

be excommunicated, the Synods of neighbour Pastors are to do as much of that as is to be done. Where then is the Necessity of such Councils at such rates? *Augustine* said that drunkenness in his time was grown so strong, that there must be a Council to suppress it. Could they do such feats as to cure Drunkenness, Whoredom, Covetousness, Pride, I would be for them.

3. If a General Council were called, it must be a most unjust Assembly. For, 1. It would be guilty of cruelty and destroying the Church of Christ, by killing so many of the Pastors as aforesaid.

2. It would be guilty of cruelty and Church destroying by the starving and desertion of the flocks at home. What will become of the poor peoples souls, when they are left to the Wolves, to Hereticks, and Deceivers, and to the temptations of their own flesh, and the world, being for ten or twenty years, or for ever deprived of their Pastors under pretense of a General Council? *Basil* in his seventieth Epistle tells the Western Bishops, that they of the East could not come to sollicite their own cause with them. For, saith he, If any one of us (*N. B.*) do for the least moment leave his Church, he presently leaveth his people to deceivers. And on this ground he shews that they could not so much as spare Bishops to be meer Messengers to them: Much less could they have spared a sufficient number to stay seven or ten years together. If any think that such Necessities are unusuall, he knows not the world. And Councils are most usefull if ever, when necessities are greatest.

3. In Councils things are carried by Votes: and so *Abassia*, *Armenia*, *Mexico*, and places so remote that they can send but one or two, would be out-voted by that corner of the world where the Council is called, that can send in proportionably an hundred for one; and so under the name of a General Council, a faction might promote any heresie or carnal interest, and no Churches would be so enslaved as those that send at the dearest rates. *Italy* and a few more parts, at *Trent*, would over-vote all the Churches of East and South, and set up what interest or opinion they please: And so if one corner of the Church can err, all may err, for all the Council: Where there is an equal interest, there should be an equal power in Councils: which will certainly be otherwise,

4. If

4. If the Pope be he that must call General Councils, we shall have none, till it will stand with his interest. And if he have not the power of calling them, no one else hath, for none pretendeth to it. And if they must be called by universal consent, three hundred years is little enough for all the world to treat of the time, place, and other circumstances, and consent.

5. And if the Pope must call them, he will easily by the very choice of the place, procure the accomplishment of his own designs.

6. Those that think it the Popes prerogative to call a Council, do also affirm (as I before shewed in the expresse words of *Binnus* and others) that a Council hath no more power then the Pope will give them, and that when they are convened by him, and have done their work, it is all of no Validity, if he allow it not. If he approve one half, that half is valid, and his approbation will make their Decrees the Articles of our faith; when as the other half which he disapproveth shall not be worth a straw. And is it not a most foolish thing for all the world to put themselves to so much charge to defray the expenses of their Bishops, and hazzard their lives, and lose their labours at home for so many years, and hazzard the Churches by their absence, when for ought they know the Bishops of the whole Christian world do but lose all their labour, and nothing shall be valid if they please not the Pope of *Rome*? And is it not most abominable justice in him thus to put all the world to trouble, and cost, and hazzard the Churches and the Pastors lives, for nothing, when if the infallible spirit be only in himself, he might have done the work himself, and saved all this cost and labour.

7. By what Justice shall all the Catholick Church be obliged by the Decrees of such a General Council? Is it by Law, or Contract? If by Law, it is by Divine Law, or by Humane. If by Divine, let it be shewed that ever God made such a Government for the Catholick Church, and then take all. If by Humane Laws, it is impossible, and therefore not to be affirmed. For no Humane Sovereign hath power to make Laws for all the world. If you say is it by contract, then 1. All those Nations that thought not meet to send any Bishops to the Council, will be free. 2. And so will all those be that sent Bishops who dissented from the rest. For contract or Consent bindeth none but

but Contracters or Consenters. And so *England* is not bound by the Council of *Nice*, *Ephesus*, *Calcedon*, *Constantinople*, &c.

