

will 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, though taken to be the Body of Christ, it being forbidden, *Matth. 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. 2. 8.* 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 Catholic, 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 Mediatours 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 Bellarmine, *lib. de notis Eccles. cap. 4.* doth not disown) or the Popes Church truly Antichristian.

SECT. 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

us no Scripture at all, ought we not to follow the order of Tradition which they delivered, to whom they committed the Churches. To understand which it is to be noted, that Irenæus having proved Valentinus his Doctrines of *Aeones* or more Gods and Lords than one to be false out of the Scriptures, chap. 2. he speaks thus of the *Valentinian* Hereticks, When they are reprov'd out of Scriptures they are turned into accusation of the Scriptures themselves, as if they were not right, nor from authority; and because they are diversly said, and because the truth cannot be found out of these by those who know not Tradition. For that truth was not delivered by Letters, but by living voice, (which is the very Plea for Traditions, which H. T. here useth) for which cause Paul said, We speak wisdom among them that are perfect, as they took themselves to be, and said, They were wiser than either Presbyters or Apostles, and would neither consent to Scriptures nor Tradition; and then cap. 3. shews the Tradition of the Apostles by what was preached in the Churches founded by them; and to avoid prolixity refers to *Linus*, *Anacletus*, *Clement* at Rome, and to *Polycarpus* and his Successours at *Smyna*, and after useth the words mentioned chap. 4. which do not at all mention Tradition in all after ages as a Rule, but the Tradition from the Apostles to them that knew the Apostles, and that onely in the main point of Faith concerning God the Creatour, and onely upon supposition there had been no Scripture, and that after he had alleged the Scripture to stop the course of Hereticks that declined the Scripture. Whence it is apparent,

1. That Irenæus counted Scripture the constant Rule of Faith.
2. That he counted Tradition unwritten a Rule onely upon supposition, that the Apostles had not left us Scripture.
3. No Tradition to be that Rule, but what was from men acquainted with Apostles.
4. To be used onely in case men were so perverse as to decline Scripture: which is our case in dealing with Papists, which moved Bishop *Fewel* in his Sermon at Paul's Cross to offer, that if the Papists could prove the Articles then enumerated by antiquity of the first five hundred years after Christ he would subscribe: which neither *Harding*, nor *Bellarmino*, nor *Perron*, nor any of the Romanists could or can do.

The words of *Tertullian* lib. de prescript. advers. Hæret. cap. 21. 37. are indeed, that the Doctrine is to be held which the Church had from the Apostles, the Apostles from Christ, Christ from God. But he expresseth how he means it, when he saith in the same place, But what the Apostles have preached, that is, what Christ hath revealed to them, I will also prescribe that it ought to be no otherwise proved but by the same Churches, which the Apostles themselves built, they themselves by preaching to them, as well by living voice (as they say) as by Epistles afterwards. Which plainly shews that *Tertullian* mentioned no other Doctrine to be received from the Churches than what the Apostles after wrote, nor from any other Churches than those which the Apostles by preaching built, by which he means the *Corinthian*, *Philippick*, *Thessalonian*, *Ephesian*, as well as *Roman*, chap. 36. And though he use against *Valentinus*, *Marcion*, and other Hereticks, the Tradition of those Churches, yet chap. 8. he plainly directs to the Scriptures, as the way to finde Christ by using his words to the Jews, *John* 5. 39. Search the Scriptures in which ye hope for salvation: for they do speak of me. This will be, seek and ye shall finde. Which being considered, it will appear, that *Tertullian* was far from asserting unwritten Traditions of things not contained in Scripture delivered in these later ages, and called

led Apostolical by Popes and Councils, the Rule of Faith. *Cyprian's* words *lib. 2. Epist. cap. 3. ad Cæcilium* in some Editions, *Epist. 63.* shew his mistake about Traditions, as he counted the mingling of Water and Wine in the Eucharist to be the Lord's tradition, so he did also Rebaptization, in which the Romanists desert him: neither shew he held unwritten tradition a Rule of Faith; yea, arguing against them that used Water without Wine, he proves the Lord's tradition out of Scripture, and argueth it against them, and though his Reasons be frivolous, yet these expressions shew he adhered to the Scripture as his Rule. But if it be commanded by Christ, and the same be confirmed and delivered by his Apostle, that as oft as we drink in commemoration of the Lord we do the same thing, which the Lord also did, we are found that it is not observed of us which is commanded, unless we also do the same things which the Lord did, and mingling the Cup in like manner recede not from the divine magistracy. Again, I marvel enough whence this hath been used, that against the Evangelical and Apostolical Discipline in some places Water is offered in the Lord's Cup, which alone cannot express Christ's Blood. Whence may be perceived, that even in *Cyprian's* days corrupt usages came in by following other Traditions than those that are written. In the same Epistle *Cyprian* adds this remarkable speech, *Wherefore if Christ alone be to be heard, we ought not to attend what any one before us hath thought is to be done, but what Christ who is before all; neither ought we to follow the custome of a man but the truth of God, sub God speaks by the Prophet Esay, and saith, Without reason do they worship me, teaching Mandates and Doctrines of men.*

Origen's words do not prove unwritten Traditions a Rule of Faith, when he saith, *In our understanding Scripture we must not depart from the first Ecclesiastical tradition, Tract. 27. in cap. 23. St. Matthei;* nor *Athanasius* when he saith, *This Doctrine we have demonstrated to have been delivered from hand to hand by fathers to sons, lib. 1. de Decret. Concil. Niceni;* sith that delivery was according to him by Scripture. *Chrysostom* on *2 Thess. 2. 15.* saith, *The Apostles did not deliver all things by writing, but many things without, and these are worthy of credit as the others, but doth not say, there remain still in the Church Traditions unwritten in matters of Faith that are different from the written, and that they are to be the Rule of Faith; yea, Homily in 2 Tim. 3. 15. 16. he determines all is to be learned from Scripture; and the same answer may serve for the words of Epiphanius, Hæres. 61. The words of Augustine lib. 5. de Bapt. cap. 23. are about a point in controversie between Cyprian and Pope Stephanus, in which both sides pretended Tradition, Cyprian for Rebaptization, and here Augustine pretends Tradition for the contrary; by which and by Augustine's words lib. 1. de pecc. merit. & remiss. cap. 24. in which he makes the giving of the Sacrament of the Eucharist to Infants an ancient and Apostolical tradition, which Pope Innocentius Epist. 93. among Augustine's Epistles determined to be necessary, yet is now condemned in the Trent Council, it is apparent how unsafe it is to rely on a Popes determination, or Austin's opinion of Apostolical tradition, and that gross Errours have been received under the name of Apostolical traditions. As for the second Council of Nice, *Act 7. Anno Dom. 781.* it was a late and an impious Council condemned by the Synod of Francford and at Paris for their impious Doctrine of worshipping Images, and therefore we count its speech not worthy*

to be answered but with detestation. Nor is there any reason to be moved with the words of the Council at *Sens* in France, which was later and but Provincial.

SECT. VII.

Objections from Scripture for its sufficiency without unwritten Traditions are vindicated from H. T. his Answers.

H. T. proceeds thus. *Objections solved.* Object. You have made frustrate the Commandments of God for your Tradition. St. Matth. cap. 15. v. 4. Beware lest any man deceive you by vain fallacy according to the Traditions of men, Col. 2. Answ. These Texts are both against the vain Traditions of private men, not against Apostolical tradition.

I Reply, they are against the Popish unwritten Traditions, which are falsely called Apostolical, which are indeed the meer Inventions of men, either devised by superstitious Prelates, Priests, Monks or people, or upon uncertain report received by credulous people, as from the Apostles, as the Traditions about Easter, Lent Fast, Christ's age, and many more shew. And in such kinde of mens Inventions doth almost all the Popish Worship and Service consist, which causeth breaking the command of God to observe mens Traditions, as is manifest in Monkish Vows, whereby honouring of Parents is made void, and the keeping of the Cup from the people, whereby the expresse command of Christ is evacuated.

Object. There is no better way to decide controversies than by Scripture. Answ. Than by Scriptures expounded by the Church, and according to the Rule of Apostolical tradition, I grant: than by Scripture according to the dead Letter, or expounded by the private spirit. I deny. For so (as Tertullian says) there is no good got by disputing out of the Texts of Scripture, but either to make a man sick or mad. *De prescript. cap. 19.*

I reply, it is well this man will grant, There is no better way to decide controversies than by the Scriptures expounded by the Church, and according to the Rule of Apostolical tradition: then Knor's Reasons for a living Judge against Dr. Potter come to nothing: we desire no other than to have our controversies decided this way, rejecting any one infallible Judge that shall take on him, as the Pope doth, to prescribe to the Church of God how they shall understand the Scripture. The Church of God, that is, the company of believers, who are the Church of God by Papists own definition, having the help of their godly and learned Guides may expound the Scriptures any where in the World, at Geneva, London, Dort, and other places as well, and better than the Pope and his Cardinals at Rome, or a Council of Canonists, titular Bishops, sworn vassals of the Pope, that never knew what it was to preach the Gospel, sophistical School-men at Trent. And for the Rule of Apostolical tradition, we like it well to expound Scripture by it, meaning that which is in the Books of Scripture, as Austin taught, *lib. 1. de doctr. Christ. cap. 2. 35. 37. 40. lib. 2. cap. 8. 9. 11.*

lib. 3. cap. 2. 3. 5. 10. 17. 18. 27. 28. lib. 4. cap. 3. as the words are cited and vindicated from *Hart's* Replies by Dr. *John Rainolt*, *Confer. with Hart. chap. 2. divis. 2.* Nor do I know any other Apostolical tradition, which is a Rule to expound Scriptures by for deciding controversies but their Epistles, and other Writings. If *H. T.* can shew me any such to expound them by, let him produce them, and I will embrace them. Sure I am Popes Expositions and Popish Councils, Canons, are so far from being Apostolical traditions, that they are rather the most ridiculous, profane, and blasphemous pervertings of Scripture that ever any sober man used, as may appear by their Canon Law. Yea, the very Council of *Trent* hath absurdly abused Scripture, as might be made manifest by going over their Canons, and the like may be said of the *Roman* Catechism.

What *H. T.* means by the *dead Letter* I understand not, unless he mean the literal sense, which sure *Bellarmino* and others allow for one sense, and that most genuine, and if it be not, why did the *Trent* Council decree the vulgar Translation not to be refused? Why did *Cajetan*, *Arias Montanus*, the *Rhemists*, and many more translate and expound according to the Letter? Is the Scripture any more a *dead Letter* than the Popes Breves or *Trent* Canons? Are they any more a living Judge than the Scripture? Pope *Pius* the fourth ties Papists to expound the Scriptures according to the unanimous consent of the Fathers, which is, except in very few things, a meer nullity, and, if it were a reality, impossible to be done, yet however could it be done the exposition must be by a *dead Letter* in *H. T.* his sense as much as the Scripture. But how intolerable is it that such a Wretch as *H. T.* should thus blasphemously call that a *dead Letter*, which *Stephen* calls *Living Oracles*, *Acts 7. 38.* Paul the word of life, *Phil. 2. 16.* It is true for Popes, of whom some, if *Alphonſus a Castro lib. 1. advers. Heret. cap. 1.* say true, were so unlearned as not to understand Grammar, it is desirable that the Scripture should not be expounded according to the Letter, sith they are unable to do it, that they may vent their illiterate fopperies under pretence of Apostolical tradition, of which sort many of their Decrees are in their Canon Law.

