infidels: And the Council of Trent hath declared, that to violate any least point of publick faith given to Hereticks is a thing punishable by the Law of God and Man, Sess.15.18. What this or that particular Doctor may hold, or the Popes flatterers, if he have any, adds nothing to the Creed of Catholicks, nor is it justly chargeable on the whole Church.

I reply, I am glad to read this passage, if this Author mean plainly, as his words seem to import: yet see not sufficient security to Princes given thereby, though this Author should mean so. For other Romanists may say as this Author doth of others, What this or that particular Doctor holds adds nothing to the Creed of Catholicks, nor is it justly chargeable on the whole Church. Nor is this Protestation so full as to leave no starting hole from it, if it be for advantage. It may mean, they will defend their Prince who is their Prince, yet not acknowledge Allegiance to their Prince, as being exempt from his Jurisdiction as Clergy-men, or their Prince ceasing to be their Prince being an Heretic, or excommunicate, or worthy to be excommunicate, or they will defend their Prince against the invasion of the Pope, but not against the Sentence of Deposition, or they will defend him till they judge him an Enemy to the Faith or Catholick Church, but not any longer. And this Author may, as some in case of Marriage conceive he is obliged to keep faith with Infidels, and yet

168. *The Popes Supremacy an Innovation.* ART. VII.

not with Hereticks. And for the determination of the Council of Trent, Sess. 15. 18. neither durst Protestants then trust to the safe conduct then given, and before and since sad instances of Papists perfidiousness have given too much occasion to Protestants to suspect the lurking of a Snake under the grass, I mean some hidden deceit under a covert of fair words, especially when we consider this Authour a little before counted the definition of the Council of Constance to be of faith, Sess. 15. 18. In which Sess. 19. that Council (as it is in Binius) hath these words, *The present holy Synod doth declare, that no prejudice to the Catholick faith, or to Ecclesiastick Jurisdiction is generated, or impediment can be, or ought to be made by any safe conduct granted by the Emperour, Kings, and other secular Princes to Hereticks, or defamed of Heresie, thinking so to recall the same from their Errours, with whatsoever Bond they have bound themselves, but that, the said safe conduct notwithstanding, it may be lawfull for a competent Judge, and Ecclesiastick to inquire of the Errours of such persons, and otherwise duly to proceed against them, and to punish them, as much as justice shall persuade, if they shall refuse stify to revoke their Errours; although trusting to their safe conduct they have come to the place of judgement, who otherwise would not have come: nor doth he that so promiseth, when he hath done what lies in him remain obliged by this in any thing.* Which surely amounted then to as much as this (and hath been thousands of times objected by Princes and others) that publick faith is not to be kept with Hereticks. And how little reason Protestants have to trust Papists not only the actions of former Papists for a thousand years past, but also of late their actings in Ireland, Poland, Piedmont, shew.

Whom he means by the Popes flatterers, or particular Doctors, I do not well understand: should he call Bellarmine, Baronius, or such like men so, perhaps he may be served as Francis a St. Clara and others were. I judge H. T. to be a gros Flatterer in maintaining the Popes Supremacy and Infallibility, there being in this tenet no better than blasphemous Antichristian flattery, ascribing to some of the worst and oftentimes most ignorant men that which is due to the Son of God. And for his Corollary, I deny the Major and Minor both, sith that may be a true Church which hath neither local personal Succession, nor conspicuous Visibility, nor such Unity, Universality, Infallibility, Sanctity, Power of Miracles, Universal Bishop as H. T. requires as necessary to a true Church, nor hath he made it plain, that these marks do agree to the present Roman Church or Bishop, and no other, but his mistakes in these are shewed. I follow him in the rest.

ART.



## ARTIC. VIII.

Unwritten Tradition now no Rule of  
Faith.

The unwritten Tradition, which H.T. terms *Apostolical*, is not the true Rule of Christian Faith.

## S E C T. I.

The Argument for Apostolical Tradition unwritten as the Rule of Faith from the means of planting and conserving Faith at first is answered.

H.T. intitles his eighth Article of Apostolical Tradition, and saith, *Our Tenant is, That the true Rule of Christian Faith is Apostolical Tradition, or a delivery of Doctrine from father to son, by hand to hand, from Christ and his Apostles, and nothing ought to be received as Faith, but what is proved to have been so delivered, which we prove thus.*

The first Argument. That is now the true Rule of Faith which was the essential means of planting and conserving it at first: But oral and Apostolical Tradition, not written Books, was the essential means of planting and conserving it at first; therefore oral and Apostolical Tradition not written Books is the true Rule of Faith. The Major is proved, because the Rule of Faith must be immutable, and the same in all Ages, as the Faith it self is. The Minor is proved, because the first Gospel was not written till eight years after the Death of Christ or thereabouts; in which space the Apostles had preached and planted the Faith of Christ in many Nations over almost all the World. Add to this that many Ages were passed before all the Books of Scripture were dispersed and accepted for Canonical by the whole Church: so that when any difference arose in points of Faith among the Christians of

*the first Age they were not to inquire what had been written, but whether the Apostles so taught.*

Answe

**T**HIS Doctor, whether it be by reason of his ignorance, or heedlessness, or malignity to the holy Scriptures, determines worse than his fellows, yea, against the Doctrine of the Trent Council and Pope *Pius* the fourths Bull. For whereas in the *Trent Council, Sess. 4.* it is said, that *the truth and Discipline of Christ and his Apostles is contained in written Books and Traditions without writing*, and would have both to be received with equal affection and reverence of piety; and Pope *Pius* the fourth his Bull requires the admission of the sacred Scripture and *Apostolical Tradition*. H. T. concludes, that *written Books are not the true Rule of Faith, but oral and Apostolical Tradition*. If he had said, they had not been the entire Rule of Faith he had agreed with the *Trent Council*, and the Popes Bull; but now he contradicts them as well as the Protestants, and his Argument doth as well conclude, that the holy Scripture is no part of the Rule of Faith, as that it is not the whole. But leaving him to be corrected by his fellows, let's view his Dispute.