8. By what Justice shall any people be required to send Delegates, on such terms as these to Councils, or to stand to their definitions when they have done? When our faith and souls are preciouser things then so boldly to cast upon the trust of a few Delegates so to be chosen and employed? What Bishops other Countries will choose, we know not. And for our own, 1. In almost all Countries it is the Princes that choose, or none must be chosen but who they will, which is all one. 2. If the Bishops choose, its those that are highest with the secular power that will have the choice, who perhaps may choose such as are contrary to the judgement of most of that Church that is thought to choose them. Most Nations have a Clergy much at difference. The Remonstrants and Contramonstrants in *Holland* would not have chosen like members for the Synod. In the Bishops days men of one mind were chosen here in *England* to Convocations: The next year we had a Learned Assembly that put down the Prelacy, for which a Convocation had formed an Oath to be imposed on all Ministers but a little before. And why should the judgement of the Prelates be taken for the judgement of the Church of *England*, any more then the other, when for number, learning and piety (to say the least) they had no advantage (laying aside ignorant, ungodly men, in point of number.) Till the Spanish match began to be treated on, the Bishops of *England* were ten, if not twenty to one Augustinians, Calvinists, or Arminians: Now the Arminians would be thought the Church of *England*, and their doctrine, agreeable to the doctrine of that Church. Would they not accordingly have differed, if they had been sent to a General Council? How bitterly are the Articles of the Church of *Ireland* decryd by the Arminian Bishops since sprung up both in *Ireland* and *England*? so that if Delegates be sent to any Council, they may speak the minds of those that sent them, (which perhaps is the King, or a small prevailing party,) but not of the rest: (which perhaps may the best and most.) If *Jeremiah* of *Constantinople* be of a Council, he will go one way. If *Cyril* be of a Council, he will go another way: And his counterfeit Successor undo what he did.

9. No Church that sendeth three or four Bishops to represent a thousand or two thousand Pastors, can be sure how those Bishops will carry it when they come thither. For ought we know they may betray our cause, and cross their instructions: They may be perverted by the reasonings of erroneous men, or bribed by the powerfull: And to cast our faith on so slender an assurance, is little wisdom.

10. If consent only bind us to the Decrees of Councils (to submit to them as our Rule,) then is Posterity bound that did not consent as their Fathers did, or are they not? If not, we are free? If yea, by what bond? And then why do not the *Grotians* in Ireland and England obey the Antiarminian Decrees of the Churches in both? Did not the Church of England send Bishop *Carlton*, Bishop *Hall*, Bishop *Davenant* (afterward a Bishop) Dr. *Ward*. Dr. *Goad*, and *Balcanquhall* Episcopal Divines to the Synod of *Dort*, and so England was a part of that Synod? And yet the *Grotians* and *Arminians* think not themselves bound to receive the Doctrine of that Synod, nor to forbear reproaching it.

11. It is unjust that any (especially most) of the Churches should be obliged by the votes of others, and oppressed by Majority, merely because their distance, or poverty, or the age, or weakness of their Pastors disableth them to send any, or an equal number, or to defray the charge of their abode, &c. Ah if good Pope *Zachary*, or Archbishop *Boniface* had considered that the essence or unity of the Church did consist in a General Council, that must be fetched partly from the Antipodes, they would have thought better on it before they had excommunicated *Virgilinus*, for saying that there were Antipodes, or *quod alius mundus, & alii homines sunt sub terras*. Dr. *Heylin* tells us in his *Geography*, Lib. 1. pag. 25. that *Bede* (*de ratione temporum*, cap. 32.) calleth it a fable that there are Antipodes, and not to be believed: and adds that *Augustine*, *Lactantius*, and some other of the Learned of those better times condemned it as a ridiculous incredible fable, whose words (saith he) I could put down at large, did I think it necessary.] And did that age dream that the Being or Unity of the Church, or the salvation of the Believers soul depended on this Article, that a General Council, partly called from the Antipodes must be the Churches

Head or Governours? or that the Pope at least must be acknowledged and obeyed by every Christian soul that will be saved at the Antipodes? And Sir *Fradcis Drake* and *Cavendish* would not have been so famous for compassing the world, if men had understood, that when the Gospel is spread through the earth, so many poor old Bishops must ordinarily take half such Journies or voyages to do their business. If the Decree of the Council of *Constance* had been executed, to have had a General Council every ten years, many would scarce have had time to go and come. But the charitable Church of *Rome* hath found out a Remedy, not only by the rarity of their Councils (let them decree what they will to the contrary) but also by condemning the most of the Churches, and the remotest, as Hereticks, and sending them to Hell, to save them a journey to the General Council.