But me thinks all the learned *Romanists*, even the *Jesuits* themselves, specially those that have written large Commentaries according to the literal sense, as *Salmeron*, *Maldonat*, *Lorinus*, *Cornelius a Lapide*, *Tirinus*, and many more should reject this foolery of *H. T.* concerning the expounding of Scripture, not according to the literal sense, which he calls the *dead Letter*, or else at once blot out all they have written for finding it as a meer encumbrance to the World. And the same may be said of not expounding by the private spirit. For why do these private men take so much pains to publish Commentaries? Is not their spirit as much private, as *Calvin's*, *Beza's*, *Luther's*, and others, and these mens spirit as publick as theirs? Let any man assign Reasons if he can why all the Commentaries of the *Romanists* should not be cashier'd under this pretence as well as the Protestants, who are as learned, industrious as they, and far more sincere and impartial. Why should not the Popes expositions be rejected as well as others? Have they any more than a private spirit? Do not their very Breves, and Monitories, and Decrees, shew that it is a private spirit they act and decide by? Sure the Spirit of God would not dictate such vain things as they utter, and which sometimes they are fain to recall, lest their

nakedness appear. Do not the Popes by their own confessions in correcting the vulgar *Latin* Translation, and other things they set forth, declare, that they use industry and the help of learned men? If they have a publick spirit, why do not the Popes make us an Exposition of Scripture, which all must own? Is it not because they are for the most part a race of ignorant and unlearned men, specially in the Scriptures; and, should they attempt such a thing, would make themselves appear ridiculous, and shew their asinine ears, though now they seem terrible, and to carry majesty with their Lions skin? Is there any thing the Popes can do more necessary than this, that they may end all controversies, and guide all souls aright? But the truth is, the Popes have been so unhappy in alleging Scripture in their Bulls, and Breves, and Monitories, in their decisions of controversies, that no side will acquiesce in their determinations they are so vain or so partial, but as of old in the controversies between *Dominicans* and *Franciscans* about the Virgin *Maries* immaculate Conception, so of late between the *Molinists* and *Jansenists* about Gods Decrees, each party holds what they held, notwithstanding the Popes decision, which for the most part is so composed, that each party may think it makes for him, and he may loose neither. And about the Edition of the vulgar Translation in *Latin* of the Bible, how much have the two Popes *Sixtus* the fifth and *Clemens* the eighth discovered their unskilfulness, when after such profession of diligence and use of learned men as the Popes make, yet they have published their Editions contrary one to another! The words of *Tertullian* are *cap. 17.* against those Hereticks *Valentinus*, *Marcion*, and such as agreed not with *Christians* in the Rule of Faith set down *cap. 13.* whom he denies to be *Christians*, and such he thinks it would be unfit to dispute with out of Scripture, but he doth not so judge concerning such as agree in the Rule of Faith, though some term them Hereticks. I may more truly say, there is no good got by Popes interpretations of holy Scripture but to make a man sick or mad: such Expositions as *Alexander* the third made of *Psalm 91. 13* *Thou shalt tread upon the Asse and Basilisk*, when he trode on the Emperour *Frederick's* neck, or *Boniface* the eighth, when to prove himself above Emperours and Kings, he alleged *Gen. 7. 16.* *God made two great Lights*, that is, the Pope and the Sun, and the Emperour as the Moon, with many more of the like sort are no better than sick mens dreams or mad mens freaks.

It is added. Object. *All Scripture divinely inspired is profitable for teaching, for arguing, for reproof, and for instructing in righteousness, that the man of God may be perfect, instructed to every good work, 1 Tim. 3. 16, 17.* therefore Traditions are not necessary. Answ. *St. Paul speaks* onely here of the old Scripture, which *Timothy* had known from his childhood (when little of any of the new could be written) as is plain by the precedent Verse, which we acknowledge to be profitable for all those uses, but not sufficient; neither will any more follow out of that Text, if understood of the new Scriptures: so that your consequence is vain and of no force.

I reply, that which is profitable to teach, reprove, correct, instruct in righteousness, so as that the man of God may be entire, fitted, or instructed for every good work. Sure that is a sufficient Rule for Doctrine of Faith and good Works, and so to salvation. But such is the Scripture, as the Text tells us. Ergo. The Major is apparent, sith no more is required to a sufficient Rule of

Doctrine; if there be, let it be shewed, that it may be known wherein this is defective. Sure that which is profitable for all uses to which Doctrine serves is a sufficient Doctrine. The Answer of H. T. here is so far from being a full Answer to the Objection (as he vainly vaunts in the Title page of his Book) that indeed it is a confirmation of the Objection. For if the old Scriptures were so profitable as to make the man of God a Teacher of the Church, entire, that they were able to make him wise to salvation, and furnish him with instruction to every good work, much more when the Books of the New Testament were added, of which one of the Gospels is by H. T. here pag. 104. said to have been written eight years after the Death of Christ, and doubtless Timothy knew it, and however he had the former Epistle to himself before the Epistle in which this passage is, which is ill printed, 1 Tim 3. 16, 17. it being 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17. and therefore the Scripture he had was a sufficient Rule to him a Bishop without Traditions, much more to others, and so Traditions unwritten are proved unnecessary and superfluous.

Again saith H. T. Object. If any one shall add to these God shall add to him the Plagues written in this Book, Apoc. 22. 18, 19. Therefore it is not lawful to add Traditions. Answ. It follows immediately, And if any one shall diminish from the words of this Prophecy God shall take away his Part out of the Book of Life, ver. 19. By which St. John evidently restrains that Text to the Book of his own Prophecies only; which is not the whole Rule of Faith; and therefore by that you cannot exclude either the rest of the Scriptures or Apostolical Traditions from that Rule.

I reply, there is no reason why the same thing is not to be understood of the whole Canon, and each particular Book, sith there is the like Deut. 4. 2. Prov. 30. 6. Jer. 7. 31. 2 Thess. 2. 1, 2. wherein are general Warnings of not receiving additions to the Scripture, yea, though the names of Moses and Paul were pretended, especially when the Traditions do adulterate the written Word as Popish traditions about Images, Fasting, single life, of the Clergy, Monastick Vows, and others of their Traditions do.

Yet he adds. Object. We may have a certain knowledge of all things necessary to salvation by the Bible or written Word only. Answ. No, we cannot; for there have been, are and will be infinite Disputes about that to the worlds end, as well what Books are Canonical as what the true sense and meaning is of every Verse and Chapter. Nor can we ever be infallibly assured of either, but by means of Apostolical tradition; so that if this be interrupted, and failed for any one whole Age together (as Protestants defend it for many) the whole Bible, for ought we know, might in that space be changed and corrupted; nor can the contrary ever be evinced without new revelation from God: the dead Letter cannot speak for it self.

I reply, this profane Wretch it seems takes delight in this blasphemous Title which he gives to the holy Scripture often in reproach terming it the dead Letter, which he hath no Warrant to do. For though it is true that Ro. 7. 3, 6. 2 Cor. 3. 6. the Law or old Covenant be termed the Letter, and is said to be dead and killing, yet this is not meant of the holy Scripture of the Law, because it is written, but because it was abrogated in the Gospel, as killing by its Sentence Sinners that continued not in all things written in it, Gal. 3. 10. And yet it can speak for it self as well, yea, incomparably better than any Writings of Popes, Councils,

or Fathers from whence he hath his Traditions, which are as dead a Letter as the Scripture. And in this his expression there is so much the more iniquity, in that he prefers before the holy Scripture the uncertain reports of credulous superstitious men, and the Decrees of doating Popes, as more lively than the holy Scripture inspired of God. And for this man who but the next Page before confessed, that the words of the Apostle, which tell us, that *επειδὴ πολλὰ γράμματα, the holy written Letters were able to make Timothy wise to salvation, 2 Tim 3 15.* to be meant of the old Scripture, and yet here to say, that we cannot have a certain knowledge of all things necessary to salvation by the Bible or written Word only, what is it but flatly to gainsay the Apostle? which is the more impiously and impudently done, in that he ascribes that to uncertain unwritten Tradition, which neither he nor any of his Fellows are able to shew where it is, or how it may be certainly known, which he denies to holy Scripture. As for his Reason it is frivolous. For a man may have a certain knowledge of that of which there will be infinite Disputes to the Worlds end, else hath he no certain knowledge of the Popes Supremacy, Infallibility, power in Temporals, superiority to a Council, of which yet there have been and are likely to be infinite Disputes. As there have been Disputes about the Canonical Books, so there have been about unwritten Traditions, as about the time of keeping Easter, Rebaptization, &c. Nor is it true that there are infinite Disputes about the true sense and meaning of every Verse and Chapter of the Bible. Sure among Christians there is no dispute of many fundamental truths, which every Christian acknowledgeth; and yet if there were, it is no other thing than what is incident not onely to Philosophers Writings, but also to the Popes Decrees, about which there are infinite Disputes among the Canonists, to the Canons and Decrees of the Council of Trent, about which there were Disputes between Catharinus, Soto, Vega, Andradius, and others, to the Popes Breves, as to Pope Paul the fifth his Breves about the Oath of Allegiance, which were not onely disputed by King James and other Protestants, but also by Waddington and other Popish Priests, and to his Monitory and Interdict of Venice disputed by Frier Paul of Venice and others against Bellarmine, Baronius, and others. And if we can never be infallibly assured of either the Canonical Books or their sense but by Apostolical tradition unwritten, then can H. T. never be assured of the Popes Infalibility, or Supremacy but by it, and if so, then the Scripture is not his ground of it, and so he cannot demonstrate the truth of his Catholick Religion by Texts of holy Scripture, as he pretends in his Title-page, and therefore they are impertinently alleged by him, he should onely allege Tradition: which whether it be Fathers, Councils, or Popes sayings, it cannot assure better than the Scripture, they being more controverted than it, and therefore by his reasoning there can be no certainty in his Faith, and then he is mad if he suffer for it, as he is who suffers for any mans saying, who may be deceived. But we are assured both of the Books of Canonical Scripture, not onely by Apostolical tradition unwritten, but also by universal tradition, and the evidence of their authour by their matter, and of the meaning without Popish tradition, not onely by common helps of understanding and arts gotten by study, and the benefit of later and elder Expositours, but also by the Spirit of God assisting us when we seek it duly. And for the interruption of this Tradition the Protestants do not pretend it to have

been one whole age or day, though it have been sometimes more full than at other times: and we have intakible assurance that the whole Bible hath not been changed or corrupted to but that by reason of the multitude of copies, and special providence of God, the chiefest points are free from change, and what is corrupted may be amended so far as is necessary for our salvation.