Setting aside his non-sense speech of being *received as Faith*, in stead of being received as the object of Faith, and taking *Apostolical Tradition* to be meant of that which is truly so called, I grant his Tenet, and say with him that *the true Rule of Christian Faith is Apostolical Tradition*, that is, the Doctrine which the Apostles delivered, or that delivery of Doctrine from father to son, by hand to hand, from *Christ and his Apostles*, and that nothing ought to be received as *Faith*, that is, a thing to be believed with a *Christian divine Faith*, which all *Christians* are bound to believe, but *what is proved to have been so delivered*. For though in general any divine revelation is to be the object of *Christian Faith* by whom or what way soever it be delivered, and God hath delivered divers revelations in the *Books of the Old Testament*, which are objects of *Faith*, yet sith now *Christ and his Apostles* have delivered those divine revelations as the oracles of God, and what the Apostles preached and thought needfull for us to know, and believe to salvation is written, and these Writings are conveyed from father to son by hand to hand, we grant the Tenet being meant of them, and yield further, that if they can prove there are *Traditions truly Apostolical* besides those which are written, and this Tradition, that those *Books* which we call *holy Scripture* are divine Writings, we will embrace them as things to be believed. But then, 1. We say it is manifest that in the Apostles days there were *Traditions* put on the *Apostles* which were not theirs, 2. *Theff 2.1.* 2. That the *Apostolical Tradition* written is sufficient for *faith to salvation*. 3. That *unwritten Traditions* are uncertain, and much corrupted. 4. That there is no certain Rule to know which are *Apostolical Traditions* but by the *Scripture or Apostolical Writings*. 5. That neither the *Popes* nor *Church of Rome*, nor general *Councils* determination is a sufficient assurance of *Apostolical Tradition unwritten*. 6. That therefore to us now the *holy Scripture* is the only Rule of *Christian faith and life*. And to the Argument of H. T. I answer, 1. By denying the *Major*, giving this as a Reason, because the means of planting and conserving *faith*, though it were the essential means,

yet

yet is not the rule of faith necessarily, there being great difference between these two. The means of faith is any way God useth to beget it, as by dreams, visions, the speech of Balaam's Ass, his Prophecy, Caiaphas Prophecy, the Star which guided the Wise-men, *Math. 2.* the Wives good conversation, *1 Pet. 3. 1.* yet these are not the Rule of Faith, but the divine revelation it self. And if it were supposed any one of these, or any other, were the essential means of Faith, that is, that means by which Faith is, and without which it were not, yet it were not therefore the Rule of Faith, but the divine revelation or truth delivered by that means. And to the proof of the Major which seems to be thus formed, *That is the true Rule of Faith which is immutable, and the same in all Ages, as the Faith it self is.* But the essential means of planting and conserving it at first is immutable, and the same in all Ages, as the Faith it self is. Ergo. I answer, 1. By denying the Major, there are many things immutable, and the same in all Ages, as the Faith it self is, and yet are not the true Rule of Faith, as namely, Gods Decrees and purposes, the being of the Heavens, the obedience of the Angels, &c. 2. By denying the Minor. For whether the immediate Declaration of God to *Adam*, *Gen. 3. 15.* or Christ's preaching by himself were the essential means of planting and conserving Faith at first, or any other, yet it is not immutable, and the same in all Ages, as Faith it self. God's Declaration immediately, or Christ's preaching by himself are not the same in all Ages; yea, *Heb. 1. 1.* it is said, that God hath spoken to us in divers manners, ways and times by the Prophets, and in these last days only hath spoken to us by his Son, *vers. 2.* & *chap. 2. 3.* The salvation was at first begun to be spoken by the Lord, and since was confirmed by them that heard him: which shews the means to be variable, by which Faith is planted and conserved. The Apostle tells us, *1 Pet. 3. 1.* that without the Word those that believe not the Word may be won by the conversation of the Wives: so that their good conversation was at first a means of converting them, and yet that was not to be the Rule of their Faith. Whence it may appear that this Argument goes upon these false Suppositions.

1. That there is some means essential to the planting and conserving of Faith at first. 2. That the same means is essential to the planting and conserving of Faith at first. 3. That this means is immutable and the same in all Ages as Faith it self. 4. That what is the means of planting and conserving Faith at first must be the true Rule of Faith.

2. I deny the Minor, that oral and Apostolical Tradition, not written Books, was the essential means of planting and conserving Faith at first. And to his proof I answer, that by oral and Apostolical Tradition, in his Tenet he means, a delivery of Doctrine from father to son, by hand to hand, from Christ and his Apostles: now if it be granted, there was no Gospel written till eight years after the death of Christ, or thereabouts, it must be granted also, that there was no delivery of Doctrine from father to son, by hand to hand, from Christ and his Apostles, but only their preaching *viva voce*, with living speech, in their own persons, and therefore if that which was according to *H. T.* the essential means of planting and conserving Faith at first must be the true Rule of Faith still, and no other, then that Rule must neither be unwritten nor written delivery of Doctrine from father to son, by hand to hand, from Christ and his Apostles, but their own personal Tradition *viva voce*, which now ceasing there