12. Moreover such Councils are unjust, because of the multitude of Bishops that must there meet and cannot be heard speak. As the case standeth already, there are many more Bishops in the world then can meet, and speak, and hear in one, or two, or three Assemblies: And many thousand more may be made. If I should say that all the Rectors of particular Churches, whom they call Parish Presbyters, are Bishops, and have votes in Councils, they would easilier deny it then disprove it, or invalidate the proofs already brought: But (to proceed on their own grounds) me thinks they that make him a Bishop who hath Presbyters and Deacons under him, should admit all those Pastors of particular Churches that have Presbyters under them, as their Curates, which are many. Or if they say that only Cities must have Bishops, yet must they on their own grounds admit a Bishop for each City: And if every City in a few Kingdoms in *Europe* had a Bishop in the Council, there would be no room for all the rest of the world. But how prove they that Countrey Parishes may not have Bishops? Why may not (on their own grounds) every four or six parishes have one? Hath God forbid it? where? and when? sure they will not say it is of Divine institution that a Bishop have just so many Parishes and Presbyters under him, and neither more nor less. The number is confest to be left undetermined. And what if Christian Princes, Bishops and people agree to settle Bishops in every

every such small number of Parishes, by what Law can they exclude them from a General Council? If they say, by the Canons of former Councils; I answer 1. Those Canons are contrary to Scripture. 2. They contradict one another. 3. They themselves do not obey the Canons of many such Councils. 4. Those Councils have no power to make Laws; much less Laws that shall reach to this time and place. But they will say *Pauls* command to *Titus* 1. 3, 5. and the example *Acts* 14. 23. is only of ordained Elders or Bishops in every City: therefore they may not ordain them any where but in Cities. But I deny the consequence. Most ancient interpreters by Elders, *Acts* 14. 23. Understand meer Presbyters: And then it would as much follow that Presbyters must be ordained no where but in Cities: What if I can prove that the Apostles never gathered a solemn Assembly of Christians for Divine Worship any where but in Cities; or that they never administered the Lords Supper any where but in Cities? will it follow that therefore we ought not to Assemble or administer the Sacrament any where but in Cities? But what if this were granted? they cannot deny but every corporation, such as most of our Burroughs and Market Towns in *England* are, may truly be called Cities in that Scripture sence. And if every such City had a Bishop, Even *England*, *France*, *Germany*, and *Italy*, a little spot of the world, would make Bishops enough for two or three Councils; and more then could Assemble and do the work.

Two shifts they have against the over-greatness of the number. One is the course now taken: to have but one Bishop over many Cities, and a very large Circuit of the Countrey.

The other is, to depute one out of many from every Countrey to represent the rest; and so it shall be a Representative General Council, though not a Real. But for the first, 1. Who hath authority to make such diminutions? 2. What if those that are supposed to have that authority, shall be otherwise minded? 3. Its apparently against the word of God, and tendeth to the frustrating of the Office that true Bishops should be so rare. By their own Rule, each City should have one. And let *Brerewoods* Enquiries, or any such writers help you to conjecture how many that would be.

And for the other way, 1. A Representative General Council is another thing, quite different from a Real. 2. What word

of God have they to prove such a Representative Council? Doubtless none: And will they give us a Church form, and center of Unity, meerly of their own brains, upon supposition that it is prudential? 3. Men are of exceeding different degrees of understanding, and of different judgements actually: so that if *e. g.* *England* should send one, or two, or ten men to represent the rest to a General Council, its more then possible that they may give their judgements in many points so far contrary to the minds of those that sent them, that twenty or an hundred to one at home may be against them. For we cannot send our understandings and all our reasons with them to the Council when we send them. And so no man can say that any such Council doth expresse the mind of the greater part of the Church. 4. By this rule you may reduce a General Council to a dozen men, or to the four or five Patriarks: For all the rest may choose them as their representatives. 5. But its not to be expected that all the Churches should be satisfied of the lawfulness or fitness of such substitutions and representations: And therefore they will not consent or elect men for such a power and work: And who may justly force them?

13. Moreover such Councils are unjust, because there can be no just satisfaction given by men that live at so vast a distance, that this great number that come thither are truly Bishops: yea or Presbyters either. Its not possible under many years time, so much as to take any satisfactory account of their ordination, and abiding in that office, and the truth of their deputations or elections. And when (in their elected Representative Councils) there will be perpetual controversies between several parties (as there is in Parliaments) whether it be this man or that which is truly elected, in how many years will all these be decided, before they begin their work? So that I may well conclude, laying all these seven considerations together, the distance of places, the age and state of the Bishops, the state of the Civil Governments which they live under, their necessary labours at home, and the ruine that will befall their Churches by so much absence, the diversity of their languages, the multitude of the Bishops, and the difficulty of knowing the Ordination and Qualifications of persons so remote to prove their capacity, I say all these together do plainly shew that such

General

General Councils are impossible and unjust: and therefore not the standing Government or form of the Church, or the center of its Unity.