And considering Gods providence for the keeping of the Law, we assure our selves the Lord will preserve the Scripture, which me thinks to H. T. should give good assurance, *ſith pag. 119 he ſaith, The Church is by Chriſt the Depoſitory of all divinely revealed verities neceſſary to be known by all, and hath the promiſe of divine aſſiſtance to all;* whereby and by other arguments it may be evinced without new revelation from God, that though H. T. his apoſtoli- cal tradition unwritten ſhould have failed for any one whole age together, yet the whole Bible ſhould not in that ſpace be changed or corrupted. And this is Reply enough to his venomous Answer to that Objection, which tends to de- preſs the Scriptures authority (which confeſſedly comes from God) to exalt the authority of the worſt of men, the Popes of Rome, as the ſtorieſ of their Lives proves ſufficiently

It is further urged. Object. *Many other ſigns alſo did Jeſus in the ſight of his Diſciples, which are not written in this Book, but theſe are written, that you may believe that Jeſus is the Son of God, and that believing you may have life in his Name, St. John 20.30,31. Therefore St. John's Goſpel contains all things neceſſary to ſalvation.* Anſw. I deny your Conſequence; for St. John omitted many things of great moment, as our Lord's Prayer and his laſt Supper, which are both neceſſary to be believed. And though he ſay, *Theſe things are written that we may believe and have life,* he ſays not, *that theſe things onely were written, or are ſufficient for that purpoſe, which is the thing in queſtion, ſo that he excludes not the reſt of the Goſpels nor Apoſtoliſal traditions.* And it is no unuſual thing in Scripture to aſcribe the whole effect to that which is but the cauſe in part; thus Chriſt promiſeth beatitude to every ſingle Chriſtian virtue. St. Matthew 5. and St. Paul, *Salvation to every one that ſhall call on the Name of our Lord, or confeſſ with his mouth the Lord Jeſus, and believe that God hath raiſed him from the dead, Rom. 10.4,9,10.* Yet more than this is requiſite to ſal- vation.

I reply. He that ſaith, *Theſe things are written that you may believe, and believing have life,* doth inculcate that theſe are ſufficient ſo far as writing or revealing is requiſite to theſe ends, or elſe he ſhould make a vain attempt. *Fruſtra fit quod non aſſequitur ſinem, That is done in vain which attains not the end,* and that is vainly done even deliberately, which is attempted to be done by that means which is foreknown to be inſufficient. And therefore H. T. muſt either yield St. John's Goſpel ſufficient to beget faith and procure life, or elſe John to have been imprudent to intend and attempt it by writing it. And therefore he doth ill to deny the Conſequence till he can avoid theſe abſurdi- ties. As for his Reason it is inſufficient. For though the Lord's Prayer and the Lord's Supper omitted by John be neceſſary to be believed, yet they are not ſo neceſſary but that we may believe, *that Jeſus is the Son of God, and have life in his Name* without them. And though he ſay not, *that theſe things onely were written,* yet he ſaith, *Theſe things onely which were written were for belief and life;* and therefore ſufficient thereto. And though he excludes

not the rest of the Gospels, nor Apostolical Traditions, yet he determines that they might believe and have life without them. As for the ascribing beatitude and salvation to each single *Christian* virtue, it is either because the beatitude is meant of a beatitude in part, or in some respect, as *Math. 5. 5.* the reason doth import, or else because all other *Christian* virtues and duties necessary to salvation are connex or comprehended in that one which is named. And thus this Objection is vindicated.

The next is. Object. *St. Luke tells us he hath written of all those things which Jesus did and taught, Act. 1. 1.* Therefore all things necessary to salvation are contained in his Gospel. Answ. He writ of all the principal passages of his Life and Death, I grant, (and that was the whole scope and intent of the Evangelists) of all absolutely which he did and taught, I deny; for in the same Chapter he tells us, that during the forty days which Christ remained with them after his Resurrection, he often appeared to them, instructing them in the things concerning the Kingdom of God, very few of which instructions are mentioned by *St. Luke*, nor does he or any other of the Evangelists say any thing in their Gospels of the coming of the Holy Ghost, or of the things by him revealed to the Church, which were great and many according to that, I have many things to say to you, but you cannot now hear them, but when the Spirit of Truth cometh he shall teach you all Truth, and the things which are to come he shall show you, *St. John 16. 12, 13, 14.* Add to this, that if all things which Jesus taught and did should be written, the whole World would not contain the Books, *St. John cap. 21. vers. last.* Therefore your Consequence is false, and that saying of *St. Luke* is to be limited.

I reply, I grant the saying of *Luke* is to be limited, and yet the consequence is not false. It is true, that *St. Luke* did not write all absolutely without limitation which Jesus did and taught, neither doth he say it, nor is the argument so framed as if he did; but thus, *Luke wrote of all the things which Jesus began to do and teach untill the day that he was taken up*, and these were all things necessary to salvation, therefore *Luke's Gospel* contains all things necessary to salvation. The Romanists say, that things of meer belief necessary to salvation are contained in the holy-days, Creeds, and Service of their Church, and *H. T.* himself in the next leaf, pag. 118. says, *The whole frame of necessary points of Christian Doctrine was in a manner made sensible and visible by external and uniform practice of the Church*. Now these are onely the principal passages of Christ's Life and Death, besides which many more practical points and all fundamental Gospel-truths are delivered therein, therefore even by their own grant all necessary points of *Christian Doctrine* are taught in the Gospel of *Luke*. It is certain their intent especially of *John* was to write of his divine nature, and such Sermons as tend to rectifie the Errors of the Pharisees and Sadduces, and predictions of his Death, Resurrection, and state of the Church after his Ascension. It is true, he did instruct them for forty days after his Resurrection in the things concerning the Kingdom of God, but whether they are mentioned by *Luke* or not it is uncertain; that they are delivered by Tradition oral, unwritten or necessary to salvation, so as that without an explicit knowledge of them it cannot be had, is not proved. The same may be said of the things mentioned *John 16. 12, 13, 14. & 21. vers. last.* and therefore the consequence is not infringed by these Exceptions. I add that

H. T. says not true, that Luke says not any thing in his Gospel of the coming of the Holy Ghost. For Luke 2:33. the Prediction of Christ, of sending the Promise of the Father, which Acts 2:33. is expressly termed the Promise of the Holy Ghost, is set down.

S E C T. VIII.

H. T. solves not the Objections from Reason for the Scriptures sufficiency without unwritten Traditions.

H. T. proceeds. *Object.* At least the whole Bible contains all things necessary to salvation, either for belief or practise for all sorts of men whatsoever, and that explicitly and plainly. Therefore the Bible is the Rule of Faith. *Answ.* I deny both Antecedent and Consequence. The three Creeds are not there, the four first Councils are not there; there is nothing expressly prohibiting Polygamy or Rebaptization, nor expressly affirming three distinct Persons in one divine nature, or the Sons consubstantiality to the Father, or the Procession of the Holy Ghost from both, or that the Holy Ghost is God, or for the necessity of Infant-baptism; or for changing the Saturday into Sunday, &c. all which notwithstanding are necessary to be known by the whole Church, and to be believed by us in particular (as Protestants will acknowledge) if they be once sufficiently proposed to us by the Church. Nor is it sufficient we believe all the Bible, unless we believe it in the true sense, and be able to confute all Heresies out of it (I speak of the whole Church) which she can never do without the Rule of Apostolical Tradition in any of the Points forementioned.

I Reply, unless the man had a minde to plead for *Arians, Photinians, Macedonians, and Socinians*, I know not why he should so often make the *Doctrines of three distinct Persons in one divine nature, the Sons consubstantiality to the Father, the Procession of the Holy Ghost from both, and his Godhead as Apostolical unwritten Tradition*. Sure this is the way to bring into question these *Doctrines*, which if they be not in Scripture, will never be believed by intelligent *Christians* for the Pope and Council of *Trent's* sayings, whose proceedings never tended to clear truth, but to juggle with the World. This is one certain evidence that they never intended to clear truth, because they condemned the *Doctrines* of Protestants unheard, nor would ever permit them to come to plead for themselves in any impartial assembly, till which be done no man can construe the proceedings of a Council to be any other than practises to suppress truth. And for their juggling they were so notorious, that many Papists themselves have observed them, as may be seen in the History of the Council of *Trent*, especially about the divine right of Bishops, of the Laity having the Cup, Priests Marriages, in which Papists themselves found that they were merely mocked by the Pope and Court of *Rome*. As for this mans denying the Antecedent, it seems to me to savour of such an imputation of a defect in God as tends to Atheism: For sure he is not to be termed a provident and just God, who declaring his minde in the Scripture, and promising life to them that ob-

serve his Word, and threatening Death and Damnation to them that do not believe and obey, yet doth not set down all necessary points therein to be believed and obeyed unto life. Yea, doth not H. T. by denying it contradict himself, who saith, pag. 105. *In the Doctrines which Christ and his Apostles taught, and the Books which they wrote are contained all things that are of Faith.* And for the Consequence if it be not good, The Bible contains all things necessary to salvation, either for belief or practise for all sorts of men whatsoever, and that explicitly and plainly; therefore the Bible is the Rule of Faith, neither is his own second argument good for Tradition, pag. 105. *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 infallible means of knowing them is the infallible and true Rule of Faith;* in both the Consequence being the same.

As for his Instances, I say, If the three Creeds and four first Councils be not in the Scripture they are not necessary to be known for the whole Church, and to be believed by us in particular, though they be sufficiently proposed to us by the Church, that is, in their non-sense gibberish the Pope or a general Council approved by him require us to receive them. Neither hath the Church (as he terms it) power to propose any thing as necessary to be known for the whole Church, and to be believed by us in particular, but what is contained in the Bible; nor hath it such authority as that we are bound to believe them if it do propound them, though never so sufficiently, but are bound to reject them as contrary to the duty we owe to Christ of acknowledging him our onely Master; much more reason have we to contend against them, when they are propounded by the Popes of Rome, who teach not the Doctrine of Christ, but cruelly and proudly tyrannize over the souls and bodies of the Saints in a most Antichristian manner, and impose on them as Apostolical traditions things contrary to Christ and his Apostles in the Bible. Nor is it true, that all Protestants will acknowledge all those Points he mentioneth as necessary to be known for the whole Church, and to be believed by us in particular. I grant it not sufficient for us to believe all the Bible, unless we believe it in the true sense, but after we can believe it in the true sense, and be able to confute all Heresies out of it without the Rule of Apostolical tradition unwritten in any of those points in which the Error is, as our Lord Christ was able by it to vanquish Satan, for which reason it is termed *the Sword of the Spirit*, Ephes. 6. 17. And for Traditions, or Popes Decrees, they are but a Leaden Sword without Fire and Faggot, yea, there is so much vanity in them as makes them ridiculous, and so unfit for refutation, and were it not for the horrid butchery and cruelty which Princes drunken with the Wine of the Cup of the Fornication of the Whore of Babylon, make of their best Subjects at the institution of Popes and Popish Priests, nothing would appear more contemptible than their decisions.