is no Rule of Faith at all left; but the Quakers device of each mans light within him to be his Rule must take place. But to me the Rule of Faith is divine revelation, by what means soever it be delivered: be it the Law written in the heart or in the Book, by the signes of God in Tables of stone, or delivered by an Angel in a Dream, Vision, Apparition, by Christ, or his Apostles, or any other. But sith God hath been pleased to order it, be it sooner or later, that what Christ and his Apostles taught should be written, we are assured God would have us to take it for the Rule of our Faith, and if Scripture be not the Rule of our Faith Christ and his Apostles did not well to commend it to us, *Luk. 16.31. Job. 5.39.* and to command them that searched the Scriptures, *Act. 17.11.* nor the Apostles to direct us to them, *1 Pet. 1.19, 20. 2 Tim. 3.16. Rom. 15.4.* nor to allege them, *Act. 3.22. & 13.33, 34, 35.* nor Christ to have used them against the Tempter, *Math. 4.4. 7.10.* nor to have imputed error to the ignorance of them, *Math. 22.29.* nor to have sent the Revelation of John to the seven Churches of Asia, with declaration of blessednes to the observers of it, and denunciation of a curse to the corrupters and infringers of it, *Revel. 1.1, 3. & 22.18, 19.* nor the Apostles to write a Letter to the Churches, *Act. 15.23.* nor the Apostles to write several Epistles to several Churches. And if many Ages (though I think H. T. therein doth exceed) were passed before all the Books of Scripture were dispersed and accepted for Canonical by the whole Church; yet it is certain some were, and they must be the Rule of Faith which were accepted. And when any difference arose in points of Faith among the Christians of the first Age, though they were to inquire of the Apostles what they taught, yet when they could not speak with them, they made use of their Letters written, as *Act. 15.31. 1 Cor. 7. &c.* And if we are not to do so still, why doth this Author allege Scripture for the Churches Infallibility, the Popes Supremacy, &c. and tells us here, pag. 113. *There is no better way to decide Controversies than by the Scripture expounded by the Church, and according to the Rule of Apostolical Tradition?* But this is an evidence of Gods infatuating these Romanists, that though they have no shew of proof for Peter's Supremacy, and consequently the Popes, without the Scripture, and therefore allege it, yet determine it not to be the Rule of Faith, and so make void their own proof, and the very Rule of Faith, which they would fain establish.

## S E C T. II.

*Unwritten Traditions are not proved to be the true Rule of Faith from the assurance thereby of the Doctrine and Books of Christ and his Apostles.*

But let us view what he adds. *A second Argument is, That is the true Rule of Faith by which we may be infallibly assured both what Doctrines Christ and his Apostles taught, and what Books they wrote, and without which we can never be infallibly assured of these things.* But by Apostolical Tradition we may infallibly be assured both what Doctrines Christ and his Apostles taught, and what Books they wrote, and by no other means. Therefore Apostolical Tradition is the true Rule of Faith. The Major is manifest, because

in the Doctrine which Christ and his Apostles taught, and the Books which they wrote are contained all things that are of Faith; therefore the infallible means of knowing them is the infallible and true Rule of Faith. The Minor is proved, because a full report from whole worlds of fathers to whole worlds of sons of what they heard and saw is altogether infallible, since sensible evidence in a world of Witnesses unanimously concurring is altogether infallible, how fallible soever men may be in their particulars; and such a report, such an evidence is Apostolical Tradition, for all the Doctrines Christ and his Apostles taught and all the Books they wrote therefore infallible.

*Answe.* **T**HE Popish Tener is, that unwritten Traditions of other points than what are in the written Books are the Rule of Faith, that so what they cannot prove out of Scripture of Peter's being at Rome, being Bishop there, Purgatory-fire, Invocation of Saints, Adoration of the Host, mixing Water with Wine in the Eucharist, and many more, which Popes and Popish Councils obtrude on the Church of God as Apostolical Traditions, may be received as Objects of Faith. But here H. T. concludes *Apostolical Tradition is the true Rule of Faith*, and proves it of no other Apostolical Tradition but that whereby the Books written are known to be the Apostles; which I might grant, and yet H. T. gain nothing for his purpose, sith Apostolical Tradition may be the true Rule of Faith, and yet not Apostolical Tradition unwritten, much les that which Popes and Councils call Apostolical Tradition, which is every corruption that hath been any long time received in the Roman Church: and this Apostolical Tradition infallible [that the Books of holy Scripture were written by the holy men whose names they bear, and that the things in them related are certain] and yet other Traditions of other things not so. But to his Argument, I say, the Major is not true, nor is it proved by his reason, which in form is this, *That is the true Rule of Faith in which are contained all things that are of Faith.* But in the Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles taught, and the Books which they wrote, are contained all things that are of Faith. The Conclusion which followeth from these premises is not his Major, [that is the true Rule of Faith, by which we may be infallibly assured both what Doctrines Christ and his Apostles taught, and what Books they wrote, and without which we can never be infallibly assured of those things], nor the Conclusion set down, [therefore the infallible means of knowing them is the infallible and true Rule of Faith] for these terms, [that by which we may be assured of the Doctrines or Books, the infallible means of knowing them] are not the same with [the Books or Doctrines in which are contained all things that are of Faith] and therefore the Major is not proved, but indeed the very Protestant Doctrine which he gainsays is proved unawares thus, *That in which are contained all things that are of Faith is the true Rule of Faith.* But in the Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles taught, and the Books which they wrote, are contained all things that are of Faith; therefore the Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles taught, and the Books which they wrote, are the true Rule of Faith. Which proves directly what H. T. denies, that the Scripture is the true Rule of Faith, and shews, that he mistook the means of Faith for the Rule of Faith, between which there is a manifest difference, the means of Faith being any outward or inward efficient, principal or instrumental,

mental, by which a person comes to believe, the Rule is that by which we know what we are to believe: the same means may be the means of believing contrary things: *Caiaphas* and *Bilaam* may prophesie right things of *Israel*, and be a means of expectation of the *Messiah*, and yet also be a means of laying a stumbling-block to overthrow them. A messenger, that brings a grant, wherein a Prince grants a thing, is the means of belief, and so is the Seal, but the Rule of believing is the words of the grant: *Thomas* his seeing and feeling were the means of his believing *Christ's* Resurrection, but the Rule was *Christ's* words.