Argum. 4. *As the Synod it self is impossible, needless, and unjust; so it is Impossible that they should do the work of a Head or Sovereign Power, if they could Assemble: therefore they are not appointed thereunto.*

The Antecedent is partly manifest by what is said from their different languages and other considerations. Moreover 1. The persons that will have appeals to them, and causes to be judged (if really they will do the work of a Sovereign Power and Judge) will be so many millions, that there will be no room for them about their doors, nor any leisure in many years to hear their causes. If you say, It was not so in former Councils, I answer, that is because they were not truly General, or were called in such times when the Church did lie in a narrow compass, and not in such remote parts of the world; and because they were assembled indeed but occasionally, to advise upon and determine some one particular mans case, or few, and never took upon them to be the Sovereign power or head of the Church, or its essential form or Center of Unity. 2. These millions of persons that have so many causes, will have so far to travail, that it will put them to great cost and labour to come and attend and bring all their witnesses. And if they be not sounder bodyed then our English Souldiers, the poor people of *Mexico* and other parts of those Indies (to look no further) will be a great part of them dead by the way before they can reach the General Council, e. g. if it should be in the midst of *Europe*. 3. And the Council will not be competent Judges of so many causes which by distance must needs be much unknown in many weighty Circumstances, whose cognisance is necessary. 4. And lastly, such Councils will sit so seldom, that the work will be undone.

Argum. 5. *If God had intended that such a Council should have been the form of his Church, or the necessary Governour of it, he would have acquainted us with his will concerning some certain Power to summon them, (or would have authorized some or other to call such a Council). But he hath not acquainted us with his will herein, nor authorized any to call such a Council: therefore is*

It was one of the Reasons of the Council of Carthage to P. Celestine to prove the invalidity of the Papal judgments upon appeals from other Countries, because the witness necessary to a just decision could not go far.

was not his intent that it should be the form or necessary Governour of his Church.

Either this Council must meet by an *Authoritative call*, or by *consent*. If by *such a call*, who must call them? The Popes pretence to this Authority is voluminously and unanswerably confuted long ago; and its well known, what ever *Baronius* say, that the ancient Councils were called by the Emperours, and many since have been called by Emperours and Cardinals. And if you say that it belongs to the Emperour, I answer, what hath he to do to summon the subjects of the *French, Spaniards, Turks, Ethiopian, &c*? And by this it appears that we never had true Universal Councils: They were but General as to the Roman world, or Empire. For (who ever preceded) it is certain that the Emperours called them. And what had *Constantine, Martinian, Theodosius*, or any Roman Emperour to do, to call the subjects in *India, Ethiopia, Persia, &c.* to a Council? Nor *de facto*, was there any such thing done. Is it not a wonderfull thing that the Pope and all his followers should be, or seem so blinded to this day, as to take the Empire for the whole earth, or the Roman world for all the Christian world! yet this is their all. If you say that it must be done by the *consent* of Princes, then either of *Christian Princes* or of *all*. If of the *Christian* only, you must exclude the Bishops that are under *Mahometan and Heathen Princes*, and then it will be no *General Council*; especially if it be now as it was in the time of *Jacob à Vitriaco* the Popes Legate in the East, who saith that the Christians of the Easterly parts of *Asia* alone, exceeded in number the Christians both of the Greek and Latine Churches. And whether it be all Princes, or only Christian Princes that should consent, who can tell whether ever it will be? God hath not promised to lead them to such a consent: And they are unlikely of themselves, as being many and distant, and of different interests and apprehensions, and usually in wars with one another, so that if an age should be spent in treating of a General Council among them, its ten to one that the treaty will be in vain, and its next to an impossibility that all should consent. Besides; no man can shew a Commission from God to enable them, and only them to such a work.

But if you say that it must be done by the *consent* of the Bishops themselves, the Impossibility (moral) is apparent, who will be

be found that will be at the cost and pains to agitate the business among them? No one can appoint the time and place but by consent of the rest. Who doth it belong to, to travail to the Indies, *Aethiopia*, *Egypt*, *Palestine*, and all the rest of the world, to treat with the Bishops about the time and place of a Council? And how many lives must he have that shall do it? And when he findeth them of a hundred minds, what course shall he take, and how many more journeys about the world must he make, to bring them to an agreement? But I am ashamed to bestow more words on so evident a case.

Argum. 6. *The Head or Sovereign of the Church (as of every body Politick) hath the Legislative Power over the whole. The Pope or a General Council have not the Legislative Power over the whole. Therefore the Pope or General Council are not the head or Sovereigns of the Church.*

The Major is of unquestionable verity in Politicks. Legislation is the first and chief work of Sovereignty.