Yet more. Object. Doubtless for speculative Points of Christian Doctrine Books are a safer and more infallible Way or Rule than oral Tradition. Answ. You are mistaken, Books are infinitely more liable to Casualties and Corruptions than Traditions, as well by reason of the variety of Languages, into which they are translated, as the diversity of Translations; scarce any two Editions agreeing, but all pretending one to mend the other; besides the multi-

plidity of Copies and Copists with the Equivocation and uncertainty of dead and written words if captiously wrested or literally insisted on. Who can prove any one Copy of the Bible to be infallible or uncorrupted (those that were written by the Apostles own hands we have not) or who can convince that any one Text of the Bible can have no other sense and meaning than what is convenient for his purpose, insisting only on the dead Letter? All which dangers, and difficulties are avoided by relying on Apostolical tradition, which binds men under pain of Damnation, to deliver nothing for Faith, but what they have received as such by hand to hand from Age to Age, and in the same sense in which they have received it. Think me not foolish (says St. Augustin) for using these terms; for I have so learned these things by Tradition, neither dare I deliver them to thee any other way than as I have received them; *Lib. de utilit. cred. cap. 3.*

I reply, A more impudently and palpably false Discourse than this is a man shall seldom meet with, it being contrary to all experience and use among men, and condemns all the customes of the most civil people of folly in Writing and Printing their Statutes, Records, Deeds, Wills, Histories, that they may be more certain and safely preserved, as knowing, that oral Traditions are apt to be lost, and corrupted, persons understandings, memories, reports, lives, and all their affairs being mutable and liable to innumerable casualties. Yea, hereby God himself is condemn'd of imprudence, in causing Moses and all the sacred Writers to write Books, and our Lord Christ in giving John express charge to write, *Revel. 1. 19.* commending the Scripture, *Rom. 15. 4. 2 Tim. 3. 15, 16, 17.* as inspired of God, directing to it, *John 5. 39.* praising the searching of it, *Acts 17. 11.* making it a persons excellency to be mighty in it, *Acts 18. 24.* usefull to convince in the greatest point of Faith, *vers. 28.* Was not Printing a great Benefit to the World? Was not the finding of the Book of the Law, *2 Chron. 34. 15.* the reading of it by *Ezra, Nehem. 8.* the having of ready Scribes counted a happiness to the Jews? Do not men more credit eyes than ears? Do not men complain of the Darkness of Times for want of Books? Are not the ninth and tenth ages since Christ counted unhappy for want of learned Writers? Was not this the great unhappiness that came into the West by the Inundations of barbarous Nations in that they spoiled Libraries? Is it not a thing for which *Ptolemaeus Philadelphus* was renowned, that he stored the Library at *Alexandria* in Egypt with Books? Do not we count them great Benefactors who build and preserve Libraries? Are not therefore Students encouraged, and they that search Libraries the men that discover truth to the World? Were the things done before the Flood or since better preserved by oral Tradition than by Moses Writing? Were the things done before the Wars of Troy better preserved thereby than these Wars by *Homer's* Poems? Or the British Antiquities by the Songs of Bards than by *Julius Caesar's* Commentaries, *Tacitus*, and other Historians Writings? How quickly are men apt to mistake and misreport sayings appears by the mistake of Christ's speeches, *John 2. 19. Matth. 26. 62. John 21. 23.* That which *Eusebius* saith of *Papias*, *lib. 3. Eccles. hist. cap. 35.* of his delivering divers fabulous things received by oral Tradition through his simplicity, *Irenaeus* of the Elders of Asia *lib. 2. advers. Haeret. cap. 39.* and innumerable other instances prove, there is nothing more uncertain than oral Tradition from hand to hand. A man may easily perceive this man is resolved to outface plain truth, who is

not ashamed thus to aver that it is a mistake to say that Books are a more safe and infallible way or Rule than oral Tradition, when his own printing his Books proves the contrary: For why did he write but for more sure conveying and preserving of his minde? Yea, his own Reason is truly retorted on himself. Oral Reports are infinitely more liable to casualties and corruptions than Books, as well by reason of the variety of Languages in which Reports are uttered, as the diversity of Interpreters, scarce any two Interpreters agreeing, but all pretending one to mend the others, besides the multiplicity of expressions and relatours one not agreeing with the other, as *Mark* 14. 56, 59. with the equivocations and uncertainties of Witnesses words, if captiously wrested or literally insisted on. Who can prove any one oral Tradition, which is not universal and written also to be infallible or uncorrupted (those that were delivered by the Apostles own tongues we have not) or who can convince that any one oral Tradition can have no other sense or meaning than what is convenient for his purpose insisting onely on the sound of a reporter? All which dangers and difficulties are avoided as much as is necessary by relying on the written Word of the Bible, which under pain of Damnation bindes men to deliver nothing for Faith, but what they have received as such from Christ and his Apostles in their Writings by hand from age to age, and in the same sense in which they have received it. It is true, Books are subject to casualties and corruptions, yet not to so many as oral Tradition, and the casualties are better prevented by Writing, which remains the same, than by Reports which vary. *Fama tam fidi pravique tenax quam nuntia veri*. And as the Enemies malice hath been great in seeking to deprive the World of Bibles, so the providence of God hath been wonderful in preserving them and their genuine writing and meaning even by the dispersing of Copies, that what is amiss in one may be mended in another, by ordering variety of Translations to the same end, persecutions that they should not be in all places at once, stirring up others to make Treatates, and Commentaries on them, all Christians (till the late Faction at Trent, and the late Papal tyranny denied the liberty of translating and reading of the Bible in the vulgar Tongue without leave, and began to punish in their Inquisition the having them) reverencing and reading the holy Scripture, however the Decree of Councils and Popes were neglected, yea Traditours of the Bible to be burnt were most infamous.

As for the words of *Austin lib. de util. cred. cap. 3.* they are falsely cited and meerly impertinent to H. T's. purpose. Having said, *The Old Testament is delivered*, that is, expounded four ways according to the History, Aetiology, Analogy, Allegory; he then adds, *Think me not a Fool, using Greek names. First, because I have so received, neither dare I intimate to thee otherwise than I have received*: which is nothing at all about Apostolical traditions unwritten as the Rule of Faith besides the Scripture, but of certain terms used by Expositours of Scripture. But that which a little after he adds is justly charged on the Romanists, and among them on H. T. *Nothing seems to me to be more impudently said by them (the Manichees) or that I may speak more mildly, more carelessly, and weakly, than that the divine Scriptures are corrupted, when they cannot convince it by any Copies extant in so fresh a memory.*

But H. T. in his tortish vein adds, *As to your difficulty of Speculative Points, I answer, that the whole frame of necessary Points of Christian Doctrine was in a manner made sensible and visible by the external and uniform practise of the Church. The incarnation and all the Mysteries thereof by the holy Images of Christ erected in all sacred places, the Passion by the sign of the Cross used in the Sacraments, and set up in Churches. The Death of Christ by the unbloody Sacrifice of the Mass, which is a lively Commemoration of it. The Trinity and Unity by doing all thing in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, &c. now who can doubt but that oral Tradition thus seconded by the outward and uniform practise of the whole World is a much safer, and more infallible Rule for conserving revealed verities than Books or dead Letters, which cannot explicate themselves.*

I reply, were not this man bewitched, or as the Prophet speaks, *Isai 44. 20. Fed on Ashes, having a deceived heart that turneth him aside, so as that he cannot say, Is there not a Lie in my right hand?* he would never have preferred oral Tradition seconded by erecting and use of Images made by idolatrous Sots, and termed Teachers of Lies by the Prophet *Hab, 2. 18. as a safer and more infallible Rule of Faith than the holy Scriptures* inspired by God, and his great gift to men, though impiously termed by this Wretch *dead Letters*. But it is the just judgement of God that they that make Images and adore them should be like them. *Psalm 115. 8. that is, as blockish as the Images are.* How uncertain oral Tradition is hath been shewed, and how impossible it is to be a true and right Rule since the departure of those who could preach infallibly. That there is any such uniform and outward practise of the Roman Church, which can second oral Tradition, and make any Point of Christian Doctrine, much less the whole frame of necessary Points of Christian Doctrine in a manner visible and sensible is a Lie with a witness. Christian Doctrine doth not consist in the History of the things sensible to the eye, but in the opening of the true causes, and ends, and uses of things done, which can only be apprehended by the understanding, and is brought to it by hearing and reading, whence Faith is said to come by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God, *Rom. 10. 14, 15, 17.* It is most false, that the erecting of Images of Christ and of the Cross hath been the uniform practise of the Church. It is certain by many Writers that Christians had no Images in their Churches for many hundred years, yea, it is certain that the best Emperours and Bishops of the East and West were against the having them in Churches, however Gregory the first Bishop of Rome by his superstitious opposing *Severus* his taking them down counting them *Lay-men's Books*, opened a Gap to that Deluge of Ignorance and Idolatry, which hath since spread over the Western Churches, which have gone a whoring after them. This Author calls them *holy Images*, which the Scripture counts abominable, as defiling places, and making them not sacred but polluted. He saith, *The Incarnation and all the Mysteries thereof are made sensible by the Images of Christ erected in all sacred places, the passion by the sign of the Cross used in Sacraments, and set up in Churches.* But what a notorious falsehood is this? One Mystery sure is the Holy Ghost's overshadowing the Virgin Mary, another the Union of the two Natures? Can any Image of Christ teach these? What can the sign of the Cross teach, but that there was such a kinde of punishment to put men to Death? If Images did teach these Mysteries, then Image-makers would