2. I deny his *Minor*. For though I grant such a full report, as he speaks of, is infallible, nor do I deny, that there is such a report, or such an evidence for all the Doctrines *Christ* and his Apostles taught, and all the Books they wrote, yet I say, 1. That this is not the Apostolical Tradition, which Papists assert; for with them any thing used in their Church a long time, and approved by a Pope, or a Council confirmed by him is an Apostolical Tradition, though it have not such report, or evidence. 2. That there are other means by which we may be assured, what Doctrines *Christ* and his Apostles taught, and what Books they wrote, besides this full report, as, 1. The inward testimony of the holy Spirit. 2. The innate characters of the Doctrine, and Books themselves foretelling things to come, opening the Mysteries of God, advancing Gods glory, enlightning and converting the soul, with many more which shew whole the Doctrine and Books were. Yet by the way I observe, 1. That notwithstanding he makes here such an Infallibility in the report and evidence of senses, yet pag. 205. he denies evidence of *sense infallible in the Sacrament*, and thereby overthrows his Position here. 2. From his words here I argue against his opinion of Transubstantiation thus, *A full report from whole worlds of fathers to whole worlds of sons of what they heard and saw is altogether infallible*, since sensible evidence in a world of ey-witnesses unanimously concurring is altogether infallible, how fallible soever men may be in their particulars. But there are worlds of ey-witnesses, and hand-witnesses, and tongue-witnesses, and nose-witnesses, and ear-witnesses of fathers and sons who all unanimously concurring discern, and say of what they have seen, felt, heard, tasted, smelted, that there is no flesh nor blood, but Bread and Wine in the consecrated Host, therefore the report that there is no flesh and blood but Bread and Wine in the Eucharist after Consecration or consecrated Host, and consequently no Transubstantiation is altogether infallible. So inconsistent are this Authours sayings in one place with that he saith in another, as indeed Popish Doctrine being a Lie must of necessity be self-repugnant.

---

### S E C T. III.

*The obligation of the Church not to deliver any thing as a point of Faith, but what they received, proves not unwritten Traditions a Rule of Faith.*

*H. T.* proceeds thus. *A third Argument.* If Christ and his Apostles have given to the Church of the first Age [together with all points of Faith] this for

for the Rule of Faith, that nothing on pain of Damnation ought to be delivered for Faith, but what they had received from them as such, then it was impossible that they should deliver any thing for Faith to the second Age, but what they had received from them as such, and so from Age to Age to this time. But Christ and his Apostles did give to the Church of the first Age, [together with all points of Faith] this for the Rule of Faith, that nothing on pain of Damnation ought to be delivered for Faith, but what they received from them as such. Therefore it was impossible that the Church of the first Age should deliver any thing to the Church of the second Age for Faith, but what they had received as such from Christ and his Apostles, or consequently that they should erre in Faith. The Major is proved, because to make her deliver more for Faith than she had received, in this supposition the whole Church must either have forgotten what she had been taught from her infancy in matters of Salvation and Damnation, which is impossible in a world of ear and eye-witnesses, as hath been shewed; or else the whole Church must have so far broken with Reason, which is the very nature of man, as to conspire in a notorious Lie to damn her self and posterity by saying she hath received such or such a point for Faith, which in her own conscience she knew she had not received; and this is more impossible than the former, even as impossible as for men not to be men: as shall be shewed in the next Argument. The Minor is proved by these positive Texts of Scripture, Therefore brethren stand ye fast, and hold the Traditions which ye have learned, whether by word or our Epistle, 2 Thess. 2.15. Those things which ye have been taught, and heard, and seen in me, these do ye, Phil. 4. So we have preached, and so ye have believed, 1 Cor. 14.15. How shall they believe in whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher? Rom. 10.17. The things that thou hast heard of me before many witnessess, the same command thou to faithfull men, which shall be fit to teach others also, 2 Tim. 2.2. If any man shall preach otherwise than ye have received, let him be Anathema, Gal. 1.9. Although we or an Angel from Heaven preach to you besides that which we have preached to you, be he Anathema, Gal. 1.8.

*Answ.* 1. **T**he Conclusion, were it granted, is not the Position to be proved, that the true Rule of Christian Faith is Apostolical oral Tradition, not Books; nor is it included in it, sith some in the Church, although not the whole Church of the first Age, might deliver to the Church of the second Age, and so from father to son that for Faith, which was not received from Christ or his Apostles, and it be after received as from the Apostles, as is manifest in the reports of keeping Easter on the fourteenth of the Moon, of the Millenary opinion, as from John, and in points of Faith the whole Church might mistake or forget, not deliver all truth, yes, might erre, and so not be fit to be a Rule of Faith. 2. Were it granted that unwritten Traditions of the whole Church of the first Age to the second were a Rule of Faith, yet are not the Romanists Traditions unwritten proved Rules of Faith, unless they be proved to be delivered by the whole Church of the first Age to the Church of the second Age, and so from father to son without alteration, which they cannot prove. Nevertheless, sith this Argument tends to the asserting of an In-

fability in the Church of the first Age distinctly taken from the Apostles and their Writings; I grant the *Minor*, and omit the examining of the Texts brought to prove it, though some of them yield a good Argument against unwritten Tradition: But I deny the *Major*, as being contrary to experience both in the Jewish Church, to whom it was forbidden to add to, or diminish from God's commands, *Deut. 4.2.* and yet they did, *Mark 7.8.9.* and in the Christian Church, as is most evident in the Traditions of the *Chiliasts*, about *Ester*, and sundry other things. And though the whole Church of the first Age did not deliver points of Faith to the second Age, yet in the second and after-ages corruptions did come in, which were taken for universal Traditions, as in giving Infants the Eucharist, which *Augustine* and Pope *Innocentius* took for an Apostolical Tradition, though the *Trent Council* condemn it. And many things there are now taken for Apostolical Traditions, as Worship of Images, praying to Saints, not allowing the Wine to be drunk by all the Communicants, which yet are manifestly repugnant to the Apostles Doctrine.

As for the proof of *H.T.* I say, 1. The eye and ear-witnesses of all the points of Faith are not a whole World. 2. Errors may be traduced as from the whole Church of the first Age, and from the Apostles which were not from them. 3. The Church delivers not Doctrines, but the Teachers in them, whereof many sometimes are Hypocrites, sometimes weak in understanding, all of them being men are liable to mistakes, passion, forgetfulness, inadvertency, and those that are not sincere may against their conscience deliver errors. Sure if *Polycarpus* an Auditour of *John the Evangelist*, and *Anicetus* Bishop of *Rome* in the second Age, *Polycrates* and Pope *Victor* in the same Age, *Cyprian* and Pope *Stephanus* in the next contradicted each other about Traditions, no marvel later and inferior Teachers, such as *Papias* a credulous man, and others mistook about them, and the after Churches follow them in their mistakes. 4. The Churches were in the Apostles days easily drawn away from the Doctrine, which *Paul* had evidently taught them by hearkening to Seducers, as the *Galatians*, *Gal. 3.1.* though the Apostle warned them *Gal. 1.8.9.* neither therefore the warning given them, nor any state of the Church in this life yields sufficient security of not being deceived, nor deceiving others. The Church and Teachers thereof may not only be men, and have reason, but also good men and conscientiable, and warned not to deliver any thing but Christ's and his Apostle's Doctrine to be believed under pain of Damnation, and yet may build Hay and Stubble, and be saved as through fire, though their Building suffer loss, keeping the Foundation, and repenting of all sins and errors, though some be secret and unknown to them. Let us see what is in the next Argument, which he terms the last Argument for Traditions.