The Minor is proved, 1. *Ad hominem* by the confession of the chief Opponents, *Grotius de Imperio summar. potest.* doth purposefully maintain it: and so do others: (See of this *Lud. Mollinæus* new Book supposed against the Presbyterians: his *Paranesis*.) 2. It is the high Prerogative of Christ the true King and Sovereign of the Church, which none must arrogate. He was faithfull in all his house as was *Moses*. His Law is perfect: It is sufficient to make the man of God perfect: even a sufficient rule of faith and life: No man must add thereto, nor take ought therefrom, but do whatsoever he hath commanded, *Deut. 12. 32.* To the Law and to the Testimony: if they speak not according to these, it is because there is no light in them, *Isa. 8. 20.*

Object. But men may make By-laws under Christ and his Laws. *Ans.* True: but as those are in this case no proper Laws, so no man or men may make them for the Universal Church. For the business of those Laws is only to determine of circumstances which God hath made necessary in genere, and left to the determination of men in specie: And we may well know that there was some special reason why Christ did not determine of these himself. And the reason is plain; even because that they depend so much on the several states, capacities, customs, &c. of men, that

The Papists confess that Pope and Council cannot make new Articles of faith, in se, but quoad nos only. And they say they have received by Tradition the doctrines, which they teach.

that they are to be varied accordingly in several times and places. If one standing Law would have fitted all the world, or all ages in these matters, Christ would have made it himself. For if you say he makes some Laws, and neglect others that are of the like kind, and might as well have been done by himself, you make him imperfect and insufficient to his work. And if it be not fit that one Universal Law be made for the world, then a Council must not make it.

And as the sufficiency of Christs law, so the nature of the things declares it, that these matters must not be determined of by an universal Law. Should there be an universal Law to determine what day of the week, or what hour of the day every Lecture or occasional Sermon shall be on? Or what place every Congregation shall meet in? Or where the Minister shall stand to preach? Or what Chapters he should read each day? Or what Text he should preach on? or how long? Whether by an hour-glass or without? in what habit of apparel particularly (when many a poor man must wear such as he can get) yea or what gestures or postures of body to use (when that gesture in one Countrey signifieth reverence, which in another rather signifieth neglect) with abundance the like.

And the same is plain from the nature of the Pastoral office. Every Bishop or Pastor is made by Christ the Ruler of the flock in such cases, and they are bound to obey him, *Heb. 13. 17.* And therefore a General Council must leave them their work to do which Christ hath put upon them, and not take it out of their hands: especially when being in the place, and seeing the variety of circumstances, they are more competent judges then a General Council at such distance.

The plain truth is, Christ hath left them none of that work to do which belongeth to a Head or Sovereign, but they make work for themselves, that there may seem to be a Necessity of a power to do it. The Church needeth none of their Laws. Let us have but the Holy Scriptures, and the Law of Nature, and the civil Laws of men, and the guidance of particular Pastors *pro tempore*, and the fraternal Consultations and Agreements of Councils, not to make any more work, but to do this foresaid work unanimously, and the Church can bear no more; there is nothing left for Legislators Ecclesiastical to do. We can spare their

their Laws, and therefore their power and work. Their business is but to make snares and burdens for us; and therefore we can live without them, and cannot believe that the felicity, or unity, or essence of the Church consisteth in them.

Argum. 7. *All the inferior officers do derive their power from the suprem.* All the other officers of the Catholick Church do not derive their power from the Pope or a General Council: therefore a Pope or General Council are not the suprem.

The Major is an unquestioned Maxime in Politicks. Its essential to the Sovereign to be the fountain of power to all under him. Yea if it be but a deputed derived Sovereignty, *secundum quid* so called, as the Viceroy of Mexico, Naples, &c. yet so far he must be the fountain of all inferiour power.

The Minor is maintained by most Christians in the world. Every Bishop or Presbyter hath his power immediately from Jesus Christ as the Efficient cause, though man must be an occasion, or *causa sine qua non*, or *per accidens*. The Italian Bishops in the Council of Trent could not carry it against the Spaniards, that the Pope only as Head was immediately *jure divino*, and the rest but *mediante Papa*.

Moreover it is easie to prove out of Scripture that God never set up any Sovereign power in his Church (personal or collective) to be the fountain of all other Church power, nor sendeth us to have recourse to any such for it. Nor can they prove such a power, on whom it is incumbent.

And lastly its most easie to prove *de facto*, that the Bishops or Presbyters now in the several Churches in the world, did not receive, and do not hold their power from any such visible Head, whether Pope or Council. Though the Popelings do, yet so do not all the rest of the Christian world. Who are not therefore no Ministers or no Church of Christ, whatever these bare affirmers and pretenders may imagine: Nor are all the Ministerial actions in the world null, which are not done by a power from him. And even the Papists themselves will few of them pretend to receive their several powers of Priesthood from a General Council. This therefore is not the Sovereign power, or head of the Church.