would be *Stewards of the Myſteries of God*, and *Successours of the Apostles*, and *Michael Angelo* and such like *Painters and Carvers* more truly *Peter's Successours and Bishops of Rome* than *Popes*, as doing more to teach the *Myſteries of God* than *Popes* do. *The unbloody Sacrifice of the Maſs* is a meer ſignet of a thing preſent, which all the ſenſe of all the men in the World contradicts, full of apish geſtures and toyish faſhions, fitter for a Stage-play than a ſpiritual Service of the *Chriſtian Church*, and being in a Tongue nor commonly underſtood, without teaching, informs not the Hearers or Seers in the *Mystery of the Death of Chriſt*, nor makes any lively Commemoration of his Paſſion, but pleaſeth ſuperſtitious and womanish or childiſh ſpirits, which are taken with ſuch ſhews; the *Sacrament* opens no *Mystery* thereof without the Word written. *Accedat Verbum ad Elementum & fit Sacramentum*, was the old reſolution, Put the Word to the Element then it is made a *Sacrament*. Nor is it true, that the practice hath been uniform therein, the variety of Miſſals, and the corruptions purged out of the *Roman Miſſal*, as is confeſſed in *Pope Pius* the fifth his Bull according to the Decree of the *Trent Council* prove the contrary. The *Trinity* is known by the institution and practice of Baptiſm, but that is learned out of the written Word, not oral Tradition. None of theſe practices do at all open the *Mystery of the Goſpel*, as experience ſhews, it being manifeſt by conference that none of the People in *Italy* and elſewhere, who go to Maſs, and look on Pictures, and have no other teaching, do underſtand any thing of the *Mystery of the Goſpel*, the end, reaſon, uſe of *Chriſt's Birth*, or *Death*, but content themſelves with a meer theatrical ſhew without any true underſtanding of the grace of God, inward feeling or effectual change in their ſouls thereupon. Perhaps it is better with *Papiſts in England*, where their Superſtitious are not altogether ſo groſs, and their underſtanding bettered by neighbourhood and converſe with *Proteſtants*. But that Images ſhould conſerve revealed verities, or oral Tradition ſeconded with Images more explicate them than Books, which this man again impiouſly terms *dead Letters*, unleſs the Images be animated, as that was that it's ſaid told *Thomas Aquinas*, Thou haſt written well of me, which was fit to be ſilenced by telling it, that it had no allowance to ſpeak in the Church, is to me unintelligible. And if theſe be ſuch a ſafe and inſallible Rule or means to teach and conſerve the whole frame of *Chriſtian Doctrine*, then ſure *Chriſt* did inconfiderately appoint *Writers and Preachers* to teach and guide the Church, till we all meet in the unity of the Faith, *Ephes. 4. 11, 12, 13.* he ſhould rather for the times after the *Apoſtles* have appointed, *Maſſing Priests and Painters* to have taught the People: nor were the *Council of Trent* and ſome of the *Popes* ſo adviſed, as they might have been, in appointing the unneceſſary buſineſſes of framing a *Catechiſm*, and amending the vulgar *Latin Edition* of the Bible, and much more fooliſh have been all the learned *Papiſts*, who have in late years and formerly made large *Commentaries* and other *Treatiſes* to conſerve revealed verities, there being a more compendious way by oral Traditions with the uſe of Images, and Maſſes, and ſome other things, if this impudent Scribler ſay true.

Yet *H. T.* continues thus. Object. If all things neceſſary to ſalvation be not contained in the whole Bible, how ſhall a man ever come to know what is neceſſary

cessary to be known, either by the whole Church in general, or himself in particular? *Ans.* For the whole Church in general, she is obliged to know all divinely revealed verities, which are necessary to the salvation of all mankind, she being made by Christ the Depositary of all, and having the Promise of divine assistance to all. And for each particular man so much onely is necessary to be believed, as is sufficiently proposed to him by the Church and her Ministers for the Word of God, or would at the least be so proposed, if he himself were not in fault: all which we may easily come to know by means of Apostolical tradition, without which we can have no infallible assurance of any Point of Christian Doctrine.

I reply, neither the Church nor her Ministers can sufficiently propose to any man for the Word of God any other than the Scripture, by which we may have infallible assurance of any Point of Christian Doctrine without oral Tradition unwritten. And to say that the whole Church in general, and not each man in particular, is obliged to know all divinely revealed verities which are necessary to the salvation of all mankind, is to speak contradictions.

Yet once more saith H. T. *Object.* You dance in a vicious Circle, proving the Scripture and the Churches infallibility by Apostolical tradition, and tradition by the Scripture, and the Churches infallibility. *Ans.* No, we go on by a right Rule towards Heaven. We prove indeed the Churches infallibility and the credibility of the Scriptures by Apostolical tradition, but that is evident of it self, and admits no other proof. When we bring Scripture for either we use it onely as a secondary testimony or argument *ad hominem*.

I reply, if this be so, then doth H. T. in his Title-page pretend demonstration of his falsely called Catholick Religion by Texts of holy Scripture in the first place onely as a secondary testimony or argument *ad hominem*, but it is oral Apostolical tradition which he principally relies on for his demonstration, as being evident of it self, and admits no other proof; which oral Apostolical Tradition being no other than what Popes and Councils approved by him have approved, it follows, that what Papists call Catholick Religion is not what the Scriptures teach, but what Popes and their Councils define, into which their Faith is ultimately resolved. No marvel then they decline Scripture, or if they use it do it onely because of Protestants importunity, not because they think it is to be rested on, and if so, sure H. T. plays the Hypocrite in pretending to demonstrate his Religion out of Texts of holy Scripture. If other Papists would stick to this which H. T. here saith, we should take it as a thing confessed, that Popery is not Scripture doctrine, but onely unwritten Tradition, and to have for its bottom foundation the Popes determination, and so to be embraced upon his credit; which sure can beget no other than a humane faith, and in fine doth make the Pope Lord of their Faith, which is all one as to make him their Christ, and that is to make him an Antichrist. Therefore I conceive other Romanists will disown this resolution of H. T. and seek other ways to get out of this Circle, and herein they go divers ways. Dr. Holden an English man and Doctor of Paris, in his Book of the *Analysis of divine Faith*, chap. 9. rejects the common way, and sticks to that of universal Tradition

tion, which by natural reason is evident and firm : But when he hath urged this as far as he can, this must be the evidence, that what all say and was so manifestly known by so many Miracles as *Christ* and his Apostles wrought must be infallibly true. But the being of *Christ* the *Messiah*, and his Doctrine from God, as the holy Scriptures declare, is avouched by all the Church and manifestly known by Miracles, therefore it must be true : which is no other than *Chillingworth's* universal Tradition, confirming the truth of the Scriptures, and deriving our Faith from thence, which if Papists do relinquish and adhere to the Popes resolutions, whether they be with Scripture or without, they do expressly declare themselves Papists or Disciples of the Pope, not *Christians*, that is, Disciples of *Christ*. I conclude therefore that *H. T.* and such as hold with him according to the Principle he here sets down are not Believers in *Christ*, whose Doctrine is delivered in the Scripture, but in men whether Popes, or Councils, or the universal Church, or any other who delivers to him that oral Tradition, which is his Rule, as being evident of it self, and admits no other proof, though I have shewed it to be uncertain, yea, not so much as probable. I go on to the next Article.

Ff 2

ART.

ARTIC. IX.

Schism and Heresie are ill charged on Protestants.

Protestants in not holding Communion with the *Roman* Church, as now it is, in their Worship, in not subjecting themselves to the Pope as their visible Head, in denying the new Articles of the *Tridentin* Council and Pope *Pius* the fourth his Bull, are neither guilty of Schism nor Heresie. But Papists by rejecting them for this cause, and seeking to impose on them this Subjection are truly Schismatics, and in holding the Articles which now they do are Hereticks.

S E C T. II.

H. T. his definitions of Heresie and Schism are not right.

H. T. intitles his ninth Article of Schism and Heresie, and begins thus. *Nothing intrenching more on the Rule of Faith or the Authority of the Church than Schism or Heresie: we shall here briefly shew what they are, and who are justly chargeable therewith. Our Tenet is, that not onely Heresie (which is a wilfull separation from the Doctrine of the Catholick Church) but also Schism (which is a separation from her government) is damnable and sacrilegious, and that most Sectaries are guilty of both.*

Ans. **I** Think Infidelity doth more intrench on the Rule of Faith than Heresie, and Heresie may be where there is no intrenching on the Authority of the Church in this Authour's own sense, as when a man living in communion with the *Roman* Church, and owning the Pope, or being the Pope himself is an *Arian*, as Pope *Liberius*, or a *Mono-*
thelie

thelie as Pope *Honorius*. And for his definition of Heresie, it is in mine apprehension too obscure and imperfect. For it neither shews what is the Catholick Church, the separation from whose Doctrine makes Heresie, nor what Doctrines of it the separation from which makes Heresie, nor what separation in heart or profession, or other act, nor when it is wilfull when not, nor how it may be known to be wilfull. Nor doth this definition agree with their own Tenets; who acquit many from Heresie, who wilfully separate from the Doctrine of the Catholick Church, as they define it; to wit, that which is defined by a general Council approved by a Pope. As for instance, The Popish French Church is acquitted from Heresie, yet they hold a Council to be above the Pope, contrary to the last *Lateran* Council approved by Pope *Leo* the tenth. Nor is this definition at all proved by this Authour, but taken as granted, though it may be justly questioned. And for the use of the terms [*Heresie*] and [*Hereticks*] in the Ancients it is certain, that many are put in the Catalogue of Hereticks by *Philastrius*, *Epiphanius*, *Augustin*, and also by other Writers elder and later, and those opinions termed Heresies, which were not so. The like faults are in the definition of Schism, in not setting down which is the Catholick Church, what is her government, what separation of heart, or outward profession, or other act it is which makes Schism. Nor is this a definition, which doth agree with their own grants; For the Councils that deposed Popes separated from the government of the Pope, and the French in their pragmatick Sanction, and the *Venetians* that refused to obey Pope *Paul* the fifth his Monitory, deny themselves to be Schismatics. Nor is it shewed how either is damnable or sacrilegious, nor how Protestants are Sectaries, or which Sectaries are guilty of both or either. So that in this Tenet there is nothing but ambiguity and imperfection: yet sith by what follows we may guess his meaning: let's view his dispute.

S E C T. II.

Protestants are not proved to be Sectaries by the first beginning of Reformation.

The Argument, saith H. T. All such as are wilfully divided both from the Doctrine and Discipline of the Catholick Church are Schismaticks and Hereticks, and consequently in a damnable state. But most Protestants and other Sectaries are wilfully divided both from the Doctrine and Discipline of the Catholick Church. Therefore they are Schismaticks and Hereticks, and consequently in a damnable state. The Major is manifest out of the very notion and definition of Schism and Heresie: The sequel of it proved thus by Scripture. Titus 3. 10. 2 Peter 2. 1. Jude 13. Rom. 16. 17. Matth. 18. 7, 17, 18. 2 Thess. 3. 14.

Answer: 1. By denying his Definition to be good, and that any of the Texts prove it. 2. By granting the Sequel of them that are truly termed Schismaticks and Hereticks, but not of such as he calls such, to wit, that do wilfully divide from the Doctrine and Discipline of the now

FOR the Church falsly by him called Catholick. There is no need of examining each Text till they are shewed to prove what is denied.

The Minor, saith he, is proved, because Luther and his fellow Protestants divided themselves from the Communion of all Churches, therefore from the Communion of the Catholick Church, and that as well in Points of Doctrine as matters of Government, as plainly appears by all we have said, and is yet confirmed, because when they began their Separation Luther in Germany, Tyndal in England, &c. the Catholick Church was in most quiet possession of her Tenets, in perfect peace and unity, her Doctrine and Government being the same they had been, not onely to the time of Gregory the Great (as Protestants confess) but to the very time of the Apostles, as is manifest both by the publick Liturgies, Councils, and Records of all Ages, in which no one Doctrine of Faith, or substantial Point of Discipline, then professed by the Roman Catholick Church, and opposed by Protestants, had ever been censured and condemned as heretical or schismatical, but all for the most part actually defined and established against ancient Hereticks, as you have seen in the Councils.