## S E C T. IV.

*Counterfeits might and did come into the Church under the name of Apostolick Tradition without such a force as H. T. imagines necessary thereto even in points of Faith.*

To make, saith H. T. a whole world of wise and disinterested men break so far with their own nature as to confire in a notorious Lie to damn themselves and their posterity (which is the onely means to make an Apostolical Tradition fallible) such a force of hopes or fears must fall upon them all at once, as may be stronger than nature in them. But such a force of hopes or fears can never fall on the whole World or Church at once, which is dispersed over all Nations, therefore it is impossible for the whole World or Church at once to confire in such a Lie, or consequently to erre in Faith.

**A n s w.** This Argument concludes for the Churches Infallibility, which was the fifth Article, not for Traditions, as is pretended in this Article. But that the Church militant and all their Teachers setting aside the Apostles, are fallible is proved before, and how the whole Church of later ages may be not onely fallible, but also deceived and deceive others without breaking with their own nature so far as to confire in a notorious Lie to damn themselves and their posterity, and without such a force of fears or hopes falling upon them all at once as may be stronger than nature to them, hath been shewed before both by reason and experience, and our Lord Christ hath told us it would be, that while men sleep the Enemy would come and sow Tares, *Math. xiii. 25.* and the Apostle tells us, *1 Cor. xi. 19.* that there must be Heresies by Gods permission, that they which are approved may be made manifest: *Jude 4.* there were certain men crept in unawares ordained of old to this condemnation: *2 Pet. 2. 1.* *1 John 4. 1.* And accordingly it fell out in the Christian Church, as Eusebius notes out of Eusebius lib. 3. hist. cap. 29. The Church of Christ remained a pure and uncorrupt Virgin unto the times of the Apostles, but after their decease, and those that heard them, there was a conspiracy of corrupters, which did lurk before that boldly vented knowledge, falsely so called, much of which was published under the name of Apostolical Tradition. Irenaeus lib. 2. advers. haeret. cap. 39. saith, In his days it was reported as from John, that Christ lived to the fiftieth year of his Age by all the Elders of Asia, which met with John the Disciple of the Lord, that John delivered it to them. Nor is this to imagine men to break with their nature, but to follow their nature, which is in all corrupt, in the best imperfect. As for what H. T. tells us of a whole World of wise and disinterested men, it is an Utopia in a countrey called no where, but in H. T. his brain. Surely the wisest and disinterested men of Fathers and other Preachers have still stood to the Scriptures, and have disowned unwritten Traditions, as not being a true Rule of Faith. Popes and Popish Councils who have been the sticklers for Traditions unwritten, as they have been none of the wisest with any holy wisdom, but serpentine craft, so have they bent all their endeavours to uphold Traditions for their interest of greatness and gain, being necessitated to fly to unwritten Traditions, because their Doctrines cannot be maintained out

of Scripture. He that shall reade the History of the Council of Trent written by Frier Paul of Venice (in which Council Traditions unwritten were first equalled to Scripture) may perceive, that if ever there were a pack of deceivers and deceived men it was at Trent, the Bishops generally being unlearned in the Scriptures, many of them meer Canonists, and such as understood not the Disputes in the Congregations, and the Divines a company of wrangling Sophisters inured onely to School-principles and arguings without skill in the Scriptures, and the Popes Legates and Italian Bishops depending on the Court of Rome, never applying themselves to search out truth, but to hinder any the least breaking forth of it, if it opposed any profit or advantage of the Popes and Court of Rome, and any thing that tended to justify the Protestants, whom they would never permit to speak for themselves: nor were they willing any thing should be concluded, but what the Pope (of all that ever were in the World the most notorious corrupter and Tyrant in the Church of God) liked. And he that shall reade the Book not long since published, intituled the *Mystery of Jesuitism*, will finde, that the chiefest Leaders now in the Popish Churches, the Jesuits, who are for the Traditions of the Church of Rome, are wholly bent, though against Scripture and Fathers, to carry on their own interest by any devices whatsoever without regard either to Rules of Scripture or of Morality delivered by infidel Philosophers. So that the talk of H. T. concerning a World of wise and disinterested men among Popish Teachers is like the talk of a company of honest Women in a society of notorious Whores, or of just men in a Band of Robbers,

H. T. adds. - *It is the assurance of this impossibility that moves the Church of the present Age to resolve her Faith and Doctrines into the precedent Age, and so from Age to Age, from sons to fathers up to the mouth of Christ and his Apostles teaching it, saying, We believe it because we have received it.*