Argum. 8. *The Head or Sovereign Power hath the finally decisive judgement, and in great causes all must, or may appeal to them.*

them. *A General Council hath not the finally decisive judgement, nor may all men in great causes appeal to them. Therefore a General Council is not the Head or Sovereign power.*

The Major is undenyable. The Minor is proved, 1. In that it is not known, nor hath the world any rule or way to know in what cases we must appeal to a General Council, and what not; and what is their proper work. 2. In that an appeal to them is an absolute evasion of the guilty, and in vain to the innocent, because of the rarity of such Councils, or rather the nullity. 3. Because the prosecuting of such an Appeal is impossible to most of the world (as is before shewed) and were it possible, it would be so tedious and laborious a course, that its ridiculous in most to mention such Appeals.

Argum. 9. *The Sovereign or Head of the Church (as of every Body Politick,) hath power to deprive and denude any other of their power. The Pope or General Council hath not power to do so: therefore they are not of the Head or Sovereigns of the Church.*

The Major is a known principle in polity: He that giveth power, can take it away: And it's confessed by the Opponents in this case.

The Minor I prove, 1. Because else it would be in the power of the Pope or Council, whether Christ shall have any Ministry and Church or not. They may at least make havock of it at pleasure. But that's false. 2. As is before said, we receive not our power from them: therefore they cannot take it from us. 3. The Holy Ghost doth make us Over-seers of the flock, *Act. 20. 28.* and lay a Necessity on us, and denounce a woe against us, if we preach not the Gospel: and hath no where given us leave to give over his work, if the Pope or a Council shall forbid us. 4. And they can shew no Commission from Christ that giveth them such a power.

Arg. 10. *If it were the form or Essence of the Church to have a humane visible Head, then our Relation to such a head would be essential to our Membership or Christianity. But the Consequence is false: therefore so is the Antecedent.*

The falseness of the consequent is apparent, 1. In that it cruelly and ungroundedly unchristeneth all that do not believe in such a visible Head: That is, the greatest part by far of the Christian

Christians in the world ; And 2. By the ensuing argument : And the necessity of the consequence is evident of it self.

Argum. 11. *If such a visible Head were essential to the Church, and so to our Christianity, then should we all be Baptized into the Pope or a General Council, as truly and necessarily as we are baptized into the Church. But we neither are nor ought to be so baptized into the Pope or a General Council ; therefore they are not essential to the Church or our Christianity.*

The Major (*viz.* the Consequence) is clear, and not denied by the Papists, who affirm that Baptism engageth the baptized to the Pope. He that is united to the body, is united to the head : he that is listed into the Army, is listed to and under the General. He that is entred into the Common-wealth, is engaged to the Sovereign thereof.

But that we are not baptized to the Pope or a General Council, is proved, 1. Because neither the form of Baptism, nor any word in Scripture doth affirm such a thing. 2. No persons in Scripture times were so baptized : Men were baptized before there was a Pope at Rome, or a General Council. And afterward none were baptized to them, at least for many hundred years : otherwise then as they were entred into the particular Church of Rome, who were *Inhabitants there*. 3. Never any was baptized to Peter or Paul, or any of the Apostles : saith Paul, 1 Cor. 1. 13. *was Paul crucified for you, or were ye baptized in the name of Paul?* They must be baptized into the name of no visible Head, but him that was crucified for them. 4. The Apostle fully resolveth all the doubt, 1 Cor. 12. describing the body into which we are baptized, ver. 13. And he entitleth it from the head, Christ, ver. 12, but acknowledgeth no other head, either co-equal with Christ, or subordinate : The highest of the other members are called by Paul but eyes and hands, and thus Apostles, Prophets, Teachers, Miracles, gifts of healing, helps, Governments, are only said to be set in the Church, as eyes and hands in the body ; but not over the Church as the Head or Sovereign Power : ver. 17, 18, 19, 28, 29. so that though he that is baptized into the Church, is baptized into an Organical body, and related to the Pastors, as to hands and eyes, yet not as to a head, nor as to a representative body neither. And me thinks neither Pope nor Council should pretend to be more then

Apostles, Prophets, and Teachers, and Governments. If the form of baptism had but delivered down the authority of the Pope or a Council, as it did the authority and name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, Tradition would have been a tolerable Argument for them, though Scripture had been silent. But when the Baptismal Tradition it self is silent, and it is a doctrine so monstrously strange to the Primitive Church, that all the baptized are baptized to the Pope or a General Council, I know no remedy but they must both put up their pretenses.