Ans. 1. The Minor speaks of most Protestants, but mentions none but Luther and his fellow Protestants, and Tyndal in England: now it is no good proof against us, that we are Schismatics, because Luther and his fellow Protestants were so, and Tyndal began Separation in England. It is told them by *Chillingworth* c. 5. p. 1. against Knot, that there may be an unjust Separation begun, and so a Schism in the Leaders, and yet no Schism in the Followers in after Ages; as in a Common-wealth it may be a Sedition and Rebellion to set up another Government and Governour in the first Ambours, and yet none in the Posterity to continue them, but rather their duty to maintain them in order to the peace and liberty which was unjustly obtained at first. 2. It is denied that Luther or Tyndal divided themselves wilfully, that is, without necessity. It is known in the History of *Steidan*, and others, that Luther at first spake honourably of the Pope, and was willing to have continued in communion with the Roman Church till *Leo* the tenth did by his Bull condemn his Doctrine, afore he had heard him, and he saw plainly (as the World found by experience) that the Popes and Court of Rome did never by good proofs out of Scripture go about to refute them, but by Excommunications, Fire, and War, (to which Emperours and Kings were stirred up by them) endeavour to root them out. And for Tyndal it is manifest by the Book of *Acts and Monuments* of the Church written by Mr. Fox in the Reign of *Henry* the eighth, that Tyndal was persecuted by the Popish Bishops, and his body burnt in *Brabant*. Now sure were the Protestants never so erroneous, yet the Law of Nature ties them to run away from such cruel Wolves, as in stead of teaching them with love, endeavour to destroy them with cruelty. 3. It is most false, that Luther and his Fellows divided themselves from the communion of all Churches: It is certain, that they actually joyned with the remainder of the *Hussites* in *Bohemia*, and the *Waldenses* about the *Alpes*, who were true Churches of Christ, however the Romanists term them: nor did they ever renounce communion with the Greek, Eastern or Southern Churches, though by reason of distance, and the Power they were under, they could not have actual communion with them. And by their desire of a free Council in Germany not called by the Pope, but the Emperour and Christian Princes, nor of Bishops sworn to the Pope, but of men that were equal

equal Judges by whom their Doctrine might be examined, and by their often Colloquies for Reconciliation they plainly shewed, that they tried all means they could with a good conscience to have prevented the breach between them and the Popish party, who were certainly the cause of the Schism, and truly the Schismatics (as may be gathered from their own stories, such as *Thuanus*, *Frier Paul's History of the Trent Council*, and others, who relate the proceedings of those times) and not the Protestants. 4. It is most false, that they separated from the Catholick Church in point of Doctrine. It is most certain, that the party from whom the Protestants separated had relinquished the Catholick Doctrine of the Scripture, and Primitive times for five hundred years at least, and had brought in a new upstart Doctrine of Invocation of Saints, worshipping Images, Transubstantiation, half-communion as sufficient, denial of Priests's Marriage, Popes universal Monarchy, Purgatory-fire, Indulgences, Sacrifice of the Mass, Justification by Works, and many more, which were unknown to the first *Christians*, nor hath the contrary appeared by any thing *H. T.* hath said before, as the Reader of this Answer may perceive. 5. It is most false, that they separated from the Catholick Church in the point of her Government. The Government of the whole Church by one universal Bishop was never the Government of the Catholick Church. It is manifest by the first general Councils that the Pope of *Rome* was not acknowledged superior to other Patriarchs, and the *Greek Churches* have always resisted his claim of Supremacy, and many, as *Nilus* Arch-bishop of *Thessalonica*, *Barlaam* and others have written against it as an unjust claim. 6. It is false, that the *Roman Church* (falsly by *H. T.* called Catholick) was in most quiet possession of her Tenets, when *Luther* began his Separation in *Germany*, *Tyndal* in *England*. It is manifest by *Cochleus* his *History of the Hussites*, that there were a remnant of them in *Bohemia*, by *Thuanus* and *Mr. Morland* that there was a remnant of the *Waldenses* in the *Valleys of the Alpes*, by *Mr. Fox* that there was a remnant of *Lollards* or *Wiclevists* in *England*, who did reject the *Roman Doctrine* then and since taught; in many, if not all the points, in which Protestants do now oppose it. 7. It is false, that the *Roman Church* was in perfect peace and unity when *Luther* and *Tyndal* began their Separation. For the controversies about the *Virgin Marie's* immaculate Conception, about the Popes Supremacy above a Council, and sundry other were rather suppressed than composed, as the event shewed, no party relinquishing the holding their Tenets to this day, but each when occasion is offered contending for their way. 8. It is false, that the Doctrines and Government of the *Roman Church* had been the same from that time *Luther* and *Tyndal* began their Separation to the time of *Gregory the Great*, or that Protestants do confess it. It is most certain to the contrary, that since *Gregory the Great* his time the Popes universal Episcopacy, the Worship of Images, Transubstantiation, half-Communion in the Eucharist, and many other points were brought into the *Roman Church*, as *Bishop Morton* in his *Appeal from Brekeley's Apology to King James* hath proved. 9. It is also most false, that their Doctrine and Government were the same that now they are to the times of the Apostles. The contrary is proved out of the Epistle to the *Romans*, by *Bishop Robert Abbot* against *Doctor Bishop*, and by *Bishop Jewel* against *Harding* out of the *Fathers*. 10. It is false which *H. T.* saith, *It is manifest both by the publick Li-*

turgies, Councils, and Records of all Ages, no one Doctrine of Faith, or substantial Point of Doctrine professed then when Luther and Tyndal began their Separation by the Roman Church, and opposed by Protestants had ever been censured and condemned as heretical or schismatical, but all for the most part actually defined and established against ancient Hereticks, as may be seen in the Councils. The contrary is most manifest, that the Council of Chalcedon and of Carthage, in which Augustine was present, opposed the Popes Supremacy as schismatical, that the Synod of Frankford opposed the worshipping of Images as heretical, besides many other, as hath been shewed in answer to what H. T. here allegeth.

SECTION III.

The Sayings of Fathers prove not Protestants Hereticks or Schismaticks.

BUT H. T. saith, *Fathers for this Point*, though there is not one of the Fathers Sayings which he brings that speaks at all to that point of the Protestants being guilty of Schism or Heresie, or that the Church of Rome is the Catholick Church, or that her Doctrine and Government have been the same in all Ages, or that in no case there may be dividing from it, or teaching contrary to it without Heresie or Schism, yea, it is certain, that *Irenæus*, *Cyprian*, and *Austin*, thought the clean contrary, *Irenæus* opposing Pope *Victor* his Excommunication of the Eastern Bishops for not holding *Easter* with him, *Cyprian* opposing Pope *Stephanus* about Rebaptization, *Augustine* opposing Popes *Boniface*, *Zozimus*, and *Celestine*, about the Appeal of *Apianus*. But let's view their Sayings.

The first is thus cited by H. T. *In the second Age Irenæus; God will judge those who make the Schisms in the Church, ambitious men, who have not the honour of God before their eyes, but rather embracing their own interests than the unity of the Church, for small and light causes divide the great and glorious body of Christ, &c. for in the end they cannot make any Reformation so important as the evil of Schism is prejudicious, lib. 4. cap. 62.* It is likely H. T. ignorantly put [prejudicious] for [pernicious] or his Authour whence he had it, for it is in *Irenæus*, *Quanta est Schismatis perniciēs*. But it appears, 1. That he hath either not read the place, or not considered it, because he puts in [God will judge] whereas it is manifest out of the words following [But he will judge also all those who are out of the truth, that is, without the Church, but he himself is judged of no man] and from chap. 53. and following to be meant of every spiritual Disciple of Christ that had received the Spirit of God, and the Apostolical Doctrine, chap. 52. alluding to Paul's words, 1 Cor. 2. 15. and he alters [the love of God] into [the honour of God before their eyes.] 2. That the place makes nothing against Protestants; for it condemns onely them that make Schisms for small and light causes, which was most true of *Victor* then Bishop of Rome, in excommunicating the *Asian* Bishops for not keeping *Easter* as he did, reprehended by *Irenæus* in his Epistle recited by *Eusebius*, *hist. 1. lib. 5. cap. 24.* but is nothing against Protestants, who neither make

make nor continue Schisms, and that Separation which they make, they do it for very great causes. And he saith, *No Reformation can be made so important by them who divide upon light causes, as is the mischief of the Schism they make*, but this hinders not but that the Protestants Reformation, or correction (which is *Irenaeus* his word) is so necessary, that it countervails the evil of the Schism consequent. I add, the words of *Irenaeus* [the spiritual man who is a Disciple of Christ will judge all them who are out of the truth] do justify the Protestants in judging the Popes and Popish Doctors, and Churches as Schismatics and Heretics, who by their Doctrine of Popes Supremacy, Invocation of Saints, humane Satisfactions, inherent Justice justifying, Merit of Condignity, have departed from the Apostolical Faith, and by their cruel tyranny and hatred of Reformation have the most horrible and pernicious Schism that ever was in the Church of God, and the Protestants are warranted thus to judge by the holy Scripture.

The words of *Cyprian de unit. Eccles.* in the third Age against the *Novatians* of the inexpiability of their crime of Schism, that it could not be purged by suffering for Christ, nor they be Martyrs, though they died for the Confession of his Name, is too heavy a censure, yet if it were true is nothing against Protestants, who are not guilty of that Schism.

The words of *Chrysostom hom. 11. in Ephes.* shew how grievous an evil Schism is, but prove not, that they are all Schismatics, that separate from the Roman Bishop and Church, nor that the Protestants are guilty thereof, or the Romanists free.

The words of *Optatus lib. 2.* are not to any of the points now in controversy except he mean by the unity of the Episcopal Chair holding communion with the Bishop of Rome, and assert that to be the one Episcopal Chair to which all other are to be subject: which if so meant, the words are not true; if meant as *Cyprian* meant, that there is one Bishoprick of which each Bishop holds a part intirely, in respect of unity of Doctrine, the speech is good, but not against Protestants, who hold the unity of that Episcopal Chair.