*Answ.* 1. This resolution of Faith not into the Scriptures testimony, but the testimony of the next age, and so upwards, and thereby judging what Christ and his Apostles taught, can beget no other than a humane Faith, sith in this way Christ and his Apostles are supposed to teach what the succeeding ages have taught: nor is it any better than an uncertain way, sith in some ages it cannot be known what was taught in many points of controversie, for as much as this Author confesseth, pag. 25. *There was no general or provincial Council that decided any Controversies of moment in the tenth Age, which and the next before it are by Genebrard and Bellarmine counted unhappy for want of learned men:* nor can this be any other than a fraudulent device to draw men from immediate searching into the Scriptures for their Faith, and prepossessing them with the Doctrines of the present age, which once received, very few, except men very learned and impartial inquisitors into the truth, will be able to examine, and in effect that which the Pope and his Council have or shall determine must be taken for unquestionable: nor is this reasonable, but against all right way of understanding, that we should apply our selves to know what Christ and his Apostles taught exteen hundred years ago, rather by the present and precedent ages after the times wherein they lived, than by their own Writings; as if a man might better know what Legacy his great grand-father gave an hundred years ago by the testimony of men now living, than by his own Will upon record. 2. The pretence for this resolution is but imaginary and

and fictitious, and refuted by experience. Surely if there were such an impossibility as this Authour speaks of, the whole World had not been corrupted as it was in *Noah's* and *Abraham's* days, nor the Church of *Israel* as it was in the days of the *Judges*, of *Elias*, *Manasseb*, our Lord *Christ* at his coming in the flesh, in the time of *Arianafius*, when as *Hieron* said, *The whole world groaned that it was become Arian*, there would not be such a falling away, as the Apostle foretold, 1 Tim. 4.1. 2 Thess. 2.4. at which time the *Rhemists* grant in their note on that place, that even the service of *Christ* shall be suppressed. And therefore the impossibility here supposed by H. T. is but imaginary out of inadvertency of what the Scripture hath related and foretold, and ignorance of the great corruption of man and the power of the old *Serpent called the Devil and Satan*, which deceiveth the whole *World*, Revel. 12.9.

3. But what Church is there that so resolves her Faith? none that I know of besides the *Roman*, or rather the *Court of Rome*. For I do not yet think that either the *Greek*, *Asiatick*, or *African* Churches do so resolve their Faith, no nor yet some of those Churches who do hold communion with the *Roman See*; nay, I hardly think the *Church* or *Court of Rome* it self doth resolve it's Faith (such as it is) as H. T. here speaks: I instance in one main point, *that the Pope is above a Council*. For sure if that be their resolution they will be cast, with the precedent age, I mean the fifteenth century did deliver by hand to hand from father to son that a general *Council* is above the *Pope*, as the two so termed general *Councils of Basile* and *Constance* did expressly determine. And in other points in difference between *Protestants* and *Papists*, if they go from age to age upwards, *Papists* would finde themselves destitute of Tradition unwritten as well as written, in the half communion, Papal indulgences, worship of Images, and many more besides. So that however this Authour pretend Tradition of a world of fathers to a world of sons, when he and his party are put to it they have not any ancient universal Tradition elder than the *sixteenth century* for the chief point of the *Papacy* the *Popes Supremacy and Infallibility*, and therein the *Pope* and his packed *Council of Trent* are the great *World*, he means at which were at some determinations of great moment about fifty *Bishops* such as they were, and some of them but *titular*, and in other points there hath been no Tradition; but what hath been gainsaid; and therefore in fine, the *Papists* faith is resolved into the *Popes* and *Council of Trent's* determination, which is the *Catholick Church* with *Papists*, as is manifest by the words of this Authour here, p.70. where he makes the *Church* which he counts infallible, *A Council called out of the whole World, and approved by the Pope*, which he judgeth the *Trent Council* to be, pag. 76. and if the *Catholick Church* do resolve its faith into the *catholick churches tradition*, what is this but to resolve its faith into its own tradition? at least the *catholick church* represented in an *ecumenical council* approved by the *Pope* must resolve its faith into it self, *Pius* the fourth and the *Trent* *Bishops* must resolve their faith into their own tradition, and so must believe what they believe in points of *Christian Faith*, because they hold so, and judge themselves infallible; and if so, it would be known whether they did believe the same things before they did determine them in a council; if not, they defined what they did not believe; if they did, then it would be known upon what tradition they did believe them, if they name the tradition of the foregoing age, the same questions will be put,

and the answer must be either at last to resolve it into Scripture, or some fallible men, or the process will be endless, or it must rest in the determination of the present church catholick, properly so called, or general council, or Pope, or else the questions wil return, and the arguing will be circular. Yet there are these Reasons why Papists make shew of this way of resolving their faith into the churches tradition unwritten, 1. Because they would not have their Doctrines and Faith tried by the holy Sripes alone, nor in the first place, nor by the Doctours of the first five hundred years. 2. Because they know that few either of the learned or unlearned can track them in this way, it being impossible for any but men of very great reading and very accurate criticks to discern truth in this way by reason of the multitude of Nations in which the Church hath been, whereof some are unknown to some other Churches, the impossibility to know what each church throughout the World held in every age, the difficulty of travel, the variety of Languages, the multitude and uncertainty of Authours, especially since they have been gelded and altered by the *Indices expurgatorii*, and practises of Monks and other Scribes, the foisting in bastard treatises under the names of approved Authours. For which reason it is that they decline as much as they can trial of their Doctrine by Scripture, pretending difficulties where there are either none, or such as might be removed, though by their course they cast men into insuperable difficulties, and when they are necessitated to let people have the Scripture in the vulgar Language by reason of importunity of adversaries, yet they so pervert it by corrupt Translations and notes (as in the *Rhemist's Testament* is manifest) that people have much ado without much diligence to finde out their deceits.

## S E C T. V.

*The Romanists can never gain their cause by referring the whole trial of Faith to the arbitrement of Scripture, but will be proved by it to have revolted from Christianity.*

Yet H. T. hath the face to say, *But if we refer the whole trial of faith to the arbitrement of Scripture, I see nothing more evident, than that this one Argument ad hominem, gives the cause into our hands, since it clearly proves either many controverted Catholick Doctrines are sufficiently contained in Scripture, or many Protestant ones are not; and thus I frame my discourse.* All Protestant Tenets (say you) are sufficiently contained in Scripture; but many Catholick Doctrines (say I) denied by Protestants are as evident in Scripture, as divers Protestant Tenets; therefore many Catholick Doctrines denied by Protestants are sufficiently contained in Scripture. He that has hardiness enough to deny this Conclusion let him compare the Texts that recommend the Churches authority in deciding controversies, and expounding Articles of Faith with those that support the Protestant private spirit, or particular judgement of discretion; let him compare the places that favour priestly Absolution with those on which they ground their necessity (not to stand upon the lawfulness) of Infant-baptism, let him compare the passages of the Bible for

for the real presence of our Saviours body in the Eucharist, for the primacy of St. Peter, for the authority of Apostolical Traditions, though unwritten, with what ever he can cite, to prove the three distinct persons in the blessed Trinity, the consubstantiality of the Son with the Father, the procession of the holy Ghost from both, the obligation of the Sunday in stead of the Sabbath, so expressly commanded in the Moral Law; and when he has turned over all his Bible as often as he pleases, I shall offer him onely this request, either to admit the Argument or teach me to answer it.