Argum. 12. *The Essence of the Church into which they were baptized, was parts of the doctrine which the Catechumeni were taught, (and all at age should learn) before their baptism. The Sovereignty or Headship of Pope or Council was no part of the Doctrine which (by the Primitive Church) the Catechumeni were taught, and ought to learn, before their baptism. Therefore the Sovereignty or Headship of Pope or Council was not then taken to be of the Essence of the Church.*

The Major is evident, 1. In that the Catholick Church was in the Creed: and it's essentials there briefly expressed in those terms [*Holy Catholick Church, and Communion of Saints.*] 2. In that Church History fully acquainteth us that it was the practice of the Catethists and other Teachers to open the Creed to them before they baptized them, and therein the Article of the *Catholick Church*, and the *Communion of Saints*.

The Minor is proved by an induction of all the Records of those times, which in gross may now suffice according to our present intended brevity to be mentioned. There is no one Writer of many hundred years, no not *Origen*, *Tertullian*, *Irenaeus*, or any other that purposely recite the Churches belief which the Catechumeni were taught, nor *Cyril*, (or *John Hierosol.* or any other who open those Articles to the Catechumens, that ever once mention the Doctrine of the Headship of the Pope or Council, when they open the Article of the *Catholick Church*; nor yet at any other time. If they affirm that they did, let them prove it if they can.

Argum. 13. *As it is high Treason in a Republick to deny the Sovereign, and to be cut off from him, is to be cut off from the Common-wealth; so it would be a damning unchristening sin to deny the Headship of the Pope or General Council, if they were indeed* the

the Head of the Church. But it is no such damning unchristening sin: Therefore they are not the Head of the Church.

The Major is plain from the Nature of Sovereignty. The Minor is certainly proved, 1. Because it is never mentioned in Scripture, nor any ancient Writer for many hundred years, as a state of Apostasie, nor as a damning sin, nor as any sin, to deny the said Headship of the Pope or Council. 2. Because else most of the Christians of the world at this day are Apostates and unchristened: Or if that seem a tolerable conclusion to the *Romanists*; Yet 3. Because then Christ had no Church for some hundreds of years, which I know they will not think so tolerable a conclusion; For to dream that the ancient Christians did know any Head of the Church but Christ, or were engaged in loyalty to the Pope or Council, is a disease that few are lyable to, except such as are strangers to the writings of those times, or such as read them with *Roman spectacles*, resolved what to find in them before hand.

Argum. 14. *All Christians are bound to study or labor to be acquainted with the Laws of the Sovereign power of the Church: All Christians are not bound to study or labor to be acquainted with the Laws of Popes and Councils: Therefore the laws of Popes and Councils are not the Laws of the Sovereign power of the Church.*

The Major is proved, in that all subjects must obey the Laws of the Sovereign power: But they cannot obey them unless they know them. Therefore they are bound to endeavour to know them.

The Minor is proved, 1. In that they being written in *Latine* and *Greek*, which a very small part of the Christians of the world do understand, and their Teachers not sufficiently expounding them, and they being more copious and voluminous, more obscure and uncertain (of which next) then for all private Christians to understand, the people cannot learn these, having enough to do to learn Gods Word. 2. The Papists that deny the use of the Holy Scriptures to the people in a known tongue, and deny the necessity of understanding them, will sure say the same of their Decretals and Canons, unless they mean to set them up above the Scripture, as well as equal them thereto.

Argum. 15. *The Sovereign Head of the visible Church and*

Center of our unity, must be evident, that all the Christian world may know it: The Pope and General Council are not such. Therefore neither of them are the Head of the Visible Church.

The Major is confessed by the Opponents; and it's plain, because men cannot obey an unknown power.

The Minor is known by common experience. For many a year together (by Bellarmine's confession) learned and wise men could not tell which was the true Pope; yea their Councils could not tell. Most of the Christian world to this day cannot discern his Commission for that power which he pretendeth to. A true General Council now no man can know, because it is a *non ens*. Their pretended General Councils are so ravelled in confusion, that they are not agreed among themselves which are indeed such, and which not: but many are rejected, and many suspected (of which Bellarmine giveth us a list) and those that one receiveth, another rejecteth; and the most by far are rejected by most of the Christian world. And when some would take up with the four first, and some with six, and some with eight, the Papists deridingly ask them, whether the Church hath not as much authority now as it had then? And how shall the Christian world know whether it were a true General Council or not? Of which see the difficulties first to be resolved, which I have recited in my Disputations against Popery.