The words of *Augustine lib. 4. de Symb. fidei ad Catech. cap. 10.* if they were true, yet are they nothing to the purpose, unless it were said, that by the holy Church he meant the Church of Rome, or that he who is found out of the Church of Rome is a stranger from the number of Sons, that he hath not God for his Father, nor will have the Church for his Mother, none of which are said by him. It is true, there are these words in *Austin's* second Exposition on *Psalm 21.* with us 22. ver. 18. *He who hath charity is secure or safe. No man moveth it out of the Catholick Church.* But these words are not against Protestants, but against Papists, who move it out of the Catholick Church, and confine it to the Roman, and most uncharitably damn them, who are not of their party, therein following the *Donatists*, whom *Austin* there condemns, who confined the Church to the part of *Donatus* in Africa. And there is another passage in the same Exposition which doth justify the Protestants and condemn the Papists in the main point of controversy between us, what shall determine controversies between us, they say the Church, when the great controversy is which is the Church, we say the Scripture, and so doth *Augustine* in these words. *The Testament of our Father* (that is, the Scriptures, as the words a little before shew) *is come out of any hole, I know not what Thieves would*

take it away, I know not what Persecutors would burn it. Whencesoever it is brought let it be read. Why strivest thou? We are brethren, why do we strive? The Father died not without a Will, he made his Will and so died, he is dead and risen again. So long there is contention about the Inheritance of the Dead untill the Will be publicly produced, and when the Will is brought into the publick all are silent, that the cables may be opened and rectified. The Judge hears within, the Advocates are silent, the Griers make silence, all the People is suspended, that the words of the Dead not perceiving it in the Tomb may be read. He lies without sense in the Monument, and his words are in force, Christ sits in Heaven, and is his Testament contradicted? Open, let us read, we are Brethren, why do we contend? Let our minds be pacified, our Father hath not left us without a Will. He that made the Will lives for ever, hears our voices, acknowledgeth his own. Let us read, why do we contend? Where the Inheritance it self is found, let us hold it. These words were spoken by Austin against Donatists, and may rightly be applied to Papists, who are the true cause of all the horrible Schisms and bloodsheds among Christians, because they will not try who hath the Inheritance of the Church by the Scriptures, which are God's Will, but usurp the name of the Catholick Church, as the Donatists did, and under that pretence trample under foot all their Christian Brethren in the World, who have as great and better Portion in the Inheritance of God their Father and of the Church than themselves.

The words of Augustine in his Sermon *super gestis Emeriti*, are not, that out of the Church an Heretick may have all things but Salvation. For he saith, He may have the Faith, which he would not say of the Heretick, but he speaks it of the Donatists, which whether it be true or no is nothing to Protestants; who are and may be in the true Church of Christ, and have salvation, though they be not in the Roman Church.

The words of Augustine Epist. 48. concerning the Donatists, that they were with other Christians in Baptism, in the Creed, and in the other Sacraments of the Lord, but in the Spirit of unity, in the bond of peace, and finally in the Catholick Church you are not with us; do not at all touch Protestants, who are in the Catholick Church with other Christians, though not with the Roman party, who are most like the Donatists; and the Protestants hold with Augustine in the same Epistle, that that kinde of Letters (to wit, of Bishops, such as Hilary, Cyprian, &c.) is to be distinguished from the authority of the Canon of the Scripture. For they are not so read as if testimony were brought out of them, that it may not be lawfull to think to the contrary, if perhaps they thought otherwise than the truth requires.

S E C T. IV.

H. T. hath not solved the Objections acquitting Protestants from Schism and Heresie, and condemning Papists.

It follows in H. T. Objections solved. Object. We separated onely from the Church of Rome's errors. Answ. Yes, from her Catholick and Apostolical Doctrines.

Doctrines. She doth not erre in Faith, as hath been proved. I answer therefore with St. Augustine to the Donatists; I object to you the crime of Schism, which you will deny, and I will presently prove, because you do not communicate with all Nations, cont. Petil. Add, no nor with any Nation before Luther.

I Reply, that we separate from any other than the Church of Rome's errors, and sins, is said, but not proved, and that she, that is, the Bishop of Rome and his party do not erre in Faith is not proved, but impudently said against plain evidence of Scripture, Councils, and Fathers, and I reply by retorting Augustine's words. *I object to you the crime of Schism, which you will deny, and I will presently prove, because you do not communicate with all Nations, particularly you English Reculant Papiſts H. T. and the rest are manifest Schismatics, for you separate from the Catholick Church in that you do not communicate with the Protestant Church of Christ in England.* It is false, that those who held the same truth with Protestants under other names, held no communion with any Nation before Luther; For as far as they could, and ought, they held communion with all that called on the Name of the Lord Jesus in France, Bohemia, England, and elsewhere, under the names of Waldenses, Hussites, Picards, Wiclevists, Lollards, and such like.

H. T. adds. *Object. We refused onely the Church of Rome's Innovations and Superstitions. Answ. You slander. Her Discipline and Doctrines were the same then that they have been in all precedent Ages. Did the Church perish (saith St. Augustine to the Donatists, or did she not? If she did, what Church brought forth the Donatists? (or the Protestants?) If she did not, what madness moved you to separate your selves from her, on pretence of avoiding the communion of bad men? lib. 1. cont. Gaudent. cap 7. And again, We are certain no man can justly separate himself from the communion of all Nations (yet Martin Luther and Mr. Tyndal did it) Epist. 43. And in another place, All Separation made before the drawing of the Net on the shore (at the Day of Judgement) is damnable and the Sacrilege of Schism, which surpasseth all other crimes, lib. 2. cont. Epist. Parmen.*

I reply, it is a Scolds trick to say we slander, and not to prove it. We prove out of Paul's Epistle to the Romans, that the Roman Church then held Justification by Faith without Works, that every Soul even Popes were to be subject to Princes, that the Scriptures are to be the Rule of Faith, that the Church of Rome might fail, that the Roman church is but a particular Church, that it is evil to judge Christians for not observing difference of Meats and Days, that it is Idolatry to do, as Papiſts now do, worshipping the Creature with such Worship as belongs to the Creatour, that we are not to invoke Saints in whom we believe not, with sundry more, in which the present Roman church hath swerved from the primitive. We prove out of Gregory the Great himself, that the Doctrine and Discipline of the Roman church is not the same now as it was in all precedent Ages, for he rejected the Title of Universal Bishop now usurped by the Pope, and disavowed the Worship of Images, with other things now received at Rome, and before him Pope Gelasius termed the denying the Cup to the Lay-people sacrilegious. Augustine himself hath taught us to account his words below Scripture-canon: yet his speeches touch not us, who do

not separate our selves from the church of *Christ* on pretence of avoiding communion of *bad men*; but from the Papacy on full proof that the communion of the Popish church is imposed on conditions of acknowledging such Errours, and practising such Idolatry as are damnable. We do not say, that the church perished, but that it was continued in a remnant of persecuted Saints. We need not allege any Church for our Mother, but *the Jerusalem which is above, which is the Mother of us all*, Gal. 4. 26. I judge it no better than an inconsiderate speech to say, any visible church is the Mother of *Christians*; it is in my apprehension all one as to say, the church is the Mother of the church; *Christians* or believers being all one with the church, and therefore count such speeches, whoever Father or Prelate he be that useth them, no better than ridiculous non-sense, and much more to call Bishops our Fathers in *Christ*, and yet to te'm them the Church also and our Mother. Nor need we allege a Church that brought us forth, it is sufficient we can prove our Faith to be according to the Gospel, and allege that we have been begotten by it, which way soever it be. Were not the *Iberians* a church of *Christians* who were converted by a captive Maid when there was no church there before; and the *Indians* by *Frumentius* without a Church to bring them forth? May not a man have Faith and Salvation in a Wilderness where he knows of no church? Neither did *Luther* nor *Tyndal* separate themselves from all Nations, but were expelled and persecuted by the devilish Popes and Popish Clergy of *Rome*, when they endeavoured to restore the purity of the Gospel to the *Germans*, *English*, and other Nations. If *Augustine* meant simply, that all Separation made before the Day of Judgement is damnable, he wrote that which is not true, it being contrary to *Paul's* practise, Acts 13. 9. God's command, 2 Cor. 6. 17. 2 Tim. 3. 5. 2 Thess. 3. 8. Revel. 18. 4. He himself acknowledgeth *1st. 2. cont. Epist. P. rmen. cap. 21. A man is not to associate with others when he cannot have society with them but by doing evil with them.* But if he meant it of such Separation as the *Donatists* made (as it is likely he doth) it toucheth not us, who separate not from the *Romanists*, because some evil men are tolerated, but because Errour, Idolatry, and other evils are urged on us by them; and such is their tyranny, that without yielding to them there is no communion, but in stead thereof Binishment or Burning.

Once more saith H. T. Object. We did but separate from the particular Church of *Rome*. Therefore not from the whole Church. Answ. I told you in the Question of the Churches universality in what sense the Church of *Rome* is universal or Catholick, and in what sense she is particular, take it in which acceptation you will your Consequence is false, for whosoever separates from an acknowledged true Member of the Catholick Church (and such the Church of *Rome* then was in her particular) he consequently separates from the whole, and is an Heretick or Schismatick.

I reply, neither as it is taken for the congregation of *Rome* or *Italy*, nor as it notes a collection of all the Churches holding communion with the See of *Rome* is the *Roman* Church rightly termed the Catholick Church: the nonsense and falshood thereof is shewed before Art. 5. Sect. 8. Nor is it true that he that separates from the Catholick *Roman* Church, in either sense is an Heretick or Schismatick. And to his proof I say, 1. That many Protestants deny the *Roman* Church a true Member of the Catholick Church when *Luther*

separated, but call it an *Antichristian* and malignant Church; and they that acknowledge it a true Church, in respect of the truth of being, yet not of Doctrine, and they that say it had the truth of being, say it not of the predominant part, but of the latent, conceiving it was with them as it was with *Israel* in the days of *Elijah*, that they did not own those Errours and evils which were practis'd in them, or avouched by them, though living among them, or if they did yield to them, or some of them, they had pardon, as doing it in ignorance, retaining the old Creed of the Apostles: And they attribute the truth of it to the few fundamental Articles which they held, who were in it, though very unsoundly by reason of the errours and corruptions mixed with them, which made the Church among the *Romanists* as a leprous man unfit for converse and communion, with whom though they might continue for a time in expectation of their repentance, yet they might say to *Rome* being found uncurable, as the *Jews* to *Babylon*, *Jer. 51. 9. We would have healed Babylon, but she is not healed: forsake her; and let us go every one into his own country: for her Judgement reacheth unto the Heaven, and is lifted up unto the Skies.* 2. That it is not universally true, that he who separates from an acknowledged true Member of the Catholick Church separates from the whole: there may be a Separation partial not total, privative not positive, out of prejudice and passion, in heat not in heart, as between *Paul* and *Barnabas*, *Acts 15. 39. Chrysostome* and *Epiphanius*, temporary not perpetual, in prudence though not out of absolute necessity, necessary not voluntary, just and not rash, without revolt from the Faith, or persecution of those from whom it is made. In many of these sorts there may be a Separation which may be from an acknowledged true Member of the Catholick Church, and yet no Separation from the whole. And therefore this Position of *H. T.* will not be yielded him without better proof and demonstration, that the Separation from the Church of *Rome* which Protestants have made cannot stand with union with the Catholick Church in Doctrine and Discipline. Which sure he hath not yet proved, nor is it likely he ever will: but as the fashion of these Scriblers is, sing over again and again their Cuckoos Song of the Catholick Roman Church, and that Protestants are Hereticks and Sectaries, with other Popish gibberish, though the folly and frivolousness thereof hath been a thousand times demonstrated.