*Answ.* H. T. sure hath a singular ey-sight, which sees such an evidence in this Argument, as that he sees nothing more evident. What? is not this more evident, that the whole is bigger than a part, that God made the World, that the Word was made Flesh? Sure an Argument *ad hominem* is no demonstration, specially when what the man holds at one time upon second and better thoughts he relinquisheth: nor is an argument *ad hominem* fit to establish any truth, but somewhat to lessen the opinion of the man who is thereby convinced of holding inconsistencies; and therefore the cause is not given into H. T. and his fellows hands, that unwritten traditions are a Rule of Faith, or that Popish Doctrine is grounded on Scripture, because some Protestant tenets have no better proof thence than some Popish tenets denied to be contained in the Scripture.

But that I may gratifie H. T. (as much as in me lieth) in his request, I tell him, The Syllogism is in no Mood or Figure that I know, nor (if I would examine the form of it) do I doubt, but that I should finde four terms in it at least, and then H. T. it is likely knows his Syllogism is caught. Nor do I know how to form it better, unless it be formed dis-junctively: but it belongs not to me to form his Weapons for him. To it as I finde it I say, that if he mean, that all Protestant tenets simply are sufficiently contained in Scripture, who ever he be that saith so, yet I dare not say so: But this I think, that all, or most of the tenets which the Protestants hold against the Papists in the points of Faith and Worship, which are controverted between them, are sufficiently contained in the Scripture, and all of them ought to be, or else they may be rejected. And for his Minor I deny it, if he mean it of those Protestant tenets in points of Faith, which are held by all, or those that are avouched by common consent in the harmony of their confessions, excepting some about Discipline, Ceremonies, and Sacraments. And for his instances, to the first I say, I am willing any Reader, who reades what is written on both sides in the fifth Article here, should judge whether hath more evidence in Scripture, the Churches imagined infallible authority in deciding controversies, or that each person is to use his own understanding to try what is propounded to be believed without relying on any authority of Pope, general Council, or Prelates, who are never called the Church in Scripture. And for the second, I do not take it to be a Protestant tenet, that Infant-baptism is necessary; and for the lawfulness, I grant, there is as much evidence in Scripture for Priests judiciary sacramental authoritative Absolution as for it, that is none at all for either. And for the third, there are Protestants, that grant a real presence of our Saviour's body in the Eucharist, as the *Lutherans*, and some *Calvinists* grant also a real presence to the worthy receiver, but not bodily,

but

but for the real presence by Transubstantiation there is not the least in Scripture of it self, as *Scotus* long ago resolved. And for the Primacy of St. Peter, it hath been told this Author, that a Primacy of order, of zeal, and some other endowments, is yielded by Protestants, but Supremacy of Jurisdiction over the Apostles is denied, and it is proved before, Article 7. to have no evidence in Scripture. And for the authority of Apostolical traditions, though unwritten, (if there were any such truly so called) I should not deny it, but that there are any such which are a rule of faith now to us, he hath not proved in this Article, nor brought one Text for it, but some far-fetched Reasons of no validity. But I presume his brethren will give him little thanks for gratifying so much the *Antitrinitarians, Arians, Socinians*, as to yield, that those points which are in the *Nicene and Athanasius* his Creed, and were determined in the first general Councils are no better proved from Scripture than Transubstantiation, the Popes Supremacy and unwritten Traditions being a Rule of Faith. Are not these Texts *Matth. 28.19. 1 John 5.7. John 1.1. 1 John 5.20.* and many more which *Bellarmino lib. 1. de Christo* brings to prove the Trinity of persons, the Sons confubstantiality, the Spirits procession more evident than, *this is my Body, for Transubstantiation, Thou art Peter, for the Popes Supremacy* & *H. T. his Scriptureless reasoning for unwritten Traditions?* *Bellarmino lib. 4. de verbo Dei, cap. 11.* and elsewhere acknowledgeth the tenets about Gods nature, and the union of natures in Christ to be plainly in Scripture.

As for Sunday being instead of the Sabbath, he should me thinks allow somewhat in Scripture for it, *Col. 2.16. Acts 20.7. 1 Cor. 16.1,2. Revel. 1.10.* more evident than for his real presence, Peter's Supremacy, unwritten Traditions. But I see prejudice doth much to sway men, and make them see what others cannot. The Crow thinks her own Bird fairest.

Yet again, saith H. T. The same Syllogism may with equal evidence be applied to the negative, as well as positive Doctrines on either side. All Catholick points denied by Protestants are sufficiently (say you) condemned in Scripture. But many points imbraced by Protestants are as clearly (say I) condemned in Scripture, as divers they deny in opposition to Catholicks; therefore many points embraced by Protestants are sufficiently condemned in Scripture. Where does the Bible so plainly forbid Prayer for the Dead, as this darling Errour and fundamental Principle of Protestantcy, that any one however ignorant, however unstable, ought to reade the holy Scriptures, and unappealably judge of their sense by his private interpretation? Where is it so plainly forbidden to adore Christ in what place soever we believe him to be really present, as it is to work upon the Saturday? Thus if the Bible be constituted sole Rule of Religion, Protestants clearly can neither condemn the Catholick, nor justify their own.