Argum. 16. *The Laws of the Sovereign Power of the Church must be certain (or else how shall we know what to obey) The Laws of Popes and General Councils are not certain: Therefore, &c.*

The Minor is proved by experience. The Popes Decretals are many unknown, and many proved forgeries (by Blondell *ubi sup.* and many others) beyond all question: and none of them proved Laws to the Church. The Canons of the first Council of Nice are not agreed on among the Papists. Many others are proved forged: Many are flatly contrary to each other (as I have shewed *ubi sup.*) and how then shall Christians know what to obey? The ancient Canons condemned the gesture of kneeling on the Lords day (and consequently then at the Lords Supper) the reading of the Heathens Books, and many such things which are now taken for lawful: The later Councils that contradict the former, do seem to most of more question-
able

able authority then they. And what Councils are to be received and what rejected, they are not agreed among themselves, nor have any certain Rule to know by on which they are agreed: Nor will their Popes or Councils yet resolve them this great question. So that Christians are at a loss concerning these Laws, and know not which of them they are obliged by, and which not.

Argum. 17. *If the Pope or Council be the Head of the Church, then must their Laws be preached to the people by their Teachers. But the Laws of Popes and Councils need not be preached to the people by their Teachers: Therefore, &c.*

The reason of the Major is, because the Laws that they must obey in matters spiritual in order to salvation, the Ministers must preach to them. But these are pretended to be such: Therefore, &c.

As to the Minor, 1. It would be but an unhandsome thing in their own hearing, for Preachers to take their Texts out of the Canons or Decretals, and preach these day after day to the people: which yet they have need to do many a year, if the obedience of them be our necessary duty. 2. Ministers are commanded to preach only the Gospel, and it is said to be sufficient or able to make us perfect, and build us up to salvation. Therefore we need not preach the Canons or Decretals.

Argum. 18. *While a Visible Head cannot be agreed on even by those that would have the Church united in such a Head, it is all one to them as if there were no such Head, and the union still is unattainable by them. But even among the Papists themselves a Visible Head is not, cannot be agreed on: Therefore, &c.*

What good will it do to say we must center some where, and know not where, and obey some body, and know not who? The *Italians* and *Spanish* make the Pope the Infallible Head, and say a General Council without him may err, and is but the body. The *French* make the Council the Head, and say the Pope may err, and that the infallibility (such as they plead for) is in the Council. It is not a Head, but this Head, *in specie*, that is, the form of the Church, if any such be: And therefore they must needs (according to their own principles) be of divers Churches, while they place the Sovereignty in several sorts and persons. Till they better agree

agree among themselves in their Fundamentals and Essentials of the Church, we have small encouragement to think of uniting on any of their grounds.

Argum. 19. *The Sovereign Power or Headship over the Church is a thing undoubtedly revealed in the Holy Scripture: (For we cannot imagine that the Scripture should be silent in so weighty a point, without intolerable accusation of it.) The Sovereign Power or Headship of Pope or Council is not revealed in the Holy Scripture. Therefore, &c.*

They have not yet produced a Text to prove either of them. Those produced by the *Italians* for the Popes Headship, are disclaimed by the *French*, as meaning no such thing; and our Writers have largely manifested their abusing of the Text. So have they done of those that are brought for the Headship of Councils. These texts are spoke to so fully by *Chamier*, *Whitaker*, *Amesius*, and abundance more, that I think it in vain to do it here again. That of *1 Tim. 3. 15.* that the Church is the pillar and ground of Truth, doth not speak a word of a General Council, nor a word of Headship: The whole Church united in Christ, is the Pillar and Ground, that is, the certain Receptacle and retainer of the Truth, the Law of Christ being written in their hearts.

None seems more to favour their conceit then *Ephes. 4. 15, 16.* which *Grotius* fastens on. But even that is against them, and not for them. For 1. It is Christ and only Christ that is here said to be the head, and all other parts contradistinguished, and excluded from Headship, and the Body is not said to be united in them. 2. And it is by association, and mutual communication of their several gifts, that the parts are compacted together, and edifie the whole; and not by meeting in any one, and deriving from it.

Object. *But were not the Apostles General Officers, and so the Church united in General officers?* Answ. This is little to the Question. For 1. the Apostles had one among them to be the Sovereign or Head of the rest, but were of equal power. 2. Nor did a major part of their whole number make such a Head for the Church to unite in, nor do we read that ever a Major vote carryed it among them against a Minor; for they were all guided by the Spirit. Yet its true that they met often together then a General Council can. 2. The Apostles as extraordinarily qualified