I have thus at last examined these nine Articles, being moved thereto out of hope to do some souls good by recovering them out of the snare in which they are held by *Satan* and *Romish* Emisaries. If they shut their eyes against the light, their judgement will be of themselves. I shall add prayer for them, that God would open their eyes; and, if time, health, and other concurrences suit with my aims, discover the vanity of the rest of *H. T.* his *Manual*. In the mean time, not as some *Romanists* blasphemously Praise be to the Virgin Mother, in the end of their Writings, but as *Paul* concluded his Epistle to the *Romans* so do I, To God only wise be glory through **JESUS CHRIST** for ever. Amen.



The Contents.

ARTICLE I.

THe Church of Rome is not demonstrated to be the true Church of God by its succession. Page 1.

- Sect. 1. Of the Title of H. T. his Manual, in which is shewed to be a vain vaunt of what he hath not performed. *ibid.*
2. Of the Epistles prefixed, in which he ascribes too much to the Church, and deceitfully begins with her Authority. 3
3. His Tenet of the falsity of all Churches, not owning the Pope is shewed to be most absurd. 4
4. The Succession required by H. T. is not necessary to the being of a true Church. 7
5. None of the Texts alleged by H. T. prove a necessity to the being of a true Church of such Succession as he imagines. 10
6. The Succession pretended in the Roman Church proves not the verity of the Roman Church, but the contrary. 11
7. The Catalogue of H. T. is defective for the proof of his pretended Succession in the Roman Church in the first three hundred years. 13
8. The Catalogue of H. T. is defective for the proof of his pretended Succession in the Roman Church in the fourth and fifth Centuries of years. 18
9. The defect of H. T. his Catalogue for proof of his Succession in sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, tenth Centuries is shewed. 21
10. The defect of his Catalogue in the eleventh and twelfth Ages is shewed. 25
11. The defect of his Catalogue in the thirteenth and fourteenth Ages is shewed. 28
12. The defect of his Catalogue in the fifteenth and sixteenth Ages is shewed. 32
13. The close of H. T. is retorted. 36
14. H. T. hath not solved the Protestants Objections. 38

ARTICLE II.

The Contents.

ARTICLE II.

Protestants have that Succession which is sufficient to demonstrate them to be a true Church of God. 42

Sec. 1. Protestant Churches need not prove such a Succession as Papists demand. ibid.

2. The Argument of H. T. against Protestants doth as well prove the nullity of the Roman Church for want of Succession as of the Protestants. 44

3. Protestants have had a Succession sufficient to aver their Doctrine. 47

4. The Succession in the Greek Churches may be alleged for Protestants, notwithstanding the Exceptions of H. T. 51

5. The Doctrine of Romanists was not the Doctrine of the Fathers of the first five hundred years, nor is acknowledged to be so by learned Protestants. 53

6. The Answers of H. T. to the Objections of Protestants concerning their Succession are shewed to be vain, and the Apostasy of the Roman Church is proved. 56

ARTICLE III.

Such visibility of Succession as the Romanists require is not proved to be necessary to the being of a true Church. 62

Sec. 1. Exterior Consecration and Ordination of Ministers is not necessary to the being of a visible Church; and what H. T. requires of Ministers preaching and administering Sacraments is most defective in the Roman Church. ibid.

2. Neither Isai 2. 2. Matth. 5. 14. Psalm 18. (19) 4. nor the words of Irenæus, Origen, Cyprian, Chrysostome, Augustine, prove such a Church visibility as H. T. asserts. 65

3. H. T. hath not solved the Protestants Objections against the visibility of the Church, as it is by H. T. asserted. 66

ARTICLE IV.

The Church of Rome is not that one Catholick Church, which in the Apostolick and Nicene Creeds is made the object of Christian Faith. 69

Unity in non-fundamentals of Faith and in Discipline is not essentially presupposed

The Contents.

- posed to the universality of the Church militant. ibid.
2. The ambiguity of H. T. his saying of the Roman Church its unity and universality is shewed. 70
3. Unity of Discipline under one visible Head, and of Faith without division in lesser Points, is not proved from 1 Cor. 10. 17. Ephes. 1. 22, 23. John 10. 16. 1 Cor. 1. 10. Acts 4. 32. John 17. 11. and the Nicene Creed necessary to the Churches being. 71
4. It is notoriously false that the Romanists are perfectly one, or have better unity or means of unity than Protestants, and H. T. his Argument from the unity of the Church is better against than for the Roman Church. 73
5. The Argument of H. T. from the unity of a natural body is against him for Protestants. 77
6. The universality which Matth. 28. 20. Ephes. 4. 12, 13. John 14. 15, 16. Luke 1. 33. for time, Psalm 85. (86) 9. Isai 2. 2. Matth. 28. 20. Psalm 19. 4. for place, agrees not to the now Roman Church, but may be better said of the Protestants. 78
7. The words of Irenæus, Origen, Lactantius, Cyril of Jerusalem, Augustine are not for the universality of H. T. by which he asserts the Catholicism of the Roman Church but against it. 80
8. It is non-sense or false to term the Roman Church the Catholic Church, and the shifts of H. T. to avoid this Objection are discovered. 81

ARTICLE V.

THE Roman Church is neither proved to be the Catholic Church, nor the highest visible Judge of controversies, nor is it proved that she is infallible both in her Propositions and Definitions of all Points of Faith, nor to have power from God to oblige all men to obey her under Pain of Damnation, but all this is a meer impudent arrogant claim of Romanists that bath no colour of proof from Scriptures or Antiquity. 85

SECT. 1. The deceit of H. T. in asserting an Infallibility and Judicature of controversies in the Church, which he means of the Pope, is shewed. ibid.

2. Luke 10. 16. proves not the Roman or Catholic Churches Infallibility. 87

3. Matth 18. 17. or 18. 1 John 4. 6. Mark 16. 15, 16. make nothing for the claim of the Roman Church, or Popes, or oecumenical Councils Infallibility. 88

4. None of these Texts Matth. 28. 20. 1 Tim. 3. 15. Matth. 16. 18. John 14. 26. John 16. 13. Acts 15. 28. do prove the Infallibility in Points of Faith of the Catholic or Roman Church, or the Pope, or a general Council approved by him. 90

5. There may be good assurance of the Word of God and its meaning, and of our Salvation without supposing the Churches Infallibility. 93

6. Neither can the Church oblige men under Pain of Damnation to believe her her

The Contents.

her Definitions of Faith, nor is there any such Judicature as H. T. asserts to be ascribed to her, nor do any of the Fathers words cited by H. T. say it is, the words of Irenæus, Cyprian, lib.1. Epist.3. August. contr. Epist. Fundam. cap.5. &c. are shewed not to be for it, but some of them plainly against it.	97
7. The Objections from Scripture and Reason against the Infallibility which H. T. ascribes to the Church are made good against his Answers.	106
8. The Objections of Protestants against the Churches Infallibility from Fathers and Councils are vindicated from H. T. his Answers.	124

ARTICLE VI.

THE Roman Church is not demonstrated to be the true Church by her sanctity and Miracles. 131

- Sect.1. The Texts brought by H. T. to prove that the true Church is known by sanctity and Miracles are shewed to be impertinent. ibid.
2. The sanctity of men in former Ages proves not the holiness of the present Roman Church. 132
3. The imagined holiness of Benedict, Augustine, Francis, Dominick, proves not the verity of the now Roman church. 134
4. The Roman church is not proved to be the true church by the holiness of its Doctrine, but the contrary is true. 136
5. The Devotion of the Romanists shews not the holiness of the Roman church, it being for the most part will-worship and Pharisaical hypocrisy. 139
6. The power of working Miracles is no certain mark of the true church. 143
7. The Popish pretended Miracles prove not the truth of their church, nor the Miracles related by some of the Fathers. 144
8. The Objections against the proof of the verity of the Roman church from the Power of Miracles are not solved by H. T. 147

ARTICLE VII.

THE Pope's or Bishop of Rome's Supremacy or Headship of the whole church is not proved by H. T. 151

- Sect.1. Neither is it proved nor probable that Peter was Bishop of Rome, or that he was to have a Successour. ibid.
2. From being the Foundation, Matth. 16.18. and feeding the sheep of Christ, John 21.16. neither Peter's nor the Pope's Supremacy is proved. 152

The Contents.

3. The Text Matth. 16. 18. proves not any Rule or Dominion in Peter over the Apostles, but a Promise of special success in his Preaching.	156
4. John 21. 16, 17, 18. proves not Peter's Supremacy over the whole church.	159
5. Peter's charge to confirm his Brethren, Luke 22. 31. and his priority of nomination, prove not his Supremacy.	161
6. The late Popes of Rome are not Successors of Peter.	164
7. The Sayings of Fathers and Councils prove not Peter's or the Popes Supremacy.	165
8. The holy Scriptures John 19. 11. Acts 25. 10, 11. Luke 22. 25. 1 Cor. 3. 11. overthrow the Pope's Supremacy.	169
9. Cyprian, Hierome, Gregory, the councils of Constantinople, Chalcedon, Nice, are against the Pope's Supremacy.	176
10. Of the Emperours calling Councils, Pope Joan, Papiſts killing Princes excommunicate, not keeping faith with Hereticks.	182

ARTICLE VIII.

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

187

- Sect. 1. The Argument for Apostolical tradition as the Rule of Faith from the means of planting and conserving Faith at first is answered. ibid.
2. 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. 190
3. The obligation of the church not to deliver any thing as a Point of Faith but what they received proves not unwritten Tradition a Rule of Faith. 192
4. Counterfeits even in Points of Faith might and did come into the church under the name of Apostolick tradition without such a force as H. T. imagines necessary thereto. 195
5. 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. 198
6. Sayings of Fathers and Councils prove not unwritten Traditions a Rule of Faith. 202
7. Objections from Scripture for its sufficiency without unwritten Traditions are vindicated from H. T. his Answers. 205
8. H. T. solves not the Objections from Reason for the Scriptures sufficiency without unwritten Traditions. 212

ARTICLE IX.

The Contents.

ARTICLE IX.

Protestants in not holding communion with the Roman church, as now it is, in their worship, in not subjecting themselves to the Pope as their visible Head, in denying the new Articles of the Tridentin Council and Pope Pius the fourth his Bull, are neither guilty of Schism nor Heresie. But Papists by ejecting them for this cause, and seeking to impose on them this subjection are truly Schismatics, and in holding the Articles which now they do are Hereticks. 220

Sect. 1. H. T. his Definitions of Schism and Heresie are not right. *ibid.*

2. Protestants are not proved to be Sectaries by the first beginning of Reformation. 221

3. The Sayings of Fathers prove not Protestants Hereticks or Schismatics. 224

4. H. T. hath not solved the Objections acquitting Protestants from Schism and Heresie, and condemning Papists. 226

FINIS.