*Answ.* The Conclusion may be granted, that many points embraced by Protestants are sufficiently condemned in Scripture without any detriment to the Protestant cause: Protestants do not pretend to Infallibility, but that the tenets in point of Faith, which in opposition to Papists their Harmony of Confessions avoucheth are sufficiently condemned in Scripture, is more than H. T. or any other can prove. To his Syllogism I answer, by denying his Minor. And to his instances I answer, the Prayer for the Dead, which Protestants say is forbidden plainly in Scripture, is Popish Prayer for the Dead to have them eased or delivered out of Purgatory: now this we say is condemned plainly in Scripture.

pture. 1. Because it supposeth a belief of a Purgatory-place in Hell, which is an Errour, and every Errour is condemned in Scripture, as contrary to truth. 2. All Prayer is condemned, which is not agreeable to the Rules of Prayer; now the Rules of Prayer in Scripture are, that we should pray in Faith, James 1.6. Ask the things which are according to the will of God, & John 5.14. Not for him that sins unto death, ver.16. But to ask for deliverance out of Purgatory, when there is no such place, nor God hath promised any such thing, is not in Faith, nor according to Gods will, but is as vain as to ask for him that sins unto death, it is all one as to pray that the elect Angels or Devils should be delivered thence, which were a Mockery of God. 3. God forbids Jeremiah to pray for that which he would not hear him, in Jer.14.11. therefore Prayer for the Dead to be delivered out of Purgatory, in which God will not hear, is by parity of reason condemned, as if a man should pray that the Reprobate should not be damned, or the Elect should not be saved.

The Protestants say not, that every one, however ignorant or unstable, ought unappealably to judge of the sense of all Scriptures by his private interpretation. There are plain Scriptures and Points fundamental, and of these they say they may and ought to judge of their sense each one by his own private interpretation, if by it be meant his own understanding, but not if by it be meant a peculiar fancy such as no man else conceives, nor the words import: but they say in difficult places and points not fundamental they ought not to judge of their sense unappealably, that is, so as not to use the help of the learned, in which number Fathers and Councils have their place, and especially their own Teachers, to finde out the meaning of them: yet when they have used means, they may, and must suspend any judgement at all, or stick to that which in their own understanding seems most probable, or else they must go against their own conscience, which were sin, or they must be Hypocrites, saying, they judge that to be so, which they do not, yea, there should be an impossibility in nature granted, that a man at the same time doth judge that to be the sense of the same thing which he doth not: but they deny, that a man ought so to rest on any Pope, or Councils, or Doctours judgement, as to hold what they hold without any other proof, though it be in their apprehension against Scripture, sith that is plainly condemned, Matib.23.10. And they hold that every man, that hath the use of natural understanding ought to reade the Scripture, John 5.39. Col. 3.16. Rom.15.4. 2 Tim.3.15,16. and to judge their sense in this manner, and this is no Errour, much les a darling Errour of Protestantcy. Nor can H. T. prove it any where condemned in Scripture. As for the place 2 Pet.3. 16. to which his words seem to allude, it proves not the reading of the Scripture or judging of the sense to be condemned, yea ver.3.15. proves the contrary, that Christians shoule reade Paul's Epistles, in which these things are which are hard to be understood. onely it condemns the wresting of them to their perdition by the unlearned and unstable, which Protestants do condemn as well as Papists.

It is not forbidden to adore Christ in what place soever he is, but 1. It is an Errour contrary to an Article of Faith to conceive Christ in a Wafer-cake on earth, called the Holt by Papists, whom we believe to be in Heaven at the right hand of God, and of whom it is said, that the Heaven must contain him

till the times of the restitution of all things. *Acts 3.21.* and so it is forbidden to adore that Bread, as if Christ's Body were there, it being a belief of an Error contrary to an Article of Faith. 2. It is flat Idolatry to adore with divine Worship a piece of Bread, thought taken to be the Body of Christ, it being forbidden, *Math.4.10.* Thou shalt worship the Lord thy God and him only shalt thou serve. Nor can the imagination of a person acquit the person that does it from Idolatry. For if it could, the Worship of the golden calf, which the Israelites proclaimed to be the Gods that brought them out of Egypt, *Exod.3.28.* and worshipped God thereby, vers. 4.5.8. Micah's Worship of his molten Image of the Silver, which he dedicated to the Lord, *Judges 17.2,3,4.* and Jeroboam's Worship of the golden Calf, *1 Kings 12.28.* yea, all the Idolatry of the Heathens who worshipped those things which were no Gods should be excused, because they thought them Gods, or intended to worship God by them. As for working upon the Saturday, it is true, it was forbidden to the Jews; but we conceive it not forbidden to us, because the Jewish Sabbath is abrogated, *Col.2.16.* And if H.T. do not think so, he doth *Judaize*, and if he hold the Lord's day and the Saturday Sabbath too, he agrees with the *Ebionites*, mentioned by *Eusebius, lib.3. hist. cap.27.* so that it is utterly false, that if the Bible be constituted sole Rule of Religion, Protestants clearly can neither condemn the Catholick, nor justify their own. But it is rather true, which Dr. Carleton in his little Book of the Church avouched, that the now Roman Church is proved not to be the true Church of Christ, because in the Trent Council the Romanists have altered the Rule of Faith. And for my part, to my best understanding I do judge, that the Romanists are not to be reckoned amongst Christians, though they call themselves so, but that as by their worshipping of Images, burning Incense to them, praying to a Crucifix, adoring the Host, and almost all their Worship, and in their invoking of Saints and Angels as Mediators to God they are departed from the two great points of Christianity, *1 Tim.2.5. 1 Cor.8.6. Ephes.4.5,6.* and thereby are become Pagans; so by their substituting of another Rule of Religion than the Doctrine of Christ and his Apostles in their Writings, to wit, unwritten Traditions, which are nothing else but the Determinations of Popes and Councils approved by him, they do prove themselves not to be Disciples of Christ, which is all one with Christians, *Acts 11.26.* and accordingly are not to be judged a church of Christ, but Papists (which name *Bellarmino, lib. de notis Eccles. cap.4.* doth not disown) or the Popes Church truly Antichristian.

## S E C T. VI.

Sayings of Fathers and Councils prove not unwritten Traditions a Rule of Faith.

**H.** T. recites the sayings of eight Fathers and two Councils for Tradition. The first of *Irenaeus lib.3. cap.4.* doth not at all prove that we have now unwritten Traditions for a Rule of Faith, but that if the Apostles (in stead of which fraudulently, as I fear H.T. puts, If the Fathers) had left